The Eucharistic Theologies of Nineteenth Century Anglican and Lutheran Repristination Movements Compared

by

J. C. NAUMANN, B.A., M.Div.,

being a thesis submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in the University of Glasgow

March 1990

A C K N O W L E D G E M E N T S

In preparing this dissertation I am indebted to my supervisor, the Reverend Doctor Gavin White of the department of Theology and Church History of Trinity College, Glasgow University. I am also deeply grateful to my wife, Deaconess Cheryl Naumann, who read and proof-read these pages.

JONATHAN NAUMANN

S U M M A R Y

The existence of movements in nineteenth century Lutheranism and Anglicanism to revive (repristinate) the doctrines and practices of a former age is well known. The scope of this dissertation only includes aspects of the eucharistic theologies of these movements, and then only as taught by a few representative theologians. The two repristination movements that are compared in this respect are the Missouri Synod of Lutheranism (the Confessional Lutherans - whose main theologian was C.F.W.Walther) and the Oxford Movement in Anglicanism (the Tractarians - whose main theologian of the Eucharist was E.B.Pusey).

To investigate the eucharistic theologies of these movements, major writings on the doctrine of the Eucharist by these chosen representatives were studied and compared. An attempt was made to discover how close these theologians came to sharing a common eucharistic theology.

The eucharistic writings of the two movements were found to be similar in their dependence upon quotations from historic eucharistic literature to promote orthodoxy in the nineteenth century. But on the Lutheran side material from the sixteenth century was usually reissued without comment in compilation

volumes. Although Walther and others usually systematised Reformation-era material for easier reference in the nineteenth century, few additions or reinterpretations were thought necessary.

On the Anglican side, Pusey quoted from the early Church Fathers extensively, often with little comment or addition, but was compelled to reinterpret much eucharistic material. This is because the task before the Oxford Movement, of promoting an orthodoxy which was not recognised by many Anglicans, required creative writing which Lutheran Confessionalism did not. For the Tractarians, Anglican doctrinal material from sixteenth century had to be reinterpreted to conform with the desired orthodoxy.

Unlike the Confessional Lutherans with their sixteenth century material on the Eucharist completely usable, Tractarians such as Pusey and Wilberforce had to struggle with eucharistic concepts in the authoritative writings available to them and, through a considerable amount of creative thinking on their part, articulate a eucharistic theology which conformed to their ideal of catholic doctrine. Hence a fuller body of nineteenth century eucharistic thought and writing is evident from the Tractarian side than from the Lutheran.

The method of investigation consisted of analysing certain issues involved in eucharistic

theology and comparing the treatments of those issues in authoritative Lutheran and Anglican sources. How and why the treatments resembled and differed from one another was explored.

Particular attention was paid to the doctrine of the Real Presence, because of the influence of that doctrine upon other eucharistic issues and questions.

Because, unlike the Confessional Lutherans, the Tractarians received a hostile reaction from within their church to their eucharistic theology, a sample was included of some of the arguments presented by Anglican opposition to the eucharistic theology of the Oxford Movement.

It was discovered that the similarity between the goals of the Anglican and Lutheran repristinationists to restore what they believed to be true catholic orthodoxy included a corresponding similarity in many of their theological presuppositions. For the most part they shared a conservative reverence for the Bible, the creedal formularies of Christian antiquity and of certain Reformation formularies.

A completely unified approach to the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist did not materialise; yet despite the independence of their respective inquiries, the Anglican and Lutheran repristinationists were discovered to maintain strikingly similar positions on several issues of eucharistic theology. Most notable

was the congruence of their teachings concerning the Real Presence.

Diversity between the two movements was encountered concerning the language and philosophy behind other issues such as that of eucharistic sacrifice. Nevertheless, such a measure of doctrinal congruence concerning the frequently devisive subject of the Lord's Supper was encouraging to discover.

The measure of congruity achieved by the independent efforts of these Lutherans and Anglicans of the nineteenth century, as they tried to repristinate purity of doctrine and orthodoxy, may constitute a superior model for modern-day ecumenical endeavours. This is especially the case if the route to Christian unity via a tolerance of contradictory doctrines around the eucharistic table threatens to collapse under the weight of its own implausibility.

S O L I D E O G L O R I A

St Cuthbert, 1990

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments

Summary

Chapter 1. Repristinationism in 19th Century American Lutheranism and British Anglicanism

I. Their goals and ideals compared
II. 19th Century Confessional Lutheranism
III. Tractarianism
IV. C.F.W. Walther and the Missouri Synod
V. E.B. Pusey and Puseyism

Chapter 2. The Doctrine of the Means of Grace

I. Grace and *Favor Dei*
II. The Tractarian doctrine of Grace

Chapter 3. Lutheran Doctrine of the Real Presence

I. Lutheran eucharistic Christology
II. Walther and Pusey compared

Chapter 4. Tractarian Doctrine of the Real Presence in Dr Pusey

I. Three Anglican camps
II. Pusey's arguments
III. *Unio sacramentalis* or transubstantiation
IV. Other Tractarians and the Real Presence
V. The conflict with the Lutheran 'ubiquity' theory

Chapter 5. The Doctrine of Eucharistic Sacrifice

I. Difficulties for Lutherans
II. The Anglican equation

Chapter 6. The Consequences of the Doctrine of the Real Presence

I. The role of the consecration of the elements
II. *Manducatio oralis*
III. *Manducatio indignorum*
IV. Eucharistic benefits
V. Eucharistic adoration

Chapter 7. The Special Opposition Encountered by Tractarians

I. The charge of betraying the Reformation
II. The charge of misusing the Church Fathers
III. The charge of misinterpreting Scripture

Chapter 8. Conclusion

Bibliography

CHAPTER ONE

REPRISTINATION MOVEMENTS IN 19TH CENTURY AMERICAN LUTHERANISM AND IN ANGLICANISM

One of the most common human devices used by those who are discontented with their present circumstances is a hearkening back to bygone and presumably better days. This device is not unknown in theological circles especially among those who find the theological trends of their times to be disconcerting in contrast to the imagined ideal orthodoxy of a former age. Such idealistic theologians who would call their wayward colleagues back to what is believed to be a more pristine position have been described by some as *repristinationists*.

In the midst of the dizzying progress which characterised the dawn of modern times several attempts at theological repristination were made on both sides of the Atlantic. Two nineteenth century repristination movements which warrant particular consideration are the Confessional movement within Lutheranism in America and the Oxford Movement within Anglicanism.

The Confessional movement within Lutheranism was characterised by the reassertion of the Lutheran theological writings of the 16th century and especially as in the Lutheran Confessions. Such use of the 16th

century confessions led to their movement being called 'Confessionalism'. The Oxford Movement was initially characterised by the publication of tracts.

Such use of tracts led to the their being labelled 'Tractarians'. For our purposes the term 'Tractarianism' will be used to refer to the Anglican repristination movement which began with the Oxford Movement, and led up to the modern Anglo-catholic movement.

Both of these movements shared many ideological goals. Their often striking similarities make something of an historical enigma of the fact that they had little to do with one another. There were several likely reasons why the Oxford Movement and the Lutheran Confessional Movement did not enjoy a closer relationship.

The language of Confessional Lutherans was not English but German, even when they lived and wrote in an English-speaking country such as America. In addition, with the exceptions of Rose and Pusey, none of the major Anglican figures in the era of the Oxford Movement knew the German language. Also, there was a difference in size between the two movements. Confessional Lutheranism in 19th century America did not involve clergy by the thousands as did the Oxford Movement. Also, the sheer physical distance between Britain and the Confessional Lutherans in exile abroad

was a factor.

These Movements' knowledge of each other suffered because of these factors. Also a measure of theological conflict and misunderstanding played a part in separating them. One does not need to read very much of the writings of the Oxford Movement to discover that contemporary Lutheranism was regarded with less than admiration. Likewise, from the Lutheran side, F.A. Craemer, who was later to become president of a Confessional Lutheran seminary in America, resigned his position as tutor of German language and literature at Oxford during early days of Tractarianism out of disdain for it.[1]

It is still possible that Craemer, even though resident at the University, was unaware of the admiration which Pusey had for Luther, whom Pusey once described as the greatest Christian since St Paul. Craemer might not have appreciated the affinity with Lutherans that Pusey felt when he was in Germany. Pusey, for his part, wrote:

> I have found myself at once more united with the friends whom I acquired in Germany, than I ever did in a similar space in England: It seemed as if we at once knew and had long known each other.[2]

SIMILARITY WITHOUT AFFINITY

Regardless of how individuals reacted to one

anothers' Churches or theologians, the fact remains that while some Tractarians knew something of Lutheranism, any confessional repristination movement in Lutheranism was largely unknown to those Oxford theologians. They did not appreciate the struggle of those Confessional Lutherans to uphold a doctrinal position similar to, though quite independent of, the Tractarians, particularly with regard to the frequently devisive doctrine of the Lord's Supper. For the purposes of this investigation, these two separate but simultaneous repristination movements will be examined, compared and contrasted. The ways in which the main exponents of both the Lutheran and Anglican repristination movements of the 19th century dealt with the issues involved in eucharistic theology must be examined in detail to determine how similar their treatments of those issues were, as well as how and why they differed.

The question will be addressed as to how close the Lutheran and Anglican repristinationist theologians of the 19th century came to having a common eucharistic theology. Yet in comparing the eucharistic theologies of these two parties, one must not overlook the historic fact of their independence and even estrangement from each other as they worked through their doctrines. Indeed, it is by virtue of the independence of their respective endeavours toward an

ideal eucharistic theology that every similarity in the features of their doctrines is made all the more fascinating.

THEIR PRESUPPOSITIONS

The similarity between the goals of the Lutheran and Anglican repristinationists to restore the orthodoxy of catholic Christianity seems to have included a corresponding similarity in their theological presuppositions.

There was a similarity in the way they approached the Bible, creeds, and formularies. In the face of growing trends within worldwide Protestantism against historic doctrines, the Confessional Lutheran and Anglican repristinationists shared a reverence for Holy Scripture, a veneration for the creedal formularies of Christian antiquity, the writings of the early Church Fathers and, to a varying extent, their own Reformation formularies.

It should be said that the Confessional Lutherans held to their formularies, the Lutheran Confessions, with relatively greater confidence because they were certain that they enshrined the orthodox teachings of the Christian faith. It was for this reason that the doctrinal literature of the

Confessional Lutherans was sixteenth century material, edited and reissued for use in the nineteenth century. The Tractarians, on the other hand, tended to be more suspicious of some of their formularies because of their character as written products of the Protestant Reformation, a movement many of them were inclined to disown if that were possible. For that reason the Tractarians published so much material that was new, or at least a creatively presented assertion of ancient catholic teaching, especially with regard to the Eucharist.

Confessional Lutherans in the nineteenth century undoubtedly had greater appreciation for the effects of the Reformation. After all, their forebears had a great deal to do with initiating it. They differed from the Tractarians in that they wished to direct nineteenth century Christians to the sixteenth century as the time when doctrinal purity was restored intact as handed down from the holy Apostles of Christ. The Tractarians, for their part, wished to focus attention on a much earlier period in the life of the Church where the stream of Christian doctrine flowed more purely, presumably for its closer proximity to the source.

The Tractarians faced a far more difficult task than did the Confessional Lutherans. The Lutherans could refer their followers to Luther's writings or the

Book of Concord, as a complete statement of their belief. The Tractarians had to do a great deal of research into patristic literature and the writings of those Anglicans whom they considered orthodox and, from that mountain of complex, often contradictory material, present their ideal of catholic doctrine and practice.

19TH CENTURY CONFESSIONAL LUTHERANISM

It may be observed that the early nineteenth century saw a revival of interest in Confessional Lutheran theology in a conservative form known as 'The Theology of Repristination'. This school of Lutheran theology included Lutherans on the European continent as well as in America and Australia. The Lutheran Cyclopedia states: 'to this group belonged A.Vilmar (d.1868), E.W.Hengstenberg (d.1869), C.P.Caspari (d.1892), F.A.Philippi (d.1882), Th.Kliefoth (d.1895), and W.Loehe (d.1872)'.[3]

Also properly added to this list should be Lutheran Repristinationism's nineteenth century expatriots, notably the Saxon-born Prussian G.D.Fritzche (d.1863), who went to Australia, and the greatest American figure, C.F.W.Walther (d.1887), the German-born father of what is now known as the Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod.

The word 'repristination' originated as a term of reproach by the theologians of the 'Erlangen school' of mid-nineteenth century Germany. Repristination theology was deeply hated by many theologians who regarded it as a threat to the progressive trends they desired. It was thought that no respectable theologian would permit himself to be numbered among the repristinationists. Remarkably, at the end of the twentieth century, Repristinationism still dominates the three million member Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod, making it a rare phenomenon in the modern ecclesiastical world.

It was largely because of the persecution they suffered under rulers such as the Prussian king, Frederick William III, that Lutheran repristinationists felt they had to emmigrate to Australia as well as America in the nineteenth century. Only with a greater measure of freedom than they found in their German homeland could the ideal desired by many Confessional Lutherans be pursued. Those who ruled the German lands at that time had only contempt for what they regarded as a troublesome repristination of the Lutheran theology and churchmanship of the past.

Despite its unpopularity among many powerful figures at the time, the Missouri Synod's definitive dogmatics text-book unashamedly acknowledged repristinationism as descriptive of that Church's

theology. F.Pieper (d.1931), author of that dogmatics, wrote in the Preface:

> Considerable space has been given to the charge, raised especially in German dogmatical treatises, that the Missouri Synod teaches a "repristination theology", which must inevitably prove harmful to the Church ... Nevertheless, I considered it necessary to refute the unwarranted charge and to remove any misgivings concerning the "repristination theology", and have therefore set forth in some detail the religious life of a church body which is definitely committed to the "repristination theology".[4]

Later, armed with multiple Bible references, Walther's successor added, 'the theology of Repristination is the theology of the Church; any other theology has no right of existence'.[5] He went on to state that those who disparaged repristination theology were to be regarded as neologists whose crime was to 'cast aspersions upon the old Scriptural theologians and their writings, as well as upon the modern representatives of the *sola scriptura* principle...'.[6]

In this respect, in addition to being opposed to the overt Rationalism of its contemporaries in the Erlangen school of theology, Repristinationism, as it has been carried forward into the present day, must be contrasted with 'Neo-Lutheranism' whose exponents include W.Elert and P.Althaus. For Repristinationism, the pristine Lutheran theology was extant already in the form of the Lutheran Confessions. It was not, as Neo-Lutheranism suggested, something radically different waiting to be found in bits and pieces by

means of critical studies of Luther's writings. To the contrary, in its own Luther studies, Repristinationism finds only confirmation of its position as articulated in the Lutheran Confessions of the *Book of Concord* of 1580.

In nineteenth century America, pressures from outside of Lutheranism, notably Revivalism, caused some Lutherans to oppose Repristinationism, but there was always a refuge for Repristinationists in the Missouri Synod of Walther and other strictly Confessional groups, such as Hoeneke's Wisconsin Synod. Pieper commented:

> ...God has blessed the "repristination theology" of our fathers with success also in this country [America], in spite of vehement opposition. But whether there be success or not, God has commanded His Church to preach His Word without subtraction or addition. Farther than that the responsibility of the Church does not go. The success rests in God's hands. In this conviction the entire Synodical Conference is by God's grace united and active as one Church.[7]

In considering the Lutheran repristinationists of the 19th century alongside their Anglican counterparts one is struck initially by the contrasts between them and those who led the Oxford Movement. The physical environments in which they flourished were certainly quite different. As an example one only need compare the relative comfort of the rooms of Oriel College, Oxford, with the South Australian outback to which the exiles from the Prussian Union sailed, or the log cabin

seminary in a frontier town called St Louis from which, in the case of the Lutherans of the Missouri Synod, their doctrines were published.

The Oxford Movement was a minority movement within the Church of England. All but the most idealistic of them knew that the doctrines of that movement would probably never dominate the Anglican Church. At best they would find several thousand sympathetic supporters within the clergy and episcopal hierarchy so that their doctrines would be, if not accepted officially, at least tolerated as permissible within the broad scope of Anglican thought. At the same time the Oxford Movement did not escape persecution from within Anglicanism.

Lutheran repristinationism paid an even greater price for their ideals in terms of persecution. Whilst some Oxford Movement figures may have considered emmigration abroad, many Lutherans felt driven to it. The most familiar example of such persecution was that of the King Frederick William III within Prussia before his death in 1840.

Every Hohenzollern ruler had tried to impose Reformed theology and churchmanship upon the Lutheran majority over which they ruled. But Frederick William III was the most religiously zealous of them all, taking a personal interest in Church affairs. In 1808 he placed the Church under the authority of the

department of the State (over which he was the head). In that way the king gave himself all necessary power to bring an end to Prussian Lutheranism once and for all.[8]

By 1817, the three hundredth anniversary of Luther's Ninety-five Theses, the king proclaimed the Union of all Reformed and Lutheran churches, and by 1830, the three hundredth anniversary of the *Augsburg Confession*, he was prepared to force his liturgical *Agende* upon all the churches of the realm. Yet in those intervening years, Lutheran Repristinationism had begun to flower and the king's plans could not be carried out without force and intimidation against those who had re-aquired an appreciation of genuine Lutheran doctrine. By 1834, the king had to try to disguise his dream of 'union' with a concept of 'confederation' to appease those who would not surrender Lutheran identity.

Forced union was still the obvious agenda, however, and compromise concerning the doctrine of the Real Presence in the Lord's Supper was the most intolerable feature of that unionism. On 4 April, 1834, an appeal was made to the king by clergy and congregations loyal to the Lutheran Confessions asking for freedom of religion and a Lutheran government for the Lutheran Church.

Frederick William reacted with repressive

measures and hostility. He imposed laws against all religious meetings and the performance of pastoral acts not approved by State authorities. Everything from the instruction of children to liturgical worship was to comply with the king's plan. Conformity was enforced through 'a comprehensive system of police espionage and persecution'.[9] Urging the king on with a strategy of harsh persecution was a sycophantic 'Minister of Public Worship', called von Altenstein, upon whom much of the blame rests for driving people to the desperate emmigrations of the 1830s.[10]

Such persecution relaxed in 1840 with the king's death and the succession of his son, the more tolerant Frederick William IV, but by then two emigrations had already taken place, the greater to America and the lesser to Australia. The emigration to Australia was partially assisted by various persons in Britain such as the chairman of the South Australia Company, George Fife Angas, who wished to colonise South Australia, and the philanthropic Mrs. Elizabeth Fry. The Lutheran pastor who led the first emigration group from Prussia to Australia, August L.C. Kavel, spent two years in London arranging the voyage with Angas' help. During his stay in London he preached every Sunday and evangelised the Germans at the London docks.[11] Kavel became engaged to an English woman called Pennyfeather, who followed him to Australia sixteen months after he

arrived where they married. She died twenty months after their marriage, giving birth to a still-born boy on Christmas day, 1841.[12]

The cause of the pious Lutheran emmigrants and their sincerity captured the immagination of Angas, a devout Baptist. Having sent them to Australia from Plymouth harbour, he compared them to the 'Pilgrim Fathers' of the seventeenth century. In his diary Angas explained:

> Mr Kavel and the German missionaries are Lutherans, and hold the doctrine of consubstantiation in the Lord's Supper, and baptismal regeneration as a sort of mysterious and indescribable change, which they do not pretend to explain or account for in any satisfactory manner. I felt at one time great difficulty in taking up their cause, but believing them to be the true friends of and believers in the Lord Jesus Christ, I conferred not with flesh and blood, but gave them the right hand of fellowship.[13]

Like Tractarianism in the Church of England, Confessional Lutheranism was always but a minority movement within world Lutheranism. The Prussian theologian Otto Zoeckler spoke for the dominant Lutheran position when he stigmatised C.F.W.Walther as a curiosity, a 'repristination theologian' teaching such doctrines as the inspiration of scripture in 'the old orthodox sense'.[14]

In contrast to Tractarianism, Confessional Lutherans formed, in the case of the Missouri Synod, an independent Church body in which their orthodox

doctrines were expected, not only to be the majority position, but insisted upon as the unanimous teaching among all members. Dissidents knew they could leave and find other Lutherans with whom they could find fellowship who were not as rigidly supportive of the Lutheran Confessions. The Confessional Lutherans believed that they were a pure continuation of the true Church of the Lutheran Confessions regardless of what other Lutherans might say.

Unlike the Oxford Movement, Confessional Lutherans enjoyed less agreement concerning the ecclesiological basis upon which they could claim membership in the Church catholic. Some of the 19th century Confessional Lutherans, like Bishop Theodore F.D.Kliefoth of Pomerania, Johann Grabau of Magdeburg (later New York) shared with the Tractarians the doctrine that apostolic succession through episcopal ordination guaranteed the validity of their church and ministry. Others, more physically cut off from the European ecclesiastical hierarchy, like C.F.W.Walther of the Missouri Synod, concluded that there were other more Biblical grounds for a valid church and ministry. His followers decided that their then several hundred congregations remained valid members of the 'True Visible Church' on earth by virtue of their faithfulness to the orthodox criteria portrayed in the Lutheran Confessions as 'the pure preaching of God's

Word and the administration of the sacraments according to Christ's institution'.[15] This position was insufficient for the more episcopalian tastes of Grabau and too revolutionary for the more traditional Wilhelm Loehe who ultimately pulled away from the Missouri Synod.

THE ORIGINS OF TRACTARIANISM

The Anglican Tractarians, for their part, claimed to maintain the true and catholic doctrine by means of faithfulness to a combination of divine inscripturated revelation and the doctrinal statements of ancient undivided Christendom. Their repristination efforts began with the Oxford Movement, often dated from the event of the famous Assize Sermon by John Keble of 14 July, 1833. The publication of the *Tracts for the Times* followed. After twelve years had gone by, and John Henry Newman had parted with Anglicanism to join the Roman Catholic Church, Dr Edward Bouverie Pusey became known as the leader of what remained of the Oxford Movement. It was during the years of his leadership that his most important eucharistic writings were published. As long as Pusey was alive, that which could still be called the Oxford Movement retained its maximum similarity to the Confessional Lutheran

movement in terms of biblical studies and sacramental theology.

A kind of kindred spirit with the reactionary tendencies of the Confessional Lutherans may be detected in Keble's sermon of 1833, mentioned earlier. In it, Keble sought to admonish what he saw to be a 'national apostasy' by the proposal of Parliament to abolish ten Irish bishoprics. [16] C.F.W.Walther and the Missouri Synod took an equally radical position in their own way as they reacted to the apostasy of their native land (Saxony) by the courageous enterprise of uprooting themselves and making a new start in the New World.

C.F.W. WALTHER & THE MISSOURI SYNOD

> We would call him the apologist of the Scripture theology of Luther and of the old dogmaticians, so far as they have proved themselves to be true representatives of the Scripture theology of Luther. Thereby Walther at the same time becomes the apologist of those theologians of our day who are designated "repristination theologians".[17]

Thus a former President of the Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod described C.F.W. Walther, the man who became the leading figure in the founding of the largest of the world's Confessional Lutheran Churches. Several biographies of Walther have been written in German and English.

Carl Ferdinand Wilhelm Walther was born in Langenschursdorf, Saxony on the 25th of October, 1811. He was the eighth child born to what eventually became a family of twelve. His father, grandfather and great-grandfather had all been Lutheran clergymen. His education, which included graduation from the University of Leipzig, was all directed toward a theological career.[18]

Some of the seminal machinations of the Confessional Lutheran movement, like the Oxford Movement, originated in a University setting. As a student Walther became involved with a group of young men who were very earnest Pietists. They read the books of Arndt, Franke, Bogatzki and others.[19] Walther later considered himself fortunate to have any Christian friends during his university days because of the 'heathen' rationalism of most of the professors at Leipzig at that time. Their rejection and ridicule of the historic Christian and Lutheran doctrines had nearly deprived Walther of his faith.

In the midst of the cool stoicism of the professors, Walther found friends who stressed an introspective personal religion which tended to draw their attention to their own sinfulness and unworthiness. Walther was miserable under their influence until the wife of F.W.Barthel, with whose family he stayed while in Leipzig, helped him

rediscover the comfort of the Gospel as taught by Luther. Martin Stephan's preaching and correspondence also brought Walther back to the orthodox Lutheran understanding of justification by grace for Christ's sake.[20]

Despite the mental suffering involved Walther later was grateful for the insight which he had gained during that period concerning the negative side of pietism. Out of this University group emerged several young men: T.J.Brohm, J.F.Buenger, and O.Feuerbringer, also Lutheran divines, who ultimately joined Walther in the emigration to America. Franz Delitsch belonged also to this circle but remained in Germany.[21]

Walther was a prematurely aged, emaciated, and balding little man with dark eyes. He wore his side whiskers long and all the way down to under his chin. He took great care with his appearance even though early in life he lost all his teeth and chose not to wear false ones. Those who described him often spoke of his gentle but unmistakable dignity and almost military bearing. Like the Oxford Movement figures, he was usually well dressed in the black 'Prince Albert' frock coats which originated in his native Germany. His sartorial consistency even under the rugged conditions of the American fronteer in which he lived was a remarkable achievement. He always personally upheld the tradition of distinctive dress for clergymen

and was remembered for his particularly high white collar and white cravat.

Like Pusey, Walther experienced serious health problems of a respiratory nature which took him away from the University for extended periods. They may have been brought on through the privation and stress involved in the spiritual struggles which preoccupied him. His health forced him home where he was surrounded by his father's books. This ultimately worked to his advantage as it was during this time of recuperation in the winter of 1831-32 that a new and intensive study of Luther's writings led him to rediscover the confident and joyful theology of the Gospel which had originally illuminated Germany in the Reformation era.

During this time Walther also drifted into the personality cult of a certain Pastor Martin Stephan whose leadership would eventually take Walther and many others to the New World. The story of Walther and the 'Stephanites' is an amazing and, at times, tragic and sordid affair. Stephan was originally an adherent of the historic Lutheran understanding of the Gospel of a particularly compelling character.

> By reason of his understanding of the genuine Gospel and of his psychological insight he also excelled as a spiritual advisor, able to comfort and strengthen the stricken conscience and doubting heart.[22]

As mentioned earlier, Stephan's personal

counselling brought relief to Walther's troubled soul and Walther became Stephan's loyal and capable disciple.

After his graduation from University in 1833, Walther worked as a private tutor. In 1837 he was ordained into the parish ministry at Braeunsdorf, Saxony. The spiritual climate which greeted him was less than favourable to Walther and his new-founded zeal for Biblically oriented Confessional Lutheranism. For over forty years the historic teachings of Lutheranism had not been maintained there.[23] Religious and moral indifference reigned. Rationalism dominated the order of service, the hymn book, and even the authorised catechism. Clergy like Walther, who shared the ideals of Martin Stephan, suffered when charges were brought against Stephan. The charges that he was financially and sexually profligate were never proved, but, in view of subsequent events in America, were probably true. Yet the loyalty of Stephan's disciples was, for the most part, blind to that possibility. Walther and many other Confessional Lutherans believed Stephan to be the victim of a devilish smear campaign and they faithfully supported him as an unjustly maligned apostle of the true Church. Those who opposed Stephan were regarded as the devil's disciples and not true Christians.[24] The more vehemently the civil and church authorities opposed Stephan, the more Walther

and others defended him.

After less than two years, Walther was on his way to America with Stephan and his fellow immigrants fleeing from the oppressive ecclesiastical conditions in Germany to begin an experiment in practising Confessional Lutheranism according to the 16th century *Book of Concord* in the presumed free climate of the American frontier. Yet, ultimately, the basic reason for their departure from Germany was not a principle as much as it was a person - Bishop Martin Stephan.[25] They chose the state of Missouri because it had been widely reported in Germany to be a paradise on earth. In the spring of 1839 Walther, together with a large part of the Stephanite group, settled in Perry County, about 100 miles south of St Louis.

The immigrants included Walther's older brother and five other clergymen. Ten candidates of theology were also among them. According to the *Lutheran Cyclopedia*, 'All in all about 750 persons, left their homes and their friends in November 1838'.[26] In this new setting Stephan had himself declared bishop and attempted to rule over the immigrants in every aspect of their lives. Soon corruption surfaced as questions began to be raised about his use of funds. Stephan's egotism and incompetence ultimately became intolerable and the final straw involved sexual misconduct revealed by some of the women in the settlement. Stephan was

quickly deposed and deposited unceremoniously on the other side of the Mississippi River.

C.F.W.Walther was reluctantly instrumental in the pathetic business of disposing of his own bishop and was soon called to exercise the leadership role himself. The bankrupt remnant of these Lutheran immigrants, many suffering illness in the Missouri heat, soon felt cut off from the legitimate Church of Christ. They could see the schismatic nature of their adventure and for two years controversy reigned among them concerning the validity of their church and its ministry.

When illness struck Walther at this time, he again used his recuperation as an opportunity to immerse himself in Luther's writings. He began to build his case for the legitimacy of their efforts to be a Church, based on a biblical concept of Christians constituting the Church by virtue of preaching the Gospel and faithfully administering the sacraments. No connection with a larger organisation other than a simple group of like-minded congregations was seen to be necessary. A debate was organised at Altenburg to air all opposing views concerning their ecclesiastical identity crisis. Walther so successfully argued his case that even the debaters who constituted his opposition happily conceded to Walther's position in the end.[27]

In April 1841, Walther was issued a call from the immigrants' first congregation: Trinity Evangelical Lutheran Church in St Louis to be their pastor. He pondered and accepted that call, remaining pastor of that congregation to the end of his career. St Louis then became the geographic centre of the rest of his life. Even when he served as a seminary professor and synodical president, he still remained part-time pastor of that congregation. He wrote a constitution for Trinity which became the model for subsequent sister-congregations which sprang from Trinity. With great patience and skill, and in many meetings and synods, Walther led all the congregations in St Louis through the biblical basis of Christian church life.

Walther's leadership was appreciated not only from the pulpit but from the organ bench where he was both a capable organist and choir master. He once described himself as 'born for nothing but music', and his great skill in performing classical keyboard works on the piano was also popular at parties.[28] In this respect Walther resembled Luther, who was also a gifted musician. Walther's spirited accompaniment to hymns such as *Auf, auf mein Herz, mit Freuden* is still spoken about to this day. He could improvise chorale preludes and when he accompanied the singing of the Lutheran chorales, he could do so with nothing more than the

words edition of the hymnal. He also composed hymns of his own such as the Easter hymn: *Erstanden! Erstanden!* which is included in the hymnals of the Missouri Synod.

Music and occasional walks were among his only recreational pursuits. He enjoyed his long stemmed clay pipe which, together with long tapers lit or unlit, were used to punctuate his conversation and gesticulations, often with humourous effect.

Walther enjoyed a stable and reverent family life. In 1841 he married Emilie Bunger, a fellow Saxon immigrant. They had six children, including one set of twins, one of whom became a Lutheran pastor, the other a miller. Two sons died in childhood, one as the result of an accidental fall. The daughters both married clergymen.[29] Walther was remembered fondly as an affectionate father and grandfather, and like Cardinal Newman, was very popular with children.

Although a very learned man, Walther seems not to have appreciated the fact. He had no interest in offers of honorary doctor's degrees, especially from heterodox institutions. In 1855 he declined a doctorate offered by the University of Goettingen. Later in life, he did finally accept an honorary doctorate in 1878 from the seminary of the Joint Synod of Ohio. Those who appreciated Luther's oft-quoted criterion for a doctorate (a proper distinction between law and gospel) agreed that, in Walther's case, it was

richly deserved.

Recognising the opportunity presented by the rise of greater literacy among the people of his time, Walther organised the publication of Bibles, hymnals and catechisms from the Missouri Synod's own publishing house. It was through his efforts that the Missouri Synod's earliest journal *Der Lutheraner* began to promote the theology of Confessional Lutheranism, together with the more academic journal: *Lehre und Wehre*.[30]

Walther began to edit and publish *Der Lutheraner* in 1844. It was a congregational periodical at that time, but it reached other orthodox Lutherans in America. It soon became instrumental in leading to correspondence and discussions about forming an alignment of Confessional Lutheran congregations from several states into one 'Synod'. By 1846 a proposed constitution was submitted to the interested churches. On April 26th 1847, the German Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States was formed in Chicago. Walther again held a strong position of theological and organisational leadership in this process. He had not presumed to assert himself. He had been recognised by others around him and served in the then part-time position of president of the synod between 1847-1850 and 1864-1878.[31] The 'Missouri Synod', traumatised as it was by the Stephan affair,

chose a democratic structure defined by Walther which, although not unbiblical, was most unpopular with some of his friends in Germany.

Walther, as the scholar and natural administrator that he was, played a prominent role in the academic life of the expatriot Lutherans. He and other pastors organised a log-cabin high-school (*Gymnasium*) in Perry County with a wide-ranging curriculum in 1839. By 1849 the Perry County congregations donated this institution to the synod. This school became a seminary for the training of Lutheran pastors and was named 'Concordia College', after the *Book of Concord* which contains the Lutheran Confessions compiled in 1580. By 1850 the seminary began to function with C.F.W.Walther as professor of theology. In 1854 the office of president was created, and Walther filled it. Teaching at the seminary became his full-time occupation for the rest of his ministry. Like Pusey, Walther was deeply loved and respected by students in his old age. So eager were his students to hear his lecturing that once, when he was quite elderly and ailing, they invited him to appear before them in his dressing gown and slippers. That being unacceptable to Walther's sense of dignity, he declined.[32]

Walther remained active for as long as possible until his health failed at the end of 1886. He was confined to bed for the last months of his life, nursed

by one of his daughters. On April 21st, 1887, a seminary graduate, Julius A.Friedrich, went to the sick room with a request that Walther lend his signature to his diploma. It was his last official act. On the seventh day of May, as the Missouri Synod met in convention in Fort Wayne, Walther died, confessing to Pastor Georg Stoeckhardt for the last time his faith in the mercy of Christ which he had long proclaimed. His funeral was said to have been one of the largest ever held in St Louis.[33]

Although a controversial figure among the progressive theologians of his day and occasionally involved in polemical battles, Walther's demeanour was always remarkably polite and civilised. He 'likened himself to Joseph, who appeared harsh to his brothers, but then went into his chamber and wept'. A lover of peace, Walther's fondest, though unfulfilled hope, was for a united Lutheran Church in the New World.[34]

Although a capable dogmatician in his own right, Walther left no comprehensive dogmatics of his own, but his lectures published as *The Proper Distinction Between Law and Gospel*, as well as his contributions to the theological journals and magazines which he helped create, constitute a considerable body of dogmatic theology. He wrote several books of ecclesiology, most notably the book, *Kirke und Amt*, which was of such importance to the polity of the early Missouri Synod.

Many of his sermons and essays were published as pamphlets and later collected in larger volumes. As the centennial of Walther's death approached, Concordia Publishing House in St Louis produced English translations of some of his works filling six volumes.

DR E. B. PUSEY & PUSEYISM

E.B.Pusey was born at Pusey House in the small Berkshire village of Pusey, on 22 August, 1800. He lived until 16 September, 1882.[35] Both his parents were lesser nobility. His maternal grandfather, the fourth Lord Harborough, was an Anglican priest whose influence on Pusey's mother made a lasting impression on Edward. He often attributed his belief in the Real Presence to her influence, having learnt it from her as a child. [36]

He was educated at Eton and in 1818 met his future wife, Catherine Maria Barker of Fairford Park. Their romance was frustrated by their parents, and as a result, Pusey's undergraduate career was clouded by what he himself called a 'Byronism', a kind of romantic version of the depression which would characterise much of his later life.[37] Some attributed his great scholarship to his habit of drowning his sorrows in study, often at the expense of his health.

After receiving his B.A. degree, he took his first journey abroad, a brief visit to France and Switzerland to meet his brother returning from Spain. By Easter 1823, he was elected to a fellowship at Oriel College, Oxford. His long association with the University had begun. Pusey met Newman at Oriel. Newman himself later recalled his impression of the young Pusey:

> His light, curly head of hair was damp with cold water which his headaches made necessary for his comfort; he walked fast, with a young manner of carrying himself, and stood rather bowed, looking up from under his eyebrows, his shoulders rounded, and his bachelor's gown not buttoned at the elbow but hanging loose over his wrists. His countenance was very sweet and he spoke little.[38]

Pusey plunged himself into his university career with exceptional energy and zeal. It included deep personal relationships and a pastoral heart which always characterised his dealings with people. His efforts to win over an atheistic friend added something of an evangelical attitude as well.[39] Lutheran commentator on the Oxford Movement, Dr Ingve Brilioth observed that 'Pusey brought with him from the Evangelical sphere an intense and tender theology of the cross....He knows that we cannot hallow ourselves, that "the blood of Christ must ever be our hope"'.[40] C.C.J.Webb, a 20th century Fellow of Oriel wrote, '...there can be no doubt that from Pusey, rather than any of the Oxford leaders came a certain strain which may conveniently be called "evangelical"'.[41]

Forrester, in his recent book, makes the strongest argument of all for the evangelical influence on Pusey, but attributes it to his connection with German theology. Pusey, while in Germany, acquired an appreciation of the seventeenth century German Lutheran Pietist, Spener. After returning to England, Pusey enjoyed a long and friendly correspondence with the German evangelical Lutheran Friedrich Tholuck.[42]

Pusey initially journeyed to Germany at the recommendation of Dr Lloyd, who was later to become Bishop of Oxford. Lloyd recommended that Pusey study German language and literature in Germany itself, that he might acquaint himself with the writings of the German critics and theologians. He eventually became familiar with Eichhorn, Schleiermacher, Tholuck, and Neander in his visits to Gottingen and Berlin.[43] His study in Germany had a lasting effect on his views, giving him a rare insight into continental Lutheranism and its history.

The priesthood awaited Pusey when he returned to England in the autumn of 1825. He had always desired Holy Orders, declaring when only nine years old that '...it is the best thing to do'.[44] It was during this time that Pusey developed his tremendous skill in oriental languages. He returned again to Germany and 'toiled terribly', studying Hebrew, Syriac, and Chaldee from fourteen to sixteen hours a day, even exceeding

the labours of the most diligent German scholars.[45] Pusey continued to attend the lectures of Hengstenberg, Neander and Schleiermacher, even acquiring an appreciation of historical and theological criticism of the Bible which he later deeply regretted.[46]

The death of Catherine Barker's father and the reluctant consent of his aging father eventually brought the satisfaction of marriage to Pusey. The death of Pusey's father postponed the wedding and in the intervening time Pusey wrote his *Historical Inquiry Into the Probable Causes of the Rationalistic Character Lately Predominant in Germany.* This book embroiled him in an unfortunate controversy with Hugh James Rose, at that time the Principal of King's College.[47] Rose had warned that German Rationalism could spread to England because of closer bonds between England and Germany. He had written that, 'in high places the fires of faith and love were burning very low'.[48]

At that time an admirer of many of the German rationalist theologians, Pusey saw in them a refreshing departure from what he described as 'orthodoxism', a kind of obsession on the part of the early Lutheran theologians with correctness of doctrine to the apparent exclusion of any other theological concern.

Later, however, Pusey reverted to a more conservative viewpoint. He agreed that there was danger in the approach of contemporary German theology.

Pusey's correspondence with the moderately conservative Tholuck may have influenced this change. Ultimately, although he began by defending the German rationalists, Pusey finally saw the danger, not in 'orthodoxism', but in the erosion of the authority of divine revelation of which Rose had warned. Pusey eventually apologised to Rose and withdrew his two books on German theology from circulation.[49]

On Trinity Sunday in 1828, over a month before his long-awaited marriage, Pusey was ordained as a deacon by his former teacher and constant friend, Charles Lloyd, then Bishop of Oxford. On the 12th of June Pusey was finally married to Catherine Barker and their honeymoon included his first sermon, a trip to the Scottish Highlands and a visit with Sir Walter Scott.[50]

The sudden death of the Regius Professor of Hebrew in September brought the Chair of Hebrew to Pusey, beginning a marathon professorship which lasted for half a century. Together with that honour came the Canonry of Christ Church. His new position necessitated Pusey's ordination into the priesthood on the 23rd of November, even before he had finished his year as a deacon.[51]

Pusey's association with the publication of the tracts began in 1834, several years after they had begun to appear in the *Times*. His first tract was the

eighteenth on fasting. Newman greatly appreciated Pusey's contribution commenting that: 'Pusey gave us at once a position and a name'.[52]

The sad death of Pusey's cherished wife in 1839 plunged him into a melancholia from which some say he never recovered. Newman's comments the day after her death convey the impact of it: 'It is now twenty-one years since Pusey became attached to his late wife, when he was a boy. For ten years after he was kept in suspense, and eleven years ago he married her. Thus she has been the one object on earth in which his thoughts have centred for the greater part of his life'.[53] Pusey was convinced that her death was divine chastisement.[54] His grief was manifested from then on in a singularly austere lifestyle.

Pusey's personal problems did not curtail his academic output, however, and he went on to write a commentary on the Minor Prophets, edit the publication of a library of patristic writings in English translation, and lend his support to colleagues who were in difficulties with church authorities because of their sacramental views. When Newman and others despaired of Anglicanism and left it for the Roman church, Pusey willingly took up the cause, and after the death of Keble, became the central figure of the movement which soon came to be called 'Puseyism'. He helped establish the congregation of St Saviour's in

Leeds as well as an order of celebate sisters, to work among the poor, giving life and meaning to the catholic principles of the Oxford Movement.

As he delved into the writings of the early Church Fathers Pusey began to be strongly influenced by their eucharistic theology. In 1843 he put his thoughts into words in a sermon that was his first major comment on the theology of the Eucharist. It resulted in disciplinary action from university officials. He was suspended for a time from preaching before the university. The title of the sermon was *The Holy Eucharist: A Comfort to the Penitent.* The object of the sermon was, in Pusey's words:

> To inculcate the love of our Redeemer for us sinners in the Holy Eucharist, both as a Sacrament and a commemorative Sacrifice. As a Sacrament, in that He, our Redeemer, God and man, vouchsafes to be our spiritual food and sustenance in that holy Sacrament. As a commemorative Sacrifice, in that He enables us therein to plead to the Father the Sacrifice. As a Sacrifice on the cross which He, our High Priest, unceasingly pleads in His own Divine Person in Heaven.[55]

The immediate consequences were traumatic for Pusey but, according to his biographer, the long term benefit to the church was unquestionable:

> It called public attention to a most precious doctrine of the Catholic faith that had been strangely neglected. It gave Pusey the unequalled opportunity of demonstrating the soundness of that doctrine, whether tried by Catholic or by Anglican authorities; and it indirectly but most really, helped to make him throughout the remainder of his long life the special champion and most insistent teacher of

the Real Presence and all It involves.[56]

Times changed as the years went by and Pusey's views met with less resistance. By the time he preached his sermon of 1853 entitled *The Real Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist,* his use of language went unchallenged by the authorities despite his similar treatment of the subject in that work. The lack of official condemnation of that sermon, and the book which followed it, came to be regarded as a victory for Pusey's cause. A.B. Donaldson, Canon and Precentor of Truro, wrote of this event:

> After all the long agony of continued attacks on those in the Church of England who taught the Real Presence, from the day when Pusey first preached his celebrated Sermon in 1843, down to 1872, when the final judgement in the Bennett case was delivered, the victory rested with Pusey and all others who, with him, accept in their plain meaning, the words of our Lord at the Institution of the Eucharist and the interpretation given to them in the Catechism of the Church, which Pusey learnt from his mother's lips.[57]

From then on, as though he were immune, or unconcerned, about any further damage to himself, Pusey went on to take his personal reputation into battle on behalf of several controversial characters including W.J. Bennett, the Vicar of Frome. It could be said in retrospect that the Eucharist, by his own choice, dominated the remainder of Pusey's long life. On his death bed it was a eucharistic blessing that was heard from his lips.[58]

PUSEY'S LUTHERAN CONNECTION

Contact with Lutheranism, its doctrine, history, piety and theological trends, began relatively early in Pusey's life. As his first study trip to Germany took place from June to October 1825, and his second included the whole of 1826 and half of 1827, Pusey studied Lutheran theology years before doing any serious study of Anglican theology. Before his later association with Newman and the Oxford Movement, Pusey knew little of the theology of the Caroline divines or early Church Fathers. Next to Dr Lloyd, Pusey's greatest academic influences up to that time had been Lutheran theologians.[59] Among His Lutheran friends, Pusey was regarded as '*stark evangelisch, ganz protestantisch*'.[60]

Such contact with Lutherans during an impressionable time of his life (his early twenties), had a lasting effect on his thinking. When he first wrote of the Lutheran Church, he did so with the highest respect. He was aware of the problems the Lutheran Church faced in his day, but he nevertheless saw great hope for it, not in Lutheran 'orthodoxism', but in Pietism, as promoted by Spener.

> He [Spener] explained that though many preachers might in many ways fail in delivering the

> revealed truths, yet that the Lutheran Church possessed in her symbolical books the right doctrines, and on that account and of the due administration of the sacraments and of public worship, it was certainly the "true visible church".[61]

Pusey entered the Oxford scene with a unique and important appreciation of the Lutheran Church and its theology. He seems to have explored Lutheran thought without bias. Students of Pusey's ecclesiology marvel that he maintained an 'independent outlook' regarding the doctrine of apostolic succession, something which Rose noted in his early debates with Pusey. Pusey did not hold it against the Lutheran Church that it lacked that traditional requirement for churchliness.

Unlike both his father and his friend Newman, Pusey even held a positive view of the Lutheran doctrine of justification, regarding works as 'the natural results of thankfulness and love towards God' for His gift of righteousness by grace alone through faith in Jesus Christ.[62]

Even after he joined the Tractarians, Pusey may have hoped to 'foster an objectivized and institutionalized form of Pietism, such as he had experienced from his reading of Spener and found practised among his German friends'.[63] Until he had his German experience, Pusey had little interest in the Anglican High-Church party, associating it with the Toryism of his father. Traditional Anglican

High-Churchmanship needed an injection of Pietism if it was to satisfy Pusey's heart as well as his mind. In Keble and Newman, Pusey felt he saw the makings of that synthesis. In the Oxford Movement, as in his own eucharistic theology, Pusey believed he could combine the best that was Lutheran with the best that was Anglican.

Pusey knew of the views of the Confessional Lutheran, Ernst Hengstenberg, but distanced himself from what he regarded as a 'returning to the Theology of the seventeenth century'.[64] It is apparent that Pusey never came to know of the Confessionalism of Walther and Loehe, which was objectivised, and yet deeply pious, a Lutheranism which returned not to the theology of the seventeenth century but to that of the sixteenth.

Later, as his love of Anglican and Roman Christianity and churchmanship grew, Pusey had less admiration for the Lutheran Church. Yet, however far from openly endorsing Lutheranism Pusey came in later years, his other-worldly behaviour, austere personal habits and unexcelled promotion of works of charity was a permanent result of the early influence of his hero, the Lutheran Spener.[65] Even to the end of his life Pusey retained a warm regard for evangelicals. He did not regard them, as Newman did, as 'the peculiars', but told the evangelical Anglicans, 'I believe all which

you believe; we only part where you deny'.[66]

THE AUTHORITY OF SCRIPTURE

Repristinationists among Lutherans held the same high regard for the Bible which Pusey had in his later years. They too clung to the old orthodox understanding of the Holy Scriptures as the Word of God, verbally inspired, inerrant, infallible and the source of all faith and doctrine. This was regarded as the 'Scripture Principle', the *sola scriptura* of the Reformation which found its way into the English Reformation as well. A similar principle of the primacy of scripture is reflected in both the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion and the homilies of the Elizabethan period. The Bible was regarded as the absolute standard, the *norma normans*, from which theology is derived. As such the *sola scriptura* principle created a doctrinal position more akin to patristic exegetical theology than to the subsequent pattern which came to divorce theology from the requirement of a biblical basis.[67] Never since the time of the Church Fathers had the approach to scripture taken up by Luther been seriously used by theologians. In that respect the Lutheran approach to truth was truly a repristination of the early church.

As far as the nineteenth century Lutheran repristinationists were concerned, all efforts to explain church doctrine as a progressive evolution of ever-changing truths was to be rejected. Doctrinal truth was believed to be as changeless as the words of the Bible from which such truth was derived. The Church was to confidently proclaim the truth as 'its precious treasure', not go about searching for truth through an evolutionary process.

> Not only Luther and the so-called repristination theologians, but all sincere theologians of the nineteenth century who were concerned about the preservation of the Christian doctrine have condemned the doctrinal development theory.[68]

In Walther's theological writings his confidence that he had access to absolute truth as he explored the Scriptures and the Lutheran Confessions was apparent. One does not find in Walther unqualified appreciation for all other orthodox Lutheran writings, even from the seventeenth century, however. Clearly, he looked to the 16th century for the ideal and for this reason, like other Lutheran repristinationists, Walther was content to merely edit and republish 16th century Lutheran eucharistic theology. He explained that

> ...those who call ours the theology of the 17th century do not know us. Highly as we value the immense work done by the great Lutheran dogmaticians of this period, still they are not in reality the ones to whom we returned; we have returned, above all, to our precious Concordia and to Luther, whom we have recognized as the man whom God has chosen to be the Moses of His Church of the New Covenant, to lead His Church out of

the bondage of the Antichrist, under the pillar of the cloud and the pillar of fire of the sterling and unalloyed Word of God. The dogmatic works of the 17th century, though storehouses of incalculably rich treasures of knowledge and experience, so that with joy and pleasure we profit from them day and night, are neither our Bible nor our confession; rather do we observe in them already a pollution of the stream that gushed forth in crystal purity in the sixteenth century.[69]

Notes to Chapter One

1. Erich H. Heintzen, *Prairie School of the Prophets* (St Louis 1989), p.43. Ironically it was Craemer, the alleged anti-Tractarian, who was later branded 'The Black Priest' by some local Protestants who accused him of wanting to 'make Catholics' of them. p.62.

2. *Pusey Rediscovered*, edited by Perry Butler, (Oxford 1983), p.12.

3. *Lutheran Cyclopedia*, edited by E.L.Lueker, (St Louis 1954), p.640.

4. F.Pieper, *Christian Dogmatics*, fourth edition, 4 Vols (St Louis 1950), I, Preface ix.

5. *Ibid.*, p.134.

6. *Ibid.*, p.157.

7. *Ibid.*, p.185.

8. A.Brauer, *Under the Southern Cross* (Adelaide 1956), p.3.

9. *Ibid.*, p.5.

10. *Ibid.*, p.8.

11. *Ibid.*, p.17.

12. *Ibid.*, p.49.

13. David Schubert, *Kavel's People*, second printing (Adelaide 1986), p.70.

14. Pieper, I, p.133.

15. *The Selected Writings of C.F.W.Walther - Convention Essays*, translated and edited by August Suelflow, (St Louis 1981), p.132.

16. B.C.A.Windle, *Who's Who of the Oxford Movement* (New York 1926), p.16.

17. Pieper, I, p.161.

18. Lewis W. Spitz, *The Life of C.F.W.Walther* (St Louis 1961), p.3.

19. C.George Fry, *A History of Lutheranism in*

America, 1619 - 1930 (Ft Wayne 1979), p.121.

20. Spitz, p.19.

21. Fry, p.122.

22. *Lutheran Cyclopedia*, p.1008.

23. Spitz, p.37.

24. Walter O.Forster, *Zion on the Mississippi* (St Louis 1953), p.151.

25. Fry, p.131.

26. Forster, p.112.

27. *Ibid.*, p.525.

28. Dennis Marzolf, 'C.F.W. Walther: The Musician and Liturgiologist' in *C.F.W. Walther: The American Luther*, edited by Arthur Drevlow (Mankato 1987), pp.83-94 (p.84).

29. Spitz, p.105.

30. *Ibid.*, p.79.

31. *Ibid.*, p.87.

32. *Ibid.*, p.114.

33. *Ibid.*, p.116.

34. *Ibid.*, p.99.

35. George W.E. Russell, *Leaders of the Church 1800-1900 - Dr Pusey* (London 1907), p.8.

36. *Ibid.*, p.7.

37. David Forrester, *Young Doctor Pusey*, (London 1989), p.10.

38. Russell, p.14.

39. *Ibid.*, p.16.

40. Ingve Brilioth, *The Anglican Revival, Studies in the Oxford Movement* (London 1925), p.242.

41. C.C.J.Webb, *Religious Thought in the Oxford Movement* (London 1928), p.81.

42. Forrester, p.109.

43. A.B.Donaldson, *Five Great Oxford Leaders* (London 1900), p.155.

44. Russel, p.17.

45. *Ibid.*, p.18.

46. Donaldson, p.156.

47. Russell, p.21.

48. *Ibid.*, p.19.

49. *Ibid.*, p.23.

50. *Ibid.*, p.25.

51. *Ibid.*, p.27.

52. Donaldson, p.163.

53. Russell, p.47.

54. *Ibid.*, p.48.

55. *Ibid.*, p.67.

56. *Ibid.*, p.68-69.

57. Donaldson, p.212.

58. Russell, p.158.

59. Forrester, p.87.

60. *Ibid.*, p.73.

61. *Ibid.*, p.111.

62. *Ibid.*, p.110

63. *Ibid.*, p.114.

64. *Ibid.*, p.44.

65. *Ibid.*, p.113.

66. *Ibid.*, p.120.

67. Robert M. Grant, *A Short History of the Interpretation of the Bible*, second edition (London 1965), p.92.

68. Pieper, I, p.133.

69. *Ibid.*, p.166.

CHAPTER TWO

THE DOCTRINE OF THE MEANS OF GRACE

The one doctrinal system of which the Lutheran repristinationists believed they were practically the sole orthodox custodians was that of the 'means of grace'. Similar to a sacramental system, the means of grace were regarded as the divine means by which God makes contact with the souls of human beings. The Lutheran view of the means of grace was the natural consequence of their insistence upon a monergistic soteriology. It was the teaching of C.F.W.Walther that only the monergistic soteriology of Confessional Lutheranism truly gave God the glory to which He was entitled, even as it discredited the powers of man.

The importance of the doctrine of the means of grace for the Lutheran theology is abundantly apparent. Franz Pieper's definitive Lutheran dogmatics text book allotted more space to the subject of the means of grace than to any other doctrine. The doctrine supplied proof to C.F.W.Walther of the orthodoxy of his church body. The continuous theme of the Convention Essay of the Western District of the Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod for 13 years (1873-1886) was *The Doctrine of the Lutheran Church Alone Gives All Glory to God, an Irrefutable Proof That Its Doctrine Alone is*

True. Walther himself gave these essays. In the essay for the 1876 convention, he confidently asserted:

> that the doctrine of this church gives all honor to God and gives nothing to us human beings except shame, disgrace, and contempt is precisely the most certain proof *that it is the correct doctrine*...it is impossible that a doctrine which ascribes honor to God can be false.[1]

GRACE AS *FAVOR DEI*

Central to the Lutheran understanding of grace is their doctrine that the grace of God is the free gift of His undeserved favour bestowed upon helpless people by virtue of Christ's complete work of atonement. According to this argument, grace is not divine assistance enabling people to merit God's pardon but always the gift of *God's pardon itself*. Such a precise or narrow definition of grace is reflected in the Lutheran Reformation slogan *sola gratia*.

The specific Latin phrase which describes the orthodox Lutheran definition of grace, as conveyed by the means of grace, is *favor Dei*. According to this definition God's complete favour is bestowed by the Gospel and the sacraments. Some Lutheran writers in the nineteenth century Repristination Movement chose to speak of grace as *favor Dei* to the exclusion of any other concept of grace so as to prevent the term 'grace' from becoming ambiguous or to prevent the

mixture of justification and sanctification, common among other Christian theologies of grace, but dreaded and avoided by Lutherans like Walther.

One negative result of their zeal for a narrow vocabulary with regard to the subject of grace was that false or misleading contrasts were drawn between Lutherans and other Christians over terminology. An example of oversimplification and misrepresentation of nomenclature is the following quote from the popular Missouri Synod dogmatician Alfred Koehler:

> The word "grace" is sometimes used of a gift, quality, virtue, or power which God imparts to man gratuitously (Rom. 15:15; 1 Pet. 4:10). But when we speak of "saving grace", we do not mean any of these things, nor do we mean an "infused" or a "prevenient" grace, by the proper use of which *man is supposed to be able to effect his conversion*...according to Romish teaching "grace" is not a quality in God, but an infused "quality inhering in the soul" of man, by the aid of which he is to do good and to obtain forgiveness. When the Romish Church says that we are saved "by grace", it means something entirely different from what we mean when we say that we are saved by grace. The grace of God by which we are saved is the "favor Dei", which is that merciful, affectionate disposition, that good will of God toward men, according to which He forgives sins... (emphasis mine).[2]

In the above case even the churchly term 'prevenient grace' was disparaged in an effort to describe grace as *favor Dei*. Fortunately the original orthodox Lutherans such as Martin Chemnitz were able to speak approvingly of prevenient grace. Describing the dawn of 'saving faith', Chemnitz wrote:

No one can show the mathematical point, in which

> the liberated will begins to act. When prevenient grace, *i.e.*, the first beginnings of faith and conversion, are given to man, at once there begins the struggle of the flesh and the Spirit, and it is manifest that this struggle cannot occur without the movement of our will...this is, then, the import of what has been taught concerning prevenient, preparatory, and operating grace, that not our part is the first in conversion, but that God anticipates us with the Word and the divine afflatus, moving and impelling the will.[3]

In 1843, the Berlin theologian Heinrich Schmid published writings by another orthodox Lutheran (Johann Andreas Quenstedt, d.1685) in which conversion was described in terms similar to those of Newman in his *Lectures on Justification* of 1838.

> The conversion of man is the action of divine grace alone operating, and is accomplished by the same infinite power by which God creates anything from nothing...through the means of the Word.[4]

The nineteenth century Lutheran repristinationists revered the orthodox Lutheran writers of the Reformation era. Rather than publish theology of their own, they preferred to reissue compilations of sixteenth and seventeenth century writings. It would be logical for them to endorse the term 'prevenient grace' as acceptable because of its usage by the Lutheran fathers. That some did not may be explained by the possibility that they may have shared some of the nineteenth century ignorance of Reformation-era Lutheranism which plagued the Anglicans of that same period. However incredible it might seem,

such Lutherans may have been ignorant of this aspect of the very teachings which they wished to revive in the nineteenth century. Yet only ignorance would explain how such contradictory use of language could exist.

Ignorance went hand in hand with caricature in the nineteenth century. It is certainly evident that Tractarians were prone to deal with caricatures of Lutheran doctrine rather than the real thing. It has been suggested that when Newman opposed Lutheranism he worked with a caricature created from a combination of certain contemporary evangelical Anglican thoughts and a second-hand knowledge of Luther.[5] Lutherans during the Tractarian period also seem to have suffered from a corresponding use of caricatures to portray the doctrine of grace as taught by their opponents.

A further explanation for the confusion that existed with regard to the doctrine of the means of grace is the complex interweaving of that doctrine with other doctrines relating to the subject of human salvation. Theories of the application of God's grace to impart salvation touch upon the mysterious forces involved in the conversion of a human soul from spiritual death to spiritual life, a phenomenon which transcends psychological or scientific explanation. The doctrines of justification, conversion, sanctification, the word, the sacraments and of election or predestination are all in some way

involved. Zeal to give the greatest glory to God moved Walther and his confessional Lutheran disciples such as Koehler to go beyond Chemnitz in favour of a theory of the application of saving grace that was the most extremely monergistic.

The study of the sacramental theologies of both Confessional Lutheranism and Tractarianism reveals the complexity and the pitfalls which can exist. Despite the misunderstanding of some Protestant writers to the contrary, no contradiction or tension must exist between the Lutheran doctrine of forensic justification and the application of justification through the means of grace. In the Lutheran view, individuals should benefit from both the imputation and the application of righteousness. The imputation of righteousness was regarded as God's gift to the world through the merits of Christ. The grace of the sacraments made that imputation more personal. God's offer of imputed righteousness, for Christ's sake, was thought to be in vain for many people who may refuse to accept it, placing their faith in themselves or false gods. Personal assurance that imputed righteousness was successfully applied was regarded as one of the benefits of the sacraments.

For example, righteousness gained by baptismal regeneration, as taught by Pusey, need not undermine imputed righteousness as taught by Luther, although

Pusey himself might not have appreciated this.[6] For Lutherans, the administration of the sacraments supplies the objective comfort that the merits of Christ are indeed applied to individuals. As such the sacraments were seen as the means by which God's grace was appropriated by individuals to their eternal benefit.

Any attempt to portray the Lutheran doctrine of justification apart from its doctrine of the means of grace can only be a caricature. Furthermore, the famous *solas* of the Lutheran Reformation, such as *sola gratia* and *sola fide* must be understood in conjunction with the doctrine of the means of grace, or else they too become caricatures. Without understanding the doctrine of the means of grace, *sola fide* could be caricatured as teaching salvation as a matter of personal conviction, autonomous from and without need for the Church and its ministry. Likewise *sola gratia* could become a slogan for universalism. To be accurately described, the great Lutheran rediscovery of justification by faith must be seen in the context of its doctrine of the means of grace.

Seen in the context of their doctrine of the means of grace, the Lutheran term forensic justification becomes less slippery. Forensic justification is taught by Lutherans to be the Christian's gift from Christ as one stands before God

(*coram Deo*). Yet pardon in God's courtroom is not intended to be extended immediately to the whole world. For that pardon and 'grace' (*favor Dei*) to be applied to individuals in this world, they must come into contact with the means of grace: the Word and Sacraments.

A very real contradiction seems apparent, however, between the Lutheran teaching that justification is a gift of holiness and the implicit teaching of synergism* that justification is the product of holiness. In the Lutheran understanding, the means of grace assist forensic justification by applying the holiness of Christ to individuals as a gift. In the synergistic view the sacraments convey but the grace to enable one to produce a life that God would judge to be holy.

A Lutheran believes that through the means of grace he receives the grace of Christ as a finished gift. A synergist believes that he receives not the *grace of Christ*, but *grace from Christ* to attempt to finish a holiness of one's own that may or may not be acceptable to God. A Lutheran is certain that his holiness is acceptable to God because it is the complete holiness of Christ. A synergist lives with uncertainty insofar as his holiness is dependent upon the quality of one's spiritual renewal. Just as Newman taught that renewal constitutes justification, much

* The hypothetical concept of 'synergism' originated among Lutherans in polemics against Semi-pelagianism before the *Formula of Concord*.

Tractarian vocabulary could be understood to teach a kind of synergism repugnant to the Lutheran theology of justification and the means of grace.[7]

Walther chose to keep justification and sanctification carefully distinguished. While doing so he did teach that the Holy Spirit, the sanctifier, worked both justification and sanctification through the same means of grace. Walther quoted from I John 5.7 to refer to the three means of grace - The Spirit (Scripture), Water (Baptism), and Blood (Holy Communion). Jesus was said to come by these three means. 'They are comparable to a canal which emanates from heaven and reaches all the way down to earth, through which the life-giving water of the grace of God flows to us, so that with the mouth of faith we can confidently and joyfully receive it'. Walther was as adamant as the Lutheran Confessions that 'whatever is attributed to the Spirit apart from such Word and sacrament is of the devil'.[8]

Newman addressed the pneumatology of justification by saying that 'Christ then does not keep the power of justification solely in His own hands, but by His Spirit dispenses it to us in due measure'.[9] Lutheran sacramental theology affirms Newman's argument that the justification of an individual consists, not in the atoning work of Christ alone, but includes the work of the Holy Spirit. In Lutheran thought, the Holy

Spirit, active through the means of grace, applies the saving work of Christ to individuals in the process of what might be called subjective justification. Subjective justification still involves imputation of the merits of Christ, but it does not happen to an individual without the mediation of the means of grace empowered by the Holy Spirit.

LUTHERAN OPPOSITION TO THE REFORMED DOCTRINE OF THE MEANS OF GRACE

Walther's dogmatism manifested its confidence as well as its polemical heritage throughout his theological writings. He was not hesitant to name the errors of his foes especially on the important and controversial subject of the means of grace. What the Reformed taught, according to Walther, was a doctrine of mere signs of grace. A true Lutheran was to speak not of signs only but of means of grace which are efficacious in conveying the grace of God. Any Protestant denial of this was attributed to the influence of Zwingli.

After quoting from Zwingli's denial of the efficacy of the sacraments, Walther remarked:

> Here is the same mockery of religion as before. At the same time he (Zwingli) wrongly sets faith against the means of grace. For faith needs the means of grace in order to make grace certain

> for us. It is as though I would say that I do not satisfy my appetite through food but only through eating it, whereas without food I can neither eat nor become satisfied. The enthusiasts speak that foolishly even today. They ask how Baptism can save, since Christ saves us. But they don't realize that Christ saves us through Baptism.[10]

Walther was resigned to the possibility that, with regard to the doctrine of the means of grace, 'the Lutheran Church stands absolutely alone among all the churches of the world'. Even those who shared in the heritage of the Protestant Reformation did not have a correct doctrine of the means of grace.

> The enthusiasts do not recognize any means of grace. In fact, the whole Reformed Church knows nothing of them. Even if they use the words "means of grace", the Reformed understand something radically different than what the Word of God and our Church mean thereby. They take it as designating something through which something is done in the hearts *of men*. But that is not a means of grace, but merely a means which begins the work of the Holy Spirit in people. A means of grace, on the other hand, brings and gives me God's grace. Grace, accordingly, is that which is in *God's* heart, the goodwill which God bears in His heart for the poor sinner.[11]

As an orthodox Lutheran, Walther would only be content when the means of grace were taught as the *media communicationis remissionis peccatorum sive iustificationis ex parte Dei*. Even the teaching that they conferred the grace of God as *instrumenta ablativa sive dativa* must also include the fact that the means of grace have the power to create faith in the heart of an unbeliever as *instrumenta operativa sive effectiva*.

He concluded that, because of their deficient teaching concerning the means of grace, all the Reformed church had was the mere sound of the words without their meaning. It was for that reason that he was prepared to assert that the Reformed churches did not have the true sacrament of the Lord's Supper.[12]

LUTHERAN OPPOSITION TO THE EPISCOPAL DOCTRINE OF THE MEANS OF GRACE

As well as rejecting what he believed to be the influence of Zwingli, Walther also felt it necessary to teach the independence of the validity of the means of grace from the worthiness of their human administrators. The leadership crisis which followed the downfall of the corrupt Bishop Stephan provided a special climate of urgency for such a teaching, through which Walther played a crucial role in the rescue of his movement from disintegration.

Yet in doing so, Walther came into conflict with episcopal teaching on the office of the pastoral ministry. Walther's teaching even conflicted with other Confessional Lutherans on this point. For Walther added the teaching that the means of grace were valid and efficacious, not only despite the moral character of their administrator, but also despite the

ecclesiastical shortcomings of the one who administers them, provided 'pure' scriptural doctrine was upheld.[13] This view was disowned by other Lutheran leaders such as Grabau and Loehe who deeply valued episcopal organisation.

The starting point for Walther in his abandonment of episcopal polity was the principle that the objective validity or efficacy of the sacraments was in no way dependent upon the character of their administrator. 'He may be unworthy as he will, he may be unconverted, a completely godless man, and live in sin, but when he does what God instituted in Baptism or in the office of the ministry or in the Lord's Supper, then it is the true Lord's Supper, the true Gospel, true absolution, true Baptism'.[14]

Such words had a particularly comforting effect upon Walther's original hearers, many of whom had been baptised, pastored and brought to America by Martin Stephan, a bishop whose flawed character came to match that described above. For many of those immigrant Lutherans, Walther's ecclesiology kept them from despair following the deposition of their bishop after which many questions were cast over the future of their church and ministry.

Combining various aspects of pastoral qualification in the administration of word and sacraments Walther wrote:

> Much less is it necessary in such ministry that someone have the proper call, or that he be set apart for such administration with the proper ceremony, or that he have the proper attitude or the right intentions, as the papists say. That all does not belong to the essence of the means of grace.[15]

The comfort of the means of grace may have survived the deposition of Stephan intact, but not so relations between the Waltherian Lutherans and their confessional Lutheran counterparts elsewhere. The consequences of Walther's loss of interest in the doctrine of apostolic succession was to have a lingering negative effect on relationships between Waltherian Lutherans and other Christians, Lutheran as well as Anglican.

Walther agreed that the efficacy of the sacraments depended upon their faithful administration according to the ordination of God. Yet Walther believed that God had ordained far less complex circumstances for the legitimate administration of the means of grace than that which episcopalian theologians required. The criterion which Walther regarded as necessary for a valid administration of the means of grace were simple and scriptural, unencumbered with the elaborate requirements of later ecclesiastical tradition. Nevertheless, he was adamant that such simplicity did not detract from the solemnity and power of the means of grace.

Thus, in a truly Lutheran fashion, Walther was

able to strip away many of the aspects of the ministry of word and sacraments which were regarded as indispensable by other catholics, yet retain a basic doctrine of the means of grace that was catholic in its essence. Walther's reason for what could be construed as an iconoclastic ecclesiology was his interest in protecting the certainty of the efficaciousness of the means of grace that human qualifications could only undermine. He believed that the less human and ecclesiastical qualifications attached to the validity of the means of grace the better for the certainty of the faithful recipient of the word and sacraments.

In this respect the traditional contingency that a priest be properly ordained in apostolic succession was regarded by Walther as just as damaging to the comfort of the means of grace as the enthusiasts' requirements for the holiness of the life of the revivalist preacher. Either way, the work of God was seen to be limited by human constraints.

Extreme congregational polity, on the other hand, also was condemned by Walther if it reflected a mere functionalism with regard to the office of the Holy Ministry. Pieper attempted to picture Walther's position, relative to other contemporary Lutherans when he wrote:

> He opposes, on the one hand, Grabau, Loehe, Kliefoth, Muenchmeyer, and others, who in a Romanising manner made of the public office a means of grace in addition to the Word and

> Sacraments, and, on the other hand, he opposes Hase, Koestlin, Hoefling, Luthardt, and others, who deny that the public ministry is divinely instituted in the sense that there is an express divine command for it and who claim that the office *in concreto* grows out of the Christian congregation by an inner necessity without an express divine command.[16]

Despite his opposition to the functionalist model of the ministry in congregationalism, it is clear that Walther questioned episcopalianism. He posed the possibility that, like a broken telegraph cable, the line of apostolic succession has been broken somewhere down through the centuries. He resented the episcopalian denial of the validity of non-episcopal ordination. With a mixture of indignation and scorn, Walther wrote:

> Such a doctrine is a truly shameful, dreadful doctrine, for through it the means of grace are made totally uncertain. No one who holds to this doctrine and goes to church can know whether the preacher actually speaks God's Word, absolves properly, baptizes properly, and whether he distributes the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper...Therefore the Episcopal church is such a dangerous sect, because it says that if the pastor is not ordained by the bishop he has no authority, all his activity is simply a human performance, and he does not actually dispense the means of grace...let us praise God that through His grace we are in a church which will have nothing of this blasphemous doctrine but which much rather teaches the full validity of the means of grace.[17]

Walther, the seminary president and church body president, had extraordinarily high requirements for ministers in other respects. They were to be well

educated and they were to be properly called by a congregation in co-operation with ecclesiastical officials. But at the same time, Walther the theologian wished to keep the validity of the means of grace in the realm of God's divine work, unaffected by the human works of the faithful.

LUTHERAN OPPOSITION TO ROMAN VIEW OF THE MEANS OF GRACE

Walther also denounced what he called 'new-Lutherans' or 'Romanising Lutherans' with teaching the unacceptable doctrine of the Episcopalians. The very fact that Walther could contrast his position with that of 'Romanisers' showed his distance from the theology of the Tractarians for whom little was rejected on the basis of being too 'Roman'. Aware that Rome taught efficacious means of grace but added considerably to the number of the sacraments, Walther condemned them as guilty of creating new means of grace as though the biblical means of grace were not sufficient.

Pieper noted that some assume an affinity between Luther's and medieval doctrine of the means of grace. He argued, however, that there is no such affinity in reality because Luther and medieval theology held diametrically opposite views of saving

grace. As Pieper understood it, the purpose of the means of grace in the middle ages was to infuse sufficient 'grace' for man to earn forgiveness and salvation. This was the danger perceived in the theory of *gratia infusa* as an explanation of the way that the means of grace have effect. Infused grace suggested less certainty than applied grace, therefore it seemed to defeat the purpose of the means of grace.

The Lutheran position was that the means of grace offered people the remission of sins provided by Christ and through this offer worked or strengthened faith. The grace offered by these means was complete *outside of the Christian*, a completeness which is missing in the theory of *gratia infusa*. *Gratia infusa* was not without a positive side for Lutherans. It was accepted as part of the sanctification of an individual Christian. But because the sanctification of an individual is always imperfect in this life, *gratia infusa* is always imperfect and inferior to the *gratuitus Dei favor* that was believed to be the actual gift bestowed by the means of grace.

The technical term *ex opere operato* is frequently used in a perjorative sense by the Lutheran Confessions and likewise in the writings of the nineteenth century Confessional Lutherans. Meaning literally 'by virtue of the work performed', the term originated in the 13th century 'to safeguard the idea

of the sacraments as means of grace'.[18] Peter of Poitiers first used the phrase in 1205 to explain that God honoured the execution of Christ *ex opere operato*, not (obviously!) on account of the attitude in the hearts of those who crucified Him. Grace came from the work of crucifying Christ despite the wickedness of those who performed that work.

It soon came to be stated by Rome* that the means of grace were valid *ex opere operato*, with the added legal ingredients of an authorised priest, and a recipient who had made both confession and satisfaction. By the time it came to be used in Lutheran polemics the term served as a label for a legalistic 'works-righteousness' cultivated by Rome.

Lutherans taught that the means of grace were effective and honoured by God for their own sake, rather than for the sake of the worthiness of the humans involved.[19] The Lutherans believed that faith on the part of the recipient was necessary only for the sacraments to have their intended benefit and no more. Ironically this is closer to what *ex opere operato* originally meant. Unfortunately, the polemical use of the term *ex opere operato* by Lutherans and Reformed writers misled Rome into believing that Lutherans joined with other Protestants in denying the objective efficacy of the sacraments. This is not the position of the Lutheran Confessions. Article thirteen of the

* see sess.7, can. 8 of the Council of Trent.

Augsburg Confession portrays faith as passive, awakened, and strengthened, by the objective administration of the sacraments.

As Dr John Stephenson asserts, the monergistic (worked only by God) character of the *ex opere operato* principle with its independence from human works is really what the Lutherans fought Reformation battles to defend. Only the Roman synergistic (worked by both God and man) additions to the original *ex opere operato* principle current at the time of the Reformation were being opposed in the Lutheran Confessions.[20]

Pusey fought his own battle in support of the *ex opere operato* principle with less emphasis on monergism, yet, at the same time, contrasting it with the efficacy of prayer and other works which he described as *ex opere operantis*. He also sought to extricate the term from what he believed was a Protestant caricature of the Roman position. Pusey asserted that the term *ex opere operato* in Roman Catholic usage is not used to

> 1)...ascribe any efficacy to the Sacraments, in themselves; nor 2) to exclude the necessity of faith or repentance in the receiver, whensoever, by reason of age, he was capable of either; nor 3) to express any inherent created virtue in the Sacrament; nor, 4) that the Sacraments are any physical means of grace. The real doctrine expressed by the words 'ex opere operato', in contrast with the 'ex opere operantis', is that, whereas every prayer, and every act of religious service, having God as its end, and proceeding from faith and love, wrought through God the Holy Ghost, obtains a blessing from God in proportion to that faith and love, God, in His

> Sacraments, bestows upon those who with faith receive them, gifts beyond all proportions, not grace generally, but the grace special to the Sacrament...[21]

It is apparent that Walther's Confessional Lutheran movement was not a 'Romanising' movement, although it, like the Oxford Movement, was caricatured as such. The Oxford Movement was far more conformable to such a description.

A further factor which tended to clear the Missouri Synod of charges of Romanising was its persistence in holding to the identification of the pope with the Antichrist. In eucharistic doctrine particularly, Walther was certain that he saw the marks of the Antichrist in the Roman Church. Referring to the pronouncement in canon law that lay communion in both kinds should change to communion by bread only Walther wrote:

> ...the papacy consciously deviates from the order of Christ, that it even admits this itself, but nevertheless says: "In spite of this, we as a holy synod declare that we do it better and more wisely than Christ ordered it" — whoever knows that the papacy has thus decreed, and still does not believe that the pope is the Antichrist, he is beyond help.[22]

Walther, like Luther, wished to shift people's vision in the church away from looking at God's human instruments and at human hearts, and over to God Himself and His gifts of grace offered freely to man for the sake of the atonement of Christ. Any doctrine

of the means of grace that did not have such a God-centred outlook was regarded as in danger of becoming merely man-centred.

THE TRACTARIAN VIEW OF THE MEANS OF GRACE

Tractarianism flourished in the midst of an Anglicanism which differed considerably from Confessional Lutheranism. One obvious difference was in the way that it was informed concerning doctrinal matters. The ancient axiom: *lex orandi, lex credendi* was alive and well with the liturgical and devotional *Book of Common Prayer* serving as a primary source of Anglican doctrine.

As such the Anglican dogmatic scene differed dramatically from its Lutheran counterpart. Like that other commentator on continental Lutheranism, H.J.Rose, Pusey understood this difference between the two churches, but did not believe that Lutheranism stood at any greater advantage for its more systematic dogmatic tradition. In his biography of Pusey, Liddon related that Pusey confessed to Tholuck, 'We have no division corresponding to your systematic theology.'[23] Yet, even with such an academic division, it was clear that theology in Germany was far adrift from the orthodox Lutheran moorings of its own past.

As Liddon himself commented, '...instability of

representations (from successive German professors) whether of theological or philosophical truth, had arrested the production of a literature that could be recognised as classical and authoritative'.[24]

Pusey had a unique appreciation for what Lutheran doctrine could have been as an ideal. It would seem, however, that he was not aware of Confessional Lutheranism's attempts to repristinate that ideal in the nineteenth century. On the basis of his own first hand observation when he lived in Germany, Pusey wrote of a Lutheranism that had largely discarded the heritage of theological literature of its own past. Pusey lamented:

> There was nothing. Whatever there had been in the previous centuries was swept away. No account was then taken of any book, except what had been published in the last twenty-five years ... I recollect the mutual surprise when the more thoughtful among them learnt from me, that in England we studied chiefly old books, and I learnt from them that they used none. If they asked of me how we studied theology, they were surprised to hear of standard, solid writers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, as Hooker or Bull, Butler or Pearson, and they said, "that is something beautiful". It was to me, at that time, something strange and mournful that they had no past.[25]

Although Pusey knew of some of the old orthodox Lutheran writers that could have been used in contemporary Germany, he knew that they were for the most part ignored. For this reason Pusey could frankly remark to Tholuck that 'you have fewer works of which you can derive benefit than we', and, 'Our divines are

more useful than yours'.[26]

Recalling his experiences in Germany to the Hebdomadal Board Pusey lamented the sorry state of orthodoxy there:

> One who wished to recount all who, in any sense, could be accounted supporters of Christianity, or (as they were called) "orthodox" among the professors, made them amount to seventeen only, in all Protestant Germany. Among them was Marheincke, and some others, who in no other country would have been accounted orthodox.[27]

The only Lutheranism that Pusey knew had so apostasised from orthodoxy, that he could see no value in closer fellowship between the Anglican and Lutheran churches of his day. At the time of the consecration of the first Lutheran Bishop at the joint Anglican/Lutheran Jerusalem bishopric, Pusey, wrote to protest the giving of Apostolic succession to Lutherans:

> A jealous heedfulness against intermingling with heretics has, you know, always been a mark of the Church. To be a parent of an heretical Succession would be very miserable. Yet I suppose there would scarcely be an individual among the German Protestants who holds the true doctrine of the Sacraments, or the Nicene Creed as it was held by the Fathers at Nicaea.[28]

It was an unfortunate twist of fate that Pusey was not in Germany to see the revival of interest in orthodox Lutheranism which began in the 1830s. As it happened, Pusey left Germany a mere five years before the rise of the Confessional Lutheran movement there and abroad. He was left with images of, at best, the

Lutheranism of the Prussian union.

Pusey spoke of the Lutheranism which he observed as having no intrinsic life, and therefore vulnerable to the ravages of Rationalism.[29] By contrast he felt able to boast about the theology of the Church of England having a stronger position. He spoke of Anglicanism as having a theology 'richer and more solid than any other church'.[30]

The Church of England of Pusey's time may have had its theological scene fragmented by movements like the Evangelical movement, or the Latitudinarian movement but it also brought forth the Oxford Movement as well. Each movement was guided more by its own traditional assumptions than by any confessional formularies, but each in their own ways valued the *Book of Common Prayer* as a force that maintained the theological integrity of the Church of England.[31]

THE ROLE OF THE SACRAMENTS IN GENERAL

For the Tractarians the sacraments played a central role in the Christian's holiness or personal sanctification. They also spoke of the sacraments as helping Christians to be justified, using that term in a different way than Lutherans would. For the Tractarians, justification was the effect of Christ

indwelling people by baptism and the Eucharist. Pusey described this as a holiness resulting from one's union with Christ, a gift of God, not of ourselves.[32]

The 'low church', he said, think more of the session at the right hand than the imminent indwelling of Christ. They imagine holiness to be derogatory to the atonement. He correctly discerned that the evangelicals regarded sinful flesh as rendering man incapable of holiness. But it was Pusey's judgement that they carried the ideas of corrupt human nature too much into the experience of the new man.[33]

Like the Lutherans Pusey brought into his arguments for the sacramental system a biblical foundation. He pointed with disapproval to the exegesis of those Anglicans who opposed his understanding of the means of grace. Liddon noted that it was the Tractarian view that, 'if the solvent which were applied by Zwingli to those great texts of scripture that teach sacramental grace were applied to other texts ... the result would be Socinianism [Unitarianism], while if the Baptismal and Eucharistic language of the New Testament were understood ... the Zwinglian and even Calvinistic theories of the sacraments would be impossible'.[34]

Liddon observed a concern on Pusey's part that faulty use of biblical truth led the Reformed into heresy on 'an inclined plane where if attachment to

such positive truth as it still held did not lead it to ascend to a point where all would be safe because consistent, it would, at no distant time, be forced downwards by the irreligious criticism of the day into an abyss where any faith would be impossible'.[35]

Although its use of terms with reference to the means of grace often differed from that of Confessional Lutheranism, Tractarianism shared several of Lutheranism's most important concerns with regard to that doctrine. A certain correspondence may be detected between the Tractarian emphasis on external religion and the Confessional Lutheran teaching on the *objectivity* of the means of grace.

Insofar as they emphasised the objective effect of the means of grace the Tractarians did share the Lutheran concern that Christian doctrine and ecclesiology be approached with an objective basis. Unfortunately the Tractarians did not appreciate a close proximity to the Lutheran position. Instead they tended to pit the objective efficacy of the means of grace in opposition to what they regarded as the Lutheran doctrine of *sola fide*. They insisted upon the objective grace of the sacraments as the instrument of justification, but added a description of faith as one's essential contribution to the grace of God which completed one's justification.[36]

Like Lutherans, the Tractarians rejected the

sectarian separation between faith and the sacraments, but at the same time their use of the term 'justification' clouded agreement between Lutheran and Tractarian sacramental theology. It could seem that Tractarians taught the Erasmian 'freedom of the will', an issue of anthropology which had been rejected by Lutherans. Whenever they spoke of justification Lutherans held to the 'bondage of the will', Luther's *servo arbitrio*. According to this anthropology the human will was thought unable to fulfil any 'necessary conditions' for salvation. If one was to be saved, God would have to convert a passive or even hostile human will. But Lutherans did not use the term justification with regard to all the sacraments. They only equated justification with infant baptism or the absolution of a convert.

With regard to other sacraments Lutherans did not use the term justification. Certainly Lutherans taught that the Eucharist conveyed grace only to those who came to receive it in faith. People with faith in Christ were already thought to be 'justified'. For the justified, the sacraments worked sanctification, not further justification. Lutheran and Tractarian teaching concerning faithful reception of the Eucharist were in complete agreement but for the Tractarian equation of the term justification with renewal.

On the one hand, Lutherans taught that human

beings were unable to contribute to their own justification. Any teaching that suggested that one could contribute to one's own justification was thought to rob Christians of their certainty of justification. This was because such teaching would place some requirement, however slight, upon the sinner as a condition for his justification (a condition one could never be certain one fulfilled). On the other hand, Lutherans taught that people could aid in sanctification by availing themselves of the Lord's Supper.

The confusion of justification and sanctification was regarded by Lutherans as a serious error. Whether Tractarian nomenclature constituted a real confusion of the two concepts is a different issue. It is important that neither Lutherans nor Tractarians separated faith from the means of grace.

Like Newman, Pusey also rejected the Reformed tendency to separate faith and justification from the means of grace. In addition he denied the Reformed claim that the Christian ordinances were included in St Paul's condemnation of the ceremonies of the Law as 'rudiments of the world'. To Pusey, the sacraments were not mere external church ordinances but were full of spiritual power. The sacraments were not to be excluded from the economy of salvation, with faith treated as a separate issue. The Tractarians expected

faith to precede the reception of some of the sacraments, but that expectation went hand in hand with their belief in the objective power of the sacraments themselves. Quoting from Newman's parochial sermons Hardelin demonstrated that the Tractarians believed faith to be 'the necessary condition from the human side for a beneficial reception of the sacramental grace which *is* there objectively, offered by God as something entirely from above'.[37] Thus it is not any act of the recipient which makes the ordinances of the Church means of grace. The qualities of the sacraments are derived from God, acting as a spiritual resource outside of the individual believer.

The Tractarian view of faith as working hand in hand with the sacraments in their work of conveying justification is portrayed in Newman's principle of mediation. According to that principle, the 'mysterious virtue of Faith' is established by means of the sacraments. Faith 'coalesces with the Sacraments, brings them into effect, dissolves (as it were) what is outward and material in them, and through them unites the soul to God'. Thus justification itself 'comes *through* the Sacraments; is received *by* faith; *consists* in God's inward presence; and *lives* in obedience'.[38]

THE TRACTARIAN SACRAMENTAL SYSTEM AND JUSTIFICATION

It has been indicated that Newman equated justification with renewal. Hardelin noted that this view of justification had a eucharistic application:

> Justification, according to Newman, consists in the indwelling of the incarnate and glorified Christ in the soul through the Spirit. The instrument most fully and perfectly conveying the gift of justification is the Eucharist. This sacrament is, in other words, the focus where the christological and soteriological aspects of redemption come together.[39]

It would certainly be perplexing to a Lutheran to see Newman exalting the efficacy of the Lord's Supper at the expense of justification in the forensic sense. Yet, Newman was emphatic in his opposition to forensic justification. In what he believed was the defense of the Holy Supper, Newman attacked the Lutheran interpretation of St Paul. Calling it a 'Judaism of the present day', Newman condemned 'what justification was to the Jews, namely, an *accounting* them righteous' but insisted that God *makes* people righteous in justification. This 'effective justification' is conveyed by means of the Holy Supper of Christ's life-giving body and blood.[40]

Newman regarded Lutherans as particularly guilty of such 'Judaism' for they did teach that people are accounted righteous in justification, but Lutherans made a distinction between *objective* justification and *subjective* justification. Objective justification was obtained for the whole world, even those yet unborn, by

the atonement of Christ. *Objective* justification alone was not regarded by Lutherans as always effective in saving people. For example objective justification was in vain for those who refused it. Those who did receive justification did so by means of some sacrament as a means of appropriating God's saving grace. Of them it was said that they were *subjectively* justified.

It could be said that Newman did share with Lutherans a similar appreciation of the role of the sacraments in sanctification. With a curious resemblance to Walther, Newman agreed that the greatest glory was given to God by those who humbly sought him through divine yet tangible means.

TRACTARIAN 'RESERVE' AND THE MEANS OF GRACE

One of the theological phenomena which guided the Tractarians' views of the means of grace was their practice of 'reserve' with regard to holy things and holy actions. For it not to lose its reality and awful seriousness, the doctrine of the Atonement, among other high and mysterious doctrines, was guarded by the Tractarians from the superficial treatment it was thought to receive at the hands of the Evangelicals.

For this reason, the Tractarian Isaac Williams spoke out against the evangelical manner of preaching

the Atonement explicitly and prominently on all occasions. Beyond complaining that such preaching offended against his pious sensibilities and taste, Williams objected that the Gospel was preached by evangelicals as though in isolation from the sacramental means which impart faith.[41] The immediate approach to God which seemed to be the message of the evangelicals was an offence to those who believed the means of grace stood as evidence that man must approach God only through their mediation.

CONCLUSION

In both the Lutheran repristinationist and the Tractarian theologies of the means of grace pastoral and churchly concerns came into play. Both appreciated the value of the means of grace as objective vehicles used by God. The Lutherans insisted on making an absolute connection between God's grace and definite means by which that grace was applied to individuals. They did not appreciate descriptions of 'prevenient grace' which seemed to describe grace imparted by God outside of His word and sacraments.

Despite their common concerns and their occasional use of common language and imagery, they

often arrived at amazingly different conclusions from one another, especially with regard to the doctrine of justification and its application by means of divine word and sacrament.

The Lutherans viewed the means of grace as acting in harmony with their understanding of forensic justification. The spiritual comfort they derived from the doctrine of imputed righteousness was reinforced by the means of grace as they applied that righteousness in an objective way. Without the contact established by the means of grace Lutherans had no certainty that God's grace would reach individuals. Those who would not come into contact with the Gospel or other means of grace for one reason or another were in eternal peril. It was thought by the Confessional Lutherans that the objective justification for the world achieved by Christ had to be subjectively applied to individuals or His work was in vain for them. This was regarded as the orthodox interpretation of Romans 10.13-17, and it gave impetus to the considerable support for missionary efforts given by the Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod.

The Tractarians likewise appreciated the role of the means of grace in objectively assisting the process of sanctification, but they believed that their salvation depended upon their quest for holiness as well as their righteousness before God. With considerable introspection, they pondered their

dependence upon God. They accepted the word and sacraments from the hand of God through the Church as divine assistance in the face of the challenge to 'work out your own salvation with fear and trembling'.

Notes to Chapter Two

1. *The Selected Essays of C.F.W.Walther - Convention Essays*, translated and edited by August Suelflow, (St Louis 1981), p.132.

2. Alfred W.A.Koehler, *A Summary of Christian Doctrine* (St Louis 1971), p.79.

3. Heinrich Schmid, *The Doctrine of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, third edition (Minneapolis 1961), p.478.

4. *Ibid.*, p.479.

5. Robert D.Brinsmead, 'Justification by Faith and John Henry Newman', *Verdict* 2 (1979), pp.5-20 (p.8).

6. *Ibid.*, p.9.

7. J.H.Newman, *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*, sixth edition (London 1892), pp.86-7.

8. Walther, pp.136-7.

9. Op cit., p.54.

10. Walther, p.143.

11. *Ibid.*, p.135.

12. *Ibid.*, p.151.

13. *Ibid.*, p.144.

14. *Ibid.*, p.143.

15. *Ibid.*, p.143-4.

16. F.Pieper, *Christian Dogmatics*, fourth edition, 4 Vols (St Louis 1950), I, p.175.

17. Walther, p.146.

18. Holsten Fagerberg, *A New Look at the Book of Concord* (St Louis 1972), p.169.

19. Pieper, II, p.5.

20. John R. Stephenson, 'The Ex Opere Operato Principle

in the Lutheran Confessions', *The Confessional Lutheran Research Society Newsletter* 8 (1987), pp.1–5 (p.5).

21. Edward Bouverie Pusey,*The Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Doctrine of the English Church, With a Vindication of the Reception of the Wicked and of the Adoration of Our Lord Jesus Christ Truly Present* (Oxford 1857), p.244.

22. Walther, p.170.

23. H.P.Liddon, *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey*, 4 Vols (London 1893), I, p.246. From Liddon's copy of Pusey's letter to Tholuck of 24th May, 1830.

24. *Ibid.*, III, p.382.

25. *Ibid.*, III, p.383. From Liddon's copy of Pusey's 'evidence' presented to the Hebdomadal Board, pp.9–10.

26. *Ibid.*, I, p.238. From Liddon's copy of Pusey's letter to Tholuck of 24th May 1830.

27. *Ibid.*, III, p.383. From Liddon's copy of Pusey's 'evidence' presented to the Hebdomadal Board, p.31.

28. *Ibid.*, III, p.74. From Liddon's copy of Pusey's letter to the Rev. B.Harrison of 13th April 1846.

29. *Ibid.*, III, p.116. From Liddon's copy of Pusey's letter to the Rev. Dr Hook of 8th November 1846.

30. *Ibid.*, I, p.229.

31. *Ibid.*, I, p.261.

32. *Ibid.*, I, p.317. From Liddon's copy of Pusey's letter to the Rev. B. Harrison of 16th April 1835.

33. *Ibid.*, I, pp.317–318.

34. *Ibid.*, I, p.348.

35. *Ibid.*, I, p.348.

36. J.H.Newman, 'Advertisement to Volume Two' *Tracts for the Times*, 5 Vols (London 1836), II, p.vi.

37. Alf Hardelin, *The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist* (Uppsala 1965), p.101.

38. J.H.Newman, *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*, p.237, p.282.

39. *Op cit.*, p.154.

40. J.H.Newman, 'Judaism of the Present Day', *Parochial and Plain Sermons, new edition, 8 Vols (London 1868), VI, p.184.*

41. Isaac Williams, 'Tract 87: On Reserve in Communicating Religious Knowledge', *Tracts for the Times*, 5 Vols (London 1840), V, p.119.

CHAPTER THREE

LUTHERAN DOCTRINE OF THE REAL PRESENCE

For the Confessional Lutherans, the task of identifying definitive statements with regard to the doctrine of the Real Presence was not a difficult one. Lutheran loyalty to a doctrine of the Real Presence was well known. Perhaps the most familiar Lutheran confession of that doctrine is found in the tenth article of the Augsburg Confession: '*Of the Supper of the Lord* they [Lutheran churches] teach that the Body and Blood of Christ are truly present, and are distributed to those who eat in the Supper of the Lord; and they reject those that teach otherwise'.[1].

It was the Lutheran understanding that their position was in agreement with historic catholic teaching on this matter. Melanchthon, the author of the *Augustana*, in his *Apology*, was even able to show that one of Lutheranism's greatest adversaries, the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V, did not disapprove of the Lutheran teaching at that point. He acknowledged that 'The Roman Church affirms the bodily presence of Christ'. The Lutheran reformer also claimed agreement with the Eastern Orthodox on this point writing: 'The Greek Church also both now believes, and formerly

believed, the same'.[2]

The most determinative factor in the Lutheran position was not the consensus of ecclesiastical tradition, but the inescapable force of Holy Scripture. As Luther wrote in his *Large Catechism*:

> Now here stands the Word of Christ: [the words of institution] ... here we abide, and would like to see those who will constitute themselves His masters, and make it different from what He has spoken. It is true, indeed, that if you take away the Word or regard it without the words, you have nothing but mere bread and wine. But if the words remain with them, as they shall and must, then, in virtue of the same it is truly the body and blood of Christ. For as the lips of Christ say and speak, so it is, as He can never lie or deceive.[3]

The specific words of Christ which most informed the Lutheran doctrine of the Real Presence were the *verba testamenti*, the words of institution. As long as Lutherans invoked the words of institution they were confident that their position was correct. As Luther had written, 'Upon these words [Christ's words of institution] rest all our foundation, protection, and defense against all errors and deception that have ever come or may yet come'.[4] Lutherans recalled that in his debate with Zwingli at Marburg it was the words of institution which Luther is said to have written in large letters for all to see.

By the nineteenth century, the position had not changed for the Confessional Lutherans despite the passage of the centuries. The words of institution

were still the foremost revelation concerning the reality of Christ's eucharistic presence. For Walther the suggestion that Christ's words with which He instituted the Eucharist were anything less than clear and explicit (*klareres und deutlicheres*) cast doubt upon all of God's word, making it dark and uncertain (*dunkel und ungewiss*). He challenged his hearers to describe how Christ could possibly have used clearer words. He illustrated his point by saying that when we give someone a glass and tell them that it is wine and that it is to be drunk, we do not expect that our word will be understood to suggest that there is no wine in the glass. Furthermore, it would be mockery to offer someone one thing and say that it is another. Walther suggested that it would be blasphemous to impute deception or mockery to Christ's solemn offer to give his body and blood to eat and drink.[5]

Walther, as did other orthodox Lutherans, took a hard line on eucharistic doctrine because he believed that three important issues were at stake for Lutheran theology concerning the Lord's Supper. These issues were the reliability (*Zuverlassigkeit*) of the clear word of God, the Real Presence (*wirkliche Gegenwart*) of Christ with His Church and the certainty of Christ's incontrovertible pledge (*unwidersprechlichste Unterpfand*) of the forgiveness of sins.[6]

The Confessional Lutherans took the words of

institution to be consecratory, a position which has Eastern as well as Western support. The Lutheran Confessions quoted St Chrysostom to describe the dymamics of the consecration. 'No man makes the bread and wine set before us the body and blood of Christ, but Christ Himself who was crucified for us. The words are spoken by the mouth of the priest, but by God's power and grace, by the word, where He speaks: "This is My Body", the elements presented are consecrated in the Supper'.[7]

LUTHERAN CHRISTOLOGY OF THE REAL PRESENCE

Believed to be equally scriptural by Confessional Lutherans, though far more controversial, in the eyes of the Tractarians, was the Christological support which the Lutherans gave to their doctrine of the Real Presence. If the Lutheran doctrine of the Real Presence was to be believed, a Christology was required in which Christ's body and blood were capable of such a sacramental presence. To arrive at such a Christology, Lutherans compared and contrasted the sacramental union between Christ's body and blood and the bread and wine with the personal union between Christ's divine and human natures.

In addition to its logical necessity for their

purposes, the Lutheran Confessions claimed that their Christological view of the Real Presence was the teaching of the Bible and the early church. Interpreting such passages as John 1.14, Colossians 2.9, Acts 10.38 and II Corinthians 5.19, they stated:

> *God was in Christ* and the like; namely, that the divine essence is not changed into the human nature, but the two natures unchanged, are personally united ... just as in Christ two distinct, unchanged natures are inseparably united, so in the Holy Supper the two substances, the natural bread and the true natural body of Christ, are present together here upon earth in the appointed administration of the Sacrament. Although this union ... is not a personal union, as that of the two natures in Christ, but as Dr Luther and our theologians, in the frequently mentioned *Articles of Agreement* [*Formula of Concord*] in the year 1536 and in other places call it *sacramentalem unionem*.[8]

One of the stated purposes of the christology of the *Formula of Concord* was to assert the unconfused, but yet inseparable character of the two natures of Christ. Such a *hypostatica unio* was particularly manifest in the Real Presence of Christ's human body and blood within the consecrated bread and wine of the Eucharist, but that was not its only important manifestation. 'On account of this personal union, ... the Son of God Himself truly suffered, however, according to the assumed human nature ... the divine nature can neither suffer nor die'. Thus the Lutherans argued that what happened to one nature is regarded as having happened to the whole Christ.[9]

The Lutheran Confessions described a real

communication of the attributes of one of Christ's two natures to the other nature.

> ...since in Christ two distinct natures exist and remain unchanged and unconfused in their natural essence and properties, and yet of both natures there is only one person, hence, that which is, indeed, an attribute of only one nature is ascribed not to that nature alone, as separate, but to the entire person, which is at the same time God and man.[10]

The Lutheran Confessions emphatically contrast this, however, with Zwingli's principle of *alloeosis* which limits to a figure of speech any implication that both natures were involved in the same experience.[11] Zwingli's principle fell short of the reality which was essential to the Lutheran understanding of the *communicatio idiomatum*. The Confessions argued that their doctrine was required to meaningfully describe Christ's suffering in the atonement. The reality of Christ's incarnation also would be under threat if the union of Christ's two natures was reduced to a figure of speech.

The Lutheran Confessions emphasised that a real and constant union between Christ's two natures was necessary for any and all of His saving acts to be effective for the salvation of mankind. This was a principle motivation for the christology of the *Formula of Concord* which later proved so controversial among some Tractarians. Quoting from Luther's book, *Of the Councils and the Church*, the *Formula* argued that Jesus'

death as the divine Son of God was the only factor weighty enough to tip the balance and compensate for the weight of the world's sins:

> But if [in the atonement] "God's death" and "God died" lie in the scale of the balance, then He sinks down, and we rise up as a light, empty scale. But indeed He can also rise again or leap out of the scale; yet He could not sit in the scale unless He became a man like us, so that it could be said: "God died", "God's passion", "God's blood", "God's death". For in His nature God cannot die; but now that God and man are united in one person, it is correctly called God's death, when the man dies who is one thing or one person with God.[12]

In another place the *Formula* states:

> It is rightly said: The Son of God suffers. For although the one part (to speak thus), namely, the divinity, does not suffer, yet the person, which is God, suffers in the other part, namely, in His humanity; for in truth God's Son has been crucified for us, that is, the person which is God.[13]

Noteworthy at the same time is the fact that this Christological doctrine was regarded by Confessional Lutherans as not only biblical and logical but catholic too. It is significant that in support of the catholicity of their eucharistic Christology much of the Christological decrees of the 'ancient pure councils' of Ephesus and Chalcedon are included in some editions of the Lutheran Confessions. The Lutherans claimed to uphold the catholic teaching concerning the full capabilities of the person of the God-man. Article VIII of the *Formula* accuses the sacramentarians of limiting the human nature of Christ to nothing

beyond 'its natural properties'. Against this the 'ancient Fathers', 'fully trained' in the Scriptures were said to join with the Lutheran view.[14]

The Lutherans were proud to assert: 'We, then, invent nothing new of ourselves, but receive and repeat the explanation which the ancient orthodox Church has given hereof from the good foundation of Holy Scripture'. They went on to explain that the human nature of Christ is not so blended with the Divine as to be consubstantial with the Father as the eternal Son is, '...for Christ is equal to the Father only according to the divine nature, while according to the assumed human nature He is beneath God'. It was not taught that all the divine powers of the flesh of Christ belong to it, as intrinsic or essential properties, but only by virtue of the personal union with the divine nature of the Son.[15]

Just as the Lutherans denied teaching consubstantiation to explain the Real Presence, so they denied teaching an heretical Christology that failed to properly distinguish the two natures of Christ. For example, the incarnation was not regarded as any 'infusion of the properties of the divine nature into the human, so that the humanity of Christ would have these by itself and apart from the divine essence' in order to bring about the communication of attributes that the human nature enjoys. The communication of

attributes was thought to neither transform the human nature of Christ into the divine nature of the Son nor render it equal to it.[16]

In saying this the Lutherans endeavoured to uphold the 'ancient approved councils on the basis of Holy Scripture' which insist that 'in no way is conversion, confusion or equalisation of the natures in Christ or of their essential properties to be maintained or admitted'.[17] The communication of attributes was believed to be more than a *modus loquendi*, but it was not intended to express more than a communication of powers of action.

The Lutheran use of the phrase *de reali communicatione* was also not a communication of essence or nature as some polemically suggested. The text 'in Him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily' (Colossians 2.9) was thus explained by virtue of *hypostatica unio*. [18]

Luther himself deserves the credit (or blame) for some of the most adventurous interpretations of orthodox Lutheran Christology. With Luther the glorified body of Christ was described more in terms of energy than matter. In this respect he comes close to describing the 'spiritual body' later described by the Tractarians as the eucharistic body of Christ.

To Luther there were three modes in which the Son of God was or is present in the created universe. The

first is the circumscribed mode in which He walked the earth. The second is 'the incomprehensible, spiritual mode, according to which He neither occupies nor vacates space, but penetrates all creatures wherever He pleases [according to His most free will]'. Luther campared this mode to the way optical vision [hence light energy] penetrates the air, glass, and water without taking up space as matter does. Christ used this mode to pass through His tomb, walls, and 'as it is believed', His mother's womb.

The third mode is the most obscure of all. It is the mode where the world and its creatures 'do not circumscribe nor comprehend Him, but rather that He has them present before Himself, circumscribes and comprehends them!'. Luther goes on to say: 'Now, whether God has and knows still more modes in which Christ's body is anywhere, I did not intend to deny herewith, but to indicate what awkward dolts our fanatics are that they concede to the body of Christ no more than the first, comprehensible mode'.[19]

Four points attributed to Luther in the *Formula* are:

1. The first is this article of our faith: Jesus Christ is essential, natural, true, perfect God and man in one person, inseparable and undivided.
2. The second, that God's right hand is everywhere.
3. The third, that God's Word is not false, nor does it lie.
4. The fourth, that God has and knows of many modes of being in any place, and not only the

> single one concerning which the fanatics talk flippantly, and which philosophers call LOCALEM, or local.[20]

The Lutheran Confessions opposed the Christology which came to dominate Anglicanism. The *Formula of Concord* clearly rejected the theory that it found in the Christology attributed to Calvinism, namely that 'the body and blood of Christ are as far from the signs as the earth is distant from the highest heaven', and the corresponding heresy that,

> our faith, reminded and excited by the visible signs, just as by the Word preached, elevates itself and ascends above all heavens and receives and enjoys the body of Christ, which is there in heaven present, yea, Christ Himself together with all His benefits, in a manner true and essential, but nevertheless *spiritual only*. For ... as the bread and wine are here upon earth and not in heaven, so the body of Christ is now in heaven and not upon earth, and consequently nothing else is received by the mouth in the Holy Supper than bread and wine.[21]

The Lutheran Confessions make frequent reference to polemical confrontations between themselves and the 'Reformed'. The intransigence of the Reformed and their refusal to believe what the Lutherans believed to be the clear testimony of Holy Scripture concerning the Real Presence was occasionaly noted. The Lutherans claimed that their opponents in debate were first forced to concede that Christ was present in the sacrament *per communicationem idiomatum* in his Divine Nature but not His body and blood. 'Afterwards [the Reformed], when they were forced by Christ's words to

confess that the body of Christ is present in the Supper, they still understood and declared it in no other way than spiritually "only of a spiritual presence" a matter of being "...united with the body of Christ which is in heaven" by means of the omnipresent Spirit of Christ'.[22]

Several of these alternatives to the Lutheran doctrine were later to be revived again and again, also in the Tractarians' debates with their Anglican opponents. The Tractarians, however, lacked the kind of dogmatic support for their position which Confessional Lutherans enjoyed with their *Book of Concord*.

WALTHER AND PUSEY AND THE REAL PRESENCE

C.F.W.Walther believed that eucharistic eating involved the closest Christian fellowship. He argued that since Christians partake of the one body and blood of Christ as they receive the consecrated elements (*das gesegnete Brot...Kelch*), by the act of eucharistic eating they are are more intimately united and bound to one another than a soul is to a body. It was with this in mind that Walther lamented the division between Christians which existed concerning the Holy Eucharist. Yet as much as he lamented the problems which existed

between Christians on this point, at the same time he insisted that the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper must not be compromised, even in the interests of harmony with non-Lutheran Christians.

In Walther's teaching concerning the Real Presence he encountered very similar opposition from non-Lutherans to that which Pusey encountered from his fellow-Anglicans. Both Walther and Pusey used remarkably similar arguments in defence of their beliefs.

For example, in opposition to those who would regard Jesus' words concerning the eucharistic bread and wine as of equally symbolic nature to biblical imagery of Christ as 'Lamb', 'Rock', 'Door' and 'true vine', Walther offered an objection the reasoning of which was strikingly like that which Pusey used in His 1855 book on the doctrine of the Real Presence. Said Walther:

> Those who do not want to believe this mystery (Real Presence) appeal to this, that it is also written that Christ is a rock, a lamb, the door, the vine, and the like. Dare not, yes, must not a person obviously take these words figuratively? Then why not also those words: "This is my body; this is my blood"? But this is an entirely empty subtrafuge. That Christ is not an ordinary but a spiritual rock...(etc.)...this God's Word itself tells us. But where does Christ say of His body and blood of which He speaks that He means only a spiritual, figurative body and only a spiritual, figurative blood or only a sign of His Body and Blood? Rather, He says the very opposite when to the word *body* He adds: "which is broken for you", and to the word *blood*: "Which is shed for you". But now it was not Christ's spiritual, figurative body, or a sign of it, but His real,

> true body which was given for us and not Christ's spiritual blood, or a sign of it, but His real, true blood was shed for us![23]

Pusey also placed a great deal of weight on the biblical foundations for any understanding of the meaning of the Sacrament. As Walther had done, and indeed Luther centuries before, Pusey challenged those who would doubt the Real Presence to take a closer look at Christ's *verba institutionis*. Like Walther, Pusey required that the Church teach a real objective presence of Christ's body and blood in and with the elements of bread and wine because of the plain meaning of Christ's words when he instituted the sacrament. '...There is no medium between real absence and real presence, those who refuse to believe in the real, objective presence, "under the form of bread and wine", really hold nothing more than Calvin, a presence of virtue and efficacy'.[24]

This similarity between Walther's and Pusey's line of argument is particularly interesting considering that they were never exposed to one another's writing or teaching. Walther added to his argument that the perspicuity of God's word was at stake. He argued that those who undermine the clear meaning of Christ's words of institution also threaten doctrines beyond the Real Presence. This concern for the integrity and perspicuity of Scripture, Walther shared with Luther and Melanchthon whom he quoted in

his Maundy Thursday sermon. Walther preached:

> If we can interpret the clear words of Christ: "This is my body" to mean: "This only *represents* (*bedeutet*) my body", then we can interpret also the clear words of God: "Christ *is* the Son of God, Christ *is* the Saviour of the world" to mean: "Christ only *represents* the Son of God, Christ only *represents* the Saviour of the world".
>
> And that is what Satan has in mind with the overthrowing of the clear words of institution. He wants to overthrow not only *these* words but the entire Word of God; he wants to make it wavering, unsure, and unreliable for us.[25]

Pusey echoed that same concern when he spoke of the 'solvent' of Zwinglian exegesis and the 'inclined plane' of popular Protestantism mentioned earlier. Both Walther and Pusey would have agreed on the importance of their common cause.

In the battle for the Real Presence, the differences between Walther and Pusey were not in their beliefs, but in the nature of the battles that they had to fight. Walther was able to take aim at his opponents from the security of the fortress of the Lutheran Confessions. Pusey had to attack opponents who were well established in his own church. The only fortress of which he could avail himself had yet to erect the ramparts from a foundation that seemed to many to be outside the realms of his own church.

Notes to Chapter Three

1. *Triglot Concordia*, edited by F.Bente (St Louis 1921), p.47. The *Triglot Concordia* is a publication of the 1580 *Book of Concord* in three languages: the Latin and German texts, plus an English translation. It includes Bente's history of the Lutheran Confessions and Chemnitz's *Catalogue of Testimonies*, a catena of patristic references in support of Lutheran eucharistic Christology which is not found in all publications of the Lutheran Confessions.

2. *Ibid.*, p.247.

3. *Ibid.*, p.755.

4. *Ibid.*, p.757.

5. *The Selected Writings of C.F.W.Walther - Convention Essays , translated and edited by August Suelflow, (St Louis 1981), p.148.*

6. *Ibid.*, p.147.

7. *Triglot Concordia*, p.999. From Article VII of the *Solid Declaration* to the *Formula of Concord* entitled: 'of The Holy Supper'.

8. *Ibid.*, p.985.

9. *Ibid.*, p.1021.

10. *Ibid.*, p.1107.

11. *Ibid.*, p.1023. From Article VIII of the *Solid Declaration* to the *Formula of Concord* concerning: 'The Person of Christ'.

12. *Ibid.*, p.1029.

12. *Ibid.*, p.1029.

14. *Ibid.*, p.1107.

15. *Ibid.*, p.1035.

16. *Ibid.*, p.1037.

17. *Ibid.*, p.1037.

18. *Ibid.*, p.1037.

19. *Ibid.*, p.1007. From Article VII of the *Solid Declaration* to the *Formula of Concord* entitled: 'of The Holy Supper'.

20. *Ibid.*, p.1006.

21. *Ibid.*, p.973.

22. *Ibid*,. p.973.

23. Walther, p.148.

24. H.P.Liddon, *The Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey*, 4 Vols (London 1893-98), III, p.454. From Liddon's copy of Pusey's letter to Keble of 29th December 1858, in the midst of the controversy concerning Forbes, Bishop of Brechin.

25. Walther, p.149.

CHAPTER FOUR

TRACTARIAN DOCTRINE OF THE REAL PRESENCE IN DR PUSEY

Students of nineteenth century theology usually divide the theologians into three camps with regard to the Real Presence: The Virtualists, the Memorialists and the Receptionists.[1] *Virtualism* was promoted by Bishop Bull, William Law, Thomas Bratt, John Johnson, Thomas Wilson, Alexander Knox and Robert Nelson, author of the extremely popular book: *A Companion for the Feasts and Fasts of the Church of England.*[2]

Virtualists taught a Real Presence of Christ and they identified that presence with the elements of bread and wine. Furthermore, the elements were regarded by them as means of grace, endowed with spiritual power after their consecration. Some of the 'high-church' nonjurors were Virtualists, although they tended to add liturgical rites associated with catholic doctrine, such as an oblation and invocation of the Holy Spirit.

Virtualism got its name from the way that such theologians believed that the consecrated elements conveyed the *virtue* of that which they signified, rather than Christ's very body and blood. But, like the Memorialists and Receptionists, the Virtualists abhorred any thought of transubstantiation, remaining

strongly Protestant in this respect despite their relatively high view of the sacrament.[3]

Memorialism was the school of thought exemplified by the views of Benjamin Hoadly, author of *A Plain Account of the Nature and End of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*. He sought to remove all ideas of mystery from the ordinance, and his efforts were not well received by many.[4] Yet, he believed his teachings to be in keeping with a more modern and scientific view of the sacrament. His position appealed to Latitudinarian, or 'Low-Church' Anglicans, but was considered obnoxious by High Churchmen and Nonjurors.

Receptionism was regarded by many as the effective reply to both the Virtualists and the Memorialists.[5] Exponents of Receptionism were Jeremy Taylor, W. Van Mildert, Charles Lloyd and Daniel Waterland, author of *A Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist*. Waterland's position was that Zwingli had reformed too much and Luther too little.[6] Receptionism is accurately attributed to high-Calvinism, more than any other Reformation school.

Like Receptionism among Lutherans, Anglican Receptionists interpreted Christ's words of institution as: 'this bread *will be* my body when you eat it'. Before being received the eucharistic elements were regarded as mere bread and wine. The elements had been consecrated to be eaten as part of the entire

institution of Christ. Receptionists did not consider the subject of the Real Presence apart from the act of receiving the elements.

The Roman practice of consecrating bread and wine for devotional display rather than for immediate consumption may have prompted Receptionism among Protestants. Receptionism over-compensated for the Romish usages, described as abuses in the Anglican Article XXVIII, by an over-emphasis on the role of the reception of the elements for the validity of a service of Holy Communion. Unlike the Virtualists, the Receptionists claimed to have real grounds for denouncing all ceremonies such as the elevation, the ringing of the sanctus bell and genuflections at the consecration. Such ceremony had no place if the elements were nothing more than mere bread and wine until they were received by communicants.

THE TRACTARIAN DOCTRINE OF THE REAL PRESENCE

The doctrine of the Real Presence as taught by the Tractarians was best portrayed by Pusey, who stated:

> I believe that after the Consecration the Holy Elements are in their natural substances bread and wine, and yet are also the Body and Blood of Christ. This I believe as a mystery, which others have long ago pointed out in, and which I believe is implied by, our Liturgy and Articles

> ... I do not attempt to explain the "how" which seems to me to have been the error of the R.C.s and the Swiss Reformers, the one holding that because it was the Body of Christ, it was not bread; and the other that because it was bread, therefore it was not his Body.
>
> I hold both, as I do the absolute foreknowledge of God and man's free agency, without having any thought to explain how: and believe both, as Bp Andrewes says, as a mystery.[7]

Pusey's confessed reserve with regard explaining the Real Presence was similar to that of the Lutherans. He approached the Real Presence as one of the mysteries of the Christian faith which he, like the Lutherans, did not feel equipped to define.

Any index of Pusey's major eucharistic writings would have to include the following:

1) LETTER: 1839 to the Lord Bishop of Oxford.

2) LETTER: 1841 to Jelf.

3) SERMON: 1843 *The Holy Eucharist, a Comfort to the Penitent.*

4) LETTER: 1851 to the Lord Bishop of London.

5) SERMON: 1853 *The Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist.*

6) BOOK: 1855 *The Doctrine of the Real Presence as Contained in the Fathers, from the Death of St John the Evangelist to the Fourth General Council (A.D.451).*

7) BOOK: 1857 *The Real Presence of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, the*

Doctrine of the English Church, with a Vindication of the Reception of the Wicked and of the Adoration of our Lord Jesus Christ Truly Present. [written during the Denison trial].

8) SERMON: based on the text: 'Will Ye also Go Away?' from: *11 Addresses during a retreat of the Companions of the Love of Jesus.*

9) SERMON: 1871 *This is My Body* [preached before the University at St Mary's].

It was usually in the midst of controversy that the Tractarians provided the most detailed descriptions of their doctrine of the Real Presence. Controversy tended to identify specific issues involved in the subject such as that of the *maducatio oralis* and the eucharistic sacrifice.

Serious controversy began for Pusey in 1843. It was at that time that he preached a routine sermon before the university at Christ Church. Out of pastoral interest for those who had learned the severer lessons concerning the sacraments about which Pusey had written in the Tracts, his sermon on that occasion was intended to be one of comfort to the penitent.

Nevertheless the sermon was a source of

considerable discomfort to those who found his descriptions of the Real Presence alarming and repugnant. An inquiry into Pusey's theology began with the announcement that Pusey's sermon had been *delated* by Dr Fausett, Margaret professor of Divinity at Oxford, to Dr Wynter of St John's, then the Vice-Chancellor of the University. According to Liddon, Pusey was accused of errors in eucharistic theology in three points during the proceedings following the condemned sermon of 1843. They were:

> 1.Holding to some carnal and corporeal presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist; as if it were not received in that Sacrament 'only after a heavenly and spiritual manner' (see Article XXVIII., and declaration annexed to the Communion Service).
>
> 2.Suggesting some sort of 'continuation or repetition' in the Eucharist of the sacrifice of Christ.
>
> 3. That, by virtue of their consecration, the elements of the Eucharist were the body and blood of Christ before being received by the faithful communicant, and that even the wicked and unbelieving recipients of those elements were partakers of Christ; or that Faith is not 'the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper' (See Articles XXVIII and XXIX).[8]

University Statutes required that Six Doctors of

Divinity take part in an examination of a delated sermon. The doctors who met with the Vice-Chancellor and examined Pusey's sermon included Dr Hawkins, Provost of Oriel, Dr Symons, Warden of Wadham, Dr Ogilvie, Dr Jenkyns, Dr Jelf and Dr Fausett. Curiously, Pusey himself was not invited to speak in his own defence before these doctors.[9]

The fears behind their charges were that Pusey was introducing, if not a 'Capernaiatic' corporeal description of the Real Presence, at least one which promoted the doctrines of transubstantiation and eucharistic sacrifice as banned by the Church of England's *Articles of Religion*. Pusey replied to their charges in an interview carried out by Dr Jelf, who served as a mediator between the six doctors and Pusey.

His replies to their charges consisted largely in explanations of the language used in the various descriptions of the Real Presence in his sermon. His use of patristic language, repeating phrases such as 'our tongues are reddened by the blood of Christ' was particularly objectionable to his accusers. Pusey stood by his view that adapting such words of the church fathers for current use was not heretical. He registered surprise that false doctrine had been read into his sermon by his accusers.

Pusey was particularly concerned that their third

charge presupposed Receptionism in Anglican eucharistic theology. They had objected to the fact that Pusey taught an objective presence of Christ's body and blood independent of the faith or lack of faith on the part of those who came to receive the sacrament. It was implied that Anglicanism would not accept the view that Christ's body and blood, objectively present in the consecrated elements would be distributed to all, even unbelievers who partook of them. This third charge foreshadowed and introduced the highly contentious concept of the *manducatio impii* as argued by Archdeacon Denison in the decade that followed.

Pusey went into some detail to explain his attitude toward the three objections lodged by the six doctors. In response to the first charge, he insisted that he agreed with the theology of Article 28, but maintained that it did not prohibit him from believing the real, though spiritual and mysterious, presence of Christ body and blood in the Holy Eucharist.

As far as the first part of their second objection - that he appeared to believe in 'some continuation or repetition' of the sacrifice of Christ's atonement in the Eucharist - Pusey was willing to grant it was not part of the authorised Anglican formularies. He did comment that the word 'continuation' was too ambiguous to describe his understanding of the eucharistic sacrifice, hastening

to add that he 'entirely and cordially' adopted their view, as articulated in the second half of their second objection, that the one sacrifice of Christ upon the cross was complete and the propitiation and 'satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world both original and actual'.[10] As described in Article XXXI, Pusey agreed that the atoning suffering of Christ was finished at the crucifixion.

To respond to the first part of their third objection - that Pusey had represented 'the body and blood of Christ as present with the consecrated elements by virtue of their consecration before they are received by the faithful communicant and independently of his faith' - Pusey referred to the Prayer Book's own words at the distribution of the sacrament where the elements are referred to as the body and blood of Christ, not only as they are received, but as they are 'given' and 'taken' by the communicant. Quoting Bishop Overall, he added, 'Herein we follow the Fathers, who, after the consecration, would not suffer it to be called bread and wine any longer, but the Body and Blood of Christ'. Pusey then implied that it was the Receptionism of his opponent's objection more than the Consecrationism of his sermon which was 'an invasion of the liberty of conscience', stating more than what the formularies did.[11]

Quoting selectively from Bishop Cosin's

eucharistic statements, Pusey lent episcopal support to his argument. To reinforce his assertion that the *Thirty-nine Articles* do not deny the Real Presence when they speak of faith as the means whereby the body of Christ is received, Pusey quoted Cosin's denial that the eucharistic Presence was caused by the faith of the communicants. To further undermine Receptionism Pusey referred to the *Book of Common Prayer*'s guidelines for the disposal of consecrated elements in which the Celebrant and those whom he chooses are instructed to 'reverently' consume all consecrated elements remaining [*extra usam*] which suggested to him that they were to be regarded as 'different from ordinary bread and wine'. Pusey concluded his theological explanation to the Vice-Chancellor confident that he had held nothing back from the enquiry.[12]

Although it has been observed that Pusey merely preached after the example of the Homilies, Jeremy Taylor, and devotional writers like George Herbert and Bishop Ken, and with the fervid language of the Fathers, the six doctors imposed a shocking public condemnation of Pusey by suspending him from preaching at the university for two years.[13]

As we have noted, ten years later Pusey preached another sermon at the University on the subject of the *Real Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist* and there was a different reaction. There were certain

differences in the approach of the sermon itself and its presentation of the Real Presence as well. Liddon judged that the sermon

> differed from the earlier sermon ... as a careful statement of doctrine might differ from a devotional appeal ... the second sermon differs from the first in the distinctness with which it insists not only on the Reality of the Sacramental Presence resulting from consecration, but also it deals with the continued existence of the substance in the consecrated elements, which are veils of our Lord's presence.[14]

Pusey's subsequent book on the Real Presence of 1855 was written to be more than an augmentation of his university sermon. It was to be a thorough treatment of the patristic support for the Real Presence as correctly taught by Anglicans over against the transubstantiation theory of Rome. A following book in 1857 was added to provide defence for the embattled Archdeacon of Taunton, George Anthony Denison. It was also written to supply arguments in opposition to a book by Dean William Goode, who challenged the Tractarian claim that their teaching concerning the Real Presence was the ancient and catholic one reflected in patristic literature.

It is within the sermon and books of 1853, 1855, and 1857 respectively that Pusey's argument for the Real Presence is most carefully and comprehensively set forth. Pusey himself recognised this. Referring to his conflict with Dean Goode, Pusey described his work in defensive terms:

> I hope, i. to maintain the clear sense of those statements, which I had specially adopted from our formularies; ii. to clear away any objections which Mr Goode has drawn from other statements of our formularies; iii. to explain my belief as to That which the wicked receive, and the worship of our Lord, truly present in the Sacrament; iv. to vindicate my argument from the Holy Scripture; v. to clear away the objections which Mr Goode raises to my argument from the Fathers.[15]

PUSEY AND THE IRENAEAN MODEL OF THE REAL PRESENCE

With regard to an orthodox understanding of the Real Presence, Pusey argued along the same lines as R.I.Wilberforce who, in his book *The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, was able to attribute the misinterpretations by contemporary Anglican divines of patristic sacramental theology to their failure to discern the patristic usage of the twin concepts of the inward and outward components of the consecrated eucharistic elements.[16] This theory of the Real Presence could be called the Irenaean dichotomy because it is derived from Irenaeus' teaching that the Real Presence in the Eucharist involves a combination of two components in each of the sacramental elements: the outward bearer of the eucharistic Jesus, the *sacramentum*, and *res sacramenti*: that actual body and blood of Christ conveyed by the *sacramentum*. Variations of this formula may be found in patristic writings including Augustine's combination of *signum*

and *res*, with the *sacramentum* spoken of as the sign or symbol yet not detracting from the reality of the *res*, the 'thing signified' which the signs and symbols of the bread and wine actually convey, i.e. the real body and blood of the God-Man, Jesus Christ. This theory of the Real Presence was of great importance to those Oxford Movement figures who wrote on the subject, such as Wilberforce and Pusey. Armed with it, Pusey was able to write: 'I maintained (as the Church of England teaches) "that the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances, and yet that under these poor outward forms, His creatures of bread and wine, the faithful verily and indeed take and receive the Body and Blood of Christ"'.[17]

As we shall see, in his book: *The Holy Eucharist - the Doctrine of the English Church*, Pusey identified this Irenaean dichotomy in the catechism of the *Book of Common Prayer*. The occasion for the writing of this book was again in response to a polemical attack, this time from a Protestant Mr Goode who challenged the eucharistic theology in Pusey's preaching of the Real Presence on the basis of the *Book of Common Prayer*.

Pusey expressed a certain regret at having to write a defence of his understanding of the *Prayer Book*. He wrote: 'I did not defend, [whilst preaching] what I did not imagine to be open to attack. I doubted not, that the formularies of the Church of England were

(as I had always received them) in harmony with themselves'. Yet defend it he did in a style that was, by then, characteristic of the kind of argument used by the Oxford Movement writers who claimed the *Prayer Book* among their creeds.[18]

Confronted by Mr Goode with the possibility that the *Book of Common Prayer* taught a doctrine of Christ's eucharistic presence contrary to that which Pusey claimed he learnt at his mother's knee, Pusey plunged himself into a defence of the catholicity of the Prayer Book's teachings. As John Henry Newman had attempted with the controversial Tract XC, Pusey also did his part to maintain the hope that the Reformation formularies of the Church of England could yet be found to teach catholic doctrine, especially with respect to the Real Presence.

At the same time, Pusey needed to do something to protect his standing as a clergyman in the Church of England, by demonstrating that he taught nothing that was contrary to the teaching of the Prayer Book. To accomplish this Pusey requoted the single statement of the Anglican formularies which he considered most pivotal for his argument: 'The authors of the first book of Homilies A.D. 1547, gave notice of a second series of Homilies which they intended to publish, in the following word; "Hereafter shall follow sermons of fasting, prayer, almsdeeds; of the Nativity, Passion,

Resurrection of our Saviour Christ; of the due receiving of his blessed Body and Blood under the form of bread and wine &c."'. 'They are', wrote Pusey, 'as formal and definite a statement of doctrine, as any, contained in the book of Homilies'.[19]

Pusey went on to claim that the word 'form', as used in the above quote from the first book of Homilies, meant the outward part of the Sacrament, as in the Catechism when water is referred to as 'the outward sign or form in Baptism'.[20]

As we have said, Pusey identified the Anglican Catechism as the layman's introduction to the Irenaean dichotomy theory of the Real Presence. It asks:

> ... *Question*. What is the inward part, or thing signified?
>
> *Answer*. "The Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper" ... The answer in the Catechism tells them that "the inward part" of "the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper", is not merely "grace", but the Body and Blood of Him who is the Author of grace. [21]

In a characteristically meticulous dissection of the text, Pusey makes the following decisive point:

> The first question enquires not into the "*grace*", but into "the *thing* signified". It is no longer "What is the inward and spiritual *grace*" (as in the question on Baptism) but first "what is the inward *part* or *thing* signified?" And after this, then follows the question as to the *Grace*...The "inward part" then, or "thing signified" is, in the Lord's Supper, something distinct from the "benefits" or "grace".[22]

Seeing an Augustinian dimension in the Catechism

Pusey wrote:

> In receiving the outward part we receive the inward, the Body and Blood; in receiving the inward part, we, if faithful, receive "the grace" ... In its largest sense, a Sacrament is a "sign of a sacred thing". There is the visible sign, and there is that which is invisible ...St Augustine was obliged, in regard to the Lord's Supper, to make a further subdivision. There is 1) the Sacrament, "the bread and wine"; 2) the *res* or substance of the sacrament, "the Body and Blood of Christ"; 3) the grace of the Sacrament, "the strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the Body and Blood of Christ".[23]

By means of this Irenaean dichotomy Pusey was able to determine that '"the bread" would not be "the communion of the Body of Christ", unless, through it, that Body was conveyed to us'. And, as the Prayer Book defined 'the nature' of the Eucharist according to Irenaeus' formula of an inward gift and an outward, visible element, so Pusey proposed that it would be just as contrary to the definition of the sacrament for the Eucharist to contain no actual body of Christ, (i.e. Zwinglianism) as it would be for the Sacrament to contain no actual bread, (i.e. Transubstantiation).[24] For that reason, the Eucharist was being described as conveying Christ's body as well as the bread.

While Pusey questioned Goode's interpretation of the Fathers which he cited in support of his argument against the Real Objective Presence with regard to his translation of the Greek and Latin, he did not place the greatest guilt upon such errors. Mostly, arguing along the same lines as R.I.Wilberforce in *The Doctrine*

of the Holy Eucharist, Pusey attributed the misinterpretations by contemporary Anglican divines of patristic sacramental theology to their failure to discern the patristic usage of the twin concepts of the inward and outward qualities of the consecrated elements.[25]

THE GRAMMATICAL ARGUMENT

Pusey's arguments for the Real Presence were not confined to documentation from authoritative sources. As we have seen, he was also prepared to argue from human grammar and logic to illustrate the case for the Real Presence. Like Luther before him, Pusey argued, for example, on the basis of a figure of speech such as synecdoche.

It was well known that eminent church writings speak of the consecrated bread and wine as the body and blood of Christ. In synecdoche, one will refer to the container of an object in terms of the object itself contained therein. 'So, as to all things of price, laid up in other things we say, without fear of being misunderstood, "This is that costly wine", and the like, disregarding the vessel whose only office is, to contain it'.[26] By such a figure of speech, one could be said to testify that the blood of Christ is contained within eucharistic wine by calling that wine

'the blood of Christ' as Christians have done and still do. Such speech testified to more than the mere verbal association between the elements and Christ's body and blood described in the so-called 'Maxim of Albertinus and the School of Calvin'. [27]

Pusey also insisted that to argue on this basis that the bread and wine were the body and blood of Christ did not mean that one must fall into the Capernaitic error. Furthermore the Calvinistic 'real absence' was not the solution to the problem. He wrote:

> The question turns, not on the relation of the outward part to the inward, but on this; whether the inward part be believed to be present, as the Ancient Church believed, or absent, as the School of Calvin thought; whether we receive,under the elements, the Body and Blood of Christ, present in a real, although "heavenly and spiritual manner", or whether, as the Calvinists held, there be contemporaneously, some effect produced by God the Holy Ghost on the soul, *then* as in the reading of the Word or any exercise of faith.[28]

THE LUTHERAN ORIGINS OF THE ANGLICAN REAL PRESENCE

Among the figures associated with the Oxford Movement of the 19th century, few felt anything but contempt for what they regarded as Lutheranism. Edward Pusey, however, was a notable exception to this. It is not difficult to establish that Pusey had considerable affection for Lutherans and even a qualified admiration for the Lutheran Confessions. He acquired this

affection early in his career during his academic work among Lutherans in Germany between 1825 - 1827.

It is with regard to the doctrines of the Lord's Supper that Pusey displays a remarkable combination of appreciation and abhorrence for various Lutheran articulations of eucharistic theories. In his 1857 Book, *The Holy Eucharist - The Doctrine of the English Church, With a Vindication of the Reception of the Wicked and of the Adoration of Our Lord Jesus Christ Truly Present*, Pusey presented a great deal of material relating to the Lutheran doctrine of the Real Presence. He did this because he believed that the Lutheran doctrine of the Real Presence was part of the heritage of Reformation Anglicanism. By delving into the history of the creation of the Anglican formularies, Pusey believed that he could show from church history that some of the best confessions of the Real Presence in the Anglican formularies originated in orthodox Lutheranism.

It is significant that Pusey should show admiration for 'Lutheranism', the theological system which the Oxford Movement figures, frequently in ignorance, so often maligned. Yet it was his knowledge of the teachings of historic Lutheranism which caused Pusey to respect it, and to trace the phrase in the book of *Homilies* which he regarded as Anglicanism's clearest confession of the Real Presence to finally

originate within the orthodoxy of Lutheranism. For this reason Pusey set out to demonstrate that 'the form of expression in which the Lutherans combined the belief in the Real Objective Presence with that of the continuance of the outward substances, was brought into England through the negotiations of Henry VIII with the Confederates of Smalcald'.[29]

Showing an insight into the history and content of Lutheran dogma rare for Anglican theologians of his day, Pusey was able to reveal a level of agreement between orthodox Lutheranism and Reformation Anglicanism which he believed to be very significant for Anglican sacramental theology. Quoting the Jenkyns edition of Cranmer's works, Pusey explained that in the early period when Anglican theology was being formulated, 'The Articles agreed upon with the German reformers' were, 1) 'on the Unity of God and the Trinity of Persons', 2) 'original sin', 3) 'on the two Natures of Christ', 4) 'Justification', 5) 'the Church', 6) 'Baptism', 7) 'the Eucharist', 8) 'Penitence', 9) 'use of Sacraments', 10) 'Ministers of the Church', 11) 'Ecclesiastical rites', 12) 'Civil matters', 13) 'Resurrection of the body, and the last Judgment'.[30]

Pusey felt that if he could establish Anglicanism's link with the sacramental theology of orthodox Lutheranism, whose faith in the Real Presence

was unquestionable, then Anglicans could better understand the articulations of the Real Presence found in their own Reformation formularies. Pusey apparently believed that Anglicanism could embrace a more orthodox view of the Real Presence if it but understood the nature of its Anglo-Lutheran Reformation foundation.

One illustration of Pusey's revealing use of examples from this period was a quotation from *The Bishop's Book*, a doctrinal exposition produced by the clergy of Henry VIII in 1537. He marked in italics the words which were taken from 'the Articles agreed upon with the Germans'.

> As touching the sacrament of the Altar, we will that all bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach our people committed by us unto their spiritual charge, that they ought and must *constantly believe, that under the form* and figure *of bread and wine* which we there presently do see and perceive by outward senses, *is verily, substantially, and really* contained and comprehended *the* very self-same *Body and Blood of* our Saviour Jesus *Christ*, which was born of the Virgin Mary, and suffered upon the Cross for our redemption. *And that under the same form* and figure of bread and wine, the very self-same Body and Blood of Christ is corporally, really and in the very substance *exhibited, distributed, and received of all* them which receive the said sacrament *and that therefore the said sacrament is used with all due reverence and honour.*'[1]

Pusey admitted that Cranmer may have abandoned the orthodox and Lutheran view of the Real Presence a year after the publication of the Homilies. He quotes one of Mr Goode's own quotations from 1548 in which the Zwinglian Trahern rejoices that 'Latimer is come over

to our opinion respecting the true doctrine of the Eucharist, together with the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the other Bishops who heretofore seemed to be Lutherans'. Later, writing to Bullinger (also in 1548), Trahern wrote that Cranmer 'openly, firmly, and learnedly, maintained your opinion upon the subject (of the Real Presence). I perceive that it is all over with Lutheranism, now that those who were considered its principal and almost only supporters have altogether come over to our side'.[32]

Pusey believed, however, that he had determined that Cranmer was a 'Lutheran' for a nine year period, during which he edited the first book of *Homilies* and during which time the first *Book of Common Prayer* of King Edward VI was produced.[33] A demonstration of Cranmer's Lutheranism at that time was all that was needed for Pusey to make his point. According to Pusey, it was during this Lutheran period in Cranmer's career that he composed that all-important notice in the first book of *Homilies* which referred to 'Body and Blood under the forms of bread and wine'.

'I shall, please God', wrote Pusey, 'shew presently, that the phrase "under the form of bread and wine" came into our Theology in the time of Henry VIII', being derived ultimately from the Confession of Augsburg.[34] With that resolve, Pusey embarked upon an astonishingly thorough history of the progress of that

phrase into the notice to the first book of *Homilies*.

Pusey endeavoured to show that the phrase, 'under the form of', in the first book of *Homilies* did not mean the empty outward appearance of bread and wine and reflect transubstantiation as Goode alleged. Goode used Pusey's quotation from the *Augsburg Confession* and its use of the word 'form' (*gestalt*) to prove that both the Augustana and the book of *Homilies* refer to transubstantiation.

Pusey easily proved that Goode was wrong as far as the *Augustana* was concerned. Pusey demonstrated that the word *Gestalt*, as used by Luther, who built much of the German Language, and as used by Lutherans, means 'species' or 'kind' as in the phrase: 'communion in both kinds'. Had the Lutherans, who did not hold to consubstantiation, let alone transubstantiation, intended to express the meaning 'mere form', they would have used the phrase *eine blosse Gestalt*. The idea of being unsubstantial, if expressed at all, would lie in the word 'mere', *blosse*, not the word *Gestalt*.[35]

Pusey's findings during his investigation are at least as interesting as his final conclusion. By translating portions of the *Augsburg Confession* such as the tenth article, he was able to show how the words used in Reformation Anglicanism corresponded to Lutheran eucharistic vocabulary. Below was Pusey's translation: [36]

GERMAN	LATIN
Of the Supper of the Lord is thus taught,that the true Body and Blood of Christ are truly present under the form of bread and wine in the Lord's Supper, and are there distributed and received. Wherefore also the opposed doctrine is rejected.	Of the Supper of the Lord they teach, that the Body and Blood of Christ are truly present and are distributed to communicants in the Lord's Supper and they disprove of those who teach otherwise.

Pusey affirmed that both the Latin and the German texts of *Augustana* 10 taught the Real Presence within the elements because they both speak of Christ's body and blood being 'distributed', clearly implying that the elements are the means through which this distribution takes place. As well as dogmatic usage of such language, Pusey also found liturgical examples of where the phrase 'under the form of bread and wine' was used among early Lutherans.

> In a "Saxon Missal", drawn up by Luther for Saxony and used in Torgau, in the time of John Frederic, Duke of Saxony, the words prescribed to be used in delivering the Sacrament are: "Receive under the species of the bread the true Body of our Lord Jesus Christ &c.", "Receive under the species of the wine the true Blood of the Lord Jesus Christ".

Pusey also translated article 10 of the the 'seventeen Articles' of Luther. In them he found language that corresponded to the Catechism of the Church of England with its questions about 'inward' and 'outward' components to the consecrated elements. Pusey also found parallels described between the

sacramental efficacy of the Eucharist and Baptism.

> The Eucharistia, or the sacrament of the altar, consists of two parts. Namely, there is truly present *in* bread and *in* wine the true Body and Blood of Christ, according to the word, "This is My Body" "This is My Blood"; and there is not bread and wine only, as the contrary party now gives out. This word requires also and brings faith too: and exercises it in all those who desire this Sacrament, and do not act against it; as Baptism brings faith, if one desires it. [37]

By his remarkable research into the history of Reformation-era Lutheranism, Pusey did a great deal to lift the veil of ignorance that existed among Anglicans concerning the history of the Lutheran doctrine of the Real Presence and its connection with the doctrinal formulations of Refomation Anglicanism. Pusey's knowledge of Lutheranism included a considerable quantity of detail concerning the Real Presence as some Lutherans believed it and as other Lutherans wrestled with it.

Pusey apparently knew a great deal about the little-known controversies and debates in Germany which ultimately forged the Lutheran doctrine. As the knowledge revealed in his books displays, Pusey knew perhaps as much about the sixteenth century struggles in early Lutheranism for the doctrine of the Real Presence as Walther did. For example, he seems to have been well acquainted with even such little known episodes as the formulation of the *Wittenberg Concord* and the 'Crypto-Calvinistic' controversy of the late

1530s in Germany in which the Lutheran doctrine of the Real Presence overcame a dire threat from Calvinism.

The Wittenberg Concord was the result of a convention between the Wittenberg Lutherans and some leading Zwinglians, including Capito and Bucer, the author of the *Confessio Tetrapolitana*. It was held in Wittenberg in 1536, 'with a view of uniting the Lutherans and the Swiss'. The representatives of 'the four cities' (Strasburg, Constance, Lindau, and Memingen), members since 1531 of the defensive treaty called the Smalkald League, had convinced the Elector of Saxony, despite Luther's previous advice, that they held the adequate doctrine of the Real Presence necessary for involvement in the treaty. Led by Bucer, they attempted to convince Lutherans of their orthodoxy by stating that they held to the two concepts so important for the Lutherans, namely the *manducatio oralis* and the *maducatio impii*.

Pusey saw how noteworthy it was that they dealt with certain crucial points in their statement:

> ...that by the institution and doing of the Lord, (as the words of Christ express) His true Body and true Blood are truly exhibited, given, and taken, with the visible signs, the bread and wine- that they believed also that, through the minister of the Church, the Body and Blood of Christ are offered to all receivers, and are received, not only by the worthy, with both heart and mouth, to salvation, but by the unworthy, with the mouth, to their judgment and condemnation. [38]

Pusey observed that Bucer and company frankly

admitted some misconceptions about Luther's views, attributing consubstantiation to him and a faulty doctrine of the *manducatio impiorum*. Fortunately Pusey was able to quote Luther, speaking in the third person, explicitly denying both consubstantiation and the idea that all who eat are made 'partakers of Christ', an important point for Pusey's own argument over the issue of the *manducatio impii*.

> He [Luther] did not unite the body and Blood by any natural bond with the bread and wine; nor did he locally include it in the bread and wine; nor did he ascribe to Sacraments any virtue of their own, whereby they should of themselves bring salvation to those who receive them; but only laid down a sacramental union between the Body and bread of the Lord; that he taught, moreover, that the strengthening of faith, which he ascribed to Sacraments, resulted from a virtue, not inherent in the outward things by themselves, but of Christ, and was dispensed by His Spirit through words and symbols.[39]

'Finally', wrote Pusey, 'the two parties agreed in a formula drawn up by Melanchthon'. Prominent in that formula is the use of the Irenaean dichotomy explanation of the Real Presence, so important, centuries later, to the Oxford Movement writers. The sentiments expressed by Bucer, whose role in Reformation Anglican theology is well known, make the *Wittenberg Concord* significant as a bridge between the Lutheran and Anglican developments of their subsequent doctrines of the Real Presence.[40]

Bucer used more negative than positive descriptions of his belief, but it was enough to

convince Luther that they were both on the same side. Among those who signed the Wittenberg Concord was Luther himself. Concerning the hope which Luther entertained that the Zwinglians were 'on a good road' to correct teaching on the Real Presence, Pusey judged,

> Luther was deceived. The Zwinglians had a strong antagonistic system of their own, consistent within itself, and making no demands upon faith. The Concord was signed. A few leading Zwinglian preachers lutheranised for a while. In seven years a more decided re-action took place. The Concord made no more impression upon the Zwinglian system, than the stone, which passes through the waters, and is buried in them, does upon the surface, which it, for the moment, rippled.[41]

With reference to the 'Crypto-Calvinist' controversy reflected in the Lutheran *Formula of Concord* thiry years later, Pusey related some of the background, much of which concerned Melanchthon. Melanchthon, to many of that time the successor to Luther, suffered from insecurity regarding the Lutheran doctrine of the Real Presence. Paradoxically, much of that insecurity arose from Melanchthon's reading of the eucharistic writings of Church Fathers, many of whom were quite confidently used by Pusey in support for his doctrine of the Real Presence.

Pusey found a letter which Melanchthon wrote to Brenz in which he confided his perplexity concerning certain passages from the 'ancient writers' (brought to his attention by Osiander) in which they 'interpret the mystery of a type, and typically'.[42]

Pusey attributed Melanchthon's doubts concerning the patristic doctrine of the Real Presence to his limited knowledge of their writings. Pusey mused:

> It is not strange ... that amid the then limited knowledge of the Fathers, he should have been perplexed by Osiander's collections of passages, in which they speak (as many do) of the consecrated symbols, as types. His own store of those passages in which the Fathers so strongly affirm the doctrine of the real objective Presence, was very limited. In his Apology, he had quoted Theofylact, of the 12th century, with St Cyril of Alexandria. His favorite passage for expressing his own belief, is a single saying of St Hilary. Perhaps too, Luther's mode of stating the doctrine hindered its occurring to him, that these Fathers when they speak of the Eucharistic elements as types, meant "types of that which, although invisible, was present, not absent". Passages, which expressed only a belief in the relation of the outward form to the inward substance, shook his belief in the Real Presence. [43]

Pusey believed that, although the Lutherans were largely unaware of it, dealing with eucharistic doctrine in patristic literature need not have been a matter of acceptance or rejection of certain Fathers, but of understanding them. Regarding the eucharistic teaching of Luther and Melanchthon, Pusey concluded that each had half of the truth. Luther had defended the objective reality of the Real Presence, Melanchthon its full benefit to the communicant. By the same token, where Melanchthon was strong Luther was weak in Pusey's judgement. He had the same verdict concerning Lutheranism as a whole combining criticism with praise that they:

> ... differed from Zwingli and Calvin, believing, not that the soul fed on Christ, but that Christ fed the soul with His own Body and Blood. The strength of the strict Lutheranism was its adherance to the meaning of our Lord's words, as the Church has ever received them; its weakness was, to make our Lord's Gift of His own Body and Blood, a *mere* testimony to faith, like the bow in the cloud ... Lutheranism then contained in itself the elements of its own decay. Melanchthon almost injured his own belief by what he retained of it. He let go Luther's strong adherence to the words, "this is My Body" and he retained what undermined the faith, Luther's theory that its very end was to be a sign of faith.[44]

Pusey defined Crypto-Calvinism as arising from Melanchthon's intention to 'withdraw the young from dogmatic statements on the Holy Eucharist ...to declare those statements to be no part of the faith'; a teaching which damaged the faith itself 'so far as it depends upon those expressions of it'.[45] Pusey wrote that the use of an altered Latin version of the *Augsburg Confession* '...being less definite, conspired with the undogmatic character of Melanchthon's teaching'. Pusey judged that 'it is better never to have had a clear expression of faith, than to lay it aside. It is laid aside through diminished faith; and the act of laying it aside diminishes faith'.[46]

An important result of Pusey's achievement in research seems to have been a rare insight on his part into the thinking of Confessional Lutherans concerning the Real Presence. Certainly Pusey left the Anglican church of his day with a fascinating glimpse into the little known historic forces which shaped its own

doctrinal statements. He proudly maintained that only the best Lutheran teaching was absorbed by Reformation Anglicanism. That which was 'heretical' was not incorporated into Anglican doctrine. He could not make the same claim about the Anglican absorption of Calvinist doctrine.

Pusey's grasp of the controversy regarding the language of various editions and translations of the *Augsburg Confession* is impressive. His conclusions are valuable as much to Lutherans as to Anglicans. Historically numerous Lutheran groups with Calvinistic views of the Real Presence have attempted to hide behind later 'altered' editions or translations of the *Augsburg Confession*, claiming that their variation had superseded the original German edition. Lutherans who chose to remain faithful to the original *Augsburg Confession* asserted that they adhered to the unaltered text. Even today the cornerstones of some old American Lutheran Churches and outdoor notice boards may be seen to have written on them: 'Church of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession'. Pusey's assertion that subsequent variations of the *Augustana* constituted faithful expansions rather than substantive alterations of the original would seem to refute the claims of Crypto-Calvinistic Lutherans, and render service to the cause of orthodox Lutheranism.[47]

THE LUTHERANS AND THE DEBATE OVER CHANGE IN THE ELEMENTS

As Pusey demonstrated at such great length, the Lutheran formularies were indeed, the source of the phrase 'under the form [*Gestalt*] of bread and wine', so crucial to Pusey's argument for the survival of the doctrine of the Real Presence into Reformation Anglicanism. Yet when Lutheran writings are further examined a question may be raised as to whether the Lutheran meaning of *unter der Gestalt* corresponded as closely to Pusey's views as he thought it did. Light is thrown upon this question through investigating the Lutheran understanding of the nature of the eucharistic elements once they are consecrated.

Historically, Lutherans were not vehemently opposed to speaking of a change in the elements at their consecration. In the *Apology to the Augsburg Confession* Melanchthon's remarks concerning the Eastern Orthodox belief were positive. He wrote that they believed in the Real Presence as something divinely effected at the time of the consecration of the elements. 'The canon of the Mass among them testifies to this, in which the priest clearly prays that the bread may be changed and become the very Body of Christ. And Vulgarius, who seems to us to be not a silly writer, says distinctly that *bread is not a mere*

figure, but is truly changed into flesh'.[48]

The Roman doctrine of transubstantiation, however, was not embraced as an accurate model of such a change in the elements because its philosophical encumbrances seemed an unwelcome intrusion into the scriptural testimony for the Real Presence. In the authoritative *Smalcald Articles* Luther wrote:

> As regards transubstantiation, we care nothing about the sophistical subtlety by which they teach that bread and wine leave or lose their own natural substance, and that there remain only the appearance and colour of bread, and not the true bread. For it is in perfect agreement with Holy Scriptures that there is, and remains, bread as Paul himself calls it, 1 Cor. 10.16 "The bread which we break", and 1 Cor.11.28, "So let him eat of that bread".[49]

The trouble with transubstantiation for Lutherans was that it failed to meet the requirement of faithfulness to the literal meaning of scripture which they demanded. However, this insistence upon faithfulness to the literal meaning of scripture did not stop the Lutherans from speaking of an *unio sacramentalis* as they described the consecrated elements.

The seventh article of the *Formula of Concord* reads:

> We believe, teach, and confess that in the Holy Supper the body and blood of Christ are truly and essentially present, and are truly distributed and received with the bread and wine. We believe, teach and confess that the words of the testament of Christ are not to be understood otherwise than as they read according to the letter [*ad literam*], so that the bread does not

> signify the absent body and the wine the absent blood of Christ, but that, on account of the sacramental union [*propter sacramentalem unionem*], they [the bread and wine] are truly the body and blood of Christ.

Thus the aspect of the theory of transubstantiation which made it particularly objectionable to Lutherans was its insistence that after consecration the substance of the bread and wine do not remain, even conjointly, with the body and blood of Christ. As Pieper indicated:

> The Council of Trent (Sess.XIII, can.2) pronounces the curse on all who deny transubstantiation: "If anyone saith that in the sacred and holy sacrament of the Eucharist the substance of the bread and wine remain conjointly with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and denieth that wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the Body and the whole substance of the wine into the Blood - the species only of the bread and wine remaining - which conversion is called Transubstantiation; let him be anathema". [50]

Yet the Lutherans insisted that the bread and wine did remain conjointly with the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist, despite their use of the phrase *unter der Gestalt*. For to the Lutherans, *unter der Gestalt* did not mean 'under the semblance of' but, as the *Apology to the Augsburg Confession* explains it: 'with those things which are seen', in other words, conjointly.[51]

Pusey was aware that Lutherans believed in this conjoined relationship between the elements and Christ's body and blood in *unio sacramentalis*. In his

book of 1857 Pusey quoted Luther's comments in which he acknowledged the fact that his Roman Catholic opponents did not object to the tenth article of the *Augsburg Confession*,

> "wherein we confess that our Lord Christ's Body and Blood are truly present in the Supper of Christ, and are, with the visible things, Bread and Wine, presented [dargereicht] and received, as has been held up to this time in the Churches, as the Canon of the Greeks shews".[52]

The above quotation used by Pusey came from a time when the Lutheran teaching on the Real Presence did not receive unanimous opposition from Rome. Yet once the Roman church met in council at Trent, they did oppose certain aspects of the Lutheran doctrine of the body and blood of Christ present conjointly with bread and wine.

It seems that by the use of a pre-Tridentine endorsement of the Lutheran position, Pusey was attempting to lead his readers to believe that the Lutheran theory of the Real Presence was in agreement with that of Rome. Pusey did so with reference to the negotiations in the early days of the Lutheran Reformation involving Cardinal Contarini, in which the Lutheran statements on the Real Presence could be endorsed by Rome, with the necessary insertion of the term 'transubstantiation'.[53]

Pusey knew that the Lutheran reformers objected to the insertion made by Cardinal Contarini, but was

heartened that the Roman legate did express agreement with the rest. Pusey eagerly made use of that pre-Tridentine colloquy as part of his explanation that the Lutheran doctrine was truly a catholic one which had made its way into the early Anglican Church. All the aspects of the Real Presence which Pusey sought to promote among Anglicans were there in that agreement between Rome and the Lutherans. The doctrine of the Real Presence within the elements was asserted, and that by virtue of their consecration. Faulty dependence upon human reason was roundly repudiated, cutting both ways against sacramentarianism and some of the philosophical concepts in transubstantiation as well. Finally the colloquy rallied around patristic descriptions of the Real Presence with the dichotomy of Irenaeus taking the prominent position.[54]

The viewpoint set forth in the Lutheran writings was clear. The inclusion of such Lutheran writings in Pusey's argument was also evidence that he was not afraid to be associated with the Lutheran doctrine of the Real Presence. It showed that Pusey was confident that he could be part of the heritage of those reformers who opposed transubstantiation, yet still retain a doctrine of Christ's eucharistic presence that testified to its objective reality together with the consecrated elements of bread and wine.

THE LUTHERAN *UNIO SACRAMENTALIS* - THEIR DEFINITION OF THE PHRASE 'UNDER THE FORM OF BREAD AND WINE'

Some doubt exists as to whether Pusey truly understood the phrase *'unter der Gestalt'* as used by Lutherans even though he argued for its orthodoxy. He may have merely used it as a bridge between the Church of England and the Roman heritage Anglicanism shared with Lutheranism at the time of the Reformation. In order to understand fully the phrase 'under the form of bread and wine', used by the Lutherans and Pusey to portray the relationship of Christ's body and blood to the eucharistic elements, the Lutheran use of the concept of an *unio sacramentalis* in the Eucharist must be understood.

Confessional Lutherans regarded the doctrine of the *unio sacramentalis* as the most scripturally sound model of the Real Presence. Both the Roman and Reformed views of the sacrament were attributed to less faithful exegesis of scripture. The Confessional Lutheran contemporary of C.F.W.Walther, Charles Porterfield Krauth even asserted that there was a 'secret affinity' between Romanism and Rationalism, in that both 'hate unswerving fidelity to the Word of God' arbitrarily doing away with scriptural testimony to the reality of the bread and wine, in the case of Romanism,

or of the body and blood of Christ in the case of the Rationalist. God. It was his understanding: 'that the Romish and rationalizing modes of interpretation are nearer to each other than either is to the Lutheran... admitted by both Rationalist and Romanists'.[55]

It is clear that, to the Confessional Lutherans, the sacramental union was a union between the elements and Christ's body and blood, although not a consubstantial one. Their teaching was not unique but comparable to the terms of the Irenaean dichotomy described earlier. The *Formula of Concord* enshrined this combination of the earthly (*terrena*) and the heavenly (*coelestis*) components of the Eucharist when it stated: 'They confess, according to the words of Irenaeus, that in the Sacrament there are two things, a heavenly and an earthly'.[56] Pieper's authoritative dogmatics book brought that teaching into more modern times when he asserted that 'all substitutes for this two-fold material are to be rejected'.[57] Furthermore, what was involved in this sacramental union was more specific than the 'whole Christ' described by some nineteenth century theologians. Christ's body and blood, given and shed for the remission of sins was offered for oral consumption in the Eucharist.[58]

So, in their own way, the Confessional Lutherans refused transubstantiation, not, out of legal obligation, as in the case of the Tractarians, but

because that theory fell short of their standard of fidelity to the Scriptures. What they put in its place was not another philosophical concept, but the mystery which Pusey sought to reclaim for Anglicanism.

TRACTARIANISM, THE REAL PRESENCE AND TRANSUBSTANTIATION

The understanding of the Real Presence among Tractarians such as Keble or Newman appears to have undergone changes and development before reaching final form. What every articulation of the Real Presence had to contain throughout that development was a rejection of transtubstantiation. After the publication of Froude's *Remains*, Newman used Hooker's eucharistic theology in a polemic with a Professor Faussett. Attempting to acquit Hooker of Receptionism, Newman used Hooker to describe a Real Presence that was not *intra* the elements, 'as if Christ were shut up in them', but only in the receiver. The Real Presence was regarded as so intimately connected with the elements that Newman was able to say: 'when we touch the one [the outward sign], we touch the Other, when we eat the one, we eat the Other, when we drink the one, we drink the Other'.[59] The Real Presence is spoken of as being indistinguishable from the elements, yet in almost a parallel relationship to them.

A merely metaphorical relationship between the elements and Christ's body and blood was thought to be unwarranted. Froude explained that Christ's body and blood could have such a relationship to bread and wine when considered in terms of the capabilities of His resurrected body:

> Where the bread is said to be the very Body of Christ which was broken for us, and the cup the very Blood that was shed for us, it is meant that they are the same in that sense in which our bodies after the Resurrection will be the same with our present bodies ... So then the very same Body of Christ which was broken for us, though then a natural Body, is now a spiritual body.[60]

E.B.Pusey faced the relationship between the Real Presence and Roman transubstantiation in his notes to the university sermon: *The Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist*. Ironically it was as the result of protest from a Roman Catholic critique of that sermon published in the *Dublin Review*, that Pusey tackled transubstantiation, not to defend his adherence to it, as Tractarians often did, but to defend his rejection of transubstantiation in favour of his own brand of real, objective Presence.

In the *Dublin Review* article, Pusey's Roman Catholic opponent used quotations from patristic writings to support transubstantiation. Over against this, Pusey used patristic quotations to show that those same Fathers believed quite the opposite of what the writer in the *Dublin Review* claimed they did. He

made it clear that the mode of Christ's presence in the Eucharist was far from consistently described until the Lateran Council of 1215.[61]

Pusey's argument against transubstantiation began with his demonstration that the Aristotelian concepts of substance and accident are human ideas not required by divine revelation concerning the Eucharist. Furthermore the first interpreters of scripture, the Church Fathers, did not use such descriptions. Instead a wide variety of views on the Real Presence were available in patrisitic writings.

He argued that many patristic descriptions of the Real Presence were quite simple and undefined, 'not, in any way, leading to a belief in any change of substance'.[62] Only the pressures brought to bear by the threat of heresy forced the Church Fathers to describe the Real Presence in greater detail. In no case, however, did they describe that the bread and wine were somehow materially annihilated as the doctrine of transubstantiation required. Just the opposite was true. Pusey found positive evidence in patristic literature that they believed bread and wine remained after consecration as Christ's body and blood.

Pusey also made use of patristic references to the nourishing qualities of the eucharistic elements to undermine transubstantiation. He quoted St Justin and others in their statements that the Eucharist nourished

physically as well as spiritually. In doing so, Pusey was able to use one of the concepts of Aristotle against the doctrine of transubstantiation because according to his philosophy only the substance of food provides nutrition.

Descriptive words which Pusey did find in patristic writings were such as that used by St Gregory of Nyssa to describe the bread of the Eucharist as hallowed and 'transmade' at the word of God into the body of God, the Word. He judged such concepts to be quite different from the complex philosophical theory of transubstantiation. Pusey determined that 'neither in their etymology nor their usage is any change in the substance implied'.[63] On the positive side, Pusey believed he could find in the writings of the Church Fathers descriptions of the miracle of the Eucharist that would be both appropriate to its divine mystery and informative in answering the questions that remained in the modern Christian mind.

Pusey's view of what transubstantiation involved went through a metamorphosis from the early days of the Tracts up to his correspondence with Cardinal Newman thirty years later. As might be expected, Pusey began in opposition to transubstantiation, but the way he perceived the doctrine changed in his later understanding.

Even in his early opposition to

transubstantiation, Pusey still held a clear doctrine of the Real Presence. From the beginning his opposition to transubstantiation was 'combined with a confession of belief in the elements as "conveying...the life-giving Body and Blood", and in the "truth of the real mystical, spriritual presence of Christ in the Eucharist"'.[64]

In the early years, Pusey seemed to maintain a view of transubstantiation that was unrefined and close to the caricature held by many Protestants of his day. In his letter to the Bishop of Oxford, written in 1839, Pusey rejected transubstantiation for its 'carnal conceptions' of the Real Presence. His ground for that assertion was his understanding of 'substance' to be equivalent to a 'sensible' presence. Hardelin states that Pusey thus attributed to Roman theology an empiricism such as that which Wilberforce described as 'Baconian'.[65] As time went on, he began to see philosophy behind the theory as being more subtle than he had previously thought.

By the time Newman was a Cardinal, Pusey wrote concerning transubstantiation without encumbering the doctrine with material aspects. By 1867, Pusey described to Newman how he understood Tridentine eucharistic theology to be free from objectionable materialism. He simply urged that, in the interests of more productive eirenic discussions with those who were

doubtful, the doctrine of the Real Presence should not be

> troubled with Aristotelic discussions about *substantia*, or physical discussions about nutrition or be told about miracles of which Scripture and the Church say nothing, about "new matter" being created, or the old brought back, &c.&c...[66]

For Pusey the worst aspect of the doctrine of transubstantiation became, not heresy, but its role in obstructing the promotion of the doctrine of the Real Presence among Protestants. He expressed to Cardinal Newman how he wished the problems created by the Roman description of transubstantiation be removed by a change in Rome's description of the Real Presence.

> If it (a Roman description of the Real Presence) is not to involve us in anything which contradicts our physical knowledge or, as an alternative, involves miracles as to the removal or new creation of matter, of which no authority tells us anything, I think that a great stumbling-block would be removed. For Transubstantiation is the great bugbear to prevent people owning to themselves that they believe a Real Objective Presence.[67]

In his correspondence with Pusey concerning the Real Presence it is interesting that Newman confessed to a certain inability on his own part to articulate the doctrine of transubstantiation, even long after Tract 90, with its discussion of article XXVIII, and subsequent correspondence with the Roman priest Dr Russell of Maynooth years before.

R.I.WILBERFORCE AND THE DOCTRINE OF THE REAL PRESENCE

With regard to an orthodox understanding of the Real Presence, another early Oxford Movement figure, Robert Isaac Wilberforce, argued along the same lines as Pusey. In his book, *The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, Wilberforce also drew much of his eucharistic ideas from patristic sources. He knew that theologians in his own church who opposed his doctrine of the Real Presence also claimed patristic support for their views, but Wilberforce regarded their judgement as a misinterpretation of the Church Fathers. Wilberforce felt able to attribute such misinterpretations to a failure to discern the patristic usage of the twin concepts of the inward and outward components of the consecrated eucharistic elements.

He frequently referred to this concept of two components in each of the sacramental elements: the outward bearer of the eucharistic Jesus, the *sacramentum*, and *res sacramenti*: that actual body and blood of Christ conveyed by the *sacramentum*. Variations of this formula may be found in patristic writings including Augustine's combination of *signum* and *res*, with the *sacramentum* spoken of as the sign or symbol yet not detracting from the reality of the *res*, the 'thing signified' which the signs and symbols of

the bread and wine actually convey, i.e. the real body and blood of the God-Man, Jesus Christ.

This theory of the Real Presence remained of great importance to those Oxford Movement figures who wrote on the subject, and Pusey was no exception. Armed with it, Pusey was able to write, 'I maintained (as the Church of England teaches) "that the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances", and yet that under these poor outward forms, His "creatures of bread and wine", "the faithful verily and indeed take and receive the Body and Blood of Christ"'.[68] Pusey often noted that he could identify this Irenaean dichotomy in the catechism of the *Book of Common Prayer*.

Wilberforce also recognised that the ancient church, though it held to the Real Presence, exercised a certain reserve with regard to analysing the nature of that presence lest they profane holy things. Hence the catechetical writings of such ancient writers as Augustine and Origen employed phrases such as '... the faithful will know what I mean...' and '...the initiated will comprehend...'. Yet despite such evasive language in patristic literature, Wilberforce was still able to demonstrate that the Fathers held to a change in the elements whereby the eucharistic gifts of Christ's body and blood was said to be bestowed. He did so by quoting one of those Church Fathers who did

offer an explanation to his catechumens, St Cyril of Jerusalem, who taught that the elements become the body and blood of Christ after the invocation of the Holy Spirit.[69]

Of central importance to Wilberforce was the patristic description of the consecrated elements as a 'compound whole' composed of its *sacramentum* and *res sacramenti*. Augustine, a bit more vague than later writers on this point, wrote of a *virtus sacramenti* as interchangeable with the *res*. Wilberforce found this formula to be of enormous value in interpreting other eucharistic theologies as well as his own. It also provided Wilberforce with an argument from silence to deal with patristic statements that could be understood to express a Calvinistic or a Zwinglian eucharistic theology.

In the case of patristic statements that could be taken to express Memorialism rather than the Real Presence, Wilberforce refered to the Fathers' use of the distinction between *sacramentum* and *res* to acquit them of any heresy. At the same time he could claim that the errors of the reformers were related to their failure to so distinguish these aspects of the Real Presence.

Ultimately Wilberforce wrote that this compound model of the Real Presence described by Augustine and Irenaeus was superior over that which he attributed to

Zwingli, Calvin and even Luther. For example, Luther was described by Wilberforce as having confused both ingredients, while Calvin was said to dissociate the *res* from its virtue. As for Zwingli, he was charged with omitting the *res* altogether.

Furthermore Luther's sacramental theology was said to suffer because of the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith. Wilberforce wrote:

> The Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith is incompatible with any real belief in the validity of the sacraments. If a man can place himself in a state of safety and acceptance, by the mere conviction of his own mind, what need has he of external ordinances? A person who possessed the secret which was sought for by the Alchymists, [changing iron into gold] could hardly be expected to earn his daily bread by the toilsome processes of ordinary labour: and those who imagined that man's salvation was wrought out by his own assurance of its attainment, could never attach any real value to the means of grace. That the importance of sacraments was an excrescence in Luther's system, and had no root in its real life, is shown by the history of his followers.[70]

Wilberforce went on to give examples of figures in Luther's own lifetime such as Melanchthon and his alleged alterations to the *Augsburg Confession* which detracted from the Lutheran eucharistic theology, and in a footnote included a damaging quote from the German exegete Lueke: 'Since the middle of the eighteenth century the generality whether of dogmatic or exegetical writers among the Lutherans have at first silently, and then avowedly, adopted the Calvinistic or Zwinglian theory of the Lord's Supper'.[71]

According to Wilberforce the orthodox teaching concerning the Real Presence is the victim of four perversions among Christians. All of these perversions were said to 'arise out of inadequate conceptions of the *sacramentum* and *res sacramenti* - the Subject that is, and the Predicate of Our Lord's words of Institution'.[72]

> CAPERNAITES denied the existance of the outward form of bread - (*sacramentum*).
>
> LUTHER confused the purposes of the *sacramentum* and *res sacramenti*.
>
> ZWINGLI denied presence of Christ in the elements - *res sacramenti*).
>
> CALVIN detached the *virtus sacramenti* from the *res sacramenti* - overthrew the 'sacramental union' of *sacramentum* and *res sacramenti*. [73]

So thorough was Wilberforce's analysis of the component parts of the consecrated elements that his descriptions sounded quite scientific. He confidently asserted that the *res* in itself had neither place nor form; like light, it assumes the shape of the container. The *res* borrows place and shape [form] from the *sacramentum*.[74]

Beyond such arguments as these, Wilberforce explored the Christological dimension of his subject.

He argued that the Real Presence of Christ's body and blood is a natural and consistent extension of His incarnation. His reasoning was as follows:

Integral to the purpose of the incarnation was the transmission of Christ's physical body and blood. The poison of Adam was transmitted through flesh, and the cure for that poison comes by virtue of the flesh of Christ. The sin of Adam transmitted mysteriously through human flesh is forgiven by virtue of Christ's flesh, communicated through the Holy Communion. By means of the Eucharist, the perfections of the Creator are extended to the creature, not by imputation, but only by communion, the means of re-creation.[75] All this corresponded to the way that in the eternal generation of the Son of God, the Godhead is imparted to Him substantially. In the incarnation the Son is substantially united to His human nature. And in the Eucharist the God-Man 'communicates His manhood to His brethren'. Wilberforce asserted, 'This is His Real Presence in the Holy Eucharist. As the first, there is the communication of that *substance* which is common to the Three Persons in the blessed Godhead, so is the last the *substantial* communication of that manhood which has been hallowed by the taking of it into God'.[76]

Much of Wilberforce's biblical support for the Real Presence was derived from the sixth chapter of the

gospel of St John. He judged that the sixth chapter taught the sacrament of the Lord's Supper even as the third taught the sacrament of Baptism. Even the structure of chapter six was said to strongly resemble John's presentation of the sacrament of Baptism in John 3.[77]

For Wilberforce John six was a chapter that spoke of the eating and drinking of Christ's body and blood. To him that could only mean the Real Presence in the Eucharist. He also took pains to demonstrate that it could not mean what so many Protestants had taught that it meant. He searched the Bible and biblical theology and determined that the eating and drinking of Christ's body and blood could not mean 'to receive the benefits of the atonement' because the blood of the [Old Testament] sacrifices was never drunk.[78] Nor could it mean 'to receive Christ's doctrines or teachings' because a metaphor of eating the flesh of a teacher would not be analogous to such a statement in the minds of any of the original hearers.[79]

Wilberforce argued that those who denied the eucharistic character of John 6 failed to take note of the lack of an expected disclaimer from St John, to his original readers, to say that Jesus' words do not refer to the Eucharist. Those who questioned the existence of eucharistic teaching in a gospel that does not refer to the Last Supper were judged to have failed to note

the unique character of the fourth Gospel as well as foreknowledge and planning of Jesus prior to the institution of the Holy Supper.[80]

Wilberforce felt that his strongest argument was his observation that all the early Church Fathers who fully expound on John 6 agree that it refers directly to the Eucharist. He was able to quote from fathers like St Chrysostom who paraphrased Jesus in John 6 to say, 'I have become a partaker of flesh and blood for your sakes; again that very flesh and blood by which I have become akin to you, I give back to you'.[81]

His strategy for reinforcing the believability of his doctrine of the Real Presence was to enumerate for his readers what the Real Presence was not. It was not a natural, typological, or virtual presence. It was a supernatural body which Christ was able to give for food and drink in the Eucharist. In this respect, Wilberforce's argument resembled that of Pusey who spoke of the presence of Christ's 'spiritual body'. Wilberforce restricted the 'natural' body of Christ to the right hand of God. The eucharistic body and blood are 'not bestowed *naturally*, or under the same form and character which belongs to Our Lord's Body in heaven, but *supernaturally*, or under the form of bread and wine'. [82]

It perplexed Wilberforce, as it did Pusey, that so many theologians believed the doctrine of the Real

Presence to be undermined by patristic references to the elements as typological of the body and blood of Christ. Those theologians who did question the Real Presence when confronted with certain patristic statements, as Melanchthon did when confronted by Oecalampedius' patristic quotations, simply failed to note the patristic distinction between the *sacramentum* and *res sacramenti*. Wilberforce believed that the Fathers never denied the Real Presence of the *res sacramenti* in the consecrated elements how ever often they may have referred to them as typological. Wilberforce asserted, 'There is not one of the ancient writers by whom the Bread and Wine are spoken of as anti-types, who has not expressed himself with the utmost distinctness respecting the reality of that inward gift of which these form the external part'.[83] Any doubts Melanchthon may have had concerning the Real Presence would have been removed had he known that in all of Oecalampedius' patristic quotations, the *res* of the sacrament was never denied to be the very body and blood of Christ truly present.

Wilberforce severely criticised Calvin's doctrine of the eucharistic presence. To Wilberforce it was quite unchurchly to hold with Virtualism in the Anglican church. He, like Pusey, argued that Calvin's teaching was too negative, suggesting a real absence rather than a Real Presence. According to Calvin's

theory of the virtual presence, that which is received in the Eucharist was a virtue, not the *res sacramenti* (the body and blood of Jesus). Furthermore, that virtue was not to be expected within the elements, nor are the elements consecrated. No peculiar reverence was applicable to the elements. Nor was the sacramental gift communicated to all who receive it. Only those who are the elect receive anything from the Sacrament in the Calvinistic scheme. In these respects Wilberforce noted that Calvin departed from Luther, but not far from Zwingli. But above all, Wilberforce judged that, in his theory, Calvin departed from the teachings of the Scriptures and the Fathers of the Church.

Nor, According to Wilberforce, was Calvin a true successor to the sacramental theology of St Augustine. Calvin may have reflected Augustine's tendency to make no distinction between the *res* and *virtus sacramenti*, but Calvin did not maintain Augustine's teaching that the validity of the sacrament was dependant upon the consecration of the elements. Likewise Calvin failed to carry forward Augustine's teaching of the *manducatio impii*, the eating and drinking of Christ's body and blood, even by the wicked.

Like Pusey, Wilberforce concluded his argument with reference to liturgical language which seemed to manifest the doctrine of the Real Presence. Liturgies

from both eastern and western rites provided him with suitable quotations. While the Western Church, with its formulations of the *res* and the *sacramentum* had the best Christology of the Real Presence, the Eastern Church, with its *epiclesis* in the Liturgy yielded the best pneumatology of the Real Presence. To Wilberforce, the different branches of Catholicism complement each other in this respect.

Wilberforce admired the eastern pneumatology of the Real Presence. He wrote of it: 'The Sacramental system, and the efficacy attributed to Our Lord's Humanity, do not trench upon the office of the Holy Ghost as the "Lord and Giver of Life" ... The Holy Spirit makes the bread into the Body as He made Christ's humanity develop in the womb of the Virgin Mary ... Yet is was the Son who was incarnate (not the Spirit). So it is that God the Word is present in the Holy Eucharist through the power of the Holy Spirit'.[84]

Wilberforce eventually left the Church of England and soon afterward died in the Roman Catholic Church. He, like Cardinal Manning, ended his days railing the Anglican church he had forsaken. His eventual bitter regard for Anglican sacramental theology was foreshadowed before his departure when he wrote accusing Protestantism and Anglicanism of hypocrisy and inconsistancy. 'As it would be presumptuous to invent (sacramental usage), so to abandon it would be impious.

And yet either, perhaps, were less heinous guilt than to retain holy and sublime usages, pregnant with great truths and associated with the love and devotion of all saints, yet to regard them with [the] cold contempt, with which men treat the unmeaning and obsolete fashions of a barbaric age'.[85]

OTHER TRACTARIANS AND THE REAL PRESENCE

Before he left the Anglican Church, Wilberforce had already distanced himself theologically from Pusey with regard to the Real Presence. Pusey confided to Keble:

> R.W.(ilberforce) is writing what I think is quite untenable; that the Roman Church by "transubstantiation" does not mean a physical change ... from which people would infer that our Article was very superfluous, and founded on a disbelief in the Real Presence ... My line would be, as in my letter and my sermon, to inculcate the doctrine of the Real Presence and to speak of the elements as remaining; as the obvious teaching of Holy Scripture and of the Fathers. The words at the end of the first book of Homilies "under the form of bread and wine" furnish a good formula for the truth. Durandus says, "It is easier to believe that the Body and Blood of Christ are present under accidents whose substance remains [which I suppose to be the English doctrine] than under the accidents whose substance is gone". This statement avoids the charge of consubstantiation.[86]

In a smaller way, the other Tractarians found themselves taking similar positions with regard to the Real Presence to those of great writers such as Pusey

and Wilberforce. They too had to confront the 'bugbear' of transubstantiation, denouncing it, mainly to save their own positions in the Church of England, and also because of some genuine objections to it. One such objection was that it tried too hard to explain what was better admired in silence. According to Hardelin many Tractarians rejected transubstantiation as a breach of the 'reserve' which they felt to be the most appropriate approach to the sacrament.[87]

Later Oxford Movement figures conceded that transubstantiation was not so much a matter of rationalism but of Church authority. It was a 'definition' of a doctrine, not an explanation of sensory phenomena. They concluded that the difference between the churches was 'verbal' or 'philosophical' more than doctrinal on the Real Presence.[88] The fact that they could make such statements suggests something of the length to which many Tractarians would go to understand and harmonise their beliefs with those of the Church of Rome.

THE DOCTRINE OF 'UBIQUITY': THE POINT OF CONFLICT BETWEEN THE LUTHERAN AND TRACTARIAN UNDERSTANDINGS OF THE REAL PRESENCE

Whilst Pusey openly admired the theology of the

Lutheran Church of the *Augsburg Confession* and gratefully acknowledged its contribution to Anglican theology, he also detected what he believed to be a strain of heresy, which, although it did not threaten the doctrine, directly involved the Real Presence. It was a heresy which he believed to be the ruin of the *Book of Concord*, making it an 'image whose toes were of mingled iron and clay ... inherently weak', a powerless, mixture of truth and error. The heresies which it [the *Formula of Concord*] contained, made the truth joined on with these, powerless. The image was broken for ever. Whatever Germany may become, it can never again be Lutheran'.[89]

The alleged 'heresy' expressed within the Lutheran Confessions was the doctrine known by its opponents as the 'ubiquity' theory. This doctrine, promoted by Luther, Johann Brenz, and Jacob Andrea, asserts that the Real Presence of Christ's body and blood in the Eucharist is best supported by Christology.

According to the ubiquity theory, Christ's body and blood, aspects of His human nature essential to the Sacrament of the Altar, are present in all world-wide celebrations of the Holy Supper because of His divine nature's powers of omnipresence which the human nature shares according to the Christological doctrine of the *communicatio idiomatum*.[90]

This Lutheran eucharistic Christology contradicted that of the Reformed, whose philosophy excluded from eucharistic distribution such supposedly finite components of Christ's human nature as His body and blood. The Lutherans labeled the Reformed position by means of an axiom: *finitum non est capax infiniti.* This was said to portray the Reformed doctrine of the impossibility of finite objects such as bread and wine carrying the infinite God-Man into the mouths of human communicants.

Lutherans, invoking Chalcedonian Christology, claimed that by virtue of the *unio personalis* of Christ's divine and human natures, His human body and blood could share the omnipresence of which His divine nature was capable. Thus the Real Presence of Christ's body and blood on every catholic altar would be Christologically possible. Their opponent's axiom that the finite cannot contain the infinite was to be regarded as part of a quasi-Platonic philosophy alien to Christian thought. Consequently, Lutherans regarded as alien and sectarian, any statement that the human body and blood of Christ were restricted to any finite location, and excluded from the catholic altars of the world, particularly as restricted to the 'right hand of God' in some local sense.

Pusey's failure to appreciate the orthodoxy of Lutheran Christology may be explained by a possible

ignorance on his part of certain very important documents. One such document is the so-called *Catalogus Testimoniorum*, a catena of Biblical and patristic references cited in defence of the orthodoxy of the Christology of the Lutheran Confessions. This document, while not officially part of the *Book of Concord* of 1580, was included in several editions of it, such as that of Magdeburg.[91] Despite its important role for Lutherans in understanding the orthodox roots of their Christology, Pusey made no reference to it in his writings and may have been ignorant of its existence.

Another document, in which the orthodoxy of Lutheran Christology may be demonstrated, is Martin Chemnitz' enormous 1578 tome: *De Duabus Naturis in Christo*. Chemnitz was part of that party of Lutherans Pusey called: 'Ultra-Lutherans'. They were those who held to Luther's sacramental views over against Calvinising influences, and even more moderate Lutherans prior to the completion of the *Book of Concord* in 1580.

In this book, the sheer scale of Chemnitz' comprehensive use of patristic references to support his assertions rivals that of Pusey himself. A more thorough vindication of the orthodoxy of the Lutheran Christology of the Real Presence would seem inconceivable. Nevertheless, Chemnitz' book remained a

rather obscure 16th century work, unknown to Anglican theologians of Pusey's day. In fact, *De Duabus Naturis in Christo* remained untranslated into English until 1971. Nor is any reference made by Pusey to this important book.

When Pusey expressed his opposition to this view he described it as more pantheistic than biblical. He did show some knowledge of the Lutheran Christology of the Real Presence, but from inferior sources. In his 1857 book on the Real Presence, Pusey introduced the Lutheran position by saying:

> These (the "Ultra-Lutherans"), having neither the authority of the Church to fall back upon, nor the personal influence of Luther, nor being able somehow to take up his ground, that the mode of Christ's Presence in the Holy Eucharist must be left to God's omnipotency, adopted a heretical defence of that Presence, derived originally from Luther. This was the supposed ubiquity of Christ's Body, by virtue of Its union with His Godhead. This was an error, founded upon a misconception of the Catholic doctrine of the "Communicatio idiomatum". The truth expressed by that term is, that our Lord being, in one Person, Perfect God and Perfect Man, what belongs to His Divine Nature may be said of Him, as Man, and what belongs to His Human Nature may be spoken of as God.[92]

Tractarianism's other eucharistic theologian, Robert Isaac Wilberforce also criticized Lutheran writings on this point. It was his view that Christ's body and blood were eucharistically present, not because His manhood makes use of an omnipresence which belongs to God by nature, but because His human nature partook accidentally of 'new qualities which our Lord's

Humanity has gained by oneness with Deity', belonging by nature only to God.[93] Where Lutheran doctrine had gone wrong was their attributing to Christ's manhood such an omnipresence as belongs to the Godhead alone.

While Lutherans would regard some of Wilberforce's thoughts with suspicion, and would steadfastly maintain as did Dr M. Chemnitz that there is no inordinate 'mingling' of Christ's two natures in Lutheran Christology, it would be regarded as a significant concession to orthodox Christology that Wilberforce believed Christ's body and blood were given an exceptional supernatural 'accidental' omnipresence for the purposes of the Real Presence in the Eucharist, even if such omnipresence was not regarded as a Christological necessity.

Further statements concerning the 'accidental' investiture of omnipresence for Christ's eucharistic body and blood are found in Wilberforce's book, *The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*. He asserted that 'any other mode of presence which can be attributed to his human nature, must belong to it by reason of some peculiar privilege with which it is invested'. Furthermore he wrote that it is 'by virtue of these new qualities which our Lord's humanity has gained by oneness with Deity, that it exists under those conditions in which it was given to men in the Holy Eucharist'.[94]

A brief examination of the writings of Martin Chemnitz, regarded as authoritative among the orthodox Lutherans of the nineteenth century, will disclose remarkably similar articulations of the communication of the attributes of Christ's divine nature to his human nature in the Eucharist. For example Chemnitz wrote, 'wherever it [the Holy Eucharist] is celebrated ... for the son of God it is not only possible but even easy for Him to will, to effect, and to manifest the presence of His body ... not indeed according to the essential or natural properties of His body, but yet with its true nature unimpaired because of and by reason of its union with the Deity'.[95]

Wilberforce also shared with Confessional Lutheranism an abhorrence of the Reformed tendency to place limitations upon Christ in eucharistic matters. Examining patristic exegeses of the eucharistic words of institution, Wilberforce observed that the predicate of the words of institution, i.e. Christ's body and blood, were not regarded as a description of His divine nature, as the Reformed believed, but of that which was sacrificed: his human nature which had flesh and blood. He noted this, not as a Christological statement, but as a eucharistic one, undermining, by means of Church Fathers like Cyril and Augustine, the Reformed idea that Christ was eucharistically present only according to His divine nature which was understood to have

neither flesh nor blood.

Wilberforce held that to limit the eucharistic presence of Christ to his divine nature was to restrict the divinity of Christ without warrant. Alluding to the limitations of the scientific understanding of substances and 'the mystery of magnetism', he questioned whether the contemporary Protestants of his day had any reasonable cause to exclude the possibility of the Real Presence as the ancient Church understood it. Christ's body, as the body of God 'must needs receive new qualities from its relation to that Deity ... possess powers and properties beyond those which other bodies are known to possess'.[96] Three centuries earlier Luther asserted that the ultimate result of Reformed reasoning with regard to the Real Presence was a limitation of theology to what can be experienced with the senses.[97]

Pusey also was in basic agreement with Luther, although apparently more aware of it than Wilberforce. Citing statements from Luther, Pusey was prepared to absolve the reformer himself of serious attachment to the use of the ubiquity idea to defend the Real Presence. He believed that Luther's main Christological understanding of the Real Presence was that Christ was present in the Supper, not as a natural consequence of the *communicatio idiomatum* in the Person of Christ, but rather as the result of 'God's

omnipotence'. Nevertheless, Luther did use some rather extreme illustrations of this Christology which Pusey judged to come close to Eutychianism. For example: from Luther's 1526 sermon: *The Sacrament: Against the Fanatics*, Pusey quoted, 'He (Christ) is present in all creatures, so that I could find Him in straw, fire, water, or even a rope; for certainly He is there. Heaven and earth are His sack, so He fills all things (sic)'. [98]

Curiously, Pusey seems to have been unaware of Luther's vehement concern that such phrases be regarded properly and not misconstrued. In the very next year Luther wrote:

> Listen now, you pig, dog, or fanatic, whatever kind of unreasonable ass you are: Even if Christ's body is everywhere, you do not therefore immediately eat or drink or touch him; nor do I talk with you about such things in this manner, either; go back to your pigpen and your filth. I said above that the right hand of God is everywhere, but at the same time nowhere and uncircumscribed, above and apart from all creatures. There is a difference between his being present and your touching. He is free and unbound wherever he is, and he does not have to stand there like a rogue set in a pillory, or his neck in irons.[99]

Ultimately, even after quoting notorious statements from Luther's debates with Zwingli about Christ being present in straw, fire, rope and crab apple, Pusey was still able to concede that Luther also taught correctly at times.

> Luther himself seems to have laid aside the heresy. He took it up, and laid it down, as his way was. In his answer to the Swiss, 1538, he

states in a natural way, his belief in the Article of the Creed, and refers the Presence of our Lord's Body and Blood in the Holy Eucharist to God's omnipotency.

"As to the third Article of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, we have again never yet taught, nor do we now teach, that Christ ascendeth and descendeth from heaven, or from the Right Hand of God, visibly or invisibly. We abide also by the Article of the Creed, 'He ascended in heaven, sitteth on the Right Hand of God, and shall come' &c. and we commit it to His divine Omnipotency, how His Body and Blood are given to us in the Supper, when we come together at His command, and the consecration takes place. We conceive of no coming or descent, but hold simply to His words, 'This is My Body'; and 'This is My Blood'".[100]

Had Pusey read more widely in the orthodox Lutheran writers he might have felt differently, but as it was, he believed that heresy had been added to the pure teaching of the Lutheran movement by some of those who followed Luther. He held that they took what the Reformer used in a polemical context and ultimately added such statements to the Lutheran Confessions, finally enshrining them as doctrine binding to all Lutherans. The result in Pusey's eyes was disasterous. He judged that they 'denied, at least, one article of the Creed and completed the destruction of the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, which they defended'.[101] It may have been completely different had Pusey regarded the phrase 'He ascended into heaven' for what it is: a confession of one's faith that the ascension of Jesus Christ historically took place, instead of an implication that He is perpetually ascended and confined to some particular location in heaven.

Pusey seems to have been ignorant of or unconvinced by the writings of Reformation-era Lutherans like Martin Chemnitz who, like Luther, insisted that the ascension was not undermined by their understanding of the *communicatio idiomatum*. Chemnitz in his great tome on the *Two Natures of Christ* explained:

> We grant that the body of Christ, which is delimited by the attributes of its nature, is not present in the Supper in all places by a local circumscription, or by some mode or condition of human life which is visible, perceptible or natural...For we have already shown that in this mode of presence Christ has been removed from the earth [at the ascension] at least as an ordinary arrangement ... for Christ now appears with his body to the blessed in heaven in this form. And before the Last Judgement, under ordinary circumstances, He will not appear on earth in this form or according to this form.[102]

It seems that the more radical statements of other Lutherans tipped the balance in Pusey's mind against Lutheranism in general. He confessed:

> It is melancholy to see Brenz, in his later years, plunging himself into heresy, in order to maintain the truth. He taught that our Lord's Manhood is, wherever His Godhead is; that it has all the attributes of God; that our Lord did not locally ascend in His Ascension; that the right hand of God is every where; that His manhood was in heaven as soon as He took our nature in the Virgin's womb; that it is now in common household bread, as much as in the Holy Eucharist, only that we have no promise annexed to it there.[103]

Pusey recorded what he regarded as a particularly bad quote from Brenz in which he applied his ideas of the Omnipresence of Christ's Human Nature to the Eucharist, whilst at the same time appearing to

question the doctrine of sacramental consecration.[104] Yet Pusey did find some Lutheran statements on this subject to have merit. He remarked that while, 'The sayings of other Ubiquitarians, as Marbach, Schmidlin, Hunius, Andr.Musculus, were equally monstrous and painful; others as Chemnitz, and J. Andrea, were more moderate'.[105] Pusey noted that the authoritative articulations of the ubiquity idea as written in the Lutheran Confessions were of this moderate sort. He judged that: 'Amid the conflict of parties, the *Formula Concordiae* moderated the extremes of Ultra-Lutheranism. It admitted very little of the Ubiquitism of Brenz; but it retained the original Ubiquitism of Luther. Still it was heretical, and committed the Lutheran body to heresy on the Nature of our Lord'.[106]

Pusey himself put his opposition in concrete terms by making Christological assertions of his own which set him at odds with those he called 'Ultra-Lutherans'. He insisted on envisioning Christ's session at God's right hand as a mode of being which is incompatible with His sacramental mode of presence. Therefore he speculated that an exceptional arrangement on Christ's part is required if He is to be sacramentally present in any Eucharistic celebration. He wrote:

> It might not be said that the Manhood, when, for us and for our salvation, our Saviour dwelt among

> us, was in heaven, or that, now that It has been exalted to God's Right Hand, *that* Manhood, in its natural mode of being, is on earth. Our Lord, Who is God and Man, has promised to be with us, "unto the end of the world"; but He Who is God and Man is with us as God only, except that, in some way known to Himself, He, while abiding in heaven in His natural mode of being, causes His Body sacramentally to be with us.[107]

When Pusey described the *communicatio idiomatum*, he took special care to avoid what he believed was a Lutheran confusion of the two natures of Christ. For example he wrote, 'what belongs to the one *Nature* may not be ascribed to the other. It may be said "God suffered", "the sufferings of Christ our God", "the Infant weeps, but *is* in heaven". But it would be blasphemous to say that "the Godhead suffered"'.[108] Yet, as no objection based on scripture is offered, some ideological objection seems to be the likely reason why Pusey insisted that Christ's sacramental presence was an exception to His 'natural mode of being'.

The conflict between Pusey and Lutherans concerning the interpretation of the credal 'right hand of God, the Father Almighty' begs an important question. In view of Pusey's claims to uphold the theology of the catholic Church before the great schism, and considering the spiritual and supernatural descriptions he used of the dynamics of the Real Presence, is it not odd that with regard to the session at the right hand that he should understand this in a

sense as some sort of local, almost materialistic, confinement? Yet it was this understanding of the session at the right hand which seems to have determined Pusey's opposition.

Nevertheless, when Pusey preached on the mystery of Christ's eucharistic presence he shared with Luther the biblical illustrations of Christ's post-resurrection passage through the sealed tomb and through his disciples' closed doors, as well as the tradition of Christ's birth *illaesa virginitate*.[109] Although they both begged to differ with Lutheranism, Pusey and Wilberforce agreed that Christ was making Himself present in the Eucharist by virtue of His supernatural powers. The Christological difficulties which resulted for these Tractarians were noted by their opponents. Difficulties abounded as they tried to teach a eucharistic presence which was 'dynamic', or 'supernatural' rather than natural, but nevertheless real.[110]

With regard to the notorious Lutheran expressions, it may be admitted that some of Brenz's speculations are not unanimously useful, but at least the orthodox Lutherans did not founder on the Christological reef faced by the Tractarians, their doctrine of Christ's session at God's right hand. It remains ironic that Pusey and Wilberforce, who claimed to oppose their adversaries on the basis of catholic

doctrine, ultimately opposed the Lutheran position that 'the right hand of God is everywhere' on the basis of a 16th century Christology. Thus encumbered, the Tractarians easily fell victim to their opponents on this point.

In his considerations of Lutheranism one detects in Pusey an unmistakeable longing for something theologically ideal which existed independantly of the *Formula of Concord*; something which Pusey himself identifies as 'Lutheran'. Yet this Lutheranism, which Pusey so passionately laments appears to be a parallel to the ideal Anglicanism of certain reformers toward which Pusey also looked with longing. It is worth remembering that Pusey was one of the few who granted Lutheran theology some share in the ecclesiastical ideal of which the Oxford Movement dreamed. Although he differed with it, Pusey seemed not to regard Lutheranism's 'mingling' of 'truth and heresy' as grounds for depriving it of its catholic identity. After all, to refuse to admit the Lutheran Church into his catholic ideal on such a basis would be to exclude almost all of the world's churches, including his own. Nor did he require of Lutheranism an infallibility which he looked for in no other church body.

Regrettably but inevitably, Pusey stumbled upon the great stumbling block that lies in the path of a common eucharistic theology between Lutherans and the

Reformed. Evidently the doctrine of the Real Presence is the place where the irreconcilability of the Reformed and Lutheran interpretations of God's revelation manifests itself. Either the humanity of Christ is wherever His divinity is, as Lutherans teach, or Christ is divided with regard to His humanity and divinity as the *Extra-Calvinisticum* of the Reformed teaches. Pusey could not bring himself to appreciate Luther's argument against Calvinistic Christology in which the Reformer treated it as an extension of the spiritualism already condemned in the New Testament by St John as a threat to the correct doctrine of the incarnation.[111] This is what caused an unfortunate rift between Pusey and his Lutheran counterparts.

Notes to Chapter Four

1. Mackean, *The Eucharistic Doctrine of the Oxford Movement, A Critical Survey* (London 1967), p.1.

2. *Ibid.*, p.5.

3. *Ibid.*, p.4.

4. *Ibid.*, p.10.

5. *Ibid.*, p.12.

6. *Ibid.*, p.13.

7. H.P.Liddon, *The Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey*, 4 Vols (London 1893-97), II, p.313. From Liddon's copy of Pusey's letter to the Vice-chancellor of the University of Oxford of 22nd May 1843.

8. *Ibid.*, II, p.323.

9. R.W.Church, *The Oxford Movement , third edition (London 1904), p.329.*

10. *Op cit.*, II, p.364. From Liddon's copy of Pusey's confidential letter to the Vice-chancellor of 30th May 1843.

11. *Ibid.*, II, p.366.

12. *Ibid.*, II, p.367.

13. Church, p.328-9.

14. Liddon, II, p.424.

15. E.B.Pusey, *The Real Presence of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Doctrine of the English Church, With a Vindication of the Reception of the Wicked and of the Adoration of Our Lord Jesus Christ Truly Present* (Oxford 1857), p.4.

16. *Ibid.*, preface XXIII.

17. *Ibid.*, p.1.

18. *Ibid.*, p.3.

19. *Ibid.*, p.5.

20. *Ibid.*, p.9.

21. *Ibid.*, p.161.

22. *Ibid.*, p.163.

23. *Ibid.*, p.164.

24. *Ibid.*, p.201.

25. *Ibid.*, preface xxiii.

26. *Ibid.*, preface xxi.

27. *Ibid.*, preface xxvii.

28. *Ibid.*, preface xxi.

29. *Ibid.*, p.125.

30. *Ibid.*, p.145.

31. *Ibid.*, p.149.

32. *Ibid.*, p.11.

33. *Ibid.*, p.12.

34. *Ibid.*, p.23.

35. *Ibid.*, p.21-22.

36. *Ibid.*, p.41.

37. *Ibid.*, p.45.

38. *Ibid.*, p.90.

39. *Ibid.*, p.91.

40. *Ibid.*, pp.92-3.

41. *Ibid.*, p.95.

42. *Ibid.*, p.103.

43. *Ibid.*, p.107.

44. *Ibid.*, pp.108-109.

45. *Ibid.*, p.109.

46. *Ibid.*, p.112.

47. *Ibid.*, pp.154-158.

48. *Triglot Concordia*, edited by F.Bente, (St Louis 1921), p.247.

49. *Ibid.*, p.493.

50. F.Pieper, *Christian Dogmatics*, fourth edition, 4 Vols (St Louis 1950), III, p.295.

51. *Op cit.*, p.247. From Article X of the *Apology to the Augsburg Confession*.

52. Pusey, p.53.

53. *Ibid.*, p.66.

54. *Ibid.*, p.67.

55. Pieper, III, p.343-4.

56. *Triglot Concordia*, p.977.

57. *Op.cit.*, p.353.

58. *Ibid.*, p.356.

59. J.H.Newman, *A Letter to the Rev.Godfrey Faussett ... On Certain Points of Faith and Practice (Oxford 1838), p.46, p.61.*

60. Richard Hurrell Froude, *Remains*, 2 Parts (London 1839), II:I, p.63.

61. *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, edited by F.L. Cross, (London 1974), p.1390.

62. E.B.Pusey, *The Doctrine of the Real Presence, as Contained in the Fathers from the Death of S.John the Evangelist to the Fourth General Council* (London 1855), p.259.

63. *Ibid.*, p.182.

64. E.B.Pusey, 'Tract 81: Catena Patrum. No.IV. Testimony of Writers of the Later English Church to the Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, with an Historical Account of the Changes Made in the Liturgy as to the Expression of that Doctrine' *Tracts for the Times*, 5 Vols (London 1839) III, p.6, p.25.

65. Hardelin, p.187.

66. Liddon, II, p.168. From Liddon's copy of Pusey's letter to Newman of 9th August 1867.

67. *Ibid.*, p.170. From Liddon's copy of Pusey's letter to Newman of 8th November 1867.

68. Pusey, *The Real Presence ... the Doctrine of the English Church*, p.1.

69. R.I.Wiberforce, *The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist* (Oxford 1864), p.64.

70. *Ibid.*, p.111.

71. *Ibid.*, p.111.

72. *Ibid.*, p.129.

73. *Ibid.*, p.125.

74. *Ibid.*, p.141.

75. *Ibid.*, p.187.

76. *Ibid.*, p.187.

77. *Ibid.*, p.159.

78. *Ibid.*, p.163.

79. *Ibid.*, p.166.

80. *Ibid.*, p.155.

81. *Ibid.*, p.176.

82. *Ibid.*, p.153.

83. *Ibid.*, p.200.

84. *Ibid.*, pp.267, 282, 284.

85. *Ibid.*, p.75.

86. Liddon, II, p.424.

87. *Ibid.*, p.187.

88. *Ibid.*, p.190-191.

89. Pusey, *The Real Presence ... the Doctrine of the English Church*, p.125. In the following passage, Pusey showed his view of the Lutheranism which gave rise to the German protestantism

contemporary with his own life: 'The Lutheran system was altogether stereotyped in the Formula Concordiae. It remained stiff, unchangeable, impressing on the Lutheran mind its form of mingled truth and heresy, until the type wore out, and the whole was broken in pieces. Like the image whose toes were of mingled iron and clay, it was inherently weak'.

90. *The Book of Concord*, edited by Theodore Tappert (Philadelphia 1959). See the *Epitome of the Formula of Concord* Article VII (The Lord's Supper); *Solid Declaration* Article VIII (The person of Christ) &c.

91. *Triglot Concordia*, p.5.

92. Pusey, *The Real Presence ... the Doctrine of the English Church*, page 113.

93. Wilberforce, The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist (London 1853), p.152.

94. *Ibid.*, p.133.

95. Martin Chemnitz, *The Two Natures of Christ*, translated by J.A.O.Preus, (St Louis 1971), p.447.

96. Wilberforce, p.82.

97. *Luther's Works - American Edition*, translated by R.H.Fischer, fifth edition, 55 Vols (Philadelphia 1983), XXXVII, p.208. From the *Confession Concerning Christ's Supper*, first published in 1528.

98. E.B.Pusey, *The Doctrine of the Real Presence as Contained in the Fathers from the the Death of St John the Evangelist to the Fourth General Council* (Oxford 1855), p.43.

99. *Luther's Works - American Edition*, XXXVII, p.68. From, *This Is My Body - Against the Fanatics* first published in 1527.

100. *Ibid.*, p.115.

101. Pusey, *The Real Presence...the Doctrine of the English Church* etc., p.115.

102. Chemnitz, p.433.

103. *Op.cit.*, p.115.

104. *Ibid.*, p.119.

105. *Ibid.*, p.119.

106. *Ibid.*, p.122.

107. *Ibid.*, p.114.

108. *Ibid.*, p.114.

109. E.B.Pusey, 'The Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist [1853]', *Nine Sermons preached before the University of Oxford* (Oxford 1855), p.23.

110. William Goode, *The Nature of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist* (London 1856), p.140.

111. Hermann Sasse, *Here We Stand*, translated by T.Tappert (Minneapolis 1946), p.147.

CHAPTER FIVE

REPRISTINATIONISM AND THE DOCTRINE OF EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE

DIFFICULTIES FOR LUTHERANS

The history of the Lutheran attitude toward the traditional doctrine of the eucharistic sacrifice is one long record of strenuous disapproval. Portrayed as the sacrifice of the the Mass in the Roman Catholic tradition, it so repelled Luther that he dramatically reduced the Lutheran Mass in order to exclude what he regarded as anthropocentric sacrificial teaching in favour of greater emphasis on the Gospel.

In order to understand the position of the Lutheran repristinationists on the subject of eucharistic sacrifice it is necessary to understand the Lutheran argument as it begins with Luther himself. As a Roman priest, familiar to the point of embarrassment with every detail of the canon of the Mass, Luther was scathing in his criticism of the 'sacrifice' that he saw portrayed in it. Not only did Luther discover theological heresy, but a great deal of superfluous and meaningless words, as well as self-contradictory and illogical thoughts in the text of the Canon.

An example of the absurdity of the Canon for Luther were the prayers before the consecration which extolled the virtue of the unconsecrated elements. Luther's anger was clearly kindled when he wrote:

> Nobody notes or observes what a blasphemy this is. How dare you, miserable man, come so shamelessly before the high majesty of God in a way that would be proper enough if he were a sow?...Shall we offer God a little bread and wine and ask him to accept it on behalf of all Christendom? And shall we say of it that it is a holy and unspotted sacrifice? If it is holy and unspotted, why should God...bless it? ... It is equivalent to blaspheming and saying to God publicly before the whole world: "We have to help Christendom with bread and wine; it is a barefaced lie when you say that the blood of your Son alone is sufficient". [1]

In another place the Canon prays 'Remember, O Lord, Thy servants...whose faith and devotion are known to Thee ... who themselves bring their own offerings to Thee ... for the redemption of their souls'. Luther deplored the weak logic and faulty soteriology that was implied. 'Behold, is not this a raging, mad, and foolish people? If they have faith, as the Canon itself says, why should their souls need redemption?'.[2]

Above the absurdity and contradictory theology of the eucharistic prayers of the Mass Luther's deepest concern arose from his belief that the concept of the eucharistic sacrifice as portrayed by it was an insult to the Gospel. He was convinced by Holy Scripture that Christ has provided the only propitiatory sacrifice which God will accept. For Luther it followed that

'all our own works undertaken to expiate sin and escape from death are necessarily blasphemous'. The blasphemy was displayed in the Mass by the presumption that human beings are able to offer an intrinsically acceptable propitiation for the living and the dead. He observed:

> In the Mass the papists do nothing but continually ride the words "we offer up, we offer up" and "these sacrifices, these gifts". They keep completely quiet about the sacrifice that Christ has made. They do not thank him. Indeed, they despise and deny his sacrifice and try to come before God with their own sacrifice. Dear reader, what will God say if you try in this way to come before him? He will say, "Must I therefore become your fool and liar? I have presented you with a sacrifice, my own Son, which you ought to receive with thanks and great joy. Yet you dare to come before me and say nothing about it, as if you did not need him, and so you despise the most precious treasure that I have in heaven and on earth. What do you think I should give you as a reward for this?" If God were the devil himself, such conduct would be insult enough.[3]

A positive view of some kind of sacrifice in the context of Holy Communion was not altogether ruled out by Luther. He believed that several issues needed to be addressed, however. He began by saying, 'It is quite certain that Christ cannot be sacrificed over and above the one single time He sacrificed Himself'. Luther condemned the Roman teaching current on this subject but noted that there are more acceptable ways of addressing the sacrificial side of the sacrament. Referring to the orthodox views of the East, Luther quoted:

> Irenaeus calls it a sacrifice in the sense that

> we offer bread and wine, which through God's Word becomes the sacrament, solely for the purpose of giving thanks, in order that we may acknowledge thereby how God feeds us, just as it was done in the Old Testament, but never for our sins or to redeem our souls or to propitiate God, as is the case when the papists celebrate Mass. Some call it a sacrifice because we remember thus the one sacrifice which Christ once made for us, just as every year we call Easter "the Resurrection" ... not that Christ rises every year, but that every year we commemorate the day of his resurrection. In this sense St Augustine calls the sacrament a sacrifice.[4]

Such preference for the sacrificial language of the Eastern Church over that of Rome was to later emerge in Tractarian writings.

In one of the earliest of the Lutheran Confessions: *The Apology to the Augburg Confession* [1537], the subject of eucharistic sacrifice is addressed with a difference. Remarkably, the term 'eucharistic' is not used to refer to the Lord's Supper at all but to the giving of thanks and praise to God in any context.

Melanchthon wrote:

> There are two, and only two, basic types of sacrifice. One is the propitiatory sacrifice ... The other type is the eucharistic sacrifice; this does not merit the forgiveness of sins or reconciliation, but by it those who have been reconciled give thanks or show their gratitude for the forgiveness of sins and other blessings received. [5]

Most likely, this was an attempt to redefine or rehabilitate the term sacrifice for evangelical usage.[6] Melanchthon went on to speak of such eucharistic sacrifices even in the Old Testament period. The

oblation, the drink offerings, the thank offerings, the first fruits and the tithes were all eucharistic sacrifices.[7]

As for propitiatory sacrifices, it was assumed that the death of Christ was the only sacrifice which could be truly defined as propitiatory. As Melanchthon wrote, 'There has really been only one propitiatory sacrifice in the world: the death of Christ, as the Epistle to the Hebrews teaches (10.4)'. The Levitical sacrifices were not propitiatory in the same way as those of the pagan religions for the sacrifices of the Old Testament were only called propitiatory 'as symbols of a future offering. By analogy they were satisfactions since they gained the righteousness of the ceremonial law and prevented the exclusion of the sinner from the commonwealth'.[8]

Thus the Lutheran Confessions teach that there are only two basic kinds of sacrifice: 'propitiatory' and 'eucharistic'. A propitiatory sacrifice meant one which 'reconciles God or placates his wrath or merits the forgiveness of sins for others'. A eucharistic sacrifice was defined as a sacrifice on the part of those who have already been reconciled to God through Christ's sacrifice of atonement, offered to 'show their gratitude for the forgiveness of sins and other blessings received'.[9] Such distinction was not so clearly maintained in Tractarian writings.

The difficulty encountered concerning the doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice as embodied in the Roman sacrifice of the Mass was the inevitable conflict between what appeared to be two opposing means of justification. As explained earlier, by the time of the polemical writings of the Lutheran Reformation the term *ex opere operato* came to be used as a label for a legalistic 'works-righteousness'. What Lutherans opposed was the idea that any sacramental act, including a eucharistic sacrifice, should be believed to be acceptable to God simply because it was done in a legally correct way. It was thought that Rome taught that sacramental benefits followed one's fulfillment of certain legal requirements (confession, attendance at Mass, and the payment of the required fee). Such faulty usage of the *ex opere operato* principle was perceived by Lutherans behind much of the sacramental administration of Rome from the saying of votive Masses to the sale of indulgences.

Over against the sacramental theology attributed to Rome, the Lutherans asserted '*Haec valent non ex opere operato, sed propter fidem*' (These [sacraments] are valid, not *ex opere operato* but on account of faith).[10] At considerable length, Melanchthon attempted to explain the role of faith in the validity of the sacraments. He wrote:

> In short, the worship of the New Testament is spiritual; it is the righteousness of faith in

> the heart and the fruits of faith. Thus it abrogates Levitical worship. Christ says in John 4.23,24, "The true worshipers will worship the Father in spirit and truth, for such the Father seeks to worship him. God is spirit, and those who worship him must worship in spirit and truth". This passage clearly condemns the notion that the sacrifices are valid *ex opere operato*, and it teaches that worship should be in spirit in faith and with the heart.[11]

In the *Apology to the Augsburg Confession* Melanchthon adduces much biblical support for his opposition to the Roman teaching that a ceremony performed in a legally correct manner will automatically please God and reap the benefits of His grace. Yet, in doing so he was not completely belligerent toward Roman ceremony and terminology. He could concede,'We are perfectly willing for the Mass to be understood as a daily sacrifice, provided this means the whole Mass, the ceremony and also the proclamation of the Gospel, faith, prayer, and thanksgiving'.[12]

Although Melanchthon's conciliatory approach to this subject was enshrined in the Lutheran Confessions, it was not always carried forward into the repristinationist writings of the nineteenth century Confessional Lutherans. Instead they were swayed by the bulk of the sixteenth and seventeenth century material, to which they exclusively refered, which tended to distance the Lord's Supper from any sacrificial imagery, beyond that of one Sacrifice of Christ proclaimed by the Eucharist. Such was the lack

of interest in the sacrificial aspects of Holy Communion that none of the nineteenth century Lutheran repristinationists attempted to rehabilitate the concept of eucharistic sacrifice beyond what Melanchthon had done in the sixteenth century. The above sixteenth century material must suffice for the purposes of contrasting the Confessional Lutheran teaching concerning the sacrifice of the Mass with that of the Tractarian.

TRACTARIAN VIEWS OF THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE

It has been proposed that Tractarians understood the sacraments as God's vehicles for objectively applying the saving work of Christ to individuals. In this respect their system was in agreement with the Lutheran understanding of dependency upon the means of grace. Wilberforce, for example, believed that 'rendering His death available in the Church's acts of worship, He (Christ) thereby extends His mediation and applies its fruit to all creatures. Christ, in other words, is active not only in the objective atonement, but also in its application to the individual'.[19]

Unfortunately many Tractarians misunderstood both the role of faith in the Lutheran scheme of the means of grace and the precise reason for the Lutheran

rejection of the sacrifice of the Mass. According to Wilberforce there is no place for the eucharistic sacrifice in Luther's system because faith has taken the place of the sacraments in the application of Christ's merits. [14]

As we have seen, the Lutherans did indeed believe the sacraments to be means by which Christ's merits were applied. Apparently, as many nineteenth century Lutherans failed to appreciate the correspondence of their doctrine to that of the concept of 'prevenient grace', so also Tractarians like Wilberforce failed to appreciate the real agreement that existed between them and the Lutherans concerning divine grace. It was their belief that faith is the supreme work of God in the human soul.

Prevenient grace was portrayed by some Lutherans as a heretical concept similar to that of 'enthusiasm' which teaches the Holy Spirit comes immediately to an individual without such means as word or sacrament. Certainly it would be erroneous for Tractarians to portray the Lutheran concept of faith as independent of or contrary to the means of grace.

For Wilberforce to imagine that Lutherans applied Christ's merits to themselves with some kind of self-generated 'faith' was to fundamentally misunderstand Lutheranism. He was correct that Lutherans utterly rejected most Roman thinking with

regard to the Sacrifice of the Mass. Wilberforce was not correct as to why the Roman and Lutheran doctrines were incapatible.

The precise reason for the incompatibility of the doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass with the Lutheran system was not that Lutherans taught a kind of self-generated 'faith' which made the sacraments obsolete. It was that Lutherans refused to clutter the Lord's Supper with talk of human offerings and sacrifices when the divine object of the sacrament was to fill a human need. Lutherans did not want to confuse man's need for God's grace with a perceived need on God's part for man's sacrifices.

Nevertheless, similarities between the Tractarian and Lutheran view of the sacrament did accumulate, although unintentionally. Wilberforce, for example, made distinctions between the emphasis of worship services of his day which Lutherans would whole-heartedly endorse. He wrote, 'Here is the exact contrast between the ancient and modern services. The first supposes Christ to descend through the agency of the Holy Spirit upon earth. The latter supposes man to ascend through the action of their spirits into heaven'. [15]

Wilberforce also noted that whereas the ancient church believed that through the consecration of the elements a gift was bestowed by God, the modern church

merely sees the Eucharist as an emblem of God's goodwill, and the Supper is said to 'bear witness to the general purpose of the Supreme Being'.[16]

The Tractarian interest in the doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice was a natural part of their repristination of what they believed was the catholic ideal. They could find the doctrine in patristic writings and in early English ones. The ancient usage of the imagery of eucharistic sacrifice was all they needed to incorporate the Sacrifice of the Mass into their vision of catholic Anglicanism. It could not be argued that they taught eucharistic sacrifice purely out of an interest in conformity with contemporary Rome. Tractarians such as Pusey did investigate union with the Roman Church, but their approach was as one catholic church body to another. The Tractarian view was that Anglican Christianity already had all the catholic doctrines, including the Sacrifice of the Mass in its own English tradition without having to copy from Rome.

Hardelin proposed that some of the Oxford Movement's thought on the subject of the Eucharistic sacrifice may have originated with Palmer's *Origines Liturgicae* and his idea that the original Eucharistic sacrifice was not of consecrated elements, but of the earthly products of bread and wine, offered to God to be sanctified in the Eucharist.[17] 'To Palmer, as a

representative of the old High Church tradition, the eucharistic oblation consisted in the offering up of bread and wine, to be consecrated and given back in communion. The relation of the Eucharist to Christ's sacrifice lies in the sacrament, and not in the oblation'.[18]

This is the approach taken by those Lutherans who would reintroduce the idea of a sacrifice in a eucharistic context. The reasoning behind disconnecting the sacrifice of the elements from the Sacrifice of Christ's atonement was to separate the human offering from the gift of Christ and so safeguard the all-sufficiency of the latter. The logical question posed by Hardelin is whether this practice tends to create a 'complementary sacrifice, without any intrinsic unity with Christ's'.[19]

For the Tractarians, with an increasing awareness of the Real Presence of Christ in the elements, came a view of the eucharistic sacrifice which saw it less as a sacrifice of the Church than 'as the means of the Church's appropriation of the saving gifts of the Atonement'. The Eucharist in this sense became a *pleading* of Christ's meritorious sacrifice more than a human offering.[20]

Wilberforce determined that 'it is clear that a sacrifice of bread and wine cannot be a perfect sacrifice pleasing to God, for it is as corruptible as

everything else of this world. As there is no perfect sacrifice apart from Christ's on the cross, nothing less can suitably be offered than Christ himself who is present as the *res sacramenti*'.[21] Thus the Tractarians acquired a doctrine of a true sacrifice of the Mass, but one which did not emphasise the human offering as did the Roman canon. The emphasis was placed on the re-presentation of Christ's original sacrifice, exhibited before God by the faithful who partake of the body and blood of His Son.

Other Tractarians, such as Keble, made their own contribution to an awareness of eucharistic sacrifice. Seeing in John 17 a eucharistic prayer, Keble imagined Christ meant 'I sanctify Myself, that they also may be sanctified through the Truth', referring to the Sacrament. In other words: 'I offer myself anew in the Sacrament of My Body and Blood, which I have just instituted, that they, partaking of Me therein, may be solemnly dedicated, sanctified, and offered, not in truth and shadow, but in deed and in truth'.[22]

Considering the biblical teaching of Christ's perpetual heavenly intercession for the faithful on earth, Wilberforce taught the idea that the eucharistic sacrifice is an earthly counterpart to heavenly sacrificial liturgy. This heavenly liturgy was thought to have direct effect on the souls of the faithful on earth.[23]

For those Anglicans who appreciated their church's position, and their role as heirs of the Protestant Reformation, the Tractarian interest in eucharistic sacrifice was very controversial. By 1843 Pusey felt able to preach the truths of that doctrine as he understood it. It was the sermon *Holy Eucharist, a Comfort to the Penitent* that soon ended up as his 'condemned sermon'.

In that sermon Pusey employed patristic quotations which provoked much criticism because of their implication regarding eucharistic sacrifice.[24] The doctrine of the eucharistic sacrifice, even as explained by the Tractarians, was not easily accepted by Anglicans. The doctrine was the hub of the controversy that involved A.P.Forbes, Bishop of Brechin. In Forbes' case, his description of the doctrine of the eucharistic sacrifice, that it 'is the same substantially with that on the Cross' was combined with offences involving eucharistic adoration and the doctrine of the *manducatio indignorum*. The controversy dragged on for three years and only ended when a judgement was handed down that Bp Forbes should not claim the authority of the Church, but simply his own opinions. Also a resolution, issued by Forbes, that his explanation for his teachings be accepted was carried with but two dissenting votes.[25]

If the Tractarians needed scriptural proof for

the doctrine of the eucharistic sacrifice they usually availed themselves of 1 Corinthians 11.26: 'As often as you eat ... drink ...you do show forth the Lord's death until He comes'. They were convinced that this text taught that the saving work of Christ must be offered up during Holy Communion in a sacrifice of faith to show God the Father that the faithful claim for themselves the benefits of Christ's death. Nevertheless, their opponents argued that Christ's death is not held before the eyes of the Father in the Eucharist but before the faithful themselves; the eating and drinking of the symbolic body and blood serving as an aid to the memories of those who would 'do this in remembrance' of Him who was slain. The positions seemed mutually exclusive, and the facts far from simple.

Pusey himself originally both misunderstood and rejected the idea of a sacrifice in the Eucharist. For some time he perceived the doctrine as a Roman aberration involving a priest offering, by transubstantiation, an offering of Christ's physical flesh to God (see his *Letter to Jelf*). Pusey later embraced the sacrifice idea but coined the term 'impetratory sacrifice' as superior to the terms propitiatory or expiatory to describe it.[26]

Taking the Tractarian line, Pusey later referred to the Eucharistic Sacrifice as 'a "continuance" of the

One sacrifice or a counter-part of the heavenly sacrifice, offered by Christ through His priests'. Such a position was believed by Pusey to be faithful to a tradition of Anglican thought regarding eucharistic sacrifice. Yet, Pusey had to confess, as far as the Anglican reformers and non-Jurors were concerned 'with them the oblation was prominently material; while, with the earlier writers, it was prominently mental'.[27]

Pusey ultimately believed there were two dimensions to the true eucharistic sacrifice with which the Church pleads before God, and neither were believed to detract from Christ's sacrifice of Atonement. These two dimensions were our pleading to God the one sacrifice of Christ for our forgiveness, and the heavenly intercession of Christ Himself as mediator. The Eucharist was to be regarded as a living image of these two pleadings, sanctified by the Real Presence.

R.I.Wilberforce tried to summarise the doctrine as he understood it, invoking his favourite distinction between the inward and outward components of the consecrated elements. He took pains to disclaim the caricature of the Roman position which suggested an adding to, or repetition of Christ's sacrificial suffering. He explained the eucharistic sacrifice in terms of Christ's ongoing work of intercession, applying, rather than repeating or renewing the sacrificial work on the cross. It is this work of

Christ which 'gives reality to the actions of His earthly ministers'.[28]

Wilberforce contributed a seven-point description of the eucharistic sacrifice that he felt was both documented and undeniable from Church history and covered all concerns: (1) The thing offered is Christ's Body. 2) Nothing is superadded to the crucifixion, nor is it a repetition. 3) It is Christ, the Victim, who is also the offerer (the Priest). 4) It was often described by early writers as 'aweful'. 5) It was understood to be efficacious in obtaining answers to prayer requests. 6) It is the antitype of the Jewish Sacrifices. They were a shadow; it is reality. 7) It was committed to the Apostles and their successors.

A number of his points (such as point five which alludes to the function of votive masses) were strictly rejected among Anglicans during the Tractarian period. Perhaps it is partially for that reason that R.I.Wilberforce and so many others ultimately ended their inquiry into the doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice as members of the Roman Catholic communion.

Notes to Chapter Five

1. *Luther's Works - American Edition*, translated by Abdel Ross Wentz, fifth edition, 55 Vols (Philadeliphia 1980), XXXVI, p.315. From *The Abomination of the Secret Mass*, first published in 1525.

2. *Ibid.*, p.316.

3. *Ibid.*, p.313.

4. *Luther's Works - American Edition*, translated by R.H.Fischer, fifth edition, 55 Vols (Philadelphia 1983), XXXVII, p.144. From *This is My Body ... Against the Fanatics*, first published in 1527.

5. *The Book of Concord*, edited by Theodore G. Tappert (Philadelphia 1959), p.252.

6. Lowell Green, 'Article VII, The Holy Supper', *A Contemporary Look at the Formula of Concord* (St Louis 1978), p.207.

7. *Ibid.*, p.253.

8. *Ibid.*, p.253.

9. *Ibid.*, p.252.

10. *Triglot Concordia*, edited by F.Bente, (St Louis 1921), p.392.

11. Tappert, p.254. From *The Apology of the Augsburg Confession* - Article XXIV, 27.

12. *Ibid.*, p.256.

13. Alf Hardelin: *The Tractarian Understanding Of The Eucharist* (Uppsala 1965), p.218.

14. *Ibid.*, p.218.

15. R.I.Wilberforce, *The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist* (Oxford 1864), p.60.

16. *Ibid.*, p.60.

17. Hardelin, p.199.

18. *Ibid.*, p.207.

19. *Ibid.*, p.207.

20. *Ibid*, p.203.

21. *Ibid.*, p.219.

22. John Keble 'Eucharistical Offices', *Sermons Occasional and Parochial* (Oxford 1847), p.257.

23. John Keble, *The Doctrine of the Incarnation of Our Lord Jesus Christ, in its Relation to Mankind and to the Church (London 1848), p.371.*

24. E.B.Pusey, 'The Holy Eucharist, a Comfort to the Penitent', *Nine Sermons Preached before the University of Oxford* (Oxford 1855), p.22.

25. Wilberforce, *The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, p.189.

26. E.B.Pusey, 'Tract 81: Catena Patrum. No. IV. Testimony of the Writers of the Later English Church to the Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, With an Historical Account of the Changes Made in the Liturgy as to the Extression of that Doctrine', *Tracts for the Times*, 5 Vols (London 1839) III, p.5.

27. H.P.Liddon, *The Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey*, 4 Vols (London 1893-97), III, p.459.

28. Wilberforce, *The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, p.187.

CHAPTER SIX

THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE REAL PRESENCE

LUTHERAN CONSECRATIONISM

Both the Lutheran and Tractarian repristinationists agreed that as the body and blood of Christ were truly present in the eucharistic elements, they came to be present by virtue of the act of consecration.

Luther's position, that the Real Presence is effected by the faithful repetition of Christ's *verba testamenti* by a priest in the context of the Holy Eucharist, is a self-evident and inescapable part of his eucharistic theology. The same is true of many orthodox Lutheran theologians such as 'the second Martin' - Martin Chemnitz.

Again it was clear that the orthodox Lutheran writings of the sixteenth and seventeenth century were the literature used by the nineteenth century Confessional Lutherans as the basis for their doctrine of the consecration of the elements in the Holy Eucharist. That Reformation-era material will be presented on the Lutheran side as the basis for comparison between the Lutheran and Tractarian repristinationists of the nineteenth century.

In his usual way, Luther was not bashful about parting company with other reformers over his doctrine of the consecration of the elements.

> Now because the fanatics do not see this (that through the Word Christ binds His body and blood so that they are also received corporeally in the bread and wine), they come with their man-made opinion to the effect that God is thereby performing some kind of hocus-pocus. Well, let them go on making fools of themselves; but you cling to the thought that Christ, as I have said, does all these things through the Word, just as the wonders which He daily thereby performs are countless. Should He not through the same power know how to do these things also here in the sacrament? He has put Himself into the Word, and through the Word He puts Himself into the bread also.[1]

For Luther the Reformed accusation that he taught some kind of sacerdotal incantation was absurd. It was not the word of a priest but the word of Christ that had the power. Luther responded to his accusers: 'If they now ask: "Where is the power that causes Christ's body to be in the Supper when we say, 'This is my body'"? I answer: "Where is the power to cause a mountain to be taken up and cast into the sea? Of course it does not reside in our speaking but in God's command, who connects His command with our speaking"'.[2]

Luther's emphasis on the power of Christ behind the sacramental use of His words was echoed in the writings of other Lutheran authors of the Confessions. Chemnitz believed patristic literature to support his view of eucharistic consecration when he wrote:

> Thus the other fathers hold that before the consecration there is only one substance there,

> namely the bread and wine. But when the Word and institution of Christ comes to these elements, then not only one substance is present as before, but at the same time also the very body and blood of Christ, as Ambrose says, *De sacramentis*, Bk.4,chs.4 and 5: "This bread is bread before the words of the Sacrament. But when the words of Christ come to it, it is the body of Christ".[3]

Other less orthodox Lutherans, of the 'Philipist' school, claiming to follow Melanchthon, tended toward Receptionism. Receptionism has always been an inescapable part of the Lutheran scene, also in Walther's day, but always in uncomfortable co-existence with clear and authoritative Lutheran writings which set forth an obvious 'consecrationism'.

It stands to reason that if the Lutheran Confessions had wished to make the oral reception of the elements the key ingredient for the Real Presence, something like that would have been clearly said. As it is, that is not the case. Only an entire use of the sacrament (consecration, distribution and reception) in faithful obedience to the command of Christ is specified as necessary for the Real Presence to take place.

The Lutheran Confessions, which the Lutheran repristinationists so wholeheartedly endorsed, deal with the doctrine of the consecration of the elements in both the *Large Catechism* of Luther and the *Formula of Concord*. The *Large Catechism* is even quoted in the *Formula of Concord*.

It may be established that the Lutheran

Confessions taught the following regarding the consecration of the elements: 1) The *verba institutionis* are the supreme cause of the Real Presence, and they should be publicly portrayed as such. 2) The consecration is an act of Christ, not mere man, as the *verba institutionis* are empowered by both His command and promise. 3) The entire divinely commanded action of the Sacrament must follow the consecration of the elements if it is to be honoured and blessed by Christ's Real Presence.

The first point is manifested not only in the teaching of the Confessions but in the Lutheran liturgical practice of chanting Christ's Words of Institution loudly enough for all to hear, as well as distinguishing them from any human prayer, in order to emphasise the consecratory quality of those words. The theory that an *epiclesis* in an *anaphora* effects the Real Presence as much as the *verba institutionis* is ruled out by the statement in the *Formula* that the consecration 'occurs in no other way than through the repetition and recitation of the Words of Institution'.[4]

The second point may be noted by the quotation from St Chrysostom used in the *Formula of Concord*.

> No man makes the bread and wine set before us the body and blood of Christ, but Christ Himself who was crucified for us. The words are spoken by the mouth of the priest, but by God's power and grace, by the word, where He speaks: "This is My body", the elements presented are consecrated in

the Supper.[5]

Luther continually upheld the simple explanation offered by St Augustine that 'The Word comes to the elements and makes it a sacrament'.[6] The consecration of the elements, however, was not to be considered *extra usum*, that is, outside of the entire sacramental use to which Christ intended. The Lutheran Confessions, like the Anglican *Articles of Religion*, bring this out in protest against the Roman usages of suffering the consecrated elements to be 'enclosed, sacrificed, or carried about'.[7]

As has been stated, the Lutheran Confessions did eventually come to specify the complete sacramental action as necessary for the validity of the Sacrament. The rash teachings of a certain Lutheran priest called Saliger in the late 1560s caused the Lutheran Fathers to coin the phrase: '*nihil habet rationem sacramenti extra usum a Christo insitutum*'. Yet this concept can hardly be regarded as proof of classical receptionism. Saliger had argued an extreme position that the Real Presence existed *ante usum*, days or even months 'before the use', that is, the oral *manducatio*. His controversial style, labelling his colleagues 'sacramentarians' if they argued with him, forced what is called the 'Wismarer Abschied', the tribunal decision at Wismar in 1569 which added the axiom concerning *extra usum* to Lutheran theology. [8]

Yet, it would certainly be alien to Luther to entertain that a human action, such as oral reception, was the deciding factor for the Real Presence. The Lutheran position is that the Eucharist must be celebrated strictly in accordance with the intention and institution of Christ if the Real Presence and its benefits are to be enjoyed.

Perhaps ultimately much of the consecrationist/receptionist debate as to whether the Real Presence is only completed when the consecrated element contacts the communicant's mouth or whether reception is on an equal plane with the consecrating word of Christ in determining the Real Presence is as futile as the attempt to determine at the pronounciation of which syllable of the *verba institutionis* the Real Presence comes into effect.

TRACTARIAN CONSECRATIONISM

Regarding the moment when the Real Presence takes place, a progression of thought and doctrine may be seen over the course of time in Pusey's eucharistic theology. Pusey at one time in his life held to a receptionist view of the Real Presence, interpreting the words of the liturgy that set apart the bread and wine 'that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of

Christ' from that perspective. Yet, as he studied patristic writings, he became increasingly persuaded that the elements are the true body and blood of Christ through a miraculous transaction which takes place prior to their reception by communicants. His views soon became aligned with the historic doctrine of eucharistic consecration as held by the Western Church.

When he set forth his firm belief in the power of the consecration of the elements in the Eucharist, he concurred with *De Sacramentis* where it stated, 'bread is bread before the words of the Sacrament : when the consecration is added. from bread it becomes the flesh of Christ'.[9] Pusey agreed with the comparison made in that same document between the words of sacramental consecration and those of the creation of the world and the creation of eternal life in a Christian soul.[10]

Pusey preached that the mystery of the consecration hinged on the powerful word of Christ. Alluding to St Ambrose, Pusey preached that, whereas before the consecration the liturgy refered to the elements as bread and wine, after the consecratory words they are called Christ's body and blood. When communicants say 'amen' to these things, they are confessing with their mouths that what Christ has said has truly transpired, whether or not it is mentally comprehensible - 'what the mouth speaketh, let the

inward mind confess; what the speech uttereth, let the affection feel'.[11]

REPRISTINATIONISM AND THE DOCTRINE OF THE *MANDUCATIO ORALIS*

FROM THE LUTHERAN PERSPECTIVE

It is an inevitable issue, whenever Christ's words at the last Supper are taken literally, whether or not communicants at the Eucharist eat and drink the body and blood of Christ orally. The position of the nineteenth century Confessional Lutherans may be determined through direct reference to the Lutheran Confessions, because of their singular loyalty to their Reformation-era formularies. They believed the Lutheran Confessions to be faithful expositions of biblical doctrine as part of their subscription to them.

In the course of the theological debates of the late sixteenth century, the Lutherans defined the question at issue to be:

> Whether in the Holy Supper the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ are truly and essentially present, are distributed with the bread and wine, and received with the mouth by all those who use this Sacrament, whether they be worthy or unworthy, godly or ungodly, believing or unbelieving; by the believing for consolation and life, by the unbelieving for judgement? The

Sacramentarians say, No; we say, Yes. [12]

In other words Confessional Lutherans 'believe, teach and confess that the body and blood of Christ are received with the bread and wine, not only spiritually by faith, but also orally; yet not in a Capernaitic, but in a supernatural, heavenly mode [Tappert: heavenly manner], because of the sacramental union'.[13] Those Reformed Christians who opposed this view were labelled as *Sacramentarians*.

Lowell Green described two kinds of Sacramentarians portrayed in the Lutheran Confessions:

> The crass ones, who clearly teach that nothing but bread and wine is received, and the subtle ones, who pretend to believe a Real Presence, but actually teach that the presence of Christ takes place only spiritually through faith, since they say that Christ's body is confined to heaven.[14]

Thus it is apparent that a complete picture of the orthodox Lutheran doctrine of the Real Presence must include three distinctive aspects: a sacramental union - *unio sacramentalis*, an oral manducation - *manducatio oralis*, and the communication of the unworthy - *communicatio indignorum*.

MANDUCATIO ORALIS AND TRACTARIANISM

The process of arriving at and expressing a doctrine of eucharistic eating that was acceptable to the Tractarians was much more complex for them than for

Confessional Lutherans of that same period. Whereas the Lutherans could refer to explicit statements in their confessional formularies which expressed their position, the Tractarians had to travel a far more circuitous route to assemble their doctrine.

From the beginning, with the Tractarians, as with all Anglicans, the question at hand concerned the definition and description of eucharistic eating as an act or event. Did it involve the oral eating of Christ's body and blood at all, or was eucharistic eating to be understood in a spiritual and non-oral way? If eucharistic eating corresponded to 'partaking of Christ', was it something that did not happen to unbelievers who partook of the elements? Perhaps, above all, where were the authoritative answers to be found?

Concerning a doctrine such as that of the *manducatio oralis*, Pusey was given to establishing the Anglican position on the basis of liturgical usages. In this respect Pusey showed how much he adhered to the theological school of *Lex Orandi, Lex Credendi*. He wrote:

> Legally, some would argue that the Articles are interpreters of the Prayer Book. I know not on what ground...we are bound solemnly to "declare our unfeigned assent and consent to all and everything contained and prescribed in and by the Book of Common Prayer and the administration of the Sacraments". But whatever be the rule of law, it is the order of nature and of grace, that our prayers are the interpreters of the Articles. Through her Prayer Book does the Church teach the

> people, and among them, ourselves. (then quoting from S.Coelestin. Auctoritt. de grat. Dei. c.8. Conc.iii.475:) Through it she continually teaches. "The Law of our Prayer constitutes the law of our faith".[15]

Then adding another expression of his own personal confidence in the orthodoxy of the Anglican Formularies, Pusey wrote, 'but for myself, I have never doubted that the Articles, understood in their natural sense, with no foreign meanings introduced into them, contain no other doctrine than the Catechism and the Liturgy', which, in his opinion, correctly established the doctrine of the Real Presence.[16]

Actual body and blood was thus eaten in the Eucharist. Looking at other parts of the Prayer Book, in reply to Mr Goode, Pusey admitted that some expression of the Real Presence had been tampered with in the past, but without damaging the orthodoxy of the final product. Dealing with specific examples of this, Pusey noted that words had been omitted in the *Book of Common Prayer* from the collect: 'we do not presume &c.' namely '*in* these holy mysteries' which normally would have followed the words 'so to eat the Flesh of Thy dear Son and to drink His Blood'. Yet, because the words '*in* that Holy Sacrament' have been retained in the words of the priest's formal announcement of a forthcoming Eucharist, Pusey argued that the theology of the Real Presence was still intact.[17] Pusey maintained that because the petitions of the 'we do not

presume &c.' prayer speak of the body and blood cleansing and washing the bodies and souls of communicants, 'We are not, then according to this prayer, only in a general way cleansed by the Precious Blood of Christ, through faith in Him. Our cleansing comes to us through our actual contact with that Sacred Body and Blood'.[18]

Other excerpts from the Prayer Book were claimed by Pusey to teach the eating and drinking of the very body and blood of Christ as he understood it. Pusey cited the *Prayer of Consecration* which speaks of the 'creatures of bread and wine' conveying the 'blessed Body and Blood' once consecrated: i.e. 'received ... according to ... Christ's holy institution'.[19] In the *Blessing of Communicants*, Pusey granted that it stated that 'in It (His Body) He is present there (in heaven), our High Priest for ever, "Who ever liveth to make intercession for us". In His Blood we have redemption'. 'Yet', Pusey remarked, 'no where in Holy Scripture is any benefit spoken of, as derived directly from His Body, except as received by us in the Holy Eucharist'.[20] 'The prayer "the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy body and soul", can mean no other than that Body which had just been spoken of in the prayer of consecration ...that which we had just prayed to eat aright'.[21]

Comparing the Anglican liturgy to that of other

Western rites, Pusey concluded, 'There is no Western liturgy, in which the Body and Blood of Christ are not given with words of benediction, "The Body of Christ", "the Blood of Christ", "preserve", "guard", &c.'.[22] As these liturgical statements teach the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the eucharistic elements behind such expressions so, Pusey argued, does Anglicanism.

> In the evil days towards the close of the reign of Edward VI they wished to lower the doctrine of the Church of England, they omitted the Benediction, "The Body of our Lord" &c. and substituted an Exhortation, "Take and eat this in remembrance &c" ...The Holy Eucharist is *also* a remembrance; so the reformers in Queen Elizabeth's reign retained the words which expressed this. But they restored the words which had been struck out, because they expressed the Presence of our Lord's Body and Blood in the consecrated elements. By doing so they gave back to the Church of England another expression of the doctrine.[23]

Further liturgical confessions of eucharistic eating included the *Second Thanksgiving* of the Anglican eucharistic liturgy in which, Pusey explained, the thought was not that we feed on Christ, but that he feeds us with his body and blood.[24] Pusey often emphasised the wording 'so eat' in prayers which refer to the Eucharist, to point out that the *manner* of eating is not mental or spiritual but by means of the bread and wine.[25]

There are some phrases in the *Book of Common Prayer* which would seem to militate against Pusey's

understanding of the Real Presence. Mr Goode, in his argument against Pusey, pointed to a number of these. Pusey, in turn, dealt with these Prayer Book statements individually to find, as Newman did with tract 90, an uphill battle involved in reading a catholic meaning into what seem to be only Protestant statements.

Pusey began with the phrase which described eucharistic eating as 'only in a spiritual manner'; a phrase which would seem to avoid the idea of orally eating and drinking Christ's body and blood in any way. He argued:

> The explanation, that "the Body of Christ is given *only* in a spiritual and heavenly manner", was added, probably, in order to remove the imputation of the opposite party, that something carnal, or circumscribed, or some earthly conception, was intended. For Archbishop Parker had removed the statement in the forty-two Articles, which rejected the Real Presence.[26]

As he argued, Pusey displayed a considerable knowledge of Reformation history, finding an historical and often catholic context behind some of the very statements which Mr Goode and others held to express only Protestant eucharistic doctrine. As has already been indicated, Pusey identified Lutheran Reformation statements from which Anglican Reformation formulae were said to originate. These Lutheran formulae seem to have been known to Mr Goode, though they were otherwise quite obscure to most Anglicans.[27]

An example of Pusey's skill at finding old

Anglican Reformation documents to support his position on eucharistic eating would be his use of a letter of 1566 written to Sir William Cecil (Lord Burleigh) by Edmund Gheast, Bishop of Rochester. This letter expressed the bishop's concern over the use of the word 'only' in the Prayer Book phrase about 'the spiritual and heavenly manner' in which the Real Presence is to be understood. In the letter the writer confided that he and Chesney, Bishop of Glocester, had discussed this concern and concluded that the word 'only' did not exclude the presence of Christ's body, but only the 'sensibleness' of it. Indeed, although the presence of Christ's body was admitted to be physically undiscernible, it could still be believed to be present 'corporally, naturally, reallye, substantially, and carnally, as ye doctors do write', and as such, held in the hand and received in the mouth. Again the author wrote:

> We maye saye, yt in ye sacrament his verye body is present, yea, really, that is to say, in deeds, substantially, that is, in substance and corporally, carnally and naturally; by which wordes is ment that his verye bodye, his verye fleshe, and his very humaine nature, is there, not after corporall carnall or natural wise, but invisibly, unspeakably, supernaturally, spiritually, diviniely, and by waye unto him only known.[28]

With this letter Pusey rediscovered what is indeed an interesting understanding of the Real Presence in which Christ's body could be spoken of as

'carnally' present, yet in a 'non-carnal way'; 'naturally' present, but in a supernatural way, spiritually eaten, but by means of the mouth.

An important element in his argument was the added factor that the descriptions of the Real Presence as 'heavenly' or 'spiritual' employed in the *Book of Common Prayer*, unlike other Reformed writings, are said to have no additional remarks added to exclude the Real Presence. For this reason, Pusey grappled manfully, if not altogether convincingly, with the phrase which the Prayer Book does add, namely: 'and the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten is faith'.

Hardelin commented that if Pusey had not believed the reception of Christ's body and blood to be dependent upon the *manducatio oralis* of each element, he would not have objected as he did to the Roman custom at that time of withholding the cup from the laity.[29]

MANDUCATIO INDIGNORUM

Like the Lutherans before them, most of the Tractarians upheld the doctrine of the *manducatio indignorum*, the communion of the unworthy, or even *manducatio impii*, the communion of the unbelieving, also called the reception of the wicked. What prompted

the Tractarians to this doctrine was the same thing which moved the Lutherans: the force of the Biblical warnings in 1 Corinthians which concern the woes which befall those who do not discern the Lord's body even as they partake of it (1 Cor. 11.27-30).

Pusey clarified his position by making a distinction between the eating and drinking of Christ's body and blood which can have a positive or negative effect on the soul, and the 'partaking of Christ' which is always a positive description.

The difficulty for Pusey was that the Prayer Book uses the terms eating and partaking of Christ interchangeably as though they are always one and the same thing. For Pusey, the theoretical possibility of a non-beneficial eating and drinking of Christ's body and blood could not be excluded, however. Pusey was able to assert this with an argument from silence. He knew that Article XXIX said that the unbelieving communicants 'are in no wise *partakers of Christ*'. He argued that the article 'does not say, that the wicked cannot be partakers *of the Body and Blood of Christ*'. Making such a distinction, he argued that the unbeliever could still eat the body and blood of Christ without enjoying the benefits attributed to faithful 'partakers of Christ'.[30]

Although Pusey realised Article XXIX implies that the wicked do not eat Christ's body, he insisted

that what is actually meant is:

> He who does not so eat the Flesh of Christ and drink His Blood, that he should dwell in Christ and Christ in him, does not eat or drink them at all, *for any purpose or effect for which Christ gave them*. And so God, in Holy Scripture, frequently speaks of that which is not done according to His will, as if it had not been done at all, Thus, He says that Israel sacrificed to devils, *not to God*...[31]

Pusey's position remained that no one could force a concept of partaking of Christ upon him which contradicted the *manducatio impii*.[32] He quoted from St Paul to show that not every eating of the body of Christ is a beneficial partaking of Christ. No apostolic warning would be necessary if all eucharistic eating was beneficial.[33] Furthermore, like the Lutherans, Pusey argued that St Paul's word of warning concerning unworthy communicants testified to the doctrine of the Real Presence. He wrote, 'Other sins have their own guilt and their own punishment. But the special sin of being "guilty of His Body and Blood" is assigned to those who "eat or drink unworthily that Bread and the Cup", of which alone it is said, "This is My Body, This is My Blood"'.[34] 'All God's gifts and promises', wrote Pusey, 'imply a right condition on the part of the recipients'.[35]

As Hardelin observed, Wilberforce held to a similar position. 'The *manducatio indignorum* is, of course, to Wilberforce no mere logical inference from a theological theory. It is to him the evident

implication of the words of St Paul in his letter to the Corinthians on those who discern not the Lord's body, a statement, he says, which is "incompatible with the denial that Christ's Presence is really vouchsafed"'.[36]

So important was this teaching concerning the *manducatio indignorum* to the Tractarians, that when it was disputed in the Denison trial of 1855, the doctrine came to be regarded as it had among Lutherans, as a test of one's true belief in the Real Presence. Following the Denison judgement Pusey, Keble, Bennet and other prominent men in the movement stated:

> That the interpretation of Scripture most commonly held in the Church has been, that the wicked, although they can "in no wise be partakers of Christ", nor "spiritually eat His flesh and drink His blood", yet do in the Sacrament not only take, but eat and drink unworthily to their own condemnation the body and blood of Christ which they do not discern.[37]

It must be noted that the Tractarian John Keble initially had serious reservations about the concept of a *manducatio indignorum*. His understanding of John 6.54 had caused him to doubt the doctrine. In the words of institution as well, Keble saw a distinction between 'receiving' and 'eating'. Pusey tried to reassure him by suggesting that all God's promises were conditional. John 6.54 is Christ's statement that 'whoever eats my flesh and drinks my blood has eternal life and I will raise him up on the last day'. Pusey's

explanation to Keble was that this text was more than a statement of fact, it was a promise, like 'if we suffer, we shall reign...'; 'I will never leave you...' and 'whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin.' Ultimately it seems that Keble was won over to Pusey's side on this issue.

The historical incident which triggered Keble's examiniation of this doctrine was the trial of Archdeacon Denison, who defended his position that all, even unbelievers, receive the objectively present and distributed body and blood of Christ. As usual, a polemical occasion such as this prompted enormous feats of patristic scholarship on Pusey's part.[38]

But for Keble it was St Augustine whose writings cast the most doubt over Pusey's and Denison's view of the reception of the wicked. Yet Pusey judged that if some writings of St Augustine undermined the *manducatio indignorum*, the Bishop of Hippo was 'at variance, not only with others but with himself'. Pusey had no difficulty finding passages from Augustine which taught the reception of the wicked, however.[39] In one book Pusey produced three tightly printed full pages of quotations from Augustine which demonstrated a belief in the reception of the wicked.[40]

Pusey added to his Augustinian quotations, those of a list of Church Fathers which reads like a patristic directory: Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian,

Firmilian, Eusebius, James of Nisibis, Athanasius, Hilary, Hilary the Deacon, Pacian, Ephrem, Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory of Nazianzus, Caesarius, Esaias Abbas, Eusebius of Alexandria, Ambrose, Jerome, Jerome of Jerusalem, Gaudentius, Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, Isidore of Pelusium, Theodoret, Peter Chrysologus, Proclus, Sedulius, and Leo the Great, all in support of the concept of a *manducatio impii*.[41]

In this way Pusey demonstrated his familiarity with patristic literature, proving at the same time that he was never without strong patristic support for his position concerning the Eucharist. Frequently very fine nuances of meaning were discerned in the writings of the Fathers from which Pusey would drew confident conclusions nevertheless.[42]

The argument concerning eucharistic eating displayed the real divisions within the Church of England with regard to the Lord's Supper. The case of the trial of Archdeacon Denison was an example of how both the Real Presence and the *manducatio impii* were both maintained and denied by different parties within the same Church of England.[43]

Denison was found guilty of false doctrine by the Court at Bath including the Archbishop of Canterbury on July 22, 1855. The decision, however, was appealed (by a mandamus from the Queen's bench) and reversed by the Dean of Arches, on April 23, 1857, on the grounds that

the time required by the Church Discipline Act had expired before the suit had been taken against Denison.[44]

One result of the trial was an important document which may be regarded as a significant confessional statement. In protest against the theology behind the charge of false doctrine against Denison, Pusey, Keble, J.M.Neale, W.P.Ward, and 14 other church dignitaries lodged a declaration which constitutes a rare and important statement of eucharistic theology, quite Lutheran in its confessional style.[45]

THE REPRISTINATIONIST APPRECIATION OF EUCHARISTIC BENEFITS

LUTHERAN APPRECIATION

Unlike the Memorialism which dominates other Reformation churches, the Lutheran Reformation perceived the action of Holy Communion to be of great and objective benefit for the communicant. In keeping with the Lutheran doctrine of the means of grace, the believer was regarded as dependent upon God for all spiritual sustenance, and that sustenance was to be sought in the word and sacraments alone. When Lutherans such as the confessional Lutherans of the

nineteenth century gathered for the Lord's Supper they did so believing that their communion had an important and concentrated effect on them.

The simplest description of the Lutheran understanding of the benefits of Holy Communion was to be obtained from Luther's *Small Catechism*, in which 'forgiveness of sins' was specifically identified, but in which other benefits were implied by the words 'life and salvation' also listed a bestowed by the Eucharist.[46]

Critics of Lutheranism like Wilberforce and Pusey should have known better that to be misled by the simple words of the *Small Catechism* into thinking that Lutherans have not thought deeply about the benefits of Holy Communion. Other confessional writings in addition to the *Small Catechism* clearly add further insight into the Lutheran appreciation of faithful eating and drinking of the Sacrament of the Altar.

In his *Large Catechism*, for example, Luther adds 'nourishment and strengthing' to the single eucharistic benefit he usually mentions: the forgiveness of sins.[47] Luther was not unaware of the awesome fact that eating and drinking the body and blood of the Son of God logically carries with it tremendous consequences. Part of his argument for eucharistic benefits is: 'Now the body of Christ can never be an unfruitful, vain thing, that effects and profits nothing'.[48]

Luther's great appreciation for the effect of sacramental eating and drinking is evident in his interest in frequent communion. He encouraged Christians to commune frequently and pointed to its 'daily' availability in churches.[49] Particiption in Holy Communion was regarded as so vital to the devotional life of every Lutheran that without it their Christian faith itself was called into question.[50]

Luther's use of a quotation from St Hilary showed his appreciation of the Eucharist's vital role in the Christian life: 'If anyone has not committed sin for which he can rightly be put out of the congregation and esteemed no Christian, he ought not stay away from the Sacrament, lest he may deprive himself of life'.[51] It is apparent that the Confessional Lutherans of the nineteenth century also saw the perpetuation of their spiritual lives to be dependant upon Holy Communion. After all, it was their disapproval of eucharistic teaching and practice in Germany and Prussia that played a major role in their dramatic protests and eventual exile.

Only their ignorance of Confessional Lutheranism could explain how Tractarians like Pusey could accuse Lutherans of having little appreciation for the blessing of Holy Communion when the Lutheran Confessions enshrine even the ancient 'medicine of immortality' imagery with the following quote from

Luther himself:

> [One who is sensible] should regard and use it only as a precious antidote against the poison which they have in them ... which brings with it the grace of God and the Spirit with all His gifts, protection, shelter, and power against death and the devil and all misfortune ...If, therefore, you are heavy-laden and feel your weakness, then go joyfully to this Sacrament and obtain refreshment, consolation, and strength.[52]

The fifteenth chapter of St John, with its imagery of the vine and the branches so important to patristic sacramental theology, was also reflected in the Lutheran Confessions in a positive way. In Melanchthon's *Apology to the Augsburg Confession*, such patristic use of the vine and branches imagery is included by means of a lengthy quote from Cyril of Alexandria.[53] Melanchthon cut his discussion short, noting that the Roman Catholic Emperor Charles V did not disapprove of this article.

Melanchthon was followed by other Lutherans from the period of Lutheran orthodoxy who also made it unquestionably clear that they deeply appreciated the effects of Holy Communion and the *unio mystica* or 'mystical union' effected by it. It is apparent that the appreciation of Holy Communion maintained since the Apostles and early Church Fathers first pondered the wonders of the Real Presence, had been carried forward into the Lutheran sacramental theology of the nineteenth century as well.

THE TRACTARIAN PICTURE OF EUCHARISTIC BENEFITS

The description of the sacramental theology of the Oxford Movement as 'the assertion of a visible church with sacraments and rites, which are channels of invisible grace' applies to their views of the benefits of eucharistic eating and drinking.[54] Pusey believed that his personal summation of his belief concerning the Church of England's theology of eucharistic benefits could be found in extracts from portions of the *Book of Common Prayer* familiar to Anglicans from childhood.[55]

The impression is given that Pusey felt that the sheer weight of quotations he could summon from the *Book of Common Prayer* would give the overwhelming impression that his was an accurate reflection of Anglican teaching. He was doubtlessly aware that the Prayer Book also contained quotations which were unfavourable to his views. It almost seems that Pusey wished to place his quotations on a scale, challenging his fellow Anglicans to match the weight of the references in his favour with those which favoured their opposite position. The greatest weight of quotations would rule the day as a kind of majority verdict.

It is certain that the benefits Pusey assigned to

the Eucharist were many. This fuelled his own personal interest in frequent reception of the Lord's Supper. Prepared to equate the eucharistic meal with the 'daily bread' mentioned in the Lord's Prayer, Pusey exclaimed, 'How should there be the fulness of the Divine Life, amid all but a month-long fast from our "daily bread"?'. He lamented from the pulpit to his fellow Anglicans that, 'We seem, alas, to have forgotten, in our very thoughts, that daily communion which once was the common privilege of the whole Church'.[56]

For his sermons, Pusey found abundant scriptural support for his teaching concerning the believers' dependency upon the Sacrament of the Altar. He favoured the imagery of the Vine and the branches as a description of the role of the Eucharist in the Christian life. In the Tracts Pusey taught that the sacrament of Baptism engrafts Christians to the Vine and they become parts of the Body of Christ. It was natural then to follow on with that imagery and describe how the sacrament of Holy Communion conveys the vital nourishment from the Vine to the branches. This also fits in with Pusey's perception of the gift of the Eucharist as a real infused quality or power.[57]

In employing the scriptures in this way Pusey found abundant patristic support. In the Church Fathers, Pusey found the concept of a mysterious and awesome physical union that was thought to be involved

in Holy Communion. Many of the Fathers, from Origen to Augustine, used the words of the sixth chapter of the Gospel of St John to develop the theme of the physical union with Christ affected through the reception of the Eucharist.

Pusey expounded that as it was the touch of Jesus' body that cleansed many people of sin and disease in the Scriptures, so those who partake of the Eucharist, because of their close (indeed, physically close) relationship with Christ, will also benefit physically. He wrote:

> Closer is the nearness of Almighty God to those who will receive Him than when He walked with Adam in Paradise, or seemed to sit with Abraham, or to speak to Moses, face to face, or when the Angel in Whom His Presence was, wrestled with Jacob ... yea, nearer yet than when in the Flesh, His disciples did eat and drink with Him, and went in and out with Him, or Mary sat at His Feet, or His Mother carried Him in her arms, or St John lay in His Bosom, or St Thomas thrust his hand into His Side ... The Christians' nearness He hath told: "We will come in to him and make our Abode with him".[58]

From patristic writings, Pusey eagerly assimilated the patristic concept of the Eucharist as a 'medicine of immortality' - food for nourishing the immortal aspect of a human being.[59] Pusey wrote that such access to the true body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist should change one's whole view of life itself.

> [Contact with the Eucharist] ... implies a life so different from our commonplace ordinary tenor, a life so above this world as knit with Him who hath overcome the world, so angelic as living on

> Him who is angel's food, a union with God so close that we cannot mostly, I suppose, imagine to ourselves how we could daily thus be in heaven and in our daily business here below.[60]

Through such descriptions of the eucharistic life, the Oxford Movement set out to affect all aspects of the Anglican Church's teaching and mission. It may be said that Pusey's doctrines, in many ways, constituted a radical reappraisal of the systematic theology understood by most Anglicans of his day. His most enduring contribution to Anglicanism was his appeal to the non-theologian, the ordinary Christian, to appreciate the outpouring of the grace of God through the Church's ministry of word and sacraments.

Pusey was able to build on the popular romantic feelings of his time as well. In the place of the kind of spiritual justification promoted by contemporary Evangelicals, Pusey and the Oxford Movement offered the benefit of a sacramental system which tended to appeal to the human need for more objective substance, rather than merely forensic concepts. With Pusey, the Oxford Movement also benefitted from a consistent theology of the cross. He did not wish to lead people into thinking that they could benefit from merely going through the motions of participation in the Church and her sacraments. He wished to teach people that they had a genuine need for the grace of God and that grace could only be conveyed by absolute God-given means,

such as Baptism and the Eucharist.

Pusey preached, 'Our comfort, our joy, our peace, our consolation, our glory, is, to have, what we have, purely from Him, to have the foundation of our hopes outside of ourselves, and conveyed by a formal act of His, whereby "according to His mercy He saved us, through the washing of regeneration and of renewal of the Holy Ghost"'.[61] Such a statement clearly illustrated the regard Pusey had for the benefits of the sacraments. To him they were the greatest source of tangible assurance that the comfort of the Gospel could be objectively and personally applied.

The Real Presence fitted in well with such an appreciation of the sacraments. Pusey's reference to it as a real *objective* presence of the redeeming Lamb that was slain, offered the communicant a tangible, though mysterious, sacrament of which its 'special joy is that it is his Redeemer's very broken Body and it is His Blood, which was shed for the remission of his sins. In the words of the ancient Church, "he drinks his ransom"'.[62]

The Eucharist was portrayed as a divine contact, applying personally what Christ achieved universally on the cross. The comfort to the penitent offered in the Eucharist was an individual application of the one oblation of Christ made upon the cross 'poured out for us now'.[63]

Pusey did not, as some alleged, deny the 'once and for all' quality of Christ's suffering on the cross. He did not assert that Christ's suffering was repeated in each Mass. Rather, he asserted that the Eucharist implemented the doctrine of justification for the eternal benefit of the body as well as the soul of the communicant.

The concept of some physical benefit to Holy Communion was one of the controversial aspects of Pusey's teaching. Yet it was Pusey's inescapable conclusion, based on his reading of the Church Fathers, that even physical imagery concerning eucharistic benefits was part of the orthodox eucharistic theology and preaching he sought to promote in the Anglican Church.[64]

In the biblical model of the vine and the branches Pusey saw faith more as a prerequisite for receiving benefit from the sacrament, rather than as the main benefit itself. He taught that once one is engrafted to the Vine initially by Baptism, the Eucharist served to infuse one with the Spirit, strengthening a faith which already existed.[65] The main complaint that Pusey had against Luther's view of the Eucharist was not in the question of the function of faith in the Eucharist but the issue of the Sacrament's real benefit to the communicant.

The minimum which Pusey believed should be taught

is that the Eucharist had a two-fold benefit for the Christian: the forgiveness of sins, and the 'infusion of His (God's) Spirit, and life and immortality, making us one with His glorified Humanity'.[66] The latter aspect with its theme of *theopoiesis* was the more dominant of the two because of the patristic usage. Pusey's efforts to examine every patristic reference to the Eucharist from the death of the last apostle to the Fourth General council of A.D. 451, resulted in his discovery that the Church Fathers emphasised the sanctifying benefits of the Eucharist at least as much as the forgiving role of the sacrament.

The role the Eucharist played in salvation was connected with Christ's incarnation in human flesh as well as his giving and shedding His body and blood in suffering. This was thought to be because, in the Eucharist, as in the incarnation, Christ takes human flesh, sanctifying individual communicants as He sanctified the whole human race by His incarnation. For the Fathers, the Eucharist involved the work of salvation Christ accomplished even before His crucifixion. Pusey extended the patristic comparison between the Eucharist and the manger in which Christ was born.[67]

Pusey appreciated St Cyril's interpretation of I Cor. 15.21, in which he gave a fundamental emphasis to the role of the incarnation in the salvation and

sanctification of man. In the Eucharist, as in the incarnation, Christ veiled His divine glory under humble forms, being intimately present within and before His people, yet not overwhelming them visually.[68]

As has been noted, Pusey found in the Fathers virtual unanimity in prescribing a eucharistic interpretation to Christ's words in the sixth chapter of John.[69] The troublesome passage in that chapter which states that 'the flesh profits nothing' was explained by Pusey, by means of patristic commentary, to refer not to the eucharistic flesh of Christ, but to 'carnal hearing'.[70]

Naturally with such a teaching concerning eucharistic benefit, frequent reception of the sacrament would also be promoted. Such teaching would be a partial explanation for the frequency of eucharistic celebrations which followed in churches influenced by the Oxford Movement. Pusey's use of the petition in the Lord's Prayer, 'give us this day our daily bread' to refer to the eucharistic bread of life had much patristic support. Pusey documented that such an interpretation of the Lord's Prayer is found in sermons nos. 68, 70, 71, and 73 of St Peter Chrysologos, Bishop of Ravenna around the time of the Council of Ephesus in A.D.431.[71]

Pusey found further value in the patristic belief

that the eucharistic touch of Jesus helps to render one protected from satanic attack.[72] Likewise he promoted the ancient belief that faithful and reverent eucharistic eating placed one on God's side over against those who ill-treated the flesh of Christ during His trial and crucifixion.[73]

Reading the patristic quotations that make up such a large part of Pusey's book on the doctrine of the Real Presence, one is clearly able to see how influential their writings were in the formation of his eucharistic theology. Pusey's sermons attempt to promote the same feeling toward the Eucharist that the Fathers expressed over one thousand years earlier. Like the Fathers, Pusey took refuge in the Eucharist for the preservation of his own salvation and he exhorted those who heard his preaching to do likewise.

As he knew more about Lutherans than any of the other Tractarians, it was Pusey who made the most illuminating connection between theirs and the Anglican understanding of the benefits of the Eucharist.

In his efforts to explain the historical origin of his favourite 'notice' previewing the eucharistic content of one of the *Homilies*, Pusey believed that he had established a link between the Anglican Article XXV and corresponding wording in the *Augsburg Confession*. 'Enlarging' and 'correcting' the Lutheran Confession of

Augsburg, Pusey suggested that the Anglican reformers augmented the deficient Lutheran statement adding the doctrine that by means of the Sacraments, God 'doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in Him'. Such a statement that the Sacraments are 'effectual' in this way was thought by Pusey to be an important addition to what the Lutherans had stated.[74] He regarded these additions as compensation for any deficiency in the Lutheran understanding of eucharistic benefits.[75]

Pusey demonstrated that the Anglican confessions also distanced themselves from the Zwinglian or Calvinistic influence which are normally suggested for them. Anglican teaching was credited with emphasising that 'the *Sacraments* especially owe their efficacy to *"the institution of Christ*", whereas, contrariwise, the Zwinglians and Calvinists believed that the Word and Sacraments had their effect in one and the same way, by kindling faith'. Having made a peculiar association between Lutheran and Reformed teachings in mutual error, Pusey added that, 'the English article again carefully corrects the Lutheran'.[76]

Pusey did not accuse all Lutherans of falling short of the Anglican appreciation of the benefits of eucharistic eating, however. He once commented that the Anglican wording of Article XXVIII reminded him of the Lutheran reformer Melanchthon 'in his later years'.

He referred to Melanchthon's comments on St Paul:

> The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? Wherefore said he not, "the participation"? Because he intended to express something more, and to point out how close was the union: in that we communicate, not only by participating, but also by being united. For as that body is united to Christ, so also we are united to Him by this bread.[77]

Perhaps in such an elderly Melanchthon, Pusey saw some of the ideal Lutheranism of which he had sometimes written. Above all others, Pusey discovered in Melanchthon a writer who clearly expanded the usual Lutheran description of the benefits of Holy Communion. Pusey appreciated Melanchthon's statement from the colloquy to the emperor, containing his listing of three benefits to the use of the Lord's Supper. The statement augmented considerably the rather general teaching of Luther's *Small Catechism* on the benefits of eucharistic eating. Melanchthon's use of the *sacramentum* and *res sacramenti* formula to describe the Real Presence, also helped establish a further point of comparison between Anglican thought and the best of Lutheran eucharistic theology.[78]

WILBERFORCE AND THE BENEFITS OF HOLY COMMUNION

R.I.Wilberforce was another Tractarian who knew something about continental Reformation theology and

felt prepared to make comparisons between their eucharistic theology and what he called the 'church system'. He observed that both Zwingli and Calvin made the benefit or even the efficacy of the sacraments contingent upon some condition on the part of the recipient, without which a sacrament would have no effect at all, either good or bad. For Zwingli the efficacy of the Eucharist was dependent upon the disposition of the receiver; for Calvin it depended upon God's predetermined destiny for the individual. If this element were removed from Calvin's eucharistic theology, it would be tantamount to Zwingli's approach. Wilberforce did not credit either of those reformers with having grasped the sacramental understanding of the catholic 'church system'.[79]

When Wilberforce calculated the benefits of Holy Communion to the faithful he felt it necessary to add the benefits of the eucharistic sacrifice to that of the sacrament. Nevertheless, he gave greater emphasis to the divine ingredients in the Eucharist than the human. For Wilberforce the great benefit of eucharistic eating and drinking was derived not as much from taking Christ's body into the believer as from causing the believer to be all the more engrafted into Christ's body.

Like Pusey, Wilberforce was fascinated by patristic testimony on any subject, and certainly with

regard to the benefits of Holy Communion. He particularly extolled their references to a blessing which Holy Communion renders to the flesh. As in the 'medicine of immortality' theory, a kind of physical benefit was believed to be enjoyed by the bodies of the faithful which orally ingest the flesh and blood of Christ.

Part of the appeal of the medicine of immortality theory was its consistency with the Tractarian appreciation of the incarnation. Christ, who came in the flesh for the salvation, indeed quasi-deification of human flesh, was believed to continue to extend His cleansing and healing touch to the corruptible bodies of His faithful people through Holy Communion. For Wilberforce, as for St Augustine, the starting point for this theory of Holy Communion was the sixth chapter of St John.[80] Beyond that, the rest of the Tractarian and patristic assertions of the medicine of immortality theory were based on logic.[81] The life-giving effect of Holy Communion was unquestionable. As long as what was offered in the Eucharist was the very body and blood of the Son of God, tremendous benefits to body and soul were thought to necessarily follow. Wilberforce was aware that such use of eucharistic logic was in the tradition of Cyril of Alexandria, who used the doctrine of the Lord's body in the Eucharist in his treatise against Nestorius.[82]

Wilberforce blamed a lack of patristic influence for the failure on the part of many of the great theologians of history to appreciate the manifold benefits of Holy Communion. He maintained that, owing to such a lack of patristic influence, Erasmus of Rotterdam believed in the Real Presence, yet had little to say of its value. As to why the Holy Eucharist was eaten, the skeptical Tillotson only speculated that 'ancient peoples customarily ate their sacrifices'.[83] Wilberforce argued that these, as well as Oecalampadius' eucharistic theology would be completely different had they embraced the incarnational understanding of the Eucharist held by the ancient Church.

CONCERNING THE *UNIO MYSTICA*

A term familiar to Lutheran dogmatics is the term *unio mystica*. It is a description of a mysterious spiritual union, nurtured by the Lord's Supper, between Christ and a faithful communicant. As we have seen, even Luther's descriptions of this relationship to the Eucharist suggest the medicine of immortality concept. Wilberforce indicated that, in patristic thought, the *unio mystica* corresponded to the incarnation, as when St Hilary wrote, 'While He is in the Father by the

Nature of His Deity, we, on the contrary, are in Him, by His corporeal nativity, and He is in us by the mystery of the sacraments'.[84] Patristic sources also added a physical dimension of the *unio mystica* concept asking, 'Why is it that we receive it? Does it not cause Christ to dwell in us even bodily, by the partaking and communion with His sacred flesh? No doubt of it'.[85] Absorbed into the body, the Holy Eucharist was thought to render it superior to corruption.[86]

Over against such deep and mysterious concepts of eucharistic benefits stood the Calvinistic concept of the *virtus sacramenti* as described by Anglicans such as Waterland. According to Wilberforce, Waterland's theory was tantamount to saying that the *virtus sacramenti* is 'merely that general assistance of divine grace which accompanies all ordinances'.[87] And, in an interesting distinction between Law and Gospel, Wilberforce comments, 'Such a course would make the Law the reality, instead of the Gospel'.[88]

Their discoveries in patristic literature and their perceptions of the catholic and orthodox teaching with regard to the benefits of Holy Communion placed the Tractarians in opposition to the theories of their Calvinistic colleagues in the Church of England. At the same time, because of that more acute appreciation of Holy Communion, they approached more closely, if

unintentionally, to the position of their contemporaries in Confessional Lutheranism.

EUCHARISTIC ADORATION - THE LUTHERAN POSITION

The teaching and practice of eucharistic adoration was dealt with in the early days of the Lutheran Reformation. It surfaced in the midst of the controversies that taxed the Lutheran movement during the creation of its doctrinal formularies. The issue was forced upon the Lutherans when Reformed church bodies questioned them about their attitudes toward such popular manifestations of catholic eucharistic doctrine as the elevation of the Host and *Corpus Christi* processions. These Zwinglian and Calvinist 'Sacramentarians' believed that such things had no place in a reformed Christianity. They also denied the Real Presence and rejected most other catholic eucharistic doctrines.

Their questions arose when they saw *Corpus Christi* day observed by some Lutherans and the elevation of the host and chalice retained in Lutheran ceremonial. Among the invectives they hurled at the Lutherans was the ignorant charge that they, like the Roman Church, worshipped bread and wine in an idolatrous fashion.

From his study of the Lutheran Reformation, Pusey observed, 'Some ...who denied the doctrine of the Real Presence, saw clearly that the Adoration of our Lord, thus present, is the legitimate consequence of the belief in that Presence. Calvin and the Zurich Zwinglians used it as an argument *ad invidiam* against Luther and the Lutherans'.[89]

Pusey noted that the Sacramentarians taunted Lutherans for their 'inconsistent' reformation of Roman usage. They wrote of Luther:

> He inveighs terribly and heavily against his Papist friends on account of this festival [Corpus Christi], and does not avow openly with them that the Sacrament ought to be adored. What then? The bread is the true and natural Body of Christ: and in the Supper Christ is present, truly and corporally (as the Pope and Luther teach). *Why then ought not the Lord to be adored there, where you say that He is present?*.[90]

What the Sacramentarians failed to discern was that, while Luther strenuously disapproved of the adoration of the consecrated elements outside of the context of the Holy Eucharist, as in a *Corpus Christi* procession, he was in favour of the adoration of Christ in the context of the Lord's Supper. That was, in Luther's view, the most appropriate treatment of the consecrated elements. Christ instituted them to be His body and blood. Christ's body and blood are to be adored, even when clothed in bread and wine. Luther did not believe it was heresy to refuse to express that adoration with outward gestures, as long as adoration

took place in the heart. Luther wrote:

> Those whose entire interest is in the words of this sacrament, so that they feed their faith; they receive the bread and wine with the body and blood of Christ as a sure sign of that Word and of faith. These are the most secure and the best. They probably seldom descend so low as to bother themselves about worshiping and adoring [outwardly], for they pay attention to the work God does to them and forget about the works they do for the sacrament.[91]

Such a description of eucharistic adoration as this from Luther is not as far from the spirit of the Oxford Movement as it may seem. It should be remembered that the outward gestures of adoration employed by the Oxford Movement figures were simple and inconspicuous. Indeed Pusey and others felt somewhat estranged from the more outwardly elaborate shows of eucharistic adoration which characterised what later came to be known as 'ritualism'.

The charge that Lutherans adored the bare elements of bread and wine was dismissed by them as misguided slander. It was not the position of Rome, nor that of the Lutherans, that mere bread and wine should be worshipped. The proper object of worship was the Lord Jesus Christ in whatever form He should appear among Christians. The position of the Lutheran Confessions became: 'of course, no one except an Arian heretic can or will deny that Christ himself, true God and man, who is truly and essentially present in the Supper when it is rightly used, should be adored in

spirit and in truth in all places but especially where his community is assembled'.[92]

Again and again Pusey detected this teaching in his study of the Lutheran Confessions. For example, in his reading of Lutheran documents Pusey noted that

> Chemnitz, even while criticising the Council of Trent, vindicates clearly the principles on which we adore our Lord present in the Sacrament: "...For that Christ, God and Man, is to be adored, no one but an Arian denies. And that His Human Nature also, on account of its union with His Godhead, is to be adored, no one but a Nestorian questions.[93]

Certain outward forms of eucharistic adoration persisted among Confessional Lutherans into the 19th Century. For example, within Confessional Lutheran movements, such as that of the Lutheran Church – Missouri Synod, the Lord's supper was received by kneeling communicants. Observations of *Corpus Christi* Day and the ceremonies of the elevation of the consecrated elements, and traditional genuflections, however, were not unanimously retained. Like the usage of eucharistic vestments, such vestiges of early sacramental devotion were probably worn away after years of separation from Roman Catholic piety and habit. Only relatively recently have eucharistic vestments and such sacramental ceremonies as the elevation of the consecrated elements and genuflection enjoyed major revival as Lutherans become more demonstrative of their theological themes and

doctrines, as well as their continuity with their catholic heritage.

EUCHARISTIC ADORATION AND THE TRACTARIANS

The Tractarians found themselves in a very different position from the Lutherans with regard to eucharistic adoration. Unlike the Lutherans, whose opponents were outside of their own church, the Tractarians faced 'Sacramentarians' from within Anglicanism who neither appreciated nor approved of eucharistic adoration. As a result of this the Tractarians had to exercise great care in how they proposed that subject.

Part of the opposition that faced them seemed to come from the doctrinal formularies of their own church. The argument of the Tractarians was that such opposition was only perceived and not a real feature of the *Book of Common Prayer*. They insisted that, if read with the correct and catholic interpretation, the Anglican formularies encouraged rather than discouraged the Tractarian teaching.

Eucharistic adoration was an important issue for the Tractarians because it dealt with so many of the other issues that concerned them. First of all, eucharistic adoration was a liturgical issue. The role of liturgy in determining Anglican doctrine made it

crucial for the Tractarians that their beliefs had liturgical endorsement as well as ritual expression. The latter interest was more fully developed by the successors to the Tractarians.

The first step for the Tractarians was to clear the way for a liturgical endorsement of their teachings. That proved to be a formidable task, especially in view of certain liturgical elements within the Prayer Book which tended to exclude the teachings of the Tractarians. The most obvious of these is the so-called 'black rubric', the Elizabethan disclaimer of the practice of kneeling for Holy Communion. The rubric has been variously described as a promotion of or a reaction against the extreme Calvinism of John Knox and his followers. In any case, it does seem to have been added to the Prayer Book to reinforce the Reformed doctrine that Christ's body and blood are not on the earthly altar toward which one may kneel, but in Heaven toward which one's soul reaches in Holy Communion.

It is a curious feature of the Tractarians that they accepted much of the Christology of the 'black rubric'. Wilberforce did attempt to harmonise his beliefs with the Christology of the 'black rubric' by arguing that the rubric must not be interpreted in material terms. The human nature of Christ 'does not depend upon local contiguity, but upon spiritual

power.'[94]

Years later Pusey felt it necessary to write that the *Book of Common Prayer* did not oppose the spirit of a *Corpus Christi* procession, although it clearly condemns the practice of it in both article twenty-five and article twenty-eight of the *Thirty-nine Articles* of the Church of England. Pusey admitted, 'the Article says that "the *Sacrament* was not by Christ's ordinance, reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped". It says nothing whatever about the adoration of *Christ* in the Sacrament ... Bishop Andrewes states that distinction so clearly that no one can call it subtle or refined..."*Christ Himself, the Substance of the Sacrament,* in and with the Sacrament; out of and without the Sacrament, wheresoever He is, is to be adored"'.[95]

In a typical Oxford Movement argument from silence, identical to that of Keble, Pusey insisted,

> The statement in Art.XXV. (concerning carrying the Eucharist in procession &c.) only asserts that such was not the object, for which our Saviour ordained the Sacraments. "They were not ordained of Christ", it says, "to be gazed upon or to be carried about". It does not even say, that this *may* not be done; only, that this was not *the* end for which it was ordained. Such also is the meaning of the statement in the 28th Article.[96]

Thus it was a typical tactic of the Tractarians to accept the words, and even the meaning, of the *Book of Common Prayer*, but to speculate as to what it does

not say. The 'black rubric' might clearly say: 'The natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one'. Nevertheless, that did not prevent Pusey vaulting over its implicit denial of the Real Presence and grasping onto its use of the term 'natural'. 'The words "natural Body"', he wrote, 'suggest the contrast of a Presence, "not after the way of nature"'. Pusey's concept of the real objective presence of Christ's 'spiritual' body and blood could survive intact.[97]

In this way, Pusey showed himself to be a Tractarian who was completely undisturbed by the 'black rubric'. This was partially because he supported the Christology behind it and genuinely believed it was a catholic Christology. He also detected among Roman Catholics and Lutherans the doctrine that the 'natural mode of existing' for Christ's human nature was as a physical body 'at the right hand of God'.

> The Council of Trent (in a passage which I have already alleged as agreeing with one the Lutheran Gerhard in regard to the Real Presence of our Lord in the Holy Eucharist,) uses only the words "really, truly, substantially", and "sacramentally"; and denies, as well as our rubric, that our Lord is present in the Holy Eucharist, "according to the natural mode of existing", in which it asserts that "He for ever sitteth at the right hand of the Father".
>
> "For neither are these things mutually repugnant, that our Saviour Himself sitteth at the Right Hand of the Father in heaven, *according to the natural mode of existing,* and that, nevertheless, be, in many other places, sacramentally present unto us in His own

> substance, by that manner of existing which, though we can scarcely express it in words, we yet can, by the understanding illuminated by faith, suppose, and ought most faithfully to believe, to be possible with God".[98]

As another example, it could be accepted that the Prayer Book says the consecrated elements are misused if they are 'gazed upon' in adoration. At the same time Pusey could still assert that those words only relate to an 'unconcerned and irreverent presence at the Mass without communicating'.[99]

Pusey became particularly skilled at this kind of manoeuvre. He was able to teach his concept of the Real Presence through the Prayer Book simply by avoiding certain prohibited terms such as 'corporal presence'. He explained:

> The belief that our Lord's Body is "present in an immaterial form", would be expressed by the words, "the *imaterial* Presence of Christ's Natural Body and Blood"; not by the words, "the Corporal Presence of Christ's Natural Body and Blood", [the Prayer Book's words] Since then this belief in "the *immaterial* or *spiritual* Presence of Christ's Body and Blood" would not be expressed by the term "the *Corporal* Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood", neither can it be condemned under those terms.[100]

Concerning eucharistic adoration Pusey got equally successful results. He was able to get round the wording of the post-communion declaration in the Prayer Book by asserting that whilst it does state that, '"no adoration is intended or ought to be done either unto the Sacramental Bread and Wine, there

bodily received, or unto any *Corporal Presence* of Christ's natural Flesh and blood", one may nevertheless adore the really, *though immaterially, present Christ*, for such adoration is not condemned in the above declaration'.[101]

One of the prominent traditional gestures of eucharistic adoration was the elevation of the elements after their consecration. The Anglican rite simply called for the priest to take the elements into his hands as he consecrated them. The chalice was not required to be lifted above the head or shown to the people in the Roman manner.

Pusey referred to the 'elevation' in his writings, not so much to advocate its use among Anglicans as to show how its use among great historic church figures testified to their belief in the Real Presence. Pusey avoided promoting adoration that was illegal among Anglicans. What Pusey sought by means of the elevation was a recognition of the catholic belief in the Real Presence. For example, he listed St Bonaventure's nine reasons for the elevation, none of which included 'adoration' that might be illegal among Anglicans:

> "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ is, on many grounds, elevated by the Priest in the Mass. Of these, the first and chief is, to obtain the grace of God the Father, which we have lost by our sins. - The second is, to obtain every good which we need in the present life and in that to come. The third, to claim our right, which we have in heaven now in hope, hereafter at length

> in substance; 4) to shew the power of God; 5) to declare His wisdom; 6) to shew His bounty; 7) to shew the goodness of Christ; 8) to gladden the Holy Church by the standard of the army; 9) that we may imitate and follow Christ".
>
> It seems almost inconceivable then, if the Host were, at that time, "lifted up" for adoration, S.Bonaventura, mentioning so many and such reasons, should not mention it here.[102]

It was most crucial for Pusey to show that the early Church Fathers overwhelmingly practised and promoted the adoration of Christ truly present in the Eucharist. He felt quite qualified to do this. He wrote confidently:

> The structure of their [the Church Fathers] words in itself shows that they are speaking, not of what they thought should be done, but of what was done. They say, "is honoured", "we adore", "are adored," words which could only be used of actual practice. Immediately, they [Theodoret, Greg.Nazianzus, & Augustine] attest the worship of Italy and Africa and the Patriarchate of Antioch, But what they speak of without any limitation, as the existing mode of worship, was, beyond all doubt, the worship of the whole world.[103]

The arguments of those who opposed him often seemed to Pusey to be inconsistent with biblical revelation. God had manifested Himself under humble forms and was worshipped there. Did Moses not take off his sandles to stand before a burning bush? Pusey appealed to those who believed in the theophanies of scripture:

> People have profanely spoken of "wafer-gods". They might as well have spoken of "fire-gods", of the manifestation of God in the flaming fire in the bush; or "light-gods" of His manifestation in the tabernacle and the temple; or "human-gods" or

"angel-gods" of His appearance to the patriarchs and prophets. Much more, might they have used the title, "Infant god", as a term of reproach against the "Holy Child Jesus".[104]

One of Pusey's favourite illustrations to defend eucharistic adoration was the raiment of Christ. Pusey wrote,

> S.Thomas, when he fell down and cried "My Lord, and my God", regarded not what raiment his Lord wore after His Resurrection. One might add that Mary was initially deterred thinking that He who seemed to be the gardener was not the Christ, but once she discovered that He was the Christ, she worshipped Him. Some may be deterred from worship at the sight of a piece of bread, but once one discovers that Christ has promised to give His Body within that humble form, one is rightly moved to worship Him, even under the form of bread and wine.[105]

An orthodox understanding of the Real Presence, in Pusey's view, had to deal with consequences of Christ's sacramental institution in a consistent way, reflecting not only upon Scripture but upon the Fathers. It was in the ancient writings of the Fathers that Pusey believed he could find a response to the miracle of the Eucharist that would be both appropriate to its divine mystery and informative in answering the questions that remained in the modern Christian mind.

Pusey's doctrine, according to W.H. Mackean, critic of the Oxford Movement,

> drew its inspiration from the Fathers; and its quasi-physical view of the Eucharist rests partly on the conception of the immanence of God in the material world (so characteristic of the Oxford Movement) and partly on the mistaken idea that a thing must be locally present in order to be

> received by us. This kind of materialism is to be seen in the oral reception of the faithless.[106]

KEBLE'S *EUCHARISTIC ADORATION*

No survey of the Tractarian approach to the subject of eucharistic adoration would be complete without an examination of John Keble's well-known book on that subject. The book was Keble's response to the censure of Archdeacon Denison by those at the Court at Bath who felt that his teachings were excluded by various statements in the Prayer Book and other Anglican authorities.

Written in the kind of beautiful English one would expect from that Oxford Professor of Poetry, the book is at the same time quite sermonic in style. Most of the book is filled with scriptural allusions and quotations, always carefully worked into the prose with only minimal disruption to the flow of thought and argument. The latter part of the book contains abundant references to church history and specifically Anglican usage in support of eucharistic adoration. He concludes with a moving appeal which urges Anglicans to rise above the decomposing trends that threatened contemporary Anglicanism, and instead to promote the most pristine ideal of the Church of England as a living part of the best of catholic Christianity.

At the outset Keble announced his method of proceeding with his argument.

> It may be well to consider calmly, not without deep reverence of heart, First, what Natural Piety would suggest; Secondly, what Holy Scripture may appear to sanction; Thirdly, what the Fathers and Liturgies indicate to have been the practice of the Primitive Church; Fourthly, what the Church of England enjoins or recommends.[107]

Keble set forth three reasons why Christians should adore Christ especially in the context of the Eucharist. These were the greatness of the benefit offered, the personal and individual nature of Christ's contact with people in the Eucharist, and the deep condescension which is necessary for Christ to give His body and blood to lowly human beings.

Finding many biblical references to people bowing and prostrating themselves before God, Keble gradually built up a case for corresponding displays of adoration in the Christian context. Virtually every contact between Christ and various biblical characters is carefully examined for applications to that subject. Contact also between various people and Jesus' body, living, dead and resurrected are also analysed, all for the purpose of proving the propriety of some form or gesture of eucharistic adoration.

Objections such as might arise among Victorian Anglicans to such gestures of adoration were portrayed as ridiculous. Alluding to the incident in the book of Leviticus where God sent fire from Heaven to consume

Aaron's offering at which the people fell on their faces in adoration, Keble remarked how unthinkable it would be for someone 'at hand to say to them, "take care: people will call it fire-worship"'.[108]

So overwhelming was Keble's biblical support for legitimate displays of adoration that he was able to summarise that 'renewed nature prompts the Christian, and Holy Scripture from beginning to end encourages him, to use special adoration to Almighty God at the receiving of any special gift'.[109]

So strong was the instinctive and biblical motivation for adoration that Keble insisted,

> The *onus probandi* lies upon those who would restrain us. We may require of them, in legal phrase, to "shew cause" from the Word of God, as understood always, everywhere, and by all, why we should do violence to so many instincts of our nature.[110]

Of course, the main task for Keble was to demonstrate why the Holy Eucharist should be the specific occasion for such conspicuous adoration. He embarked upon such a demonstration with great care and imagination. Some of the arguments were taken from patristic sources, but greatly developed by Keble.

Among such arguments was the idea that adoration should take place at the Eucharist for the sake of the angels, whose daily work is to adore Christ present among them. St Paul was quoted to show that the demeanour and even the dress of Christians should be ordered with the understanding that heavenly beings are

witnesses to them. Keble drew attention to the apparent centrality of the Eucharist as a place where spiritual beings, good and evil, are especially involved. His use of Luke 17.37 is particularly striking, interpreting the 'Carcase' as Christ's eucharistic body, around which gather winged spirits, good and evil, to feed either piously or profanely upon it![111]

A further argument for the adoration of Christ in the Eucharist was Keble's belief that there should be a link between the adoration required at the name of Jesus and the Holy Supper in His body and blood. He traced the special reverence afforded to the name of Jesus from the liturgical pronoucement of the Council of Lyons in 1274 concerning the bowing of the head at reading of Jesus' name to similar rulings during the Reformation era.

Keble made a connection between the use of name of Jesus and the imagery of the Eucharist. The name Jesus was most expressive of God the Son's state of humiliation. The 'cheap and ordinary' elements which Christ makes His body and blood are a corresponding condescension. The name 'Jesus' is the Son of God's 'proper name' which calls to memory all His saving work from incarnation to atonement. The bowing of every knee to a particular name as a memorial certainly would be a part of a sacrament in which it is intended that

Jesus and His saving work should be solemnly remembered. The Son of God's unique communion with the lives of human beings also was embodied in the name 'Jesus'. The adoration afforded to that name would be appropriate in the context of 'Holy Communion' as well.

Furthermore, the name of Jesus was connected with every healing touch and saving contact between Christ and His people in the Bible. It would follow that the eating and drinking of His body and blood would be a contact with Christ which should be regarded as an extension of Jesus' healing touch through His healing name. Keble concluded, 'It should seem, then, that whatever can be alleged for peculiar devotion to the holy Name, the same, and much more, can be alleged for peculiar devotion to the holy Thing received in the Sacrament'.[112]

A similar argument is developed from Jesus' use of the title 'Son of Man'. His use of that name was regarded by Keble as an indication from Jesus as to the relationship which He wished to have with His people. Keble referred to the sixth chapter of John for the eucharistic application of this relationship.

Keble's book of *Eucharistic Adoration* gives a picture of his eucharistic theology that goes far beyond that single subject. His belief in the sacrament as a means of grace, as a sacrifice, and as a vehicle for the Holy Spirit in sanctification are

revealed. Particularly interesting is Keble's explanation of his own belief in the 'real objective Presence of Jesus Christ in the Holy Eucharist', sometimes attributed to the influence of Pusey.

Immediately upon entering into the subject of the Real Presence, Keble shows his Christological presuppositions. Stating that 'all who in any sense believe the Creeds of the Church' would admit that the omnipresent Son of God is present at the Eucharist according to His *divine nature*, Keble adds the Tractarian teaching that in the Supper itself

> He is then and there present *according to His human nature*, really and substantially present, as truly present as He was to any of those with whom He conversed when He went in and out among us; or again, as He is now present in heaven interceding for us. Both of these last two mentioned are modes of His human Presence, acknowledged by all who confess Him come in the flesh.[113]

Ultimately for Keble it was his belief in the Real Presence which motivated his adoration in the Eucharist. He spoke of an 'inseparable connection' between the two subjects. He admitted that, for himself, his belief in the Real Presence made it so that he could not help but adore Christ in the bread and wine of that sacrament. The charge that he would be adoring the elements themselves would be as invalid as accusing the woman cured by Christ of an issue of blood of worshipping the hem of His garment which was the 'instrument of blessing to her'.[114]

Also set forth in his book is Keble's own understanding of the doctrine of the eucharistic sacrifice. Such a doctrine of sacrifice was regarded by him as inseparable from the true meaning and right use of the Sacrament. He found the doctrine of sacrifice in the words of institution where the memorial is commanded. For Keble the Bible taught that remembrance, memory, and memorial refer to something offered to Almighty God, to remind Him. Old Testament sacrificial prayers were shown to be full of such usages, as he demonstrated with quotations from Exodus, Isaiah, Nehemiah and the Psalms.

Keble added patristic quotations in support of the the doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice. He tried to explain that Hooker's scruples over the doctrine as well as those stated in the thirty-first Article in the Prayer Book, did not refer to an orthodox doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice, but rather one in which satisfaction for sin was heretically said to be obtained apart from the one offering of Christ on the cross. Keble insisted that an orthodox understanding of eucharistic sacrifice would not so interfere with the sufficiency of the sacrifice made by Christ.

Applying this to the subject of eucharistic adoration, Keble proposed that as Christ was offering His High Priestly mediation before the Father in the sight of the adoring angels, so the earthly counterpart

to the heavenly offering should be accompanied by corresponding adoration on the part of human worshippers.

As for the witness of Church Fathers, Council, Liturgies and Church Tradition to eucharistic adoration, Keble's earliest testimonies, SS Cyril of Jerusalem and Ambrose of the fourth century say little of outward adoration beyond how one should come forward for Holy Communion and how one should say 'Amen' to the anaphora. Augustine and Theodoret were also quoted to say that adoration was due to Christ present in the Eucharist. All this added to the weight of patristic evidence, and even the iconoclasts of the eighth century could be shown to favour adoration of Christ in the Eucharist, for the bread and wine were the only true icon of Jesus in the Church worthy to be adored.[115]

A shortage of direct references to bodily gestures of adoration in patristic literature did not bother Keble, for bodily gestures were not his primary concern. Like Luther in his writings on eucharistic adoration, Keble was most interested in the approach of the heart to the realities of the Real Presence. Keble stated,

> Religious adoration is of the heart, and not of the lips only; it is practised in praise and thanksgiving, as well as in prayer; we adore as often as we approach God in any act of divine faith, hope, or love, with or without any verbal or bodily expression: neither, among postures,

> is it limited to actual prostration; kneeling, or standing with inclination of the body (*venerabiliter curvi*), was always accepted in most ancient times as a competent attitude of outward worship.[116]

Keble preferred literature which left the subject of eucharistic adoration as a self-explanatory matter or an unwritten law to the writings of the 'Reformed Church of England' which did offer writings on the subject, so many of which Keble found quite lamentable. One consolation to Keble was that by the time of the Reformation, no writings on the subject of eucharistic adoration could be described as having 'oecumenical authority'.[117]

The heresy of transubstantiation was to blame, in Keble's view, for provoking so much unfortunate misbehaviour and comment on this subject. Transubstantiation 'forces men to think of the manner of the Presence, and, to subtle minds, must prove so far a hindrance to devotion, if not a temptation to unbelief'.[118]

The Anglican reformers were treated by Keble with great respect, but he ultimately recognised that almost without exception their theology was tainted in various ways by Calvinism and other doctrinal impurities. Thus the likes of Hooker were described as,

> biassed by his respect for Calvin and some of his school, in whose opinions he had been educated, and by sympathy with the most suffering portion of the foreign Reformers, so as instinctively and

> unconsciously to hide his eyes from the unquestionable consent of antiquity, and to make allowances which, logically carried out, would lead to conclusions such as the ancient Church never could have endured.[119]

Keble found Receptionism to be a particular blight on the writings of some of the greatest Reformers. He blamed Receptionism on the influence of the Calvinistic (and some Lutheran) schools of thought. Not all Anglican reformers were so infected, however. Keble could pronouce Bishop Overall as clear of it, but not his chaplain and disciple, Bishop Cosin.[120]

Yet, the most formidable obstacles to the success of what Keble believed to be the orthodox teaching of the adoration of Christ in the Eucharist were not the writings of particular Reformers, but the troublesome statements on that subject enshrined in the Prayer Book. Much discussion was taken up concerning the often debated 'black rubric' as well as some of the Articles which referred to the treatment of the consecrated elements in the Eucharist.

Painstakingly, and in the established style of other Oxford Movement writers who attempted similar things, Keble sifted the words of the formularies of the 'Reformed Church of England' to see if they would admit his views despite the conclusions and even court rulings of those who opposed him on the basis of those very same formularies. Manifestly capable of handling very detailed legal debate, Keble displayed amazing

knowledge of the historical background to the development of the wording of the various formularies in question. He even described how an act of Elizabeth I could be regarded as rendering the Articles and rubrics in question invalid, in themselves, as a sole test of doctrine. Yet this task obviously taxed Keble's considerable powers of language. Frequently his arguments are reduced to that of silence. Or he would try to establish the admissibility of a doctrine or practice in the Church of England because it was not specifically contrary or repugnant to an Anglican article.

Article twenty-eight, of the *Thirty-nine Articles*, 'the only place where Eucharistical Adoration is mentioned', was a particularly difficult statement as it specified that not only worship, but also elevation and reservation of the Sacrament was not done 'by Christ's ordinance'. Keble knew that he could demonstrate that such usage of the sacrament of Christ's body and blood had indeed been done and recommended by some of the most venerable Fathers of the Church. This, he believed, gave sanction to such practices even if they did not enjoy the specific command of Christ.

Yet, despite what Keble could do with the interpretation of the wording of various statements in the formularies, he could do nothing about the Denison

judgement. He quoted from the proceedings of the Bath judgement where he felt there was a loop-hole, such as the following:

> It is not true that the consecrated Bread and Wine are changed in their natural substances, for they remain in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored. It is true that worship is due to the real though invisible and supernatural presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Holy Eucharist, under the form of Bread and Wine.[121]

Here Keble believed that Denison's accusers were talking past him. No Tractarian advocated the worship of the outward visible sign or form of the sacrament. Even Denison, when he said, 'We adore and worship Christ in the Eucharist; and, if you mean the external Sacrament, I say also is to be worshipped as a Sacrament', did not mean worshipping the elements, but rather Him who is seated on the table under the form of the elements.[122]

Keble also leapt upon the phrase used at Bath: 'under the form of bread and wine'. Like Pusey, Keble added his historical documentation that a Lutheran and indeed Catholic meaning lay behind that phrase.

His concluding section, described as a 'practical enquiry' reveals Keble as an embattled man. Like Pusey, he plunged himself fully into the conflict which faced his fellow Tractarian, the Archdeacon of Taunton, and anyone else who was prosecuted for their Catholic eucharistic views. Keble asked,

> What ought they to do, who have gone on hitherto

> believing the Real Presence, and adoring accordingly, in no undutifulness to the English Church, but in full conviction that they were but carrying out what they had learned in the Catechism and Communion Office? They cannot give up their convictions, they cannot cease to believe and adore, in deference to a mere affirmation, even from the highest human authority.[123]

As for clergy, who were more vulnerable than laity to the wrath of the courts, Keble added,

> truth and charity, and loyalty and devotion, the honour of God Incarnate, and the salvation of the souls of our brethren - all the motives that can be imagined going to make up the highest expediency - would render it the duty of every Catholic clergyman to abide in his place until he was forcibly expelled from it.[124]

Such reverent and, at the same time, heroic words in the face of clouds of opposition make it clear why Pusey and others looked up to Keble with such high regard, considering him the greatest father of the Oxford Movement.

The dilemma that had befallen the Tractarians begged the question of their communion with others in their own church as well as their relationship to other churches which also contained beleaguered adherents to orthodoxy. Keble believed that, while obviously there were heretics in the Church of England, even in places of power, the Church as a whole was not in unsalvageable peril.

He recommended that individuals, lay or clerical, should consider the ancient practice of selectivity within the Church as a whole with regard to communion.

One need not 'break communion with the mass of believers at Constantinople', though one might refuse to go to communion with the heresiarch Nestorius. Such separation was the received mode in former times of bringing doctrinal questions to the fore. Whatever one did, Keble urged that it should be done with prayer, tongue and pen, and with appropriate zeal, 'not rashly or in the way of challenge, but in the serious discharge of a painful duty'.[125] Pusey seems to have exercised just such a personal discipline when he refused to preach in Westminster Abbey, lest it be construed that he, and the then Dean Stanley, did not have any fundamental differences in theology.[126]

In an interesting and creative use of words, Keble asserted that he did not *protest* against the Court at Bath or other such errant judgements. Instead he *appealed* against them. He did so in the same sense that all orthodox (but non-Roman) churches should not be regarded as *Protestant*, but *Appellant*, for a protest is only lodged against those who are admitted to be the supreme authority. For example, 'by simply protesting we do in some sense admit the paramount authority of Rome, by appealing we assert Rome herself to be under authority'. Keble's true position was that,

> We should keep in our own minds. and before all Christendom, the fact that we stand as orthodox Catholics upon a constant virtual appeal to the oecumenical voice of the Church, expressed by the four great Councils, and by general consent in all the ages during which she continued

undivided.[127]

Also Keble was aware that he and his disciples and colleagues in the Church of England were not alone in upholding such an ideal. Other churches had their orthodox Catholics as well. He only wished that another worldwide ecumenical council could be called so that orthodox Christians of many churches could again speak with one voice as in ancient times. In the meantime Keble acknowledged that Christians live in an imperfect world, assigned by God Almighty to various positions in the church for their 'trial'. The way of further schism would do nothing to further the ideal of unity and catholicity. 'Men will not escape from this state of decay by going elsewhere, though they may shut their eyes to the reality of it ... Shall we not make the best of it?... This (please God) is the way of truth and peace, and therefore in it we may hope for a blessing; the rather, if it should prove to be the way of the Cross also'.[128]

Certainly Keble had Pusey on his side in all of his conflicts over the subject of eucharistic adoration, which would have proved a great blessing in itself. He concurred with the patristic approach to the consecrated elements in eucharistic worship and adoration advocated by Keble. Also, he quoted those patristic writings in which the elements themselves were considered objects of adoration because of what

they had become at their consecration with the words of Christ. These seem to have been the common reasons why Tractarians advocated the practices of eucharistic adoration which ranged from the discipline of careful preparations before Holy Communion to the later Anglican versions of the traditional Reservation and Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament.

Like Keble, Pusey often denied the likelihood of people worshipping the eucharistic bread and wine, because that would be equivalent to worshipping the robe Jesus wore as a man. Instead, he joined in teaching the adoration of Christ Himself as He is spiritually present in the Eucharist under the form of bread and wine. He argued that since Christ is objectively present in the elements, their outward appearance should not hinder our worship of Him within them anymore than Christ's clothing hindered people's worship of Him when He was on earth.

Christ's presence in the Eucharist was a continual source of wonder and reverence in Tractarian piety. Like the Lutherans, they saw it as a beautiful example of the willingness of God to condescend in a miraculous way into the midst of His Church on earth. They saw the visitation of God in the Eucharist as more than a spectacle or curiosity. It was not a showpiece, but a vital means of grace, and like the incarnation, Christ's presence among His people in the Eucharist was

a miracle with far-reaching and important divine purpose.

Notes to Chapter Six

1. *Luther's Works - American Edition*, edited by Helmut Lehmann, fifth edition, 55 Vols (Philadelphia 1980), XXXVI, p.343.

2. *Luther's Works - American Edition*, translated by R.H.Fischer, fifth edition, 55 Vols (Philadelphia 1983), XXXVII, p.184.

3. Martin Chemnitz, *The Lord's Supper*, translated by J.A.O.Preus (St Louis 1979), p.156.

4. *Triglot Concordia*, edited by F.Bente (St Louis 1921), p.1001. From Article VII:83 of the *Solid Declaration* to the *Formula of Concord*.

5. *Ibid.*, p.999.

6. *Ibid.*, p.755. Augustine, Tractate 80, (on John 3).

7. *Ibid.*, p.1001.

8. Hermann Sasse, *Consecration and the Real Presence* (Adelaide 1957), p.23.

9. E.B.Pusey, *The Doctrine of the Real Presence as Contained in the Fathers from the Death of St John the Evangelist to the Fourth General Council (A.D.451)* (Oxford 1855), p.281.

10. *Ibid.*, p.282-3.

11. *Ibid.*, p.293. Ambrose, De Myst. (of the Eucharist) c.9.

12. *Triglot Concordia*, p.809. From Article VII of the *Epitome* to the *Formula of Concord*.

13. *Ibid.*, p.811.

14. Lowell Green, 'Article VII, The Holy Supper', *A Contemporary Look at the Formula of Concord* (St Louis 1978), p.213.

15. Pusey, P.185.

16. *Ibid.*, p.186.

17. *Ibid.*, p.167.

18. *Ibid.*, p.170.

19. *Ibid.*, p.171.

20. *Ibid.*, p.172.

21. *Ibid.*, p.173.

22. *Ibid.*, p.178.

23. *Ibid.*, p.180.

24. *Ibid.*, p.181.

25. *Ibid.*, p.183.

26. *Ibid.*, p.202.

27. *Ibid.*, p.202.

28. *Ibid.*, p.204.

29. Alf Hardelin, *The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist* (Uppsala 1965), p.136.

30. E.B.Pusey, *The Real Presence of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ - The Doctrine of the English Church With a Vindiction of the Reception by the Wicked and of the Adoration of our Lord Jesus Christ Truly Present* (Oxford 1857), p.251.

31. *Ibid.*, p.256.

32. *Ibid.*, p.253.

33. *Ibid.*, p.293.

34. *Ibid.*, p.297.

35. *Ibid.*, p.300.

36. Hardelin, p.174.

37. *Ibid.*, p.175.

38. H.P.Liddon, *The Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey*, 4 Vols (London 1893-97), III, p.465. From Liddon's copy of Pusey's letter to Keble of 3rd October 1856. concerning Denison's defens on the basis of patristic literature.

39. *Ibid.*, p.465. From Liddon's copy of Pusey's letter to Keble of 3rd October 1856.

40. E.B.Pusey, *The Real Presence ... The Doctrine of the English Church etc.*, p.262.

41. *Ibid.*, p.282.

42. Liddon, III, p.469. From Liddon's copy of Pusey's letter to Keble of 16th October 1856.

43. *Ibid.*, p.430.

44. *Ibid.*, p.445.

45. John Keble, *Eucharistic Adoration* 2nd edition, (Oxford 1859), p.180.

46. *The Book of Concord*, edited by T.Tappert, fourteenth printing, (Philadelphia 1981), p.352.

47. *Triglot Concordia*, p.757.

48. *Ibid.*, p.759.

49. *Ibid.*, p.761.

50. *Ibid.*, p.763.

51. *Ibid.*, p.767. Gratian, Decretum, Pt.III, D.2, c.15.

52. *Ibid.*, p.769.

53. *Ibid.*, p.247.

54. W.H.Mackean, *The Eucharistic Doctrine of the Oxford Movement, A Critical Survey* (London 1967), p.33.

55. Pusey, *The Real Presence ... The Doctrine of the English Church etc.*, pp. 234-237.

56. E.B.Pusey, *Nine Sermons Preached Before the University of Oxford*, new edition (Oxford 1879), pp.27-29.

57. I.Brilioth, *The Anglican Revival, Studies in the Oxford Movement* (London 1925), p.319.

58. Pusey, E.B., 'The Christian's Life in Christ', *Sermons During the Season from Advent to Whitsuntide*, (Oxford 1848), p.238.

59. Pusey, *The Doctrine of the Real Presence as Contained in the Fathers etc.*, p.76.

60. Liddon, III, p.309.

61. E.B.Pusey, 'Tract 67: Scriptural Views of Holy

Baptism', *Tracts for the Times*, 5 Vols (London 1840), p.89.

62. E.B.Pusey, *The Holy Eucharist, a Comfort to the Penitent*, new edition (Oxford 1879), p.18.

63. *Ibid.*, p.22

64. Pusey, *The Doctrine of the Real Presence as Contained in the Fathers etc.*, p.180.

65. *Ibid.*, p.41.

66. Brilioth, p.321.

67. Pusey, *The Doctrine of the Real Presence as Contained in the Fathers etc.*, p.622.

68. *Ibid.*, p.626.

69. *Ibid.*, p.628.

70. *Ibid.*, p.576.

71. *Ibid.*, p.6.

72. *Ibid.*, p.623.

73. *Ibid.*, p.417.

74. Pusey, *The Real Presence ... The Doctrine of the English Church etc.*, p.195.

75. *Ibid.*, p.196.

76. *Ibid.*, p.196-7.

77. *Ibid.*, p. 198.

78. *Ibid.*, p.73.

79. R.I.Wilberforce, *The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist* (London 1854), p.35.

80. *Ibid.*, p.87.

81. *Ibid.*, p.88.

82. *Ibid.*, p.196.

83. *Ibid.*, p.93.

84. *Ibid.*, p.347.

85. *Ibid.*, p.94.

86. *Ibid.*, p.144.

87. *Ibid.*, p.188.

88. *Ibid.*, p.189.

89. *Ibid.*, p.332.

90. *Ibid.*, p.333.

91. *Luther's Works - American Edition*, translated by Abdel Ross Wentz, fifth edition, 55 Vols (Philadelphia 1980), XXXVI, p.296. From *The Adoration of the Sacrament*, first published in 1523.

92. *The Book of Concord*, p.591.

93. Pusey, *The Real Presence ... The Doctrine of the English Church etc.*, p.334.

94. R.I.Wilberforce, *The Doctrine of the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ, in its Relation to Mankind and to the Church* (London 1848), p.287.

95. Pusey, *The Real Presence ... The Doctrine of the English Church etc.*, p.315.

96. *Ibid.*, p.313.

97. *Ibid.*, p.318.

98. *Ibid.*, p.324.

99. *Ibid.*, p.314.

100. *Ibid.*, p.321.

101. *Ibid.*, p.321.

102. *Ibid.*, p.314.

103. *Ibid.*, p.331.

104. *Ibid.*, p.329.

105. *Ibid.*, p.330.

106. Mackean, p.170.

107. Keble, p.1.

108. *Ibid.*, p.3.

109. *Ibid.*, p.8.

110. *Ibid.*, p.11.

111. *Ibid.*, p.19.

112. *Ibid.*, p.28.

113. *Ibid.*, p.57.

114. *Ibid.*, p.58.

115. *Ibid.*, p.110.

116. *Ibid.*, p.117.

117. *Ibid.*, p.121.

118. *Ibid.*, p.123.

119. *Ibid.*, p.124.

120. *Ibid.*, p.140.

121. *Ibid.*, p.150.

122. *Ibid.*, p.150.

123. *Ibid.*, p.163.

124. *Ibid.*, p.165.

125. *Ibid.*, p.176.

126. John Stephenson, 'Authority in English Theology from the Oxford Movement to the Present', *Concordia Theological Quarterly*, 48 (1984), pp.265-277 (p.273).

127. *Op cit.*, p.176.

128. *Ibid.*, p.178.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE THEOLOGICAL OPPOSITION TO THE TRACTARIAN DOCTRINE OF THE REAL PRESENCE.

As has been noted previously, the Tractarians faced opposition to their eucharistic doctrines that came from within their own church body, the Church of England. That special problem warrants particular investigation. The Tractarians faced an entirely different situation, with regard to the opposition they faced. Therefore more attention must be paid to that opposition than to any opposition that faced the Lutherans.

As historians of this period well know, from the very beginning, the eucharistic theology of the Oxford Movement did not go uncontested. Much has been written about the occasions when this opposition manifested itself. To examine this one need only refer to the accounts of the condemnation at Oxford of Pusey's 1843 sermon on the Holy Eucharist, Archdeacon Denison's struggles against prosecution concerning the same subject between 1854 - 1858, and the litigation that followed William Bennett's 1867 letter to Pusey concerning the Lord's Supper paradoxically entitled: *A Plea for toleration in the Church of England*. Even Bishops like Forbes of Brechin and Hamilton of

Salisbury were not immune from serious censure from the College of Bishops and members of the House of Lords.

Opposition to their teachings occasionally provoked the Oxford Movement figures to produce some of their most important and revealing writings. Pusey published his 'Notes' to his 1853 sermon in 1855 after opposition had been voiced from the Roman Catholic corner in the *Dublin Review*. He wrote his 1857 book, *The Real Presence ... The Doctrine of the English Church etc*, during the trial of his disciple, Archdeacon Denison. In that book reference is made to W.Goode's two volume work written against Pusey and his 'fictitious Real Presence'. Pusey's major defensive writings concluded with his 1857 book which he claimed was a great strain on his health and, for that reason, not as complete as he would have preferred.[1]

Pusey bore the brunt of most of the attacks against the eucharistic theology of the Oxford Movement because of his leadership and influence over the movement. Pusey's monumental notes published in 1855 as *The Doctrine of the Real Presence as Contained in the Fathers, from the Death of St John the Evangelist to the Fourth General Council (A.D. 451)* was so influential that its catena of patristic quotations was regarded as authoritative by many of his supporters. This was an important fact considering the weight placed upon patristic authority in Anglican minds. One

of Pusey's later opponents, the Revd Dr John Harrison, Vicar of Fenwick, claimed that Pusey's notes were often used as a primary source of patristic teaching without recourse to the actual patristic writings themselves.[2] He went so far as to charge that the leading champions of the Tractarian view of the Real Presence did not glean patristic evidence from anywhere other than Pusey's work.[3] It is because of his very real stature as the leader of the Oxford Movement in its campaign concerning the Real Presence, as well as his influence over other Tractarian theologians, that Pusey deserves primary attention.

Several of the major attacks on Pusey published in book form were from Evangelical Anglicans. Two of them were quite large works, each consisting of two volumes. The first was by the Revd (later Dean) William Goode, and was written before Pusey's 1857 'vindication' of the Real Presence as the doctrine of the English Church. The larger of his two volumes was devoted to scriptural and patristic evidence in opposition to Pusey and the Tractarians. The smaller volume (a mere four hundred pages) was devoted to evidence from authoritative or eminent Anglican sources. The latter was written by Dr Harrison when Pusey was already a septuagenarian. One of Harrison's even larger two volumes was devoted to documentation from the Tractarians as well as the Church Fathers and

served as a reference volume. He published a further and briefer one-volume attack on Pusey's use of patristic evidence for his doctrine a few years later. Pusey did not directly reply to either of Harrison's books.

Dr Pusey's most formidable adversary, Dr Harrison, was eager to accept a 'challenge' issued by Pusey in 1867 which stated that:

> Should it be decided by competent authority that either the real objective presence, or the Eucharistic sacrifice, or the worship of Christ here present (as I have above stated these doctrines), were contrary to the doctrine held by the Church of England, I would resign my office.[4]

In fact, Harrison entitled his two volume work of 1871: *An Answer to Dr Pusey's Challenge respecting the Doctrine of the Real Presence*. This reply to Pusey amounted to some eleven hundred pages including a four hundred page catena of patristic writings. Harrison's books, subsequent to those of Goode, will receive greater attention because they restated and amplified much of what Dean Goode had presented before Pusey's 1857 book on the Real Presence.

THE ARGUMENT CONCERNING ANGLICAN DOCTRINAL HERITAGE

As has been stated above, to score against Pusey and perhaps even force His resignation, his opponents would have to demonstrate that Pusey taught that which

was 'contrary to the Church of England'.[5] To this end Goode, and later Harrison, believed they could marshal an assortment of Anglican divines including Cranmer, Ridley, Jewel, Andrewes, Hooker, Overall, Taylor, Usher, Albertinus, Beverage, and Bramhall, among many others.[6] As their opponents piled quotation on to quotation it became clear that the Tractarians faced a difficult task if they were to continue to assert that they spoke for historic and catholic doctrine within the Church of England.

There were several aspects of Tractarian eucharistic theology which were regarded by their opponents as alien to the Anglican doctrinal heritage. One of the most important deviations was believed to be Pusey's understanding of the sources of authoritative and catholic doctrine. Early in his career Pusey sought authoritative dogma only in what could be academically demonstrated to have been the belief held *semper, ubique, et ab omnibus*.[7] In his later *Eirenicon*s Pusey, in the interests of reunion with the Church of Rome, would plead for information beyond that ideal formula to determine what was to be regarded as *de fide* for the Anglican Christian.[8] By then he seemed prepared to accept anything from the writings of the early Church Fathers to the Council of Trent and beyond as authoritative whether or not it was clearly taught in the Bible.

Against this, the opponents of Tractarian eucharistic theology appealed to a sounder basis for doctrinal purity. Their appeal was to the Scriptures and the early Church Fathers as well as to the formularies and writings of seminal Anglicanism. It is interesting that the absence of an authoritative dogmatic system for interpreting the theology of the Reformation-era formularies of Anglicanism was not regarded as a hindrance by these theologians. In fact, Goode commended Anglicanism's vague teaching on Christ's eucharistic presence for having 'wisely forborne to give any precise definition, leaving scope for some difference of opinion on a mysterious subject'.[9] Clearly, Goode did not regard the limitations of Anglican systematic theology as a threat to orthodoxy. On the contrary, Goode believed 'the maintenance of those limits is absolutely essential to the preservation of the purity of the Christian faith in our Church'. He was content to admit that 'the only fair way of judging what is the doctrine of the Church of England, and to what the clergy have pledged themselves, on the question of the nature of the Christ's presence in the Eucharist, is by PUTTING TOGETHER, *and comparing with one another*, the various dogmatic statements she has made on the subject'.[10] With remarkable certainty, the opponents of Tractarianism were confident that they could look to

Anglicanism's formularies and 'all her great divines' to ascertain authoritative Anglican teaching and arrive at a coherent and defensible position.[11]

One of the great values of Anglican formularies, according to Goode, was their 'limiting' function. The apparent anathemas in Articles XXV, XXVIII, XXXI, etc. were regarded as preventatives against false doctrines which might otherwise flourish. Other limitations were said to be found in the text of the liturgies of the *Book of Common Prayer*. The opponents of Tractarianism regarded one such limit on the teaching of the Real Presence to be found in the declaration that 'the mean whereby we eat and drink the Body and Blood of Christ is faith'.[12] Another limit on the Real Presence was found in the 'black rubric' where it was maintained that Christ's body could not be present on the altar because it is now in Heaven, and 'it is against the truth of Christ's natural body that it should be in more than one place at the same time'.[13]

Thought to be an equally strong feature of the theological heritage of historic Anglicanism was the normative role played by Holy Scripture. Echoing the assertion of the 16th century French controversialist Jean Daille, Harrison argued that it was not the practice of the Anglican reformers to build any article of faith upon the authority of the early Church Fathers alone.[14] Indeed he stated that the Fathers themselves

urged Scripture alone to be the rule and norm of doctrine and practice.[15] It was diagnosed that the Tractarian heresy had its roots in an abandonment of the Reformation principle of *sola scriptura*.

Understandably, the opponents of Pusey and the Tractarians leapt upon the obvious Calvinism and even Zwinglianism apparent in the eucharistic writings of some of the pillars of the Anglican tradition. The Reformed views of many of the premier theologians of early Anglicanism and their incompatibility with Roman or Lutheran eucharistic theology rendered them practically useless to Tractarian apologists. Pusey, for example, had tried to use the writings of Richard Hooker to support the Anglicanism of his doctrines in an appendix to his 1843 sermon *The Holy Eucharist: a Comfort to the Penitent*. Yet, with apparent ease, Harrison showed that he could quote other statements by Hooker which manifestly undermined the Tractarian position by not attaching any Real Presence to the consecrated elements.[16]

Unlike Harrison, Goode did go so far as to argue for a Zwinglian interpretation of the Anglican formularies. Showing signs of a high-Calvinistic outlook, he was willing to make references to the Articles and Catechism in which the sacraments were described as 'effectual signs of grace' taken and received by the faithful.[17] Goode also defended the

portrayal of a Real Presence in the Supper. In fact, Goode wrote that his view of the Real Presence was as real as that of the authors he discredits if 'spiritually considered'.[18] He denied only its connection with the elements.

Goode's understanding of Anglican orthodoxy concerning eucharistic eating was that it was receptionistic, not consecrationist. Under such a scheme no *manducatio impiorum* would be possible. 'In short, it is a Real Presence to the receiver and not to the elements'.[19] Goode confidently asserted that, 'our Church no doubt holds a real spiritual presence of Christ in the sacrament or rite to every faithful communicant, but not in the sacramental bread and wine'.[20] In support of his assertions Goode quoted prominent Anglican authorities at great length. An example of such a quotation was a four-page excerpt from a Dr Aldrich, Dean of Christ Church in 1687, a 'high-churchman' from the time of William and Mary, a resister of dissenters and a receptionist, to prove the receptionist character of the Anglican doctrine of the Real Presence.[21]

It was agreed by the anti-Tractarians that they could not only demonstrate from the Scriptures, the Church Fathers, and the writings of the Anglican reformers that the Tractarians had apostatised from the Anglican sacramental position, but they could also

demonstrate that, even if Pusey had not altogether abandoned Anglican sacramental theology, he held to a contradictory and, therefore, logically untenable position.

For example, Pusey could be caught by Harrison in the 'silly' situation of holding both an Anglican Reformation doctrine and, at the same time, an idea which is contrary to it. Pusey's predicament was illustrated when Harrison described how Pusey taught both the contrary philosophy of the 'black rubric' in the Prayer Book, describing as it does the consequence of Christ's bodily location at the Right Hand of God, and at the same time a 'spiritual existence' of Christ's body on every catholic altar.[22] Goode had previously accused Pusey of 'flying to a figment' of his own imagining to teach a presence different from that which Christ has in Heaven.[23]

Although Harrison also indulged in a considerable quantity of scoffing against Tractarianism on the basis of human reason, Goode before him had made use of *ad absurdam* arguments even more frequently. One target of Goode's incredulity was the Tractarian understanding of the qualities of Christ's glorified body. Rather than pursuing his argument purely on the basis of Christology, Goode, perhaps taking his cue from the 'black rubric', mixed Christology with human reason.

> Thus Goode reasoned,
> If the same body could be present in a number of different places and under different circumstances

> at the same time, all manner of self contradictions would hold good respecting it. For the same body would be moving and not moving, eaten whole and perfect by millions and yet not eaten at all; sitting at the right hand of God in Heaven, and at the same time being carried in procession in various churches on earth, and also lying on the communion table in other churches.[24]

Goode also variously accused the Tractarians of imagining that Christ has two sets of bodies and of making Christ's body into a spirit.[25]

Goode naturally referred to previous commentators on the Real Presence who expressed a similar scepticism to his own. For example, Bishop Jeremy Taylor was quoted: 'To say, therefore, that a body has no dimensions and no local presence, is to say that it is *not a body*'.[26] Jewel was able in this regard to deal a similar blow to the Romanist Harding who held to the same contradictory views held centuries later by Wilberforce.[27] Goode adduces both Hooker and Taylor to deny that a true body can be anything but finite and that the finite is incapable of the infinite. Ultimately this revealed a bias on the part of these writers along the lines of the Lutheran caricature of the Reformed position embodied in the axiom *finitum non est capax infiniti*.[28]

As it happened, Wilberforce, like Pusey, was also vulnerable to attack on these same grounds, for he simultaneously taught the Real Presence on every

catholic altar yet insisted that Christ's body was in Heaven taking a certain form, place, and having limited dimension.[29] Ultimately Goode was led to conclude: 'Here lies the difficulty with our authors. The material body they *must* admit, to escape the direct condemnation not only of Scripture, but of the Fathers too. The immaterial body they need for their doctrine on the Eucharist'.[30]

Not only was the Tractarian description of the glorified post-resurrection condition of Christ's spiritual body regarded as an absurdity by Goode, the eating of such a body was thought to be equally ludicrous. Certainly it was regarded as a departure from the spiritual eating by means of faith portrayed in the *Book of Common Prayer*. Goode was able to put it quite simply: the Tractarian teaching amounted to a twisting of 'the *spiritual eating of Christ's flesh* into the *bodily eating of Christ's flesh in the form of a spirit*'.[31]

To discredit the Tractarians, Goode believed he must simply address the question, 'Is the reception of the true Body and Blood of Christ an act of the body or of the soul, of the mouth or of faith?'. He admitted that those who hold to a Real Presence 'in, with, or under the forms of the elements' also believe Christ's body and blood to be received by faith, but he remained perplexed that this eucharistic eating required a

belief in an oral reception of elements which have become Christ's body and blood 'in an invisible and immaterial form'.[32]

Goode's perplexity was fuelled by the fact that some Tractarians, such as Robert Wilberforce, admitted that the oral manducation itself had no purpose. Wilberforce taught that the body of the communicant was not affected by the Eucharist.[33] To Goode it also seemed a similar inconsistency that Archdeacon Denison would admit that 'the Body and Blood of Christ are food only for the soul, and can only be fed upon by faith', yet at the same time hold to the 'absurd' idea that oral reception of Christ's body and blood to be equally necessary.[34] Goode felt he could only conclude that the idea of the oral manducation of an immaterial thing is one of the manifest absurdities of Tractarian eucharistic theology.[35]

The nature of the eating seemed quite incredible to Goode. In exasperation he stated: 'It is hardly possible to conceive a more complete *reductio ad absurdum* than when the argument is brought down to this plea, that the mouth has two modes of eating, a natural and a spiritual, and that by the latter it can eat a spirit'.[36]

Goode ultimately admitted he held to the following scheme: 'The distinction is here expressly drawn between the mouth of the body and the spiritual

mouth of the soul; and the heavenly bread is said to be received by the latter as distinguished from the former; which is precisely the position which I am here maintaining'.[37]

Yet this statement begged the question as to whether it is really more legitimate to invent a 'mouth' for the soul than it is to believe that the one physical mouth serves as the means by which we eat Christ's spiritual body. The Tractarian understanding would be that the very reason why God does give the sacraments physical aspects such as the touch of water in Baptism and the taste of bread and wine in the Eucharist is for the purpose of giving people greater certainty that God has touched and blessed them than may be had by means of only imaginary 'spiritual mouths'.

It became evident that Dean Goode was able to attack the Tractarians from several angles. One of the most important was his attack upon the unacceptable accumulation of additional freight which the Tractarians carried with their views as they embraced the Roman Catholic doctrines of the Real Presence. Some of these vulnerable positions were:

1. That the natural body of Christ is locally situated in Heaven at all times, yet supernaturally present on every catholic altar.

2. That the eucharistic body and blood are the whole

Christ, body, soul, and divinity.

3. That as Christ's living body contains blood, so the blood of Christ is as much contained in the consecrated bread as in the wine (concomitance).

Roman Catholic Transubstantiation, with its belief that the 'substance' of the bread and wine are replaced by the substance of Christ's body and blood was not openly endorsed by most Tractarians because of the explicit disapproval of that doctrine by the *Thirty-nine Articles*. Thus it did not play a prominent part in the dispute among Anglicans.

It has been noted that Pusey placed great weight on the *Book of Common Prayer* as endorsing much of his teaching concerning the Real Presence, particularly the references in the Catechism to the 'inward' and 'outward' parts of the eucharistic elements. Harrison insisted that on this point as well that Pusey was deviating from the teaching of the Prayer Book. After all, did not Pusey teach in essence that there are not two but three parts to the sacramental elements: an inward, an outward, and, only in the case of the faithful recipient, the grace of the sacrament? [38] As far as the idea of an inward and an outward part of the sacrament is concerned, Harrison quoted Zwingli to explain that idea when he spoke of the Supper as consisting of 'a spiritual thing and a corporal thing'. Zwingli was fond of saying that: 'you properly eat

sacramentally when you do the same thing inwardly as you do outwardly'.[39]

As for the thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, attempts by the Tractarians, as in Tract XC, to claim a Roman Catholic meaning for them were dismissed as absurd by Harrison. This subject was apparently an emotive one for the Anglican opponents of Tractarianism. Goode reminded his readers that Cranmer and Ridley had laid down their lives opposing the viewpoint now taught by the the Tractarian 'Romanists'. The fact that the Tractarian authors tried to evade the term 'transubstantiation' did not mean that they did not teach the basic ideas nonetheless. Their opposition maintained that the Tractarians were to be tirelessly opposed and condemned as people who were making a mockery of the Protestant Reformation.[40] Goode did not believe it could be seriously maintained that Reformation writers such as Cranmer and Jewel intended a Roman meaning to the sacramental statements in the formularies.

An example of the intolerable behaviour of the Tractarians was the attempt on the part of R.Wilberforce to evade Article XXVIII by saying that the word 'substance' according to Anglicanism corresponds more to the accidental part of the sacrament; thus a mere verbal rather than real conflict exists between Rome and Article XXVIII. Goode

jeeringly stated, 'so ... our martyrs shed their blood on the most ridiculous misunderstanding that ever existed, for notwithstanding all their long disputes with the Romanists, both sides really meant the same thing, and never found it out'.[41] Harrison scathingly added the question: if the Anglican reformers really had agreed with Rome, why did they suffer themselves to have Rome burn them at the stake over those very sacramental questions? [42]

In several cases, Harrison believed he was able to accuse Pusey of conceding his Anglicanism in favour of Roman sacramental doctrine. Goode accused Tractarianism of misinterpreting the venerable Anglican phrase 'presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist' to refer to the presence of Christ in the elements. Their persistent use of such a ploy was regarded by Goode as proof that these men were not interested in maintaining the cause of truth.[43] Goode expressed astonishment that anyone who knew the Romish jargon of the sixteenth century would see the phrase 'under the form of bread and wine' as anything other than transubstantiation. He stated that, according to Gardiner it was at least Lutheran to speak of Christ in the elements in this manner. As far as Goode was concerned it was obviously the Roman heresy to speak of Christ's body and blood as under the form of bread and wine.[44] Goode only gave Pusey credit for not violating Article XXIX, as Denison

had allegedly done, because his books were published prior to Pusey's 'vindication' of Denison's doctrine in 1857! [45]

Harrison did not claim to have any delusions that Pusey still held to Anglican eucharistic theology. As far as he was concerned, Pusey was openly Roman Catholic in his thinking. He did add that he did not maintain that Pusey had *always* held to such Romanism, but that in the course of time Pusey changed his views to embrace the doctrines of Rome. With regard to the heresy of transubstantiation, Harrison credited Pusey with writing in 1855 that the Church Fathers did not speak of a change in the consecrated eucharistic elements in terms of *metousiosis* as favoured by Rome.

Harrison claimed that by the time he was writing his book against him, Pusey had adopted that Greek version of transubstantiation.[46] Harrison had detected a change in Pusey's views over the years. Although Pusey had previously applauded the Eastern Church for refraining from that very one word, implying that it was merely Roman, by the time he wrote his Eirenicons he was prepared to quote 'Archbishop Plato' and the value of his admittance of *metousiosis* in 1865.[47] In this as well as many other areas, Pusey's opponents believed that he led the Tractarians down the Roman path to heresy leaving his Anglican heritage well behind him.

Perhaps the most convincing argument that Harrison could set forth to illustrate Pusey's departure from Anglican sacramental theology was his demonstration that Pusey held 'Lutheran' beliefs, especially concerning the Real Presence. It must be admitted at the outset that Harrison made little distinction between Romanism and Lutheranism regarding the Real Presence. Harrison was among those who accused Pusey of interpreting the thirty-nine Articles with a Roman meaning. Yet he was equally prepared to label Pusey's interpretation of the articles dealing with the Eucharist as Lutheran.[48] For the purposes of this enquiry such accusations from the opponents of the Tractarians are very interesting.

If some question was raised as to what extent the Tractarian's opponents were familiar with Lutheran doctrine, it is clear that Goode and, to a similar extent, Harrison knew of the Lutheran Confessions which make up the *Book of Concord* of 1580. That reference resource alone would have enabled them to comment with considerable knowledge on the eucharistic theology of Lutheranism. Certainly the Lutheran Confessions were written with far less ambiguity on such doctrines as the Real Presence than their Anglican counterparts.

Prior to Harrison's efforts, Goode had determined that there were three views of the Real Presence: the Roman, Lutheran, and Reformed. Goode believed that the

Tractarians held to the Lutheran position in that they rejected both the Roman notion of a substituted substance, and the Reformed position on Christ's corporeal absence from the elements. Their opponents then proceeded to attribute to Tractarianism the Lutheran position with its understanding of the presence of Christ's body and blood sacramentally within or under the consecrated elements distributed to both the believing and the unbelieving. This was a remarkable confirmation on the part of the opponents of the Oxford Movement of the Lutheranism of Pusey, Denison and others on this point.[49]

Two places where Pusey does, intentionally or unintentionally, approach the Lutheran position are in his emphasis upon the words of institution to establish the Real Presence, and in his method of defending the possibility of the Real Presence on the basis of the capabilities of Christ's post-resurrection 'spiritual body'. Both of these arguments for the Real Presence can be readily found in the writings of Luther himself, in the Lutheran *Book of Concord*, and in other Lutheran dogmatic literature.

As he approached an expression of the Lutheran position, it must be recognised that Pusey did mix that expression with other, non-Lutheran concepts. One can see this in the text of Pusey's sermon: *The Presence of Christ* of 1853. He began one statement with the

non-Lutheran concept of Christ's local session at God's right hand, and then went into a very Lutheran emphasis on the Real Presence by virtue of Christ's consecratory words of institution:

> We know not the manner of His presence, save that it is not according to the natural presence of our Lord's human flesh, which is at the right hand of God: and therefore it is called sacramental. But it is a presence without us, not within us only; a presence by virtue of our Lord's words, although to us it becomes a saving presence, received to our salvation through our faith. It is not a presence simply in the soul of the receiver, as "Christ dwells in our hearts by faith"; or as, in acts of spiritual, apart from sacramental communion, we by our longings invite Him into our souls. But while the consecrated elements, as we believe (because our Lord and God the Holy Ghost in Holy Scripture call them still after their consecration by the names of their natural substances, and do not say that they cease to be as such), while the consecrated elements remain in their natural substances, still, since our Lord says, "This is My Body ... this is My Blood", [then, again alluding to that dubiously authoritative announcement to the 2nd Book of Homilies, Pusey adds] the Church of England believes that "under the form of Bread and Wine", so consecrated, we "receive the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ".[50]

Equally Lutheran in essence is the following quotation from Pusey: 'The proposition "this bread is my body", could have no other meaning than that it was in some way both: "this, which is in its natural substance bread, is sacramentally my Body, through the presence of my Body under its form"'.[51] Such words display the same literal interpretation taken by Lutherans and the same reluctance to tamper with their mysterious meaning.

As the contemporary expert in Lutheran

sacramental theology Bjarne Teigen has observed, it was part of the heritage of Lutheran orthodoxy to regard Christ's words of institution as the unalterable last will and testament of the Son of God, and adequate scriptural proof in themselves for the Real Presence.[52] Martin Chemnitz wrote in 1570: 'They are the words of the last will and testament of the very Son of God and not a game or place for exercising the mind by dreaming up unending interpretations that depart from the simplicity and proper meaning of the words'.[53] Pusey expressed similar thoughts nearly three hundred years later when he wrote, 'The words of the testator must not be departed from, because the intention is presumed to have been such as the words properly mean. It is not to be believed that the testator willed what he has not said. We ought to be content with the limitations of the words, because no disposition goes farther than the words bear: the reader then of a deed has the solution of what he seeks'.[54]

Lutherans hesitated to be drawn into explaining how the Real Presence might be possible. The Tractarians shared this hesitancy to go beyond commending faith in the Scripture's words alone. The Real Presence was judged to be possible by virtue of the consecratory power of the words themselves spoken in faith and obedience to the literal command of Christ.

In an interesting quote from Archdeacon Freeman, it is clear that this Anglican had a similar mystical regard for the superhuman power of Christ's *verba institutionis*. In a quite Lutheran way, he placed the weight upon Christ's words rather than man's in effecting the Real Presence. Alluding to the eucharistic liturgy he wrote:

> Hitherto [in the liturgy of the word] she [church] has poured forth, with bold heart and lavish hand, all manner of address and service to God. But now she suddenly ceases from her own words. Struck with awe at a task so transcending all human speech, she stands reverently aside, and, for all sufficient memorial recited the words...the elements have now become, through her memorial, and the priestly operation of Christ, and sanctification of the Holy Ghost, the body and blood of Christ ... The Consecrator is still no other than Christ.[55]

It was known that Lutherans attempted to explain the possibility of the Real Presence by means of arguments from Christology. They spoke of the divine attribute of omnipresence being communicated to and exercised by Christ's human nature through the inseparable union of His two natures. Like the Lutherans in this respect, Pusey also used a Christological argument to explain the capability of Christ's body and blood to be present in the consecrated elements of the Eucharist. He could write: 'Since His Body is there [in the eucharistic elements] there must His soul be also, there also is His Divinity *for they are inseparable*' [emphasis mine].[56] Although it has been noted that he differed from what he

believed to be Luther's theory of the 'ubiquity' of Christ's human nature, Pusey did believe that by virtue of His resurrection, Christ had a body with superhuman capabilities. This, combined with his belief in the value of the words of institution made Pusey sound most Lutheran when he preached:

> Christ hath said, "This is my Body"; He saith not, by what mode. We believe what He, the Truth, saith. Truth cannot lie. How he bringeth it to pass, we may leave to His Omnipotency. It is a law which He hath impressed upon physical nature, that two bodies cannot be in the same place at the same time. And yet we receive, without doubting, that our Lord, in His spiritual Body, passed, on the morning of the Resurrection, through the sealed tomb....he passed through the closed doors, so that the disciples thought that "it was a spirit", ...We do not stay to inquire in what way the substance of His Body passed through the substance of the closed doors. Enough that God has said it. As it passed, it must have been in the same place, penetrating, but not displacing them. Still less need we ask, by what law of nature, the Sacramental Presence can be, which is not after the order of nature, but is above nature.[57]

Harrison labelled such a belief in Christ's risen and glorified 'spiritual' body as the 'heresy of Marcion' that Pusey shared with Paschasius.[58] He maintained that Anglicans were prepared to speak of a spiritual eating and drinking, in the Eucharist, of Christ's body and blood, but he argued that such a position was quite different from Pusey's oral eating and drinking of Christ's 'spiritual' body and blood. In this regard Harrison defined Pusey's understanding of the Real Presence as follows:

> He does not mean a real spiritual presence, which

> is the doctrine of the Fathers and of the Reformers, Zwingle (sic) not excepted, but a real spiritual presence of Christ's human body; that is, the Real Presence of that very body which was born of the blessed Mary and rose from the dead, and that as the same body which came, as he teaches, after the manner of a spirit through the membraneous substance of the blessed Mary's womb, and through the solid block of stone, without, in either case, displacing any parts, so still after the manner of a spirit the very same body is present in each consecrated portion of bread and wine as received by every communicant - whether saint or sinner.[59]

Pusey did admit that the Fathers used the word 'spiritually' to oppose a physical or carnal understanding of the Real Presence, but he did not record any patristic denial of an oral consumption of Christ's body and blood present in the eucharistic elements in a spiritual form. He was able to quote from St Ambrose to say, 'In that sacrament Christ is,[present] because it is Christ's Body; it is not, therefore, bodily food, but spiritual. Whence the Apostle says of its type: "our fathers ate a spiritual food, and drank a spiritual drink", for the Body of God is a spiritual Body: the Body of Christ is Body of a Divine Spirit; for Christ is a Spirit'.[60] Nevertheless, Harrison was confident that the Fathers also used the word 'spiritually' to rule out Pusey's understanding of eucharistic eating.

To drive a further wedge between Pusey and orthodox Anglicanism, Harrison noted that the Lutheran *Formula of Concord* condemned Anglican reformers for the use of such language as 'spiritual' (Although it must

be said that the Anglicans were not named). If Pusey was going to defend a Lutheran position as harmonious with Anglicanism, Harrison wanted him to know that the Lutherans themselves did not envision such harmony with Anglican nomenclature.[61]

In the realm of nomenclature, Goode included some remarks about the usage of the term *consubstantiation* as a description of the teachings of the Lutherans and their unwitting Tractarian disciples. Goode observed that, in addition to teaching that the very body and blood of Christ were present in the Eucharist, 'Archdeacon Denison and Dr Pusey appear to grant the presence of bread and wine in the elements after consecration, and therefore go little, if at all, beyond the high Lutheran doctrine'.[62] That 'Lutheran doctrine' of consubstantiation taught that the true body and blood of Christ were joined together with the consecrated bread and wine. In Denison's case Goode judged that he seemed to hold to both transubstantiation (because of his use of the phrase 'under the form of bread and wine') and consubstantiation (because of his statements that the elements are joined together with Christ's body and blood). In his 'sermon i. pp.9,&c.', Denison attempted to acquit himself of holding to what Goode calls the 'Roman' or 'Lutheran' positions by denying any material or physical presence. Goode correctly pointed out the

fallacy of the idea that either Rome or Wittenburg ever held to such a material presence anyway.[63] Goode judged that there was no small quantity of hypocrisy in Denison's denial of a corporal presence, yet speaking of the presence of Christ's body itself. After all, Denison advocated kneeling in reverence before bread and wine, justifying it 'on the ground that he is not worshipping the bread and wine, but that which is in the bread and wine!'.[64]

The fact that the polemical word 'consubstantiation' was never intended to be a material matter any more than transubstantiation made Denison's remarks seem to be only a matter of confusing the issue. In Goode's opinion, the best thing for the Lutherans to do would be to admit rather than deny the use of the term consubstantiation with reference to their doctrine.[65] The opponents of Tractarianism were not the first or the last party to wish that their adversaries' position conformed more easily to a convenient stereotype.

It is interesting to note how ignorant some of the Tractarians were to their proximity to Lutheran eucharistic theology. Referring to Gerhardt's *Loci*, Goode asserted that Pusey and Denison both held doctrines identical to that of 'high Lutheranism', though Denison 'seems to be entirely ignorant of the fact', even to the point of denying that the other

doctrine which he held in common with orthodox Lutheranism, the reception of the wicked, was consistent with Lutheran doctrine.[66] Pusey, who knew more about Lutheranism did not prefer to contemplate his proximity to Lutheranism as such. He preferred to point to his proximity to the orthodoxy of historic catholic doctrine. If the Lutherans could then be judged to be close to Tractarianism it would have to be by default.

THE ARGUMENT CONCERNING MISREPRESENTED PATRISTIC REFERENCES

It leant great weight to Pusey's claim to orthodoxy when, in his 1853 book, he explicitly claimed to have exhaustively treated all pertinent patristic references to the Eucharist.[67] His opponents knew that a particularly telling argument against Pusey as a valid interpreter of patristic thought would be provided by documented evidence that Pusey had misrepresented the early Church Fathers by misquoting and misusing their writings. Out of respect for the eminent professor, Dr Harrison referred to Pusey's claim to have fairly and accurately treated the patristic writings as an innocent bit of self-deception on Pusey's part which, nevertheless, had to be

exposed.[68]

As he examined Pusey's writings, especially his pivotal 1853 book with its enormous catena, Harrison discerned that he had a certain 'style' of interpreting eucharistic passages in the Fathers which contributed to his conclusions concerning the Real Presence. Harrison judged that Pusey's style was characterised by asserting the most literal possible meaning to patristic quotations in which Christ was suggested to be present in the Eucharist. What Pusey then chose to interpret less literally were those passages by the same writers in which other things were said to be associated with the consecrated eucharistic elements. Harrison poignantly observed that if he was to use the same biased style of interpretation, but with a different emphasis, he could teach radically different things. For example, he could, by such methods, make St Augustine teach that the body of the *faithful communicant* was really and objectively present in the eucharistic elements.[69]

Having examined Pusey's use of the Fathers even further, Harrison accused Pusey of taking about a dozen extracts

> from more than a hundred volumes of patristic records. These extracts happen to have the little word "in" so placed from the accidents or chances of position, that with other congenial words, and duly manipulated by artificial means, and the context also disregarded, Dr Pusey manages to get from them a few phrases which seem to teach his doctrine.[70]

To counteract the damage done by Pusey's distorted quotations, Harrison included in his volume (filling some four pages) other patristic quotations which he claimed were not capable of such manipulation.

In Response to what appeared to be a biased approach on Pusey's part to the interpretation of patristic writings, Harrison asserted his conviction that Pusey's argument, based as it was on an accumulation of authorities whose testimony was in his favour, was basically worthless.[71] On the one hand, Pusey had printed four hundred pages worth of patristic quotations in which nowhere was Pusey's notion of 'presence', denoting the existence of Christ in the eucharistic elements, to be found.[72] On the other hand, Pusey was said to have omitted from his catena the 'true key to the meaning of the language of the Fathers': the principle that the Fathers commonly referred to the eucharistic elements in terms of that which they signified.[73] Once their true meaning was understood, therefore, Pusey's thousands of quotations which repeatedly refer to the elements as the Christ's body and blood were useless to the Tractarian cause. Once the weakness of Pusey's technique of repetition was comprehended, Harrison compared Pusey's whole catena with a newspaper advertisement which merely covers a whole page with the same equally unpersuasive slogan.[74]

Some misrepresented quotations could be traced to flawed scholarship on Pusey's part. According to Harrison, such a mistake was exemplified by an occasion when Pusey seemed to have attributed to St Augustine an argument which was really that of Lanfranc in answer to Berengar's quotations from that very same St Augustine![75]

More frequently than Harrison found faulty scholarship, he believed he discovered in Pusey a blinkered approach to patristic writings in which he would see or select only those statements or phrases which seemed to lend support to his understanding of the Real Presence, even if he had to ignore, overlook or disregard equally strong statements which contradicted such views.

In his attack on the Tractarians, W.Goode questioned the claims made by them on the basis of their findings. He accused them of taking their private judgments and inflicting them on Anglicanism under the pretence of regard for the writings of the Church Fathers. He pointed out that the Church of England had enshrined its respect for the Fathers in some of its official statements. As a result of such statements as the 'Canon of 1571' Archdeacon Denison had claimed that his findings in the Church Fathers endorsed the doctrines he taught as far as the Church of England was concerned. Goode challenged such an

appeal. He argued that Denison 'has no right to say, - The Church of England professes to agree with the Primitive Church [as per Canon of 1571] in her doctrine, and I, in the exercise of my private judgment on the writings of antiquity, consider so and so to be the doctrine of the Primitive Church, and therefore such is the doctrine of the Church of England'. Goode substantiated his challenge by drawing his reader's attention to the fact that the very words of that same Canon (beyond those quoted by Denison) set forth the 'Articles of Christian religion' as a true exposition of patristic doctrine. He argued, therefore, that 'the very principle the Archdeacon has adopted is utterly irreconcilable with his obligations as a minister of our Church'.[76]

As Harrison would later do, Goode accused the controversial authors of foisting a deception upon 'the unlearned reader' as they 'sit down and pick out of the few remains of the antient (sic) authors we possess a certain doctrine, and then call it "the Church's judgment"'.[77]

FATHERS ALLEGEDLY QUOTED SELECTIVELY

Contrary to his announced intention of giving a comprehensive picture of patristic thought concerning

the Real Presence, Pusey was alleged by Harrison to have omitted writings from Tertullian, Origen, Ambrose, Eusebius, Basil, Augustine, and Chrysostom which would seem to contradict the oral eating of Christ which Pusey seemed to teach.[78]

Further, it was alleged that certain patristic writings, if they were not altogether overlooked by Pusey, were selectively quoted where they seemed to support his views. For example, had the words been included from Cyprian in which he spoke of Christ calling His body and blood bread and wine, Harrison believed the words quoted by Pusey in which bread and wine were called body and blood would be given the metaphorical interpretation consistent with the Cyprian's true views.[79] Also, Clement was thought to have been treated most unfairly by Pusey, according to Harrison. Clement was supposed to refute Pusey's doctrine of the Real Presence, but Pusey, by means of very selective quotation, made it seem that Clement taught that doctrine as well.[80]

Other writers, such as Tertullian, were said to have been misquoted. As an example of this, Harrison alleged that Pusey tried to perpetuate a misquotation of Tertullian, making it appear that he spoke of Christ calling bread His body, when he really spoke of Christ metaphorically calling His body bread.[81]

Much of Harrison's argumentation had to do with

an alleged misunderstanding on Pusey's part of patristic vocabulary regarding the Eucharist. Pusey himself, naturally, insisted that he understood the Fathers perfectly. They spoke in terms of metaphors and symbols, but that did not negate their faith in a Real Presence:

> S.Basil, S.Gregory of Nazianzus, S.Macarius, Eusebius, Theodoret, Eustathius, S.Augustine, say, as did Tertullian, that the consecrated elements are symbols, types, antitypes, figures, images of our Lord's Body and Blood, as it is clear from their own writings that they did *not* mean figures of an *absent* body, so also is it that they did mean, that there was a real visible substance which was the image or symbol of the *present* spiritual, invisible substance ... Tertullian says, "*In* the bread is understood His Body". S.Augustine says, "Our Lord Jesus Christ commended His Body and Blood *in* those things which are, out of many [many grains and many grapes], reduced into some one".[82]

While it was vital to Pusey's argument that a Real Presence should be believed to be in the elements after their consecration, Harrison maintained that there was no literal proof of this in the Fathers' writings. Referring to the patristic use of the preposition 'in' as in Tertullian's phrase: '*In* the bread is understood to be His body', Harrison asserted that it was but an example of 'one of several synonymous phrases which he commonly uses when speaking of signs as signifying or representing other things'.[83]

Statements by Augustine which were quoted by Pusey about receiving 'in the bread that which hung upon the cross; receive ye that in the cup which flowed

from His side', were said by Harrison to merely refer to the people of God 'under the aspect of body and blood'. He asserted that Augustine often made little or no distinction between the body of Christ the deity, and the body of believers which mystically constitute His body.[84] Apparently, the patristic usage of the eucharistic bread and wine as symbolic of the Church corporate was one of Harrison's primary reasons for interpreting other patristic statements as inconsistent with the 'Puseyite Real Presence'.[85]

By means of such interpretations of his own, Harrison was able to doubt even the most formidable patristic quotations that Pusey was able to bring to bear. For example, Pusey quoted the sixth century African bishop, Facundus, for his use of the term mystery to refer to the inward part of the sacrament.

> "The Sacrament of His Body and Blood, which is *in* the consecrated bread and cup, we call His Body and Blood, not that the Bread is properly His Body, or the cup His Blood, but because they contain *in* them the mystery of His Body and Blood". Facundus says (what none can doubt), that "the bread [i.e. the outward part] is not *properly* the Body of Christ", but he attests at the same time, his belief in the Real objective Presence; "they [the bread and cup] contain *in* them the mystery of His Body and Blood".[86]

Harrison replied that the word mystery is used by Facundus in the patristic manner as merely synonymous with sacrament, not implying any unseen mysterious presence.[87]

Harrison regarded as a further misuse of

patristic teaching Pusey's assertion that the phrase 'daily bread' in the Lord's prayer was regarded by the Fathers to refer to the Eucharist. Harrison pointed out that those Fathers spoke of Christ as the 'daily Bread' of the Christian as much apart from the Eucharist as symbolised in it. Harrison referred to the example of Augustine who applied the phrase 'daily bread' as much to the reading, preaching and the singing of hymns as to the Eucharist.[88]

One of the most important complaints Harrison had, which he shared with Dean Goode before him, about Pusey's interpretation of the Fathers, was his rejection of the 'maxim of Albertinus and the school of Calvin' which, as we have previously noted, Harrison believed to be 'the true key to the meaning of the language of the Fathers'.[89] This law stated that the Fathers tended to call the consecrated elements Christ's body and blood merely indicating that which was signified by them; not implying any Real Presence within those elements.

By this principle Goode could admit that there were passages in the Fathers which could 'easily be found which speak of a bodily and oral reception of the Body and Blood of Christ'. Yet it could nevertheless be insisted upon that all such passages must not be interpreted literally as the Tractarians did. Instead they were to be interpreted according to the rule which

asserts that the Fathers merely called the eucharistic elements by the names of that which they signify.[90]

There is no doubt that Goode, and later Harrison, adduced an enormous quantity of references from the Fathers to support their views. Yet these quotations must be interpreted according to Goode's presuppositions if they are to have his meaning. To understand the Fathers, Goode believed that one must understand their *usus loquendi*: that 'the signs are commonly called by the Fathers by the names of the things signified'.[91] His primary presupposition is that the Fathers do not literally mean what they say when they speak of eating and drinking the body and blood of Christ. For this reason Pusey felt that he could challenge this principle by inquiring as to whether such quotations would still be coherent if the words bread and wine were then substituted in references to Christ's body and blood. Pusey proposed:

> The above, as far I see, are the only grounds of the canon of Mr Goode and the School of Calvin, which is to "sweep away at once the larger portion of the testimonies" from the fathers which I adduced. I have, I believe, shewn how little it can discharge that office. But I would only ask any one who loves, and desires to know, the truth, to examine for himself, the passages of the fathers, which I have adduced, and see whether he thinks that the words "bread and wine" could be substituted for their words "the Body and Blood of Christ", and the meaning remain the same. For if that maxim of Albertinus and the School of Calvin were true, that "the signs are called by the name of the things signified", and the inference which alone would make it bear upon this doctrine, also true, viz. that when "the Fathers speak of the things signified", "the Body

> and Blood of Christ", we are entitled to suppose that they meant *only* the "signs" i.e. the bread and wine, then, of course, we might, in every case which is so to be disposed of, substitute the words "bread and wine" for "the Body and Blood of Christ" and the sense receive no damage. Let anyone really and earnestly and perseveringly try this, and I feel no doubt, that he would soon be convinced, at least, that Christians of old, learned or unlearned, believed in the Real Presence of "the Body and Blood of Christ under the form of bread and wine".[92]

Harrison rejected this test of the rule which Pusey sought to impose and condemned it as preposterous, proving nothing, and a complete misuse of 'the maxim of Albertinus'.[93]

HARRISON REVEALED HIS OWN STYLE OF PATRISTIC INTERPRETATION

As Harrison criticised and condemned Pusey's use of the Fathers, some peculiar techniques of interpretation on his own part became evident. For example, it was Harrison's position that the Fathers do not really contradict one another as often as was commonly supposed, and especially with regard to the Lord's Supper. Yet he agreed that they could be *quoted* to do so. Harrison acknowledged that the early Church Fathers could be quoted to support Puseyism now and Zwinglianism later, but he favoured a 'consistent' interpretation of them along the Zwinglian lines portraying the elements as symbols of Christ's body and

blood.[94]

Where a patristic writer, Gaudentius for example, appeared to weaken the Zwinglian cause by means of a strong statement saying that Christ 'made the bread His body', Harrison enlisted another Father to clarify the expression, implying that patristic references must be read to interpret one another.[95]

Weak expressions from the same Father were used by Harrison to undermine stronger ones. In this way that same Gaudentius was said to have used the phrase 'pattern of Christ's passion' to refer to the elements in a way 'fatal' to Pusey's view.[96] Goode, in his books, included quotations from the original Latin of such Fathers such as Tertullian in footnotes. In the case of Tertullian's paraphrase of Christ's '*id est, figura corporis mei*', it does seem to make a Zwinglian of that patristic writer![97]

Often a patristic writer is described as a witness 'against the Roman doctrine of the Real Presence, and not in favour of it' when another examination might seem to show that they witness to *both* a Puseyite Real Presence *and* a symbolic value in the elements at the same time.[98]

Harrison's own comprehension of patristic theology was not always unanimously convincing. When he referred to a passage in Chrysostom used by Pusey in his condemned sermon of 1843, he stated that Chrysostom

must have been referring to something unreal when he said that Christ's body was being broken in the Eucharist, something which it did not suffer on the cross. Yet it is far from certain that Chrysostom was intending something unreal in this context. Harrison's claim that one unreality suggests another does not follow unless Chrysostom really intended to teach that the breaking of Christ's eucharistic body was unreal. Pusey interpreted Chrysostom to say that in the Eucharist Christ really did suffer His body to be broken in a very real, though sacramental way.

Occasionally in his writings it became apparent that Harrison was flying the Reformed flag and implying his own bias. In a review of Harrison's *An Answer to Dr Pusey's Challenge* published in *the Spectator* of 9 March, 1872, it was observed that the book was a 'vindication of Zwingle'. This was apparent by virtue of Harrison's use of some of the very arguments Zwingli originally used (against Lutherans) to oppose Pusey's teachings. Harrison's use of Zwingli may have been provoked by Pusey's attacks against that Swiss reformer. For example, mention is made by Pusey of Zwingli's argument that as the sacrificed and eaten Lamb which 'is' the passover represents the passing over of the Angel of Death, so the bread which 'is' Christ's body represents His body. Pusey argued that there is no such figure of speech here. Harrison

argued that Zwingli was right and that it was not just his idea but that of the Fathers as well.[99] Harrison also represented other Reformed ideas as expressions of patristic thought. As an example, he pointed out that Jerome used nearly the same imagery as Calvin when he expressly said of Holy Communion, 'Let us go up...and let us receive from Him on high the cup of the New Testament'.[100]

Harrison felt comfortable with a portrait of Anglican eucharistic or sacramental theology which was supremely Protestant. The Tractarians were far less comfortable with the *status quo*. They were far from certain that Jerome or any other ancient Father would even recognise, let alone feel at home in the Church of England if it were to continue much further down the sectarian and Erastian path. As the Oxford Movement surveyed the state of things, they would not entertain any thoughts of comfort until they wrested the Anglican Church from the grip of the Protestant Reformation and returned it to the security of the arms of Holy Mother Church as they had grown to know her.

THE ARGUMENT CONCERNING MISUSE OF SCRIPTURE

The opponents of Tractarianism believed that at least as strong an argument as that from the Church Fathers could be mounted against Tractarian teaching on

the basis of Holy Scripture. Many of their efforts followed the pattern of previous opponents of the doctrine of a Real objective eucharistic Presence from Zwingli to Hoadly.

JOHN 6

Characteristic of their method of attack was the fact that much of their scriptural evidence against Pusey's exegesis rested upon the use of verses from the chapter of the New Testament that was most popular with the sixteenth century Protestant opponents of Luther: the sixth chapter of St John's Gospel. That chapter seemed to teach the eating and drinking of Christ's body and blood as a spiritual and non-oral consumption which happened apart from any eucharistic bread or wine.

Such a usage of John 6 was part of Harrison's doctrinal heritage in this respect. Unlike Luther, who interpreted that chapter to refer exclusively to a spiritual eating of Christ independent of the Eucharist, Reformed theologians often drew little distinction between eucharistic eating and any other spiritual ingestion of the teachings of Christ. No such eating is believed to involve the actual body and blood of Christ. All such eating of Christ was regarded as a spiritual matter whether or not the

symbols of bread and wine were involved.

The trouble for the Tractarians came with the fact that, like the early Church Fathers before them, they imperilled their doctrine of a Real objective eucharistic Presence by connecting the doctrine too closely to the sixth chapter of St John's Gospel. The Tractarians seemed oblivious to the claims of those like Dean Goode that, 'the greatest violence...must be done both to the words and the sense of the passage, to make it relate directly and properly to the reception of the eucharistic elements'.[101] As the abundant material assembled by their opponents made clear, the Tractarian position was indeed a very difficult one to defend.

In his opposition to the Tractarian interpretation of John 6, Goode was able to go on for nearly thirty pages giving scriptural and patristic support for his opposition to a eucharistic interpretation of John 6. Against the claims of R.Wilberforce, Goode was able to assert that the Church Fathers 'do *not* state that the Holy Eucharist is referred to in this chapter. All any of them do is to *apply* the words used in this chapter to what takes place in the eucharistic rite in the case of the faithful, which is a very different matter. If they 'refer' the words to spiritual acts which may be performed independently of the Eucharist; and if they

apply the words to the Eucharistic rite, it is because those spiritual acts peculiarly belong to that rite'.[102]

He concluded by saying that whilst John 6 is no direct reference to the Eucharist, it affords the best explanation in scripture of the nature of eucharistic eating. It could legitimately be said that Goode did not so much interpret John 6 eucharistically as give a *John 6 interpretation* to the Eucharist.

Harrison was able to expose the vulnerability of the Tractarian position when he documented the patristic teaching concerning extra-sacramental eating. Naturally, Harrison was able to refer to Augustine's well-known teaching about extra-sacramental eating of Christ's body and blood.[103] He then could demonstrate the concurrence of Fulgentius, on Augustine's authority, with this idea, together with that of Origen,[104] and Tertullian.[105]

Had they had a clear doctrine of extra-sacramental eating of Christ's body and blood it would have helped the Tractarian cause. Rather than embrace a doctrine of extra-sacramental eating associated with John 6, however, Pusey and the Tractarians chose to try to succeed with a purely eucharistic interpretation of that chapter. Such an approach brought with it ready-made problems. No problem would have existed for Puseyites had they

followed Luther.

An example of the difficulty encountered by the Tractarians because of their eucharistic interpretation of John 6 was the way that the fifty-sixth verse of that chapter seemed to contradict their doctrine of the *manducatio impii*. W.Goode launched one of his attacks at this point, setting his sights on Archdeacon Denison, one of the most outspoken Tractarians on this doctrine that Christ's body and blood are eucharistically ingested by unbelieving communicants. Goode wrote that Denison's argument:

> is one of the most arbitrary kind, founded upon the *assumption* that the words do not refer to an act of faith, and also contrary to their plain meaning. For he makes the blessing here promised [John 6.56] dependent - not upon eating and drinking our Lord's flesh and blood, *according to our Lord's own words* - but upon eating and drinking them *with faith;* and this because our Lord says, "He that believeth on me hath everlasting life"; *assuming* that this eating and drinking does not refer, *in itself*, to an act of faith, though the context clearly shows that it does; and a similar explanation is given by Archdeacon Wilberforce. So that here also our Lord's words must be *altered*, before they can be made to bear in the sense put upon them by the two Archdeacons.[106]

The theological impasse thus described by Goode could have been avoided in this case, had the Tractarians accepted the fact, made obvious by verse 56, that, in John 6, Christ is describing an eating and drinking of His flesh and blood that occurs by faith among all believers quite independently of the Eucharist. Had Goode accepted that Christ was

referring to a spiritual relationship enjoyed by the faithful independent of, yet also objectively affirmed within the consecrated bread and wine of the Holy Eucharist, there would have been less to argue about.

In his writings Goode revealed the results of his biased frame of reference with a four-fold interpretation of John 6. It could be summarized as: 1. 'It can hardly be argued, that we eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood in the Eucharist in a different way from that which is here (John 6) spoken of'. 2. John 6.56 rules out the *manducatio impii* concept. 3. John 6.56 teaches that eating Christ's body and blood must produce salutary effects. 4. Christ's words 'the flesh profiteth nothing' discredits the idea that a Real Presence of Christ's body and blood is essential for the Eucharist.[107]

For his part, Harrison seemed quite incapable of comprehending both a spiritual eating which takes place independently from the Eucharist, and a spiritual eating which takes place in the soul of the worthy communicant during a physical eating of Christ's eucharistic body and blood. Harrison showed himself capable of statements that Martin Luther would have endorsed concerning John 6. For example, he could observe that Ambrose had no conception of that text as a reference to eucharistic eating.[108] He could note how Eusebius of Caesarea interpreted the eating and

drinking of Christ's blood as a receiving of His words and teachings.[109] He could reveal how a completely allegorical and spiritual interpretation of the sixth chapter of John was held by Clement of Alexandria.[110] Yet, Harrison was not willing to allow that while such views would be an accurate interpretation of John 6, they would only hinder a Puseyite understanding of sacramental eating if John 6 were understood to be a eucharistic text. The Tractarian party held to that very position which Harrison found so vulnerable, so he gave no consideration to the possibilities presented by the Lutheran position on non-sacramental eating. For this reason he was able to plunge himself into battle with the Tractarians on the basis of John 6.

The precedent set by the early Church Fathers probably supplied Pusey with the impetus for his usage of John 6 as a eucharistic text. In his condemned sermon of 1843, Pusey made so many references to John 6 that one could be excused from forgetting that his text was actually Matthew 25. It was largely his own exegesis of the text which provided him with what he believed to be compelling proof for his position over against that of his adversaries who denied the Real Presence. In one case, Pusey equated the scepticism of the sacramentarians with 'the strivings of the Jews' as they asked in disbelief: 'how can these things be?'.[111] For Pusey such a question was improper with reference

to the Real Presence as that was the issue to which Christ was alluding in the words of St John's Gospel.

Summarising the eucharistic theme of Jesus' teaching in John 6, Pusey preached:

> That He is the Living Bread, because He came down from heaven, and as being One God with the Father, hath life in Himself, even as the Father hath life in Himself; the life then which He is, He imparted to that flesh which He took into Himself, yea, which He took so wholly, that Holy Scripture says, He became it, "the Word became flesh", and since it is thus a part of Himself. "Whoso eateth my Flesh and drinketh my Blood", (He Himself says the amazing words) "eateth me", and so receiveth into himself, in an ineffable manner, his Lord Himself, "dwelleth" (our Lord says) "in Me and I in him", and having Christ within him not only *shall* he *have*, but he "*hath*" already "eternal Life", because he hath Him who is "the Only True God and Eternal Life"'.[112]

Harrison found the above quotation to be an indictment against Pusey's reputation as a linguist. He cast doubt upon the validity of Pusey's emphasis on the word 'hath', and, in the process, revealed his own bias against the belief that one may have eternal life as a present reality rather than merely an eschatological one.[113]

Pusey was convinced that John 6 described a eucharistic unity with Christ that would have bodily expression. He wrote 'the Eternal Word so took our flesh into Himself as to impart to it His own inherent life; so then we, partaking of it, that life is transmitted on to us also, and not to our souls only, but our bodies also, since we became flesh of His flesh, and bone of His bone, and He who is wholly life

is imparted to us wholly'. Harrison was astonished at this wholistic opinion of eucharistic benefits.[114]

THE VERBA

Goode observed that for the the Tractarians it was often the case that their final resort was to the words of institution to support their doctrine of the oral eating of Christ's body and blood.[115] As has been noted already, Pusey tended to rely upon a literal interpretation of the *verba* in much the same way as Luther did.

Pusey explained the reason why in his largest book on the Real Presence:

> In a figurative sentence, the figure must lie either (1) in the thing spoken of, or (2) in that which is spoken of it, or (3) in the word by which these two are connected...The whole cannot be figurative, unless there be a figure somewhere in its parts.[116]

Thus the *verba* were to be taken literally if there were no individual metaphors among the individual words of its text. The whole phrase, therefore, must be taken literally. Together with this hermaneutical principle, Pusey required that a figurative word be identified by the Scriptures as such if he was not to take it literally.[117]

Pusey's principle of interpretation threatened the exegetical conclusions in his opponent's arguments. Goode quoted Waterland's *Review of the Doctrine of the*

Eucharist by the page, including the popular but flawed argument that St Paul's statement 'the Rock was Christ' is equivalent to 'This is My Body' as a metaphorical statement. Pusey's rule that a metaphorical phrase must contain metaphorical words would exclude Waterland's comparison, for clearly, St Paul in referring to a rock 'which followed them' (1 Corinthians 10.4) is speaking of a metaphorical 'Rock', [cf. Psalm 62.2] nothing like the literal bread which Christ declared to be His body. There is no comparison, therefore, between the Rock and the bread.[118]

With regard to this axiom that no metaphorical meaning can be attributed to a phrase if none of the words in that phrase are metaphors Harrison remarked, 'Dr Pusey must presume largely upon the general ignorance of his disciples to treat them to such a statement'. Harrison admitted that no individual word in the *verba* was figurative, but instead, he insisted that the whole phrase was figurative. Pusey's definition of a figurative statement was said to be fallacious. For Harrison, a figure need not be a component part of a statement in order for that statement to be figurative.[119]

Also, Harrison accused Pusey of dishonesty in this regard, for Pusey did seem to violate his own rules and regard one of the words as figurative, though

not designated as such in Scripture. His example was the word 'cup', said to be the New Covenant in Christ's blood.[120] Harrison did not consider that the word cup could be taken, as Lutherans understood it, as a *synecdoche*, a figure of speech which does not deny the reality of its object, but only uses an inclusive or less inclusive term for it.

As noted above, Pusey regarded Christ's words of institution as His last will and testament, to be understood literally and not to be tampered with. Harrison maintained that there was a testamental character to the supper, but as such it implied the absence of the testator, not his Real Presence. It seemed reasonable to Harrison to believe that Christ left a supper, rather than, as Pusey seemed to hold, to leave Himself under the form of a supper.[121] Harrison preferred to imagine that Christ had left figurative *spiritual food* in the Lord's Supper corresponding to the spiritual food associated with the Old Testament by St Paul.

The giving of such spiritual food by Christ was not Pusey's understanding. Whereas Jesus spoke in parables among the public because of the hardness of their hearts, Pusey believed that in the privacy of the upper room among His disciples, Jesus:

> in that solemn hour was completing the shadows of the law. Why should we think that He brought in a mere shadow less expressive that those which He abolished? He, our good Master, was leaving "His

> Testament" in His Blood to His Disciples, even to the end of the world. We do not think that even a man, in a testament, means to leave the mere figure of what he professes to bestow. Human principles of interpretation require that we should believe that a testator means what he says. Reverence for the word of God requires, that we should not tamper with its apparent meaning, on any preconceived notions of our own.[122]

Again Pusey's argument resembles that of the great Lutheran dogmatician Martin Chemnitz who taught that the clear meaning of the last will and testament of the Son of God is that He offers His body and blood within the bread and wine that He distributes .

THE VERBA, CONSECRATION AND SACRIFICE

In Pusey's eucharistic writings it becomes clear that his interpretation of Christ's words of institution revealed his adherence to controversial doctrines going beyond the Real Presence. One of these doctrines was that of Eucharistic Sacrifice. In this respect Harrison compared the Puseyite controversy with that between the Papist Harding and Jewel. Harding claimed a contemporary sacrifice was implied in Christ's words of institution. Pusey seemed to have the same view as he interpreted the tense of the verbs in the phrases referring to Christ's body and blood: 'being given', 'being broken', 'being shed'. For Pusey these words taught a perpetuation of Christ's

Sacrifice. Any literal usage of these verba, however, was said by Harrison to imply not a perpetuation but a repetition. He then used *argumentum ad absurdum* to describe the thousands of deaths Christ would have to die involving 'thousands of bodies' if Pusey's idea was to be entertained.[123] In Harrison's later book he went so far as to question the validity of Pusey's reputation as a linguist for making the assertion that the grammar of the words of institution teaches the perpetuation of Christ's sacrifice.[124]

Another source of irritation for the opponents of Pusey was his interpretation of the *verba* in relation to the doctrine of the consecration of the elements. Pusey combined this with a belief in eucharistic sacrifice when he taught that 'this may have been another truth which our Lord intended to convey to us, when He pronounced the words as the form which consecrates the sacramental elements into His body and blood that that precious blood is still, in continuance and application of His one oblation once made upon the cross, poured out for us now'.[125]

In several of his rebuttals to this idea, Harrison criticised Pusey for taking such a 'western' position, teaching that the words of institution are consecratory when such an idea is 'not required' by the Eastern Orthodox who attribute the consecration of the elements to the prayer of invocation of the Holy

Spirit, the *epiclesis*, rather than the *verba*. Harrison found this criticism to be particularly effective considering Pusey's claim that Anglicanism is in agreement with the Eastern Orthodox Church in many eucharistic doctrines.[126]

1 CORINTHIANS

In addition to the words of institution, St Paul's references to the Eucharist in 1 Corinthians came in for much comment by Harrison and other opponents of Pusey. 1 Corinthians contains St Paul's version of the eucharistic *verba*, but it also refers to a 'communion' in the body and blood of Christ which opponents of Pusey's doctrine of the Real Presence believed could be understood to exclude that doctrine. Pusey himself preached his 1853 sermon on the text in the tenth chapter of St Paul's first letter to the Corinthians.

Pusey's preaching in this context was strong as long as it remained Biblical. It could become vulnerable to Harrison's attack when he attempted to reinforce it with patristic quotations. For example, having begun to preach Biblically on 1 Corinthians 10.16 to say:

> St Paul's words are an expansion and application of our Lord's. Our Lord says, "This is my body";

> St Paul, "Is it not the communion of the body of Christ?". Our Lord says "this is My blood"; St Paul, "Is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?". There is no bond between a communion and a figure. Had the Holy Eucharist been only a figure, there would be nothing whereof it could be a communion. True, what we see, in that it is broken is an image of His body which was slain; and in that it is poured out, is an image of His blood which was shed. That which is seen is an image of the reality which is unseen. Yet God says not by St Paul, it is an image, but it is "the communion of the body of Christ". But, in order to be a communion of it, there must be that of which it is the communion.

Pusey then brought in a commentary from St Chrysostom:

> "Why", asks St Chrysostom, "did he not say participation? Because he wished to point out something more, to shew how great is the conjunction. For we communicate, not by sharing only and partaking, but also by being united. For as that body is united to Christ, so also are we united to Him by this bread".[127]

Harrison was able to fill in this quotation with what he regarded as a misleadingly omitted portion where Chrysostom went on to explain: 'For what is the bread? The body of Christ. And what do they become who partake of it? The body of Christ'. Harrison believed that this further symbolic quality attached to the eucharistic bread by Chrysostom, in which he included human believers under the expression. 'For what is bread', excluded the Real Presence of what Pusey called 'that of which it is a communion'.[128]

The Puseyite interpretation of the word *koinonia* was disputed by Goode and Harrison. Against the communion of Christ's body and blood in the elements

asserted by Pusey, Goode urged that St Paul's use of the term *koinonia* in a previous reference to demons does not admit the idea of a real oral contact with a supernatural being within food.[129] Using the same argument, Harrison also challenged the use of St Paul's word *communion* in 1 Corinthians as a reference to a Puseyite Real Presence. He asserted that, as the Apostle also uses the same word communion to describe the relationship between demons and those who eat food sacrificed to demons, and later rhetorically asks whether what is offered to idols 'is anything', St Paul's later references to communion with Christ's body and blood would not support the Puseyite Real Presence concept. If, as the Apostle implies, such a communion is communion with nothing, Harrison states that St Paul would not use the word communion to refer to the Lord's Supper if he had thought of it in terms of Pusey's view of communion.[130]

By means of such arguments as these their opponents challenged the Biblical basis for the Tractarian position on the Real Presence. Liddon briefly recorded the reaction of the elderly Pusey to Harrison's ambitious enterprise. He 'only expressed his great satisfaction that a person [like Harrison] belonging to that school should have induced some of those who agree with him to read the Fathers'.[131] Pusey remained confident that, if they persevered, such

students of the Fathers would eventually discover Pusey's conclusions to be the correct ones.

Notes to Chapter Seven

1. E.B.Pusey, *The Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ - The Doctrine of the English Church with a Vindication of the Reception by the Wicked and of the Adoration of Our Lord Jesus Christ Truly Present* (Oxford 1857), preface p.vi.

2. J. Harrison, *The Fathers Versus Dr Pusey: An Exposure of His Unfair Treatment of Their Evidence on the Doctrine of the Real Presence* (London 1873), p.14.

3. J. Harrison, *An Answer to Dr Pusey's Challenge Respecting the Doctrine of the Real Presence*, 2 Vols (London 1871), I, p.5.

4. E.B.Pusey, [appendix] 'Will Ye Go Away', *A Sermon Preached at St Mary's, on the Fourth Sunday After the Epiphany, 1867* (London 1880), p.28.

5. Harrison, *The Fathers Versus Dr Pusey...*, p.4.

6. *Ibid*, p.11.

7. E.B.Pusey, *The Rule of Faith, as Maintained by the Fathers, and the Church of England: a Sermon, Preached before the University, in the Cathedral Church of Christ, in Oxford, on the Fifth Sunday after Epiphany* (Oxford 1851), p.39.

8. E.B.Pusey, 'Is Healthful Reunion Impossible?' - *A Second Letter to the Very Rev. H. Newman, D.D., [EIRENICON PART III]* (Oxford 1870), p.104.

9. William Goode, *The Nature of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist* (London 1856), p.30.

10. *Ibid.*, p.33.

11. *Ibid.*, p.29.

12. *Ibid.*, p.30.

13. *Ibid.*, p.31.

14. Harrison, *The Fathers Versus Dr Pusey...*, p.9.

15. *Ibid.*, p.10.

16. *Ibid.*, preface p.xix.

17. Goode, p.31.

18. *Ibid.*, preface vii.

19. *Ibid.*, p.30.

20. *Ibid.*, p.29.

21. *Ibid.*, p.36-40.

22. *Ibid.*, p.31.

23. *Ibid.*, p.59.

24. *Ibid.*, p.159.

25. *Ibid.*, p.50.

26. *Ibid.*, p.163.

27. *Ibid.*, p.164.

28. *Ibid., p.51.*

29. *Ibid., p.163.*

30. *Ibid.*, p.164.

31. *Ibid.*, preface vi.

32. *Ibid.*, preface vii.

33. *Ibid.*, p.177.

34. *Ibid.*, p.53.

35. *Ibid.*, p.184.

36. *Ibid.*, p.185.

37. *Ibid.*, p.335.

38. Harrison, *An Answer to Dr Pusey's Challenge*, p.298.

39. *Ibid.*, p.358.

40. Goode, p.3.

41. *Ibid.*, p.24.

42. *Ibid.*, p.261.

43. *Ibid.*, p.35.

44. *Ibid.*, p.43.

45. *Ibid.*, p.20.

46. *Ibid.*, p.622.

47. *Ibid.*, p.472.

48. *Ibid.*, p.261.

49. Goode, p.35.

50. E.B.Pusey, 'The Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist [1853]' *Nine Sermons preached before the University of Oxford* (Oxford 1855), p.22.

51. E.B.Pusey, *The Doctrine of the Real Presence, as Contained in the Fathers from the Death of St John the Evangelist to the Fourth General Council, vindicated, in Notes on a Sermon, 'The Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist'* (Oxford 1855), p.258.

52. B.W.Teigen, *The Lord's Supper in the Theology of Martin Chemnitz* (Brewster 1986), p.18.

53. M.Chemnitz, *The Lord's Supper*, translated by J.A.O.Preus, (St Louis 1979), p.26.

54. Pusey, *The Doctrine of the Real Presence...*, p. 61.

55. Philip Freeman, *The Principles of Divine Service*, second edition, 3 Vols (Oxford 1863), III, p.194.

56. Harrison, *An Answer to Dr Pusey's Challenge*, p.342.

57. Pusey, 'The Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist', p.23.

58. *Op cit.*, p.266.

59. *Ibid.*, p.288.

60. Pusey, 'The Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist', p.42.

61. Harrison, *An Answer to Dr Pusey's Challenge*, p.260.

62. Goode, p.6.

63. *Ibid.*, p.19.

64. *Ibid.*, p.15.

65. *Ibid.*, p.20.

66. *Ibid.*, p.20.

67. Pusey, *The Real Presence ... The Doctrine of the English Church etc.*, preface, p.xxviii.

68. Harrison, *The Fathers Versus Dr Pusey...*, p.14.

69. *Ibid.*, p.127.

70. Harrison, *An Answer to Dr Pusey's Challenge*, p.376.

71. Harrison, *The Fathers Versus Dr Pusey...*, p.15.

72. *Ibid.*, p.85.

73. Harrison, *An Answer to Dr Pusey's Challenge*, p.15.

74. *Ibid.*, p.13.

75. Harrison, *The Fathers versus Dr Pusey...*, p.48.

76. Goode, p.9.

77. *Ibid.*, p.10.

78. *Ibid.*, p.63.

79. *Ibid.*, p.32.

80. *Ibid.*, p.117.

81. *Ibid.*, p.30.

82. Pusey, 'The Presence of Christ', p.40.

83. Harrison, *An Answer to Dr Pusey's Challenge*, p.363. Tertullian, De Oratione, cap.vi.

84. *Ibid.*, p.367. Expositio in Evang. Johannis, Tract. xxvi, tom ix.

85. Harrison, *The Fathers Versus Dr Pusey...*, p.127.

86. Pusey, *The Real Presence ... The Doctrine of the English Church etc.*, preface, xxiii.
Facundas, Pro Defens 3. Capp. L. 9, c.5.

87. Harrison, *An Answer to Dr Pusey's Challenge*, p.371.

88. Harrison, *The Fathers Versus Dr Pusey...*, p.81.

89. *Op cit.*, p.625.

90. Goode, p.336.

91. *Ibid.*, p.610.

92. Pusey, *The Real Presence ... The Doctrine of the English Church etc.*, preface, xxvii.

93. Harrison, *An Answer to Dr Pusey's Challenge*, p.625.

94. *Ibid.*, p.137.

95. *Ibid.*, p.152.

96. *Ibid.*, p.160.

97. Goode, p.62. Tertullian, adv. Marc. iv. 40.

98. *Ibid.*, p.150.

99. Harrison, *An Answer to Dr Pusey's Challenge*, p.537.

100. *Ibid.*, p.332.

101. Goode, p.96.

102. *Ibid.*, p.116.

103. Harrison, *An Answer to Dr Pusey's Challenge*, p.459.

104. *Ibid.*, p.125.

105. *Ibid.*, p.55.

106. Goode, p.97.

107. *Ibid.*, p.99.

108. Harrison, *An Answer to Dr Pusey's Challenge*, p.51.

109. *Ibid.*, p.59. Contra Marcel. de Eccles. Theo., lib iii., cap. 12.

110. *Ibid.*, p.60.
Clement of Alexandria, Pedag. lib. i., cap. vi.

111. *Ibid.*, p.119.

112. E.B.Pusey, 'The Holy Eucharist - A Comfort to the Penitent' *Nine Sermons, Preached before the University of Oxford* (Oxford 1865), p.7.

113. *Ibid.*, p.8.

114. Harrison, *An Answer to Dr Pusey's Challenge*, p.158.

115. Goode, p.69.

116. Pusey, *The Doctrine of the Real Presence ...*, p.62.

117. *Ibid.*, p.185.

118. *Ibid.*, p.160.

119. Pusey, *The Doctrine of the Real Presence ...*, p.64.

120. Harrison, *An Answer to Dr Pusey's Challenge*, p.79.

121. *Ibid.*, p.57.

122. *Ibid.*, p.28.

123. Pusey, 'The Presence of Christ', p.29.

124. Harrison, *An Answer to Dr Pusey's Challenge*, p.25.

125. Harrison, *The Fathers Versus Dr Pusey ...*, p.27.

126. Pusey, 'The Holy Eucharist, a Comfort to the Penitent', p.22.

127. Harrison, *An Answer to Dr Pusey's Challenge*, p.506.

128. *Ibid.*, p.110. in Epist. i., ad Cor., hom. vii., tom ix.

129. Goode, p.84.

130. *Op cit.*, p.107.

131. H.P.Liddon, *The Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey*, 4 Vols (London 1893-98), III, p.448.

CHAPTER EIGHT

CONCLUSION

A MIXED PICTURE

Any assessment of the success achieved between the Confessional Lutherans and the Tractarians in reaching agreement or even a common eucharistic theology will discover mixed results. After all, they made no concerted effort to achieve consensus.

It has been observed that Pusey made considerable comment on Lutheran eucharistic theology. Yet it is a fact that no important *reciprocal* effort was made on the part of the Confessional Lutherans to comment on Tractarian eucharistic theology. The Confessional Lutherans and Tractarians lived in very different worlds simultaneously. They had little or no contact with one another and no dialogue took place between them. The measure of agreement they achieved was arrived at quite unintentionally, and that is what makes it so intriguing.

Several questions may be raised for which there may never be answers. What if the Confessional Lutherans and Tractarians had been able to hold a prolonged conference and worked together toward theological agreement? What if a third group of

Christians, equally detached from these two groups, were to approach the subject of the Holy Eucharist in an effort to repristinate orthodoxy? Would agreement be reached between them?

It seems likely that if issues involved in doctrines such as the means of grace and even the Eucharist are approached with similar presuppositions, the resultant sacramental theology will be similar. This is probably one of the reasons why the Lutherans and Tractarians arrived at eucharistic theologies which approximated one another as closely as they did. Also, just as presuppositions played a part in their doctrinal harmony, the places where the Lutheran and Tractarian repristinationists diverged were the places where their presuppositions clashed. Nevertheless, the list of issues upon which they were agreed, considering the normally divisive nature of these doctrines, is striking.

AGREEMENTS

The Confessional Lutherans and Tractarians above all agreed that the primary quality of the 'means of grace' is their objectivity. They are bestowed upon people in need and their spiritual work is accomplished by the power of God, not man. The focus of both

movements was upon God, rather than man. The mutually held presupposition involved here was monergism - the old orthodox view of the relationship between God and man in which man plays a passive part, and God is the main agent of spiritual change and renewal.

Both movements agreed on the effect of the consecration of the elements. They agreed that the words of institution are the words which Christ uses to bestow the gifts of his body and blood by means of bread and wine. Both agreed that Christ's body and blood do not replace the 'substances' of the elements, but that they remain bread and wine, even as they bear the body and blood of Christ. The presupposition that came into play in this case was that God had revealed His word in an infallible way with the power of His Holy Spirit working through it.

In expressing their doctrines of the Real Presence, both the Lutherans and the Tractarians settled on understandings of the subject that were remarkably free from the entanglements of medieval philosophy. In this respect they were both repristinating the mind of the early Church. The Tractarians sought catholicity in the same ways that the Lutherans did, and to a notable certain extent, they both acheived that objective.

In Lutheran thinking the body and blood of Christ were real in sacramental union with the material

elements.[1] Indeed, Luther scholar Hermann Sasse commented that so real was the interaction between Christ's body and blood in the eucharistic elements for Luther that he makes Aquinas seem semi-Calvinistic.[2] Sasse's disciple, T.G.A.Hardt believes that the Reformed understood this, and recoiled from Luther more than from Rome, for Lutheran doctrine was a 'sevenfold transubstantiation'.[3] As Pusey rightly noted, the concept or label of consubstantiation is not correct as a description of the Lutheran doctrine of the *unio sacramentalis*.

Both repristination movements agreed that the body and blood of Christ are eaten orally, and most importantly, that all, even unbelievers (although without benefit) eat and drink Christ's body and blood. Although, regrettably, the Tractarians were unable to fully appreciate the Confessional Lutheran view of the *manducatio oralis* because of the prominence of Receptionism in the writings of Johann Gerhard.

It is true that receptionistic Lutherans well known to Pusey such as Gerhard and those of the Philippist school did dominate the dogmatic literature of the seventeenth century. Yet an important aspect of the repristination efforts of the Confessional Lutherans of the nineteenth century was their insistence that even the most venerable works of the seventeeth century must be examined to ascertain their

faithfulness to pure Lutheran doctrine as formulated in the sixteenth century.[4]

Both the Lutherans and Tractarians believed that the benefits of Holy Communion to the faithful were manifold. Among these benefits of Holy Communion were the assurance of grace, the remission of sins, an *unio mystica* with Christ, and a possible benefit to the body as a 'medicine of immortality'. To arrive at this it was presupposed that reality is constituted by more than the physical senses can discern. It was presupposed that miracles do happen and that the spiritual dynamics such as sin and redemption of which the Bible speaks are real factors in the life and eternal destiny of human beings.

Most of these presuppositions unintentionally shared between two isolated Christian groups were doctrinal in character, a fact that is particularly noteworthy in view of the disillusionment which has historically accompanied the idea of doctrinal consensus in Anglicanism.

Probably the most astonishing document the Tractarians produced in terms of expressing agreement with the eucharistic theology of Confessional Lutheranism was the declaration of those who supported Archdeacon Denison against the decision at Bath in the summer of 1855. As far as it goes, it perfectly fulfils Lutheran doctrinal requirements with regard to

the Real Presence, the *manducatio oralis*, and the *manducatio impii*.

The disagreements between the Tractarians and the Lutheran repristinationists often were merely perceived disagreements which were the result of ignorance of one another's positions. An example would be Pusey's perception of the Lutheran attitude toward left-over consecrated elements. Regarding the allegation of his opponent, Dr Goode, that the Church of England makes no vital distinction between the benefits of sacramental and non-sacramental eating of Christ's body and blood, Pusey replied that Dr Goode's use of a rubric for 'The Communion of the Sick' was inconclusive.[5] Pusey was able to point to a different rubric regarding the disposal of the sacramental *reliquiae* to make a stronger argument in favour of the sacramental presence of Christ's body and blood within the elements remaining there until all is consumed. Goode had already recognised the theology of this ritual and proposed an appropriate revision of the Liturgy.[6] Pusey had revealed the vulnerability of Anglican Receptionism.[7]

Yet, revealing an ignorance of the sacramental practices of Confessional Lutheranism (including those of his day), Pusey misjudged that 'No such direction [for reverent disposal of the sacramental reliquiae] would be found in bodies, (such as the Lutherans also)

where there is no belief in any Presence after Communion'.[8] Pusey did not correctly describe Confessional Lutheranism when he judged that the Church of England 'has guarded her doctrine, in a way which Melanchthon and the later Lutherans emphatically repudiated'. Neither Melanchthon, in his later years, nor the 'later Lutherans' to which Pusey referred, were Confessional Lutherans in the same way the nineteenth century Lutheran Repristinationists were. It should be remembered that when Pusey spoke of 'later Lutherans' he most likely meant those in his own day who often taught and acted without anything like the concern for the Lutheran Confessions which the Lutheran repristinationists had.

With reference to the treatment of left-over eucharistic elements, the Confessional Lutherans' practice would have been at least as consistent as that practised by the Tractarians. Near the end of his life Martin Luther advocated that a Lutheran priest, called Besserer, who mixed left-over consecrated wafers with un-consecrated ones, should be defrocked and regarded as a Zwinglian. In Thuringia Besserer was imprisoned for his irreverence.[9] There can be no question but that for Luther it was a dogmatic demand that all consecrated elements in the Mass were to be consumed. Among the prominent Lutherans of that time who also insisted upon the reverent consumption of left-over

consecrated elements were Andreas Musculus, Martin Chemnitz, Nicolaus Selnecker (co-authors of the Formula of Concord), as well as Prince/Bishop Johannes Wigand, and Johann Agricola. Swedish Archbishop Laurentius Petri promoted eucharistic adoration, but he may have been ignorant of orthodox treatment of sacramental *reliquiae*.[10] The high regard maintained by the Confessional Lutherans in the nineteenth century for all the doctrines and practises of sixteenth century orthodox Lutheranism ensured a high regard for the Eucharist as well.[11]

Some dissimilar teachings were the result of different presuppostions, most acutely in the realm of sacramental Christology. They described differently the mode of presence of which Christ's resurrected body and blood are capable. Yet, although Pusey did not admit it, his expressions were occasionally quite close to those of the Lutherans, as when he wrote: 'This follows from the Incarnation ... Where God's Almighty Word causes His Body to be, in whatever mode of being, *there* His Godhead is, because It is inseparable; *there* is Christ Himself, our Redeeming Lord, the Object of our thankfulness, and reverence, and love, and Adoration'.[12]

The Confessional Lutherans even shared the same reverence and adoration for the Eucharist as did the Tractarians, although they may have expressed it

differently. In this they followed Luther who taught that 'In the venerable Sacrament of the Altar, which one is to worship with all honour, the natural body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ is veritably given and received, both by the worthy and the unworthy'.[13]

For T.G.A.Hardt, 'that Luther himself practised, taught and defended the adoration of the Sacrament is a fact that is almost unanimously confirmed by research scholars; albeit the fact is often regretted'. There was no question in Luther's lifetime that he adored Christ in the sacrament. Two of Luther's partners in such devotion, the Princes of Anhalt testified, 'We have seen Luther throw himself on the floor with earnest and with reverence and worship Christ when the Sacrament was elevated'.[14] Hermann Sasse judged that 'perhaps no Catholic ever had such reverence for the miracle of the Real Presence as Luther did. No one could think more highly of the consecration, no one could treat the consecrated elements more reverently'.[15] Furthermore, the authors of the *Formula of Concord* held that same position, one of them writing his doctoral dissertaion in support of the practice. The full extent of the orthodox Lutheran practice of eucharistic adoration stands as in important point of agreement between Lutheran and Anglican Repristinationists although that adoration might be expressed in different ways.

The disagreement which might have been anticipated between Anglicans and Lutherans over words such as 'spiritual eating' and present 'only after an heavenly manner' proved not to be as dramatic as might have been expected. This was because the Tractarians interpreted words such as 'spiritual' and 'supernatural' to describe the body and blood of Christ after His resurrection, drawing attention to new qualities then assumed by his human body. Christ's very body and blood, in Pusey's words, could be really, objectively and substantially present even though physically indiscernible because of the divine and supernatural qualities they now had.

The other disagreement which might have been anticipated over the subject of justification and the role of faith in the sacrament did show more of a gap between Lutherans and Tractarians. Pusey's early remarks concerning justification and works, however, had the closest resemblance to Lutheran teachings of all the Tractarians.

REPRISTINATION, ROMANTICISM AND TRUTH

One of the underlying goals of repristination was the attainment of absolute truth, unclouded by the impurities of thought and philosophy which had lately

arisen on the Christian scene. In the case of the Confessional Lutherans that ideal time was the late sixteenth century when Luther's pure doctrine was clear and mature. In the case of the Tractarians the ideal time was that of the undivided catholic church, when ecumenical cooperation in doctrine and practice was at its height.

A strong element of Romanticism has been attributed to the Repristination efforts of the nineteenth century. Romanticism most profoundly exercised its influence on the educated classes of Europe in the century between 1730 and 1830. Pusey's recent biographer asserts that four out of six characteristics of Romanticism listed by Professor Lovejoy applied to Pusey:

i A craving for infinite values or infinite objects for thought or for the imagination to contemplate or for the will to aim at.
ii A love of mystery and otherworldliness.
iii An awareness of the duality of man's constitution.
iv A preoccupation with the inner life and a sense of man's corruption.[16]

Several of those points would describe not only Pusey and the Oxford Movement, but the Confessional Lutheran Movement as well. It could be argued that any fascination with truth in an imperfect world is a romantic one. By such an argument the Lutheran repristinationists could accurately be called romantics. Both their passionate and dogmatic writings

and their dramatic action of leaving Europe for an ideal new land were symptomatic of a kind of Romanticism that sought after infinite values, regardless of the temporal or finite setting or physical consequences. They did more than crave for their goal. They acted upon their aims with great effect.

Romanticism explains some of the sacramental theology of the Tractarians. Forrester quoted from a sermon by Pusey in which he adored the mystery of 'the Infinite enshrined in the finite', a concept which portrays the Eucharist as well as the Incarnation.[17] Reformation-era Lutherans had repudiated the Reformed formula which denied that the finite was capable of the infinite [*finitum non est capax infiniti*] in connection with the Real Presence. The nineteenth century Lutheran repristinationists fully confessed the Real Presence, restoring all the mystery and wonder of Luther's own teachings on the subject. The same reverent Romanticism of the Real Presence was characteristic of the Tractarians.

Compared side by side, perhaps the most fundamental similarity between the two repristination movements in question was the way in which they attempted to attain their respective, yet common, aims. Lutheranism, as it hearkened back to the time of Luther and the Lutheran Confessions did so in a way that could

not accurately be described as traditionalistic. The Lutheran position with regard to the authority of tradition ruled out traditionalism as such. For the Confessional Lutherans, the Bible and sacred tradition were not on the same level of authority.

Tradition has no metaphysical dimension. Tradition is anthropological. The repristinationist elevated the authority of biblical revelation to that of a powerful, mysterious spiritual force. This explains why the priority and supremacy of the authority of biblical revelation over tradition, however ancient and venerable, was institutionalised by the Lutheran repristinationists. They insisted that the word of God had more than traditional value. The Bible, like the words of eucharistic consecration contained within it, had metaphysical qualities and effects. This attitude on their part also helps explain the survival of the Lutheran doctrine of the Real Presence among them.

The Tractarian position held sacred tradition to be virtually on the same level with the authority of the Bible. In some cases tradition interpreted biblical revelation. From the experience of Lutheranism, the Tractarian position made the doctrine of the Real Presence unnecessarily vulnerable. This was because of the uses to which patristic writings, so crucial to traditionalism, might be put.

Patristic quotations were brought to bear with considerable effect during the Reformation era in undermining the doctrine of the Real Presence. Long lists of patristic quotations in the hands of the Reformed helped make crypto-Calvinists of Melanchthon's followers and possibly Melanchthon himself. The opponents of Tractarianism also used patristic quotations to undermine the Real Presence. Yet the Tractarians, like the Lutheran repristinationists held the word of God to have more than merely traditional authority. They believed in its metaphysical power. The Lutherans added to that a belief in a plenary inspiration and inerrancy of the Bible which the Tractarians did not unanimously share.

Keble's biographer noted that for that Tractarian 'truth was a master to be served, not to be criticized and patronized; it was like the ark which he dreaded to touch with unconsecrated hands'.[18] Tractarianism in the hands of Pusey was not as vulnerable as it could have been because he borrowed a Lutheran technique for buttressing his teaching of the Real Presence. Pusey, like Luther, did try to prove that the Reformed misunderstood patristic texts. Most importantly, he asserted that the doctrine of the Real Presence was informed primarily by biblical texts. As a doctor of Holy Scripture, Pusey brought to Tractarianism its greatest resemblance to Confessional Lutheranism.

The combination of faith in the trustworthiness and power of the Bible and respect for the historic doctrines of the catholic church seems to have been the source of the great measure of agreement which the Tractarians seem to have unintentionally enjoyed with their Lutheran counterparts. Whether or not the formula they used would be successful today in creating widespread agreement over such a volatile subject as the Lord's Supper is hypothetical. Such conjecture could only become feasible if the ingredients were nearly the same as they were in the mid-nineteenth century.

One does not have to look too far before finding church groups which long for past glories. If such longing can go beyond nostalgia and grasp something concrete, as the Confessional Lutherans were able to do when they rediscovered their *Book of Concord* of 1580, then re-establishing a lost foundation is a real possibility. Movements in the Church of England to reassert the normative authority of the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* show a similar interest. Yet, however it is sought, Church unity seems likely to be most successful where Christians gather in faith and obedience around 'the quick and powerful' inscripturated revelation of the word of God.

Notes to Chapter Eight

1. T.G.A.Hardt, *On the Sacrament of the Altar* (Ft Wayne 1982), p.39.

2. *Ibid.*, p.19.

3. *Ibid.*, p.42.

4. T.G.A.Hardt, (lecture) *On the Babylonian Captivity of the Sacrament of the Altar* (Stockholm 1972), p.2.

5. E.B.Pusey, *The Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ - The Doctrine of the English Church with a Vindication of the Reception by the Wicked and of the Adoration of our Lord Jesus Christ Truly Present* (Oxford 1857), p.227.

6. *Ibid.*, p.229.

7. *Ibid.*, p.231.

8. *Ibid.*, p.231.

9. Edward F. Peters, 'The Blight of Receptionism', *The Bride of Christ*, 3, no.2 (Lent-Easter 1981), pp.15-26 (p.20).

10. Hardt, *On the Babylonian Captivity ...*, p.7.

11. *Ibid.*, p.8.

12. Pusey, *The Real Presence ... The Doctrine of the English Church etc.*, p.330.

13. *Luther's Works - American Edition*, translated by Lewis W. Spitz, Sr., second printing, 55 Vols (Philadelphia 1976), XXXIV, p.355.

14. Hardt, *On the Sacrament of the Altar*, p.68.

15. Hermann Sasse, *This is My Body* (Adelaide 1970), p.176.

16. David Forrester, *Young Dr Pusey* (London 1989), p.100.

17. *Ibid.*, p.98.

18. *Ibid.*, p.77.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

Bente, F. ed.,*Concordia Triglotta* (St Louis 1921)

Brilioth, Ingve, *The Anglican Revival, Studies in the Oxford Movement* (London 1925)
Eucharistic Faith & Practice Evangelical & Catholic (New York 1934)

Brinsmead, Robert D.,'Justification by Faith and John Henry Newman', *Verdict* 2 (1979) 5-20

Butler, Perry, ed., *Pusey Rediscovered* (London 1983)

Chadwick, Owen, *The Mind of the Oxford Movement* (London 1963)

Chemnitz, Martin, *The Lord's Supper*, trans. by J.A.O.Preus (St Louis 1979).
The Two Natures of Christ, trans. by J.A.O.Preus (St Louis 1971)

Church, R.W., *The Oxford Movement*, third edition (London 1904)

Coombs, Joyce, *George Anthony Denison: The Firebrand* (London 1984)

Cross, F.L., ed.,*The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (Oxford 1978)

Denison, G.A., *Saravia on the Holy Eucharist* (London 1855)
Defence of the Archdeacon of Taunton (July 1856)

Donaldson, A.B., *Five Great Oxford Leaders* (London 1900)

Drummond, A.L., *German Protestantism Since Luther* (London 1951)

Fagerberg, Holsten, *A New Look at the Book of Concord* (St Louis 1972)

Fairweather, Eugene R., 'The Oxford Movement' *the Library of Protestant Thought* (New York 1964)

Forrester, David, *Young Doctor Pusey*, (London 1989)

Forster, Walter O., *Zion on the Mississippi* (St Louis 1953)

Freeman, Philip, *Principles of the Divine Service*,

second edition, 3 Vols (Oxford 1863)

Froude, Richard Hurrell, *Remains*, 2 Parts (London 1839)

Fry, C.George, *A History of Lutheranism in America, 1619 - 1930* (Ft Wayne 1979)

Goode, William, *The Nature of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist* (London 1856)

Grant, Robert M., *A Short History of the Interpretation of the Bible*, second edition (London 1965)

Green, Lowell, 'Article VII, The Holy Supper', *A Contemporary Look at the Formula of Concord*, (St Louis 1978)

Hardelin, Alf, *The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist* (Uppsala 1965)

Harrison, John, *An Answer to Dr Pusey's Challenge Respecting the Doctrine of the Real Presence* (London 1871)
The Fathers Versus Dr Pusey: An Exposure of the Unfair Treatment of their Evidence on the Doctrine of the Real Presnece (London 1873)

Hardt, T.G.A., (lecture) *On the Babylonian Captivity of the Sacrament of the Altar* (Stockholm 1972)
On the Sacrament of the Altar (Ft Wayne 1982)

Heintzen Erich H., *Prairie School of the Prophets* (St Louis 1989)

Johnston, J.O., and W.C.E.Newbolt, ed., *Spiritual Letters of E.B.Pusey* (London 1898)

Keble, John, *Eucharistic Adoration* (Hursley 1859)
The Doctrine of the Incarnation of Our Lord Jesus Christ, in its Relation to Mankind and to the Church (London 1848)

Koehler, Alfred W.A., *A Summary of Christian Doctrine* (St Louis 1971)

Liddon, Henry Parry, *Life Of Edward Bouverie Pusey* (London 1894)

Lueker, E.L., ed., *Lutheran Cyclopedia* (St Louis 1954)

Luther, Martin, 'The Adoration of the Sacrament' (1523), in *Luther's Works* - American Edition,

trans. Abdel Ross Wentz, 55 Vols, fifth printing, 36 (Philadelphia 1980)
'The Abomination of the Secret Mass' (1525) in *Luther's Works - American Edition*, trans. by Abdel Ross Wentz, 55 vols, fifth printing, 36 (Philadelphia 1980)
'This Is My Body - Against the Fanatics' (1527) in *Luther's Works - American Edition*, trans. by R.H.Fischer, 55 Vols, fourth printing, 37 (Philadelphia 1983)
'Confession Concerning Christ's Supper', (1528), in *Luther's Works - American Edition*, trans. by R.H.Fischer, 55 Vols, fourth printing, 37 (Philadelphia 1983)
'Against the Thirty-Two Articles of the Louvain Theologians', (1545), in *Luther's Works - American Edition*, trans. by Lewis W.Spitz Sr., 55 Vols. Second Printing, 34 (Philadelphia 1976)

Mackean, W.H., *The Eucharistic Doctrine of the Oxford Movement, A Critical Survey* (London 1967)

Marzolf, Dennis, 'C.F.W. Walther: The Musician and Liturgiologist', in *C.F.W. Walther: The American Luther*, edited by Arthur Drevlow (Mankato 1987)

Newman, J.H., *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*, sixth edition (Oxford 1892)
A Letter to the Reverend Godfrey Faussett...on Certain Points of Faith and Practice (Oxford 1838)
Parochial and Plain Sermons, new edition, 8 Vols (London 1868)
'Advertisement to Volume Two', *Tracts for the Times*, 5 Vols (London 1836)

O'Connell, M.R., *The Oxford Conspirators* (London 1969)

Peters, Edward F., 'The Blight of Receptionism', *The Bride of Christ*, 3, no.2 (Lent-Easter 1981), 15-26

Pieper, F., *Christian Dogmatics*, 4 Vols, fourth edition (St Louis 1950)

Preus, R., *The Theology of Post-Reformation Lutheranism* 2 Vols (St Louis 1972)

Pusey, E.B., 'Is Healthful Reunion Impossible?' - *A Second Letter to the Very Rev. H. Newman, D.D. [EIRENICON PART III]* (Oxford 1870)
Letter to the Right Reverend Father in God, Richard Lord Bishop of Oxford, on the Tendency to Romanism Imputed to Doctrines Held of Old, as Now, in the English Church (Oxford 1839)
'The Rule of Faith, as Maintained by the Fathers,

and the Church of England', A Sermon, Preached before the University, in the Cathedral Church of Christ, in Oxford, on the Fifth Sunday after Epiphany *(Oxford 1851)*
'The Holy Eucharist, a Comfort to the Penitent' [1843] *Nine Sermons preached before the University of Oxford* (Oxford 1855)
'The Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist' [1853] *Nine Sermons preached before the University of Oxford* (Oxford 1855)
The Doctrine of the Real Presence, as Contained in the Fathers from the Death of St John the Evangelist to the Fourth General Council, Vindicated, in Notes on a Sermon, 'The Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist' (Oxford 1855)
The Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ - The Doctrine of the English Church with a Vindication of the Reception by the Wicked and of the Adoration of Our Lord Jesus Christ Truly Present (Oxford 1857)
'The Church of England a Portion of Christ's One Holy Catholic Church, and a Means of Restoring Visible Unity'. *An Eirenicon, in a Letter to the Author of 'the Christian Year'* (London 1865)
'Tract 67: Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism', *Tracts for the Times*, 5 Vols (London 1840)
'Tract 81: Catena Patrum. No.IV. Testimony of Writers of the Later English Church to the Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, with an Historical Account of the Changes Made in the Liturgy as to the Expression of that Doctrine' *Tracts for the Times*, 5 Vols (London 1839)

Russell George W.E., *Leaders of the Church 1800-1900 - Dr Pusey* (London 1907)

Rose, H.J., *The State of Protestantism in Germany* (Cambridge 1829)

Sasse, Hermann, *Consecration and the Real Presence* (Adelaide 1957)
This Is My Body (Adelaide 1977)

Schmid, Heinrich, *The Doctrine of the Evangelical Lutheran Church* third edition (Minneapolis 1961)

Spitz, Lewis W., *The Life of C.F.W.Walther* (St Louis 1961)

Stone, Darwell, *A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist* (London 1909)

Stephenson, J.R., 'Authority in English Theology from the Oxford Movement to the Present', *Concordia*

Theological Quarterly, 48 (1984), 265-277
'The Ex Opere Operato Principle in the Lutheran Confessions' *The Confessional Lutheran Research Society Newsletter* 8 (1987)

Tappert, T.E., ed., *The Book of Concord* (Philadelphia 1959)

Suelflow, August, ed., *The Selected Writings of C.F.W.Walther - Convention Essays* (St Louis 1981)

Teigen, B.W., *The Lord's Supper in the Theology of Martin Chemnitz* (Brewster 1986)

Webb, C.C.J., *Religious Thought in the Oxford Movement* (London 1928)

Wilberforce, R.I., *The Doctrine of The Holy Eucharist* (London 1854)
'Eucharistical Offices', *Sermons Occasional and Parochial* (Oxford 1847)

Williams, Isaac, 'Tract 87: On Reserve in Communicating Religious Knowledge', *Tracts for the Times*, 5 Vols (London 1840)

Windle,B.C.A., *Who's Who of the Oxford Movement* (New York 1926)