

***‘It is Bread and it is Christ’s Body Too’:
Presence and Sacrifice in the Eucharistic
Theology of Jeremy Taylor***

Paul Andrew Barlow PhD, MA, BSc, PGCE

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
Dublin City University

Supervisor: Dr Joseph Rivera

School of Theology, Philosophy and Music

July 2019

I hereby certify that this material, which I now submit for assessment on the programme of study leading to the award of Doctor of Philosophy is entirely my own work, and that I have exercised reasonable care to ensure that the work is original, and does not to the best of my knowledge breach any law of copyright, and has not been taken from the work of others save and to the extent that such work has been cited and acknowledged within the text of my work.

Signed:

ID No.:15212014

Date: 15th July 2019

And yet if men would but do reason, there were in all religion no article which might more easily excuse us from meddling with questions about it than this of the holy sacrament. For as the man in Phaedrus that being asked what he carried hidden under his cloak, answered, it was hidden under his cloak; meaning that he would not have hidden it but that he intended it should be secret; so we may say in this mystery to them that curiously ask what or how it is, *mysterium est*, ‘it is a sacrament and a mystery;’ by sensible instruments it consigns spiritual graces, by the creatures it brings us to God, by the body it ministers to the Spirit.

Jeremy Taylor, *The Real Presence and Spiritual of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament*. (Taylor, VI, p. 11)

Acknowledgements

There are number of people to whom I must extend my thanks, for without their help, encouragement and support this thesis would not have been written: my wife, Caroline, whose support made it possible for me to undertake this study and bring it to completion; my supervisor, Dr. Joseph Rivera, whose encouragement and enthusiasm, along with his expertise and sense of humour, have been crucial in helping me see this project through; Dr. Ethna Regan, who welcomed me as an MA student and encouraged me to pursue doctoral studies; Dr. Susan Hood, who kindly arranged me to have access to the thesis by Fr. Thomas Carroll; the Trustees and community of the Church of St. John the Evangelist, Sandymount, who have graciously allowed their priest the space for academic study; and, finally, the librarians, who have helped me find the books which were sitting on shelves in front of my nose.

Contents

Acknowledgements	vii
Abstract	xiii
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
1.1 Early Studies of Taylor’s Theology	3
1.2 The 1970s: Thomas Carroll and Harry Boone Porter	9
1.3 H.R. McAdoo’s The Eucharistic Theology of Jeremy Taylor Today	15
1.4 Three Authors and their Interrelated Studies	19
1.5 New Voices	22
1.6 Drawing the Threads Together: Competing Descriptions of Taylor’s Theology	24
1.7 The Structure of the Thesis	25
Chapter 2: Eucharistic Presence Following the Reformation	27
2.1 Being and Identity, Ontology and Substance	27
2.2 Lutherans and the Eucharist	29
2.3 The Zürich Reformer Ulrich Zwingli	32
2.4 Jean Calvin	37
2.5 Bullinger – A Middle Way between Zwingli and Calvin	41
2.6 Thomas Cranmer and the English Prayer Books	42
2.7 Richard Hooker and the Beginnings of Anglicanism	48
2.8 Lancelot Andrewes, Bishop of Winchester	50
2.9 The Anglican Position	53
Chapter 3: Taylor’s Arguments against Transubstantiation and his Support for ‘Spiritual Presence’	55
3.1 The State of the Question	56
3.2 Transubstantiation not Warrantable by Scripture	63
3.3 Of the Sixth Chapter of S. John’s Gospel	64
3.4 Of the Words of Institution	74
3.5 Hoc, ‘This’	77
3.6 Est Corpus Meum	81
3.7 Considerations of the Manner and Circumstances of the Institution	83
3.8 Arguments from Other Scriptures, Proving Christ’s Real Presence in the Sacrament to be Only Spiritual and not Natural.	87
3.9 The Story So Far	90
Chapter 4: Transubstantiation and Taylor’s Thought	93
4.1 Thomas Aquinas’ Exposition of Transubstantiation	99

4.2 Aquinas' Hymns for Corpus Christi	106
4.3 Transubstantiation in the Decrees of the Council of Trent	107
4.4 The Doctrine of Transubstantiation is Against Sense.....	109
4.5 The Doctrine of Transubstantiation is Wholly Without and Against Reason	114
4.6 Transubstantiation: Both a Shibboleth and a Straw Man	121
4.7 Taylor's Ressourcement: Looking to the Fathers	123
4.8 Transubstantiation Defeated, Spiritual Presence Vindicated.....	126
Chapter 5: Taylor on the Eucharist: Sacrifice, Presence and Benefits.	129
5.1 How Does the Eucharist Connect with the Sacrifice of Jesus on the Cross?	129
5.2 How is Christ Present in the Sacrament?.....	138
5.3 The Benefits of Receiving Holy Communion	146
5.4 Conditional Grace? Who May Receive the Holy Sacrament?.....	150
5.5 What are Taylor's Main Themes?	152
Chapter 6: Fathers and Philosophers: Sources and Influences on Jeremy Taylor	157
6.1 Reason and Mystery: The Platonic Strands in Taylor's Thought.....	157
6.2 Taylor and Patristic Sources: What Taylor Understood as the Proper Way of Using the Fathers	161
6.3 John Chrysostom, Bishop of Constantinople	163
6.4 Origen c. 185 – c. 254: Alexandrian Biblical Critic, Exegete, Theologian and Spiritual Writer.....	167
6.5 Tertullian (c. 160 – c. 255) African Church Father	170
6.6 St. Augustine or Austin (354 – 430) Bishop of Hippo	173
6.7 S. Ambrose (c. 339 – 97) Bishop of Milan.....	178
6.8 Platonic Theology Redivivus.....	179
Chapter 7: A Contemporary Vision of Real Presence Rooted in Taylor's Theology.....	181
7.1 Thomas Cranmer	183
7.2 Transelementation: A Description of Eucharistic Change Drawn from Eastern Theology.....	185
7.3 Convaluation: a Description of Eucharistic Presence Based in Value Philosophy	191
7.4 Convaluation: William Temple and Value Philosophy	194
7.5 How Does this Fit with Taylor's Description of Eucharistic Presence?.....	197
7.6 Efficacious Signs: E.L. Mascall and Sacramental Signification	198
7.7 Transignification: The Work of Edward Schillebeeckx	200
7.8 Critique of Schillebeeckx: Matthew Levering.....	204
7.9 Transelementation, Convaluation, Transignification	207
7.10 Can Convaluation and Transignification Help Us to Characterise Taylor?	209
7.11 And What About Transubstantiation?	211
7.12 Signs that Convey Reality	212

7.13 Taylor: From Augustine to Schillebeeckx	214
Chapter 8: Conclusions	215
8.1 Presence: Real and Spiritual.....	216
8.2 Presence and Sacrifice.....	217
8.3 Reimagining Spiritual Presence	217
8.4 Transubstantiation Itself Reimagined	218
8.5 Jeremy Taylor, Priest and Bishop of the English Church	219
8.6 Taylor's Thought and the Contemporary Anglican Eucharist	223
8.7 Jeremy Taylor, Priest of the Eucharist	224
Bibliography	227

Abstract

P.A. Barlow 'It is Bread and it is Christ's Body Too': Presence and Sacrifice in the Eucharistic Theology of Jeremy Taylor

This thesis examines the eucharistic theology of Bishop Jeremy Taylor (1613 – 1667), Bishop of Down and Connor. The introductory material surveys material written on Taylor over the 20th Century and the second chapter then lays out the development of eucharistic doctrine following the Reformation with a focus on the Church of England in order to locate Taylor's thought. Two chapters offer an analysis and exegesis of Taylor's important work *The Real Presence and Spiritual of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament Proved Against the Doctrine of Transubstantiation*, including an assessment of his understanding of transubstantiation. These are followed by a further chapter investigating Taylor's writing on the eucharist in other devotional and apologetic works. Together this provides an assessment of Taylor's understanding of eucharistic presence, an evaluation of his term 'spiritual presence' and additionally an exposition of his theology of eucharistic sacrifice. The analysis of Taylor's writing concludes with a chapter exploring his use of patristic material and the influence of Platonism on his theology. Locating Taylor's theology in the Augustinian framework of sacraments as signs Taylor's description of eucharistic presence is then characterised using concepts from the 20th Century: transelementation, convaluation and transelementation. The thesis shows how these concepts can help to express Taylor's thought by supplying new metaphysical lenses which were unavailable to him, freeing his ideas from the Aristotelian concepts of substance and accidents which dominated the Reformation era discussion of eucharistic presence. Taylor's motif of spiritual presence is then reimagined using these descriptions of eucharistic presence to give a contemporary account of the eucharist.

Chapter 1: Introduction

This thesis examines the works of Jeremy Taylor (1613 – 67), in particular his writing about the eucharist. Taylor's life is described in detail in the biography by Charles Stranks,¹ usually considered to be the most complete, and summarised in the introductions to selected extracts of his works by Thomas Carroll,² and Kenneth Stevenson.³ Taylor was born in Cambridge and was educated at the Perse Grammar School and Gonville and Caius College in that city. After graduation and ordination, he remained at Gonville and Caius as a fellow; he subsequently came to the notice of Bishop William Laud who procured a fellowship for him at All Souls' in Oxford. He left Oxford for parochial ministry at Uppingham and was married.

Following the outbreak of the English Civil War he became a royal chaplain, in 1642 he wrote his first major treatise, *Episcopacy Asserted*, on the importance and necessity of episcopal government for the Church. The ascendancy of Parliament over the King led to Taylor being ejected from his parish, thus losing both his home and his livelihood; he subsequently lived in Wales at Golden Grove where he ran a school at Newton Hall and was chaplain to Lord Carbery. It was here that he wrote a number of major works including the best known, *The Rule and Exercises of Holy Living*. It became impossible for him to remain in Lord Carbery's service and after a time when he seems to have been ministering to clandestine congregations in London, he was appointed chaplain to Lord Conway, who had lands in the north of Ireland. At the Restoration of the monarchy in 1660, Taylor was appointed Bishop of Down and Connor and Vice Chancellor of the University of Dublin. Taylor was chosen to preach at his own consecration service⁴ in St. Patrick's Cathedral in 1661.⁵ His

¹ C.J. Stranks, *The Life and Writings of Jeremy Taylor* (London: SPCK, 1952).

² *Jeremy Taylor: Selected Works*, Edited and Introduced by T.K. Carroll (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist, 1990), pp. 15–85.

³ *A Following Holy Life: Jeremy Taylor and His Writings*, Edited and Introduced by K. Stevenson (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2011), pp. 1–31.

⁴ This sermon can be found at: Jeremy Taylor, *The Whole Works of The Right Rev. Jeremy Taylor, D.D., Lord Bishop of Down Connor, and Dromore: with a Life of the Author and a Critical Examination of his Writings by The Right Rev. Reginald Heber, D.D.*, revised and corrected by Charles Page Eden, M.A. 10 Vols., (London: Longman, Brown Green, and Longmans, 1850), VIII, pp. 309–330.

⁵ Taylor lived at a time of upheaval in England. In 1630 the King (Charles I) had embarked on programme of political and religious reform, including imposing on the Scottish Church a version of the Prayer Book with

literary output was large; the collected edition amounts to ten volumes. It includes collections of sermons, moral theology, devotional works and polemical works. Our aim will be to interrogate Taylor's view of eucharistic presence: he was a staunch opponent of the doctrine of transubstantiation but that does not mean he denied the presence of Christ in the eucharist. We will also investigate Taylor's understanding of eucharistic sacrifice, another controversial topic during the Reformation.

This opening chapter considers the literature on Taylor's eucharistic theology from the nineteenth century to the present, beginning with E.B. Pusey's historical catena of quotations on the real presence in the sacrament of the eucharist. Our focus is on our commentators' investigation of Taylor's view on eucharistic presence and on eucharistic sacrifice. We will find that there is little recent academic study of Taylor, although some full-length works have been written on his eucharistic theology. In much of the literature will discover the constant refrain that Taylor's theology is difficult to characterise or accurately define, despite his clear reverence for the eucharist.

more 'Catholic' features. This began a chain of events which resulted in Parliament imposing a 'drastic settlement of their religious and political grievances against their King'. Parliament seemed intent on dismantling the Church of England and episcopacy. In turn many people wished to defend the Church. Following a rebellion in Ireland in 1641 there was a need to act, yet Parliament were hesitant to trust the King with an army to invade Ireland. The mounting tensions between the King and Parliament led to civil war, which broke out in 1642. The King was identified with support for the Church of England and Parliament with those favouring reform, split between those who favoured Presbyterianism along the Scottish system and Independents who looked for a looser system of Church polity. Parliament set up a synod in 1643 to reform the Church of England and, because of the strength of Presbyterians in Parliament, produced a confession of faith which was Calvinist and Presbyterian in form. The polity and Prayer Book of the Church of England was suppressed. Taylor's friend John Evelyn vividly describes the scene on Christmas Day 1657 when soldiers surrounded and entered the chapel where 'Mr. Gunning was preaching and celebrating the sacrament': 'As we went up to receive the Sacrament the miscreants held their muskets against us as if they would have shot us at the altar, but yet suffering us to finish the office of Communion, as perhaps not having instructions what to do in case they found us in that action.' (John Evelyn, *Diary*, 25 December 1657, quoted in Reginald Askew, *Muskets and Altars: Jeremy Taylor and the Last of the Anglicans*, (London: Mowbray, 1997), p. vii.) An outcome of the Civil War was the arrest, trial and execution of the King. Following the King's death, the country became a republic, 'The Commonwealth' effectively ruled by Oliver Cromwell, a 'brilliant and ruthless soldier', who had a 'deeply held and intense Protestant faith'. Cromwell was unable to devise a satisfactory form of government for the whole of Britain and Ireland, as the power of the army was required to subdue Ireland and overawe the Scots. The army had political and religious agendas of its own, and during this time religious diversity flourished. (See: Christopher Hill, *A World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the English Revolution*, (London: Penguin, 1991) for a description of the variety of the groups which flourished.) Following Cromwell's death in 1658 it became clear that there was no one of sufficient stature to replace him and in 1660 there was a successful move to restore the monarchy, inviting Charles, the son of Charles I to take the throne. See: Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Reformation: Europe's House Divided 1490 – 1700*, (London: Allen Lane, 2003), pp. 520–525.

1.1 Early Studies of Taylor's Theology

In 1885 Edward Pusey drew up a catena of quotations with the aim of compiling 'a succinct statement of the opinions of the principal divines [...] who, since the Reformation have vindicated the doctrine of a real presence in the Holy Sacrament.'⁶ Amongst 180 pages of quotations he includes 16 pages of extracts from Taylor's works.⁷ These extracts are from works we will consider in detail. Pusey includes very little commentary; he pleads 'very limited time';⁸ there are just a few marginal notes which point out certain features in the text. His quotations are taken from the collected edition of Taylor's works edited by Charles Page Eden, this was then quite recently published and provided a complete critical edition of Taylor's writings. We will refer to this edition in our work as there has not been a later edition.

Darwell Stone's *A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*⁹ includes a short section on Taylor as one of four representative authors from the Restoration period (the others were Cosin, Thorndyke and Bramhall). Stone refers to a selection of Taylor's writings which give 'indications of his belief about the Eucharist'.¹⁰ He includes lengthy quotations and precedes a quotation from *The Worthy Communicant* by commenting that this includes teaching which closely resembles that of Clement of Alexandria and Origen, 'by which the Eucharistic flesh and blood of Christ are identified with His word and Spirit.'¹¹ Stone comments that in both *Real Presence and Spiritual* and *Dissuasive from Popery* 'it is maintained at length that our Lord's words at the institution of the Sacrament were figurative, and that He is present in effect to the souls of faithful communicants.'¹² His summary is

⁶ *The Doctrine of the Real Presence as set forth in the Works of divines and others of the English Church since the Reformation*, Edited by E. B. Pusey (Oxford: Henry Parker, 1855).

⁷ Pusey, pp. 81–97.

⁸ Pusey, p. iii.

⁹ Darwell Stone, *A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, 2 vols (London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1909).

¹⁰ Stone, II, p. 328.

¹¹ Stone, II, p. 331.

¹² Stone, II, p. 332.

that Taylor held ‘some such receptionist¹³ doctrine as that of Calvin, or virtualist¹⁴ doctrine as that of Cranmer.’¹⁵ Stone suggests that Taylor’s understanding of eucharistic sacrifice is fuller than might have been thought from his understanding of eucharistic presence. He highlights Taylor’s connection between the eucharist and pleading Christ’s sacrifice in heaven, a patristic and later Greek theme which had been to a ‘large extent obscured in the schoolmen and in the later Western theology.’¹⁶ Stone concludes his consideration of Taylor with some extracts from his writing on eucharistic sacrifice.

In his study of eucharistic doctrine in England in the Seventeenth Century, Clifford Dugmore¹⁷ describes Taylor as having High Church views in his early life and becoming a ‘representative Central Churchman of Restoration times.’¹⁸ Dugmore sees the High Churchmen as living with doctrinal compromise, asserting unequivocally Christ’s real presence in the eucharist, yet rejecting transubstantiation;¹⁹ they exhibited deep piety and reverence, but they were unable to give a thorough account of the relationship between presence and sacramental eating.²⁰ Dugmore dismisses the arguments of High Churchmen as ‘intellectual bankruptcy’²¹ since they could not give a clear account of why they believed it proper to revere the consecrated elements, and yet argue that they are revering not the elements but Christ. He gives as examples of this group some leading churchmen such as Archbishop Laud and Bishop Lancelot Andrewes. He argues that Taylor began

¹³ ‘Receptionism’: A form of Eucharistic teaching according to which, while the bread and wine continue to exist unchanged after consecration, the faithful communicant receives together with them the true Body and Blood of Christ. Such a doctrine was common among Anglican divines in the seventeenth century. Those who lean to such teaching have generally shrunk from giving it precise definition. The word itself is apparently not found before 1867. in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* Edited by F.L. Cross and E.A. Livingstone (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983) p. 1163.

¹⁴ ‘Virtualism’: A form of Eucharistic doctrine according to which, while the bread and wine continue to exist unchanged after consecration, the faithful communicant receives the virtue or power of the Body and Blood of Christ. *The dictionary definition continues*: Its classical exponent was J. Calvin. in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, p. 1445.

¹⁵ Stone, II, p. 334.

¹⁶ Stone, II, p. 334.

¹⁷ C.W. Dugmore, *Eucharistic Doctrine in England from Hooker to Waterland: Being the Norrisian Prize Essay in the University of Cambridge for the Year 1940* (London: SPCK, 1942).

¹⁸ Dugmore, p. 91.

¹⁹ Dugmore, p. 46.

²⁰ Dugmore, p. 53.

²¹ Dugmore, p. 79.

as a High Churchman, unsurprising as Laud was his patron, and *The Reverence Due to the Altar*, an early treatise of Taylor's bore witness to this. He wrote that the 'Altar or Holy Table is *sedes corporis et Sanguinis Christi*' and thus it was a holy place worthy of reverence. Further, Dugmore argues that the writing on the eucharist in *The Great Exemplar* (1649) shows belief in the presence of the crucified Christ in the elements and that the consecrated elements exhibit Christ in each consecrated portion. He then argues that the slightly later *Holy Living* (1650) modifies this view slightly, speaking more in terms of the sacred use of the elements. Despite this, Dugmore notes that Taylor enjoins his readers to believe that Christ gives his body and blood in the sacrament, and like the High Churchmen he warns them not to enquire too deeply into the manner of the presence.²²

Dugmore sees the influence of Taylor's friend and colleague William Nicholson on his later thinking. Nicholson and Taylor ran a school together in Wales near Golden Grove where Taylor was Lord Carbery's chaplain. He argues that Nicholson's view was that 'there is no change in the bread and wine except in the use to which they are appointed'²³ and this is typical of Central Churchmanship. Dugmore does not clearly define Central Churchmanship; he writes that it is a position characterised by the belief that any change in the bread and wine at the eucharist consists in their sacred use, and Christ's body and blood are spiritually received in the souls of worthy communicants.²⁴ We will return to the question of Nicholson's influence when considering other commentators.

Dugmore includes some brief quotations from Taylor's extensive work *The Real Presence and Spiritual of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament*, he argues that Taylor's view now is that 'the change in the bread and wine [is] due to or consisting in the use to which they are appointed'²⁵ taking as his evidence part of Taylor's long argument about the words of institution where he suggests 'Take and eat' may be as essential in causing the eucharistic transformation as 'this is my body'. This seems an

²² Dugmore, pp. 91–96.

²³ Dugmore, p. 97.

²⁴ Dugmore, p. 107.

²⁵ Dugmore, p. 101.

arbitrary use of a small section of a very long and complex work, and it does not appear to be supported by Dugmore's quotation from the same work in which Taylor wrote, 'after the minister hath ritely prayed, and blessed or consecrated the bread and the wine, the symbols become changed into the body and blood of Christ, after a sacramental, that is spiritual, real manner'.²⁶ Dugmore's final reference is to *The Worthy Communicant* (1660) which he describes as 'strongly mystical' and the eucharist is described as an 'extension of the incarnation' following the Fathers.²⁷ Dugmore makes no comment about this, although it seems to beg the question about the nature of the presence in the sacrament if it is so described. Dugmore also includes two quotations from works published about ten years apart, as illustrations of Taylor's thought on eucharistic sacrifice. He summarises the first as speaking of the Eucharist as a 'commemoration and representment of Christ's death [...] it is, ministerially and by application, an instrument propitiatory; it is eucharistical, it is an homage and an act of adoration; and it is impetratory'.²⁸ He describes the later extract as giving Taylor's later doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice without further explanation.²⁹ There seems to be little difference in the content of the two quotations.

C.J. Stranks' *The Life and Writings of Jeremy Taylor*³⁰ is the most recent full-length biography of Taylor, it was published over sixty years ago in 1952. Stranks first mentions Taylor's thought on the eucharist when he is discussing *Holy Living*. He describes this as a subject on which Taylor was doctrinally 'never very sure of himself' giving apparently contradictory accounts in different places. Despite this his attitude to holy communion is always filled with awe at approaching so great a mystery, a sense of abasement stemming from his sense of unworthiness, and understanding that he was commanded to come to the altar where his soul drew life and health.³¹ Stranks looks at *The Real Presence and Spiritual* in more detail, giving a brief summary of its

²⁶ Dugmore, p. 99.

²⁷ Dugmore, pp. 101–2.

²⁸ Dugmore, p. 94.

²⁹ Dugmore, p. 102.

³⁰ C.J. Stranks, *The Life and Writings of Jeremy Taylor* (London: SPCK, 1952).

³¹ Stranks, p. 106.

sections and outlining some of the arguments within them. Like Dugmore, he mentions Taylor's treatment of the words of institution.³² Stranks summarises the book as 'one of the driest he ever wrote' yet also 'one of the most important for the estimation of his teaching.'³³ But even here Stranks is left unsure; he says that it is possible to

gain something like a clear outline of what his faith about the Sacrament was, it is always a little difficult to be absolutely sure, since he was given to making apparently contradictory statements. It may be doubted whether in his own mind Taylor ever committed himself to any one school of thought about the Eucharist. He knew what he did not believe; he was not so eager to write down what he did believe.³⁴

He suggests that taking all of Taylor's writing together he might be classed as a receptionist, linking this term with Calvin, or a virtualist, linking this theology with Cranmer.³⁵ Here he follows the same estimation as Darwell Stone. Stranks suggests that Taylor's doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice is not consonant with this, however. Taylor is 'clear that the priesthood is a sacrificial office' and he links the sacrament of the altar with the pleading of Christ's perpetual sacrifice in heaven in a way which shows the influence of the Fathers.³⁶ Stranks summarises Taylor's teaching on eucharistic sacrifice as 'above most Laudians' but on presence he was 'below them.'³⁷

Frederick Bolton's investigation into *The Caroline Tradition of the Church of Ireland*³⁸ includes a consideration of Taylor's eucharistic theology along with other writers of the Seventeenth Century period. (His particular focus on Taylor is in part due to his contention that the 1666 Irish order of consecrating churches is Taylor's work.) In his chapter on Irish Caroline teaching, Bolton includes Taylor's teaching on eucharistic sacrifice and presence. He places Taylor among his contemporaries and shows that they held a consistent view of eucharistic sacrifice. He sees the teaching found in *The Worthy Communicant* to be the fullest, noting that this was written whilst

³² Stranks, p. 135.

³³ Stranks, p. 137.

³⁴ Stranks, p. 137.

³⁵ Stranks, p. 137.

³⁶ Stranks, p. 137.

³⁷ Stranks, p. 285.

³⁸ F. R. Bolton, *The Caroline Tradition of the Church of Ireland: with Particular Reference to Bishop Jeremy Taylor* (London: SPCK, 1958).

Taylor was resident in Ireland.³⁹ He summarises Taylor's teaching, noting that he understands Taylor to follow Gregory Nazianzen in understanding the earthly sacrifice as being a 'copy, imitation, or representation of the celestial, real and archetypal offering perpetually presented at the "Celestial altar"'.⁴⁰ The eucharist is, for Taylor, not merely an imitation of what Christ did at the Last Supper, remembering a past event, but a representation of his celestial priesthood and intercession, which is eternal. He writes that Taylor 'continually dwells upon the mystical union between Christ as Head and the Church as his Body in the Eucharistic action.'⁴¹ He describes Taylor's teaching as a 'clear exposition of the Augustinian view of the Eucharist as the Church's self-offering to God through Christ the head'.⁴² Bolton again looks to *The Worthy Communicant* to summarise Taylor's teaching on eucharistic presence. Like Dugmore, he mentions Taylor's description of the sacrament as the 'extension of the incarnation'; he then shows that Taylor sees that in the sacrament we partake of the divine nature, are joined into the Body of Christ and so will enter into glory with the one who has already risen to glory. He also notes that Taylor expands on the teaching that Christ is 'exhibited on the table of the Lord' and that Taylor stresses that communicants should kneel.⁴³ Dugmore argued that Taylor moved away from the idea that Christ is exhibited on the holy table, which he had written of in the earlier *Great Exemplar*. Here we see that Taylor retains this belief in the later work. Bolton notes that in Taylor's final published work, *The Dissuasive from Popery* (1667), Taylor still implies that he believes in the objective gift of Christ in the sacrament.⁴⁴ Bolton says that Taylor is consistent in his view that the Holy Spirit consecrates the elements, and the Spirit is called down by the prayers of the church, the priest or bishop blessing, and the people saying their "Amen" to the prayer of consecration. There is no one instant of change, 'but a Divine alteration consequent to the whole

³⁹ Bolton, p. 96.

⁴⁰ Bolton, p. 96. Although Bolton believes this is Gregory Nazianzen's position, he refers to Taylor's *Worthy Communicant* (Taylor, VIII, p. 38) in his quotation, which does not refer explicitly to Gregory.

⁴¹ Bolton, p. 97.

⁴² Bolton, p. 97.

⁴³ Bolton, p. 110.

⁴⁴ Bolton, p. 111.

ministry'.⁴⁵ Here Taylor shows a divergence from the Roman Catholic position of his time which was that the eucharistic change is effected by the priest reciting the words of institution.

In his *The Piety of Jeremy Taylor*,⁴⁶ H. Trevor Hughes focuses on Taylor's moral theology but includes a short section on his eucharistic theology as he sets out Taylor's overall theological position. He argues that receptionism and virtualism were the main lines of thought for seventeenth century Anglicans, but remarks that it is hard to fix Taylor in one or the other category. He says that because of Taylor's 'developing interest in holiness' it is unsurprising that his later works put more stress on the importance of worthy reception.⁴⁷ Trevor Hughes refers to Dugmore's argument that Taylor was influenced by Nicholson, and suggests this was combined with a 'growing concern about Christian spirituality'.⁴⁸ It seems odd that he believes Taylor's interest in spirituality was 'growing' since some of his earliest works such as *The Great Exemplar* (1550) are intended to encourage a holy and devout life. He does note that Taylor's linking of the eucharist with the Resurrection and not simply with the death of Jesus differs from his contemporaries.⁴⁹ Finally he makes a very brief comment about Taylor's order for Holy Communion (1658) and links this with his argument in *The Real Presence and Spiritual* showing that Taylor follows the Eastern Church in believing that the consecration is by the prayers of the minister blessing the elements rather than simply the words 'hoc est corpus meum' as argued by Taylor's Latin contemporaries.⁵⁰

1.2 The 1970s: Thomas Carroll and Harry Boone Porter

In 1970, Thomas Carroll wrote a doctoral thesis in the light of the liturgical renewal of the Second Vatican Council and the ecumenical turn that the Council began. He focused on Taylor because in him he saw a writer who shone a spotlight on an area where 'Christians who are separated by

⁴⁵ Bolton, p. 111.

⁴⁶ H. Trevor Hughes, *The Piety of Jeremy Taylor* (London: Macmillan, 1960).

⁴⁷ Trevor Hughes, p. 41.

⁴⁸ Trevor Hughes, p. 42.

⁴⁹ Trevor Hughes, p. 42.

⁵⁰ Trevor Hughes, p. 44.

confessional loyalties and theological differences may come together to give glory to God and to be sanctified by the mysterious action of the Christ who is always present when the Church prays and sings.⁵¹ Carroll found that, although Taylor held to the teachings of the Church of England on the sacraments, he was also a theologian who took to heart the Anglican appeal to scripture and the Fathers, and it was because of Taylor's knowledge and use of the Fathers that Carroll believed him to be 'the first of the Anglican Fathers to succeed in getting behind the mentality of the Middle Ages [...] to unearth the soul of the primitive Church and to discover its sacramental spirit.'⁵² He finds in Taylor a discovery of mystery, 'in the real patristic sense of the term', which he combined with a 'new awareness of the role of the Spirit and the reality of the risen Christ'. Together this forms the basis of his sacramental theology.⁵³ Taylor uses the concept of representation in its original meaning: 'to make present, to manifest, to show forth' and likens his use of the concept to that of Dom Odo Casel in the twentieth century, a representation which is 'sacramental and not historical' distinguishing between a past and a 'mystic or sacramental reality.'⁵⁴ Carroll summarises Taylor's achievements thus:

He escaped from the mentality of the middle ages and, by having recourse to the original sources, rediscovered the rich and wonderful concept of mystery, which enabled him to understand the real nature of sacramental representation. By the power of the Holy Spirit, the Risen Christ becomes present in mystery through sacred signs and actions to men of faith. This is man's encounter with the living God for the sacraments are "God's proper and accustomed times of grace."⁵⁵

He describes Taylor's discovery of the 'heavenly dimension of the Eucharistic sacrifice and his resulting awareness of the dynamic encounter that takes place in the eucharistic action between God and man' as 'quite unknown among both his Anglican and Roman contemporaries.'⁵⁶

⁵¹ T.K. Carroll, 'Jeremy Taylor: an Essay in Liturgical Ecumenics' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Pontifical University of St. Thomas Aquinas, Rome, 1970), p. XXI.

⁵² Carroll, 'Jeremy Taylor: an Essay in Liturgical Ecumenics', pp. 30–1.

⁵³ Carroll, 'Jeremy Taylor: an Essay in Liturgical Ecumenics', p. 31.

⁵⁴ Carroll, 'Jeremy Taylor: an Essay in Liturgical Ecumenics', p. 33.

⁵⁵ Carroll, 'Jeremy Taylor: an Essay in Liturgical Ecumenics', p. 41.

⁵⁶ Carroll, 'Jeremy Taylor: an Essay in Liturgical Ecumenics', p. 71.

In examining Taylor's eucharistic rite, Carroll discovers 'the dynamic nature of worship in the primitive church' and a unique emphasis on the role of the Spirit, connecting the eucharistic sacrifice with the resurrection and placing the sacrifice 'within the sacramental order.' In doing this he avoids making a distinction between sacrifice and sacrament, which Carroll sees as thoroughly patristic.⁵⁷ Carroll argues that in *The Worthy Communicant* Taylor gives his 'best presentation' of his understanding of the eternal priesthood of Christ, and how this relates to the eucharist.⁵⁸ He summarises Taylor's teaching: 'for Taylor the great central action of the Eucharist is the incorporation of the offerers into Christ, the eternal High Priest, and he understands the Eucharistic sacrifice in terms of the earthly showing forth of Christ's heavenly mediation.'⁵⁹ (By 'incorporation' Carroll means that all those who celebrate the eucharist are gathered into the one body of Christ, united in heaven and on earth. In being so gathered they offer themselves to God with Christ.) He claims that Taylor was the first Anglican to elaborate this concept of the earthly showing forth and it is a concept also found in the (then recent) Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy from the Second Vatican Council.⁶⁰ In emphasising the resurrection Taylor does not lessen the importance of the cross, but gave back to the eucharist a dimension which 'had become dimmed with the passing of time' and so reasserted the whole Paschal mystery as represented in the eucharist.⁶¹ The final feature of the eucharistic sacrifice in Taylor's writing is that of banquet: it is corporate and it knits together the faithful as they partake in the one bread.⁶² Carroll sees Taylor as a pioneer who had rediscovered lost horizons; their loss had exacerbated the eucharistic controversies of Taylor's age. His use of the Fathers led him to rediscover the role of the Spirit and the Risen Christ; his study of scripture led him to see 'the paschal setting of the eucharist and its banquet and corporate nature.'⁶³ Taylor's presentation of the eucharist transforms the Cranmerian remembering of a past event: by sacramental

⁵⁷ Carroll, 'Jeremy Taylor: an Essay in Liturgical Ecumenics', pp. 77–8.

⁵⁸ Carroll, 'Jeremy Taylor: an Essay in Liturgical Ecumenics', p. 80.

⁵⁹ Carroll, 'Jeremy Taylor: an Essay in Liturgical Ecumenics', p. 83.

⁶⁰ Carroll, 'Jeremy Taylor: an Essay in Liturgical Ecumenics', pp. 83–4.

⁶¹ Carroll, 'Jeremy Taylor: an Essay in Liturgical Ecumenics', p. 84.

⁶² Carroll, 'Jeremy Taylor: an Essay in Liturgical Ecumenics', p. 86.

⁶³ Carroll, 'Jeremy Taylor: an Essay in Liturgical Ecumenics', p. 87.

representation the past event is drawn into present reality. The eucharist is an ‘earthly celebration in sign of the ever present and continuous heavenly banquet’. His use of the word ‘memorial’, which is differentiated from ‘commemoration’, refers to a representation or making present in mystery of the actual event.⁶⁴

Carroll gives a brief study of Taylor’s understanding of eucharistic presence. This seems to draw heavily on Dugmore and, like other commentators, Carroll finds it difficult to place Taylor as either believing in receptionism or virtualism. He remarks that, although Taylor had escaped the middle ages in his views on eucharistic sacrifice he ‘remained a prisoner of the age while dealing with the presence.’⁶⁵ Carroll gives summaries of Taylor’s writings before concluding by discussing the possible influence of Nicholson on Taylor first suggested by Dugmore. Carroll, however, points out that Taylor could have influenced Nicholson rather than the other way around. The evidence Dugmore uses is taken from Nicholson’s *Commentary on the Catechism of the Church of England*, which was published two years after Taylor’s *Real Presence and Spiritual*. Furthermore, Carroll estimates Taylor as a far more able theologian and controversialist than his friend Nicholson.⁶⁶ Nevertheless, Carroll sees Nicholson’s *Commentary* as a clear description of Central Church belief and to his mind does present the mind of Taylor on the subject. (i.e. Christ is really present, divinely, spiritually and sacramentally: spiritually in the hearts of communicants and sacramentally in the consecrated elements.)⁶⁷ Carroll does suggest that the ‘Central Churchmanship’ position has a ‘vague comprehensiveness’ which prefers to use the language of encounter rather than the concepts of scholastic theology.⁶⁸ He finds that ‘it may even be doubted whether in his own mind Taylor ever committed himself to any one school. He knew what he did not believe, he was not so eager to write down just what precisely he did believe.’⁶⁹

⁶⁴ Carroll, ‘Jeremy Taylor: an Essay in Liturgical Ecumenics’, p. 165.

⁶⁵ Carroll, ‘Jeremy Taylor: an Essay in Liturgical Ecumenics’, p. 89.

⁶⁶ Carroll, ‘Jeremy Taylor: an Essay in Liturgical Ecumenics’, p. 109.

⁶⁷ Carroll, ‘Jeremy Taylor: an Essay in Liturgical Ecumenics’, p. 111.

⁶⁸ Carroll, ‘Jeremy Taylor: an Essay in Liturgical Ecumenics’, p. 108.

⁶⁹ Carroll, ‘Jeremy Taylor: an Essay in Liturgical Ecumenics’, p. 108.

In his study of Jeremy Taylor as a liturgist,⁷⁰ Harry Boone Porter focuses on Taylor's *Collection of Offices*, but he begins his chapter on 'The Sacrifice Eucharistical' with a consideration of Taylor's theology of eucharistic sacrifice. He compares excerpts from *Holy Living* and *The Worthy Communicant* and shows they are both paraphrases of the same passage in John Chrysostom's *On the Priesthood*.⁷¹ This passage is one which gathers together Taylor's eucharistic teaching: 'the liturgical action in the church as analogous to the action of Christ in heaven, the representation of his suffering, death and resurrection, and the present effects of the sacrifice in the Christian.'⁷² Taylor expands on the glory of the sacrament, urging the communicant to 'approach with reverence, trusting in the immediate presence of Christ and putting aside all intellectual scruple as to how bread and wine can be his flesh and blood.'⁷³ He argues that Taylor not only had a deep sense of the eucharist as an act which nourishes the body of which each worshipper is a member, i.e. it is a corporate act, but he also saw it as a sacrament of unity for all humanity. Hence the prayers which Taylor proposes for his communicants include petitions not only for those who have received holy communion but for all humanity.⁷⁴

Porter says that Taylor's sacramental realism and objectivity can puzzle, for they might be more readily associated with transubstantiation, yet Taylor along with many of his contemporaries expended much energy in refuting that doctrine.⁷⁵ Nevertheless, he believes Taylor does not fall into a straightforward category because his understanding of real presence is not passive but active. 'In and through the sacrament Christ carries on his work of teaching, healing, forgiving, and renewing our souls, uniting himself to us, and incorporating us into him.' Hence Taylor is able to sum up the meaning of the sacrament in the phrase, 'the extension of the incarnation.'⁷⁶ He argues that Taylor

⁷⁰ Harry Boone Porter, *Jeremy Taylor: Liturgist* (London: SPCK, 1979).

⁷¹ Porter, pp. 62–4. The passage referred to is S. John Chrysostom, *On the Priesthood*, Book III, Chapter IV s. 177. See a further discussion of Taylor's use of this passage in our consideration of Taylor's use of S. John Chrysostom in Chapter 6.

⁷² Porter, p. 62.

⁷³ Porter, p. 64.

⁷⁴ Porter, p. 66.

⁷⁵ Porter, p. 67.

⁷⁶ Porter, p. 68.

underlines that we receive the body and blood of Christ spiritually, but this is not divorced from Christ's incarnate person, it is the sacrament of that body which was broken for us. Alongside this he discusses the interpretation which sees Christ's body as the edible word and the blood as the Holy Spirit, interpretations which have their roots in St. John's Gospel.⁷⁷ He says that Taylor offers 'many possible interpretations, all contributing some element of truth.'⁷⁸ It is surely this multiplicity of images which makes Taylor's thought hard to pin down.

In considering the link between presence and eucharistic sacrifice, Porter argues that although Taylor does not exclude the idea of offering the consecrated elements, as the body and blood of the crucified Christ really present, to the Father, which was the normal medieval approach, he sees the whole action of the eucharist as the sacrifice. It is this which 'commemorates Christ's sacrifice on the cross, and which mirrors here on earth his present action in heaven, where he, as our eternal High Priest, forever presents and pleads his sacrifice before the Father.'⁷⁹

In his commentary on Taylor's eucharistic liturgy, Porter notes that Taylor places the Lord's Prayer after the reception of Holy Communion (as Cranmer had in the English Prayer Books). Placing the prayer at this point in the celebration is understood to be because it is only when the people have received holy communion they are incorporated into the Body of Christ and so can say 'Our Father' with confidence. Taylor writes that after holy communion, 'the people are sacrificers too and may plead the benefits of the sacrifice for themselves, the Church, and all mankind.'⁸⁰ Taylor, despite his consistent arguments for the dignity of priesthood, nevertheless does not understand the ministry of the priest at the eucharist as sharing in Christ's priesthood in a privileged way. Priests are Christ's ministers who obey his commands and they are instruments who offer the prayers of the Church, but the mystical union offered is no greater for the priest than for all the others gathered around the altar.⁸¹

⁷⁷ Porter, pp. 68–9.

⁷⁸ Porter, p. 69.

⁷⁹ Porter, p. 69.

⁸⁰ Porter, p. 80.

⁸¹ Porter, p. 132.

1.3 H.R. McAdoo's *The Eucharistic Theology of Jeremy Taylor Today*⁸²

Henry McAdoo's study is the most detailed available, in some two hundred pages he examines Taylor's various works which focus on the eucharist. McAdoo is a sympathetic commentator who sees Taylor's theology of the eucharist set in his overall concern for moral/ascetic theology and his quest for holy living transformed by faith in Christ.⁸³ In Taylor he sees a quality of 'liberality' alongside a deep knowledge of patristic literature and the appeal to tradition and scripture. As with earlier commentators, McAdoo finds 'a certain elusiveness, a resistance to classification, in Taylor'.⁸⁴ He sees Taylor as spanning different eras, paralleling Cranmer and yet also looking forward to the Anglican Roman Catholic Dialogue of the late 20th century (McAdoo was Anglican co-chair of ARCIC I).⁸⁵ McAdoo agrees that Taylor could be referred to as 'Laudian'⁸⁶ and he also stands in the tradition of the Prayer Book Catechism and its author Bishop John Overall.⁸⁷

McAdoo criticises Dugmore's disparagement of 'mystery' as a theological description. He suggests at the outset that he may not have sufficiently appreciated the use of 'mystery' as a deliberately chosen description of presence for the High Church or Laudian divines. Dugmore describes this as a 'refuge' and one of 'intellectual bankruptcy'; McAdoo asks, 'Could it not be, however, that they did so because they held it to be impossible and unacceptable to define as *de fide* what could not be claimed as Scripturally revealed and authenticated?'⁸⁸ McAdoo finds in Taylor 'a considered affirmation of the existence of mystery' and recalls his description of 'what is mysterious in religion as uncomprehended rather than incomprehensible'.⁸⁹

McAdoo selects a series of sentences from a paragraph in Taylor's *The Real Presence and Spiritual* as a summary of how he sees Taylor's understanding of eucharistic presence:

- (1) 'Christ's body is now in heaven definitively, and nowhere else'.

⁸² H.R. McAdoo, *The Eucharistic Theology of Jeremy Taylor Today* (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 1988).

⁸³ McAdoo, p. 10.

⁸⁴ McAdoo, p. 80.

⁸⁵ McAdoo, p. 61.

⁸⁶ McAdoo, p. 60.

⁸⁷ McAdoo, p. 142.

⁸⁸ McAdoo, p. 45.

⁸⁹ McAdoo, p. 45.

- (2) “corpus” is taken in a spiritual sense; sacramental and mysterious’.
- (3) Christ ‘is in the sacrament as he can be in a sacrament’.
- (4) Christ ‘is in the hearts of faithful receivers, as he hath promised to be there’.
- (5) Accordingly, Christ is ‘in the sacrament mystically, operatively as in a moral and divine instrument, in the hearts of receivers by faith and blessing’.
- (6) The ‘change’ or ‘conversion’ in the elements is ‘figurative, mysterious and sacramental;’ it is ‘sacramental and spiritual; exhibiting what it signifies’.
- (7) It ‘is bread and verily Christ’s body’.⁹⁰

McAdoo reminds his reader that sacramentality and mystery are constant components of Taylor’s theology.⁹¹ McAdoo does not deny that Taylor places great importance on faith, indeed ‘it receives and apprehends the gift but it does not create the gift in any sense. It does create the worthy communicant.’⁹² He comments that although Stranks may be correct in saying that Taylor never committed himself to one school of thought on the eucharist he was ‘surely wrong in suggesting virtualism or receptionism as a possible category for Jeremy Taylor.’⁹³ Taylor wrote: ‘That which before the consecration was known to be natural bread is now “bread and something more”.’⁹⁴ McAdoo argues that this shows Taylor does not simply adhere to a virtualist position, although he can sometimes use language which sounds like it: in one place he describes the sacrament as ‘not Christ’s body formally, but *virtually and effectively*’. But then Taylor continues by emphasising the bread is changed and made sacramental, no longer common bread. McAdoo argues that virtualism must be a part of eucharistic theology, for there must be a notion of received *virtus*. Nevertheless, Taylor argues for more than a communication of the virtue of Christ’s body and blood in receiving the bread and wine, for he continually argues for a change in the bread and wine. Christ is, for Taylor, present in a real and sacramental manner. For McAdoo, this rules out Stranks’ classification of Taylor as a virtualist or a receptionist.⁹⁵

McAdoo also discusses Dugmore’s assertions that Taylor changed his theology and that this change was influenced by his friend William Nicholson. McAdoo shows that Nicholson’s *Exposition*

⁹⁰ McAdoo, pp. 148–9.

⁹¹ McAdoo, p. 140.

⁹² McAdoo, p. 141.

⁹³ McAdoo, p. 87.

⁹⁴ McAdoo, p. 139.

⁹⁵ McAdoo, pp. 139–40.

to the *Catechism* does make statements about presence which are very similar to the writings of Taylor, Nicholson's writing has the advantage of being concise 'almost mathematical condensing'. They both write of a real spiritual presence it is true. However, McAdoo argues that Taylor insists on a change of condition in the elements, not just a change of use as Nicholson seems to imply. Their expositions are similar but not precisely the same. And as to the influences, McAdoo suggests they 'each had a lot to give to the other'. In the final analysis, it depends on how much store is set in the possible change in Taylor's theology.⁹⁶ McAdoo suggests that Taylor's theology may not have changed, but rather developed: 'he held on to the concepts of mystery and sacramentality, *but thought them through*'.⁹⁷ McAdoo muses, 'one wonders if Dugmore is putting quite the right question when he asks whether Taylor's views changed from High to Central in respect of the eucharist.'⁹⁸

In his final chapter, McAdoo turns to consider Taylor's *The Worthy Communicant*. McAdoo says the book shows a shift in emphasis rather than a shift in Taylor's teaching. In this book, there is increased emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit in the holy communion and Taylor does this by incorporating teaching from the Alexandrian Ante-Nicene Fathers, such as Clement, Origen, Tertullian and Chrysostom.⁹⁹ It is from them that he introduces the idea of the sacrament as *verbum visibile*¹⁰⁰ and the teaching that 'The flesh of Christ is his Word, the blood of Christ is his spirit'.¹⁰¹ He safeguards over-spiritualising by turning to Augustine's definition of a sacrament as 'the word and the element joined', insisting on a 'change of condition' in the elements.¹⁰²

Alongside Taylor's understanding of presence, sacramental and mysterious, there is an investigation of his theology of eucharistic sacrifice; McAdoo describes this as parallelism. Christ perpetually represents his sacrifice to his Father in heaven, as a perpetual intercession, the church

⁹⁶ McAdoo, pp. 148–54.

⁹⁷ McAdoo, p. 155.

⁹⁸ McAdoo, p. 156.

⁹⁹ McAdoo, p. 172.

¹⁰⁰ McAdoo, p. 176.

¹⁰¹ McAdoo, p. 180.

¹⁰² McAdoo, p. 180.

represents this sacrifice ministerially on earth.¹⁰³ On earth Christ is in prayer and sacrament represented or ‘offered up to God, as sacrificed’. The representation is an instrument of applying the sacrifice to present and future purposes. “‘The heavenly altar’ is inseparably linked with the earthly *anamnesis*, the making effective in the present of a past event, the once-and-for-all event of salvation, through the action of the Spirit’.¹⁰⁴ McAdoo emphasises ‘*The reality of the Sacrifice is inextricably bound up with the reality of the Presence, as we can see from Taylor’s prayers and his Collection of Offices.*’¹⁰⁵ McAdoo shows the parallels with the reception of the ARCIC discussions at the 1988 Lambeth Conference, suggesting ‘Taylor would have felt his successors were speaking his language.’¹⁰⁶

Throughout the book, McAdoo stresses that Taylor argues for a change in the elements. A mysterious change such that bread and wine become in ‘some sense’ Christ’s body and blood. ‘The mystery of sacramentality positively demands the reverent admission we do not know *how*’.¹⁰⁷ The presence is apprehended by faith, but not created by it.¹⁰⁸

He suggests that by taking isolated passages from Taylor it might be possible to see him as virtualist, but this is not a true picture. His conclusion is: He is in effect formulating a doctrine of the real presence in terms of ‘the vital power, virtue and efficacy’ of the body of Christ ‘joined with’ the elements to effect ‘the real exhibition and ministration of the body of the Lord’. The thrust of this is to express the real presence in a way which safeguards the two realities of the eucharist, that of Christ’s body and blood and that of the bread and wine.¹⁰⁹ He describes this as ‘personalist’, rather than ‘entitive’,¹¹⁰ a person, Jesus Christ, is given and received, rather than, ‘the body of Christ’ or the ‘power of Christ’.

¹⁰³ McAdoo, p. 144.

¹⁰⁴ McAdoo, p. 66.

¹⁰⁵ McAdoo, p. 144.

¹⁰⁶ McAdoo, p. 144.

¹⁰⁷ McAdoo, pp. 189–90.

¹⁰⁸ McAdoo, p. 191.

¹⁰⁹ McAdoo, p. 192.

¹¹⁰ McAdoo, p. 184.

McAdoo suggests that Taylor anticipated a later trend and reminds his reader that he had earlier referred to this formulation as dualist. He suggests it is reminiscent of William Temple's term 'convaluation' 'by means of which two sets of value are held together in relation to one object.'¹¹¹

We will return to McAdoo's writing throughout the course of the thesis, as we include his insights along with our own exegesis of Taylor's writing.

1.4 Three Authors and their Interrelated Studies

Carroll, McAdoo and Kenneth Stevenson brought out a number of books in the 1990s which referred to one another's writing on Taylor. In his introduction to *Jeremy Taylor: Selected Works*,¹¹² Carroll refers back to his earlier doctoral work on Taylor. He refers to Taylor's 'sacramental mode of seeing and saying or, *sacramental representation*, as he frequently and everywhere calls it'. This is a vision of reality in which 'heaven is wedded to earth and the life of the one is made present in the other, as the earthly sacraments of the church represent the heavenly sacrifice of Christ'.¹¹³ Carroll emphasizes again that Taylor moves beyond the theology of the Renaissance and Reformation which in both Catholic and Protestant modes, tended to look back to a past act of redemption; his eucharistic theology

opened up from the patristic past a new or renewed way of understanding the Mystery that is ever ancient ever new. By celebrating the sacrifice of Christ within the sacramental framework he restored to the eucharistic rite the commemorative, demonstrative and prophetic dimensions of the sign, which the ancients felt as a unity in which the past and the future were equally present.¹¹⁴

At the end of his introduction Carroll refers his reader both to Stranks' biography and to McAdoo's study.¹¹⁵

¹¹¹ McAdoo, pp. 192 – 193.

¹¹² *Jeremy Taylor: Selected Works*, Edited and Introduced by Thomas K. Carroll (Mahwah NJ: Paulist 1990).

¹¹³ Carroll, *Jeremy Taylor: Selected Works*, p. 54.

¹¹⁴ Carroll, *Jeremy Taylor: Selected Works*, p. 55.

¹¹⁵ Carroll, *Jeremy Taylor: Selected Works*, pp. 83–4.

Kenneth Stevenson's *Covenant of Grace Renewed*¹¹⁶ places Taylor amongst his contemporaries, the book has brief studies of ten writers on the eucharist beginning with Hooker and Andrewes. The chapter on Taylor also includes his Puritan contemporary Richard Baxter. Stevenson suggest that Taylor's view of reason was characteristic of the group of theologians who came to be known as the Cambridge Platonists:¹¹⁷ 'For Taylor – as for Plato and Plotinus of old – reason has a transcendent quality about it, which is the key to the unity between heaven and earth. It comes near to what the Romantic Age two centuries later came to call the imagination.'¹¹⁸ He also remarks that Taylor's 'heart goes out to the eucharist' because 'the eucharist is fundamentally about God and *humanity* and is no mere cultic act.'¹¹⁹ He brings out Taylor's understanding of the purpose of the eucharist 'to make us like God'.¹²⁰ Stevenson sees in Taylor's writing on the eucharist 'integrity and unity of thought' which underlie a consistent approach, even if different works have different emphases.¹²¹

Similarly, he sees '*coherence and unity*'¹²² in Taylor's approach to eucharistic sacrifice. He argues that Taylor links the perpetual sacrifice offered by Christ in heaven with the commemorative representation of that sacrifice by the priest in the eucharist, and sacramental presence in the elements. This means that the church's offering becomes part of Christ's offering himself, and means our offering is no longer confined to history.¹²³ Stevenson believes Taylor is a 'curiously prophetic figure. He has a novel understanding of eucharistic sacrifice in terms of the union of earthly and

¹¹⁶ Kenneth Stevenson, *Covenant of Grace Renewed: A Vision of the Eucharist in the Seventeenth Century* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1994).

¹¹⁷ The Cambridge Platonists were a group of influential philosophical divines who flourished at Cambridge between 1633 and 1688. They stood between the Puritans and High Anglicans and consistently advocated tolerance and comprehension within the Church, basing their demand on the conception that reason was the arbiter of both natural and revealed religion. Their view of reason was derived principally from Plotinus, and they interpreted reason as an abiding direction of will and affection alike. 'Cambridge Platonists', in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, p. 225.

¹¹⁸ Stevenson, *Covenant of Grace Renewed*, p. 112.

¹¹⁹ Stevenson, *Covenant of Grace Renewed*, p. 117.

¹²⁰ Stevenson, *Covenant of Grace Renewed*, p. 121.

¹²¹ Stevenson, *Covenant of Grace Renewed*, p. 115.

¹²² Stevenson, *Covenant of Grace Renewed*, p. 122.

¹²³ Stevenson, *Covenant of Grace Renewed*, p. 122.

heavenly which had much to commend it.’¹²⁴ In his commentary on Taylor, Stevenson refers to both Carroll¹²⁵ and McAdoo.¹²⁶

Stevenson’s last work, the preface completed only a month before his death, was *A Following Holy Life*,¹²⁷ another edited collection of Taylor’s writings. In his introduction Stevenson again refers to Taylor’s Platonism, suggesting that this is evident in his description of God’s self-revelation, using the image of the ‘cloud’ which ‘reveals the truth partially, as mystery.’¹²⁸ He also suggests that Taylor’s view of the eucharist is coloured by Platonism, both in his writing about presence and sacrifice. Stevenson suggest that it is this influence which leads Taylor to refuse neat definition, ‘bringing in instead a firm but non-evasive reticence.’¹²⁹ He comments on Taylor’s linkage between the eucharist on earth and the heavenly intercession of Christ (rooted in Hebrews 7.25 and 8.1) and he argues that the ‘heavenly altar is without doubt a central plank in Taylor’s understanding of the sacrifice.’¹³⁰ Stevenson then refers back both to McAdoo and Porter and their comments on Taylor.

Stevenson also looks at Taylor’s view of presence using terms which we shall encounter in the next chapter, based on the ideas of Brian Gerrish and his study of Reformed eucharistic theology. Whereas Gerrish describes Calvin’s view as ‘symbolic instrumentalism’ (the sacraments are instruments of God’s grace) Taylor’s view might be described as “‘effectual instrumentalism,” which places a stronger emphasis on what the sacrament does, without underplaying human appropriation of the gifts of God, expressed by the strong role of the Holy Spirit as the means of consecration.’¹³¹ In his selection of extracts, Stevenson includes pieces from *The Real Presence and Spiritual* and *The Worthy Communicant*.

¹²⁴ Stevenson, *Covenant of Grace Renewed*, p. 125.

¹²⁵ Stevenson, *Covenant of Grace Renewed*, p. 125.

¹²⁶ Stevenson, *Covenant of Grace Renewed*, p. 123.

¹²⁷ *A Following Holy Life: Jeremy Taylor and His Writings*, Edited and Introduced by Kenneth Stevenson (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2011).

¹²⁸ Stevenson, *A Following Holy Life*, p. 17.

¹²⁹ Stevenson, *A Following Holy Life*, p. 17.

¹³⁰ Stevenson, *A Following Holy Life*, p. 18.

¹³¹ Stevenson, *A Following Holy Life*, p. 21.

1.5 New Voices

There have been few other commentators on Taylor. Edmund Newey's 2002 paper on the use of reason in Hooker, Whichcote, Cudworth and Taylor looks at the way in which they use the term as something shared with the divine wisdom or *Logos*. Although the paper does not directly bear on our topic it does argue for the influence of Platonism on Taylor.¹³² Owen Cummings' 2003 paper 'The Liturgical Jeremy Taylor'¹³³ argues for a genuinely Catholic and critical evaluation of Taylor that might make a substantial contribution to healing between Canterbury and Rome.¹³⁴ He finds in Taylor 'eucharistic reflection at its best' but finds both interest and frustration in the fact that it is not 'couched in scholastic terms' but is 'almost entirely patristic.'¹³⁵ There is a 'tension between a Catholic and a Protestant point of view in respect of the eucharistic presence of Christ.'¹³⁶ Again here is a commentator who is at a loss to find a suitable category in which to place Taylor. He argues that 'divinization is not possible through the eucharist unless it is indeed the body and blood of Christ' and he further argues that Taylor indeed sees divinization as 'the immediate saving effect of the eucharist in Holy Communion'.¹³⁷ Cummings suggests that there is a failure, not only in Taylor, to 'adequately distinguish between a "sacramental realism" and a "symbolic virtualism."' ¹³⁸ He also focuses on Taylor's idea of confederation, noting the Latin for covenant is *foedus* and hence by implication confederation also had the sense of covenant for Taylor. It has a vertical aspect, uniting with God and a horizontal aspect, binding humanity together.¹³⁹ Cummings does allow that Taylor is correct in arguing that it is not necessary to be able to define the eucharist correctly in metaphysical terms to appreciate its gifts and benefits.¹⁴⁰ Perhaps there is a difference of approach between Anglican and Roman Catholic theologians, the latter expect metaphysical precision couched in

¹³² Edmund Newey, 'The Form of Reason: Participation in the Work of Richard Hooker, Benjamin Whichcote, Ralph Cudworth and Jeremy Taylor', *Modern Theology*, 18.1 (2002), 1–26.

¹³³ Owen F. Cummings, 'The Liturgical Jeremy Taylor', *Worship*, 77.5 (2003), 425–38.

¹³⁴ Cummings, p. 438.

¹³⁵ Cummings, p. 434.

¹³⁶ Cummings, p. 435.

¹³⁷ Cummings, pp. 435–6.

¹³⁸ Cummings, p. 436.

¹³⁹ Cummings, pp. 433–4.

¹⁴⁰ Cummings, p. 436.

scholastic language, the former are more at home with descriptive language. And, as we have seen, Taylor wishes to leave the sacrament as mystery. Cummings along with other commentators finds the language of representation very clear in Taylor's work on eucharistic sacrifice.¹⁴¹

Schwarz's paper¹⁴² on language and metaphor in Taylor's *Worthy Communicant* takes an approach that is quite different from any other so far surveyed. He examines Taylor's language and argues that Taylor uses '*metaphor* for the manner in which God communicates his word to us'.¹⁴³ We will return to Schwarz's thought as we bring our thoughts and findings on Taylor's eucharistic thought together in Chapter 7.

Finally, we turn to Brian Douglas' *A Companion to Anglican Eucharistic Theology*.¹⁴⁴ He includes a section on Taylor as a case study as part of his demonstration that seventeenth century Anglicanism is characterised by 'moderate realism'. His summary of Taylor's writing is:

Taylor's views on the Eucharist seem to indicate both a figurative and realist element. He emphasises that Christ is really present, but he also emphasises that this is a 'spiritual' not a 'carnal' sense. It also seems that Taylor does not emphasise the spiritual at the expense of the real. Taylor therefore bridges any gap between figurative and realist language, with the power of this bridging or joining being assigned to the Holy Spirit [...] It is this linking, of the spiritual and the physical, the figurative and the real, which demonstrates the moderate realism of Taylor.¹⁴⁵

As we will see, this is a fair summary of Taylor's position. Douglas differentiates moderate realism from immoderate or fleshy realism. He argues that moderate realism suggests a loose identity between the sign and the signified, whereas immoderate realism implies strict identity.¹⁴⁶ He suggests that moderate realism in the eucharistic context means that bread and wine instantiate the nature of Christ's body and blood.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴¹ Cummings, p. 436.

¹⁴² Robert C. Schwarz, 'Metaphor qua Metaphor: Jeremy Taylor's Eucharistic Theology', *Sewanee Theological Review*, 50.4 (2007), 495–520.

¹⁴³ Schwarz, p. 510

¹⁴⁴ Brian Douglas *A Companion to Anglican Eucharistic Theology: Volume 1: The Reformation to the 19th Century* (Leiden: Brill, 2011), pp. 214–31.

¹⁴⁵ Douglas, I, p. 231.

¹⁴⁶ Douglas, I, p. 27.

¹⁴⁷ Douglas, I, p. 33.

1.6 Drawing the Threads Together: Competing Descriptions of Taylor's Theology

All our commentators have recognised that Taylor speaks about *real* presence, yet he does not believe in the carnal, fleshy presence which Taylor believed is implied by transubstantiation. McAdoo argues persuasively that the categories receptionism and virtualism are not adequate to describe Taylor's theology of presence, as he believes in a change of condition of the elements. Similarly, he shows that Dugmore's argument that Taylor's understanding changes and is consistent with Central Churchmanship is not persuasive. In defence of Dugmore it may be that he is constrained by his overall thesis of a general shift in belief to ideas he calls 'Central Churchmanship' and he is trying to fit Taylor into a pre-formed category. The constant theme is that Taylor is not easy to categorise. The commentators from a Roman Catholic background, Carroll and Cummings, express frustration that Taylor does not describe his theology in the precise metaphysical language they are familiar with, although McAdoo would suggest that Taylor simply does not find that style of expression congruent with his thought. All our commentators recognise in Taylor a writer who is deeply engaged with the eucharist and approaches it with piety and reverence. There is likewise a uniform respect for Taylor's learning and his great knowledge of and reference to the Fathers, his language is patristic rather than scholastic. McAdoo emphasises Taylor's insistence on mystery as a descriptive category. He argues this is not evidence of imprecise thinking, but it is a deliberate choice when faced with what is unknowable, beyond the proofs of sense and argument. He also underlines Taylor's use of the concept of sacramentality, there is a *sacramental* change, a *sacramental* presence which describes elements changed by the Holy Spirit so that they can bear the names body and blood of Christ. Alongside this there is the importance of the Holy Spirit active in the eucharist, called down by the intercession of the priest, as consecrator of the elements. McAdoo has argued against categorising Taylor as a virtualist or receptionist and we have some tentative proposals for describing Taylor's position: *convaluation* following the thought of William Temple and *effectual instrumentalism* building on the work of Brian Gerrish. Douglas' term *moderate realism* is too broad a term to classify

Taylor, it is too all-inclusive, and Douglas argues that it includes even Aquinas' metaphysical description of transubstantiation.¹⁴⁸

All the authors are clear that Taylor has a distinctive theology of eucharistic sacrifice, which is not confined to looking back to an historical event, the Crucifixion. They describe an approach which is characterised by parallelism: of offering, of priesthood, of intercession and of presence. The eternal high priest is mirrored by the earthly priest, the heavenly offering of Christ to the Father by the earthly offering, the unmediated presence of Christ in heaven to the mysterious presence of Christ on the altar, and the unity of intercession. All is enabled by the operation of the Holy Spirit, such that the earthly altar becomes an image which parallels the heavenly altar. Taylor draws heavily on the language and theology of the Letter to Hebrews and again on patristic sources. As Carroll writes, he looks back to the patristic sources to formulate a theology which escapes the middle ages and is a reflection of the Paschal mystery.

1.7 The Structure of the Thesis

Having these foundations on which to build we will investigate Taylor's theology of presence and sacrifice. We will begin by setting the scene and describing the approaches to eucharistic presence post-reformation, concentrating on the Church of England and developments in its thought. After looking at Zwingli and Calvin we will interrogate the Church of England's emerging position by looking at the first English Prayer Books, the Articles of Religion and the Catechism. We will also look at the writings of Richard Hooker and the sermons of Lancelot Andrews bringing our study close to Taylor's era. We will then address Taylor's complex and lengthy polemical work *The Real Presence and Spiritual of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament*, devoting two chapters to this. The first of these looks at Taylor's introduction and claims for spiritual presence and his treatment of scriptural evidence; the second focuses on Taylor's treatment of transubstantiation and includes a brief history of the doctrine and exposition of the relevant sections of Aquinas' Summa. This chapter concludes

¹⁴⁸ Douglas, I, p. 33.

with Taylor's evidence from patristic sources. A further chapter looks at Taylor's devotional writing, for further information of his views on presence and also his understanding of eucharistic sacrifice. Following our exposition and commentary on Taylor's writing we will look at some of the influences on Taylor: patristic authors and Platonic philosophy. This will then give us an opportunity to engage with Taylor's thought and attempt to clarify it, a task which all our commentators have already described as difficult.

Chapter 2: Eucharistic Presence Following the Reformation

Taylor's eucharistic theology was not formed in a vacuum. He lived in the century following the upheavals of the Reformation, although in his native England these crises would continue to play out during his lifetime in the reign of Charles I (1625 – 1649)¹ and the Commonwealth period, when episcopacy and the Book of Common Prayer were suppressed. In this chapter, we will look at the currents in eucharistic thought coming from Continental Europe and the ways in which the Church of England reflected their influence and sought to describe the presence of Christ in the sacrament.

In a short section of her work on the mediaeval eucharist, Miri Rubin reminds her readers that there had always been those who did not accept the doctrine of transubstantiation and critiqued the Church's practice.² She argues 'the Eucharist could never really be reformed, it could only be wholly accepted or negated outright',³ so it was at the Reformation that the eucharist became a focus of argument and reinterpretation by the reformers.⁴

2.1 Being and Identity, Ontology and Substance

Any discussion of eucharistic presence will require us to look at the identity of the consecrated elements. Are they simply bread and wine, or have they changed in some way? Since it is clear that there is no change which can be detected by the senses any change must be metaphysical or supernatural rather than physical or natural. Aristotle argues that the primary meaning of 'being' is 'what a thing is'.⁵ Aristotle also argues that being and substance are equivalent, because 'what a thing is' denotes substance.⁶ It is because of this identity between being and substance that the word 'transubstantiation', transformation of substance, was seen as appropriate to describe the change in

¹ 'Charles I', in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, p. 269

² Miri Rubin, *Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 319–34.

³ Rubin, p. 352.

⁴ For an overview of the Reformation debates see: Michael S. Horton, 'Theologies of Sacraments in the Reformation and Catholic Counter-Reformation' in *Christian Theologies of the Sacraments: A Comparative Introduction*, Edited by Justin S. Holcomb and David A. Johnson (New York: New York University Press, 2017), pp. 119–131.

⁵ Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, ed. & trans. by John Warrington (London: J.M. Dent and Son.), p. 167.

⁶ Aristotle, p. 167.

being of the consecrated elements: from the initial bread and wine they had become the body and blood of Christ. As their substance had changed, so their identity was now that of the body and blood of Christ, in a manner which implied exact equivalence of being. They had a new identity and it was no longer appropriate to refer to them as bread and wine. This then led to further philosophical arguments to elucidate how substance could change whilst physical characteristics, referred to as ‘accidents’, could remain. In discussions on sacramental theology change in being is frequently referred to as an ontological change (this term may be used beyond discussion of the eucharist to include ordination and baptism). Ontology is the study of the essence of things,⁷ or the nature of their being, and in seeking to describe eucharistic transformation there is an aim to describe the essential nature of the elements as transformed, or as bare signs, or as some mixed state where the transformation is by addition or mixing to give a dual identity.⁸ Thus an ontological change refers to a change in being or identity. The identity of being between the consecrated elements and the body and blood of Christ may be exact, as the advocates of transubstantiation claim, or it may be looser. The ontological change described may imply that the consecrated elements participate in the being of the body and blood of Christ, yet still retain the identity or being of bread and wine. Nevertheless, it may be understood as appropriate to describe the consecrated elements as the body and blood of Christ, even though they still retain, in addition, the identity of bread and wine. This is the type of ontological change which results in what Douglas referred to as ‘moderate realism’.⁹ We are investigating how authors express the doctrine of St. Paul that ‘The cup of blessing that we bless, is it not a sharing in the blood of Christ? The bread that we break, is it not a sharing in the body of Christ?’¹⁰ ‘Sharing’ is also translated as ‘communion’ and ‘participation.’ The bread and wine share the being of the body and blood of Christ. Herein lies one of the contentious issues; the Aristotelian

⁷ ‘Ontology’ in *The Shorter Oxford Dictionary: On Historical Principles*, prepared by William Little, H.W. Fowler and Jessie Coulson, rev. and ed. By C.T. Onions, 2 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973), II, p. 1449.

⁸ The word ontology, the study of being, is anachronistic for our study, it is first found in English in 1721, following a Latin use of 1691, well after the death of Jeremy Taylor and the Reformers who preceded him.

⁹ Douglas, I, p. 27.

¹⁰ I Corinthians 10.16

idea of substance is that it is a description of individuality¹¹ along with separability;¹² this means that an object cannot be described as having two substances, e.g. bread and the body of Christ. We will see that this is an important area of argument for Taylor in later chapters. It can lead, on the one hand, to the claim that the substance is wholly transformed, the elements are no longer bread and wine, but the body and blood of Christ or, on the other, the counterclaim that there is no substantial change, bread and wine remain, but they are the body and blood of Christ through some other way of understanding or expressing it.

We will begin our survey of the Reformers' positions by looking at the Lutheran beginning, seeing how the Lutherans approached the Sacrament, and then moving to the Swiss Reformation focusing on Zwingli, Bullinger and Calvin before looking at the situation as it developed in England from 1549 into the 1620s.

2.2 Lutherans and the Eucharist

The Lutheran^{13, 14, 15} position on the eucharist is set out in the Lutheran confessional documents, including the Catechisms and the Augsburg Confession, recorded in the *Book of Concord*.¹⁶ Article X of the Augsburg Confession says:

¹¹ Aristotle, p. 167.

¹² Aristotle, p. 171.

¹³ MacCulloch describes Martin Luther as 'the catalyst of the Protestant revolution'. (p. 116). He was Augustinian friar who became a teacher at the newly founded University of Wittenburg in Saxony. Luther was influenced by the writings of Augustine and his key doctrinal tenet was that human beings received God's gift of faith; God declared someone righteous by his own free gift; this was divine grace. Luther spoke out against what he perceived as the abuses of the Catholic Church, particularly the system of indulgences. This set in chain a reforming movement which spread throughout parts of the German states and beyond. Despite his reforming zeal, Luther remained wedded to infant baptism, and his devotion to the eucharist meant he strongly defended the notion that the body and blood of Christ could be present at the eucharist. (MacCulloch, pp. 115 – 144.)

¹⁴ For a further discussion of Luther's approach to the sacraments see: Robert Kolb, 'Martin Luther', in *Christian Theologies of the Sacraments: A Comparative Introduction*, Edited by Justin S. Holcomb and David A. Johnson (New York: New York University Press, 2017), pp. 132–151.

¹⁵ For a sympathetic contemporary Roman Catholic examination of Luther's eucharistic theology see: Giuseppe Lorizio, 'The Eucharistic Doctrine of Luther, Read and Interpreted by a Catholic Theologian', *Lateranum*, 82, (2016), 35–54.

¹⁶ *Concordia: The Lutheran Confessions*, ed. by Paul Timothy McCain and others, trans. by William Hermann Theodore Dau and Gerhard Friedrich Bente, 2nd edn (St. Louis, Mo: Concordia Publishing House, 2006). The Formula of Concord forms a classical formula of faith. It was drawn up in 1577, the definitive statement of Lutheran orthodoxy. It corresponds to the declarations of the Roman Catholic Council of Trent. A Book of

Our churches teach that the body and blood of Christ are truly present and distributed to those who eat the Lord's Supper [1 Corinthians 10:16]. They reject those who teach otherwise.¹⁷

In the defence of this article the confession argues that

In the Lord's Supper Christ's body and blood are truly and actually present, and are truly tendered with those things which are seen (bread and wine) [...] And we speak of the presence of the living Christ [living body]; "for we know that death no longer has dominion over Him" (Romans 6:9).¹⁸

Luther's Smalcald Articles¹⁹ also affirm in Part III Article VI that the godly and wicked alike receive the true body and blood of Christ and that the substances of bread and wine remain in the elements, describing transubstantiation as 'sophistical cunning'.²⁰

Luther's *Large Catechism*²¹ has a lengthy discussion of the *Sacrament of the Altar*.²² He says of the sacrament: 'It is the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, in and under the bread and wine'.²³ This true presence comes about because of the power and authority of the Word of God; as he has spoken the words so they must be true.²⁴ He argues that a sacrament has the word joined to the element, and cites S. Augustine as the authority for this understanding of the nature of a sacrament.²⁵ Since it is the Word of God alone which is the agent of sacramental change it matters not if the priest is wicked, or if the recipient is a knave, the true body and blood of Christ are given and received.²⁶ Luther argues that the sacrament is given to us for the forgiveness of sins,²⁷ and he

Concord containing the formula along with the historic Creeds, the 1530 Augsburg Confession and other Lutheran confessional documents were published as the definitive Book of Concord in 1580, setting out the Christian faith as believed by Lutherans. A later Latin edition was published in 1584. The book was approved by 86 representatives of Lutheran state churches and some 8,000 pastors. 'Concord, The Formula (1577) and Book (1580)', in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, p. 1801.

¹⁷ McCain and others, p. 35.

¹⁸ McCain and others, pp. 153, 155.

¹⁹ McCain and others, p. 279.

²⁰ McCain and others, p. 279.

²¹ McCain and others, p. 349.

²² McCain and others, p. 431.

²³ McCain and others, p. 432.

²⁴ McCain and others, pp. 432–33.

²⁵ McCain and others, p. 432.

²⁶ McCain and others, p. 434.

²⁷ McCain and others, p. 434.

urges Christians to receive the sacrament frequently, as ‘a daily pasture and sustenance’²⁸ as it is ‘a food of souls, which nourishes and strengthens the new man.’²⁹ The benefit of the sacrament is received by those who believe:

Whoever believes the words has what they declare and bring. For they are not spoken or proclaimed to stone and wood, but to those who hear them, to whom He says: “Take, eat,” and so on. Because He offers and promises forgiveness of sin, it cannot be received except by faith.³⁰

All who wish to receive forgiveness of sins, and so trust by faith in the sacrament, should come frequently and receive it for the building up of the life of faith; the sacrament does not depend on our worthiness,³¹ indeed it is the unworthy, those who need forgiveness, who need the sacrament. Only those who are

Lewd and morally loose must be told to stay away [1 Corinthians 5:9 – 13]. They are not prepared to receive forgiveness of sin, since they do not desire it and do not wish to be godly. [...] To be sure, it is true that those who despise the Sacrament and live in an unchristian manner receive it to their hurt and damnation [1 Corinthians 11:29 – 30]. Nothing shall be good or wholesome for them. It is just like a sick person who on a whim eats and drinks what is forbidden him by the doctor. But those who are mindful of their weakness desire to be rid of it and long for help. They should regard and use the Sacrament just like a precious antidote against the poison which they have in them. Here in the Sacrament you are to receive from the lips of Christ forgiveness of sin. It contains and brings with it God’s grace and the Spirit with all His gifts, protection, shelter, and power against death and the devil and all misfortune.³²

In summary, the Lutheran position is focused on the power and authority of the word of God. Because Jesus’ words are, ‘This is my Body, This is my Blood’, then the bread and wine must be changed by the power of God’s word. The substances of bread and wine remain, and since Melancthon’s defence of the Augsburg Confession asserts that ‘the body and blood of Christ are truly and substantially present’; this understanding of eucharistic presence is sometimes referred to as ‘consubstantiation’ although it is not a term used in the Lutheran articles of faith. The body and blood of Christ are received by all who receive the sacrament, but those who do not faithfully receive them receive to

²⁸ McCain and others, p. 434.

²⁹ McCain and others, p. 434.

³⁰ McCain and others, p. 435.

³¹ McCain and others, p. 438.

³² McCain and others, pp. 438–39.

their hurt and damnation. Luther argues that the sacrament is given for the forgiveness of sins and frequent communion is an ideal which builds up the Christian in faith.

2.3 The Zürich Reformer Ulrich Zwingli

In his paper on '*The Lord's Supper in the Reformed Confessions*',³³ Brian Gerrish quotes the Sixty-Seven Articles of 1523 as an indicator of Zwingli's^{34, 35} views on the Lord's Supper. In the articles, the Supper is declared to be 'both a memorial and a pledge',³⁶ the '*Short and Christian Introduction*' of the same year

assails the sacrifice of the Roman mass and insists that Christ's 'ordinance' is rather a commemoration and preaching of his one sacrifice upon the Cross. Not the breaking of the bread, but his death was his sacrifice. All a man can now offer to God is himself, not Christ. He cannot sacrifice Christ, but he can commemorate the sacrifice of Christ. For Christ has left us "a certain visible sign of his flesh and blood."³⁷

For Zwingli, the key notion is that of a memorial. He uses symbolic language so

An inward spiritual occurrence is symbolically represented by a parallel outward and physical occurrence. The relation between the two occurrences is not causal, as though the outward eating gave rise to the inward. Zwingli has nothing more to say about it than simply that the outward represents the inward.³⁸

In 1526, Zwingli wrote a treatise entitled *On the Lord's Supper*.³⁹ In his introduction Zwingli says that: 'we know from the Word of God that in this sacrament there is no partaking of the corporal

³³ B.A. Gerrish, 'The Lord's Supper in the Reformed Confessions', *Theology Today*, 23.2 (1966), 224–43.

³⁴ Ulrich Zwingli (1484 – 1531) was born in Eastern Switzerland, ordained as a Roman Catholic priest and served as a military chaplain. In 1618 he was appointed to a post at the important Grossmünster in Zürich. He began his ministry there by preaching through Matthew's Gospel in order and then Acts, a break from the Catholic lectionary tradition. Zwingli led a reforming movement in Zürich which focused on the Bible as the Divine Law which represented the will of God.

³⁵ For a further discussion on Zwingli's approach to sacraments see: Bruce Gordon, 'Huldrych Zwingli', in *Christian Theologies of the Sacraments: A Comparative Introduction*, Edited by Justin S. Holcomb and David A. Johnson (New York: New York University Press, 2017), pp. 152–174.

³⁶ Gerrish, p. 226.

³⁷ Gerrish, p. 226.

³⁸ Gerrish, p. 228.

³⁹ *Zwingli and Bullinger*, ed. and trans. by G.W. Bromley, The Library of Christian Classics (Westminster Louisville, Kentucky: John Knox Press 2006). 185 – 238.

Zwingli tells his reader that although he had written on the Supper in Latin this is now a German text. This would have made it more accessible to the inhabitants of Zürich, and apparently less susceptible to censorship (p. 185).

body and blood'.⁴⁰ He says that 'the articles of our Christian Creed' confound any who argue for 'the essential body of Christ in this sacrament'.⁴¹ Zwingli is quite sure of his position, 'I stand upon a rock which does not shake under me',⁴² and he tells his reader: 'The whole question has its source in the misunderstanding of the text: "This is my Body"'.⁴³ Zwingli's definition of a sacrament is 'the sign of a holy thing',⁴⁴ implying there is no ontological identification between the sign and the signified:

But the very body of Christ is the body which is seated at the right hand of God, and the sacrament of his body is the bread, and the sacrament of his blood is the wine, of which we partake with thanksgiving. Now the sign and the thing signified cannot be one and the same. Therefore the sacrament of the body of Christ cannot be the body itself.⁴⁵

Zwingli first argues against those who believe that the power of the word of God is able to change bread into flesh, either by transubstantiation or in the Lutheran sense of the body being added to the bread. He argues that 'is' cannot be taken literally, for we cannot perceive the body which is present.⁴⁶ As 'we see and perceive bread, it is evident that we are ascribing to God a miracle which he himself neither wills nor approves: for he does not work miracles which cannot be perceived'.⁴⁷ He turns to Augustine and argues that, as Augustine writes that believing in Christ is partaking of him, when you publicly receive the bread and wine 'all that you do is to confess publicly that you believe in the Lord Jesus Christ'.⁴⁸ After looking at the meaning of 'This is my Body', Zwingli turns to John 6 which he interprets to refer only to spiritual eating of Christ, and does not refer to the sacrament at all: 'it follows that in this context the bread and flesh are simply believing on him, for it is faith which carries with it eternal life. If he is the bread of life, he gives everlasting life to those who believe on

⁴⁰ Bromley, p. 185.

⁴¹ Bromley, p. 186.

⁴² Bromley, p. 187.

⁴³ Bromley, p. 187.

⁴⁴ Bromley, p. 188.

⁴⁵ Bromley, p. 188.

⁴⁶ Bromley, p. 195.

⁴⁷ Bromley, p. 196.

⁴⁸ Bromley, p. 198.

him.⁴⁹ His conclusion on John 6 is that it *forbids* a literal or carnal understanding of ‘This is my Body’.⁵⁰ Zwingli then moves to I Corinthians 10, referring to the passage: ‘our fathers etc... did all eat the same spiritual meat; and did all drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of that spiritual rock that followed them: and that rock was Christ’.⁵¹ He argues that if all were sustained by the same Christ pre- and post-incarnation then the ancestors could not have been fed with the actual flesh and blood of Christ since he had not yet lived in the flesh.

Now there cannot be the slightest doubt that they did not partake of the literal body and blood of Christ, for Christ did not come in the flesh until sixteen hundred years later. Therefore in their case this eating was simply believing in the one who was to give his flesh and blood to death on their behalf. Similarly in our case the eating and drinking of his body cannot be anything else but believing in the one who has already given his flesh and blood. For he says *to auto*, that is, “one and the same food.”⁵²

Zwingli further argues that the creedal articles on the Ascension of Christ into heaven and his awaited return in judgement also show that Jesus cannot be present in the sacrament in a bodily way.

But if he is present in the bread, or if the bread is the body of Christ, then the last day has already come, he is already present, he is already seated on the judgment throne. But if the last day has not yet come, he is not present in the flesh: for when he does come in the flesh, he will sit in judgment.⁵³

This argument relies on a sort of crude physicalism which is quite absent from the official documents on transubstantiation.

Since Zwingli has argued to his satisfaction that the presence of Christ in the sacrament cannot be bodily, he then investigates whether it is reasonable to understand ‘This is my Body’ in a metaphorical or tropical sense.⁵⁴ He argues that there are very many instances where metaphorical speech is used in different ways.⁵⁵ From his examples he is happy he has shown, ‘In all these sayings “is” means “signifies,” or “are” “signify”’.⁵⁶ He thus argues:

⁴⁹ Bromley, p. 203.

⁵⁰ Bromley, p. 211.

⁵¹ Bromley, p. 211.

⁵² Bromley, p. 211.

⁵³ Bromley, p. 216.

⁵⁴ Bromley, p. 223.

⁵⁵ Bromley, pp. 223–4.

⁵⁶ Bromley, p. 224.

In the words: “This is my body,” the word “this” means the bread, and the word “body” the body which is put to death for us. Therefore the word “is” cannot be taken literally, for the bread is not the body and cannot be, as we have seen already. Necessarily, then, it must be taken figuratively or metaphorically; “This is my body,” means, “The bread signifies my body,” or “is a figure of my body.” For immediately afterwards in Luke 22 Christ adds: “This do in remembrance of me,” from which it follows that the bread is only a figure of his body to remind us in the Supper that the body was crucified for us.⁵⁷

Zwingli shows us that his view of a figure is one that is bare, simply a reminder. After his arguments taken from the Gospel narratives, Zwingli turns to I Corinthians 11. He explains that Paul continues to refer to the elements as bread and wine after consecration⁵⁸ and that in the phrase ‘ye do shew the Lord’s death until he come’ (I Cor. 11.26b) ‘the word “shew” simply means to praise, honour, give thanks, as in I Peter 2 and many Old Testament passages.’⁵⁹

He then turns to the Fathers, quoting from Augustine, Jerome and Ambrose. He interprets them in this way:

the Fathers held exactly the same view as we do. And they use exactly the same speech as we do, for they call the bread and wine the body and blood of Christ, although what they really mean is that they are the representation and memorial of his body and blood, just as a faithful wife, whose husband has left her a ring as a keepsake, frequently refers to the ring as her husband, saying: This is my late husband, although what she means is that it recalls her husband.⁶⁰

It seems clear that Zwingli is willing to read into the writings his definition of a sacrament as a sign with no ontological link to the signified.

What is more interesting is his treatment of I Corinthians 10.16,17. He argues that ‘*eulogoumen*’ should not be translated as blessing, but as “thanksgiving” and “to give thanks” or to “honour”.⁶¹ (Contemporary translations offer ‘blessing’, NRSV.) More significantly, he argues that ‘*koinonia*’ should not be translated as ‘communion’ but ‘community’:⁶² ‘Now consider the meaning

⁵⁷ Bromley, p. 225.

⁵⁸ Bromley, p. 230.

⁵⁹ Bromley, p. 230.

⁶⁰ Bromley, p. 234.

⁶¹ Bromley, p. 236.

⁶² Bromley, p. 236.

of the words: “The cup of praise or thanksgiving, with which we give praise or thanks, or which we praise, or drink with thanksgiving, is it not the community of the blood of Christ?”⁶³ In arguing for this sense, he is arguing against the idea of the elements offering a communion, participation (RSV) or sharing (NRSV) in the body and blood of Christ.⁶⁴

Gerrish summarises Zwingli’s understanding of the eucharist thus:

In the Lord’s Supper the spiritual feeding upon Christ by faith is symbolized by an outward eating of the bread. “You do inwardly what you enact outwardly.” An inward spiritual occurrence is symbolically represented by a parallel outward and physical occurrence. The relation between the two occurrences is not causal, as though the outward eating gave rise to the inward.⁶⁵

For Zwingli the sign is not the thing signified, there is no identity between the two.⁶⁶ Gerrish labels Zwingli’s theology as ‘symbolic memorialism’.⁶⁷ He argues this may be because for Zwingli

the Spirit needs no vehicle, least of all a material vehicle, certainly is one of his reasons for rejecting the old concept of the means of grace. But he was also motivated by what one may perhaps call anachronistically a “Barthian” dread of putting God at man’s disposal. If grace were bound up with the sacraments, they would profit and renew whenever they were celebrated. The clergy would then have infallible power to grant or withhold salvation. Indeed, they would have the fearful power to sell God at a higher price than even Judas asked. Zwingli is therefore speaking as reformer and pastor in his protest against abuses in sacramental theology and practice. Do not buy what you possess already! The Sacrament is simply a public testimony that you do indeed possess what God has given freely. Zwingli’s sacramental theology sounds persistently the joyful note of possession. The “image” of Christ in the Eucharist, like the ring the husband gives to his wife, is a perpetual reminder to the Church that he is wholly ours in all that he is.⁶⁸

⁶³ Bromley, pp. 236–7.

⁶⁴ MacCulloch suggests that towards the end of his life Zwingli had begun to explore using the language of presence to describe the mystery of the eucharist, sensing his former position had been too uncompromising. (p. 177)

⁶⁵ Gerrish, p. 228.

⁶⁶ Gerrish, p. 231.

⁶⁷ Gerrish, p. 239.

⁶⁸ Gerrish, p. 241.

2.4 Jean Calvin

Gerrish suggests that Calvin's beliefs about eucharistic presence can seem very like those of Zwingli and have been judged to be effectively the same.⁶⁹ Nevertheless, he argues that Calvin^{70, 71} differs essentially from Zwingli. For Calvin, 'it is the nature of the sacraments to cause and communicate (*apporter et communiquer*) what they signify.'⁷² Thus at the eucharist, for Calvin, the benefits of Christ are not simply signified, they are also given; in his 1562 Confession Calvin writes: 'Through the signs of the bread and wine our Lord Jesus presents to us his Body and Blood.'⁷³ Gerrish argues,

his position is still, in effect, the exact opposite of Zwingli's: *because a sacrament is a sign, therefore it bestows what it signifies*. More correctly, because sacraments are divinely appointed signs, and God does not lie, therefore the Spirit uses them to confer what they symbolize.⁷⁴

Calvin devotes a large section of his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*^{75, 76} to the Lord's

⁶⁹ Gerrish, p. 230.

⁷⁰ John Calvin (1509 – 64) was born in France but is associated with the city of Geneva. In 1533 a religious experience led him to undertake a personal mission to restore the Church to its original purity. The *Institutes of Christian Religion* is his major written work, the first edition was published in 1536. In Geneva he became a leading organiser of the Reformation, and in 1541 he began devoting himself to transforming the life of the city into a theocratic city state. He was also a commentator on scripture and wrote on predestination. His revolt against Rome was systematic and organised, and understood himself to be a supreme authority on the nature of true Christianity — a trait which was resented even by his own followers. He was one of the most influential voices of the Reformation, because of his theological insight and exegetical skill, which he was able to present clearly and pithily. 'Calvin, John', in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, p. 222–3.

⁷¹ For further discussion on Calvin's sacramental theology see: Randall C. Zachman, 'John Calvin', in *Christian Theologies of the Sacraments: A Comparative Introduction*, Edited by Justin S. Holcomb and David A. Johnson (New York: New York University Press, 2017), pp. 191–208.

⁷² Gerrish, p. 230.

⁷³ Gerrish, p. 231.

⁷⁴ Gerrish, p. 231.

⁷⁵ Jean Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, ed. by John T McNeill, trans. by Ford Lewis Battles, 2 vols., The Library of the Christian Classics, 21 (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960).

The first edition of the *Institutes* was published in 1536, it comprised six chapters. Calvin revised and enlarged the work; its final edition, published in Latin in 1559 and French in 1560 has 80 chapters. The work is in four parts: God the Creator; God the Redeemer; the Holy Spirit; and the means of grace and the Church. Calvin's fundamental doctrines remained unchanged throughout the evolution of the work. It is a clear and systematic exposition of Calvin's beliefs (a counterpart to Aquinas' *Summa*). It became a textbook of Reformed theology expounding the absolute sovereignty of God, the basis of all Christian faith in the Word of God revealed in the scriptures and our inability to find salvation apart from the free grace of God. Our study will focus on the fourth part of the *Institutes*, which looks at the Church. 'Institutes, The', in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, p. 707.

⁷⁶ For a summary of some of Calvin's other writing on the eucharist see: Larry Daniel Siekawitch, 'Calvin, Spirit, Communion and the Supper', *Journal of The European Pentecostal Theological Association*, (2009), 14–35.

Supper. Book IV, Chapter 17⁷⁷ is entitled ‘The Sacred Supper of Christ, and what it brings to us’. The following chapter is an attack on the beliefs and practices of the Roman Catholic Church: ‘The Papal Mass, a Sacrilege by which Christ’s Supper was not only Profaned but Annihilated’.⁷⁸ He writes about the Supper: ‘[God] has, through the hand of his Son, given to his church another sacrament, that is, a spiritual banquet, wherein Christ attests himself to be the life-giving bread, upon which our souls feed unto true and blessed immortality.’⁷⁹

Of the elements of bread and wine themselves he writes: ‘we ought to guard against two faults. First, we should not, by too little regard for the signs, divorce them from their mysteries, to which they are so to speak attached. Secondly, we should not, by extolling them immoderately, seem to obscure the mysteries themselves.’⁸⁰ Calvin uses the word ‘attached’ to describe the relation between the sign and the signified; they are not ontologically identified with what they represent, but they are linked.

He has described the bread and wine as *signs* ‘which represent for us the invisible food that we receive from the flesh and blood of Christ.’⁸¹ As we shall see this is a representation which is effective, not merely an empty sign. The sacrament is a witness to the unity with Christ promised to the devout and so the signs should be treated appropriately:

In this Sacrament we have such full witness of all these things that we must certainly consider them as if Christ here present were himself set before our eyes and touched by our hands. For his word cannot lie or deceive us: “Take, eat, drink: this is my body, which is given for you: this is my blood which is shed for forgiveness of sins.”⁸²

Calvin speaks of the physical signs as a sort of ‘analogy’⁸³ which connects physical eating and drinking and their benefits to the body with the similar spiritual benefits given to the soul by the body and blood of Christ: ‘to nourish, refresh, strengthen, and gladden.’⁸⁴ He sees the purpose of the

⁷⁷ Calvin, II, pp. 1359–1428.

⁷⁸ Calvin, II, pp. 1429–1448.

⁷⁹ Calvin, II, p. 1360.

⁸⁰ Calvin, II, p. 1364.

⁸¹ Calvin, II, p. 1360.

⁸² Calvin, II, p. 1362.

⁸³ Calvin, II, p. 1363.

⁸⁴ Calvin, II, p. 1363.

sacrament not only in extending to us the body and blood of Christ but as guaranteeing Christ's promises; it 'sends us to the Cross of Christ'.⁸⁵ We appropriate the life-giving sacrifice of Jesus by eating and drinking in faith. Calvin refers to John 6, arguing that 'true partaking in him'⁸⁶ does not simply come from knowledge. Calvin argues that eating follows from faith, it is not simply faith alone, thus the actual eating of the sacrament is required for partaking.⁸⁷

Calvin reasons that Christ is present in the Sacrament by the power of the Holy Spirit:

Even though it seems unbelievable that Christ's flesh, separated from us by such a great distance, penetrates to us, so that it becomes our food, let us remember how far the secret power of the Holy Spirit towers above all our senses, and how foolish it is to wish to measure his immeasurableness by our measure. What, then, our mind does not comprehend, let faith conceive: that the Spirit truly unites things separated in space.⁸⁸

He argues that Supper is not a case of the name of the signified being given to the sign, his position is 'by the showing of the symbol the thing itself is also shown.'⁸⁹ To disbelieve this is to call God a 'deceiver'.⁹⁰

Therefore, if the Lord truly represents the participation in his body through the breaking of bread, there ought to be no doubt that he truly presents and shows his body. And the godly ought by all means to keep this rule: whenever they see symbols appointed by the Lord, to think, and be persuaded that the truth of the thing signified is surely present there. For why should the Lord put into your hand the symbol of his body, except to assure you of a true participation in it?⁹¹

We see here in Calvin's writing a very plain opposition to Zwingli's symbolism, which is without actual effect and argues against any effective presence in the Sacrament. Calvin argues against the ideas of local presence developed to explain the doctrine of transubstantiation,⁹² nevertheless, he writes that

⁸⁵ Calvin, II, p. 1363.

⁸⁶ Calvin, II, p. 1365.

⁸⁷ Calvin, II, p. 1365.

⁸⁸ Calvin, II, p. 1370.

⁸⁹ Calvin, II, p. 1371.

⁹⁰ Calvin, II, p. 1371.

⁹¹ Calvin, II, p. 1371.

⁹² Calvin, II, pp. 1371–82.

when these absurdities have been set aside, I freely accept whatever can be made to express the true and substantial partaking of the body and blood of the Lord, which is shown to believers under the sacred symbols of the Supper – and so to express it that they may be understood not to receive it solely by imagination or understanding of mind, but to enjoy the thing itself as nourishment of eternal life.⁹³

Calvin argues against the adoration of the consecrated host and other ‘Superstitious rites’⁹⁴ but in his discussion on taking the Sacrament to the sick there is hesitation. It may be inferred that he does believe in a persistent presence of the body and blood of Christ in the elements, although he believes that they should not be distributed apart from the Word of God.⁹⁵ There is some anxiety here for Calvin and he argues that the Sacrament should not be given apart from hearing the promises recited over them. He concedes that the practice of taking holy communion to the sick is attested by ancient practice, but it opens the way to grave error.⁹⁶ His position is also that the Lord’s Supper should be celebrated frequently, he argues that

The Lord’s Table should have been spread at least once a week for the assembly of Christians, and the promises declared in it should feed us spiritually. None is indeed to be forcibly compelled, but all are to be urged and aroused; also the inertia of indolent people is to be rebuked. All, like hungry men, should flock to such a bounteous repast.⁹⁷

Gerrish argues that Calvin’s theology can be termed ‘symbolic instrumentalism’.⁹⁸ Communion with Christ actually takes place in the Lord’s Supper and the communion is given *through* the elements of consecrated bread and wine; interestingly, Gerrish suggest that this has Thomistic overtones.⁹⁹

⁹³ Calvin, II, p. 1382.

⁹⁴ Calvin, II, pp. 1411–14.

⁹⁵ For a discussion on Calvin’s theology of word and sacrament see: Michael S. Horton, ‘Union and Communion: Calvin’s Theology of Word and Sacrament’, *International Journal of Systematic Theology*, 11.4, (2009), 398–414.

⁹⁶ Calvin, II, p. 1417.

⁹⁷ Calvin, II, p. 1424.

⁹⁸ Gerrish, p. 239.

⁹⁹ Gerrish, p. 240.

2.5 Bullinger – A Middle Way between Zwingli and Calvin

Gerrish identifies a third strand of Reformed thought in the writing of Henry Bullinger,¹⁰⁰ like Zwingli a Zürich based Reformer. In some of his writing, Gerrish suggests that Bullinger approaches the view held by Calvin, but in other places he holds to a view which Gerrish terms *symbolic parallelism*, ‘outwardly we eat the bread, inwardly *at the same time* we also feed upon Christ’s Body’.¹⁰¹ In his *Decades* (a series of fifty sermons or lectures) Bullinger wrote:

we affirm, that the bread and wine remain as they are in their own substances, but that there is added unto them the institution, will, and word of Christ, and so become a sacrament, and so differ much from common bread and wine, as we have said in place convenient.¹⁰²

He describes sacraments as ‘witnesses to the truth’¹⁰³ and he argues that Christ communicates himself to us ‘after a special manner’ when we partake of the sacraments, but he does not understand the sacraments to act like ‘conduit pipes’ nor containers of grace.¹⁰⁴ The *Decades* were translated into English in the late sixteenth century, one of the sermons was dedicated to Edward VI, another volume to Lord Grey. Archbishop Whitgift gave the English translations semi-official standing in the Church of England as a recommended text for unlicensed ministers.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁰ Henry Bullinger (1504–75) was appointed as leader of the church in Zürich following Zwingli’s death at the Battle of Kappel, he was still a young man of only 27. MacCulloch describes the city as left in a ‘mess’ following Zwingli’s death. Bullinger was loyal to Zwingli’s memory but carefully modified some of his more controversial teachings. Bullinger spoke of the eucharist using terms which would be more congenial to Lutheran thought. Although he rarely left Zürich he corresponded widely, some 12,000 of his letters survive as a witness to his network of contacts across Europe. (See: MacCulloch, pp. 176–9.)

¹⁰¹ Gerrish, p. 234.

¹⁰² H. Bullinger ‘*The Decades of Henry Bullinger*’, Translated by H.I. Edited by Thomas Harding, 4 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1852), IV, p. 416.

The *Decades* of Henry Bullinger is a collection of fifty sermons or lectures. These are a cycle which forms a treatise in pastoral theology. The first two decades (i.e. the first twenty sermons) were published in 1549, the next two in 1550 and the final decade in 1551. Bullinger dedicated the third and fourth decades to King Edward VI of England. The decades are intended to expound the chief and principal points of religion. (See above, p. xx)

¹⁰³ Bullinger, IV, p. 316.

¹⁰⁴ Bullinger, IV, p. 315.

¹⁰⁵ Bromley, p. 283.

2.6 Thomas Cranmer and the English Prayer Books

We have looked at the theological positions of the most prominent Continental reformers. Since Taylor was a priest and bishop of the Church of England, raised and nurtured in that tradition, we need to focus on how the Reformers' thought was received and developed by that Church in the years from its inception until Taylor's time. We find its eucharistic doctrine by interrogating the eucharistic rites of the Books of Common Prayer in their historical development and then in significant figures in the English Church tradition following on from Thomas Cranmer¹⁰⁶, Archbishop of Canterbury from 1532,¹⁰⁷ who is credited with writing the first and second Prayer Books. The first English Prayer Book was printed in 1549 by act of parliament, enforcing its use by an Act of Uniformity.¹⁰⁸ This was the first complete rite in English. The eucharist is entitled: 'The Supper of the Lorde and the holy Communion, commonly called the Masse.'¹⁰⁹ The exhortation refers to the 'holy Communion of the bodye and bloude of our savior Christe' and tells the worthy recipient that: 'for then we spiritually eate the fleshe of Christ, and drinke his bloude, then we dwell in Christ and Christ in us, wee bee made one with Christ, and Christ with us'. During the prayer over the elements of bread and wine the priest prays:

Heare us (O merciful fater) we besech thee; and with thy holy spirite and worde, vouchsafe to blesse and sanctifie these thy gyftes, and creatures of bread and wyne, that they maie be unto us the bodye and bloude of thy moste derely beloved sonne Jesus Christe.

Before receiving the consecrated elements, the priest knelt before the table and prayed on behalf of all who would receive holy communion using these words: 'Graunt us therefore (gracious lorde) so to eate the fleshe of thy dere sonne Jesus Christ, and to drynke his bloud in these holy Misteries, that

¹⁰⁶ For further discussion of Cranmer's sacramental theology see: Ashely Null, 'Thomas Cranmer', in *Christian Theologies of the Sacraments: A Comparative Introduction*, Edited by Justin S. Holcomb and David A. Johnson (New York: New York University Press, 2017), pp. 209–232.

¹⁰⁷ 'Cranmer, Thomas', in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, Second Edition*, Edited by F.L Cross and E.A. Livingstone (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983) pp. 356, 357.

¹⁰⁸ 'Common Prayer, The Book of', in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, pp. 320, 321.

¹⁰⁹ <http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/1549/Communion_1549.htm> [Accessed 11th January 2017] (All quotations from the 1549 rite are from this reference.)

we may continually dwell in hym, and he in us...' And as the elements were given to the people they were given with these words:

The body of our Lorde Jesus Christe whiche was geven for thee, preserve thy bodye and soule unto everlasting lyfe.

The bloud of our Lorde Jesus Christe which was shed for thee, preserve thy bodye and soule unto everlastyng lyfe.

Following the communion, the priest prays the prayer of thanksgiving beginning: 'Almighty and everlyvyng God, we moste hartely thanke thee, for that thou hast vouchsafed to feede us in these holy Misteries, with the spirituall foode of the moste precious body and bloud of thy sonne, our saviour Jesus Christ'.

Whilst there is a reticence about the nature of the presence, it seems clear that the elements themselves were described as the body and blood of Christ and that they were understood to be transformed in some way by the action of the Holy Spirit. They were spiritual food rather than corporal food, but the communicants prayed that they might 'eate the fleshe of thy dere sonne Jesus Christ, and to drynke his bloud in these holy Misteries'. It is not spelt out, but the implication is that Christ was spiritually present in the consecrated elements.

The 1549 Book was short-lived. It was replaced by a revised book in 1552.¹¹⁰ This book indicated a move to a more reformed Church and incorporated the response to criticism from the reformers Peter Martyr and Martin Bucer. The new eucharistic rite removed the word Masse, becoming, 'The order of the ministracion of the Lordes Supper or holy Communion.'¹¹¹ The invocation of the Holy Spirit over the bread and wine is omitted altogether, and there are other more subtle yet significant alterations. The prayer before receiving the elements now read:

graunt us therfore (gracious lord) so to eate the fleshe of thy dere sonne Jesus Christe, and to drinke his bloud, that our synfulle bodyes maye be made cleane by his body, and our soules wasched through his most precious bloud, and that we may evermore dwel in him, and he in us.

¹¹⁰ 'Common Prayer, The Book of', in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, p. 320.

¹¹¹ <http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/1552/Communion_1552.htm> [Accessed 11th January 2017] (All quotations from the 1552 rite are from this reference.)

The words 'in these holy Misteries' from 1549 are omitted. Further, the words at the distribution of Holy Communion are altered:

Take and eate this, in remembraunce that Christ dyed for thee, and feede on him in thy hearte by faythe, with thankesgeving.
Drinke this in remembraunce that Christ's bloude was shed for thee, and be thankfull.

The elements are no longer described as the body and blood of Christ. The prayer of thanksgiving, one of a pair of alternatives, reads:

Almightie and everliving God, we most hartely thank thee, for that thou doest vouchsafe to fede us, whiche have duely receyved these holye misteries, with the spirituall foode of the most precious body and bloud of thy sonne our saviour Jesus Christ

This disconnects the spiritual feeding from the actual reception of the elements. In the rubrics following the order there is an instruction concerning any leftover elements: 'And yf any of the bread or wine remayne, the Curate shal have it to hys owne use'. This suggests that there was no understanding of any change in the elements, whether substantial or otherwise. A final paragraph of rubric was added without the authority of the Act of Uniformity:

[...] Whereas it is ordeyned in the booke of common prayer, in the administracion of the Lord's Supper, that the Communicants knelyng shoulde receyve the holye Communion. whiche thyng beyng well mente, for a sygnificacion of the humble and gratefull acknowledgyng of the benefites of Chryst, geven unto the woorthye receyver, and to avoyde the prophanacion and dysordre, which about the holy Communion myght els ensue: Leste yet the same kneelyng myght be thought or taken otherwyse, we dooe declare that it is not ment thereby, that any adoracion is doone, or oughte to bee doone, eyther unto the Sacramentall bread or wyne there bodily receyved, or unto any reall and essencial presence there beeyng of Christ's naturall fleshe and bloude. For as concernynge the Sacramentall bread and wyne, they remayne styll in theyr verye naturall substaunces, and therefore may not be adored, for that were Idolatrye to be abhorred of all faythfull christians. And as concernynge the naturall body and blood of our saviour Christ, they are in heaven and not here. For it is agaynst the trueth of Christes true natural bodye, to be in moe places then in one, at one tyme.

Here there is a clear repudiation of transubstantiation as commonly understood, and an assertion that kneeling does not imply adoration. These changes point to a withdrawal from the belief in the presence of the body and blood of Christ connected with the elements, possibly indicating instead a Zwinglian symbolic memorialism; the elements of bread and wine being signs remaining unchanged

after the liturgical prayer and ontologically disconnected from the body and blood of Christ. They were given that the communicant might remember that Christ died for them and so subjectively feed on Christ.

This may be an incorrect reading, however. Cranmer himself said ‘For they teach that Christ is in the bread and wine; but we say (according to the truth), that he is in them that worthily eat and drink the bread and wine.’¹¹² (‘They’ are Cranmer’s Roman Catholic interlocutors.) Cranmer denies that Christ is either spiritually or corporally in or under the bread and wine, but he is present in those who worthily eat and drink.¹¹³ But Cranmer still argues,

the bread and wine be made unto us the body and blood of Christ, (as it is in the book of common prayer,) but not by changing the substance of bread and wine into the substance of Christ’s natural body and blood, but that in prayer, the godly using of them they be unto the receivers Christ’s body and blood.¹¹⁴

In this statement, he implies that the giving of bread and wine in the eucharist is instrumental in giving the Body and Blood of Christ to the worthy communicant. In this way, he argues that

I say that Christ is spiritually and by grace in his supper, as he is when two or three be gathered together in his name, meaning that with both he is spiritually, and with neither corporally; and yet I say not that there is no difference. For this difference there is, that with the one he is sacramentally, and with the other not sacramentally, except they be gathered together in his name to receive the sacrament. Nevertheless the selfsame Christ is present in both, nourisheth and feedeth both, if the sacrament be rightly received. But that is only spiritually, as I say, and only after a spiritual manner, as you say.¹¹⁵

It may be that the best way to understand the theology of the 1552 Book, and Cranmer himself, as akin to that of Henry Bullinger. The elements do not convey the grace, but Christ is in them that worthily eat and drink the bread and wine. There is a symbolic parallel between giving the bread and

¹¹² *Writings and Disputations of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Martyr, 1556, Relative to the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper*, Edited by John Edmund Cox (Cambridge: The University Press, 1844), p. 52. The discussion here is a record of Cranmer’s disputation with Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, who had remained loyal to the Roman Catholic Church.

¹¹³ Cox, p. 54.

¹¹⁴ Cox, p. 79.

¹¹⁵ Cox, p. 92.

wine and receiving the body and blood of Christ, the elements could be considered bare symbols, but in the action of holy communion the body and blood of Christ are received.

The 1552 Book was very short-lived, Edward VI¹¹⁶ died and was succeeded by his Catholic half-sister Mary Tudor¹¹⁷ whose Repeal Act of 1553 returned the English Church to Roman Catholic practice.¹¹⁸ Following Mary's death, the Book of Common Prayer was reinstated by Elizabeth¹¹⁹ with the 1559 Book.¹²⁰ There were few changes from the 1552 book, but the significant ones were that the words for the administration of holy communion were combined from both previous books becoming:

The bodie of our lord Jesu Christ, which was geven for the, preserve thy body and soule into everlasting life: and take and eate this in remembraunce that Christ died for thee, feede on him in thine heart by faith, with thankesgevyng.

The bloude of our lorde Jesu Christ, which was shedd for the, preserve thy body and soule into everlasting life: and drinke this in remembraunce that Christes bloude was shedde for thee, and be thankful.¹²¹

This small change implies a belief that the consecrated elements themselves were, in some way, the body and blood of Christ. This Book also removed the final rubric inserted into the 1552 Book. This

¹¹⁶ Ob. 1553, 'Edward VI', in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, p. 446.

¹¹⁷ Ob. 1558, 'Mary Tudor', in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, pp. 885–6.

¹¹⁸ This formative period for the English Church was coloured by the religious affiliations of Henry VIII's three children. Edward VI acceded to the throne in 1547, at the age of ten. His reign was dominated by Protestant members of his Privy Council, and by the evangelical Archbishop Cranmer. Religious change accelerated during his reign, and the tenor of English Protestantism changed from Lutheran to Reformed. During this time Cranmer welcomed many continental reformers to England. The King himself was sympathetic to reform, having 'adolescent evangelical enthusiasm'. During this time there was both protest against religious reform and demonstrations in favour of more radical reform. (See: MacCulloch, pp. 255–258.) However, Edward's death, aged only 16, brought this process to a halt. His sister Mary Tudor came to the throne, a Roman Catholic. She returned England to the Roman Catholic faith, and during her reign Thomas Cranmer and other leading reformers were burned as heretics. (See 'Mary Tudor', in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, pp. 885–6.) Although Mary's reign was also short, she died in 1558, the character of the English Reformation was changed by this interruption, many reformers would go into exile in Europe and England would no longer 'play the captaining role Cranmer planned for it among the Reformed Churches.' (MacCulloch, p. 258.)

¹¹⁹ Elizabeth I (1533–1603) Queen of England from 1558. Elizabeth's accession on the death of her sister returned England to Protestantism, yet she was of a very careful temper, suspicious of Catholics and Calvinists alike. MacCulloch describes her Protestantism as 'peculiarly conservative' (MacCulloch, p. 290.) noting her ability to appeal to 'the broadest possible constituency of her subjects'. (MacCulloch, p. 289.) 'Elizabeth I', in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, p. 453.

¹²⁰ 'Common Prayer, The Book of', in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, p. 320.

¹²¹ <http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/1559/Communion_1559.htm> [Accessed 11th January 2017]

was the form of the Book of Common Prayer which remained effectively current until it was suppressed by the Commonwealth, so this was the form that Taylor would have known.

In 1562 Articles were drawn up and agreed by the English Bishops ‘for the avoiding of diversities of opinions and for the establishing of consent touching true religion.’¹²² These Thirty-Nine Articles include a number which refer to the sacraments in general and to the Lord’s Supper in particular. Article XXV, ‘Of the Sacraments’, describes sacraments as ‘certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace, and God’s good will towards us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our Faith in him.’¹²³ Article XXVIII, ‘Of the Lord’s Supper’ reads:

THE Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another; but rather is a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ’s death: insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ; and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ.

Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.

The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith.

The Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper was not by Christ’s ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.¹²⁴

Gerrish argues that this teaching rules out Zwinglianism and is ‘cautiously Calvinistic’; he further argues that the position in the Catechism from 1604 is a clear expression of a sacrament that would coincide with Calvin’s theology:¹²⁵

Question. What meanest thou by this word *Sacrament*?

¹²² Church of Ireland ‘*The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments*’ (Dublin: Columba Press, 2004), p. 778.

¹²³ *The Book of Common Prayer*, p. 784.

¹²⁴ *The Book of Common Prayer*, pp. 785–6.

¹²⁵ Gerrish, p. 236.

Answer. I meane an outward and visible signe of an inward and spirituall grace given unto us; ordained by Christ himselfe, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof.^{126, 127}

From these Articles and the catechism, it is clear that although the Church of England repudiated substantial change in the elements, they were considered effectual signs of what was promised. They were not simply bare signs, mere reminders of Christ's Passion.

2.7 Richard Hooker and the Beginnings of Anglicanism

In his study of the Reformation, Diarmaid MacCulloch argues that Richard Hooker's *The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* began the movement of the Church of England away from Continental Protestantism. Hooker died in 1600, his Laws were published in 1593.¹²⁸ Hooker¹²⁹ writes Of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ in Chapter 67 of Book 5 of the Laws.^{130, 131} He argues that there is general agreement that there is real participation in Christ by means of the sacrament, and that the human soul is the place where Christ is received.¹³² Hooker argues:

Is there anything more expidite, clear, and easy, than that as Christ is termed our life because through him we obtain life, so the parts of this sacrament are his body and blood for that they are so to us who receiving them receive that by them they are termed? The bread and cup are his body and blood because they are causes instrumental upon the receipt whereof the *participation* of his body and blood ensueth.

¹²⁶ <http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/1559/Confirmation_1559.htm> [Accessed 17th January 2017]

¹²⁷ The questions on the Sacraments were added to the catechism in 1604. Although they were thus not part of the 1559 book, they would have been part of the Prayer Book current during Taylor's lifetime.

¹²⁸ Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Reformation: Europe's House Divided 1490 – 1700* (London: Allen Lane, 2003) pp. 503–4.

¹²⁹ Richard Hooker (c.1554 – 1600) is seen as an accomplished apologist for Anglicanism. His *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* sets out a broadly conceived philosophical theology. In opposition to the Puritans he set out a theory of law based on natural law whose seat is the bosom of God. This natural law is an expression of God's supreme reason and everything, including the scriptures, must be interpreted in its light. He understood the church as a dynamic institution, adapting to its circumstances as necessary, governed by this natural law. 'Hooker, Richard', in, *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, p. 665.

¹³⁰ *The Works of the Learned and Judicious Divine Mr. Richard Hooker with an Account of his Life and Death by Isaac Walton*, Volume II Arranged by John Keble, Revised by R.W. Church and F. Paget (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1888) pp. 348–62.

¹³¹ A more detailed commentary on this passage of Hooker's Laws can be found here: Ronald Vince, 'Richard Hooker on the Eucharist: A Commentary on the Laws V.67', *Anglican Theological Review*, 89.3 (2007), 421–442.

¹³² Hooker, p. 349.

For that which produceth any certain effect is not vainly nor improperly said to be that very effect whereunto it tendeth.¹³³

Hooker sees the bread and wine as instruments which bring about what is promised, again we are following the same line of thought as Calvin. Hooker seems to repudiate any change in the bread and wine themselves, he writes:

The real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not therefore to be sought for in the sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the sacrament. [...] As for the sacraments, they really exhibit, but for aught we can gather out of that which is written of them, they are not really nor do really contain in themselves that grace which with them or by them it pleaseth God to bestow.¹³⁴

He makes an analogy with Baptism; we do not believe the water to be the seat of the grace which is bestowed, so why should we do so in the bread and wine?¹³⁵ Hooker uses the witness of Tertullian, Irenaeus and Theodoret to argue:

They teach that Christ is *personally* there present, yea present whole, albeit a part of Christ be *corporally* absent from thence; that Christ assisting this heavenly banquet with his personal and true presence doth by his own divine power add to the natural substance thereof supernatural efficacy, which addition to the nature of those consecrated elements changeth them and maketh them that unto us which otherwise they could not be; that to us they are thereby made such instruments as mystically yet truly, invisibly yet really work our communion or fellowship with the person of Jesus Christ [...] whereupon there ensueth a kind of transubstantiation in us, a true change both of soul and body, an alteration from death to life.¹³⁶

So, although Hooker does not argue for a real presence within the elements of bread and wine, he does argue that they are changed so that they become instruments of what is promised. They are no longer common bread and wine but are now given supernatural efficacy.¹³⁷ He is clear that the sacrament is effective, bringing about a real transformation in the worthy recipient. Hooker imagines Christ himself describing the three differing ways of understanding the sacrament: consubstantiation, transubstantiation and this third way:

¹³³ Hooker, p. 352.

¹³⁴ Hooker, p. 352.

¹³⁵ Hooker, p. 353.

¹³⁶ Hooker, pp. 357–8.

¹³⁷ Hooker, p. 357.

This hallowed food, through concurrence of divine power, is in verity and truth, unto faithful receivers, instrumentally a cause of that mystical participation, whereby as I make myself wholly theirs, so I give them in had an actual possession of all such saving grace as my sacrificial body can yield, and as their souls do presently need, *this is to them and in them my body*.¹³⁸

This, for Hooker, is the best description of the sacrament, containing ‘nothing but what the rest do all approve and acknowledge to be most true’ and ‘nothing but wherewith the writings of all antiquity are consonant and all Christian confessions agreeable.’¹³⁹ In the phrase ‘instrumentally a cause of that mystical participation’ we see a theology very similar to that of Calvin, and indeed an echo of Gerrish’s phrase ‘symbolic instrumentalism’.

2.8 Lancelot Andrewes, Bishop of Winchester

Alongside Richard Hooker, MacCulloch identifies Lancelot Andrewes as a significant figure in the beginning of the creation of a distinct Anglican identity.¹⁴⁰ He writes, ‘The whole style of Andrewes’s preaching and theological writing marked him off from the Reformation mainstream, largely ignoring the work of the sixteenth-century Reformers to concentrate on writings from the early Church.’¹⁴¹ Andrewes was born in 1555,¹⁴² in 1601 he was appointed Dean of Westminster, and would subsequently become Bishop of Chichester (1605), Bishop of Ely (1609) and finally Bishop of Winchester (1619).¹⁴³ Andrewes wrote a response to Cardinal Bellarmine in which he argued that the ‘Anglican controversy with Rome is not as to the reality but as to the method of the presence of Christ’:¹⁴⁴

Christ said, ‘This is My body’ He did not say, ‘This is My body in this way’ [...] We believe no less than you that the presence is real. Concerning the method of the presence, we define nothing rashly, and, I add, we do not anxiously inquire, any more than how the blood of Christ washes us in our Baptism, any more than how the human and divine natures are united in one Person in the Incarnation of Christ.¹⁴⁵

¹³⁸ Hooker, p. 359.

¹³⁹ Hooker, p.359.

¹⁴⁰ MacCulloch, pp. 508–10.

¹⁴¹ MacCulloch, p. 508.

¹⁴² Stevenson, *Covenant of Grace Renewed*, p.40.

¹⁴³ Stevenson, *Covenant of Grace Renewed*, pp. 42–43.

¹⁴⁴ Stone, II, p. 264.

¹⁴⁵ Stone, II, p. 264.

Andrewes argues that although Bellarmine can point to writers who speak of

some kind of change (*pro mutatione, immutatione, transmutatione*) But there is no mention there of a change in substance, or of the substance. But neither do we deny in this matter the preposition *trans*; and we allow that the elements are changed (*transmutari*). But a change in substance we look for, and we find it nowhere.

At the coming of the almighty power of the Word, the nature is changed so that what before was the mere element now becomes a divine Sacrament, the substance nevertheless remaining what it was before. ... There is that kind of union between the visible Sacrament and the invisible reality (*rem*) of the Sacrament which there is between the manhood and the Godhead of Christ, where unless you want to smack of Eutyches, the manhood is not transubstantiated into the Godhead.¹⁴⁶

In Andrewes, we discover a writer who argues for presence, without wishing to define its manner, except in that it is not substantial: the visible elements of bread and wine are united with the reality of the body and blood of Christ which they convey.

In Andrewes' *Two Answers to Cardinal Perron* he argues that it is permissible to reserve the sacrament for the purpose of communicating the sick, but it is not for the purpose of adoration.¹⁴⁷ This implies that Andrewes believes in a persistent change in the consecrated elements.

Many of Andrewes' sermons conclude with a reference to the eucharist, he frequently preached before the King at festivals, and of these festival sermons all the Christmas sermons from 1605 – 1623 contain a specific mention of the eucharist except that for Christmas 1622; similarly, all of the Easter Day sermons from 1606 – 1624 and the Pentecost sermons from 1606 – 1620. These not only reflect on the benefit of receiving holy communion and the foretaste of the heavenly banquet, but also reflect on the nature of the presence of Christ.¹⁴⁸ For example, his sermon for Christmas 1615 plays on the word Bethlehem, meaning 'house of bread'. Towards the end of the sermon Andrewes preached:

We speak of the *transeamus usque Bethlehem*, 'going thither'. That may we even locally do and never go out of this room, inasmuch as here is to be had the 'true Bread of life that came down from Heaven'. Which is His 'flesh' this day born, which 'He

¹⁴⁶ Stone, II, p. 264.

¹⁴⁷ *Two Answers to Cardinal Perron and Other Miscellaneous Works of Lancelot Andrewes* (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1865), p. 19.

¹⁴⁸ Stevenson, *Covenant of Grace Renewed*, pp. 48–9.

gave for the life of the world', called by Him so, the true Bread, the Bread of heaven, the Bread of life--and where that Bread is, there is Bethlehem for ever. Even *stricte loquendo*, it may be said and said truly, the Church in this sense is very Bethlehem no less than the town itself. For that town itself never had the name rightly all the while there was but bread made there, bread (*panis hominum*) 'the bread of men'. Not till this Bread was born there, which is *Panis Angelorum*, as the Psalm calleth it, 'and man did eat Angel's Food'. Then, and never till then was it Bethlehem; and that is in the Church, as truly as ever in it.¹⁴⁹

Two years later, Andrewes compares the sacrament with the cratch (crib) in which Christ was laid:

The Sacrament we shall have besides, and of the Sacrament we may well say, *Hoc erit signum*. For a sign it is, and by it *invenietis Puerum*, ye will find this Child. For finding His flesh and blood, ye cannot miss but find Him too. And a sign, not much from this here. For Christ in the Sacrament is not altogether unlike Christ in the cratch. To the cratch we may well like the husk or outward symbols of it. Outwardly it seems little worth but it is rich of contents, as was the crib this day with Christ in it. For what are they, but *infirma et egena elementa*, weak and poor elements of themselves? yet in them find we Christ. Even as they did this day in the beasts' crib the food of Angels; which very food our signs both represent, and present unto us.¹⁵⁰

In these sermon fragments we recognise a preacher who believes that Christ is present as the bread of life for us in the sacrament, in the bread, and that the symbols of bread and wine are rich with the content of Christ. Stevenson¹⁵¹ points to the 1616 Pentecost sermon in which Andrewes reminds us that the sacraments are channels of grace, they are not themselves the grace they offer:

That as the carpenters that built the ark wherein Noah was saved, were themselves drowned in the flood; that as the water of baptism that send the child to Heaven, is itself cast down the kennel; semblably is it with these: and they that by the word, the Sacraments, the keys, are unto other the conduits of grace, to make them fructify in all good works, may well so be, though themselves remain unfruitful, as do the pipes of wood or lead, that by transmitting the water make the garden to bear both herbs and flowers, though themselves never bear any. And let that content us, that what is here received, for us, and is given us by them.¹⁵²

Andrewes presents a view of the sacrament which steers a middle course between Zwingli's bare memorialism and the Roman Catholic position. He argues for Christ present, but not identified with

¹⁴⁹ *Ninety-Six Sermons by the Right honourable and Reverend Father in God, Lancelot Andrewes*, Vol. I, Edited by J.P. Wilson (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1841), p. 173.

¹⁵⁰ Wilson, I, p. 213.

¹⁵¹ Stevenson, *Covenant of Grace Renewed*, p. 51.

¹⁵² Wilson, I, p. 278.

the sacrament, a sacrament in which the elements are changed by the operation of the Holy Spirit but changed in such a way that they are channels of grace.

2.9 The Anglican Position

This brief survey shows us that the Church of England's eucharistic thought was in essence in the same strand as Calvin: the elements of bread and wine, once consecrated, were instruments which would bring about the reception of the body and blood of Christ. Although the elements are not completely identified with the matter of the sacrament, they are in some way changed by the eucharist to become 'conduits of grace', in Andrewes' words. By worthily eating and drinking the communicant is a participant in the body and blood of Christ. There is a real reception of grace, even if there is a hesitation about locating the grace within the elements that are given. In following chapters, we shall investigate how true Taylor's writing is to this developing thread, begun in 1549 and continuing through later writers such as Hooker and Andrewes in the generation before him. In Taylor we will find a writer who is the inheritor of Hooker and Andrewes in their Anglican tradition; we will see that he believes, like Hooker, that the elements are a cause of mystical participation and, like Andrewes, that the elements represent and present to us Christ's body and blood.

Chapter 3: Taylor's Arguments against Transubstantiation and his Support for 'Spiritual Presence'.

Here we begin our examination of Taylor's writings. This chapter focuses on the opening sections of Taylor's polemic work *The Real Presence and Spiritual of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament Proved Against the Doctrine of Transubstantiation*. This long work is divided into sections, each focusing on a particular element of Taylor's argument. Some of these sections are very detailed, focusing on the meaning of a single word. As it is a long work, we will spread our discussion of it over two chapters. This first chapter examines Taylor's scene setting and his arguments which are based in scripture, investigating Taylor's argument that transubstantiation is not warrantable by scripture.

The Real Presence and Spiritual was published in 1654. Taylor was spurred to write it by a controversy with a Roman Catholic who was taking advantage of the awkward circumstances of the Church of England (although the Commonwealth was unlikely to be more welcoming to Roman Catholics than to the Church of England). In a letter to Gilbert Sheldon, Taylor describes the work as 'occasioned by my conference with a Jesuit';¹ Stranks states that this person has been generally taken to be John Sargeant, a convert who had at one time been secretary to the Bishop of Durham.² The work is dedicated to Dr Warner, Bishop of Rochester.³ McAdoo describes this work as 'an outstanding example of the classical Anglican three-fold appeal to Scripture, to the teaching of the Primitive Church and to reason'; important for evaluating Taylor's eucharistic theology because of its breadth and depth.⁴ In it Taylor argues that the doctrine of transubstantiation is unsupported by Scripture and is against the evidence of the senses and against reason. When Taylor argues that transubstantiation is against 'sense' he means the sacramental change cannot be verified by the human senses of touch, smell, taste, hearing or sight. There is no perceptible change in the elements

¹ Jeremy Taylor, *The Whole Works of The Right Rev. Jeremy Taylor, D.D., Lord Bishop of Down Connor, and Dromore: with a Life of the Author and a Critical Examination of his Writings by The Right Rev. Reginald Heber, D.D.*, revised and corrected by Charles Page Eden, M.A. 10 Vols., (London: Longman, Brown Green, and Longmans, 1850), I, p xxxviii fn.

² CJ Stranks *The Life and Writings of Jeremy Taylor* (London: SPCK, 1952), p. 133.

³ Taylor, *The Real Presence and Spiritual of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament*, VI, p. 3.

⁴ McAdoo p. 109.

which corresponds to the claimed transformation of substance. He argues that it is not the doctrine held by the early Church Fathers and is an innovation which does violence to the concept of a sacrament.

3.1 The State of the Question

In his first part, Taylor sets out his own position and clarifies some of the ways in which he will develop his argument. His wish is that Christians would not speculate about the nature of the presence in the sacrament at all. Taylor shows he is aware of history and has a large body of quotations from previous generations back to the early Fathers to draw upon. He begins with a quotation from Erasmus, about a century or so earlier than Taylor: ‘it was late before the church defined transubstantiation; for a long time together it did suffice to believe that the true body of Christ was present, whether under the consecrated bread or any other way’.⁵ He fortifies his argument with quotations from other authorities, including S. Bernard and Cyril of Alexandria. His summary is:

The manner was defined but very lately; there is no need at all to dispute it, no advantages by it, and therefore it were better it were left at liberty to every man to think as he please; for so it was in the church for above a thousand years together; and yet it were better men would not at all trouble themselves concerning it; for it is a thing impossible to be understood, and therefore it is not fit to be enquired after.⁶

He then makes his own definitive statement, in upper case for emphasis: ‘THE PRESENCE OF CHRIST IS REAL AND SPIRITUAL’⁷ and explains why he believes this is an acceptable compromise between keeping silent and investigating the matter too deeply and describing the question too precisely. Things that are ‘spiritual’ are not measurable or detectable by normal means and the works of the Spirit are ‘various and many’,⁸ so he is not making too precise a statement.

Our word of ‘spiritual presence’ is particular in nothing but that it excludes the corporal and natural manner; we say it is not this, but it is to be understood figuratively, that is, not naturally, but to the purposes and in the manner of the Spirit and spiritual things [...] Christ is present spiritually, that is, by effect and blessing.⁹

⁵ Erasmus on I Cor. 7, quoted in Taylor, VI, p. 12.

⁶ Taylor, VI, p. 12.

⁷ Taylor, VI, p. 12.

⁸ Taylor, VI, p. 13.

⁹ Taylor, VI, p. 13.

Before we continue further into our investigation of Taylor it is worth pausing and considering the words Taylor uses throughout the work: ‘spiritual’, ‘sacramental’, figurative’, ‘tropical’. There is a vocabulary of imprecision which can leave the reader with the impression that Taylor understands the consecrated elements to be bare signs, after the manner of Zwingli. This is, however, not the case. All these words are, for Taylor, elements in his descriptive armoury which he uses to speak of a presence which is supernatural, ‘spiritual’, and not carnal. It is his method of expressing the ‘moderate realism’ which we found in Brian Douglas’ assessment of Taylor in an earlier chapter.¹⁰ Taylor wishes to both allow for the identity of the consecrated elements to be that of the body and blood of Christ and yet remain physically bread and wine. They are all words which allow for the action of the Spirit to be unmeasurable and yet real, particular in nothing except the exclusion of any sense of carnal presence. They are all terms that Taylor uses to underline that he is rejecting immoderate or fleshy realism.¹¹

Taylor laments that if only people had been content to leave the sacrament as mystery there would be no contention, and all could kneel together in harmony. McAdoo’s view is that mystery is, for Taylor, ‘no side stepping of the issue but a vital element in a position deliberately taken’ because it protects the truth of experience.¹² Taylor sets out the doctrine of the Church of England, which he holds to be common to Protestant churches:

after the minister of the holy mysteries hath ritely¹³ prayed, and blessed or consecrated the bread and the wine, the symbols become changed into the body and blood of Christ, after a SACRAMENTAL, that is, in a SPIRITUAL, REAL manner; so that all that worthily communicate do by faith receive Christ really, effectually, to all the purposes of His passion.¹⁴

He says the consequent of the doctrine is this:

it is bread, and it is Christ’s body: it is bread in substance, Christ in the sacrament; and Christ is as really given to all that are truly disposed, as the symbols are; each as they

¹⁰ Douglas, I, p. 27.

¹¹ Douglas, I, p. 27.

¹² McAdoo p. 110.

¹³ The editors note that ‘ritely’ is Taylor’s use. He means after ritual prayer.

¹⁴ Taylor, VI, p. 13.

can; Christ as Christ can be given; the bread and wine as they can, and to the same real purposes to which they are designed; and Christ does as really nourish and sanctify the soul as the elements do the body.¹⁵

Taylor reveals his underlying Platonism: he argues that spiritual things are real; which is ‘easily credible to them that believe that the gifts of the Holy Ghost are real graces’;¹⁶ then he argues the spiritual is *more* real than the material. So, it is that the

spiritual presence of Christ is the most true, real, and effective; the other can be but the image and shadow of it, something in order to this: for if it were in the sacrament naturally or corporeally, it could be but in order to this spiritual, celestial, and effective presence; as appears beyond exception in this, that the faithful and pious communicants receive the ultimate end of His presence, that is, spiritual blessings.¹⁷

Since the spiritual is ‘most real, most true’,¹⁸ Taylor claims he is the best defender of the real presence in the sacrament, as opposed to those who argue that transubstantiation makes the presence real because it is corporal and natural.¹⁹ (This is a very literal understanding of transubstantiation.) So, if Protestants deny ‘real presence’ what they are denying is *natural* presence, not spiritual presence.²⁰ No commentator appears to pick up on Taylor’s assertion of the spiritual as the more real. Taylor also argues that *substance* can be used in an acceptable way: ‘in substance but after a sacramental manner’²¹ and again he quotes S. Bernard as evidence for this usage: ‘in the sacrament is given us the true substance of Christ’s body or flesh, but not carnally, but spiritually; that is, not to our mouths, but to our hearts, not to be chewed by teeth, but to be eaten by faith.’²²

¹⁵ Taylor, VI, p. 14.

¹⁶ Taylor, VI, p. 14.

¹⁷ Taylor, VI, p. 15.

¹⁸ Taylor, VI, p. 15.

¹⁹ Taylor, VI, p. 15.

²⁰ Taylor, VI, p. 16.

²¹ Taylor, VI, p. 16.

²² Taylor, VI, p. 16. Taylor is quoting from S. Bernard’s *Sermon on the Feast of St. Martin*. His quotation seems to conflate two separate sentences: ‘... although the same flesh is offered to us it is no longer offered in a carnal but only a spiritual manner.’ And, ‘Have we not the true substance of the Lord’s flesh present in the Sacrament of the altar?’ S. Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermons for the Seasons & Principal Festivals of the Year: Translated from the Original Latin by a Priest of Mount Melleray*, III, (Westminster, MD: The Carroll Press, 1950), p. 14.

However, Bellarmine uses this same quotation from S. Bernard; writing of the sacramental presence he says: ‘Christ’s body is there “truly, substantially, really, but not corporally, nay you may say spiritually”’.²³ Taylor warns his reader to be cautious here, for though it might seem that Bellarmine and Taylor are saying the same thing, this is not quite the case. We must take care to define our terms exactly so we can be sure of what each party is saying.²⁴ Taylor makes the distinction in this way: ‘Here; by ‘spiritually’ they mean ‘present after the manner of a spirit;’ by ‘spiritually’ we mean ‘present to our spirits only;’ that is, so as Christ is not present to any other sense but that of faith, or spiritual susception’.²⁵ Taylor argues that ‘their’ way of understanding implies contradiction, an impossibility; ‘a body not after the manner of a body’.²⁶ Underlying his argument is the assumption that transubstantiation means that there is a corporal presence, and they are arguing that this corporal presence is unlike the manner of being of any body, ‘a body without a body’.²⁷

They say that Christ’s body is truly present there as it was upon the cross, but not after the manner of all or any body, but after that manner of being as an angel is in a place; that’s their ‘spiritually:’ but we by the ‘real spiritual presence’ of Christ do understand Christ to be present as the Spirit of God is present in the hearts of the faithful, by blessing and grace; and this is all which we mean besides the tropical and figurative presence.²⁸

It seems that there is an impasse here; Taylor will allow transubstantiation only to mean a corporal presence after the manner of a body in a way that is normally understood by ‘body’, despite the quotation from Bellarmine who describes the presence as ‘after the manner of a spirit’, i.e. incorporeally. It seems Taylor has a set view of what constitutes transubstantiation and is not open to the views and ideas of the people who believe that transubstantiation is the appropriate way to describe eucharistic presence. The Council of Trent is more careful in its definition of substantial presence than Taylor’s ‘corporal’ and ‘natural’:

²³ Taylor, VI, p. 16. Most of the works of Robert Bellarmine are not available in English, nor are they available in the original Latin. This quotation is referenced as from *On the Eucharist*, I, ch. 3.

²⁴ Taylor, VI, p. 17.

²⁵ Taylor, VI, p. 17.

²⁶ Taylor, VI, p. 17.

²⁷ Taylor, VI, p. 17.

²⁸ Taylor, VI, p. 17.

in the august sacrament of the holy Eucharist, after the consecration of the bread and wine, our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and man, is truly, really, and substantially contained under the species of those sensible things. For neither are these things mutually repugnant, —that our Saviour Himself always sitteth at the right hand of the Father in heaven, according to the natural mode of existing, and that, nevertheless, He be, in many other places, sacramentally present to us in his own substance, by a manner of existing, which, though we can scarcely express it in words, yet can we, by the understanding illuminated by faith, conceive, and we ought most firmly to believe, to be possible unto God.²⁹

It is frustrating that Taylor does not make use of the statement from the Council but continues to use ‘corporal’ and ‘natural’, which are not found in the Council’s decrees, as normative for his understanding of transubstantiation. Given that his desire here is to clarify terms this seems to be an important omission. Is it that he is so sure of his own view of transubstantiation that he is unwilling to allow for other, subtler, readings of the term? Is he not actually giving the opposing argument due weight or a fair hearing?

Taylor has been careful to define his terms ‘because until we are agreed upon the signification of the words, they are equivocal’³⁰ and because historically language was used which might be understood to support transubstantiation but can be equally shown to support Taylor’s case.³¹ But Taylor’s care appears to omit the actual terms used by the Council of Trent, he uses language to describe transubstantiation which is not used in the decrees on the eucharist.

Following Taylor’s definition of terms comes a curious passage in which Taylor assures the reader that ‘we eat and drink the body and blood of Christ that was broken, and poured forth; for there is no other body, no other blood of Christ’.³² His point is that we receive this in a spiritual way, not a natural way, yet we receive the only body and blood that there can be.

That body which was crucified is not that body that is eaten in the sacrament, if the intention of the proposition be to speak of the eating it in the same manner of being; but that body which was crucified, the same body we do eat, if the intention be to speak of the same thing in several manners of being and operating.³³

²⁹ *The Canons and Decrees of the Sacred and Oecumenical Council of Trent*, Ed. and trans. J. Waterworth (London: Dolman, 1848), p. 76.

³⁰ Taylor, VI, p. 18.

³¹ Taylor, VI, p. 19.

³² Taylor, VI, p. 19.

³³ Taylor, VI, p. 19.

For Taylor, this is a way of assuring the reader that he believes Christ to be really present in the sacrament. However, after complaining that terms may be used equivocally, he has made an argument which seems to increase equivocation, for he does not make clear what these different modes of being might be and, in arguing this, he misses the point that the Roman Catholic position also allows for different modes of being, as the above quotation from the Council shows. If it is allowable for Taylor, why is it not allowable for the Catholic Church to posit different modes of being?

He summarises his dissatisfaction with the teaching of the ‘church of Rome’.³⁴ The logic of their arguments is that after the words of consecration bread and wine no longer remain, although they appear to as their accidents remain. Furthermore, the accidents remain neither in bread and wine, nor in the body and blood of Christ but by themselves: ‘there is whiteness and nothing white, sweetness and nothing sweet’.³⁵ The substance of the bread and wine is replaced by the ‘natural body of Christ, and His blood which was shed upon the cross’³⁶ so that all who eat and drink, worthy or unworthy receive the body and blood of Christ. They describe this as: ‘Transubstantiation, that is, a conversion of the whole substance of bread into the substance of Christ’s natural body, of the whole substance of the wine into His blood.’³⁷ As we have seen in the quotation from the Council, the Roman Catholic position was *not* that there is a conversion into the substance of Christ’s *natural* body. The argument is that there is substantial presence in a manner which is scarcely expressible in language and for which the word *sacramental* is used. Taylor argues that in their doctrine they oppose ‘spiritual’ to ‘sacramental and real’ supposing the spiritual manducation, though done in the sacrament by a worthy receiver, not to be sacramental and real.³⁸ This seems to be an artificial distinction. The Council talks of three modes of receiving: sacramental, spiritual and the third both

³⁴ Taylor, VI, p. 19.

³⁵ Taylor, VI, p. 20.

³⁶ Taylor, VI, p. 20.

³⁷ Taylor, VI, p. 20.

³⁸ Taylor, VI, p. 20.

sacramental and spiritual. The first mode is that reception of the sacrament to no good effect, the reception by ‘sinners’, the second is a spiritual communion brought about by desire, and the third is the marriage of sacrament and spirit brought about by worthy reception of the sacrament.³⁹

We come to the end of Taylor’s scene setting with a summary of what he wants to test. It is not disputed that the bread and wine are changed into the body and blood of Christ, nor that Christ is really received. What is at stake for Taylor is

whether this conversion be sacramental and figurative, or whether it be natural and bodily [...] whether He be taken in a spiritual or in a natural manner. We say the conversion is figurative, mysterious, and sacramental; they say it is proper, natural, and corporal: we affirm that Christ is really taken by faith, by the spirit, to all real effects of His passion; they say He is taken by the mouth, and that the spiritual and the virtual taking Him in virtue or effect is not sufficient, though done also in the sacrament.⁴⁰

Taylor’s phrase ‘proper, natural and corporal’ is not the language of the Council. They speak of ‘sacramental’ and ‘spiritual’ receiving and that ‘sinners’ only receive sacramentally with no spiritual benefit.⁴¹ The Council uses the terms ‘veritable Body’ and ‘veritable Blood’,⁴² yet these may convey the concept of *really present* without meaning *corporally present* as the Council asserts that Christ is present in his natural mode of existing with his Father in heaven and is present to us by a different, sacramental mode of presence which conveys his true substance.⁴³ Taylor may not be giving his opponents a fair hearing by leaving the Tridentine documents unexamined. (It may be that they were unavailable to him.) McAdoo questions why Taylor maintains that the Roman Catholic position is one of ‘natural’, ‘corporal’ or ‘carnal’ presence. He concludes that Taylor must be influenced by contemporary debate and polemic in which these terms were used, despite them being distant from

³⁹ Waterworth, p. 81.

⁴⁰ Taylor, VI, p. 20.

⁴¹ Waterworth, p. 81.

⁴² Waterworth, p. 78.

⁴³ Waterworth, p. 76.

Aquinas' careful exposition⁴⁴ and the Tridentine decrees.⁴⁵ What is, however, fair is that Taylor is arguing that the sacrament does not, of itself, contain Christ, but conveys his presence to the believing recipient. The Council makes it clear that they believe that the sacrament of the eucharist differs from other sacraments because 'in the Eucharist, before being used, there is the Author Himself of sanctity.'⁴⁶

Taylor tells us 'this thing I will try by Scripture, —by Reason, —by Sense, —and by Tradition.'⁴⁷ Here Taylor makes explicit the threefold appeal that McAdoo describes as 'classically Anglican'.⁴⁸ As we shall see, what he means by this is that he will examine particular passages of scripture, said to be supportive of transubstantiation, including looking at patristic traditions of interpreting them; he will look at the early Fathers' description of the eucharist and see how it fits with his argument; he will look at how our senses of touch, smell, taste and sight perceive the sacramental elements of bread and wine and any possible change in them and finally he will argue whether the language of substance and accidents make logical sense.

3.2 Transubstantiation not Warrantable by Scripture

Taylor begins by listing the scripture passages which are used as evidence for transubstantiation: S. John Chapter 6 and the institution narratives recorded in the Synoptic Gospels and I Corinthians.⁴⁹ He then gathers evidence to show that many Roman Catholic authors have said that scripture alone does not necessarily imply transubstantiation; it is the teaching of the Roman Church that then uses its belief in transubstantiation to interpret scripture as supporting the doctrine. Among a number of witnesses, he quotes Scotus: 'there is no place of scripture so express that without the declaration of

⁴⁴ S. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, Translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province (Benzinger Bros: New York, 1947), Part III Q75, Q76, Q77.

⁴⁵ McAdoo pp. 121–5. (For the Decree on the Most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist see: Waterworth, pp. 75–84.)

⁴⁶ Waterworth, pp. 77 – 78.

⁴⁷ Taylor, VI, p. 20.

⁴⁸ McAdoo, p. 109.

⁴⁹ Taylor, VI, p. 20.

the church it can evidently compel us to admit Transubstantiation.⁵⁰ Taylor argues that it was only in Luther's time that the church had declared that transubstantiation was proven by scripture, long after the doctrine was decreed by the Fourth Lateran Council. It was thus unsurprising that many historical witnesses did not mention that the church had declared transubstantiation inferred or proven from scripture.⁵¹

Despite his belief that there has never been a clear argument for transubstantiation based on scripture Taylor believes he is compelled to test whether the doctrine is found in scripture because those who 'follow the decree of Trent'⁵² will not be satisfied unless he delves into the matter.

3.3 Of the Sixth Chapter of S. John's Gospel

Taylor tells us that 'in this chapter it is earnestly pretended that our blessed Saviour taught the mystery of Transubstantiation',⁵³ but then he tells us that this is in dispute, some say the whole passage from John 6.33 – 58, others only a part; Bellarmine limits it to 6.51 onward. Furthermore, many 'learned Romanists'⁵⁴ deny that the passage speaks of either sacramental or corporal eating of Christ's body, but Taylor tells us this is only through dishonesty, Bellarmine admits it is because to read of both eating and drinking would mean they are condemned by their Hussite and Lutheran critics.⁵⁵ Taylor includes in his argument a condemnation of their 'half communion'.⁵⁶ He argues that to fulfil the command of Christ in John 6.53, 'Unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood, ye have no life in you', both bread and chalice must be given, and that their 'new whimsy of "concomitancy"'⁵⁷ would not be sufficient for this should only the host be given. Taylor misunderstands concomitancy, he recognises that it means that both body and blood are given in the

⁵⁰ Taylor, VI, p. 21. Duns Scotus, *Commentary on Book IV of the Sentences*. (I was unable to make a more precise attribution.)

⁵¹ Taylor, VI, p. 22.

⁵² Taylor, VI, p. 23.

⁵³ Taylor, VI, p. 23.

⁵⁴ Taylor, VI, p. 24.

⁵⁵ Taylor, VI, p. 24. No attribution made.

⁵⁶ Taylor, VI, p. 24.

⁵⁷ Taylor, VI, p. 24.

host, but not that it is equally true that both are given in the cup. It is better to say the whole Christ is given in each part of the sacrament.⁵⁸ Taylor's argument is that, 'Christ commanded the manner as well as the thing, and that without eating and drinking the precept of Christ is not obeyed.'⁵⁹ He notes that Pope Innocent III (1160 – 1216)⁶⁰ had so commanded that both elements were to be administered to all communicants.

Taylor then changes tack and considers infant communion, he notes that, although it was historic practice, it is no longer the case.⁶¹ Why is this important to his argument? Because he is opposing the argument based on the phrase: Unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood, ye have no life in you. (John 6.53) If this were literally true and the argument that the sacrament was indeed the corporal body and blood of Jesus then everyone, infant or adult, would have to receive the sacrament or they would be in danger of damnation; they would not have life in them. Although infants can be given the sacrament, they cannot be made to believe, so would not be able to make the spiritual communion Taylor argues for. Because infants are unable to believe, Taylor argues they are not required to receive the sacrament; so that passage cannot be about the sacrament, as it is wrong to argue for the necessity of children receiving the sacrament.⁶² Given the historical precedent of at least seven hundred years when infant communion was the practice,⁶³ Taylor's argument seems very weak here. There was a time in Christian practice when it was the norm for all the baptised to receive Holy Communion, regardless of age, because this was understood as an essential part of belonging. This may indeed have been motivated by this passage in John 6. In fact, a proper response might be to call for a return to primitive practice, rather than see the falling away of infant communion as acceptable. Taylor's understanding of faith seems to require intellectual assents, rather than the shared faith of family or community. Here we see Taylor is a man of his age. He understands faith to include an adult assent to doctrine, rather than simply trust in God. He also

⁵⁸ Waterworth, p. 142.

⁵⁹ Taylor, VI, p. 25.

⁶⁰ 'Innocent III', in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, pp. 703–4.

⁶¹ Taylor, VI, p. 26.

⁶² Taylor, VI, p. 26.

⁶³ Taylor, VI, p. 26.

is unable to understand the Gospel account as anything other than a verbatim, chronological account of what Jesus said and did without any editorial shaping or community context. He can only picture faith in a certain way; and he cannot see S. John's Gospel (along with the other scriptures) as a book of the community, a community where belonging was marked by holy communion and only those who ate the sacrament were those destined for life. He cannot imagine that this passage might have been written to be read at early eucharistic meetings, in which the context of hearing would include reception of the sacrament, and so the hearers would naturally associate what they heard with what they were doing. For example, Cyril of Alexandria in his commentary on John wrote: 'if they [...] will not partake of Him sacramentally, they exclude themselves from eternal life'.⁶⁴

Taylor finds it difficult to believe that the Gospel writer could mean that "unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood, ye have no life in you" (John 6.53) referred to partaking of the sacrament. He argues that those who desire baptism, or are too young to have that desire, or who are 'fools'⁶⁵ should still be saved. A spiritual desire for the sacrament might suffice for reception of the sacrament if such actually were necessary.⁶⁶ Taylor then refers to Bede quoting Augustine, saying that if he has correctly understood 'he affirms that in baptism infants receive the body of Christ'.⁶⁷ However the sermon which he seems to refer to, to the *Infantes*, i.e. the newly baptised, sermon 227, reads thus:

I am not unmindful of the promise by which I pledged myself to deliver a sermon to instruct you, who have just been baptized, on the Sacrament of the Lord's table, which you now look upon and of which you partook last night. You ought to know what you have received, what you are going to receive, and what you ought to receive daily. That Bread which you see on the altar, consecrated by the word of God, is the Body of Christ. That chalice, or rather, what the chalice holds, consecrated by the word of God, is the Blood of Christ.⁶⁸

⁶⁴ Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentary on the Gospel according to John*, Library of the Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church Vol. 43 (Oxford: Parker and Co., 1874), p.443.

⁶⁵ Taylor, VI, p. 26.

⁶⁶ Taylor, VI, p. 27.

⁶⁷ Taylor, VI, p. 27–8.

⁶⁸ S. Augustine, Sermon 277, *The Fathers of the Church: A New Translation* ed. Joseph Deferrari, trans. Sr. Mary Sarah Muldowney (New York: Fathers of the Church, 1959), p. 195.

So, the sermon affirms that as part of their baptism at Easter the newly baptised will also be admitted to holy communion.

Taylor argues that the ‘men of Capernaum’⁶⁹ were scandalised by Jesus’ words, because they thought he meant his actual flesh; Taylor argues that Jesus ‘reproved their folly’⁷⁰ whilst speaking to his disciples, saying ‘the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I have spoken they are spirit, and they are life’ (John 6.52). Here Taylor seems to move away from arguing that the passage does not refer to the sacrament at all to arguing for spiritual rather than natural eating.

Now we come to one of Taylor’s particular sticking points, the passage cannot be about the sacrament, because Jesus says of the bread that he shall give: whosoever eats it hath life abiding in him (John 6.54) and Taylor argues that ‘this is not true of the sacrament; for the wicked eating it, receive to themselves damnation.’⁷¹ This has its basis in I Cor. 11.27 – 30 where Paul warns the Corinthian Christians that those who eat and drink unworthily eat and drink judgement on themselves. Taylor seems to have a very clear view that Christ is not received, although Paul says only that those who eat or drink unworthily ‘will be answerable for the body and blood of the Lord’.⁷² Taylor seems in some sense surer about the *absence* of Christ in unworthy receiving than in the *presence* of Christ in worthy receiving. For Taylor, this is ‘unanswerably certain’⁷³ proof that Jesus is talking about spiritual feeding rather than sacramental because those who partake of the sacrament unworthily do not receive it to life but to condemnation. Taylor argues that since Jesus says, ‘he that eats hath life’⁷⁴ then this must be referring to some sort of way of eating in which we can be certain that only those who are in a state of present grace will partake.⁷⁵

The argument therefore lies thus,— There is something which Christ hath promised us, which whosoever receives, he receives life and not death: but this is not the sacrament, for of them that communicate, some receive to life and some to death, saith S. Austin, and a greater than S. Austin, S. Paul: and yet this which is life to all that

⁶⁹ Taylor, VI, p. 28.

⁷⁰ Taylor, VI, p. 28.

⁷¹ Taylor, VI, p. 30.

⁷² I Corinthians 11.27

⁷³ Taylor, VI, p. 30.

⁷⁴ Taylor, VI, p. 30.

⁷⁵ Taylor, VI, p. 30.

receive it, is Christ's flesh, said Christ himself; therefore Christ's flesh here spoken of is not sacramental.⁷⁶

But, in I Cor. 11.32, Paul argues that judgement brings discipline and correction so that we may not be condemned. In other words, the judgement brought about by unworthy reception is not for death, but for repentance and thus life. Taylor reads the passage from S. John's Gospel as if it were a verbatim account of historical events. He does not have the appreciation that the Gospels (indeed all the Scriptures) were written for a certain context and the material is edited to enhance the author's point, in this case the identity and significance of the person of Jesus.

Taylor includes a long digression, arguing that 'the doctrine of Transubstantiation is infinitely useless, and to no purpose' because it is not the physical but 'the spiritual eating of Him is the instrument of life to us'.⁷⁷ This section shows again the tensions between the ideas involved in transubstantiation, Taylor talks of 'transubstantiated flesh'⁷⁸ yet it is 'present in the eucharist after the manner of a spirit, therefore without proportions to our body or bodily actions.'⁷⁹ Thus, the body that is present cannot nourish after a natural manner, although being the 'natural body' that is what might be understood. But the spiritual cannot be eaten and drunk like the natural food.⁸⁰ Taylor again includes in his argument the belief that only some are nourished spiritually by the sacrament:

That the corporal presence does not nourish spiritually, appears, because some are nourished spiritually who do not receive the sacrament at all, and some that do receive yet fall short of being spiritually nourished, and so do all unworthy communicants.⁸¹

Perron and Bellarmine argue that, 'the residence of Christ's natural body in our bodies does really and substantially join us unto God, establishing a true and real unity between God and men.'⁸²

Although they are arguing for a spiritual union, Taylor argues that this implies substantial unity

⁷⁶ Taylor, VI, p. 31.

⁷⁷ Taylor, VI, p. 32.

⁷⁸ Taylor, VI, p. 32.

⁷⁹ Taylor, VI, p. 33.

⁸⁰ Taylor, VI, p. 33.

⁸¹ Taylor, VI, p. 33.

⁸² Taylor, VI, p. 33. Taylor is referring to Perron's, *On the Eucharist* and Bellarmine, *On the Eucharist*, III ch. 9.

between the believer and Christ, which is arguing for consubstantial union with God. So, in other words this union would make man to be God, ‘which to affirm were highest blasphemy.’⁸³ He says that our unity with Christ comes from baptismal regeneration by water and the Spirit. One who is baptised is

‘the same plant’ with Christ, as S. Paul calls him Rom. vi. 5, he ‘hath put on Christ’, he is ‘bone of His bone, and flesh of His flesh’, Gal. iii. 27; Eph. v. 30, and all this by faith, by baptism, by regeneration of the spirit.⁸⁴

Taylor’s argument turns to the Fathers, first he looks to Tertullian’s *On the Resurrection of the Flesh*,⁸⁵ a passage which refers to eating Christ: ‘to devour Him with the ear, and to ruminate on Him with the understanding, and to digest Him by faith’.⁸⁶ Taylor can use Tertullian’s argument to show that Jesus’ words in John 6 (not really referenced in Tertullian) are to be taken in a spiritual manner, indicating that he did not understand the passage as referring to the sacrament at all. This is almost special pleading on Taylor’s part as the passage is part of a discourse on resurrection rather than a commentary on the Gospel of John, Chapter 6. Similarly, he quotes Athanasius, ‘the things which he speaks are not carnal but spiritual; for to how many might His body suffice for meat, that it should become the nourishment of the whole world?’⁸⁷ And then Origen:

if we understand these words of Christ, ‘Unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood’ literally, this letter kills; for there is in the New testament a letter that kills him who does not spiritually understand those things which are spoken.⁸⁸

Similarly, he uses quotes from Ambrose to argue “‘coming” to Christ is eating Him, “believing Him” is drinking His blood; “it is not touched by the body, it is not seen with the eyes”’.⁸⁹ He piles up the

⁸³ Taylor, VI, p. 33.

⁸⁴ Taylor, VI, p. 33.

⁸⁵ Taylor, VI, p. 31, p. 34.

⁸⁶ Tertullian, *On the Resurrection of the Flesh*, 23. Ante-Nicene Fathers Vol. 3 (T & T Clark: Edinburgh, 1885), p. 572.

⁸⁷ Taylor, VI, p. 34. Taylor reference Athnansius, or who is the author of the tractate on the words *Quicumque dixerit verbum in Filium hominis*. The footnote says ‘Sive Epist. iv. ad Serapion’ but the Fourth epistle to Serapion does not contain this material. The original source is thus unclear.

⁸⁸ Origen, *Homilies on Leviticus*, VII, quoted in Taylor, VI, pp. 34–5.

⁸⁹ Taylor refers to S. Ambrose, *On the Sacraments*, V, ch 4. And *Sermons on the Gospel of St. Luke*, VI, ch 8. The editors note that the passage on Luke’s Gospel refers not to the sacrament but to the woman who touches Christ’s garment, in Taylor, VI, p. 35.

quotations, from S. Augustine, Theophylact, Eusebius, S. Jerome, Clement of Alexandria, S. Basil and S. Bernard.⁹⁰ He concludes that all show a similar and convincing pattern of interpretation:

It may suffice that it is the direct sense of Tertullian, Origen, Athanasius, S. Ambrose, S. Austin, and Theophylact, that these words of Christ in the sixth of S. John are not to be understood in the natural or proper but in the spiritual sense. The spiritual they declare not to be the mystical, but the literal sense; and therefore their testimonies cannot be eluded by any such pretence.⁹¹

Taylor asserts that the literal sense of John 6 is a *spiritual* understanding of eating and drinking. For Taylor, the ‘plain meaning’ of the passage is that when we read of eating Christ’s body and drinking his blood we are to understand it in a way that excludes actual bodily eating. If we wish to read into the passage a eucharistic understanding, then we are doing so by reading the passage in its *mystical* sense.

What Taylor does not reflect on is how the Patristic authors might understand the Sacrament using their interpretations of John 6. He has quoted from S. Augustine’s Tractate xxvi on S. John’s Gospel, yet this sermon also clearly speaks about the Sacrament:

Therefore, indeed, it is, even as men of God understood this before us, that our Lord Jesus Christ has pointed our minds to His body and blood in those things, which from being many are reduced to some one thing. For a unity is formed by many grains forming together; and another unity is effected by the clustering together of many berries. He now explains how that which He speaks of comes to pass, and what it is to eat His body and to drink His blood. “He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.” This it is, therefore, for a man to eat that meat and to drink that drink, to dwell in Christ, and to have Christ dwelling in him. Consequently, he that dwelleth not in Christ, and in whom Christ dwelleth not, doubtless neither eateth His flesh [spiritually] nor drinketh His blood [although he may press the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ carnally and visibly with his teeth], but rather doth he eat and drink the sacrament of so great a thing to his own judgment, because he, being unclean, has presumed to come to the sacraments of Christ, which no man taketh worthily except he that is pure: of such it is said, “Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God.”⁹²

⁹⁰ Taylor, VI, pp. 35–6.

⁹¹ Taylor, VI, p. 35.

⁹² S. Augustine *Homilies on the Gospel of John XXVI*, Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers I Vol. 7 ed. Philip Schaff (T & T Clark: Edinburgh, 1885), p. 173.

Cyril of Alexandria, in his commentary on S. John, writes at length about John 6 over several chapters. He explains how it is that Jesus gives his flesh:

For this cause (I suppose) did the Lord with reason refrain from telling them how He would give them His Flesh to eat, and calls them to the duty of believing before seeking. For to them that had length believed He *brake* bread, *and gave to them, saying, Take, eat, This is my Body.* Likewise handing round the Cup to them all, He saith, *Drink of it all of you, for this is My Blood of the New Testament, which is being shed for many for the remission of sins.* Seest thou how to those who were yet senseless and thrust from them faith without explanation, He explaineth not the mode of the Mystery, but to those who had now believed, He is found to declare it most clearly?⁹³

S. Cyprian, in his Tractate on the Lord's Prayer makes a link between our daily bread, the bread of the Sacrament and the Bread of Life in John 6:

As the prayer goes forward, we ask and say, "Give us this day our daily bread." And this may be understood both spiritually and literally, because either way of understanding it is rich in divine usefulness to our salvation. For Christ is the bread of life; and this bread does not belong to all men, but it is ours. And according as we say, "Our Father," because He is the Father of those who understand and believe; so also we call it "our bread," because Christ is the bread of those who are in union with His body. And we ask that this bread should be given to us daily, that we who are in Christ, and daily receive the Eucharist for the food of salvation, may not, by the interposition of some heinous sin, by being prevented, as withheld and not communicating, from partaking of the heavenly bread, be separated from Christ's body, as He Himself predicts, and warns, "I am the bread of life which came down from heaven. If any man eat of my bread, he shall live for ever: and the bread which I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world." When, therefore, He says, that whoever shall eat of His bread shall live for ever; as it is manifest that those who partake of His body and receive the Eucharist by the right of communion are living, so, on the other hand, we must fear and pray lest any one who, being withheld from communion, is separate from Christ's body should remain at a distance from salvation; as He Himself threatens, and says, "Unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye shall have no life in you." And therefore we ask that our bread—that is, Christ—may be given to us daily, that we who abide and live in Christ may not depart from His sanctification and body.⁹⁴

As we can see, there is patristic material which does refer to John 6 in the context of the body and blood of Christ. It appears Taylor has chosen to ignore this as it does not support his argument.

⁹³ S. Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentary on The Gospel According to S. John*, Library of the Fathers of the Catholic Church, 43, (Oxford: Parker and Co., 1874), pp. 417–8.

⁹⁴ S. Cyprian, *Tractate on the Lord's Prayer* ANF Vol. 5, ed. Philip Schaff (T & T Clark: Edinburgh, 1885), p. 452.

After his argument for a completely spiritual reading of John 6, Taylor concedes that sacramental eating may indeed be included in the spiritual eating;

He speaks of flesh and blood, [...] ‘bread and drink’ and therefore by analogy He may allude to the sacrament, which is His similitude and representation; but this is but the meaning of the second or third remove ; if here Christ begins to change the particulars of His discourse, it can primarily relate to nothing but His death upon the cross; at which time He gave His flesh for the life of the world; and so giving it, it became meat; the receiving this gift was a receiving of life, for it was given for the life of the world.⁹⁵

Nevertheless, Taylor insists that the manner of receiving is by faith.⁹⁶ He then underlines his argument:

And therefore now I will resume those testimonies of Clemens Alexandrinus, of Eusebius, S. Basil, S. Hierome and S. Bernard, which I waved before, all agreeing upon this exposition, that the word of God, Christ’s doctrine, is the flesh He speaks of, and the receiving it and practising it are the eating His flesh; for this sense is the literal and proper: and S. Hierome is express to affirm that the other exposition is mystical, and that this is the more true and proper.⁹⁷

Taylor’s argument takes a final turn: ‘suppose these words of Christ, “The bread which I shall give is My flesh” were spoken literally of the sacrament’.⁹⁸ That would imply that the sacrament given is still bread, ‘the bread is the body of Christ.’⁹⁹ The proponents of transubstantiation cannot allow that the sacrament is both bread and Christ’s body, this was anathematised by the Council of Trent.¹⁰⁰ Taylor concludes with a Latin quotation from Stapleton: John writes nothing of the Supper, it was sufficiently described by the three Evangelists before him.¹⁰¹

Taylor’s main argument is that this passage does not refer to the Lord’s Supper at all, except at a remove, and even at this remove the text cannot be taken to support transubstantiation. It is

⁹⁵ Taylor, VI, p. 37.

⁹⁶ Taylor, VI, p. 37.

⁹⁷ Taylor, VI, p. 37.

⁹⁸ Taylor, VI, p. 39.

⁹⁹ Taylor, VI, p. 39.

¹⁰⁰ Waterworth, p. 82.

¹⁰¹ Taylor, VI, p. 40.

instructive to compare Taylor's opinion with more contemporary Biblical scholarship. In his commentary on John's Gospel, Barnabas Lindars¹⁰² writes of the passage:

The teaching of Jesus is based upon an exposition of the miracle of the manna in the wilderness [...] let us consider the consequences of the Jewish tradition for the interpretation of the discourse. It means that when Jesus says: 'I am the bread of life', he is designating himself as the Wisdom of God and as the word of God coming to mankind; as such he is the fulfilment of the Law which was given on Mount Sinai. [...] this must be regarded as the primary purpose of the discourse. [...] But is this interpretation —which may be called briefly 'the sapiential interpretation' — compatible with a reference to the Eucharist? It is only in verses 51 – 8 that such a reference becomes inescapable, and then it seems to predominate to the exclusion of the sapiential ideas.¹⁰³

Lindars continues by summarising the discussion between scholars as to whether these verses are a later addition and how they might be treated. He suggests that it is a false distinction to separate the two understandings, eucharistic and sapiential; an issue 'that would never have arisen had it not been for the effect of the Reformation on Western theology'.¹⁰⁴ He suggests that the discourse could have its roots in a homily at the Christian eucharist and so it is the two interpretations should complement one another.

The Eucharist is a meal of fellowship with the risen and exalted Lord, and when Christians receive the sacramental elements they realise their fellowship with him, who is the Bread of Life who came down from heaven. Thus the Eucharistic interpretation is latent beneath the sapiential section (35 – 50), and the sapiential continues without any diminution in the Eucharistic section (51 – 8).¹⁰⁵

At the very beginning of the section, Taylor notes that some say the whole section from verses 33 – 58 speaks of transubstantiation, whereas Bellarmine says the question is only in the verses from 51 – end, in the preceding verses 'Christ there discourses of natural bread; the miracle of the loaves, of faith, and of the incarnation'.¹⁰⁶ This shows that some of the issues discussed by Lindars were already evident to Reformation era scholars. Contemporary scholarship concurs with Taylor's reluctance to

¹⁰² Barnabas Lindars, *The Gospel of John*, The New Century Bible Commentaries (Marshall, Morgan and Scott: London, 1981)

¹⁰³ Lindars, pp. 249–51.

¹⁰⁴ Lindars, p. 251.

¹⁰⁵ Lindars, p. 251.

¹⁰⁶ Taylor, VI, p. 23. Attributed to Bellarmine, *On the Eucharist I*, ch 5.

see the whole passage as referring to the eucharist; but Taylor setting out to show that the whole has a spiritual meaning divorced from the eucharist has left him unable to include possible eucharistic readings which would not damage his argument about corporal presence.

This section of the work seems unsatisfactory, Taylor's argument has several digressions and seeks to show that the tradition had not interpreted John 6 in a way which had any reference to the eucharist. His conclusions are fair from the resources he uses, but is Taylor missing the point of the Gospel discourse altogether? By making rigid distinctions between 'spiritual' and 'corporal' he seems unable to allow for multivalent readings of the text, and his lengthy argument depends on so much external material that it is bogged down. He certainly succeeds in making a detailed case, using all the material that is available to him. In doing so he seems to lose the wood in the trees.

3.4 Of the Words of Institution

Following this long section on John 6, which contains digressions and sometimes loses focus, Taylor devotes four consecutive sections of the book to studying the words of institution. These sections are much more closely focused and analytical. He begins by looking at '*Hoc est corpus meum*' and investigating the claim that they are the effective words of consecration before further sections concentrating on what meaning '*hoc*' can bear and then how '*est*' relates to '*corpus meum*'. Taylor concludes by looking at the context of the Last Supper and how that helps in interpreting the institution. He says that Bellarmine believes the words of institution are 'the greatest ground of the whole question'.¹⁰⁷ After quoting the four passages narrating the institution of the eucharist, the narratives from the Synoptic Gospels and I Corinthians, he begins his examination of the question afresh.

Taylor begins by focusing on the way the Latin church concentrates on the four words *Hoc est corpus meum*. He says that following Aquinas, they 'say that these words pronounced by the priest with due intention do effect this change of the bread into Christ's body, which change they call

¹⁰⁷ Taylor, VI, p. 40. Attributed to Bellarmine, *On the Eucharist*, I, ch. 8.

Transubstantiation.¹⁰⁸ But, he argues, what if it is not these precise words which affect a change, the sacrament could be already Christ's body when they are spoken, they could be declarative of what has already occurred; on the other hand, a sacramental change might only be effected in the eating of the sacrament. If it cannot be shown exactly when a change occurs, then it must surely be impossible to define exactly how such a change occurs. What argument can show that "Take and eat" are not as effective of the change as *Hoc est corpus meum*, "this is My body?"¹⁰⁹ What is more, if it were to be taking and eating which effects sacramental change then reservation and the other forms of eucharistic devotion practised by the Latin church must be without foundation. 'It will also follow that it is Christ's body only in a mystical, spiritual, and sacramental manner.'¹¹⁰

There seems to be no strong argument to show that these particular words are effective, Jesus used these words amongst others. He gave no indication as to the focal, consecrating words; his instructions were rather to 'do this' than to 'say this'. Furthermore, S. Basil affirms that the actual form of consecration was not handed down to us, and S. Gregory reports that 'the apostles consecrated the eucharist only by saying the Lord's prayer.'¹¹¹ Taylor argues that because the narratives in the Gospels and Paul differ anyway, it cannot be the case that there are specific, necessary, words.¹¹²

If these words do mean a 'proper' rather than a figurative transformation then *Est* surely means something that already is, rather than shall be. The conversion is not made 'till the -um in meum be quite out, till the last syllable be spoken'¹¹³ according to the Roman teaching; thus, there is a grammatical error. 'They affirm that it is made Christ's body by saying it is Christ's body; but their

¹⁰⁸ Taylor, VI, p. 41.

¹⁰⁹ Taylor, VI, p. 41.

¹¹⁰ Taylor, VI, p. 41.

¹¹¹ S. Gregory the Great, *Letters*, XII, letter 9, quoted in Taylor, VI, p. 42. (The footnote incorrectly references VII, letter 63.)

¹¹² Taylor, VI, p. 42.

¹¹³ Taylor, VI, p. 42.

saying so must suppose the thing done, or else their saying so is false; and if it be done before, then to say it does not do it at all, because it is done already.’¹¹⁴

Taylor then looks more closely at the institution narrative. He finds that Jesus blessed the bread or gave thanks over the bread; ‘He blessed it and made it eucharistical’.¹¹⁵ If it was the Lord’s blessing then it must surely have been effective, with a change consequent on the blessing. ‘If any change was consequent, it was a blessing of the thing in order to what was intended, that is, that it might be eucharistical’.¹¹⁶ The subsequent phrases, ‘this is my Body’, ‘this is my Blood’, then describe the change that has been effected by the blessing.¹¹⁷

Taylor continues by stating: ‘the Greek church universally taught that the consecration was made by the prayers of the ministering man.’¹¹⁸ He quotes Justin Martyr, Origen and John Damascene in support of this, and he quotes Jerome and Augustine in support of this view in the Latin church; Jerome says of priests: ‘by their prayers the body and blood of Christ is in the sacrament.’¹¹⁹ He notes that he has discussed this at length in an earlier work (*Clerus Domini*¹²⁰). His point for this discussion is that the change (however that might be understood) is not made by the recitation of certain words, like a sort of spell, but because prayer is made over the elements.¹²¹ And, as Christ’s priesthood in heaven is a ministry of intercession; the ministry of the church must be of the same kind. From this it follows that:

if these words which are called the words of consecration be exegetical, and enunciative of the change that is made by prayers and other mystical words; it cannot be possibly inferred from these words that there is any other change made than what refers to the whole mystery and action: and therefore “Take, eat” and “This do” are as necessary to the sacrament as *Hoc est corpus*, and declare that it is Christ’s body only in the use and administration; and therefore not natural but spiritual.¹²²

¹¹⁴ Taylor, VI, p. 43.

¹¹⁵ Taylor, VI, p. 43.

¹¹⁶ Taylor, VI, p. 43.

¹¹⁷ Taylor, VI, p. 43.

¹¹⁸ Taylor, VI, p. 44.

¹¹⁹ S. Jerome, *Letters*, 146, to *Evangelus*, quoted in Taylor, VI, p. 44.

¹²⁰ Taylor, *Clerus Domini*, I, pp. 3–61.

¹²¹ Taylor, VI, p. 44.

¹²² Taylor, VI, p. 44.

Dugmore uses this passage as evidence that Taylor had come to believe that any change in the bread and wine was ‘due to, or consisting in, the sacred use to which they are appointed’.¹²³ We have seen in our introduction that McAdoo shows that Dugmore is incorrect in his overall estimation of Taylor’s theology. The complexity and wide range of arguments in even this small section of Taylor’s work demonstrate that it is very difficult to use a single quotation to make a definitive statement about Taylor.

Taylor shows that there have been historical differences of opinion in the Western, pre-Reformation church, and that many authorities were not of the opinion that the consecration was made by the words ‘This is my Body’: ‘Aquinas makes them consecratory, and his authority brought that opinion into credit: and yet Scotus and his followers are against it’.¹²⁴ Nevertheless, whether or not these words are consecratory, Taylor still argues that any change is ‘not natural and proper, but figurative, sacramental, and spiritual; exhibiting what it signifies, being real to all intents and purposes of the Spirit’.¹²⁵ Taylor concludes the section with a brief discussion of the Passover meal, as the eucharist contained elements of the ceremony. Jesus’ words were an imitation of the words then used: ‘This is the bread of sorrow which our fathers ate in Egypt, this is the passover’.¹²⁶ Taylor contends this was also ‘called “The body of the paschal lamb” nay, it was called “the body of our Saviour” and “our Saviour” himself’.¹²⁷ Thus the words were ripe for Christ to repurpose them by appropriating them.¹²⁸

3.5 *Hoc, ‘This’*

Having shown that he does not believe that these four words ‘*Hoc est corpus meum*’ are the sole focus of the consecration of the elements, Taylor narrows his focus further: that Taylor should devote

¹²³ Dugmore, p. 101.

¹²⁴ Taylor, VI, p. 45–6.

¹²⁵ Taylor, VI, p. 46.

¹²⁶ Taylor, VI, p. 46.

¹²⁷ Taylor, VI, p. 46.

¹²⁸ Taylor, VI, p. 46.

a section to the word ‘*Hoc*’ is witness to the exhaustive detail of the whole work. In this section he asks, ‘what does “this” mean?’ We are moving from the general to the very particular. ‘*Hoc*’ “this” that is, “this bread is My body, this cup” or the wine in the cup, “is My blood”.¹²⁹ Taylor tells us that ‘the pronoun demonstrative’¹³⁰ refers to the bread of which Christ said ‘this is my Body’, and this is affirmed by the Fathers, he quotes Tertullian, Jerome, Cyril of Alexandria and Theodoret as examples.¹³¹ It is immaterial that the Greek ‘*τοῦτο*’ does not agree with the masculine ‘bread’ because ‘*hoc*’ signifies ‘this thing’.¹³² This/*τοῦτο* is not merely bread, it is ‘sacramental bread’¹³³ that is, bread which has been taken, blessed, broken and given and eaten; it is ‘My body’. And Taylor argues that ‘this’ does not simply mean the bread, but bread taken, blessed, broken and shared and eaten. That alone should be thought of as Christ’s body.¹³⁴ Taylor argues that Jesus gave what he had taken, blessed and broken; bread which he affirmed was his body. If it is clear that it was indeed bread that he affirmed to be his body, ‘then we have cleared the question’¹³⁵ because then it is shown that it is both bread and Christ’s body, so transubstantiation is untrue. *This* must refer to something, and it only makes sense if it is something other than ‘body’. It is nonsense to say the phrase ‘this is my body’ means ‘this body is my body’, it must mean something distinct, so it must mean that there are two distinct substances, bread and the body of Christ.¹³⁶

The only other possibility put forward is that ‘this’ ‘signifies an individual determinate substance under the accidents of bread’.¹³⁷ Taylor highlights the contradictions this introduces. He points out that Bellarmine’s effort to clear the contradictions introduce further contradictions: ‘this’ points to a substance that is not yet present, as the sacramental change, according to Bellarmine himself, is not made until the words have been spoken.

¹²⁹ Taylor, VI, p. 46.

¹³⁰ Taylor, VI, p. 46.

¹³¹ Taylor, VI, p. 47. (e.g. Tertullian, *An Answer to the Jews*, ch. 10; Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentary on S. John 12*; Theodoret, *Dialogues I*.)

¹³² Taylor, VI, p. 47.

¹³³ Taylor, VI, p. 48.

¹³⁴ Taylor, VI, p. 48.

¹³⁵ Taylor, VI, p. 48.

¹³⁶ Taylor, VI, p. 49.

¹³⁷ Taylor, VI, p. 50.

When Christ said, Hoc, ‘this’ is My body, by ‘this’ He meant ‘this which is contained under the accidents of bread’ is My body. But at that instant that which was contained under the accidents of bread was the substance of bread; therefore to the substance of bread Christ pointed, that He related to by the pronoun demonstrative, and of that He affirmed it was His body [...] However I will make bold to call it a demonstration upon their own grounds, and conclude that it is bread and Christ’s body too; and that is the doctrine of the protestants.¹³⁸

Taylor introduces the teaching of Ockham ‘the father of the nominalists’¹³⁹ who says that as it holds with reason and scripture that the substance of bread remains under the species, it is both more reasonable to maintain and introduces fewer ‘inconveniences’.¹⁴⁰ To introduce Ockham is a risk, it would be easy to argue that, on this principle, the bread and wine remain merely bread and wine, as Zwingli does, with no ontological link to the body and blood of Christ at all.

The case is more straightforward when referring to the chalice; *τοῦτο* or *hic* clearly refers to “‘this cup;” that is, the wine in this cup’.¹⁴¹ Jesus said of the wine in the cup that it was the New testament in his blood, or the blood of the New testament.¹⁴² Taylor quotes Juvencus, a Spanish priest from the reign of Constantine: ‘Drink this wine’.¹⁴³ Again Taylor refutes Bellarmine’s arguments: he argued that although ‘cup’ was signified by ‘this’ it does not follow that wine was meant, rather it should be understood as blood, for it was blood that was poured out. Taylor replies that this does not follow; ‘this cup’ was a cup of wine.¹⁴⁴

In any case S. Paul affirms that the sacrament is referred to as ‘bread’ and ‘the cup’ after consecration. (I Cor. 10.16) He writes that the bread, which we break, is the communication of the body of Christ and the cup of blessing is the communication of the blood of Christ. Taylor also quotes S. Augustine: ‘to eat the bread, in the New testament is the sacrifice of Christians’.¹⁴⁵ Furthermore, in his later discussion in I Corinthians, Paul again uses the words ‘bread’ and ‘cup’. He calls the

¹³⁸ Taylor, VI, p. 51. No attribution made to Bellarmine.

¹³⁹ Taylor, VI, p. 51.

¹⁴⁰ Taylor, VI, p. 51. Attributed to Ockham, *In iv. qu. 6*.

¹⁴¹ Taylor, VI, p. 51.

¹⁴² Taylor, VI, p. 51.

¹⁴³ Taylor, VI, p. 51.

¹⁴⁴ Taylor, VI, p. 52. Attributed to Bellarmine, *On the Eucharist*, I, ch. 10.

¹⁴⁵ S. Augustine, *City of God*, XVII, ch. 5, quoted in Taylor, VI, p. 53.

sacrament ‘bread’ three times in chapter 11. ‘It is bread, sacramental bread when the communicant eats it’,¹⁴⁶ Taylor insists.

Some ‘Roman doctors’¹⁴⁷ argue that the description ‘bread’ is used because the sacrament was at one time bread, ‘just as we say, the blind see, the lame walk’.¹⁴⁸ Taylor says this is simply not a reasonable argument because their doctrine says the bread is completely annihilated; ‘nothing of the bread becomes any thing of the holy body’.¹⁴⁹ It can only be called ‘bread’ if it actually is bread.¹⁵⁰

Taylor’s next point turns to the nature of God and God’s blessing. If the bread is annihilated by the blessing, as the doctrine of transubstantiation argues, then God destroys by blessing. Surely, Taylor argues, a blessing must change something for the better, not destroy it.¹⁵¹ He confirms his argument with a quotation from S. Augustine: ‘He that is the fountain of all being, is not the cause of not being, much less can His blessing cause any thing not to be.’¹⁵² In his paper on Berengar of Tours, which surveys the controversies following Berengar’s recantation ‘*Ego Berengarius*’, Henry Chadwick tells us, ‘Berengar was sharp against the notion that the Creator could annihilate his own handiwork’,¹⁵³ so we see Taylor echoing Berengar hundreds of years later. In his concluding section, Taylor looks back to the witness of the Fathers. They, he shows by his quotations, refer to the sacrament as bread and wine. He looks to the witness of Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Origen, Tertullian, S. Cyprian, S. Cyril of Jerusalem and others before invoking the authority of S. Augustine.¹⁵⁴ He then refers to later writers, including Scotus and Ockham, arguing that they were for consubstantiation;¹⁵⁵ Taylor did not ‘approve’ of their doctrine, but it still follows that they believed

¹⁴⁶ Taylor, VI, p. 53.

¹⁴⁷ Taylor, VI, p. 53.

¹⁴⁸ Taylor, VI, p. 53.

¹⁴⁹ Taylor, VI, p. 54.

¹⁵⁰ Taylor, VI, p. 54.

¹⁵¹ Taylor, VI, p. 55.

¹⁵² Taylor, VI, p. 55. Attributed to S. Augustine, *LXXXIII Questions*, q. 21.

¹⁵³ Henry Chadwick, ‘Ego Berengarius’, *The Journal of Theological Studies*, 40.2 (1989), 415–45 (p. 418).

¹⁵⁴ Taylor, VI, pp. 55–8. Refers to S. Augustine, *Sermons on the New Testament*, IX. (Tertullian, *1st Apology*, ch. 66; the passage from Irenaeus is attributed to *Against Heresies*, IV, ch. 57. The closest match seems to be Bk. V, ch. 2; Origen, *Contra Celsum*, VIII, ch. 57; Tertullian, *Against Marcion*, IV, ch. 40 and *De Corona*, ch.3; Cyprian, misattributed; Cyril of Jerusalem, *On the Mysteries*, IV).

¹⁵⁵ Taylor, VI, p. 58. Attributed to *Sent. iv. Dist. 11. Q. 3* (Scotus) and *Ibid. q.6* (Ockham).

that bread remained.¹⁵⁶ Furthermore, ‘in the primitive church eating the eucharistical bread was esteemed a breaking the fast, which is not imaginable any man can admit but he that believes bread to remain after consecration, and to be nutritive as before’.¹⁵⁷ Taylor recapitulates his argument:

The sum of all is this; if of bread Christ said, ‘This is My body’ because it cannot be true in a proper natural sense, it implying a contradiction that it should be properly bread and properly Christ’s body, it must follow that it is Christ’s body in a figurative improper sense. But if the bread does not remain bread, but be changed by blessing into our Lord’s body; this also is impossible to be in any sense true but by affirming the change to be only in use, virtue and condition, with which change the natural being of bread may remain. For he that supposes that by the blessing the bread ceases so to be, that nothing of it remains, must also necessarily suppose that the bread being no more, it neither can be the body of Christ nor any thing else. [...] Since therefore (as I have proved) the bread remains, and of bread it was affirmed, ‘This is My body’ it follows inevitably that it is figuratively, not properly and naturally spoken of bread, that it is the flesh or body of our Lord.¹⁵⁸

Taylor opposes ‘figurative’ and ‘natural’. ‘Figurative’ could mean that there is no real presence at all, the figure being a bare sign, as Zwingli understood the sacrament to be. For Taylor, it appears to mean that some communication of the body and blood of Christ is made in a manner other than the literal, corporal and fleshy way he thinks transubstantiation implies. Taylor equates figurative with spiritual.

3.6 *Est Corpus Meum*

Having considered the four words ‘*Hoc est corpus meum*’ and the single word ‘*hoc*’, Taylor continues his analysis by focusing on the remaining three words: ‘*est corpus meum*’. He has shown that the phrase is not, of itself, consecratory; he has argued that ‘this’ must mean bread or wine, now he asks what meaning ‘*est*’, “is”, can bear in the phrase. He begins with *Est corpus*, an examination which will be mainly linguistic. If *est* is ‘tropical’: ‘*Est*, that is, *significat* or *repræsentat et exhibet corpus meum*, say some’.¹⁵⁹ On the other hand, there are those who take *est* as literal, ‘but corpus is

¹⁵⁶ Taylor, VI, p. 58.

¹⁵⁷ Taylor, VI, p. 58.

¹⁵⁸ Taylor, VI, p. 59.

¹⁵⁹ Taylor, VI, p. 59.

taken in a spiritual sense, sacramental and mysterious, not a natural and presential.¹⁶⁰ Whether it is the one or the other that is ‘tropical’ is irrelevant; the phrase speaks figuratively: ‘Christ’s natural body is now in heaven definitely and nowhere else; and that He is in the sacrament as He can be in a sacrament’.¹⁶¹ Taylor’s issue is with those who take *est* to mean ‘is’ literally and *corpus* to be natural, or proper, body, rather than speak figuratively of the body, or the ‘effects and real benefits.’¹⁶²

Taylor begins by looking at the structure of language; in Jesus’ own tongue there was no word for ‘signify’; instead *is* was used and understood. He quotes Old and New Testament examples of this usage.¹⁶³ Further, we are speaking of a sacrament and ‘mysterious and tropical expressions are very frequently, almost regularly and universally used in scripture in sacraments and sacramentals’.¹⁶⁴ Taylor continues: because we speak of a ‘covenant and a testament’¹⁶⁵ there is still no reason to argue that the words must be taken literally. It is true that a will should be expressed in plain language, to avoid legal dispute, but Christ can continue to speak to us and give us understanding for he is not dead but alive; ‘He can by His Spirit make the church understand as much as He please’.¹⁶⁶ It is also clear that some parts of sacraments are clear commands: ‘Go and baptize’, ‘do this’; others are descriptions: ‘Jesus took bread and blessed it’. But the ‘sacramental proposition’ is figurative, hence baptism is referred to by S. Paul as both the grave and burial.¹⁶⁷ Taylor refers once more to S. Augustine who observed that, ‘the thing which signifies is wont to be called by that which it signifies: the seven ears of corn are seven years; he did not say they signified seven years, but are; and many like this.’¹⁶⁸ What is more, taking scripture literally in other places can lead to

¹⁶⁰ Taylor, VI, p. 59.

¹⁶¹ Taylor, VI, pp. 59–60.

¹⁶² Taylor, VI, p. 60.

¹⁶³ Taylor, VI, p. 60.

¹⁶⁴ Taylor, VI, p. 61.

¹⁶⁵ Taylor, VI, p. 61.

¹⁶⁶ Taylor, VI, pp. 61–2.

¹⁶⁷ Taylor, VI, p. 63.

¹⁶⁸ Taylor, VI, p. 63. Attributed to S. Augustine, *Commentary on Leviticus*. (I was unable to make a more precise attribution.)

‘strange inconveniences and impossibilities, scandals and errors’,¹⁶⁹ Taylor cites ‘Origen gelding himself’¹⁷⁰ as an example of mistakenly following the letter of scripture. Here Taylor shows more sophistication than in his investigation into John 6. He recognises that Scripture has texture and meaning is shaped by the context or genre of the passage. S. Augustine argued that ‘the fathers’ ate Christ’s body when they were fed with manna and they could not have eaten ‘Christ’s flesh in a natural manner, for it was not yet assumed’.¹⁷¹

Taylor ends the section with a summary of why it is reasonable that the words should be taken as figurative, rather than literal. He lists fourteen points, ending with:

It is not pretended to be verifiable without an infinite company of miracles, all which being more than needs, and none of them visible, but contestations against art and the notices of two or three sciences, cannot be supposed to be done by God, who does nothing superfluously. It seems to contradict an article of faith, viz., of Christ’s sitting in heaven in a determinate place, and being contained there till His second coming.¹⁷²

3.7 Considerations of the Manner and Circumstances of the Institution

The preceding sections have analysed the institution narrative in detail, focusing on language, grammar and other close readings. Taylor has discussed that it cannot be shown that ‘*Hoc est corpus meum*’ alone effects the consecration of bread and wine, that ‘*hoc*’ must refer to bread and continue to mean bread, even after consecration, and that ‘*est corpus meum*’ does not imply that the sacrament is literally Christ’s body. Now he lifts his gaze and looks at the context of the Last Supper. He begins by stating his assumption that the sacrament was given at the Last Supper in the same way that it is now given; ‘Christ did not give his natural body properly in the last supper, therefore neither does he now’.¹⁷³ The sacrament is of the body which has been broken, and blood which has been poured out. Yet at the supper his body was whole, so he could only have given them his body

¹⁶⁹ Taylor, VI, p. 65.

¹⁷⁰ Taylor, VI, p. 65.

¹⁷¹ Taylor, VI, p. 66. Referring to S. Augustine, *Tractates in S. John*, XXVI.

¹⁷² Taylor, VI, p. 67.

¹⁷³ Taylor, VI, pp. 67–8.

figuratively in a sacramental sense.¹⁷⁴ Taylor understands Roman Catholic teaching to say that the Mass is a propitiatory sacrifice. If his body was given in a propitiatory sacrifice at the Last Supper, then there was no need of the Cross, for the world was already redeemed by this action. This was not the case at the supper, so it cannot be the case now.¹⁷⁵ Taylor may be overstating his case here; the Tridentine Decree states that the fruits of Christ's offering himself on the cross are received most plentifully through the offering of the Mass, but that this does not in any way derogate from the sacrifice of the cross.¹⁷⁶ Again, the giving of the sacrament before the Passion shows that the body must be given in a figurative and sacramental way, as a type of the Passion.¹⁷⁷ And how could the body and blood be properly given when the apostles saw Jesus with them? His body would be visible to them, and present invisibly simultaneously. How could it be imagined that they understood themselves to have received his proper body whilst he was alive and eating with them?¹⁷⁸

It is in the next part of his argument that we see clearly how Taylor confounds substantial presence with carnal or bodily presence. He asks if Christ were naturally present in the sacrament at the Last Supper, which body is it that is present? The body that is there with the disciples; the body broken on the cross; or the risen and glorified body? Since Christ has no other body 'but that which is in heaven; and that can never be otherwise than it is, and so it cannot be received otherwise properly',¹⁷⁹ it must be received in a spiritual, not fleshy, material way as the sacrament is a remembrance of Christ's death.¹⁸⁰ Yet it might be argued that the substance of Christ remains the same through life, death, resurrection and glorification, although the actual body of Christ undergoes transformation.

Taylor then focuses on the fact of giving the sacrament before the death of Jesus. He argues it cannot yet be a remembrance of his death, for things can only be remembered that are in the past.

¹⁷⁴ Taylor, VI, p. 68.

¹⁷⁵ Taylor, VI, p. 68.

¹⁷⁶ Waterworth, p. 153.

¹⁷⁷ Taylor, VI, p. 68.

¹⁷⁸ Taylor, VI, p. 68.

¹⁷⁹ Taylor, VI, p. 69.

¹⁸⁰ Taylor, VI, p. 69.

This means the sacrament can only be an icon, a sacramental image of Jesus' death. It is a 'sacrament or mysterious representment' of the thing that will be verified on the Cross.¹⁸¹

Taylor returns to a familiar theme. 'He that receives unworthily receives no benefit to his body or to his soul by the holy sacrament'.¹⁸² It follows that the spiritual benefit of the sacrament comes to the body by way of the soul. The spiritual benefit is received in the soul by way of faith, not by way of the mouth; for those who communicate worthily communicate by faith. If Christ were naturally present then he would first be received by the body, and then benefit the soul. Taylor quotes Cajetan: 'the true body of Christ is eaten in the sacrament, but not corporally, but spiritually; the spiritual manducation which is made by the soul, reaches to the flesh of Christ in the sacrament'.¹⁸³ He approves this, calling it 'very good protestant doctrine'¹⁸⁴ but he does not question whether his own assumptions about transubstantiation are entirely correct. He still maintains that they argue Christ is received corporally, even though the body does not nourish corporally.¹⁸⁵ Taylor then turns to the Fathers to reinforce his insistence that 'by the doctrine of the ancient Church, wicked men do not eat the body, nor drink the blood of Christ'.¹⁸⁶ Again he assumes that transubstantiation means that all who eat and drink receive the body and blood of Christ. Taylor looks both to the early Fathers, Origen, S. Hilary and S. Cyprian as well as later voices, S. Bernard and Bede. Finally, he turns to S. Augustine:

if the Roman doctors will be judged by S. Austin for the sense of the church in this question, and will allow him in this point to be a good catholic, 1) he dogmatically declares that the wicked man does not eat Christ's body truly: 2) he does eat it sacramentally: 3) that to eat with effect, is to eat Christ's body truly; to which if they please to add this, that to eat it spiritually is to eat it with effect, it follows by S. Austin's doctrine that spiritually is really, and that there is no true and real body of Christ eaten in the sacrament but by the faithful receiver: or if you please receive the conclusion in the words of S. Austin [...] 'then to each receiver it becomes the body and blood of

¹⁸¹ Taylor, VI, p. 69.

¹⁸² Taylor, VI, p. 70.

¹⁸³ Taylor, VI, pp. 70–1. Attributed to Cajetan, *Opusc., tom. ii. Tract. 2 de euch. c.5.*

¹⁸⁴ Taylor, VI, p. 71.

¹⁸⁵ Taylor, VI, pp. 70–1.

¹⁸⁶ Taylor, VI, p. 71.

Christ, if that which is taken in the sacrament be in the very truth itself spiritually eaten, and spiritually drunk'¹⁸⁷

Taylor argues forcefully, 'all the wicked do but eat the sign of Christ's body, all that is to be done beyond is to eat it spiritually; there is no other eating but these two.'¹⁸⁸ He is adamant that transubstantiation implies 'proper eating' of Christ's body and that scandalously means the wicked receive Christ. He simply cannot allow this, because he believes the weight of opinion and the scriptural evidence is against it. Again, he ignores the Council of Trent's definitions of eating, referred to earlier. The Council's position is that only those who are receiving the sacrament in good faith will receive the spiritual blessings, thus the wicked do not, in the Council's understanding, receive Christ.

Taylor then changes tack. He returns to the institution narratives, focusing on the words that are spoken about the cup of wine. They differ markedly between the evangelists and S. Paul, so they may not be the actual words of Jesus which implies that the 'sense and meaning of the mystery'¹⁸⁹ are what is important. Since they are so different it cannot be that Jesus meant any one to be consecratory, and in any case the Roman Missal uses a form which differs from all the recorded instances.¹⁹⁰ The form of words that the Missal uses includes the phrase *mysterium fidei*; Taylor argues:

all this declares it is *mysterium fidei*, and so to be taken in all senses: and those words are left in their canon, as if on purpose either to prevent the literal and natural understanding of the other words, or for the reducing the communicants to the only apprehensions of faith; it is *mysterium fidei*, not *sanguis naturalis*, 'a mystery of faith' not 'natural blood'.¹⁹¹

Taylor finds no evidence for transubstantiation in either the scriptural text or in the text in the Roman Missal. He has argued to his satisfaction that Christ is not present 'properly', but spiritually.

¹⁸⁷ Taylor, VI, p. 72. Attributed to S. Augustine, *Serm. ii. de verb. apost.*

¹⁸⁸ Taylor, VI, p. 73.

¹⁸⁹ Taylor, VI, p. 73.

¹⁹⁰ Taylor, VI, p. 73.

¹⁹¹ Taylor, VI, p. 74.

He continues with a short section confirming that he has ‘proved’ the argument that these Scriptures show ‘that Christ’s body is eaten only sacramentally by the body, but really and effectively only by faith, which is the mouth of the soul’.¹⁹² He reminds his reader that ‘the flesh profiteth nothing’ and Jesus spoke words of ‘spirit and life.’¹⁹³ Despite his undertaking to ‘disprove’ transubstantiation, Taylor’s argument that only the faithful truly receive the body and blood of Christ in holy communion is paralleled by the decrees of the Council of Trent. The Council argues that sinners only receive sacramentally, but the properly prepared faithful receive both sacramentally and also spiritually, and it is the spiritual receiving which makes ‘sensible’ the fruitfulness and usefulness of the sacrament.¹⁹⁴

3.8 Arguments from Other Scriptures, Proving Christ’s Real Presence in the Sacrament to be Only Spiritual and not Natural.

The previous sections have discussed scriptural passages which appear most relevant to the argument. We have looked at John 6 and then the institution narrative, before breaking down the phrase ‘*Hoc est corpus meum*’ and subjecting it to close analysis. Now Taylor turns to other scriptures which he marshals to support his argument. These are texts which may not, at first glance, seem to have much to do with the topic in hand.

His first text is not promising: Whatsoever entereth into the mouth goeth into the belly and is cast forth into the draught. (Matt. 15.17) There follows a lengthy discussion about the process of digestion. Taylor argues that the sacrament does nourish the body and quotes Rabanus: ‘that body is changed into us when we eat it and drink it’.¹⁹⁵ We cannot eat accidents alone; either we eat bread, or we eat Christ’s body, if the latter then it will be subject to the natural processes of digestion. Henry Chadwick shows that in discussing substantial change Berengar made the same objection as Taylor

¹⁹² Taylor, VI, p. 74.

¹⁹³ Taylor, VI, p. 74.

¹⁹⁴ Waterworth, p. 81.

¹⁹⁵ Taylor, VI, p. 77.

in the eleventh century.¹⁹⁶ (This assumes that transubstantiation is making the claim that Christ's natural, corporal body is present in the sacrament.) If the digestion of Christ's body, spiritually present, is by spiritual means we are spared this awful possibility.¹⁹⁷ This opinion of Taylor's is fostered by the Roman canon law: 'as long as the species remain uncorrupted, the holy body is there under those species; and therefore may be vomited; and consequently ejected all ways by which the species can pass unaltered'.¹⁹⁸ Taylor also invokes a prayer from the missal: 'let Thy body, O Lord, which I have taken, and the blood which I have drunk, cleave to my bowels'¹⁹⁹ as evidence that they believe that the body of Christ is processed through the digestive system. The prayer that the body should cleave to the bowels indicates to Taylor that they are concerned lest it continue to the drain. He does admit that this might be metaphorical language: 'but certain it is that if they intended it for a figurative speech, it was a bold one, and not so fitted for edification as for an objection.'^{200,201} Taylor then turns to Origen, who 'plainly distinguishes the material part from the spiritual in the sacrament'.²⁰² He affirms that Christ is present 'in a typical and symbolical manner'²⁰³ and so the material part only is subject to the natural processes of digestion.²⁰⁴ Taylor complains Bellarmine and Perron try and twist Origen's meaning²⁰⁵ and he further quotes a determination from a ninth century synod: 'the bread and wine are spiritually made the body of Christ, which being a meat of the mind and not of the belly, is not corrupted, but remaineth unto everlasting life.'²⁰⁶ What follows is a discussion around accidents and substances, invoking Aristotle's Categories. Here Taylor makes

¹⁹⁶ Chadwick, p. 430.

¹⁹⁷ Taylor, VI, p. 77.

¹⁹⁸ Taylor, VI, p. 78.

¹⁹⁹ Taylor, VI, p. 78.

²⁰⁰ Taylor, VI, p. 78.

²⁰¹ The English Missal (*The English Missal: Missale Anglicanum* (London: Knott, 1934), p. 304, p. 316) translates 'Corpus tuum, Domine, quod sumpsi, et Sanguinis, quem potavi, adhaerat visceribus meis' as 'Let thy Body, O Lord, which I have taken, and thy Blood which I have drunk, cleave to my members'. It is a prayer to be said by the priest whilst purifying the vessels following Holy Communion and is clearly a prayer that the Body and Blood of Christ should be joined to the priest in his deepest parts, his inmost being. Taylor has missed its point.

²⁰² Taylor, VI, p. 78.

²⁰³ Origen, *Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*, XI, ch. 14, quoted in Taylor, VI, p. 79.

²⁰⁴ Taylor, VI, p. 78.

²⁰⁵ Taylor, VI, p. 79.

²⁰⁶ Taylor, VI, p. 80.

the statement, ‘matter and form are substances, and those that integrate all physical and compound substances’²⁰⁷ showing Taylor understands *substance* in a physical rather than metaphysical way. Hence, he understands transubstantiation to imply Christ’s body is present in a natural way which involves physical reality. That is why this question of digestion appears important, and why he is so concerned about protecting the body of Christ from the physical consequences of digestion.

The next argument from scripture is taken from Christ’s departing from this world; His going from us, the ascension of His body and soul into heaven; His not being with us, His being contained in the heavens.²⁰⁸

This might be conceived as an argument from ‘real absence’! Christ’s body can only be in one place at a time, the scriptures affirm both that Jesus is ascended and that he is not here. Taylor quotes S. Augustine: ‘Christ as God is every where, but in respect of His body He is determined to a particular residence in heaven’.²⁰⁹ And he quotes other examples from the Fathers to witness to the belief that the local presence of Christ is in heaven.²¹⁰ Taylor is either ignorant of or deliberately ignoring the Council of Trent which also affirms that ‘our Saviour Himself always sitteth at the right hand of the Father in heaven, according to the natural mode of existing’.²¹¹ What is more, Jesus himself said, ‘Me ye have not always’²¹² and if he were still present in person why would there be a need to send ‘his Vicar’, the Holy Spirit?²¹³

But that such sacred things as these may not be exposed to contempt, by such weak propositions and their trifling consequents, the case is plain, that Christ being to depart hence sent His holy spirit in substitution to supply to His Church the office of a teacher, which He on earth in person was to His disciples; when He went from hence, He was to come no more in person, and therefore He sent His substitute; and therefore to pretend Him to be here in person though under a disguise which we see through with the eye of faith, and converse with Him by presential adoration of His humanity, is in effect to undervalue the real purposes and sense of all the sayings of Christ concerning His departure hence, and the deputation of the Holy Spirit.²¹⁴

²⁰⁷ Taylor, VI, p. 80.

²⁰⁸ Taylor, VI, p. 81.

²⁰⁹ S. Augustine, *Letter 187 (To Dardanus)*, ch. 10, quoted in Taylor, VI, p. 82.

²¹⁰ Taylor, VI, p. 82.

²¹¹ Waterworth, p. 76.

²¹² Taylor, VI, p. 83.

²¹³ Taylor, VI, p. 83.

²¹⁴ Taylor, VI, p. 84.

Again, Taylor seems determined to understand substantial presence in a local way, in which Christ is corporally present in his person under the eucharistic species, despite Aquinas' statement on local presence in ST III Q76, A5: 'Hence in no way is Christ's body locally in this sacrament'.

3.9 *The Story So Far*

After setting out the problem as he sees it, we have seen Taylor working with scripture to make his argument. He looks at John 6, in a way which is not always focused, and then turns to the institution narratives. In three sections he analyses the words and in a fourth he looks at the context. Following these analyses, he gathers together a few more texts to help his argument. In these first sections of *The Real Presence and Spiritual*, Taylor has set out his understanding of presence, which sometimes gets submerged in his argument. There are times when it would be easy to lose sight of Taylor's belief that the elements are changed by the prayers of the priest²¹⁵ and instead assume that Taylor believed in 'symbolic memorialism',²¹⁶ like the theology of Zwingli referred to in the previous chapter; the communicant makes a spiritual communion, the elements are a memorial of Christ's Passion. Nevertheless, there are several positive assertions included in his argument:

- The presence of Christ is real and spiritual.
- After ritual prayer, the symbols become changed into the body and blood of Christ.
- It is bread, and it is Christ's body: it is bread in substance, Christ in the sacrament; and Christ is as really given to all that are truly disposed.
- The spiritual presence of Christ is 'most real, most true'.
- The sacrament is powerful, bringing damnation to the wicked who might receive it.
- He speaks of an effective sacramental change.
- He follows the Fathers in believing that sacramental change is as a result of the intercession of the minister (in opposition to the recitation of a set formula).
- The true body of Christ is eaten in the sacrament, not corporally but spiritually.

²¹⁵ Taylor, VI, p. 11.

²¹⁶ Gerrish, p. 239.

We have seen that Taylor is conversant with a wide range of patristic material as well as much of the writings of those whose thought he opposes, in particular Robert Bellarmine. His sections give each focus an exhaustive treatment, again and again showing to his satisfaction that the arguments of his opponents do not stand scrutiny. There is, however, a sense of negativity which comes from Taylor setting out to *disprove*. Because he is secure in his own belief that deep investigations into the matters of God are inappropriate and that there is a proper reticence in saying little beyond the general, and not seeking precise definition²¹⁷ he often has much more to say about what he does not believe than what he does. This is consistent with Article XXVIII which clearly rejects transubstantiation, but speaks in a more open ended way about how the body and blood of Christ are given and taken; ‘after an heavenly and spiritual manner.’²¹⁸ This chapter has set out Taylor’s arguments which are focused on showing that the sacrament is not ontologically identical to the body and blood of Christ and it is not necessary that it should be. There is a distance between them, the use of the word ‘is’ in the institution narrative does not imply complete identity but a looser relationship between sacrament and signified. In the following chapter, we will see how Taylor argues against transubstantiation as an idea, both in its implications for empirical verification of reality by the senses and its internal logic.

²¹⁷ Taylor, VI, pp. 12–13.

²¹⁸ *Book of Common Prayer*, p. 785.

Chapter 4: Transubstantiation and Taylor's Thought

In the previous chapter, we have looked at Taylor's long work on the Real Presence and how he wishes to use the term in opposition to transubstantiation. So far, his work has focused more on ontological identity than on the actual doctrine of transubstantiation. He has been arguing to show that 'This is my Body' should not be taken literally but figuratively; the ontological link between sign and signified remains, but it is not one of complete identity. Before we consider the remaining sections of Taylor's work, we will look at the development of the doctrine of transubstantiation from its apparent beginning as a literary conversation between two monks through the early arguments and Conciliar statements. We will consider in depth Thomas Aquinas' presentation of transubstantiation in his *Summa Theologica* and note his devotional hymns. This will give us a foundation to help us understand Taylor's position and critique it, as it seems in some places Taylor does not have a clear understanding of Aquinas' presentation of transubstantiation.

In her survey of the eucharist in late medieval society, *Corpus Christi*,¹ Miri Rubin traces the beginnings of the doctrine of transubstantiation to the first half of the ninth century, where, in the monastery of Corbie, Paschasius Radbert wrote a book entitled *De corpore et sanguine domini* which contained the assertion that the corporal body of Christ was present after the eucharistic consecration: 'so that following the consecration Christ's real flesh is truly created.'² In response a confrère, Ratramnus, wrote 'a polemical interpretation of Christ as 'figure' in the eucharist, as an image of a spiritual truth which resided elsewhere.'³ Owen Phelan suggests that, because this correspondence is seen as the starting point for a conversation about the mode of eucharistic presence, some of the authors' important intentions have become obscured over the centuries. They had different approaches to the importance of sacraments, 'Paschasius sees sacraments primarily as instruments

¹ M. Rubin, *Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

² Rubin, p. 15.

³ Rubin, pp. 15–16.

of unity, while Ratramnus views sacraments principally as salvific tools.⁴ Rubin characterises Ratramnus as holding to Augustinian ideas, the sacraments as ‘visible words, quite distinct from the *res* they signified, although correlated with them.’⁵ She sees in Paschasius echoes of the theology of Ambrose⁶ with the relation between sacrament (sign) and the reality which is signified or given/received as ‘simple *being* through a change in essence.’⁷ Taylor shows he is aware of this controversy in a later section of *The Real Presence*.⁸ The debate between these two poles of thought was brought into sharp focus in the eleventh century. The realist view had become dominant, but the teacher and scholar Berengar of Tours articulated a strong argument in defence of a figurative relation between the sacrament and Christ’s Body; Berengar used the language of scholarly debate, but the temperature had increased. During the eleventh century, the Church was beginning to insist that in the sacraments something *real* was given.⁹ In his dialogues with Lanfranc of Bec¹⁰, Berengar argued that ‘In ‘Hoc est Corpus meum’, ‘Hoc’ the pronoun, signified the bread on the altar. If this was so, could a predicate destroy its own subject?’¹¹ This is an argument we have already seen Taylor make.¹² Berengar was condemned and in 1089 was forced by Rome to make this oath in recantation:

I believe that the bread and wine which are laid on the altar are after the consecration not only a sacrament but also the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and they are physically taken up and broken in the hands of the priest and crushed by the teeth of the faithful, not only sacramentally, but in truth.¹³

⁴ Owen M. Phelan, ‘Horizontal and Vertical Theologies: “Sacraments” in the Works of Paschasius Radbertus and Ratramnus of Corbie’, *Harvard Theological Review*, 103:3, (2010), 217–289.

⁵ Rubin, p. 16.

⁶ For more on the Augustinian sign vs. realism aspect of this debate see: Willemien Otten, ‘Between Augustinian Sign and Carolingian Reality: The Presence of Ambrose and Augustine in the Eucharistic Debate between Paschasius Radbertus and Ratramnus of Corbie’, *Dutch Review of Church History*, 80:2, (2000), 137–156.

⁷ Rubin, p. 16.

⁸ Taylor, VI, pp. 159–160.

⁹ Rubin, p. 17–18.

¹⁰ For a discussion of the developments of sacramental theology during this period see: Mark G. Vaillancourt, ‘Sacramental Theology from Gottschalk to Lanfranc’ in *The Oxford Handbook of Sacramental Theology*, ed. Hans Boersma and Matthew Levering (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 187–200.

¹¹ Rubin, p. 19.

¹² Taylor, VI, p. 54.

¹³ Rubin, pp. 19–20.

Henry Chadwick examined the controversy surrounding Berengar, and notes that he was not a lone voice, in his extended article, 'Ego Berengarius.'¹⁴ Taylor refers to Berengar in his section on John 6,¹⁵ likening the content of his forced confession to the naturalism implied in the complaints of the people of Capernaum. This over crude realism could not stand, even Lanfranc, Berengar's opponent, was unable to live with it.¹⁶

Rubin describes how the debate continued during the following century, in Liège a critique of the realist view was developed around the use of Scriptural images, without considering the argument in terms of substance and accidents. Rupert of Deutz suggested a theory of *impanation*: Christ became bread. Alger developed a description of the sacrament having a particular mode of existence, neither material nor figurative; 'an ambivalent mode which allowed for two simultaneous eatings – spiritual and carnal.'¹⁷ However, the ways of symbolic thinking which had sustained Christianity for centuries were changing. During the twelfth century, new philosophical ideas were introduced,¹⁸ the eucharist began to be described in the Aristotelian terms of substance and accidents. Rubin argues that 'Transubstantiation was a neologism which arose from the eleventh century debate, and developed in the twelfth century within a realist philosophy of the universe.'¹⁹ Bonaventure drew on the ideas of Peter of Poitiers, who suggested Christ's body was covered by the accidents of bread and wine,²⁰ he described Christ's flesh in the sacrament as covered like 'the meat cooked on ashes which sustained Elijah on his way to Mount Horeb'.²¹

The realist explanations were opposed by thinkers such as Albert the Great, who 'simply derided the sort of formulations of the mass which were being created and disseminated to the

¹⁴ H. Chadwick, 'Ego Berengarius' *Journal of Theological Studies*, 40 (1989), 414–445.

¹⁵ Taylor, VI, p. 28.

¹⁶ Rubin, p. 21.

¹⁷ Rubin, p. 21.

¹⁸ For a discussion of the developments of the Twelfth Century see: Boyd Taylor Coolman, 'The Christopneumatic-Ecclesial Character of Twelfth-Century Sacramental Theology' in *The Oxford Handbook of Sacramental Theology*, ed. Hans Boersma and Matthew Levering (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 201–217.

¹⁹ Rubin, p. 24.

²⁰ Rubin, p. 24.

²¹ S. Bonaventure, *Sermones Selecti de Rebus Theologicis*, sermon 3: 'De Santissimo Corporis Christi,' quoted in Rubin, p. 25.

celebrating clergy’,²² and Thomas Aquinas ‘who felt that the realist views constrained God in time and space.’²³ We will later review Thomas’ exposition of transubstantiation in Part III of the *Summa Theologica*; Rubin summarises Thomas’ understanding thus: ‘that the species realised Christ’s physical presence, but only in an invisible, spiritual, and non-materialist way’.²⁴ This begs the question, how can the presence be physical if it is ‘spiritual and non-material’?

Rubin argues that the period between 1150 and 1350 saw eucharistic theology become more and more dependent on Aristotle’s philosophy of matter, this began with with Peter Comestor and Peter the Chanter. At the end of this period of philosophical development Duns Scotus’ theology was completely identified with Aristotle’s philosophy. Rubin characterises Thomas Aquinas’ position as ‘moderate’.

In this view bodies were constituted by two metaphysical principles: matter and form. A body was extended from matter, in a form which governed its particular appearance, in quantity and shape. The substance exists within these two principles which are none the less separate. So the substance of Christ’s body in the eucharist could exist in the appearance of bread, as an extension of the substance of Christ’s body in heaven.²⁵

Aquinas argued that there was a change of substance, but the properties of taste, size and so on, referred to as ‘accidents’, remained unchanged. In his formulation of transubstantiation his description of the change of substance described a process of conversion of substance.²⁶ Scotus argued that the substance of bread was annihilated and the substance of Christ was substituted at consecration, enacted by God’s unlimited power.²⁷ Ockham²⁸ understood the change of substance as succession.²⁹ As the fourteenth century proceeded, the language of enquiry became more and more technical, leaving behind any space for mystery.³⁰ Marilyn McCord Adams sets out some of the ways

²² Rubin, p. 25.

²³ Rubin, p. 25.

²⁴ Rubin, p. 25.

²⁵ Rubin, p. 30.

²⁶ Rubin, p. 30.

²⁷ Rubin, p. 30.

²⁸ For a discussion of similarities and differences between the theologies of Ockham and Aquinas see: John T. Slotemaker, ‘Ontology, Theology and the Eucharist: Thomas Aquinas and William of Ockham’, *The Saint Anselm Journal*, 9.2 (Spring 2014), 1–20.

²⁹ Rubin, p. 32.

³⁰ Rubin, p. 33.

in which medieval philosopher theologians used Aristotelian metaphysics to explain the process of transubstantiation. In her book she shows how Aquinas and Giles of Rome differ from Duns Scotus and Ockham as each attempts a proper philosophical underpinning to the idea of transubstantiation.³¹ Although we will look in detail at S. Thomas Aquinas' account of transubstantiation, Adams reminds us that he posits something *new* which she calls 'Thomistic transubstantiation'; she argues that Aquinas takes Aristotle's understanding of the kinds of change which can be found in observed world and adds to this the notion that whole-being conversion, required by transubstantiation, which is within the scope of divine power alone.³²

The Fourth Lateran Council (1215)³³ had introduced the term 'transubstantiation' with no further explanation or definition:

There is one Universal Church of the faithful, outside of which there is absolutely no salvation. In which there is the same priest and sacrifice, Jesus Christ, whose body and blood are truly contained in the sacrament of the altar under the forms of bread and wine; the bread being changed (*transsubstantiation*) by divine power into the body, and the wine into the blood, so that to realize the mystery of unity we may receive of Him what He has received of us.³⁴

The subsequent centuries had developed the philosophical idea of transubstantiation and described it in the technical language of the age. Alongside the theological/philosophical project there was a pastoral project. This focused on 'This special food, Christ's very body'³⁵ exemplified in the elevation of the host following the consecration, with a growing parallel focus on the words *hoc est corpus meum*.³⁶ Worshippers were instructed to 'kneel and join hands'³⁷ at the moment of elevation. Holy communion was the zenith of sacramental experience, 'the tasting, 'smackyng', of the host-God.'³⁸ Although the mass was said daily, and the priest communicated each day, the laity

³¹ Marilyn McCord Adams, *Some Later Medieval Theories of the Eucharist*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).

³² Adams, pp. 241–2.

³³ 'Lateran Councils' in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, pp. 801 – 802.

³⁴ 4th Lateran Council, Canon I <<http://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/basis/lateran4.asp>> [Retrieved 13th October 2016]

³⁵ Rubin, p. 38.

³⁶ Rubin, pp. 54–5.

³⁷ Rubin, p. 57.

³⁸ Rubin, p. 64.

communicated less frequently, 'the Fourth Lateran Council required annual communion after due confession and penance.'³⁹ The holiness of the consecrated host emphasised the actuality of God present in the consecrated species, and localised that presence in the host. Lay people were taught in catechism the nature of the sacrament:

The ferthe is the sacrament of the auter,
Cristes owen bodi in the likeness of brede,
Als hale as he toke it of that blessed maiden.⁴⁰

Unsurprisingly, lay people were taught about the eucharist in language that emphasised presence and closeness and thus used corporal imagery, 'Cristes own bodi', rather than the scholastic language of accident and substance.

Alongside doctrine, and the drama of liturgy and popular systematic instruction, there grew up a series of miracle narratives which were disseminated to prove the presence of Christ in the consecrated host. These fell into three main styles: some manifestation of the physical presence of Christ, seeing a child in place of the host for example, or the host dripping blood; the behaviour of animals being altered by the sacrament; or an abuser being converted and punished by contact with the host.⁴¹ For example, Edward the Confessor was reputed to have seen a child in the hands of Archbishop Wulfstan as he celebrated the mass.⁴²

The drama of the celebration of the eucharist, the teaching of miraculous visions and properties and the insistence that Christ was really present led to an understanding that transubstantiation meant that Christ was locally and physically present in the consecrated elements, even if some philosophical formulations did not argue for this. Transubstantiation ceased to have a precise metaphysical meaning and became a much broader idea. Hence Taylor's frustration when trying to argue against it, because the writers he opposes seem to say different things at the same time.

³⁹ Rubin, p. 65.

⁴⁰ Rubin, p. 100.

⁴¹ Rubin, p. 118.

⁴² Rubin, p. 118.

4.1 Thomas Aquinas' Exposition of Transubstantiation

Thomas Aquinas⁴³ is associated with the doctrine and is credited with writing the hymns for the Office of Corpus Christi which was inaugurated by Pope Urban IV with the Bull *Transiturus* on 11th August 1264.⁴⁴ His doctrine of transubstantiation is set out in the third part of his *Summa*, which was written later than the Corpus Christi hymnody; this part of the *Summa* was probably begun whilst Aquinas was in Paris in 1271 – 2 and the last articles were being written up until the date when he finished writing, 6th December 1273, when he was in Naples.⁴⁵

The eucharist is discussed in Questions 73 – 83 of the third part of the *Summa*.⁴⁶ Aquinas describes the eucharist as a 'spiritual food' which changes the partaker into itself.⁴⁷ In ST III Q75 Aquinas focuses on '*The Change of Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Christ*' in eight articles. Aquinas states:

The presence of Christ's true body and blood in this sacrament cannot be detected by sense, nor understanding, but by faith alone, which rests upon Divine authority. [...] Some men accordingly, not paying heed to these things, have contended that Christ's body and blood are not in this sacrament except as in a sign, a thing to be rejected as heretical, since it is contrary to Christ's words. Hence Berengarius, who had been the first deviser of this heresy, was afterwards forced to withdraw his error, and to acknowledge the truth of the faith.⁴⁸

In his reply to Objection 3, he makes an important clarification:

Christ's body is not in this sacrament in the same way as a body is in a place, which by its dimensions is commensurate with the place; but in a special manner which is proper to this sacrament. Hence we say that Christ's body is upon many altars, not as in different places, but "sacramentally": and thereby we do not understand that Christ

⁴³ For a discussion of S. Thomas' sacramental theology see: Matthew Levering, 'Aquinas on the Sacramental Life', in *Christian Theologies of the Sacraments: A Comparative Introduction*, Edited by Justin S. Holcomb and David A. Johnson (New York: New York University Press, 2017), pp. 81–99. For extensive engagement with the eucharistic theology of Aquinas see: Matthew Levering, *Sacrifice and Community: Jewish Offering and Christian Eucharist* (Malden MA: Blackwell, 2005).

⁴⁴ J-P Torrell, *Saint Thomas Aquinas: Vol. I The Person and His Works*, trans. R. Royal (Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2005), p. 130.

⁴⁵ Torrell, I, p. 147.

⁴⁶ S. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, Translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province (New York: Benzinger Bros, 1947).

⁴⁷ ST III Q73, A3 Reply to objection 2. (References to the *Summa* are in the following format: first the Part, then the Question, then the Article of the question, finally an indication what part of the response to the Article is referenced.)

⁴⁸ ST III Q75, A1 Answer.

is there only as in a sign, although a sacrament is a kind of sign; but that Christ's body is here after a fashion proper to this sacrament, as stated above.⁴⁹

Although Christ's body is in the sacrament it is in the sacrament in a special way, which has properties which belong to a particular way of being. Objection 4 and its answer also make the argument that the body is present 'invisibly, after the manner and by the virtue of the spirit.'⁵⁰

Following Ambrose, Aquinas argues that

Christ's body does not begin to be present in this sacrament by local motion. First of all, because it would follow that it would cease to be in heaven: for what is moved locally does not come anew to some place unless it quit the former one. Secondly, because every body moved locally passes through all intermediary spaces, which cannot be said here. Thirdly, because it is not possible for one movement of the same body moved locally to be terminated in different places at the one time, whereas the body of Christ under this sacrament begins at the one time to be in several places. And consequently it remains that Christ's body cannot begin to be anew in this sacrament except by change of the substance of bread into itself. But what is changed into another thing, no longer remains after such change.⁵¹

The substance of bread no longer remains following sacramental conversion. Aquinas also adds that this must be the case because: 'it would be opposed to the veneration of this sacrament, if any substance were there, which could not be adored with adoration of latria.'⁵² Almost in passing he tells the reader that the sacrament is worthy of 'latria', the 'fullness of divine worship which may be paid to God alone.'⁵³ The substance of bread is not annihilated but changed into the substance of Christ's body.⁵⁴ This substantial conversion is made by the operation of divine power, it is not any sort of natural movement, it has a particular name, 'transubstantiation'.⁵⁵ Despite the change of substance, the 'accidents' are unchanged by this sacramental conversion:

It is evident to sense that all the accidents of the bread and wine remain after the consecration. And this is reasonably done by Divine providence. First of all, because it is not customary, but horrible, for men to eat human flesh, and to drink blood. And therefore Christ's flesh and blood are set before us to be partaken of under the species

⁴⁹ ST III Q75, A1 Reply to Objection 3.

⁵⁰ ST III Q75, A1 Reply to Objection 4.

⁵¹ ST III Q75, A2 Answer.

⁵² ST III Q75, A2 Answer.

⁵³ 'Latria', in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, p. 803.

⁵⁴ ST III Q75, A3 Answer.

⁵⁵ ST III Q75, A4 Answer.

of those things which are the more commonly used by men, namely, bread and wine. Secondly, lest this sacrament might be derided by unbelievers, if we were to eat our Lord under His own species. Thirdly, that while we receive our Lord's body and blood invisibly, this may redound to the merit of faith.⁵⁶

Aquinas enlarges on the nature of discerning the sacrament in his responses to Objections 2 and 3 in the Article:

There is no deception in this sacrament; for the accidents which are discerned by the senses are truly present. But the intellect, whose proper object is substance as is said in *De Anima* iii, is preserved by faith from deception. And this serves as answer to the third argument; because faith is not contrary to the senses, but concerns things to which sense does not reach.⁵⁷

Aquinas argues that the conversion is instantaneous⁵⁸ and that

it must be said that this change, as stated above, is wrought by Christ's words which are spoken by the priest, so that the last instant of pronouncing the words is the first instant in which Christ's body is in the sacrament; and that the substance of the bread is there during the whole preceding time.⁵⁹

Following sacramental conversion, it is permissible to say, 'the Body of Christ is made of bread' only by way of similitude: 'by the word "bread" is not understood the substance of bread, but in general "that which is contained under the species of bread," under which species there is first contained the substance of bread, and afterwards the body of Christ.'⁶⁰ Question 76 focuses on the way in which Christ is present in the sacrament. Aquinas first argues that the whole Christ is present in both elements of the sacrament:

It is absolutely necessary to confess according to Catholic faith that the entire Christ is in this sacrament. [...] But from natural concomitance there is also in this sacrament that which is really united with that thing wherein the aforesaid conversion is terminated. For if any two things be really united, then wherever the one is really, there must the other also be: since things really united together are only distinguished by an operation of the mind.⁶¹

⁵⁶ ST III Q75, A5 Answer.

⁵⁷ ST III Q75, A5 Reply to Objection 2.

⁵⁸ ST III Q75, A7 Answer.

⁵⁹ ST III Q75, A7 Reply to Objection 1.

⁶⁰ ST III Q75, A8 Answer.

⁶¹ ST III Q76, A1 Answer.

Objection 3 argues that the whole Christ cannot be in the sacrament because the elements are smaller than Christ's natural body, but Aquinas responds:

it is evident that the dimensions of the bread or wine are not changed into the dimensions of the body of Christ, but substance into substance. And so the substance of Christ's body or blood is under this sacrament by the power of the sacrament, but not the dimensions of Christ's body or blood. Hence it is clear that the body of Christ is in this sacrament "by way of substance," and not by way of quantity. But the proper totality of substance is contained indifferently in a small or large quantity; as the whole nature of air in a great or small amount of air, and the whole nature of a man in a big or small individual.⁶²

Aquinas then continues to argue that Christ is entire in every part of the sacrament because the presence is substantive and not corporal.⁶³ Nevertheless, the whole Christ is not present in dimensive quantity, Christ is not squashed into the sacrament like a tiny homunculus, Christ is present in substance. Despite this, there is some sense in which although the dimensive quantity of bread is that which remains and is present: 'since the substance of Christ's body is not really deprived of its dimensive quantity and its other accidents, hence it comes that by reason of real concomitance the whole dimensive quantity of Christ's body and all its other accidents are in this sacrament.'⁶⁴ The substantial presence under the accidents of bread and wine alters the concept of place:

it remains that Christ's body is not in this sacrament as in a place, but after the manner of substance, that is to say, in that way in which substance is contained by dimensions; because the substance of Christ's body succeeds the substance of bread in this sacrament: hence as the substance of bread was not locally under its dimensions, but after the manner of substance, so neither is the substance of Christ's body. Nevertheless the substance of Christ's body is not the subject of those dimensions, as was the substance of the bread: and therefore the substance of the bread was there locally by reason of its dimensions, because it was compared with that place through the medium of its own dimensions; but the substance of Christ's body is compared with that place through the medium of foreign dimensions, so that, on the contrary, the proper dimensions of Christ's body are compared with that place through the medium of substance; which is contrary to the notion of a located body. Hence in no way is Christ's body locally in this sacrament.⁶⁵

⁶² ST III Q76, A1 Reply to Objection 3.

⁶³ ST III Q76, A3.

⁶⁴ ST III Q76, A4 Answer.

⁶⁵ ST III Q76, A5 Answer.

Article 6 asks whether Christ is in the sacrament movably. This leads to a curious argument that, ‘Christ is not moved locally of Himself, but only accidentally, because Christ is not in this sacrament as in a place. [...] But what is not in a place, is not moved of itself locally, but only according to the motion of the subject in which it is.’⁶⁶ This article also addresses the permanence of the eucharistic consecration arguing that:

The body of Christ remains in this sacrament not only until the morrow, but also in the future, so long as the sacramental species remain: and when they cease, Christ’s body ceases to be under them, not because it depends on them, but because the relationship of Christ’s body to those species is taken away, in the same way as God ceases to be the Lord of a creature which ceases to exist.⁶⁷

The substantial presence of Christ is not visible to the human eye, it is seen only by the intellect: ‘substance, as such, is not visible to the bodily eye, nor does it come under any one of the senses, nor under the imagination, but solely under the intellect, whose object is “what a thing is”’.⁶⁸ The presence of Christ in the sacrament is ‘entirely supernatural’⁶⁹ which means that for the ‘wayfarer’ (a mortal person) it can only be seen by ‘faith alone’.⁷⁰ The eucharistic miracles, which were part of the apparatus of medieval teaching of the real presence, do not mean that Christ is ever in the sacrament in his natural form, for his natural body is definitively in heaven; the miraculous changes are made to show the truth of the sacrament, that the body of Christ is there.⁷¹

One of the arguments against transubstantiation is the problem that the accidents of bread and wine remain, apparently without a subject, as the substance of Christ’s body is not the subject of these accidents as the substances of bread and wine have been. Question 77 considers these remaining accidents. Aquinas argues that:

the accidents continue in this sacrament without a subject. This can be done by Divine power: for since an effect depends more upon the first cause than on the second, God Who is the first cause both of substance and accident, can by His unlimited power preserve an accident in existence when the substance is withdrawn whereby it was

⁶⁶ ST III Q76, A6 Answer.

⁶⁷ ST III Q76, A6 Reply to Objection 3.

⁶⁸ ST III Q76, A7 Answer.

⁶⁹ ST III Q76, A7 Answer.

⁷⁰ ST III Q76, A7 Answer.

⁷¹ ST III Q76, A8 Answer.

preserved in existence as by its proper cause, just as without natural causes He can produce other effects of natural causes, even as He formed a human body in the Virgin's womb, "*without the seed of man*".⁷²

The accidents are sustained in being by an act of God who is all-powerful. It is possible that 'dimensive quantity' can act as the subject of the other accidents once their proper substances have been converted.⁷³ And, although the body of Christ is not the subject of the remnant accidents of bread and wine, if the remnant accidents are sufficiently corrupted the body and blood of Christ will no longer remain present under them.⁷⁴ Since the body of Christ is entire under every part of the elements, 'the breaking is in the dimensive quantity of the bread'.⁷⁵ In other words, although the host is broken during the mass, the body of Christ is not broken in two but remains whole in each part, because the presence is substantial, not local, the nature of the presence is 'What a thing is'.⁷⁶

According to his understanding of presence, Aquinas argues that 'the sinner, and not merely the just, can eat Christ's body.'⁷⁷ However, Aquinas distinguishes between sacramental and spiritual eating: 'sacramental eating, whereby the sacrament only is received without its effect, is divided against spiritual eating, by which one receives the effect of this sacrament, whereby a man is spiritually united with Christ through faith and charity.'⁷⁸ Aquinas also argues that it is reasonable for the people to be offered only the body of Christ, although

it is the priest's duty both to consecrate and finish the sacrament, he ought on no account to receive Christ's body without the blood. But on the part of the recipient the greatest reverence and caution are called for, lest anything happen which is unworthy of so great a mystery. Now this could especially happen in receiving the blood, for, if incautiously handled, it might easily be spilt. [...] on that account it is a prudent custom in some churches for the blood not to be offered to the reception of the people, but to be received by the priest alone.⁷⁹

This is an acceptable solution because:

⁷² ST III Q77, A1 Answer.

⁷³ ST III Q77, A2 Answer.

⁷⁴ ST III Q77, A4 Answer.

⁷⁵ ST III Q77, A7 Answer.

⁷⁶ ST III Q76, A7 Answer.

⁷⁷ ST III Q80, A3 Answer.

⁷⁸ ST III Q80, A1 Answer.

⁷⁹ ST III Q80, A12 Answer.

Our Lord's Passion is represented in the very consecration of this sacrament, in which the body ought not to be consecrated without the blood. But the body can be received by the people without the blood: nor is this detrimental to the sacrament. Because the priest both offers and consumes the blood on behalf of all; and Christ is fully contained under either species.⁸⁰

Aquinas has set out his arguments at length, he argues for a change of substance at consecration, a change which is in the class of "*what a thing is*". This change is permanent, but indistinguishable by the normal senses; the change is not natural but entirely supernatural. Because the change is one of substance, what a thing is, it follows that although the accidents of consecrated bread may be broken, the whole substance remains in each part of a broken host. Because the whole Christ is substantially present, the sacrament is worthy of the same worship that belongs to Christ, even though his risen body in its proper form remains in heaven, as described in the Ascension narratives and attested to in the creeds. Transubstantiation had become part of the official teaching of the church in 1215 as part of the canons of the Fourth Lateran Council and there are some pointers in the questions which may suggest that Aquinas was setting out a systematic exposition of the already existing understanding of eucharistic presence, including the confession of Berengar⁸¹ and the references to the 'latria' due to the sacrament.⁸² Despite the great philosophical care which he takes, it is clear that he believes the presence of Christ in the sacrament is a matter for faith, 'The presence of Christ's true body and blood in this sacrament cannot be detected by sense, nor understanding, but by faith alone, which rests upon Divine authority'.⁸³ He also makes a distinction between sacramental eating, receiving the sacrament, and the spiritual eating which gives the benefit of the sacrament, which is again only done by faith.⁸⁴

⁸⁰ ST III Q80, A12 Reply to Objection 3.

⁸¹ ST III Q75, A1 Answer.

⁸² ST III Q75, A2, Q76, A8.

⁸³ ST III Q75, A1 Answer.

⁸⁴ ST III Q80, A4 Answer.

4.2 Aquinas' Hymns for Corpus Christi

These Latin hymns, which date from before the Summa, speak of the sacramental presence in necessarily poetic style. They allow for a sense of mystery in Aquinas' thought. In the hymn '*Pangue lingua*'⁸⁵ Aquinas describes Jesus at the Last Supper:

He observed the law most fully
And the feast it did command;
Then as food to his apostles,
Gives himself with his own hand.

Word made Flesh, true bread he changes
By a word, his flesh to be;
Wine to blood of Christ transforming,
Though the eye no change may see;
Faith alone provides assurance,
If the heart sincere should be.⁸⁶

The hymn continues with words of adoration:

Humbly then in veneration
This great myst'ry we adore:
For the ancient rite surrenders
To the new for evermore:
Faith divine supplies abundance
Where frail senses cannot soar.⁸⁷

In the hymn for lauds '*Verbum supernum*' he includes the lines:

First, he gave, as very food of life,
Himself to his disciples still.
To whom beneath a twofold sign
He gave his blood, his flesh to eat.⁸⁸

In these verses, we see Aquinas writing of sacramental change being brought about by the words of Jesus, whose authority is that of the Word of God. Bread becomes his flesh, wine his blood, though the change is imperceptible to the senses, it is only discernible to faith through a sincere heart.

⁸⁵ *Hymnarium O.P.*: Adapted from the books of the Friars Preachers, (Province of St. Joseph: New York, 2013), p. 52.

⁸⁶ *Hymnarium O.P.*, p. 188.

⁸⁷ *Hymnarium O.P.*, pp. 188–9.

⁸⁸ *Hymnarium O.P.*, p. 195.

4.3 Transubstantiation in the Decrees of the Council of Trent

Although Aquinas' *Summa* is the lengthiest and most complete exposition of transubstantiation it was not the arbiter of doctrine. The Council of Trent set out the doctrinal statement much more briefly in the Decree Concerning the Most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist.⁸⁹ The first chapter sets out the teaching of the presence of Christ in the Sacrament:

In the first place, the holy Synod teaches, and openly and simply professes, that, in the august sacrament of the holy Eucharist, after the consecration of the bread and wine, our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and man, is truly, really, and substantially contained under the species of those sensible things. For neither are these things mutually repugnant, -that our Saviour Himself always sitteth at the right hand of the Father in heaven, according to the natural mode of existing, and that, nevertheless, He be, in many other places, sacramentally present to us in his own substance, by a manner of existing, which, though we can scarcely express it in words, yet can we, by the understanding illuminated by faith, conceive, and we ought most firmly to believe, to be possible unto God.⁹⁰

Despite the Reformers' assumptions about the Catholic understanding of real presence, there is a clear statement that Christ's natural body remains in heaven, and that the presence in the sacrament is by a different mode, which requires the understanding to be aided by faith. Transubstantiation is explicitly mentioned in chapter IV:

And because that Christ, our Redeemer, declared that which He offered under the species of bread to be truly His own body, therefore has it ever been a firm belief in the Church of God, and this holy Synod doth now declare it anew, that, by the consecration of the bread and of the wine, a conversion is made of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of His blood; which conversion is, by the holy Catholic Church, suitably and properly called Transubstantiation.⁹¹

Because of the substantial presence of Christ in the sacrament it is proper that it should receive due honour and worship:

Wherefore, there is no room left for doubt, that all the faithful of Christ may, according to the custom ever received in the Catholic Church, render in veneration the worship of latria, which is due to the true God, to this most holy sacrament.⁹²

⁸⁹ Waterworth, pp. 75–84.

⁹⁰ Waterworth, p. 76.

⁹¹ Waterworth, p. 78.

⁹² Waterworth, p. 79.

In the canons of the decree the Council makes clear the teaching of sacramental eating: 'If any one saith, that Christ, given in the Eucharist, is eaten spiritually only, and not also sacramentally and really; let him be anathema.'⁹³ Here there is an example of dualism between spiritual and sacramental understandings, which may feed the Protestant views of the doctrine.

These, shorter, statements summarise the belief in transubstantiation as the means by which Christ is present in the sacrament according to the Catholic Church, what is not necessarily clear is to what extent they are underpinned by Aquinas' more extensive arguments about the nature of transubstantiation, and more particularly what is meant by the word 'substance'. Nevertheless, the decree makes an important distinction between the '*natural mode of existing*' of Jesus' risen body, which is limited in place, and the '*manner of existing*' in the sacrament, which is almost inexpressible.⁹⁴ However the phrase 'substantially contained under the species'⁹⁵ could be understood to imply a material presence, i.e. substance is in some way material, although Aquinas uses the word to mean '*what a thing is*'.

We have examined the history and doctrine of transubstantiation to give us an overview to help us understand and critique Taylor's examination of the doctrine in these next sections of his work. So far, we have followed his arguments which look at the scriptural grounds for arguing for ontological identity between the sacrament and the body and blood of Christ. Now we return to the subsequent sections of Taylor's work which focus on the doctrine of transubstantiation as Taylor understands it. We will follow Taylor's sections, looking first at his investigation of the empirical implications of the doctrine, does it defy our senses and our normal experience of the world around us? After this we will examine his argument that transubstantiation is logically inconsistent, in his words, is it 'against reason'.

⁹³ Waterworth, p. 83.

⁹⁴ Waterworth, p. 76.

⁹⁵ Waterworth, p. 76.

4.4 The Doctrine of Transubstantiation is Against Sense.

Taylor's language, archaic to contemporary ears, needs clarification. In this section, Taylor uses the word 'sense' to mean senses of touch, sight and taste, rather than logic; that is the topic of the next section of the work. Thus 'against sense' means contravening the evidence of our senses. He is asking whether transubstantiation can be in any way tested by empirical observation, and if it cannot, then does the doctrine do violence to our understanding of the world around us? Taylor asserts that if we cannot trust the evidence of our senses, both science and religion are in danger.⁹⁶ Moreover, the first letter of John asserts that the evidence for the Christian faith relies upon our senses (I John 1.1 – 3). 'In nature there is not a greater argument than to have heard, and seen, and handled.'⁹⁷ If we cannot trust our eyes, or our ears, how can we believe since 'faith comes by hearing, and evidence comes by seeing?''⁹⁸

As we have seen, Aquinas has argued that there is no deception, the accidents are really there and so are seen, touched and tasted; the changed substance is known to the intellect and that is preserved from error by faith.⁹⁹ Taylor argues that we have seen and handled bread, tasted bread, heard it called bread, 'that very substance which is called the body of our Lord.'¹⁰⁰ So how could it be that our senses are mistaken? Taylor again echoes the arguments made by Berengar six hundred years earlier.¹⁰¹ Now, it may be that although the sense information is correct, the substance which lies under the accidents which can be perceived by our senses may deceive us in some way. Taylor remarks that 'they' argue that Abraham was deceived when he saw an angel and believed it to be a man and so in the same way we perceive bread, but it is in substance the body of Christ.¹⁰²

Taylor's response is that accidents properly disclose the substance which underlies them, they have no purpose in themselves, they are signs which point to the substance, the true identity of

⁹⁶ Taylor, VI, p. 85.

⁹⁷ Taylor, VI, p. 85.

⁹⁸ Taylor, VI, p. 85.

⁹⁹ ST III Q75, A5 Reply to objection 2.

¹⁰⁰ Taylor, VI, p. 86.

¹⁰¹ Chadwick, pp. 420–21.

¹⁰² Taylor, VI, p. 86.

something.¹⁰³ Sense can be deceived, or more truly senses may mislead true perception if a deception is intended, or if judgement is made too hastily, on the evidence of one sense where more should be employed.¹⁰⁴ So as all the accidents of bread remain at the eucharist, all the senses must be deceived if the substance is altered.

And then the question will not be whether our senses can be deceived or no, but whether or no it can stand with the justice and goodness of God to be angry with us for believing our senses, since Himself hath so ordered it that we cannot avoid being deceived; there being in this case as much reason to believe a lie as to believe a truth, if things were so as they pretend.¹⁰⁵

Taylor argues this cannot be God's intention since God has appointed the senses as the means of conveying information and thus understanding and gaining true knowledge of the world around us.¹⁰⁶

If it were true that the senses could be so deceived, then it would negate S. John's evidence, for although there is witness to Jesus' life, death, resurrection and ascension it might have been 'an angelical substance'¹⁰⁷ which was concealed under the human form, making it uncertain that human nature had been assumed.¹⁰⁸ Similarly, when the risen Jesus appeared to his apostles he instructed them to touch him to verify his presence. Taylor argues this was to show 'that the accidents of a body were not communicable to a spirit'¹⁰⁹ and warns that if God decided to 'invest other substances with new and stranger accidents'¹¹⁰ this evidence would no longer stand. Furthermore, the apostles verified that it was *Jesus* risen from the dead, not just 'a body'.¹¹¹ It must similarly be true that the eucharistic bread remains bread, as it can be felt, tasted and seen to be so, and the scriptures affirm it both to be bread and Christ's body. It thus cannot be Christ's body in the natural sense, for that would mean substantial change, but only in the 'figurative and tropical'¹¹² sense.

¹⁰³ Taylor, VI, p. 86.

¹⁰⁴ Taylor, VI, p. 87.

¹⁰⁵ Taylor, VI, p. 87.

¹⁰⁶ Taylor, VI, p. 88.

¹⁰⁷ Taylor, VI, p. 88.

¹⁰⁸ Taylor, VI, p. 88.

¹⁰⁹ Taylor, VI, p. 88.

¹¹⁰ Taylor, VI, p. 88.

¹¹¹ Taylor, VI, p. 90.

¹¹² Taylor, VI, p. 89.

If Christ had said only, 'This is My body' and no apostle, had told us also that is bread; we had reason to suspect our senses to be deceived, if it were possible they should be: but when it is equally affirmed to be bread as to be our Lord's body, and but one of them can be naturally true and in the letter, shall the testimony of all our senses be absolutely of no use in casting the balance? The two affirmatives are equal; one must be expounded tropically, which will you choose? Is there in the world any thing more certain and expedite than that what you see, and feel, and taste natural and proper, should be judged to be that which you see, and feel, and taste naturally and properly, and therefore that the other be expounded tropically?¹¹³

Taylor returns to Tertullian's disputes against the Valentinians and Marcionites, those who argued that Christ's body was not real, but only seemed to be a body. This is because Bellarmine argues similarly that the bread is so called because it seems to be so; the senses were not deceived because they truly perceived the accidents, but they did not perceive the inward reality.¹¹⁴ Tertullian's answer was, 'it is not lawful to doubt of our senses, lest the same doubt be made concerning Christ; lest peradventure it should be said He was deceived'.¹¹⁵ As Tertullian asserts 'it is not lawful to doubt of our senses' Taylor concludes that if Christians had believed in the 'substantial, natural presence'¹¹⁶ of Christ in the sacrament, which he argues implies disbelieving the evidence of their senses, then Tertullian had no authority to reprove Marcion on the sensory evidence of the reality of Christ's body.¹¹⁷

Taylor refers to both Tertullian and S. Augustine asserting that senses cannot be deceived, and proper understanding requires assent to the information they give.¹¹⁸ It thus follows that our senses tell us that we see and taste bread and wine, so we should assent that it is so. However, our senses are unable to tell us what bread and wine 'become by the institution of our Saviour; for that we are to learn by faith, that what is bread and wine in nature is by God's ordinance the sacrament of the body and blood of the Saviour of the world'.¹¹⁹ Taylor argues for a transformation which is

¹¹³ Taylor, VI, p. 89.

¹¹⁴ Taylor, VI, p. 90. Refers to: Bellarmine, *On the Eucharist*, I, ch. 14.

¹¹⁵ Tertullian, *Liber de Anima XVII*, quoted in Taylor, VI, p. 91. (Possibly Taylor's own translation from the Latin.)

¹¹⁶ Taylor, VI, p. 91.

¹¹⁷ Taylor, VI, p. 91.

¹¹⁸ Taylor, VI, p. 91.

¹¹⁹ Taylor, VI, p. 92.

outside the realm of empirical verification, and so involves neither accidents nor substance, as the two are inextricably linked. Taylor continues by quoting Aquinas, to tell us, ‘Grace never destroys nature but perfects it’.¹²⁰ He uses this to argue that sacramental conversion is the result of grace, rather than the work of nature, the elements ‘are consecrated and exalted by religion’;¹²¹ so Christ is not naturally present in the consecrated elements.

Taylor ends his subsection by referring to S. Cyril of Jerusalem: ‘Be sure of this, that this bread which is seen of us is not bread, although the taste perceives it to be bread, but the body of Christ; for under the species of bread the body is given to thee, under the species of wine the blood is given to thee.’¹²² Although this seems to argue against Taylor’s case, as he argues that you should not believe your senses, all is well for in his next catechism he explains further: ‘Think not that you taste bread and wine but the antitypes of the body and blood’.¹²³ Taylor emphasises that Cyril uses the word *τύπος*, which should not be translated as ‘species’, i.e. accidental forms.¹²⁴ Moreover, when Cyril says it is not bread, the meaning is ‘not mere bread’, it is more than bread ‘and the sense does not perceive it, for it is “the body of our Lord”’.¹²⁵ In Question 76, A7 of the Summa, Aquinas also addresses the question of whether the substance of Christ is visible to the human eye. In his response, he argues that substance is ‘not visible to the bodily eye, nor does it come under any one of the senses, nor under the imagination, but solely under the intellect, whose object is “what a thing is”’.¹²⁶ This implies that the change is in what the sacramental elements are understood to be, because there is no natural change involved in the sacramental conversion. Aquinas emphasises in the same article that, ‘the way in which Christ is in this sacrament is entirely supernatural’.¹²⁷ For Aquinas there is no natural presence of Christ and no perceptible change because only imperceptible things have been

¹²⁰ STI, Q1, A8, quoted in Taylor, VI, p. 92.

¹²¹ Taylor, VI, p. 92.

¹²² S. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Mystagogical Catechesis: On the Mysteries*, IV, quoted in Taylor, VI, p. 94.

¹²³ S. Cyril of Jerusalem, *On the Mysteries*, V, quoted in Taylor, VI, p. 94.

¹²⁴ Taylor, VI, p. 95.

¹²⁵ Taylor, VI, p. 95.

¹²⁶ ST III Q76, A7 Answer.

¹²⁷ ST III Q76, A7 Answer.

transformed. Taylor and Aquinas are far closer than Taylor would admit. Finally, Taylor turns to the writings of S. Chrysostom: 'nothing sensible is given to us, but things insensible, by things sensible'.¹²⁸ The Sacrament gives us nothing that is detectable by our normal senses, but this donation is made in conjunction with the sensible elements of bread and wine. It could be reasonably argued that Aquinas is saying the same thing in his description of transubstantiation; as we have seen, he understands substance to be discerned by the intellect guided by faith and not by the senses. Taylor and Aquinas are closer than Taylor admits, or realises. Both argue for a presence which is only known by the faith of the recipient.

We are left with a final question: has Taylor taken an explanation, transubstantiation, whose purpose is in part to explain why there is no discernible change in the elements and instead used it to accuse its proponents of a belief which entails deception? There certainly seems again to be an impasse here. Aquinas argues that the substance is solely under the intellect and there is no natural action but only the supernatural sacramental conversion. Taylor clearly agrees with the final quotation from Chrysostom, which could also be taken to agree with Aquinas' response in ST III Q76, A7. Taylor seems to have an underlying understanding of substance as something material, a sort of substrate on to which the accidents are attached. Nevertheless, his argument that accidents witness faithfully to the underlying substance is fair. Taylor argues there cannot be a substantial change without some corresponding accidental change, this is our normal experience of the world. Aquinas argues that there *can* be a substantial change without a corresponding accidental change, because it does not come under any of the senses. And both Aquinas and Taylor concur in arguing that any sacramental conversion is entirely supernatural.

¹²⁸ S. John Chrysostom, *Homily on The Gospel of Matthew*, LXXXII, quoted in Taylor, VI, p. 96.

4.5 The Doctrine of Transubstantiation is Wholly Without and Against Reason

Here begins a section which demonstrates Taylor's initial assertion that it was best if the subject of real presence was believed heartily without curious investigation.¹²⁹ Throughout the series of arguments Taylor always appears to believe that transubstantiation means that Christ's body is present in a 'natural sense',¹³⁰ despite the statements of the Council of Trent and the exposition of Aquinas. This implies he understands substance to mean a physical rather than a metaphysical reality. He first reminds us of the ways in which it can be true to say that the consecrated elements may be Christ's body without the necessity for 'this strange and new doctrine of Transubstantiation',¹³¹ he includes the suggestion 'that between Christ's body and the consecrate symbols there was an hypostatical union, then both substances would remain, and yet it were a true proposition to affirm of the whole hypostasis, "this is the body of Christ"'.¹³² Naturally he includes in his list his own preference, describing the real presence of Christ as spiritual.

He counters those who say that transubstantiation should be believed by faith above reason, quoting the authority of S. Augustine and also taking aim at the independent preachers of the Commonwealth era who proclaimed they were spiritual men because they had no learning.¹³³ He argues that reason says if the substance were converted the accidents also would be converted, giving as an example the transformation of water into wine in John 2. It would have been worthless had the accidents remained unchanged, for how could the miracle have been verified?¹³⁴ Our senses tell us that the accidents of bread are not changed into the body of Christ, so our reason argues that the substance cannot be changed either.¹³⁵ Neither is the omnipotence of God a refuge for the conversion;

¹²⁹ Taylor, VI, pp. 11–13.

¹³⁰ Taylor, VI, p. 96.

¹³¹ Taylor, VI, p. 97.

¹³² Taylor, VI, p. 97.

¹³³ Taylor, VI, p. 98.

¹³⁴ Taylor, VI, p. 99.

¹³⁵ Taylor, VI, p. 100.

yes, God is able to perform miracles, but it must be possible to demonstrate the miracle in some way.¹³⁶

Taylor then moves to explore the logic of God's omnipotence; it must be bounded, he argues, because 'God cannot reconcile contradictions';¹³⁷ the only warrant that is claimed for transubstantiation is the literal understanding of the words of institution and the claim is that God works perpetual miracles to verify 'their' argument. Why should it be that God would perform a miracle when there are many other ways to make the words true without? Moreover, it would require a huge multiplication of miracles, such that the miraculous become a supernatural commonplace.¹³⁸

Taylor then turns to Scotus, who argues that

'the truth of the eucharist may be saved without Transubstantiation' [...] That understanding of the words of institution, that the substance of bread is not there, seems harder to be maintained, and to it more inconveniences are consequent, than by putting the substance of bread to be there.¹³⁹

Then Taylor turns to Aquinas' own comment: 'there are more difficulties in this conversion of the sacrament than in the whole creation.'¹⁴⁰ Taylor tells his reader there are two logical impossibilities he finds in transubstantiation:

the one, that this doctrine affirms that of the essence or existence of a thing which is contrary to the essence or existence of it, and yet that the same thing remains; that is, that the essence remains without the essence, that is, without itself: the other, that this doctrine makes a thing to be and not to be at the same time.¹⁴¹

He will demonstrate how these show the doctrine to be against reason.

Taylor begins by arguing that the doctrine is against the nature and essence of a body. Christ's body is now a spiritual body, so it cannot be in the sacrament after a natural manner, yet it is argued that in the sacrament it is broken 'naturally and properly'.¹⁴² This is an opinion that can be

¹³⁶ Taylor, VI, p. 102.

¹³⁷ Taylor, VI, p. 102.

¹³⁸ Taylor, VI, p. 103.

¹³⁹ Taylor, VI, pp. 103–4.

¹⁴⁰ STIII Q75, A8, quoted in Taylor, VI, p. 104.

¹⁴¹ Taylor, VI, p. 105.

¹⁴² Taylor, VI, p. 105.

traced back to Berengar's recantation rather than the later doctrinal statements. The argument that it is broken under the species rather than 'in itself'¹⁴³ does not hold for Taylor because the species are not Christ's body. Further, how can accidents be broken without breaking the underlying substance?¹⁴⁴ (This implies Taylor understands substance to have physical reality and he does not understand substance to mean 'what a thing is' as Aquinas does.)

Taylor then asks what is meant by 'body'? He argues that a body is finite, and confined to a certain place, although a finite spirit might not be so confined, but would not have material parts.¹⁴⁵ He then argues that transubstantiation makes the body of Christ to be present both in heaven and on many altars simultaneously, making it not a body but a spirit, what is more it makes the finite body into an infinite spirit.¹⁴⁶ Here, for Taylor, are the inherent contradictions of transubstantiation: 'can a body, remaining a body, be at the same time a spirit? or can it be a body, and yet not be in a place? is it not determined so that remaining in a place it cannot be out of it?'¹⁴⁷ McAdoo suggests that, at root, Taylor simply believes that using the term 'substance' applied to the idea of a body as a way of expressing Christ's presence in the eucharist is meaningless: simply nonsense. Taylor and Aquinas will never be reconciled because of this fundamental divergence of view.¹⁴⁸

Taylor returns again to the authority of S. Augustine who states that although it is a property of God to be everywhere, bodies are circumscribed by place. Even Christ's body is only in one place at once, this proves that the incarnate body is as ours are.¹⁴⁹ He goes on to argue that there are three ways of being in a place 'circumscriptive, definitive, repletive'¹⁵⁰ and that Christ's body is not in the sacrament in either of the first two, for it would have to be in one place only, nor in the third for that is an attribute of God only. A fourth way is introduced: 'sacramentally'; Taylor says this is true,

¹⁴³ Taylor, VI, p. 105.

¹⁴⁴ Taylor, VI, p. 106.

¹⁴⁵ Taylor, VI, p. 106.

¹⁴⁶ Taylor, VI, p. 107.

¹⁴⁷ Taylor, VI, p. 107.

¹⁴⁸ McAdoo, p. 131.

¹⁴⁹ Taylor, VI, p. 108.

¹⁵⁰ Taylor, VI, p. 109.

Christ's body is sacramentally in many places 'figuratively, tropically, representatively in being, and really in effect and blessing; but this is not a natural, real being in a place, but a relation to a person'.¹⁵¹ As we have already seen, Aquinas argues for a sacramental presence, which does not imply that the natural body is in different places at the same time.¹⁵² Again, Taylor and Aquinas are closer than Taylor sees; both argue for a mode of sacramental presence which does not detract from the bodily presence of Christ at the right hand of the Father.

Taylor then asserts of a body that it must be differentiated, hands, feet etc. this clearly implies Taylor understands 'body' to be physical, rather than metaphysical substance. He writes that 'in transubstantiation the whole body is in a point, in a minimum naturale, in the least imaginable crumb of consecrated bread'.¹⁵³ He wonders how the parts of the body might be differentiated. This is clearly a misunderstanding of the doctrine, for it is the *substance* which is understood to be present in each crumb, just as it might be argued that the substance of bread was entirely present in each crumb, or they would not be crumbs of bread. He continues by asking how the broken wafer cannot be broken into two half bodies, but now is 'two whole ones'.¹⁵⁴ Again there is a misunderstanding about the nature of substance here. The host is described as the body of Christ because Christ is present in substance, not because the physical body of Christ is hidden under the accidents. Substance is not divisible; it is a metaphysical, not physical term, the substance is what it is.

Taylor then enters into dialogue with Aquinas, quoting him: 'The body of Christ is not in the sacrament in the manner of a body, but of a substance, and so is whole in the whole'.¹⁵⁵ Taylor asks how such a substance can be multiplied by breaking, as when the host is broken, again suggesting he understands *substance* in material, bounded terms. Substance is not multiplied by breaking; the underlying identity remains in each part. He then asks if the body is present after the manner of a material or immaterial substance, for if immaterial it cannot be a body but a spirit. If it is a spirit,

¹⁵¹ Taylor, VI, p. 109.

¹⁵² ST III Q75, A1 Reply to Objection 3.

¹⁵³ Taylor, VI, p. 110.

¹⁵⁴ Taylor, VI, p. 110.

¹⁵⁵ STIII Q76, A4 Reply to Objection 1, quoted in Taylor, VI, p. 110.

then it is not a body. He seems to be reifying substance, it is not a thing but an identity. He is using ‘substance’ to mean the assemblage of substance and accidents when he refers to material or immaterial substances. Taylor argues that substances cannot be in a place unless related to body or spirit, that is the nature of substances, so to be in a place after the manner of a substance is to be in no place at all.¹⁵⁶ He remarks that Aquinas does say that the one body is in many places sacramentally, rather than locally; Taylor’s response is that if that means figuratively then he concurs with Aquinas; if he means ‘naturally and properly’¹⁵⁷ then he can only mean locally. As we have seen earlier, Aquinas does *not* mean naturally and properly, but in a manner unique to the sacrament. However, Bellarmine demurs: if a body cannot be in two places locally then neither can it be sacramentally. Taylor has only allowed for a pair of alternatives without listening to Aquinas fully; it may be that Taylor did not have access to Aquinas’ *Summa* and was only responding to Aquinas as reported by other writers. Taylor says: ‘it were easy then to infer that therefore it is in two places no way in the world’¹⁵⁸ but he declines to take advantage of this apparent contradiction between two ‘great patrons of Transubstantiation’.¹⁵⁹

Taylor then questions how the body of Christ, one continual, bounded substance, divided from all else can be in heaven and in numerous hosts, whilst not being in the intermediate bodies or places. He argues that two glasses of wine are not one – but ignores the fact that they are two glasses *of wine*, i.e. the same substance is in both, although separated.¹⁶⁰ He continues by asking: ‘how can any thing be divided from itself wholly?’¹⁶¹ Either it is divided into two, or it is connected. Taylor has lost sight of the concept of substance. It is normal for the same substance to be entirely separated in space; returning to Taylor’s example of glasses of wine: each glass which is poured is the same substance, and each bottle of the same wine is the same substance, even if they are in different places,

¹⁵⁶ Taylor, VI, p. 111.

¹⁵⁷ Taylor, VI, p. 111.

¹⁵⁸ Taylor, VI, p. 112.

¹⁵⁹ Taylor, VI, p. 112. Referring to Bellarmine, *On the Eucharist*, III, ch. 3.

¹⁶⁰ Taylor, VI, p. 112.

¹⁶¹ Taylor, VI, p. 113.

even different countries. After this there follows a long argument about the nature of bodies, asserting that quantity is inseparable from bodies.¹⁶²

Taylor continues by asserting that although the Holy Spirit is ubiquitous, indeed this is proof of his divinity, it does not follow that Christ's body should be present in many places simultaneously. That would be to communicate something of the divine to something created.¹⁶³ However, the incarnation does exactly this, the hypostatic union joins human, created, nature with the divine, it does more than simply communicate something of the divine to creation, it identifies the divine completely with a created person, Jesus of Nazareth. Taylor's argument has left him vulnerable to the charge of denying Christ's divinity.

Taylor compares belief in transubstantiation with belief in the Trinity, since both seem to imply impossibilities. He says that Trinitarian belief is revealed in scripture, and he has already shown that transubstantiation is not supported by scripture. Furthermore, the Trinitarian doctrine was taught by the early Fathers and in the Apostles' Creed, even though the language of metaphysics was employed to deepen understanding of the mystery. The difficulties were in the lack of vocabulary, which was stretched by the task. Taylor argues this is a completely different case to transubstantiation.¹⁶⁴

Taylor then continues by arguing that two bodies cannot be in one place,¹⁶⁵ implying that he believes the substance that is said to be under the consecrated species to have dimensions. Aquinas argues that the substance of the bread and wine must be converted because if the substance of Christ is present then the original substance can no longer be present because there can only be one, unique, identity, what the thing is.¹⁶⁶ He continues by arguing that to say it is absurd to argue that Christ's ascended body is not now in a place.¹⁶⁷ The conclusion of this argument is

¹⁶² Taylor, VI, p. 113.

¹⁶³ Taylor, VI, p. 115.

¹⁶⁴ Taylor, VI, pp. 118–9.

¹⁶⁵ Taylor, VI, pp. 119–123.

¹⁶⁶ ST III Q75, A2 Answer.

¹⁶⁷ Taylor, VI, p. 123.

as substances cannot subsist without the manner of substances, no more can accidents without the manner of accidents, quantities after the manner of quantities, qualities as qualities; for to separate that from either by which we distinguish them from each other, is to separate that from them by which we understand them to be themselves.¹⁶⁸

He implies that transubstantiation entails a substance behaving in a manner which is impossible.

This is followed by a section in which Taylor implies that transubstantiation means that a sort of homunculus is hidden in the host. First, he argues that if one host is bigger than another then the body is bigger than itself¹⁶⁹ – although substance has no dimensions. He argues that each wafer must contain a perfect body, with head, feet and breast.¹⁷⁰ The whole section seems to descend into absurdities, making claims for transubstantiation that are very distant from the precise distinction of the substance of Christ and the accidents of bread and wine. He continues with a discussion about the sacramental change involved. It is neither creation, nor natural conversion.

By this doctrine Christ's body is there where it was not before; and yet not by change of place, for it descends not; nor by production, for it was produced before; not by natural mutation, for Christ himself is wholly immutable, and though the bread be mutable, it can never become Christ.¹⁷¹

In these final sections the arguments become more confusing, Taylor seems not to have read Aquinas and so does not address him directly. He finally argues that the sacramental change is not a conversion but a succession;¹⁷² and he refers to the consecrated host as a 'body made of bread'.¹⁷³ But accidents cannot subsist without their proper subjects,¹⁷⁴ and since Christ's body is said to subsist without these (or any) accidents why do they remain at all?¹⁷⁵ We have seen above that Aquinas recognises this is problematic, but he argues that God is able, because his power is unlimited, to preserve the accidents. He suggests that dimensive quantity can act as a sort of quasi-substance for the other accidents. Furthermore, the accidents appear to retain all their properties; the contents of

¹⁶⁸ Taylor, VI, p. 124.

¹⁶⁹ Taylor, VI, p. 124.

¹⁷⁰ Taylor, VI, p. 124.

¹⁷¹ Taylor, VI, p. 127.

¹⁷² Taylor, VI, p. 128.

¹⁷³ Taylor, VI, p. 128.

¹⁷⁴ Taylor, VI, p. 128.

¹⁷⁵ Taylor, VI, p. 129.

the chalice can still inebriate, the consecrated bread can still nourish.¹⁷⁶ How is it possible to touch Christ's body in the host if all that can be touched are accidents?¹⁷⁷

If Christ be properly said to be touched and to be eaten, because the accidents are so, then by the same reason He may be properly made hot, or cold, or mouldy, or dry, or wet, or venomous, by the proportionable mutation of accidents; if Christ be not properly taken and manducated, to what purpose is He properly there?¹⁷⁸

Taylor has exhausted his logical investigation (and possibly his reader). It is clear that he understands transubstantiation to imply a 'proper' presence, which he seems to believe means a corporal presence in a quite realistic way, even to suggesting that there should be a body concealed under the accidents of the host. His arguments imply that he understands 'substance' to infer a material, physical, thing rather than a metaphysical category. He is simply not arguing with the best of the theological and philosophical material which sets out the doctrine. But McAdoo suggests that the root of the impasse is that Taylor is convinced that 'substance' as a concept applied to 'body' is meaningless.¹⁷⁹ So, there can never be a meeting of minds here. McAdoo describes the argument as 'seeming like a series of near misses' because there is no clear agreement between Taylor and Aquinas over the meaning of 'body' and 'substance'.¹⁸⁰

4.6 Transubstantiation: Both a Shibboleth and a Straw Man

In his introductory section, Taylor argues that had the matter of eucharistic presence been left a mystery, unexamined in detail, then all would be able to kneel together in harmony.¹⁸¹ He takes the doctrine of transubstantiation to be the major difference between the English Church and the Roman Catholic Church, implying that if that had not intervened then there would be no rupture in communion. Clearly this is not the whole picture, but it serves as a defining point of difference for Taylor. It has become a shibboleth, representing all the differences between the churches. His work

¹⁷⁶ Taylor, VI, p. 129.

¹⁷⁷ Taylor, VI, p. 129.

¹⁷⁸ Taylor, VI, p. 130.

¹⁷⁹ McAdoo, p. 131.

¹⁸⁰ McAdoo, p. 130.

¹⁸¹ Taylor, VI, p. 13.

on transubstantiation is his apology for the English Church when criticised by a Roman Catholic controversialist. To disprove transubstantiation is to disprove the authority of the Roman Catholic Church, to vindicate Taylor's own position is to vindicate the English Church. Because he uses transubstantiation as this focal point, he aims to ensure he makes his point and wins his argument. But to do this he turns the doctrine from a philosophical point of controversy into an argument which verges on the absurd. Taylor rightly questions whether it is right to argue for change of substance when the accidents so clearly remain unchanged and asks how it can be that the accidents can remain when they are no longer subjects of a substance, but he also clings to the idea of natural presence, beyond what is meant by the doctrine. Taylor continually argues against natural presence and for spiritual presence, yet the doctrine of transubstantiation does not argue for natural or corporal presence. He takes the use of 'body' to mean a physical body although it is clear that that is not what is actually implied. Further, he takes 'body' to mean a whole physical body. He speaks of multiplication of bodies as a consecrated host is broken, although substance is not multiplied. In short, the transubstantiation he argues against is not the transubstantiation that the Council of Trent or the teaching of Thomas Aquinas promote. By pushing the boundaries of the definition, he has produced a doctrine that is too easy to refute – and easy to ridicule. If we take the essence of Aquinas' presentation, that any change is entirely supernatural and that what changes is the identity of the consecrated elements,¹⁸² then we are very close to Taylor's arguments that Christ is present spiritually (i.e. supernaturally) and that the consecrated elements can be called the body and blood of Christ. Clearly it is important for Taylor to accentuate the difference between his teaching and that of the Catholic Church, to show the (in Taylor's mind) clear superiority of his understanding of presence, and by extension the superiority of the English Church, over that of the Roman Catholic Church. However, in his desire to make a clear differentiation, there are places where he inflates his position, making the doctrine of transubstantiation to be absurd, to gain his advantage. The doctrine changes from a metaphysical explanation containing difficulties, which may remain unresolved, to a straw

¹⁸² ST III Q76, A7 Answer.

man, a doctrine which is too easy to dismantle, and which does not truly represent the proper doctrinal position.

Despite Taylor distorting the doctrine of transubstantiation, there is an important point here. Transubstantiation is a metaphysical doctrine, but it seems that it is frequently misunderstood as an explanation in the realm of natural science. There are, I believe, a number of causes for this. The use of the word ‘real’ to describe the presence of Christ in the consecrated elements encourages the idea that the body and blood of Christ are physically present. This was reinforced by miracle stories and by popular piety and teaching. The words ‘substance’ and ‘accidents’ are metaphysical categories, but the accidents themselves belong to the natural realm, they are discernible by the senses. The word substance has a number of meanings, and is often understood to mean a physical thing, i.e. the unity of substance and accidents. We have seen Taylor writing about material and immaterial substances;¹⁸³ yet the metaphysical meaning of substance is *identity*. There may be material or immaterial things, they are described by way of what they are, i.e. their substance. But substance is a metaphysical concept, ‘what a thing is’, a description of a thing in the world, it is a metaphysical category and is neither material nor immaterial, but a concept that is the object of the intellect. And finally, the phrase ‘conversion of substance’ which is described by transubstantiation is easily misunderstood as a sort of chemical change, we will discover in our discussion of Edward Schillebeeckx’s theology in a later chapter that this misapprehension remained even in the 20th century.

From these philosophical and logical arguments, Taylor turns to the Fathers, looking at the historical doctrine of the church in the matter of transubstantiation.

4.7 Taylor’s Ressourcement: Looking to the Fathers

In setting out to show that ‘Transubstantiation was not the doctrine of the primitive church’ Taylor turns to the patristic witness to support his claim that the doctrine of transubstantiation is a relatively

¹⁸³ Taylor, VI, p. 111.

late addition to Christian doctrine. He shows he is familiar with the controversy between Paschasius and Ratramnus in the 9th century¹⁸⁴ and the determination of the Lateran Council in 1215¹⁸⁵ following the first use of the word transubstantiation around 1100.¹⁸⁶

Taylor begins his case by referring to Vincent of Lerins' definition of 'Catholic' as universally taught; thus, he has to show only a substantial body of opinion which follows his argument to show that transubstantiation was not the settled doctrine of the Fathers.¹⁸⁷ He lists the terms that are used for the sacramental change: 'conversion, mutation, transition, migration, transfiguration'; arguing that none of these imply substantial conversion.¹⁸⁸ Taylor argues that there is a conversion 'meaning by it a change of use, of condition, of sanctification'.¹⁸⁹ As always, the section includes a large amount of careful definition and argument, seeking to ensure there can be no doubt about Taylor's point. Following Taylor's introductory arguments, he turns to the examples he finds in the Fathers, beginning with Ignatius of Antioch and his arguments against those who denied the incarnation.¹⁹⁰ Ignatius questioned how the sacrament could represent Christ's flesh if he had had none? Taylor then cites Tertullian who argued for Christ having a real body in these words: 'because in the sacrament He gave bread as the figure of His body, saying, This is My body, that is, the figure of My body.'¹⁹¹ Taylor argues that the use of the word 'figure' indicates that there is no transubstantiation implied here. He further quotes Justin Martyr: 'The bread of the eucharist was a figure which Christ the Lord commanded to do in remembrance of His passion.'¹⁹² He shows from Clement of Alexandria that there is a differentiation between carnal and spiritual presence in the Fathers:

the blood of Christ is twofold; the one is carnal, by which we are redeemed from death;
the other spiritual, viz., by which we are anointed: and this is to drink the blood of

¹⁸⁴ Taylor, VI, p. 159.

¹⁸⁵ Taylor, VI, p. 161.

¹⁸⁶ Taylor, VI, p. 161.

¹⁸⁷ Taylor, VI, p. 130.

¹⁸⁸ Taylor, VI, pp. 131–2.

¹⁸⁹ Taylor, VI, p. 133.

¹⁹⁰ Referring to Ignatius of Antioch Letter to Smyrnaeans, Ch. 7, in Taylor, VI, p. 141.

¹⁹¹ Tertullian, *Against Marcion*, IV, ch. 40, quoted in Taylor, VI, p. 142.

¹⁹² Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho*, ch. 42, quoted in Taylor, VI, p. 145.

Jesus, to be partakers of the incorruption of our Lord. But the power of the word is the Spirit, as blood is of the flesh.¹⁹³

These quotations are the basis of Taylor's arguments from the Fathers. He continues with a catalogue of quotations from the early writers: Origen, Eusebius, Ephrem the Syrian and Macarius. From S. Ambrose he includes: 'it is a wonderful power of God which makes that the bread should remain what it is, and yet be changed into another thing.'¹⁹⁴ One of a series of quotations on the theme of the elements remaining bread and wine whilst they are still sacramentally changed. He finds a similarly authoritative statement from S. Chrysostom: 'for as before the bread is sanctified we name it bread, but the divine grace sanctifying it by the means of the priest, it is freed from the name of bread, but it is esteemed worthy to be called the Lord's body, although the nature of bread remains in it.'¹⁹⁵ He finds S. Augustine to be a 'protestant in this article'¹⁹⁶ for he wrote:

for if the sacraments had not a certain similitude of those things whereof they are sacraments, they were no sacraments at all: but from this similitude for the most part they receive the names of the things themselves; as therefore according to a certain manner the sacrament of the body of Christ is the body of Christ, the sacrament of the blood of Christ is the blood of Christ; so the sacrament of faith is faith.¹⁹⁷

The subsequent pages offer a wealth of quotations from the Fathers and he ends with a quotation from Gelasius which shows the patristic author paralleling Taylor's own position:

truly the sacraments of the body and blood of Christ which we receive are a divine thing, for that by them we are made partakers of the divine nature, and yet it ceases not to be the substance or nature of bread and wine. And truly an image and similitude of the body and blood of Christ are celebrated in the action of the mysteries.¹⁹⁸

After this Taylor says there is little more to add, except a few testimonies from later writers for completeness.¹⁹⁹

¹⁹³ S. Clement of Alexandria, *The Instructor*, II, ch. 2, quoted in Taylor, VI, p. 145.

¹⁹⁴ S. Ambrose, *On the Sacraments*, IV, ch. 4, quoted in Taylor, VI, p. 149.

¹⁹⁵ Taylor, VI, p. 150. This source is unclear. The reference refers to a letter from Chrysostom, *to Caesarius Against the Apollinarian Heresy*, cited by John Damascene.

¹⁹⁶ Taylor, VI, p. 151.

¹⁹⁷ S. Augustine, *Letter 98 (To Boniface)*, Section 9, quoted in Taylor, VI, pp. 151–2.

¹⁹⁸ Gelasius, *On the dual natures, against Eutyches and Nestorius*, quoted in Taylor, VI, p. 158.

¹⁹⁹ Taylor, VI, p. 158.

Taylor has shown himself to have a great command of the patristic literature and piles up quotations to make an authoritative case. What is less clear is whether Taylor's position was arrived at by reading the Fathers or whether he is using Patristic material in support of his belief in spiritual presence which he came to by other arguments. Taylor refers in passing to David Blondel's 1641 treatise *'Eclaircissements familiers de la controverse de l'eucharistie'*²⁰⁰ but makes very little reference to reformed writers. He does quote Calvin at the beginning of the work as an authority supporting the view that Taylor ascribes to the Church of England: 'In the supper Christ Jesus, viz., His body and blood, is truly given under the signs of bread and wine.'²⁰¹ Some of Taylor's arguments in his section on John 6 parallel those of Zwingli but he does not mention him at all. Taylor is clear that he believes that the bread and wine remain unchanged in substance yet are means by which the body and blood of Christ are given, he is also clear that he believes this to be the view of the Fathers. He is not clear about whether his view comes from the Fathers, or whether he recognises in their writing evidence to support his position.

4.8 Transubstantiation Defeated, Spiritual Presence Vindicated

The overall impression is one of a dogged and persistent controversialist; Taylor burrows deeply into each of the parts of the question he has set out in his sections. He is well versed in the Fathers and quotes liberally from them. As his concern is to show primitive practice he naturally turns to the earliest sources: Ignatius of Antioch, Irenæus, Origen and Tertullian. He looks to the east as well as the west: quoting Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus and Chrysostom. He gives great weight to Augustine and refers to him frequently. Nevertheless, there is a strand in the work that is irenic; Taylor believes that there should be no argument about this doctrine, there should be no communion dividing insistence on these matters. It is a mystery, and a mystery it should remain.

Taylor looks to history to show that transubstantiation is a late doctrinal development, and his continual insistence that the scriptures and the Fathers speak of the consecrated elements as bread

²⁰⁰ Taylor, VI, p. 131.

²⁰¹ Taylor, VI, p. 14.

and wine, ‘bread made eucharistical’, is to argue that transubstantiation is not simply a refinement of talking about real presence but an innovation. He quotes from later authorities such as Scotus to underline that this idea was a relatively recent introduction.

The thrust of Taylor’s argument is that the words of scripture used to support the doctrine of transubstantiation are not clear and definitive enough to prove it. His discussion about the meaning of the words ‘is’ and ‘this’ show that metaphorical readings are more easily accepted than literal ones. However, his investigations into the nature of transubstantiation are more unsatisfactory. Taylor seems to give too little weight to the Council of Trent’s position that Christ remains at the right hand of the Father and he does not engage with S. Thomas, who says in the *Summa* ‘the way in which Christ is in this sacrament is entirely supernatural’.²⁰² Taylor insists that the advocates of transubstantiation are arguing for a ‘proper, natural’ presence of Christ’s body and blood in the sacrament.

Nevertheless, Taylor also understands that transubstantiation involves a change that he simply cannot believe: the remnant accidents of bread and wine existing by themselves, with no substance. He also says that for it to be true it requires two miracles, the annihilation of the substance of the bread and wine and the procession of the substance of Christ into the accidents, whilst the accidents remain without being accidents of the body of Christ. What is more these miracles would not be rare, as is the usual nature of miracles, but commonplace, and furthermore they are miracles which cannot be verified by the senses. He argues that the substance of bread must remain; the consecrated elements remain bread and wine after their consecration. This means that any description of Taylor’s theology which uses the prefix ‘trans-’ is unsatisfactory; he understands the presence to be added in some way to the existing elements by the action of the Holy Spirit. He argues early in the work that the spiritual is real, more real than the simple material. He is clear that there is a change in the elements, but he deliberately takes a vague position about precisely what that change might be.

²⁰² ST III Q76, A7.

Chapter 5: Taylor on the Eucharist: Sacrifice, Presence and Benefits.

In the previous chapters, we have seen Taylor writing on the eucharist from a controversial or polemic standpoint. Although this has enabled us to discover much about his understanding of the eucharist it has been couched in a particular style, which can be more negative than positive and rather heavy. Taylor wrote more on the eucharist and in different genres, these show different aspects of his thought and enable us to understand his thought from other angles. It will also give us the opportunity to see if there is any apparent change in Taylor's position over time, as these works span some ten years in writing. We shall be considering some of Taylor's best-known works which had a relatively wide audience and were written for lay people. Rather than survey each work in turn we shall look at three themes in his writing on the eucharist and see where contributions can be made to our understanding from the works. The books which will form our material are: *The Great Exemplar* (1649), which is a devotional life of Christ; *The Rule and Exercises of Holy Living* (1650); *Clerus Domini* (1651), a treatise on the necessity of an ordained ministry; The Communion Office from *A Collection of Offices* (1658) and *The Worthy Communicant* (1660). We shall consider Taylor's writings in three areas: eucharistic sacrifice, eucharistic presence, and the benefits of receiving the sacrament.

5.1 How Does the Eucharist Connect with the Sacrifice of Jesus on the Cross?

In his very early work, *On the Reverence due to the Altar*, Taylor wrote of the altar in a church: 'the Altar or Holy Table is *sedes Corporis et Sanguinis Christi* [...] there we commemorate his Death and passion in the dreadfull, and mysterious way that himselfe with greatest mysteriousness appointed [...] Here are all the Christian Sacrifices presented.'¹ In the opening prayers of Taylor's 1658 *Order of the Administration of the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper* (published because the Book of Common Prayer was suppressed by the Commonwealth) the priest prays on behalf of

¹ Taylor, *On the Reverence Due to the Altar*, V, p. 330.

priest and people, who are commanded to ‘present ourselves before Thee at Thy holy table to represent a holy, venerable, and unbloody sacrifice for our sins, and for the errors and ignorances of all Thy people’.² And, after rehearsing the Beatitudes, he again prays that they may present ‘a holy sacrifice holily unto Thee, that Thou mayest receive it in heaven, and smell a sweet odour in the union of the eternal sacrifice which our blessed Lord perpetually offers’.³ Before the holy communion the minister prays the prayer of oblation, including: ‘We [...] do humbly present to Thee, O Lord, this present sacrifice of remembrance and thanksgiving’.⁴ Following holy communion the priest is to pray for the Catholic church: ‘Receive, O eternal God, this sacrifice for and in behalf of all christian people...’⁵ It is clear from this that Taylor associates the idea of sacrifice with the eucharist. In some of his other writing he expands on what he means by sacrifice in the context of the eucharist and how it is associated with the sacrifice of Jesus on the cross. In 1651 Taylor published *Clerus Domini*, a short apology for the ordained ministry and its divine institution. The fifth section looks at the eucharist and the minister’s particular role in it. Taylor describes the eucharist as the ‘most solemn, sacred and divinest mystery in our religion’.⁶ He quotes S. Cyprian:

Jesus Christ is our high-priest, and Himself become our sacrifice, which He finished upon the cross in a real performance, and now in His office of mediatorship makes intercession for us by a perpetual exhibition of Himself, of His own person in heaven, which is a continual actually represented argument to move God to mercy to all that believe in and obey the holy Jesus.⁷

Taylor argues from the Letter to Hebrews that because Christ is a priest forever, possessing a perpetual priesthood, he must continually offer sacrifice. Since the sacrifice of Christ was completed on the cross, he has nothing more to offer than that sacrifice. Nevertheless, as he is perpetually a priest, he must make a perpetual offering and the offering he must make is the offering of himself to

² Taylor, *A Collection of Offices*, VIII, p. 616.

³ Taylor, VIII, p. 618.

⁴ Taylor, VIII, p. 626.

⁵ Taylor, VIII, p. 628.

⁶ Taylor, I, p. 31.

⁷ S. Cyprian, *Letters*, 62, referred to in: Taylor, I, p. 32.

the Father. This offering is a ‘medium of advocacy’,⁸ the perpetual intercession Jesus makes on our behalf to the Father. As Jesus offers the sacrifice of himself to the Father present in heaven, so the priests also offer to the Father this same sacrifice by commemorating it and representing it by prayer to the Father on behalf of the whole Church. This sacrifice at the eucharist is present to the Father in a ‘more mysterious way of presence’⁹ than the immediate presence of the ascended Christ.

Both Christ in heaven, and His ministers on earth do actuate that sacrifice, and apply it to its purposed design by praying to God in the virtue and merit of that sacrifice; Christ himself, in a high and glorious manner; the ministers of His priesthood (as it becomes ministers) humbly, sacramentally, and according to the energy of human advocacy and intercession.¹⁰

The priest in his ministry is to ‘exhibit and represent to God’¹¹ the great sacrifice of Jesus, ‘by way of prayers and impetration, offering up that action in behalf of the people’.¹² The connection between the eucharist on earth and the perpetual offering of Jesus, present to God, is the prayer of the priest. By way of prayer it is a sacrifice for it represents to God the one sacrifice; further, Taylor argues that this representation is also a ‘propitiation, as all holy prayers are in their several proportions.’¹³ Taylor calls the eucharist, ‘the only remnant express of Christ’s sacrifice on earth’ and because of this it is proper that ‘this commemorative sacrifice be presented by persons as separate and distinct in their ministry, as the sacrifice itself is from and above the other parts of our religion.’¹⁴

McAdoo uses the word *parallelism* to describe the action of the priest at the altar and the great High Priest Jesus, we will return to this idea of parallelism a little later. Here it is to note that the earthly minister parallels the ministry of the High Priest. It is on another plane, the plane of *sacramental representation*. The earthly priesthood is different from the High Priesthood of Christ, yet related, related ‘in the commemorative representation of the unique sacrifice of the one High-

⁸ Taylor, I, p. 33.

⁹ Taylor, I, p. 32.

¹⁰ Taylor, I, p. 32.

¹¹ Taylor, I, p. 32.

¹² Taylor, I, p. 32.

¹³ Taylor, I, p. 33.

¹⁴ Taylor, I, p. 33.

Priest'.¹⁵ There is parallelism and not identity of priesthood.¹⁶ Porter similarly holds that Taylor does not argue for a 'personal mystical union between Christ and the officiating priest'. The minister at the altar is obeying the commands of Christ, he is an instrument of Christ, but he does not have special access to Christ.¹⁷

In *Clerus Domini*, Taylor is ready to describe the eucharist as a sacrifice, which represents the one sacrifice of Jesus and actuates that one sacrifice for present needs. What is present and visible at the altar on earth is connected to the one true tabernacle in heaven and the earthly sacrifice is an image of the perpetual heavenly sacrifice which is Jesus' perpetual self-offering.

Taylor returns to the theme of sacrifice in the section 'Of the institution and reception of the holy sacrament of the Lord's supper'¹⁸ in his devotional life of Christ known as *The Great Exemplar*. This work follows Jesus' life in description, discourses and prayers. Taylor describes the eucharist as a 'holy sacrament and sacrifice'.¹⁹ The reason, he argues, that we should consider it a sacrifice is again because Jesus, in heaven, makes

perpetual intercession for His church, the body of His redeemed ones, by representing to His Father His death and sacrifice. There He sits, a high priest continually, and offers still the same one perfect sacrifice; that is, still represents it as having been once finished and consummate, in order to perpetual and never-failing events. And this also His ministers do on earth; they offer up the same sacrifice to God, the sacrifice of the cross, by prayers, and a commemorating rite and representment, according to His holy institution.²⁰

Taylor uses a quite startling sacrificial analogy: 'Themistocles snatched up the son of king Admetus, and held him between himself and death, to mitigate the rage of the king'²¹ and applies this to the eucharist; we hold up the Son of God and represent him to his Father, and in so doing we make intercession for ourselves because Christ is the mediator. The celebration of the eucharist on earth is

¹⁵ McAdoo, p. 99.

¹⁶ McAdoo, p. 100.

¹⁷ Porter, p. 132.

¹⁸ Taylor, *The Great Exemplar*, II, pp. 637–59.

¹⁹ Taylor, II, p. 642.

²⁰ Taylor, II, p. 643.

²¹ Taylor, II, p. 643.

seen as the offering of Christ to God in the sacrament and prayers as he perpetually offers himself in heaven, present to the Father; 'He is by prayers and the sacrament represented or offered up to God, as sacrificed; which in effect is a celebration of His death, and the applying it to the present and future necessities of the church'.²² The representative sacrifice of the eucharist applies 'the proper sacrifice to all the purposes which it first designed'.²³ Taylor lists the benefits of the celebration, it is propitiatory; it is an act of thanksgiving, homage and adoration and it is impetratory and obtains for us and the whole church all the benefits of Christ's passion. It is worth noting particularly the point that the eucharist is celebrated for the whole church, it is a sacrifice which has an effect not just for those present, or those who receive the sacrament, but for the whole church, including those who are not present at the celebration.²⁴

Taylor once more returns to the theme of eucharist as sacrifice in *Holy Living*, perhaps his most widely known and disseminated work which was reprinted for many years after his death. *The Rule and Exercises of Holy Living* and its companion volume *The Rule and Exercises of Holy Dying* are a manual for Christian life, full of practical advice as well as instruction and prayers. Section X of *Holy Living* is 'Of preparation to, and the manner how to receive the holy sacrament of the Lord's supper'.²⁵ Taylor begins by telling his reader that the sacrifice by Jesus of himself on the cross was of such value that it is able to 'purify the soul from sin'²⁶ where the animal sacrifices of Judaism had not had the power to do so. The sacrifice was perfect and thus unrepeatable, but because the needs of the world continue they require a perpetual ministry to make it 'eternally effectual to the several new arising needs of all the world'.²⁷ This is established in the high priesthood of Christ, ascended to the Father, 'where He sits perpetually representing and exhibiting to the Father that great effective sacrifice which He offered on the cross, to eternal and never-failing purposes'.²⁸ Priests on earth

²² Taylor, II, p. 643.

²³ Taylor, II, p. 643.

²⁴ Taylor, II, pp. 643–4.

²⁵ Taylor, *The Rule and Exercises of Holy Living*, III, pp. 214–54.

²⁶ Taylor, III, p. 214.

²⁷ Taylor, III, p. 214.

²⁸ Taylor, III, p. 214.

shew forth the Lord's death by sacramental representation. They offer 'Christ as already offered'²⁹ (not sacrificed *again*) by the same ministry of intercession that Christ offers to his Father in heaven. By intercession the sacramental representation is offered to the Father in union with Christ's perpetual offering of himself once sacrificed. The people join in the action of the priest by their 'Amen'.³⁰ In receiving the holy communion they receive Christ within them and

therefore may also offer him to God, while in their sacrifice of obedience and thanksgiving they present themselves to God with Christ, whom they have spiritually received, that is, themselves with that which will make them gracious and acceptable. The offering their bodies and souls and services to God, in Him, and by Him, and with Him, who is His Father's well-beloved, and in whom He is well pleased, cannot but be accepted to all the purposes of blessing, grace, and glory.³¹

Taylor connects the communicant who has worthily received the consecrated elements with the sacrifice of Christ on the cross; the priesthood of Christ is eternal, perpetually showing forth the sacrifice by the presence of his ascended body with the Father; his priests who represent the sacrifice at the eucharist do so by sacramental representation, the broken bread and wine poured out which become the body and blood of Christ for the worthy communicant and the representation of Christ.

Taylor also picks up the theme of sacrifice in his 1660 work *The Worthy Communicant*. Again we read of the command 'to represent His death, to commemorate this sacrifice by humble prayer and thankful record; and by faithful manifestation and joyful eucharist to lay it before the eyes of our heavenly Father'.³² He describes the holy table as a 'copy of the celestial altar'³³ and again connects the perpetual heavenly intercession in virtue of Christ's sacrifice with the action of Christ's priests on earth.³⁴ Taylor tells us that the priests, ministers of Christ's unchangeable priesthood, imitate the offering up of Christ's body and blood by the sacraments of bread and wine and the prayer of oblation. 'And therefore it was not without great mystery and clear signification that our blessed

²⁹ Taylor, III, p. 214.

³⁰ Taylor, III, p. 215.

³¹ Taylor, III, p. 215.

³² Taylor, *The Worthy Communicant*, VIII, pp. 37–8.

³³ Taylor, VIII, p. 38.

³⁴ Taylor, VIII, p. 38.

Lord was pleased to command the representation of His death and sacrifice on the cross should be made by breaking bread and effusion of wine'.³⁵ McAdoo sees the 'core of the matter' for Taylor as 're-presentation and pleading of the one perfect sacrifice in the eucharistic action, of the *anamnesis*, mystery and sacrament, and of the heavenly altar'.³⁶ He sees a *parallelism* (a word McAdoo frequently returns to) transcending time and space. The temporal, earth-bound church re-presents to the Father the Son, as sacrificed (by the elements and by itself, the Body of Christ) and unites that earthly offering with the perfect offering made once and for all by Christ on the cross which he perpetually re-presents to his Father in heaven. The heavenly intercession of Christ pleads the sacrifice.³⁷ What happens at the eucharist is a parallel with what continues eternally in heaven. The linkage between heavenly altar and earthly holy table is basic to Taylor's understanding;³⁸ the heavenly altar is 'inseparably linked with the earthly *anamnesis*, the making effective in the present of a past event, the once-for-all event of salvation, through the action of the Spirit'. The Spirit transmits the life of Christ to the people.³⁹

Taylor continues by reference to patristic sources; *The Worthy Communicant* alone includes patristic material in Taylor's devotional writing on eucharistic sacrifice. He includes quotations from S. Chrysostom including:

Christ is not impiously slain by us, but piously sacrificed; and by this means we declare the Lord's death till He come; for here through Him we humbly do in earth, which He as a Son who is heard according to His reverence, does powerfully for us in heaven; where as an advocate He intercedes with His Father, whose office or work it is, for us to exhibit and interpose His flesh which He took of us and for us, and as it were to press it upon His Father.⁴⁰

He also includes references to S. Ambrose, S. Augustine, Tertullian and S. Basil and the Franciscan Nicholas of Lyra: 'that which is daily offered in the church is a daily commemoration of that one

³⁵ Taylor, VIII, p. 38.

³⁶ McAdoo, p. 65.

³⁷ McAdoo, p. 66.

³⁸ McAdoo, p. 67.

³⁹ McAdoo, p. 66.

⁴⁰ Taylor, VIII, p. 39. An earlier quotation on the page is correctly attributed to S. Chrysostom, *Homily on Hebrews*, no. 17, but this quotation is not from that homily.

sacrifice which was offered on the cross, according to the command of Christ, Do this in commemoration of Me.⁴¹

McAdoo returns to Porter's view that Taylor's theology of eucharistic sacrifice does not fit into medieval or protestant schools of thought. He argues (as we have seen did Carroll) that Taylor's thought has roots in a more distant past, and yet has contemporary echoes. It is rooted in patristic thought (unsurprising given the way in which Taylor threads patristic quotations through his writing on the sacrifice) but McAdoo also sees echoes of Taylor's thought in the report from ARCIC I and the Lima report from the World Council of Churches.⁴² He summarises Taylor's sacrificial theology:

The eucharist is a commemoration and sacramental re-presentation of the unique sacrifice. It is offered by the Church in union with the heavenly offering by which Christ, eternally active and life-bestowing through His Cross, offers Himself 'as sacrificed'. It is also a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving and an instrument by means of which, appropriated by faith, all the benefits of the Paschal Mystery are bestowed by the crucified, risen and glorified Saviour, through the Spirit. The manner of Christ's presence is a mystery only to be expressed in the language both of sacramental realism and of effectual sign. The eucharist, being the sacrament of Life, is a means for the continuance of the holy people in that new quality of life which ceaselessly flows from 'the high priest... who... offers still the same one perfect sacrifice'.⁴³

Taylor's theology leaves no room for a literalist interpretation of 'offering Christ'. The mode of offering is parallelism, the earthly offering and sacramental representation on the holy table parallel the perpetual heavenly offering and the actual presence of Christ. Christ offers himself 'as sacrificed', so is both priest and sacrifice, and priest and people represent in solemn prayer and sacrament Christ as already offered. All is covered in mystery, Taylor's constant refrain, for this reality cannot be fully explained.⁴⁴ What is present to the Father in heaven in an unqualified manner is present to the worshippers on earth in a mediated, sacramental way. The presence is always qualified.

In his description of the Eucharist as sacrifice Taylor seems very close to Aquinas. In a question on 'Whether Christ is sacrificed in this sacrament?'⁴⁵ Aquinas says that the eucharist is a

⁴¹ Nicholas of Lyra, *Postilla Litteralis Super Epistolam ad Hebraeos*, quoted in Taylor, VIII, p. 39.

⁴² McAdoo, p. 67.

⁴³ McAdoo, p. 68.

⁴⁴ McAdoo, p. 82.

⁴⁵ STIII Q83, A1.

sacrifice for two reasons: the celebration of the Eucharist is an image of Christ's Passion which is the true sacrifice, and images bear the name of what they represent, and the eucharist is a sacrifice because it offers the fruits of Christ's Passion. Taylor is also not greatly distant from the teaching of the Council of Trent. In the 'Doctrine on the Sacrifice of the Mass'⁴⁶ the council sets out its teaching that the mass is a sacrifice in which Christ, the new Passover, is immolated under the signs of bread and wine and offered to the Father as a way in which his sacrifice on the cross might be represented so that its virtues might be applied to our ongoing sins. The teaching draws on the image of Christ's eternal priesthood, as Taylor's does. This sacrifice is truly propitiatory and offers mercy and grace. The same victim, Christ, is offered but in a different manner. The fruits of the offering on the cross are received plentifully through the offering of the unbloody sacrifice, which does not in any way derogate from Christ's offering on the cross. The doctrine ends with a series of nine canons, which are set in negative form: 'If anyone saith not [...] let him be anathema.'⁴⁷ Taylor's teaching would seem to pass some of the tests set; he does believe a true and proper sacrifice is offered to God (cf. Canon I); he believes that 'Do this for commemoration of me' is an instruction to celebrate the sacrament (cf. Canon II) and he believes the eucharist is more than a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, it is a sacrifice, not a bare memorial and it is offered for the whole Catholic Church, not only the communicant (cf. Canon III). In fact, Taylor's position seems closer to the Roman Catholic position than to the Church of England's Articles of Religion. Article XXXI, 'Of the one oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross',⁴⁸ asserts that sacrifices of masses, 'in the which it was commonly said, that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead [...] were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits.' The article focuses on the one, complete and perfect sacrifice made on the Cross which is all-sufficient. The authors of the article believe that offering the 'sacrifice of the mass' is erroneously trying to add something to Christ's sacrifice, hence it is a blasphemous belief. Taylor follows Aquinas in arguing that the eucharist is a representation of the one perfect

⁴⁶ Waterworth, pp. 152 – 153.

⁴⁷ Waterworth, p. 158.

⁴⁸ *Book of Common Prayer*, p. 786.

sacrifice, which is offered in eternity by Christ the risen High Priest. For Taylor, the eucharist is a connection between the eternal Christ, offering himself at the right hand of the Father in representation of his perfect and complete sacrifice made on the cross, and the priest and people celebrating in time.

Taylor uses the word ‘representation’ to describe the mode of the sacrifice offered at the eucharist. Carroll summarises Taylor’s use of representation thus: ‘by the power of the Holy Spirit the Risen and glorified Christ is made present through sacred signs and actions to men and women of faith. This real presence of Christ is called sacramental or mysterious’.⁴⁹ Sacramental representation makes a past event present reality.⁵⁰ Taylor’s use of the word is echoed in the words of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in their description of how the eucharist is a sacrifice: ‘first we offer the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; then next we plead and represent before the Father the sacrifice of the cross, and by it we confidently entreat remission of sins and all other benefits of the Lord’s Passion for all the whole Church; and lastly we offer the sacrifice of ourselves to the creator of all things’.⁵¹ The sacrifice is not ‘re-made’, it cannot be, but the elements of bread and wine, transformed into the body and blood of Christ, show to the Father the sacrificial body of Jesus, in a parallel manner to the eternal offering made in heaven. We may not re-make the sacrifice, but we can reclaim it, pleading the death of Jesus once more, since it is the only thing we have to offer.

5.2 How is Christ Present in the Sacrament?

We have considered how Taylor understands the eucharist to represent or mirror Christ’s sacrifice, made once of all on the Cross and perpetually represented by the risen Christ. The representation of the eucharist requires the consecrated elements to show forth Christ’s body and blood, so we move to survey how Taylor describes the presence of Christ in the consecrated elements in his writing. In

⁴⁹ Carroll, ‘Jeremy Taylor: an Essay in Liturgical Ecumenics’, p. 34.

⁵⁰ Carroll, ‘Jeremy Taylor: an Essay in Liturgical Ecumenics’, p. 165.

⁵¹ A Davison, *Why Sacraments?* (London: SPCK, 2013), p. 40.

his *Order for the Administration of the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper* the minister prays for God's mercy on those who come 'to be refreshed and comforted by the divine nutriment of Thy holy body and blood.'⁵² At the beginning of the *Communion* he prays a 'denunciation' which includes this verse: 'The King of kings and the Lord of lords, Christ our God comes down from heaven unto us, and gives Himself to be meat for the souls of all faithful people.'^{53, 54} The minister prays the prayer of consecration:

Have mercy upon us, O heavenly Father, according to Thy glorious mercies and promises, send Thy holy Ghost upon our hearts, and let Him also descend upon these gifts, that by His good, His holy, His glorious presence, He may sanctify and enlighten our hearts, and He may bless and sanctify these gifts.

That this bread may become the holy body of Christ.

Amen.

And this chalice may become the life-giving blood of Christ.

*Amen.*⁵⁵

It is noteworthy that Taylor does not qualify 'become the holy body of Christ' with 'for us' as Cranmer did in the 1549 Prayer Book; similarly contemporary Church of England prayers also qualify the invocation over the gifts that they 'may be to us the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ'.⁵⁶ Taylor's prayer implies a change which is not subjective. McAdoo comments that 'Taylor has no qualms about the scriptural realism [...] since his theology hitherto is that of a real, a true, presence which is sacramental.'⁵⁷ In *Clerus Domini*, Taylor argues that it is the action of the Holy Spirit invoked by the prayer of the priest which brings about the sacramental change. Amongst his examples, he quotes S. Cyril of Jerusalem: 'the eucharistical bread, after the invocation of the holy Ghost, is not any longer common bread, but the body of Christ.'⁵⁸ And he quotes Proclus of Constantinople's summary of the tradition: "'By these prayers," saith he, "they expected the coming

⁵² Taylor, VIII, p. 617.

⁵³ Taylor, VIII, p. 624.

⁵⁴ This 'denunciation' is an extract from the Liturgy of St. James. A more familiar version is the hymn 'Let all mortal flesh keep silence' *The New English Hymnal* (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 1986) Hymn 295.

⁵⁵ Taylor, VIII, p. 624.

⁵⁶ E.g. *Common Worship: Services and Prayers for the Church of England* (Church House Publishing: London, 2000), p. 188.

⁵⁷ McAdoo, p. 105.

⁵⁸ S. Cyril of Jerusalem, *On the Mysteries*, I, quoted in Taylor, I, p. 45.

of the holy Ghost, that His divine presence might make the bread and the wine mixed with water to become the body and blood of our blessed Saviour”.⁵⁹

It is clear from these quotations that Taylor does indeed believe that a change in the elements is brought about, and the Holy Spirit is the agent of the change. When he speaks of the consecrated elements as the body and blood of Christ, he means something has changed in them, they are more than mere signs. ‘The bread and wine are changed into the body and blood of Christ supernaturally by invocation, and coming of the holy Ghost.’⁶⁰ (Taylor quoting John Damascene.)

Taylor opens *The Worthy Communicant* with a discussion on the nature of the sacrament. McAdoo describes this later work of Taylor’s (1660) as one in which, although he does not change his underlying theology, he changes its emphasis.⁶¹ This work shows the influence of the teaching of Origen, Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria that identifies the flesh of Christ with the Word and the blood of Christ with his Spirit. This is an influence that we have seen implicitly in Taylor’s treatment of John 6 in *The Real and Spiritual Presence*. Taylor avoids the ‘trap’ of spiritualising the sacrament away so that there was nothing which could not be received simply by hearing and receiving the proclaimed Word by invoking Augustine: ‘when the word and the element are joined, then it is a perfect sacrament.’⁶²

Taylor begins by dismissing those who describe sacraments as: “marks of Christianity,” “symbols of mutual charity,” “testimonies of a thankful mind to God,” “allegorical admonitions of christian mortification,” and “spiritual alimony,” “symbols of grace conferred before the sacrament,” and “rites instituted to stir up faith by way of object and representation”.⁶³ These say simply too little about the sacrament. They are professing the sacraments to be merely signs and Taylor argues that they are more than this. Nevertheless, he is similarly unhappy with those who affirm:

⁵⁹ Taylor, I, p. 46. This is a quotation from the *Speech Regarding the Divine Liturgy*, incorrectly attributed to Proclus.

⁶⁰ S. John of Damascus, *An Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, IV, ch. 13, quoted in Taylor, I, p. 47.

⁶¹ McAdoo p. 172.

⁶² McAdoo, p. 180.

⁶³ Taylor, VIII, p. 12.

in the blessed sacrament we receive the body and blood of Christ ; we chew His flesh, we drink His blood ; for ‘His flesh is meat indeed, and His blood is drink indeed;’ and this is the manna which came down from heaven ; our bodies are nourished, our souls united to Christ; and the sacrament is the infallible instrument of pardon to all persons that do not maliciously hinder it; and it produces all its effects by virtue of the sacrament itself so appointed ; and that the dispositions of the communicants are only for removing obstacles and impediments, but effect nothing ; the sumption of the mysteries does all in a capable subject.⁶⁴

Taylor believes this is simply not true, the idea that the sacrament acts by itself, of its own virtue, is incorrect. Christ is not present in this unmediated way, although they speak correctly of the benefits the sacrament is able to confer; they misrepresent the way in which the blessings and benefits are conferred.⁶⁵

Taylor turns to a flesh/spirit duality to explain his position: ‘we have two lives, a natural and a spiritual, and both must have bread for their support and maintenance in proportion to their needs and to their capacities’.⁶⁶ He opposes flesh which is described as ‘nature, flesh and death’⁶⁷ against life and Spirit. There is no fleshy, natural presence of Christ’s body, we can only eat the life-giving bread which is the body of Christ in a spiritual manner.⁶⁸ As Christ is the food of our souls it is his will that we receive the food by means of symbols such as bread and wine.⁶⁹

The sum is this. —Christ’s body, His flesh and His blood, are therefore called our meat and our drink, because by His incarnation and manifestation in the flesh He became life unto us: so that it is mysterious indeed in the expression, but very proper and intelligible in the event, to say that we eat His flesh and drink His blood, since by these it is that we have and preserve life. But because what Christ begun in His incarnation He finished in His body on the cross, and all the whole progression of mysteries in His body was still an operatory of life and spiritual being to us; the sacrament of the Lord’s supper being a commemoration and exhibition of this death which was the consummation of our redemption by His body and blood, does contain in it a ‘visible word’ the word in symbol and visibility, and special manifestation. Consonant to which doctrine, the fathers by an elegant expression called the blessed sacrament ‘the extension of the incarnation’. So that here are two things highly to be remarked; — First, that by whatsoever way Christ is taken ‘out of the sacrament’, by the same He is

⁶⁴ Taylor, VIII, p. 13.

⁶⁵ Taylor, VIII, p. 13.

⁶⁶ Taylor, VIII, p. 15.

⁶⁷ Taylor, VIII, p. 17.

⁶⁸ Taylor, VIII, p. 16.

⁶⁹ Taylor, VIII, p. 18.

taken ‘in the sacrament’ and by some ways’ here more than there. Secondly, that the eating and drinking the consecrated symbols is but the body and lesser part of the sacrament: the life and the spirit is believing greatly, and doing all the actions of that believing, direct and consequent. So that there are in this two manducations, the ‘sacramental’ and the ‘spiritual’.⁷⁰

We have seen the sacramental/spiritual pairing already in Taylor’s *Real Presence and Spiritual*. On the one hand Taylor speaks of ‘consecrated symbols’ which suggests a change in the bread and wine, but the language of spiritual eating implies no particular attachment of the spirit to the elements. He begins by asserting that we have a natural life and a spiritual life, but he makes no such claim for bread and wine. Yet he also rehearses the Fathers’ summary of the sacrament as the ‘extension of the incarnation’, the Word of God becoming flesh in the person of Jesus. The sacrament makes Jesus present in the world and continues the saving work of the incarnation, making it real for those who partake of it. There is also something in common with the symbolic parallelism which describes Bullinger’s understanding of the sacrament here. Taylor argues that there is a spiritual eating which goes along with the literal eating of the consecrated bread, but he makes no argument as to how the two are joined. Further he says that the spiritual eating can be done ‘outside of the sacrament’ even though it is by the sacrament that ‘we eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ with much eminency and advantage’⁷¹ for we feed on Christ when we hear the word of God. Taylor uses baptism as an example: ‘out of the sacrament the Spirit operates with the word in the ministry of man; in baptism, the Spirit operates with the word in the ministry of God. For here God is the preacher, the sacrament is God’s sign, and by it He ministers life to us by the flesh and blood of His Son, that is, by the death of Christ into which we are baptized.’⁷² He uses this analogy to explain why the sacrament is an effective partaking of Christ’s body and blood: it is because

This is *verbum visibile*, the same word read to the eye and to the ear. Here the word of God is made our food in a manner so near to our understanding, that our tongues and palates feel the metaphor and the sacramental signification; here faith is in triumph and exaltation: but as in all the other ministries evangelical we eat Christ by faith, here we

⁷⁰ Taylor, VIII, p. 23.

⁷¹ Taylor, VIII, p. 23.

⁷² Taylor, VIII, pp. 22.

have faith also by eating Christ. Thus eating and drinking is faith; it is faith in mystery and faith in ceremony; it is faith in act and faith in habit; it is exercised and it is advanced; and therefore it is certain that here we eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ with much eminency and advantage.⁷³

Taylor suggests that the sacrament is a sort of visible sermon in which God himself is the preacher, so the word is preached more effectively and powerfully, and thus it can be received more deeply and effectively. Faith is key, 'it is exercised', so it is the work of faith to believe and receive the sacrament and thus receive Christ, and 'it is advanced': receiving the body and blood of Christ deepens and increases faith. Nevertheless, Taylor holds to his assertion that the elements are changed by consecration, 'though as in a sacrament, mystically', and not by the faith of the receiver. McAdoo argues that the emphasis on the Spirit's role in holy communion also heightens Taylor's concept of a personalist presence: Christ continues through the Sacrament the life-imparting work which was the purpose of the Incarnation, hence Taylor's claim that the sacrament is the 'extension of the Incarnation.'⁷⁴

Taylor continues his argument over a second section, again arguing against the possibility that the 'sacraments confer grace by their own excellency and power with which they are endued from above'.⁷⁵ He describes baptism as an 'instrument and sign in the hands of God to confer the holy Spirit upon believers',⁷⁶ suggesting that here he holds to the 'symbolic instrumentalism' which Gerrish characterised as Calvin's position on sacraments. For, Taylor argues, 'God does nothing in vain; the sacraments do something in the hand of God; at least they are God's proper and accustomed times of grace'.⁷⁷ Proper use of the sacrament is required for grace to be joined to the sacrament – either baptism or eucharist.⁷⁸ As we have already seen, Taylor argues that it is invocation of the Spirit which makes the elements sacramental, and so Taylor also can argue, 'as the sacrament operates only by the virtue of the Spirit of God, so the Spirit ordinarily works by the instrumentality of the

⁷³ Taylor, VIII, p. 23.

⁷⁴ McAdoo, p. 183.

⁷⁵ Taylor, VIII, p. 27.

⁷⁶ Taylor, VIII, p. 28.

⁷⁷ Taylor, VIII, p. 28.

⁷⁸ Taylor, VIII, p. 30.

sacraments.⁷⁹ In justification of this he quotes Chrysostom: ‘If we were wholly incorporeal, God would have given us graces unclothed with signs and sacraments; but because our spirits are in earthen vessels, God conveys His graces to us by sensible ministrations.’⁸⁰ Here is Taylor’s summary:

In conclusion, the sum is this. The sacraments and symbols, if they be considered in their own nature, are just such as they seem, water, and bread, and wine; they retain the names proper to their own natures; but because they are made to be signs of a secret mystery, and water is the symbol of purification of the soul from sin, and bread and wine of Christ’s body and blood, therefore the symbols and sacraments receive the names of what themselves do sign; they are the body and they are the blood of Christ; they are metonymically such. But because yet further; they are instruments of grace in the hand of God, and by these His holy spirit changes our hearts and translates us into a divine nature; therefore the whole work is attributed to them by a synecdoche; that is, they do in their manner the work for which God ordained them, and they are placed there for our sakes, and speak God’s language in our accent, and they appear in the outside; we receive the benefit of their ministry, and God receives the glory.⁸¹

‘Instruments in the hands of God’ clearly suggests ‘symbolic instrumentalism’. God uses the sacrament to give the grace he has promised, a very similar position to that of John Calvin. McAdoo summarises: ‘The spiritual is sacramentally expressed by the physical and the physical achieves the fulfilment of its divinely ordained purpose through the spiritual.’⁸²

In the section on the sacrament in the *Great Exemplar*, Taylor tells his reader that, ‘The bread, when it is consecrated and made sacramental, is the body of our Lord: and the fraction and distribution of it is the communication of that body which died for us upon the cross.’⁸³ This joins philosophy with faith, philosophy tells us that as the accidents are unchanged so the substance must remain, but as it was affirmed as Christ’s body by Christ himself we are bound to trust in his word and power.⁸⁴ Christ, by his own power, has made the ‘symbols to be instruments of conveying Himself to the spirit of the receiver’.⁸⁵ Here again is an instrumental view of the symbols as noted

⁷⁹ Taylor, VIII, p. 31.

⁸⁰ S. John Chrysostom, *Homilies on Matthew*, LXXXII, ch. 4, quoted in Taylor, VIII, p. 31.

⁸¹ Taylor, VIII, p. 32.

⁸² McAdoo, p. 181.

⁸³ Taylor, II, p. 637.

⁸⁴ Taylor, II, pp. 638–9.

⁸⁵ Taylor, II, p. 640.

above. There is also an affirmation of sacramental change by Taylor, the elements are in some way altered, although mysteriously, ‘In the sacrament, that body which is reigning in heaven is exposed upon the table of blessing; and His body which was broken for us, is now broken again, and yet remains impassible.’⁸⁶ Taylor also argues that the whole Christ is ministered in each broken piece of bread to the faithful receiver. The visible symbols make the invisible grace as ‘presential and discernible’ as it can possibly be.⁸⁷ Here we have the two key words McAdoo sees as essential to understanding Taylor’s theology of presence: mystery and sacramental.⁸⁸

In *Holy Living* Taylor focuses more on the eucharistic sacrifice than on the presence of Christ in the sacrament, however he does not pass over it completely. He refers to the ‘rite of consecration’⁸⁹ in which the impassible Christ is ‘broken into pieces’ so that he may ‘enter into the body to support and nourish the spirit’ whilst remaining in heaven.⁹⁰ He describes the consecrated elements as no longer

common bread and wine, but holy in their use, holy in their signification, holy in their change, and holy in their effect: and believe, if thou art a worthy communicant, thou dost as verily receive Christ’s body and blood to all effects and purposes of the Spirit as thou dost receive the blessed elements into thy mouth.⁹¹

Taylor shows here that he believes the elements to be changed by consecration, not only in use but in their signification and in their *change*. He warns his reader not to dispute the ‘secret of the mystery and the nicety of the manner of Christ’s presence’ but to

indefinitely assent to the words of institution, and believe that Christ in the holy sacrament gives thee His body and His blood. He that believes not this is not a Christian; he that believes so much needs not to enquire further, nor to entangle his faith by disbelieving his sense.⁹²

⁸⁶ Taylor, II, p. 640–1.

⁸⁷ Taylor, II, p. 641.

⁸⁸ McAdoo, p. 85.

⁸⁹ Taylor, III, p. 217.

⁹⁰ Taylor, III, p. 217.

⁹¹ Taylor, III, p. 218.

⁹² Taylor, III, p. 218.

Taylor uses starkly carnal language, faithful receiving is as real and powerful as if the communicant ‘puttest thy finger to His hand, and thy hand into His side, and thy lips to His fontinel of blood, sucking life from His heart’.⁹³ Here is Taylor’s position which we saw in *The Real Presence and Spiritual*; he argues that it is correct and a matter of faith and trust in Christ to believe that the elements become the body and blood of Christ after consecratory prayer, and they convey the body and blood of Christ to the worthy communicant; they are received spiritually by faith rather than physically by the body. The consecrated elements make the body and blood as ‘presential and discernible’ as might be possible but to enquire any more deeply into the manner of presence is discouraged, for these things are mysteries, impossible to precisely discern.

5.3 The Benefits of Receiving Holy Communion

Having considered the connection between the eucharist and the sacrifice of Jesus and how the presence of Jesus is actualised in the consecrated bread and wine of the sacrament we turn to investigating how holy communion benefits the participants in the eucharist. In his *Office for the Holy Communion* the priest prays that the mysteries may be for pardon of sins, renovation of souls and sanctification and preservation of the body.⁹⁴ In *The Great Exemplar*, Taylor tells us the benefits and virtue of the sacrament:

this holy bread being like the cake in Gideon’s camp overturning the tents of Midian; that it is the relief of our sorrows, the antidote and preservative of souls, the viand of our journey, the guard and passport of our death, the wine of angels; that it is more healthful than rhubarb, more pleasant than cassia; that the betel and lareca of the Indians, the moly or nepenthe of Pliny, the lirinon of the Persians, the balsam of Judea, the manna of Israel, the honey of Jonathan, are but weak expressions, to tell us that this is excellent above art and nature, and that nothing is good enough in philosophy to become its emblem.⁹⁵

In less poetic language, he sets out the benefits that the sacrament confers on the faithful recipient. The sacrament nourishes the body and by grace makes the body spiritual and unites the spirit of the

⁹³ Taylor, III, p. 218.

⁹⁴ Taylor, VIII, p. 623.

⁹⁵ Taylor, II, p. 646.

communicant with Christ's body.⁹⁶ As Christ is the food of our souls we are assimilated into Christ and partake of the divine nature which then informs our lives.⁹⁷ The sacrament 'is an instrument of reconciling us to God'⁹⁸ so that any guilt and stain of sin which remains within us is taken away. The 'sacrament is a pledge of glory and the earnest of immortality'⁹⁹ because in receiving the sacrament we receive into ourselves and unite ourselves with the one who has overcome death and who will die no more. The sacrament enlightens the spirit and confers spiritual discernment and it is a 'great defence against the hostilities of our ghostly enemies'.¹⁰⁰

He includes a section entitled 'The effects and benefits of worthy communicating' in *Holy Living*. The first thing to remember is that receiving the sacrament means the communicant receives all the benefits of Christ's sacrifice on the cross, which has been represented by the celebration of the sacrament. The church is nourished in faith, strengthened in hope and charity and the members of the body of Christ are united with one another and Jesus, the head of the body. Our covenant with God is renewed once again. 'Our bodies are nourished with the signs, and our souls with the mystery: our bodies receive into them the seed of an immortal nature, and our souls are joined with Him who is the first-fruits of the resurrection, and never can die.'¹⁰¹ Frequent reception of holy communion means that our souls are transformed into the likeness of Christ by our feeding on him.¹⁰²

The Worthy Communicant similarly contains a section on the benefits of receiving the sacrament. Taylor says the first benefit is increased faith. Receiving the sacrament is an act of faith, which requires faith to properly receive it. But in receiving faithfully we receive grace which increases faith by blessing and so there is a virtuous spiral of faith engendering deepened faith by means of the sacrament.¹⁰³ Secondly the sacrament unites the communicants into one body, the bread

⁹⁶ Taylor, II, p. 640.

⁹⁷ Taylor, II, p. 641.

⁹⁸ Taylor, II, p. 644.

⁹⁹ Taylor, II, p. 645.

¹⁰⁰ Taylor, II, p. 646.

¹⁰¹ Taylor, III, p. 220.

¹⁰² Taylor, III, p. 221.

¹⁰³ Taylor, VIII, p. 34.

of the sacrament is the body of Christ, the church is also the body of Christ and the work of the Holy Spirit in the sacrament is to unite us into the one body, by a bond of charity: we are ‘mystically united by the sacramental participation.’¹⁰⁴ Taylor is cautious when he discusses the third in his list of benefits. Yes, the sacrament is ‘of great efficacy for the remission of sins’,¹⁰⁵ but we only receive forgiveness if we are penitent. The sacrament cannot bring pardon to the unrepentant sinner.¹⁰⁶ Taylor warns us that ‘pardon of sins is proportionable to our repentance’;¹⁰⁷ this means that the sacrament offers pardon only in conjunction with ‘all that Christ requires as conditions of pardon’.¹⁰⁸ The sacrament is the agency by which our bodies are ‘made capable of the resurrection to life and eternal glory.’¹⁰⁹ The sacrament joins us with Jesus, who rose again, so we too will rise as he is already risen.¹¹⁰ Taylor quotes a number of patristic sources in support of this, for example S. Irenaeus: “As the bread which grows from the earth, receiving the calling of God,” that is, blessed by prayer and the word of God, “is not now common bread, but the eucharist, consisting of two things, an earthly and an heavenly: so also our bodies receiving the eucharist, are not now corruptible, but have the hope of resurrection”.¹¹¹ Taylor also argues that, as there are spiritual benefits conferred by corporal elements, the sacrament may be a medicine for our physical health and bring secular benefits (he uses the rise of the House of Hapsburgh as an example). Taylor also argues from the negative: S. Paul tells us how the Corinthians were afflicted with illness because they treated the sacrament irreverently.¹¹² Taylor sums up with a quotation from S. Hilary: ‘These holy mysteries being taken, cause that Christ shall be in us, and we in Christ’.¹¹³ What more benefit could there be than receiving the gift of Christ?¹¹⁴

¹⁰⁴ Taylor, VIII, pp. 34–5.

¹⁰⁵ Taylor, VIII, p. 35.

¹⁰⁶ Taylor, VIII, p. 36.

¹⁰⁷ Taylor, VIII, p. 37.

¹⁰⁸ Taylor, VIII, p. 37.

¹⁰⁹ Taylor, VIII, p. 40.

¹¹⁰ Taylor, VIII, p. 40.

¹¹¹ S. Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, IV, ch. 18, quoted in Taylor, VIII, p. 41.

¹¹² Taylor, VIII, pp. 41 – 42.

¹¹³ S. Hilary of Poitiers, *On the Trinity*, VIII, ch. 14, quoted in Taylor, VIII, p. 43.

¹¹⁴ Taylor, VIII, p. 43.

Taylor concludes his section on the benefits of holy communion in *Holy Living* with a charming exhortation, reminding his reader that ‘all persons should communicate very often, even as often as they can’.

All christian people must come. They indeed that are in the state of sin must not come so, but yet they must come; first they must quit their state of death, and then partake of the bread of life. They that are at enmity with their neighbours must come, that is no excuse for their not coming; only they must not bring their enmity along with them, but leave it, and then come. They that have variety of secular employments must come; only they must leave their secular thoughts and affections behind them, and then come and converse with God. If any man be well grown in grace, he must needs come, because he is excellently disposed to so holy a feast; but he that is but in the infancy of piety had need to come, that so he may grow in grace. The strong must come lest they become weak, and the weak that they may become strong. The sick must come to be cured, the healthful to be preserved. They that have leisure must come, because they have no excuse; they that have no leisure must come hither, that by so excellent religion they may sanctify their business. The penitent sinners must come that they may be justified, and they that are justified that they may be justified still. They that have fears and great reverence to these mysteries, and think no preparation to be sufficient, must receive, that they may learn how to receive the more worthily; and they that have a less degree of reverence, must come often to have it heightened: that as those creatures that live amongst the snows of the mountains turn white with their food and conversation with such perpetual whitenesses, so our souls may be, transformed into the similitude and union with Christ by our perpetual feeding on Him, and conversation, not only in His courts, but in His very heart and most secret affections and incomparable purities.¹¹⁵

Aquinas considers the effects of the sacrament in Question 79 of the Third part of the Summa. The first article concludes that the sacrament bestows grace; the second, that the sacrament is the cause of attaining eternal life. Aquinas argues that the sacrament bestows forgiveness of sins, since it is the sacrament of Christ’s passion which is for the forgiveness of sins. Furthermore, if the sacrament is received in good faith then an unrecognised mortal sin will be forgiven, but ‘whoever is conscious of mortal sin, has within him an obstacle to receiving the effect of this sacrament’.¹¹⁶ Venial sins are forgiven by the sacrament, but they can still diminish the fervour of charity. But, since the sacrament can be a means of rekindling charity, reception can remedy this infirmity of

¹¹⁵ Taylor, III, p. 221.

¹¹⁶ STIII Q79, A3.

spirit.¹¹⁷ The sacrament is of benefit both as sacrament and sacrifice: ‘invisible grace is bestowed in this sacrament under a visible species’¹¹⁸ and it is a sacrifice offered for the salvation of others, those who do not receive the sacrament.¹¹⁹

5.4 Conditional Grace? Who May Receive the Holy Sacrament?

Taylor includes a chapter in *The Worthy Communicant* which examines who may receive holy communion. Since faith and self-examination are necessary this means the unbaptized should not receive the sacrament.¹²⁰ Baptism alone, however, is not sufficient, ‘it must be the actual faith of baptized persons’ which is the prerequisite for admission to the sacrament.¹²¹ Taylor argues that although infants did historically receive the sacrament, and S. Augustine argued for it,¹²² he does not deem it appropriate for infants to receive. This is because baptism is sufficient for those who are not yet at the age of reason, because they are unable to sin and fall away from the promise given in baptism. They are not obliged to receive the sacrament which is given for reparation and security.¹²³ ‘Fools’ may receive the sacrament, providing ‘they be capable of love and obedience in some degree’,¹²⁴ and ‘madmen’ likewise, provided they were men of a good life; if, however, they entered their madness ‘from a state of sin and debauchery’ then they are not to be admitted to the sacrament, ‘their debt books are sealed up and they are like dead men’.¹²⁵

In a sense, the title *The Worthy Communicant* betrays a particular way of viewing reception. Taylor’s sections look at the faith required, meaning ‘consent to the articles of his belief by an assent firmer than can be naturally produced from the ordinary arguments of his persuasion.’¹²⁶ It must be

¹¹⁷ STIII Q79, A4.

¹¹⁸ STIII Q79, A7.

¹¹⁹ STIII Q79, A7.

¹²⁰ Taylor, VIII, p. 87.

¹²¹ Taylor, VIII, p. 88.

¹²² Taylor, VIII, p. 90.

¹²³ Taylor, VIII, p. 94.

¹²⁴ Taylor, VIII, p. 95.

¹²⁵ Taylor, VIII, p. 95.

¹²⁶ Taylor, VIII, p. 96.

faith which is ‘the actual principle and effective of a good life’;¹²⁷ and it must be faith which believes correctly about the sacrament, considering how the sacrament supports the soul.¹²⁸ It is to faith ‘Christ is present; by faith we eat His flesh, and by faith we drink His blood; that is, we communicate not as men, but as faithful and believers’.¹²⁹ Right believing is a condition of right receiving. Taylor also instructs his *Worthy Communicant* how he is to prepare for reception by living in charity, forgiving injuries, and the necessity of repentance before holy communion. The sacrament is proper for those who lead a moral, faithful and recollected life. It is an article of faith to Taylor that ‘he that eats and drinks unworthily, eats and drinks damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord’s body’ (I Cor. 11.29) and this colours all his writing on preparation for receiving the sacrament. In his section on the sacrament in *The Great Exemplar*, Taylor characteristically includes a section on self-examination, and the importance of repentance before receiving the sacrament.¹³⁰ In *Holy Living* a section on repentance precedes the section on the sacrament¹³¹ and Taylor warns the communicant that, ‘No man must dare to approach to the holy sacrament of the Lord’s supper if he be in a state of any one sin, that is, unless he have entered into the state of repentance. [...] Every communicant must first have examined himself, that is, tried the condition and state of his soul’.¹³² Self-examination and repentance are not to be hasty, ‘It is not the preparation of two or three days that can render a person capable of this banquet’.¹³³ The person must be fit to receive the conveyance of the blessings and effects of Christ’s sufferings,¹³⁴ and this requires a proper period of pious life and action building ‘our souls up into a temple fit for the reception of Christ himself, and the inhabitation of the Holy Spirit.’¹³⁵

¹²⁷ Taylor, VIII, p. 101.

¹²⁸ Taylor, VIII, p. 109.

¹²⁹ Taylor, VIII, p. 109.

¹³⁰ Taylor, II, pp 647–50.

¹³¹ Taylor, III, pp. 204–14.

¹³² Taylor, III, p. 215.

¹³³ Taylor, III, p. 216.

¹³⁴ Taylor, III, p. 216.

¹³⁵ Taylor, III, p. 216.

There is a tension here between what is given in the sacrament and the disposition of the receiver. Clearly Taylor understands that holy communion should not be taken lightly, the communicant must be well prepared to receive so great a guest. His *Communion Office* includes a commination which warns that any who have not truly repented of any sin to be ‘unworthy of these holy mysteries’.¹³⁶ However, Taylor can imply that the body and blood of Christ are only received if the communicant is properly prepared and living a devout, repentant and recollected life. If this is really the case, how can it be said that the consecrated elements are ‘The body and blood of Christ’? Is the spiritual presence reliant on the spiritually prepared recipient? This would imply a view of the sacrament which might be called receptionism. Yet we have seen that Taylor argues that the consecrated elements are changed by the liturgical action and prayer of ‘the ministering man’, so Taylor does not believe this. Also, the very power of the sacrament to bring judgement on the unworthy recipient speaks of its transformation and the presence of Christ therein. It could be better understood by considering the invitation in Revelation 3.20: ‘Listen! I am standing at the door, knocking; if you hear my voice and open the door, I will come in to you and eat with you, and you with me.’ The recipient has to be ready and willing to admit Christ, present in the sacrament.

5.5 What are Taylor’s Main Themes?

In his section on Sacrifice and the Eucharist in *The Mystery of the Eucharist in the Anglican Tradition*, Kenneth Stevenson described how the eucharist had taken on a particular understanding of sacrifice during the Middle Ages. The eucharist had become a private offering by the priest, in which the elements, consecrated by the words of institution were offered, as Christ, to the Father. The offering became the Church’s offering, rather than Christ’s self-offering, and this was exacerbated by the idea of transaction; the offering was made, often on behalf of the souls in purgatory, or towards a specific aim, with the expectation of a particular benefit.¹³⁷ This became

¹³⁶ Taylor, VIII, p. 620.

¹³⁷ H.R. McAdoo and Kenneth Stevenson, *The Mystery of the Eucharist in the Anglican Tradition: What Happens in Holy Communion?* (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 1995), p. 109.

understood as re-offering Christ. It was these facets of medieval Catholic teaching which led the Reformers to strongly react against the idea of the mass as a sacrifice.¹³⁸ We have seen that Taylor regards the eucharist as a sacrifice by way of representation, a description which echoes the Summa of Thomas Aquinas and the Decrees of the Council of Trent and is in turn picked up by documents produced by the archbishops of Canterbury and York in the nineteenth century. Article XXXI distances the eucharist from any offering of sacrifice, because of a suspicion that sacrificial language implies adding to the already complete sacrifice of Christ on the cross. Taylor's argument is not that anything is added, but that the historic sacrifice is constantly represented by the eternal Christ who is seated at the right hand of the Father (and Taylor appears to have a quite literal spatial conception of this). This heavenly representation is mirrored on earth by the celebration of the eucharist, with the consecrated elements making Christ present and showing forth his body and blood. This is a temporal representation of the eternal, heavenly, representation. This offering is an intercession, so it is offered with intercessory purpose, both for those who gather at the table and for the whole Catholic Church. Porter sees Taylor as emphasising the eucharist as a series of events which mirror on earth Christ's present action in heaven. Taylor does not exclude the medieval understanding of the eucharistic sacrifice, that is the priest offering to God the Father the body and blood of Christ present in the consecrated elements, but the whole drama of acts and prayers receives more emphasis, and this also includes Christ's incarnation and birth.¹³⁹ Carroll summarises Taylor's understanding of eucharistic sacrifice as the 'earthly showing forth of Christ's heavenly mediation'.¹⁴⁰ He maintains that Taylor was the first Anglican divine to elaborate this view, and he believes that it had come to dominate High Anglican thought; this belief had also been incorporated into the new Roman Rite and is found in the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*.¹⁴¹ Kenneth Stevenson sees in Taylor 'coherence and unity' in his approach to eucharistic sacrifice; linking the eternal representation of

¹³⁸ McAdoo and Stevenson, p.110.

¹³⁹ Porter, p. 69.

¹⁴⁰ Carroll, 'Jeremy Taylor: an Essay in Liturgical Ecumenics', p. 83.

¹⁴¹ Carroll, 'Jeremy Taylor: an Essay in Liturgical Ecumenics', p. 83.

the sacrifice of the Cross by Christ in heaven with the commemorative repetition made by the priest at the eucharist and the sacramental presence in the elements.¹⁴² McAdoo has also emphasised the linkage between real presence and eucharistic sacrifice: *'The reality of the sacrifice is inextricably bound up with the reality of the Presence'*.¹⁴³ Stevenson too describes Taylor's teaching as novel: 'He has a novel understanding of eucharistic sacrifice in terms of the union of earthly and heavenly which has much to commend it.'¹⁴⁴

As we have seen in previous chapters, Taylor is deliberately imprecise in describing eucharistic presence. He is clear what he does not believe, neither that the elements are bare signs with no spiritual effect, nor that the consecrated elements become absolutely ontologically identified with the body and blood of Christ such that they act of their own virtue and can be said to be the body and blood of Christ in an unqualified way. He is equally clear that the unworthy are not fed by the body and blood of Christ, and risk punishment instead. Taylor's thought occupies a space between these poles. He refers to the consecrated elements as the body and blood of Christ and says that they exhibit the body and blood of Christ upon the altar, which is a copy of the heavenly altar. He maintains that the bread and wine remain bread and wine in substance, but that the presence of Christ is spiritual. He describes a dual feeding, the body is fed with the bread and wine and the spirit, or faith, is fed by the spiritual body. He says the bread and wine are changed ('holy in their change') and they are instruments in the hand of God, made by Christ that he might convey himself to the communicant. The real but spiritual presence is effectual, and it is proper to faith to believe that in the sacrament Christ gives his body and blood, to disbelieve this is to disbelieve Christ himself.

The benefits of receiving holy communion are not really in dispute, save that Taylor would not allow that reception alone brings forgiveness, previous repentance is necessary. There is a corporate element to receiving, the communicant is bound into the body of Christ; there is a future hope: the communicant is given the pledge of immortality. The sacrament washes away the stain of

¹⁴² Stevenson, *Covenant of Grace Renewed*, p. 122.

¹⁴³ McAdoo, p. 144.

¹⁴⁴ Stevenson, *Covenant of Grace Renewed*, p. 125.

repented sin and reconciles to God. Moreover, the sacrament is a defence against ‘ghostly enemies’ and brings enlightenment and spiritual discernment. Since the sacrament is received by faith it is unsurprising that Taylor argues that reception feeds faith, faith is needed for worthy receiving (and Taylor means an intellectual belief, rather than simply a disposition), and since faith is fed, faith grows by receiving, it is transformative.

Chapter 6: Fathers and Philosophers: Sources and Influences on Jeremy Taylor

A brief glance at Taylor's polemic works shows him quoting freely from patristic sources. Taylor mentions S. Austin (Augustine) some seventy times in *The Real Presence and Spiritual*, for example. In this chapter we will look at some of the most important patristic authors Taylor uses. However, we will begin by looking at the underlying aspects of Platonism which accompany Taylor's ideas of real presence and the currents of Platonism contemporary with him. This is because many of the Patristic authors Taylor uses would have been in some way shaped by Plato's thought.

6.1 Reason and Mystery: The Platonic Strands in Taylor's Thought.

In his biography of Taylor, Stranks comments that 'Taylor loved Plato' and was a contemporary of the group known as the 'Cambridge Platonists'.¹ McAdoo remarks that Taylor continually affirms that 'faith cannot be contrary to reason' which he also sees as a common theme of the Cambridge Platonists. Taylor was particularly a friend and correspondent of one of these men, Henry More.² More believed that 'Reason connects man to God'.³ Alongside reason they argued that the Christian faith had at its heart mystery, because 'the candle of the Lord was said to enable man to attain an almost mystical awareness of God at the point where the rational and the spiritual merge'.⁴ We have seen Taylor use the idea of mystery consistently through his exposition of eucharistic presence. In fact, Taylor uses a quotation from Plato's *Phaedrus* at the beginning of *The Real Presence and Spiritual* to assert the nature of the mystery.⁵ We find references to Taylor's friendship with More in the correspondence between More and Anne, Lady Conway.⁶ We see More referring to letters he has

¹ Stranks, p. 285.

² McAdoo, p. 118.

³ *The Cambridge Platonists*, Edited and Introduced by C. A. Patrides (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), p. 10.

⁴ Patrides, p. 17.

⁵ Taylor, VI, p. 11.

⁶ Anne Conway, *The Conway Letters: The Correspondence of Anne, Viscountess Conway, Henry More and their friends 1642 – 1684*, Edited by Marjorie Hope Nicholson, Revised and Introduced by Sarah Hutton (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992)

sent to Taylor;⁷ we also see that More had sent Taylor a copy of a book by ‘Des Cartes’ along with one of More’s own works.⁸ A later letter implies Taylor was not in accord with More’s thought in a book he had sent him⁹ although More was impressed with Taylor’s *Dissuasive from Popery*.¹⁰ Despite the obvious friendship between More and Taylor, Newey argues that there is no evidence Taylor was influenced directly by the Cambridge Platonists, although he shared many of their characteristic strands of thought.¹¹ They gave primacy to Origen and the Greek fathers over Tertullian and Augustine;¹² we have seen Taylor use the writings of Origen and Clement of Alexandria in his description of spiritual reality in *The Worthy Communicant*. Although Taylor uses Augustine widely, we saw at the beginning of this chapter that he is not a slavish follower of Augustine, remarking that Augustine’s teaching on predestination was an innovation. More believed that reason connects man to God¹³ and the group believed in the importance of mystery, a constant theme of Taylor’s, which was accentuated in their writing.¹⁴ They were, like Taylor, proponents of practical ethics¹⁵ and gave a high value to human reason¹⁶ which made them anti-Calvinists.¹⁷ Like Taylor, who we saw (in chapter 3) describe the spiritual as ‘more real’, they were dualists; they saw the mind as ontologically prior to matter¹⁸ and as idealists believed in ‘a world palpitating with spirit’.¹⁹ Offering an alternative to scholastic Aristotelianism,²⁰ they found Plato’s philosophy ‘most consistent and coherent’.²¹

In a paper which looks at the way in which four theologians make use of the concept of reason, Taylor, two of his contemporaries numbered among the Cambridge Platonists, Benjamin

⁷ Conway, p. 193, p. 195, p. 218.

⁸ Conway, p. 216.

⁹ Conway, p. 219.

¹⁰ Conway, p. 223.

¹¹ Newey, p. 15.

¹² Patrides, pp. 4,5.

¹³ Patrides, p. 10.

¹⁴ Patrides, p. 17.

¹⁵ Sarah Hutton, *British Philosophy in the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), p. 139.

¹⁶ Patrides, p. 10.

¹⁷ Hutton, p. 139.

¹⁸ Hutton, p. 140.

¹⁹ Patrides, p. 28.

²⁰ Hutton, p. 141.

²¹ Patrides, p. 41.

Whichcote and Ralph Cudworth, and the earlier theologian Richard Hooker (whose writing on sacraments we have investigated in Chapter 2), Edmund Newey considers what Taylor might mean by reason. He sets out his threefold purpose: to examine the doctrine of participation as deification; to examine the place of reason; and finally, to show the coherent understanding of discipleship as learned holiness shared between all four authors. Newey argues that ‘participation’ is an idea with roots in Plato and likewise ‘reasonableness’ which encompassed both practical reasonableness and the theoretical disposition of the knower. Both these ideas were incorporated into early Christian thought.²² He uses as his example Taylor’s sermon *Via Intelligentiae* preached to the University of Dublin in 1662. He sees in Taylor’s opening the influence of Descartes: radical doubt about the power of human reason.²³ Taylor argued that scripture cannot be properly interpreted except by inspired reason, and this is not the flash of inspiration, but a gradual and mysterious process.²⁴ It is by participation in God, through Christ in the Spirit that the Gospel will be revealed.²⁵ Newey shows that Taylor is reticent in his use of terms, but he interprets ‘the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist as a supremely mysterious instance of our participation in God’.²⁶ Newey also includes a quotation from *The Worthy Communicant* we have already considered, paralleling John Chrysostom, Taylor speaks of the love and wonder that comes with partaking in the divine nature at the eucharist.²⁷ Although Taylor is aware that to rely on reasonableness alone is not enough, he ‘insists we recognise reason as a divine gift in which we must participate if we are to have a share with God’.²⁸

In a paper on ‘Voluntarism in Jeremy Taylor and the Platonic Tradition’, Robert Hoopes describes Taylor’s thought as characterised by ‘Christian Platonism’.²⁹ He sees in Taylor the belief that ‘right reason forms the final court of ethical and religious appeal.’³⁰ Hoopes argues that right

²² Newey, p 4.

²³ Newey, p. 16.

²⁴ Newey, p. 16.

²⁵ Newey, p. 17.

²⁶ Newey, p. 17.

²⁷ Newey, p. 17.

²⁸ Newey, p. 18.

²⁹ Robert Hoopes, ‘Voluntarism in Jeremy Taylor and the Platonic Tradition’, *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 13.4 (1950), 341–54.

³⁰ Hoopes, p. 343.

reason involves ‘a threefold attitude toward the facts of reality. First, it is based upon a firm belief in certain absolute and eternal values as the most real things in the universe; second, it expresses confidence that these values are knowable by man; third, it tempers that confidence with the conviction that these values can be known only by a wholehearted consecration of the intellect, will, and affections to the great task of righteous living, of the imitation of Christ.’³¹ Hoopes sees Taylor in the philosophical tradition, begun with Plato, which sees right reason as part of religion. He includes quotations from Taylor showing that he believed reason to be a sure guide for faith.³² Hoopes argues that Taylor is positing a ‘specifically Christian exercise of reason [...] he is not glorifying unrestrained intellection, but the power of mind wholly dedicated to the service of Christian faith.’³³ Taylor cannot separate reason from the person who reasons, the whole personality is taken up in reasoning illuminated by the Holy Spirit.³⁴ ‘Reason, thus conceived, is “right” to the degree that it seeks [...] the knowledge of absolute Truth, that is, the Truth of Christianity.’³⁵ For Taylor, knowledge of God ‘rests ultimately not upon intellectual but upon moral grounds, that is, upon moral purification’.³⁶ Here Taylor is consistent with Henry More whose view of reason required a purified mind;³⁷ with that purified mind reason can connect man to God.³⁸

Hoopes continues his paper to show Taylor’s inconsistency. Taylor argues that God seems free to break the natural law.³⁹ In *Ductor Dubitantium*, Taylor wrote: ‘Indeed God cannot do an unjust thing, because whatsoever he wills or does is therefore just because he wills and does it.’⁴⁰ Here Taylor is following Ockham who wrote:

God cannot be obligated to any act. With Him a thing becomes right solely for the reason that He wants it to be so. If God as a total cause were to instigate hatred toward Himself in the will of somebody-just as He now causes it as a partial cause-such a

³¹ Hoopes, p. 343.

³² Hoopes, p. 346.

³³ Hoopes, p. 347.

³⁴ Hoopes, p. 348.

³⁵ Hoopes, p. 348.

³⁶ Hoopes, p. 348.

³⁷ Patrides, p. 8.

³⁸ Patrides, p. 10.

³⁹ Hoopes, p. 350.

⁴⁰ Hoopes, p. 351.

person would not be guilty of sin and neither would God, because He is not obligated to anything.⁴¹

Taylor has moved away from the Platonic God who is all-wise and all-good.⁴² Hoopes points out that

Taylor follows Descartes in his solution:

On the one hand he regarded distinctions between truth and falsehood, good and evil, as eternal truths, eternal from the fact that they are conceived and established by God, who is Himself eternal. On the other hand he was forced to admit that in the last analysis they are contingent upon the sovereign power and liberty of God, who indeed could have brought it about that two plus one do not equal three.⁴³

Hoopes argues Taylor has placed himself in an unsatisfactory position, he asserts the immutability of the law of nature, but he also ‘retreats from the *hybris* of viewing God as limited in any way by the order of truth he once established.’⁴⁴ So Taylor posits an ‘omnipotent God whose will works behind the back of His reason’ which is a ‘complete reversal of the Platonic tradition in Christian theology.’⁴⁵ Hoopes concludes that Taylor was philosophically unsystematic and inconsistent, having ‘mixed, if not confused, allegiance to the metaphysical bases of Christian Platonism’.⁴⁶

6.2 Taylor and Patristic Sources: What Taylor Understood as the Proper Way of Using the Fathers

We noted in an earlier chapter that Taylor’s use of the Fathers was not indiscriminate; he does not simply produce a quotation and let it stand on its own authority. In his work on the limits of religious toleration, *The Liberty of Prophesying*,⁴⁷ Taylor discusses the limitations of using patristic texts. Section 8 of this work is entitled ‘Of the disability of fathers or writers ecclesiastical to determine our questions with certainty and truth.’⁴⁸ In this section, he discusses how the Fathers may not be reliable as witnesses to tradition and may indeed innovate. He notes that Augustine taught absolute

⁴¹ Hoopes, p. 351.

⁴² Hoopes, p. 351.

⁴³ Hoopes, p. 352.

⁴⁴ Hoopes, p. 353.

⁴⁵ Hoopes, p. 353.

⁴⁶ Hoopes, p. 354.

⁴⁷ Taylor, *The Liberty of Prophesying*, V, pp. 341–602.

⁴⁸ Taylor, V, pp. 462–83.

predestination, but this was a novelty, contradicting the teaching of many earlier authorities, and carried by Augustine's prestige even though he ignored the witness of tradition.⁴⁹ The Fathers can bring conflicting witness and it is only honest to use their witness if both sides of any argument are brought to bear, simply claiming the testimony of two or three sources who support your case is not sufficient to settle a cause.⁵⁰ The Fathers may be wise, and they should be given credit for their wisdom, but there is a danger in giving them credit simply because they lived a long time ago, their authority has to have a proper foundation if it is to be of use to later readers: 'a divine commandment, human sanction, excellency of spirit, and greatness of understanding, on which things all human authority is regularly built.'⁵¹ In this section Taylor refers his readers who wish to understand more about the uses of patristic literature to 'M. Daillé *Du vrai usage des Peres*'⁵² a work we previously referred to in Chapter 4. In his dedication to a 1657 republication of a number of his polemic works bound together (including both *The Liberty of Prophesying* and *Episcopacy Asserted*) he writes to the dedicatee explaining why he thinks it reasonable to use the Fathers in support of episcopacy yet be much more hesitant in their use when addressing the question of religious toleration. Episcopacy was based on the institution of the apostles and a universal tradition, the Fathers witnessed to it and were, in the most part, bishops themselves. Episcopacy does not derive from their authority; they bear witness to the tradition already established.⁵³ Taylor sums up his approach to the use of patristic literature:

But now he that says that episcopacy besides all its own proper grounds hath also the witness of antiquity to have descended from Christ and His apostles, and he that says that in questions of religion the sayings of the fathers alone is demonstration of faith, does not speak things contradictory. He that says that we may dissent from the fathers when we have a reason greater than that authority, does no way oppose him that says you ought not to dissent from what they say when you have no reason great enough to outweigh it. He that says the words of the fathers are not sufficient to determine a nice question, stands not against him who says they are excellent corroboratives in a question already determined and practised accordingly He that says the sayings of fathers are no demonstration in a question, may say true; and yet he that says it is a

⁴⁹ Taylor, V, pp. 483–4.

⁵⁰ Taylor, V, p. 486.

⁵¹ Taylor, V, p. 487.

⁵² Taylor, V, p. 488.

⁵³ Taylor, *Dedication to the Volume of Polemical Works* V, pp. 4–5.

degree of probability, may say true too. He that says they are not our masters, speaks consonantly to the words of Christ; but he that denies them to be good instructors does not speak agreeably to reason or to the sense of the church. Sometimes they are excellent arbitrators, but not always good judges: in matters of fact they are excellent witnesses; in matters of right or question they are rare doctors, and because they bring good arguments, are to be valued accordingly.⁵⁴

As we noted when we considered Taylor's evidence from the Fathers at the end of *The Real Presence and Spiritual*, we see in Taylor a critical mind, able to bring the historic resources of the Fathers to his writing whilst approaching them with a critical eye. His inclination is to use them to bear witness to arguments which have already been grounded in Scripture. Their assertions alone will not be enough to decide or persuade, they must bear witness to a continuing tradition and to logical argument.

It is in this spirit that Taylor draws on the witness of the past. He uses patristic material in his polemic works which are based on argument and evidence, he is much less inclined to refer to them in his devotional works, although *The Worthy Communicant* does make extensive use of the Fathers in some sections. Since some works draw on the patristic witness very extensively, we cannot give a complete survey of all the sources Taylor uses; we will focus on some of the main ones and see how Taylor uses them to support his arguments and shape his theology.

6.3 John Chrysostom, Bishop of Constantinople

McAdoo remarks that Chrysostom, and in particular his treatise *On the Priesthood*, was a favourite of Taylor.⁵⁵ Taylor quotes from Chrysostom in *The Real Presence and Spiritual*, he warns his reader that his rhetorical style allows some to claim he believed in the corporal presence in the sacrament,⁵⁶ but this was not the evidence of his teaching. Taylor argues that Chrysostom's teaching is clear; who could dispute the meaning of: 'for as before the bread is sanctified we name it bread, but the divine grace sanctifying it by the means of the priest, it is freed from the name of bread, but it is esteemed

⁵⁴ Taylor, V, p. 5.

⁵⁵ McAdoo, p. 82, p. 96.

⁵⁶ Taylor, VI, p.28, p. 150.

worthy to be called the Lord's body, although the nature of bread remains in it.⁵⁷ Taylor shows that he is quite able to answer those who dispute Chrysostom's authorship of the text, he demonstrates how he is familiar with a number of ancient manuscripts which testify to its authenticity.⁵⁸ Taylor refers to Chrysostom in earlier sections of the work: in support of his argument for a wholly spiritual understanding of John 6;⁵⁹ and in arguing that the senses are not deceived by the elements in holy communion;⁶⁰ but it is the section which focuses on the doctrine of the early church which is most important here. He shows his rhetoric to go beyond what could possibly be meant by transubstantiation (and thus is hyperbole),⁶¹ and he shows that as he speaks of the elements being changed into Christ's body and blood, so he speaks in the same way about the communicants being transformed into Christ's body: 'He reduces us into the same mass or lump, [...] and in very deed makes us to be His body',⁶² so his language cannot be understood to refer to a carnal change in the elements.

In *Clerus Domini*, Taylor refers to Chrysostom's *On the Priesthood* in his list of witnesses to the practice of ordained ministers alone presiding at the eucharist⁶³ and for the proper dignity of the ministry and its scriptural foundation.⁶⁴

In *The Worthy Communicant*, Taylor quotes Chrysostom again, in his argument that there is no carnal presence in the elements,⁶⁵ and again to evidence the nature of sacramental presence: 'the meditation of S. Chrysostom is very pious and reasonable, "If we were wholly incorporeal, God would have given us graces unclothed with signs and sacraments; but because our spirits are in earthen vessels, God conveys His graces to us by sensible ministrations"'.⁶⁶ He further refers to his

⁵⁷ Taylor, VI, p. 150. Attributed to John Chrysostom, *Letter to Caesarius*.

⁵⁸ Taylor, VI, p. 151.

⁵⁹ Taylor, VI, p. 35. Referring to S. John Chrysostom, *Homilies on S. Matthew*, XLVII.

⁶⁰ Taylor, VI, pp. 95–6.

⁶¹ Taylor, VI, p. 135.

⁶² S. John Chrysostom, *Homilies on S. Matthew*, LXXXII, ch. 5, quoted in Taylor, VI, p. 135.

⁶³ Taylor, I, p. 34. Referring to S. John Chrysostom, *On the Priesthood*, III, ch. 5.

⁶⁴ Taylor, I, pp. 37, 38, 41. Referring to S. John Chrysostom, *On the Priesthood*.

⁶⁵ Taylor, VIII, p. 16. Referring to S. John Chrysostom, *Homilies in S. John*, XLVII and p. 110 Referring to S. John Chrysostom, *Homilies in S. John*, XLVI.

⁶⁶ S. John Chrysostom, *Homilies on S. Matthew*, LXXXII, ch. 4, quoted in Taylor, VIII, p. 31 and p. 112.

teaching about eucharistic sacrifice, quoting Chrysostom commending a daily memorial of the sacrifice once offered. In this ‘pious sacrifice’ ‘through Him we humbly do in earth, which He as a Son who is heard according to His reverence, does powerfully for us in heaven; where as an advocate He intercedes with His Father, whose office or work it is, for us to exhibit and interpose His flesh which He took of us and for us, and as it were to press it upon His Father.’⁶⁷ Here Taylor is using Chrysostom to support his own view of the parallel action of the earthly eucharist with the heavenly intercession of Christ. Taylor quotes Chrysostom in his passage encouraging his readers to desire holy communion,⁶⁸ and again to warn his readers that the sacrament should be approached in purity with respect, rather than with overconfident familiarity.⁶⁹ He also uses Chrysostom’s opinion in his argument that those who do live an appropriate life of repentance and prayer do well to communicate frequently: ‘for this is the daily bread, the heavenly super-substantial bread, by which our souls are nourished to life eternal. This is the medicine against our daily imperfections and intrudings of lesser crimes and sudden emigration of passions’.⁷⁰ Taylor further finds an opinion in Chrysostom on the question of whether someone who is fit should communicate at every opportunity provided, “‘If thou stand by, and do not communicate, thou art wicked, thou art shameless, thou art impudent,” so S. Chrysostom; and to him that objects, he is not worthy to communicate he answers, that “then neither is he fit to pray”’.⁷¹ Taylor remarks that Chrysostom refers to Sunday as ‘the day of bread’,⁷² i.e. the day when the eucharist was celebrated, in his argument for frequent communion.

We have seen Taylor is concerned that those who are unworthy should not receive, he cites Chrysostom amongst a number of bishops who urge penitential discipline⁷³ and quotes him writing ‘he would rather lose his life than admit unworthy men to the Lord’s table.’⁷⁴

⁶⁷ Taylor, VIII, p. 39. As noted earlier, there is an attribution to S. John Chrysostom, *Commentary on Hebrews*, Homily 17, but that doesn’t include all the quotation from Chrysostom used by Taylor.

⁶⁸ Taylor, VIII, p. 63. Referring to S. John Chrysostom, *Homilies on S. Matthew*, LXXXII, ch. 4.

⁶⁹ Taylor, VIII, p. 181, pp. 184–5. Referring to S. John Chrysostom, *Homilies on I Corinthians*, XXIV (I Cor. 10.23 – 24) and S. John Chrysostom, *Homilies on Hebrews*, XVII (Heb. 10.2 – 9).

⁷⁰ Taylor, VIII, p. 186. No attribution made.

⁷¹ S. John Chrysostom, *Homilies on Ephesians*, III, quoted in Taylor, VIII, p. 189.

⁷² Taylor, VIII, p. 191. This is attributed to S. John Chrysostom, *Homil. v. de Resurrect.*

⁷³ Taylor, VIII, p. 203.

⁷⁴ S. John Chrysostom, *Homilies on S. Matthew*, LXXXII, quoted in Taylor, VIII, p. 204.

His final quotation from Chrysostom concerns the appropriate reverence to give to the sacrament when approaching the altar.

For the wise men and the barbarians did worship this body in the manger with very much fear and reverence; let us therefore who are citizens of heaven at least not fall short of the barbarians. But thou seest Him not in the manger, but on the altar; and thou beholdest Him not in the Virgin's arms, but represented by the priest, and brought to thee in sacrifice by the holy Spirit of God.⁷⁵

In this quotation we see Taylor implying he understands that the elements are indeed changed by consecration by the action of the Holy Spirit, and that it is right that communicants should approach them with due reverence. For Taylor this means they should kneel to receive Holy Communion, a practice common to churches of east and west, and the proper practice of the church of England.⁷⁶

Harry Porter points out that there is a deeper influence of Chrysostom in some of Taylor's writing.⁷⁷ He shows that passages in *The Worthy Communicant* and *Holy Living* are paraphrases of Chrysostom. The passages in Taylor instruct the communicant in how he or she might approach the altar. They read:

When the holy man stands at the table of blessing and ministers the rite of consecration, then do as the angels do, who behold, and love, and wonder that the Son of God should become food to the souls of His servants; that He who cannot suffer any change or lessening, should be broken into pieces, and enter into the body to support and nourish the spirit, and yet at the same time remain in heaven while He descends to thee upon earth; that He who hath essential felicity should become miserable and die for thee, and then give Himself to thee for ever to redeem thee from sin and misery; that by His wounds He should procure health to thee, by His affronts He should entitle thee to glory, by His death He should bring thee to life, and by becoming a man He should make thee partaker of the divine nature.⁷⁸ (*Holy Living*)

And:

When the holy man reaches forth his hands upon the symbols and prays over them, and intercedes for the sins of the people, and breaks the holy bread and pours forth the sacred calice, place thyself by faith and meditation in heaven; and see Christ doing in His glorious manner this very thing which thou seest ministered and imitated upon the table of the Lord; and then remember that it is impossible thou shouldest miss of eternal

⁷⁵ S. John Chrysostom, *Homilies on I Corinthians*, XXIV, quoted in Taylor, VIII, p. 225.

⁷⁶ Taylor, VIII, p. 225.

⁷⁷ Porter, pp.63–4.

⁷⁸ Taylor, III, p. 217.

blessings which are so powerfully procured for thee by the Lord himself; unless thou wilt despise all this, and neglect so great salvation, and choosest to eat with swine the dirty pleasures of the earth, rather than thus to feast with saints and angels, and to eat the body of thy Lord with a clean heart and humble affections.⁷⁹ (*The Worthy Communicant*.)

The passage from Chrysostom reads:

When you see the Lord sacrificed and lying before you, and the Priest standing over the Sacrifice, and praying, and all who partake reddened with that precious Blood, can you think that you are still among men, and standing on earth? Are you not straightway transported to heaven, and, having cast forth from your soul every fleshly thought, do you not with naked soul and pure mind, look around upon the things in heaven? Oh the marvel! Oh the loving-kindness of God to men! He that sits above with the Father is, at the same time, held in our hands, and suffers himself to be clasped and embraced by those who wish; and then do all this by the eyes.⁸⁰

Porter reckons the first as ‘what is perhaps the most beautiful sentence on this topic ever to be composed in the English language’.⁸¹ He suggests the first passage has so digested the words of Chrysostom as to render the connection less recognisable than the later passage from *The Worthy Communicant* however, the latter is more informative.⁸² In both the Chrysostom passage and the passages from Taylor we recognise the themes in Taylor’s eucharistic teaching: the parallel between the liturgical action of the eucharist and the self-offering of Christ in heaven, the representation of the sacrifice of the cross, and the effect of the sacrifice in the present on the worshipping Christian.⁸³

6.4 Origen c. 185 – c. 254: Alexandrian Biblical Critic, Exegete, Theologian and Spiritual Writer.

In *The Real Presence and Spiritual*, Taylor first quotes Origen^{84, 85} in his investigation of John 6. Taylor finds him to provide a strong argument for a spiritual understanding of Jesus’ words, ‘Unless

⁷⁹ Taylor, VIII, p. 224.

⁸⁰ *On The Priesthood*, III, ch. 4, s. 177, in T. Allen Moxon, *St. Chrysostom On The Priesthood* (London: SPCK, 1907), p. 62.

⁸¹ Porter, p. 62.

⁸² Porter, p. 64.

⁸³ Porter, p. 62.

⁸⁴ ‘Origen’, in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, pp. 1008–10.

⁸⁵ For a general background to the early Fathers’ understanding of the eucharist see: Everett Ferguson, ‘Sacraments in the Pre-Nicene Period’ in *The Oxford Handbook of Sacramental Theology*, ed. Hans Boersma and Matthew Levering (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 126–139.

ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood'. Origen argues that a literal understanding is false: 'this letter kills', the phrase should be understood spiritually.⁸⁶

In his discussion on the words of institution he includes the witness of Origen in his argument that the consecration is made 'by the prayers of the ministering man': 'Origen calls it bread made holy, a holy thing by prayer'.⁸⁷ The quotation also supports Taylor's insistence that the bread remains bread, although it is 'made holy'. Taylor similarly quotes Origen in *Clerus Domini*: 'we eat the bread, holy, and made the body of Christ by prayer'.⁸⁸ In the following section of *The Real Presence* he again quotes Origen, in Latin, '*typicum symbolicumque corpus*',⁸⁹ describing the consecrated bread as a type and symbol of the body (of Christ). (Taylor repeats this in his section on the patristic witness, quoting Origen as describing the consecrated elements as '*corpus symbolicum et typicum*'.⁹⁰) And later in the same section: 'the bread which is called the eucharist is to us the symbol of thanksgiving or eucharist to God.'⁹¹ Further, he quotes Origen's arguments against the Marcionites, who did not believe in the corporal reality of Jesus; Origen refers to the bread and wine as 'images and figures' of Christ's physical body and blood.⁹² (Taylor refers to this argument again in a later section.⁹³) Here, once more, Taylor is emphasising the witness to the bread which remains unchanged in substance, although it becomes a symbol of Christ's body. He also shows that Origen holds to the opinion that the wicked do not receive the body and blood of Christ.⁹⁴

In the curious section revolving around Jesus' words from Matthew 15, 'Whatsoever entereth into the body goeth into the belly and is cast forth into the draught', Taylor finds an ally in Origen. He argues that the material part, the typical and symbolical body, undergoes the normal digestive

⁸⁶ Origen, *Sermons on Leviticus*, VII, quoted in Taylor, VI, pp. 34–5.

⁸⁷ Origen, *Contra Celsum*, VIII, ch. 33, quoted in Taylor, VI, p. 44.

⁸⁸ Origen, *Contra Celsum*, VIII, ch. 33, quoted in Taylor, I, pp. 46–7.

⁸⁹ Origen, *Commentary on the Gospel of S. Matthew*, XI, ch. 14, quoted in Taylor, VI, p. 48.

⁹⁰ Taylor, VI, p. 153. No attribution made.

⁹¹ Origen, *Contra Celsum*, VIII, ch. 57, quoted in Taylor, VI, p. 57.

⁹² Taylor, VI, pp. 57–8. This is attributed as a quotation from Maximus' *Adamntii Dialogus de Recta in Deum Fide*.

⁹³ Taylor, VI, p. 148.

⁹⁴ Taylor, VI, p. 71. Referring to Origen, *Commentary on S. Matthew*, XI, ch. 14.

processes, and so ‘distinguishes the material part from the spiritual in the sacrament’.⁹⁵ Taylor shows that others have tried to subtly alter Origen’s clear meaning, but they are twisting his meaning when they argue that Origen is speaking only of accidents. Origen’s words ‘material part’ and symbolical body’ cannot mean accidents without substance, Taylor argues that would be nonsense. He notes that around Gregory IV’s time Origen’s argument ‘was better answered, and the article determined, that “the bread and wine are spiritually made the body of Christ, which being a meat of the mind and not of the belly, is not corrupted, but remaineth unto everlasting life”’.⁹⁶

We should not leave our investigation into Taylor’s use of Origen in *The Real Presence and Spiritual* without noting his comment that ‘Origen gelding himself’ is an example of misreading scripture literally, rather than expounding words of scripture by ‘tropes and allegories.’⁹⁷

McAdoo writes that in *The Worthy Communicant* Taylor is developing his emphasis on the work of the Holy Spirit in Holy Communion, and uses the teaching of Clement, Origen, Tertullian and Chrysostom in particular.⁹⁸ In fact, although he does refer to Origen in *The Worthy Communicant*, Taylor does so very sparingly. The first quotation echoes what we saw earlier in Taylor’s argument on John 6: ‘For this is the letter which in the New testament kills him who understands not spiritually what is spoken to him under the signification of meat and flesh, and blood and drink’.⁹⁹ Here Taylor is using Origen (along with Athanasius, Ambrose, Augustine and Basil) to remind his reader that what is received is a spiritual, not carnal reality. He footnotes a further quotation from Origen in Latin to his assertion that the ‘eating and drinking of Christ’s flesh and blood can only be done by the ministries of life and of the Spirit’, the quotation underlines that the sacrifice is of spiritual things.¹⁰⁰ Nevertheless, Taylor also quotes Origen in his ‘Practical consideration from preceding discourses’, the instruction he gives to his reader. We should recognise

⁹⁵ Origen, *Commentary on the Gospel of S. Matthew*, XI, ch. 14, quoted in Taylor, VI, p. 78.

⁹⁶ Taylor, VI, pp. 78–80. Referring to Origen, *Commentary on S. Matthew*, XV.

⁹⁷ Taylor, VI, p. 65.

⁹⁸ McAdoo, p. 172.

⁹⁹ Origen, *Homilies in Leviticus*, VII, quoted in Taylor, VIII, p. 16.

¹⁰⁰ Taylor, VIII, p. 27. Attributed to Origen, *Homily on Psalm XXXVIII*.

that the sacrament is ‘a holy thing, appointed for our sanctification’¹⁰¹ and the name eucharist is given by Origen, ‘The bread which is called the eucharist, is the symbol of our thanksgiving towards God.’¹⁰²

Taylor again footnotes a quotation from Origen in support of his assertion from Augustine that the sacrament is called the body and blood of Christ because it is a figure of them (were it not a figure it could be neither sign nor sacrament) which says that the body is given in sign and again ‘typus et symbolum’, sign and type.¹⁰³ Taylor also refers to Origen in his instructions before receiving holy communion. We learn from Origen: ‘We eat the bread which is made a holy thing, and which sanctifies and makes holy all them who use it with holy and salutary purposes’,¹⁰⁴ i.e. we must approach the altar with the right spirit. Origen is finally cited in support of daily reception of the sacrament, for it is good to be with Christ.¹⁰⁵

6.5 Tertullian (c. 160 – c. 255) African Church Father

As with Origen, Taylor first refers to Tertullian¹⁰⁶ in *The Real Presence and Spiritual* in the section on John 6; Tertullian argues that it is the Spirit that brings life, not eating Jesus’ flesh in any fleshy sense.¹⁰⁷ A further reference to Tertullian in the same section shows him describing the word in allegorical terms, which will reoccur in *The Worthy Communicant*:

because the Word was made flesh, therefore He was desired for life, to be devoured by hearing, to be ruminated or chewed by the understanding, to be digested by faith; for a little before He called His flesh also celestial bread, still, or all the way, urging by an allegory of necessity food, the memory of their fathers who preferred the bread and flesh of Egypt before the divine calling.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰¹ Origen, *Contra Celsum*, VIII, ch. 33, quoted in Taylor, VIII, p. 44.

¹⁰² Origen, *Contra Celsum*, VIII, ch. 57, quoted in Taylor, VIII, p. 46.

¹⁰³ Taylor, VIII, p. 110. The source of the quotation is unclear.

¹⁰⁴ Origen, *Contra Celsum*, VII, ch. 33, quoted in Taylor, VIII, p. 161.

¹⁰⁵ Taylor, VIII, p. 184. No attribution made.

¹⁰⁶ ‘Tertullian’, in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, pp. 1352–3.

¹⁰⁷ Taylor, VI, pp. 21, 31. Referring to Tertullian, *On the Resurrection of the Flesh*, ch. 32.

¹⁰⁸ Tertullian, *On the Resurrection of the Flesh*, ch. 37, quoted in Taylor, VI, p. 34.

Eating the Word made flesh becomes hearing and understanding the Word. In the following section on the words of institution, Taylor includes Tertullian amongst a number of witnesses who refer to the sacrament as bread, Christ called bread his body.¹⁰⁹ And again in the next section he shows Tertullian referring to the sacrament as bread and Christ's body in two quotations and in a further argument which shows that as eating the sacrament broke the fast it remained bread without substantial conversion.¹¹⁰

In his argument that sight, touch and taste are not deceived when we receive the sacrament Taylor turns immediately to Tertullian and his argument against the Marcionites based on the First Letter of John: 'his testimony was false, if eyes, and ears, and hands be deceived.'¹¹¹ Tertullian's argument about the witness of the senses for the Resurrection becomes Taylor's argument for the unchanged substance of bread and wine. Tertullian argued that 'it is not lawful to doubt of our senses'¹¹² and this provides a firm foundation for Taylor's argument that since we taste and touch and see bread and wine, that is what they are, unaltered in substance by consecration. He also includes a section from Tertullian's discourse on the resurrection of the body which refers to change and perdition in his discussion concerning the logical inconsistency of the argument that bread is both changed and yet perishes in transubstantiation.¹¹³

In his section showing that transubstantiation was 'not the primitive doctrine of the church' Taylor first quotes Tertullian in a discussion about baptism,¹¹⁴ and later in a section showing how Christians were at pains to show their worship did not involve consuming blood: 'Tertullian in his Apologetic presses further, affirming that to discover Christians they use to offer them a black pudding, or something in which blood remained, and they chose rather to die than to do it.'¹¹⁵ Taylor returns to Tertullian's writing against Marcion: 'He proves against the Marcionites that Christ had a

¹⁰⁹ Tertullian, *An Answer to the Jews*, ch. 10, referred to in Taylor, VI, p. 47.

¹¹⁰ Taylor, VI, pp. 57–8. Referring to Tertullian, *Against Marcion*, ch. 40 and Tertullian, *On Prayer*, ch. 14.

¹¹¹ Tertullian, *De Anima*, ch. 17, quoted in Taylor, VI, p. 85.

¹¹² Tertullian, *De Anima*, ch. 17, quoted in Taylor, VI, p. 91.

¹¹³ Taylor, VI, p. 127. Referring to Tertullian, *On the Resurrection of the Flesh*, ch. 55.

¹¹⁴ Taylor, VI, p. 136. Referring to Tertullian, *On Baptism*, ch. 19.

¹¹⁵ Taylor, VI, p. 138. Referring to Tertullian, *The Apology*, ch. 9.

true real body in His incarnation, by this argument, “because in the sacrament He gave bread as the figure of His body, saying, This is My body, that is, the figure of My body”.¹¹⁶ This is a long subsection (about 3 pages) as Taylor shows that Roman Catholic commentators have been concerned by Tertullian’s witness and so try to alter its sense, and also there are those who admit Tertullian’s sense but describe it as in error. Nevertheless, Taylor is confident that Tertullian believes the sacrament to be a figure of Christ’s body, and the elements remain bread and wine in substance, supporting his position.

As we found when looking at Taylor’s references to Origen, although McAdoo argues Tertullian’s teaching to be important to Taylor’s exposition in *The Worthy Communicant*, he, in fact, quotes him seldom. The first quotation is one we have already met in *The Real Presence and Spiritual* quoted above.¹¹⁷ Taylor refers to Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria, claiming both to have taught ‘The word of God is called flesh and blood.’¹¹⁸ Taylor uses this in support of his argument that ‘The “flesh” of Christ is His word: the “blood” of Christ is His spirit; and by believing in His word, and being assisted and conducted by His spirit, we are nourished up to life; and so Christ is our food, so He becomes life unto our souls.’¹¹⁹ Taylor refers to Tertullian’s teaching that ‘we are baptized in the passion of our Lord’ in his argument that the Spirit is ministered in baptism and we feed on the body and blood of Christ in baptism by the ministration of the Spirit in the sacrament.¹²⁰

In his description of the eucharistic sacrifice as an intercession for the whole church, Taylor uses a phrase from Tertullian, ‘by pure prayer’, as a description of the sacrifice.¹²¹ He also refers to Tertullian in his admonition that those who come to the eucharist must enquire into themselves and come with pure heart – the quotation from Tertullian is an observation about the practice of pagan priests offering animal sacrifice!¹²²

¹¹⁶ Tertullian, *Against Marcion*, IV, ch. 40, quoted in Taylor, VI, p. 142.

¹¹⁷ Taylor, VIII, p. 17.

¹¹⁸ Taylor, VIII, p. 18. Referring to Tertullian, *On the Resurrection of the Flesh*, ch. 37.

¹¹⁹ Taylor, VIII, p. 18. Again, referring to Tertullian, *On the Resurrection of the Flesh*, ch. 37.

¹²⁰ Tertullian, *On Baptism*, ch. 19 quoted in Taylor, VIII, p. 22.

¹²¹ Tertullian, *Letter to Scapula*, ch. 2, quoted in Taylor, VIII, p. 40.

¹²² Taylor, VIII, p. 65. Referring to Tertullian, *The Apology*, ch. 30.

Taylor returns to his overarching theme that the bread and wine remain unchanged in substance and he again quotes Tertullian's defence of the evidence of our senses: 'it is (not only unreasonable but) unlawful to contradict the testimony of our sense; lest the same question be made of Christ himself; lest it be suspected that He also might be deceived when He heard His Father's voice from heaven.'¹²³ And he again refers to Tertullian describing the sacrament as a figure of Christ's body.¹²⁴ Finally, Tertullian is referenced in Taylor's arguments for frequent communion¹²⁵ and for proper reverence at the eucharist.¹²⁶

6.6 St. Augustine or Austin (354 – 430) Bishop of Hippo

Despite Taylor's misgivings over some of Augustine's^{127, 128} teaching that we saw earlier, Taylor draws extensively from Augustine in his arguments. In his opening section of *The Real Presence and Spiritual*, Taylor refers to Augustine's arguments that words in scripture often refer not to the substance of a thing, but to its 'quality and effect'.¹²⁹ In his long section on John 6, Taylor refers to Augustine in his argument that the words of Jesus cannot refer to the sacrament, since Jesus says all who receive his body receive life and Augustine says that some receive the sacrament 'to life and some to death'.¹³⁰ He quotes Augustine's tractates on John: 'to believe in him, that is to eat the bread of life; who believes eats'.¹³¹ (We will meet this again in *The Worthy Communicant*.¹³²) Later in the

¹²³ Tertullian, *De Anima*, ch. 17, quoted in Taylor, VIII, p. 105.

¹²⁴ Taylor, VIII, p. 110. Referring to Tertullian, *Against Marcion*, IV, ch. 40.

¹²⁵ Taylor, VIII, p. 188. Referring to Tertullian, *De Corona*, ch. 3.

¹²⁶ Taylor, VIII, p. 225. Referring to Tertullian, *On Prayer*, ch. 16.

¹²⁷ 'Augustine, St., of Hippo', in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, pp. 108–10.

¹²⁸ For a discussion of Augustine's approach to sacraments see: Thomas L. Humphries, Jr., 'St. Augustine of Hippo', in *Christian Theologies of the Sacraments: A Comparative Introduction*, Edited by Justin S. Holcomb and David A. Johnson (New York: New York University Press, 2017), pp. 41–58.

¹²⁹ Taylor, VI, p. 16. Referring to S. Augustine, *Contra Faustum*, XI, ch. 7.

¹³⁰ Taylor, VI, p. 31.

¹³¹ S. Augustine, *Tractates on S. John*, XXVI, 2, quoted in Taylor, VI, p. 35 (*Credere in eum, hoc est manducare panem vivum; qui credit manducat.*)

¹³² Taylor, VIII, p. 16.

same section he again quotes from Augustine, (his commentary on Psalm 99) which Taylor uses as evidence that Augustine believes ‘sacramentally and spiritually’ ‘to be all one’.¹³³

Taylor includes Augustine’s witness in his argument that the sacrament is consecrated by the Holy Spirit following the prayers of the priest (rather than by a set form of words) in his discussion of the words of institution¹³⁴ (a reference Taylor also makes in *Clerus Domini*¹³⁵) and that the sacrament remains bread after consecration.¹³⁶ He is also a useful ally in Taylor’s argument that blessing the bread and wine cannot in any way destroy them, for blessing adds: “‘He that is the fountain of all being, is not the cause of not being, much less can His blessing cause any thing not to be.’” It follows therefore that by blessing the bread becomes better, but therefore it still remains.’¹³⁷ Further, because the bread remains unchanged in substance it retains its ability to nourish the body, whereas the sacramental nature of the eucharist also nourishes the understanding.¹³⁸

Taylor quotes from Augustine’s ‘On Christian Doctrine’ to support his argument that it was normal for centuries to understand the words of institution as figurative¹³⁹ and reinforces this with Augustine’s argument that as baptism is said to be the tomb, so the sacrament is said to be the body of Christ. It is true, but not literally so.¹⁴⁰ Augustine himself says ‘the thing which signifies is wont to be called by that which it signifies’, so figurative speech is a common component of Biblical narrative and can be assumed in the words of institution.¹⁴¹ Taylor refers back to Augustine’s statement that believing is eating Christ’s body in his argument that through history God’s people

¹³³ S. Augustine *Exposition on Psalm 99*, quoted in Taylor, VI, pp. 39–40 ‘that which I have spoken is to be understood spiritually, ye are not to eat that body which ye see; I have commended a sacrament to you, which being understood spiritually will give you life’.

¹³⁴ S. Augustine, *On the Trinity*, III, ch. 4, quoted in Taylor, VI, p. 44 ‘*prece mystica consecratum*’.

¹³⁵ Taylor, I, pp. 46, 47, 50, 51.

¹³⁶ S. Augustine, *City of God*, XVII, ch. 5, quoted in Taylor, VI, p. 53 “‘to eat the bread, in the New testament is the sacrifice of Christians;” they are the words of S. Austin’.

¹³⁷ Taylor, VI, p. 55. Attributed to S. Augustine, *Book of 83 Diverse Questions*, q. 21.

¹³⁸ S. Augustine, *Sermons on the New Testament*, IX, quoted in Taylor, VI, p. 58 ‘The eucharist is our daily bread, but we receive it so that we are not only nourished by the belly, but also by the understanding’.

¹³⁹ S. Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine*, III, ch. 37, quoted in Taylor, VI, p. 62 ‘*Tropica loquutio cum fit ubi fieri solet, sine labore sequitur intellectus*’.

¹⁴⁰ Taylor, VI, p. 63 ‘*ut baptismus sepulchrum, sic hoc est corpus meum*’. Incorrectly attributed to S. Augustine, *Contra Faustum*, XX, ch. 21.

¹⁴¹ Taylor, VI, p. 63.

have been fed, and received the body of Christ through faith. Since some of those people predated the incarnation, they could not have eaten his flesh literally, but as spiritual food. As they did ‘under the sacrament of Manna’ so we do ‘under the sacrament of bread and wine’.¹⁴² Taylor also uses a long quotation from Augustine to underline his argument that ‘wicked men do not eat the body, nor drink the blood of Christ’¹⁴³ demonstrating that from Augustine it can be shown:

1) he dogmatically declares that the wicked man does not eat Christ’s body truly: 2) he does eat it sacramentally: 3) that to eat with effect, is to eat Christ’s body truly; to which if they please to add this, that to eat it spiritually is to eat it with effect, it follows by S. Austin’s doctrine that spiritually is really, and that there is no true and real body of Christ eaten in the sacrament but by the faithful receiver.¹⁴⁴

Taylor further underlines his conclusion by quoting again: ‘then to each receiver it becomes the body and blood of Christ, if that which is taken in the sacrament be in the very truth itself spiritually eaten, and spiritually drunk’¹⁴⁵ which supports Taylor’s argument that the presence is real and spiritual. He is not yet finished with Augustine; two further quotations press home his point that the wicked do not eat the body and blood of Christ.¹⁴⁶

In his argument concerning the location of Jesus’ body, Taylor turns again to quotations from Augustine: ‘Christ as God is every where, but in respect of His body He is determined to a particular residence in heaven’ and ‘It behoveth that the body of our Lord since it is raised again should be in one place alone, but the truth is spread over all.’¹⁴⁷ He sees that this has proven a difficulty for some of his opponents who appear to have corrupted the text, weakening must be (or should be) to may be, but this alteration is shown to be against the readings of many earlier authorities. For, if as Taylor argues, Jesus’ body is located in heaven, his actual body cannot be in the sacrament.¹⁴⁸ This argument

¹⁴² Taylor, VI, p. 66. Referring to S. Augustine, *Tractates in S. John*, XXVI.

¹⁴³ Taylor, VI, p. 71. Referring to S. Augustine, *City of God*, XXI, ch. 25.

¹⁴⁴ Taylor, VI, p. 72. Attributed to S. Augustine, *Serm. ii. de verb. apost.*

¹⁴⁵ Taylor, VI, p. 72. Attributed to S. Augustine, *Serm. ii. de verb. apost.* The editors note that both Taylor and Bellarmine had misapprehended the passage.

¹⁴⁶ Taylor, VI, pp. 72–3. Referring to S. Augustine, *Tractates in S. John*, XXVI and LIX.

¹⁴⁷ S. Augustine, *Letter 187 (To Dardanus)*, ch. 10, and S. Augustine, *Tractates in S. John*, XXX, quoted in Taylor, VI, p. 82.

¹⁴⁸ Taylor, VI, p. 82.

is underlined with a further quotation from Augustine in which he argues that Jesus tells his disciples they will not have him with them according to the flesh.¹⁴⁹

In his instruction to the newly baptised, Augustine tells them to believe the evidence of their senses, they see bread and the chalice of wine, they are not deceived, they can trust their senses in this matter.¹⁵⁰ Along with Tertullian, Augustine gives weight to the argument that the understanding should assent to the evidence of the senses.¹⁵¹ Taylor's argument that the senses are not deceived, bread and wine remain unchanged in substance, are supported by Augustine.

In the complex section on the logic of transubstantiation, Taylor first uses Augustine in his argument for reason: 'he that opposes the authority of the holy scriptures against manifest and certain reason, does neither understand himself nor the scripture';¹⁵² in his argument that the omnipotence of God is not sufficient explanation for the logical inconsistencies of transubstantiation¹⁵³ and then in his argument that it is not the property of bodies to be in more than one place: 'Christ as man according to the body is in a place and goes from a place, and when He comes to another place is not in the place from whence He came.'¹⁵⁴ Taylor argues that ubiquity is a property of God alone, and cannot be communicated to Christ's body, which is created. Augustine is again used as authority arguing that it is an attribute of God to be 'unlimited and to be undefined by places.'¹⁵⁵

In his opening paragraphs of his section looking at the witness of the Fathers on the nature of the sacrament, Taylor refers to Augustine, along with S. Cyprian, as someone who affirmed that the same words represent both sign and signified.¹⁵⁶ And in underlining the spiritual meaning of the reception of the body and blood of Christ he quotes Augustine on baptism: 'that we are made partakers of the body and blood of Christ, when in baptism we are made members of Christ; and are

¹⁴⁹ Taylor, VI, p. 83. Referring to S. Augustine, *Tractates in S. John*, L.

¹⁵⁰ Taylor, VI, p. 86 '*Quod ergo vidistis panis est et calix; quod vobis etiam oculi vestri renunciant*'. Attributed to a sermon by S. Augustine referred to by S. Bede on I Cor. 10. Possibly Sermon 227, 2228 or 228b.

¹⁵¹ Taylor, VI, p. 91.

¹⁵² S. Augustine, *Letter 143*, quoted in Taylor, VI, p. 98.

¹⁵³ Taylor, VI, p. 100.

¹⁵⁴ S. Augustine, *Tractates in S. John*, XXXI, quoted in Taylor, VI, p. 108.

¹⁵⁵ Taylor, VI, p. 109. Attributed to S. Augustine, *Lib. de essent. divinit.*

¹⁵⁶ Taylor, VI, p. 134. Referring to S. Augustine, *Letter to Boniface*.

not estranged from the fellowship of that bread and chalice, although we die before we eat that bread, and drink that cup.’¹⁵⁷ (Taylor will again quote this in *The Worthy Communicant*.¹⁵⁸)

In the paragraph on Augustine in the section on the Fathers, Taylor begins by observing ‘it is evident that he was a protestant in this article’.¹⁵⁹ For Augustine wrote, ‘for if the sacraments had not a certain similitude of those things whereof they are sacraments, they were no sacraments at all [...] as therefore according to a certain manner the sacrament of the body of Christ is the body of Christ, the sacrament of the blood of Christ is the blood of Christ.’¹⁶⁰ Taylor furnishes his reader with further quotations which refer to the sacrament as a sign to be understood spiritually.¹⁶¹

In *The Worthy Communicant* Taylor quotes Augustine’s definition of a sacrament: ‘when the word and the element are joined, then it is a perfect sacrament’;¹⁶² later he will quote him again: ‘The body of Christ is truth and figure too.’¹⁶³ For Augustine the sacrament is ‘the intelligible’, ‘the invisible’, ‘the spiritual body’.¹⁶⁴ These descriptions are consistent with Taylor’s own position. Taylor also turns to Augustine in describing the nature of the eucharist as a sacrifice, he quotes him describing Christ as both priest and oblation: ‘the sacrament of which He would have the daily sacrifice of the church to be’.¹⁶⁵

It is clear that the witness of Augustine provides substantial material for Taylor in his argument against transubstantiation, and that Augustine’s teaching on the spiritual reception of the body and blood of Christ – feeding on Christ outside the sacrament – are a key component of Taylor’s sacramental thought. Augustine also furnishes quotations on the disposition¹⁶⁶ and fervour¹⁶⁷ required of communicants.

¹⁵⁷ Taylor, VI, p. 136. Again referring to the sermon *Ad Infantes* quoted by S. Bede.

¹⁵⁸ Taylor, VIII, p. 22.

¹⁵⁹ Taylor, VI, p. 151.

¹⁶⁰ S. Augustin, *Letter 98 (to Boniface)*, quoted in Taylor, VI, p. 152.

¹⁶¹ Taylor, VI, p. 152.

¹⁶² S. Augustine, *Tractates in S. John LXXX*, quoted in Taylor, VIII, p. 30.

¹⁶³ Taylor, VIII, p. 110. No attribution made.

¹⁶⁴ Taylor, VIII, pp. 110–1. No attribution made.

¹⁶⁵ S. Augustine, *City of God*, X, ch. 20, quoted in Taylor, VIII, p. 39.

¹⁶⁶ Taylor, VIII, p. 61. No attribution made.

¹⁶⁷ Taylor, VIII, p. 63. Referring to S. Augustine, *Confessions*, IX, ch. 13.

6.7 S. Ambrose (c. 339 – 97) Bishop of Milan

Taylor does not refer to Ambrose¹⁶⁸ as much as he does to Augustine, but it is instructive to review his quotations from Ambrose as we saw in an earlier chapter that Ambrose's writing was seen as the foundation which led to the argument for substantial change in the eucharistic elements. In his section on John 6 in *The Real Presence and Spiritual*, Taylor shows that Ambrose expounds the meaning in a spiritual sense and denies the proper and natural sense¹⁶⁹ and he refers in passing to Ambrose in his argument that the Holy Spirit alone is ubiquitous in the section on 'Transubstantiation against Reason'.¹⁷⁰

In his section on the Fathers' teaching on the sacrament, Taylor first refers to Ambrose when he compares baptism with eucharist. Ambrose does argue that the water's nature is changed by blessing, but it is the spiritual purpose which is important, grace is the chief ingredient.¹⁷¹ In his references to the eucharist, Ambrose clearly describes the oblation as a 'figure of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ', and maintains that the 'bread should remain what it is, and yet be changed into another thing' and 'the things be what they were, and yet be changed into another'.¹⁷² Taylor has found Ambrose as a witness to his assertion that the substance of the bread remains unchanged. Nevertheless, he also quotes Ambrose: 'We worship the flesh of Christ in the mysteries as the apostles did worship it in our Saviour'¹⁷³ in his arguments against giving divine honour to the signs, this seems more ambiguous, as Ambrose could be understood to mean that the elements are due the same reverence as the human person of Jesus. In *The Worthy Communicant* Ambrose is quoted along with Origen and Chrysostom in Taylor's argument that the body and blood of Christ is 'not touched by the body, nor seen with the eyes, but by faith it is seen and touched';¹⁷⁴ a theme Taylor takes up

¹⁶⁸ 'Ambrose, St.', in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, pp. 42–3.

¹⁶⁹ Taylor, VI, p. 35. Referring to S. Ambrose, *On the Sacraments*, V, ch. 4 and *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke*, VI, ch. 8.

¹⁷⁰ Taylor, VI, p. 115.

¹⁷¹ Taylor, VI, p. 136. Referring to S. Ambrose, *On the Sacraments*, I, ch. 5.

¹⁷² S. Ambrose, *On the Sacraments*, IV, ch. 5, quoted in Taylor, VI, p. 149.

¹⁷³ S. Ambrose, *On the Holy Spirit*, III, ch. 11, quoted in Taylor, VI, p. 167.

¹⁷⁴ Taylor, VIII, p. 16. Attributed to S. Ambrose, *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke*, VI, ch. 8.

again later.¹⁷⁵ Ambrose bears witness that ‘thou receivest the sacrament as the similitude of Christ’s body, but thou shalt receive the grace and the virtue of the true nature.’¹⁷⁶ Taylor also invokes Ambrose in instructing the communicant in repentance.¹⁷⁷

In *Clerus Domini*, Taylor invokes Ambrose’s witness to argue that the Holy Spirit is the actor in consecration, ‘man imposes his hand, but God gives the grace’.¹⁷⁸

As we have seen, Taylor is well versed in the Fathers, and he uses their witness to reinforce his own ideas. All the patristic witnesses we have used as examples had a view of the world which held spiritual and material together. They believed in dimensions of reality beyond those which can be apprehended by the senses. We move on from their witness, and the part they play in supporting and shaping Taylor’s writing, to consider the philosophical assumptions which underpin their common understanding of the world.

6.8 Platonic Theology Redivivus

Taylor clearly was very well read in the patristic literature, but he was careful to use his sources as evidence to confirm his arguments, rather than as sources which introduced new ideas. He argued from scripture and used the tradition as a means to support the argument from scripture; the patristic sources always serve as witnesses, not innovators. Each of the examples show the witness to bread and wine remaining in the sacrament, supporting Taylor’s argument that there is no change in substance. Augustine’s witness is particularly important for Taylor, and it seems that Taylor strongly approves of Augustine’s description of a sacrament as ‘the word and the element joined’, this description is in sympathy with Taylor’s continued argument that the bread and wine remain as they are, yet the presence of Christ is added for those who spiritually discern it. This affirmation of

¹⁷⁵ Taylor, VIII, p. 111, p. 113.

¹⁷⁶ S. Ambrose, *On the Sacraments*, VI, ch.1, quoted in Taylor, VIII, p. 27.

¹⁷⁷ Taylor, VIII, p. 156, pp. 180–181, p. 186, p. 194. Referring to S. Ambrose, *On the Sacraments*, V, ch. 2, and IV, ch. 6, and *Concerning Repentance*, II, ch. 9

¹⁷⁸ Taylor, I, p. 42. Attributed to Pseudo Ambrose, *On the Dignity of the Priesthood*.

spiritual and material reality working together is a way of looking at reality which has its roots in Platonism, although, as we have seen, Taylor is not a strict Platonist.

We have seen that Taylor inhabited a Platonic world, and thus he shared a common view of the world with the early Fathers, whose philosophical background would also have been Platonic. It is a view of the world which gives strong weight to spiritual realities, and so can support Taylor's constant argument for a real and spiritual presence of Christ in the sacrament. The spiritual is real to Taylor and to his patristic forbears, it is not ephemeral or diffuse. There is no question for Taylor that this is not a sufficient vehicle for the presence of Christ, and to him it is perhaps the obvious explanation for Christ's presence.

Chapter 7: A Contemporary Vision of Real Presence Rooted in Taylor's Theology

In our journey through Taylor's writing so far, we have encountered a number of schemas for describing eucharistic presence. We have seen Augustine's influence on Taylor and how much of his sacramental theology is *Augustinian* in character. Taylor's insistence on mystery as a category when discussing the eucharist reflects Augustine's understanding of the sacraments. As the Latin *sacramentum* and *mysterium* are both words used by Augustine to translate the Greek *mysterion* this means that in Augustine's writing the phrases 'sacred mysteries' and 'holy sacraments' are effectively interchangeable.¹ Furthermore, sacraments are *signs*, they signify something but are not identical with the thing signified.² With Augustine, Taylor teaches that the bread and wine of the eucharist remain bread and wine yet become the body and blood of Christ. The elements are inclusive signs; signifying both bread and wine *and* the body and blood of Christ.³ For Augustine, as for Taylor, the bread and wine of the eucharist signify the invisible, spiritual food which is given at the eucharist.⁴ So in our characterisation of Taylor we will look for the concept of signification as a motif. Taylor also sees the sacrament as being created by addition, he quotes from Augustine's Tractates on the Gospel of John: 'when the word and the element are joined, then it is a perfect sacrament'⁵ (Tractate 80, on John 15.1 – 3). That this also implies meaning, or significance, is shown because the quotation from Augustine continues to describe the sacrament as a 'visible word';⁶ Taylor uses this description, although he does not make it immediately clear it comes from Augustine, he only footnotes the reference. The complete quotation from Augustine runs: 'The word is added to the element, and there results the Sacrament, as if itself also a kind of visible word.'⁷

¹ Thomas L. Humphries Jr., 'St. Augustine of Hippo' in *Christian Theologies of the Sacraments: A Comparative Introduction*, Edited by Justin S. Holcomb and David A. Johnson (New York: New York University Press, 2017) pp. 41 – 58 (pp. 43–4).

² Humphries, p. 44.

³ Humphries, p. 55.

⁴ Humphries, p. 54.

⁵ Taylor, VIII, p. 30.

⁶ Taylor, VIII, p. 22.

⁷ *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, First Series, Edited by Philip Schaff, Vol. VII* (Peabody Mass: Hendrickson, 1994), p. 344.

Another historical datum is the writing of Berengar of Tours; Taylor's thought reflects his in a number of ways. Berengar was strongly against the idea that God could destroy by consecration, he also argued that should the substance of bread and wine be destroyed, how could the accidents remain? What would they be in, since the substances of bread and wine had passed away to be replaced by the accident free substances of Christ's Body and Blood?⁸ Berengar, like Taylor, argues that the bread and wine must remain, for if they are completely changed by consecration that destroys the nature of a sign.⁹ But, like Taylor, Berengar does speak of supernatural change, a change in which something is added to the bread and wine by consecration, but in such a way that the senses are not deceived, bread and wine still remain. For Berengar, that consecration makes the sacrament effective for its purpose: '*efficax*'. And again, like Taylor, he argues that the elements feed the physical body as the soul is fed by the sacramental body.¹⁰

The Augustinian concept of an effective sign and sacrament will inform our search for a contemporary way of characterising Taylor. After comparing Taylor's thought with the writing of Thomas Cranmer, the founding father of the Church of England expressed in his authorship of the Book of Common Prayer, we will look at some theological/philosophical ways in which the eucharist has been characterized. We will consider the concept of *transelementation*, which has its roots in Eastern Christianity and has been championed as a hope for ecumenical agreement by the contemporary author George Hunsinger; and two concepts first expounded in the 20th Century: *convaluation*, which is based on the writings of William Temple and Will Spens, and *transignification*, based on the thought of Edward Schillebeeckx. We will then show how they can be used to characterise Taylor in the context of 20th Century sacramental theology.

We shall conclude by using these theologies to propose a contemporary way of understanding the eucharist which draws on Taylor's thought, a eucharistic theology of Jeremy Taylor for today (to borrow McAdoo's title).

⁸ Chadwick, p. 418.

⁹ Chadwick, p. 418.

¹⁰ Chadwick, p. 421.

7.1 Thomas Cranmer

Cranmer was Archbishop of Canterbury during the process of the English church's break from Rome in the mid-sixteenth century. He was instrumental in the production of the first English Prayer Books of 1549 and 1552, as we saw in our second chapter. Although by Taylor's time there had already been subtle changes in the English Prayer Book, Cranmer's language and thought still shaped the theology and practice of the English church. Taylor wrote a defence of the Prayer Book in his *An Apology for Authorized and Set Forms of Liturgy*,¹¹ published in 1646.

In his survey of Cranmer's sacramental theology, Ashley Null charts the process of Cranmer's changing thought.¹² Null points to the influence of Erasmus, going back to original sources, as an important key to understanding his conversion to Protestant ideas. Whilst Cranmer was in Germany as ambassador to the emperor, he was exposed to the new Protestant ideas and Cranmer's commitment to scripture and the Fathers enabled Cranmer to grasp the crucial Protestant ideas around justification.¹³

Cranmer's mature sacramental thought was governed by his understanding of believing as spiritually feeding on Christ. Reading and ruminating on scripture is the way Christians are fed by Christ, they feed on the death of Christ by 'chewing it by faith in the cud of their spirit'. In doing this they eat Christ's body spiritually, even though they have not received the sacrament. They come to the holy table for greater confirmation of eternal life, they feed on Christ spiritually and also corporally on the sacramental bread, which increases the former spiritual feeding.¹⁴ Here we have a view very similar to Taylor's, who writes that we receive Christ both in and out of the sacrament. We feed on Christ in all ways, of which the sacrament is a particular one, and one in which the feeding is amplified by God. For Cranmer,

¹¹ Taylor, V, pp. 227 – 314.

¹² Ashley Null, 'Thomas Cranmer' in *Christian Theologies of the Sacraments: A Comparative Introduction* Edited by Justin S. Holcomb and David A. Johnson (New York: New York University Press, 2017) pp. 209–32.

¹³ Null, p. 209.

¹⁴ Null, p. 217.

the sacraments were a more efficacious means of ruminating on Scripture than private Bible reading, not because they had greater spiritual power, but because God designed them to be more effective in proclaiming truth to the human means of perception.¹⁵

Here we have a divergence, Taylor *does* believe in the spiritual power of the sacrament, although Cranmer does not.

Null argues that by understanding Cranmer's use of Cyril of Alexandria we can come to a full understanding of Cranmer and how he can argue that the sacraments promote mutual indwelling and unite us with the divine by using Cyril's teaching of the *communicatio idiomatum* (communication of properties).¹⁶ Cranmer argues from his use of Cyril that it is possible to understand that we have Christ in us 'substantially, pithily and effectually' yet we do not receive a corporal or local presence of Christ in the sacrament. There is a 'heavenly, spiritual and supernatural dwelling'.¹⁷ This sounds quite like Taylor's understanding of the sacrament, but there is a crucial difference. For Cranmer there was no change in the elements, they were not instrumental in giving the body and blood of Christ. He was, to use the term from Brian Gerrish we encountered earlier, a symbolic parallelist. Cranmer's focus was on the change in the recipients. They come to the supper, meditate on the Gospel message of the Last Supper and receive bread and wine which are unchanged, but simultaneously they receive the gift of the Spirit once more into their hearts,¹⁸ which strengthens love and leads them to new life in Christ and immortal life with Christ. Cranmer did believe that the 'sacraments increased the recipient's participation in Christ'¹⁹ and he believed that faithful participation in holy communion was an 'effectual means of ever-increasing new life in Christ'.²⁰ Nevertheless, he did not believe that the elements were changed by consecration. Cranmer wrote: 'For they teach, that Christ is in the bread and wine; but we say (according to the truth), that he is in them that worthily eat and drink the bread and wine.'²¹ Taylor shares with Cranmer the belief in the

¹⁵ Null, p. 219.

¹⁶ Null, pp. 221–7.

¹⁷ Null, p. 224.

¹⁸ Null, p. 227.

¹⁹ Null, p. 228.

²⁰ Null, p. 228.

²¹ Null, p. 223.

importance of worthy receiving, but for Taylor the gift that is given is given in the consecrated elements.

We have seen in our investigation of Taylor's writing, that although it can be unclear and sometimes contradictory, Taylor diverges from Cranmer. He believes that the consecrated elements convey the body and blood of Christ because they are changed in some way by the prayer of consecration and they exhibit the body and blood of the Lord on the altar. Taylor's ministry will have been shaped by the words of Cranmer in the English Prayer Book; nevertheless, Taylor (and many of his contemporaries) had moved away from Cranmer's position. However, Taylor still shares with Cranmer the belief that we are fed by Christ in the scriptures and in many ways; the sacraments are only one way, albeit an especially efficacious and holy way, of feeding on Christ.

7.2 Transelementation: A Description of Eucharistic Change Drawn from Eastern Theology

In his book *The Eucharist and Ecumenism*,²² George Hunsinger devotes the first section to the question of real presence and how a consensus might be arrived at for describing eucharistic presence which is acceptable to Catholic, Lutheran and Reformed Christians. After discussing Aquinas' arguments for transubstantiation, Hunsinger looks at the various strands of Reformed thought. He suggests that the writing of Peter Martyr Vermigli (1500 – 1562),²³ a friend and correspondent of Calvin,²⁴ gives a possible way forward. Vermigli wrote about the eucharistic presence using an incarnational analogy, which allowed the combination of Luther's idea of participation with Aquinas' emphasis on conversion whilst maintaining Reformed concerns about local presence.²⁵ Like Calvin, Vermigli emphasised the role of the Spirit (a role also emphasised by Taylor), although he saw the

²² George Hunsinger, *The Eucharist and Ecumenism*, Current Issues in Theology (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008)

²³ 'Peter Martyr', in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, pp. 1073–4. Vermigli was an Italian who had been an Augustinian friar. He was made Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford in 1549, on Mary's accession he was imprisoned and then went to Strassburg, where he was appointed professor of Theology in 1554. His Eucharistic views were controversial and led to him removing to Zürich in 1556, becoming Professor of Hebrew.

²⁴ Hunsinger, p. 39.

²⁵ Hunsinger, p. 39.

sacrament as an ‘instrument of the Spirit’, rather than simply a ‘means of grace’: thus, the elements were not empty signs.²⁶ With Luther, Vermigli made an incarnational analogy between the broken bread and the life-giving flesh of Christ, making it clear that this was an *analogy*, there could be no hypostatic union and it was time limited for the purpose of holy communion. There was, however, a Chalcedonian pattern:

The eucharistic bread and the life-giving flesh were brought together by the Spirit to form a unity-in-distinction. They were related without separation or division and without confusion or change.²⁷

Vermigli used the term ‘traselementation’ to describe this: the bread was transformed ‘by virtue of its sacramental union with, and participation in, Christ’s flesh.’²⁸ Vermigli appears to have learned of the term from Theophylact, an 11th century Bulgarian writer, although its use goes back to Gregory of Nazianzus and Cyril of Alexandria.²⁹ Taylor mentions Theophylact and traselementation in his discussion in *The Real Presence and Spiritual*, he quotes Suarez as approving of the term as being close to the meaning of transubstantiation. He also notes that Theophylact uses the same term to express the change of our bodies to the state of incorruption, and the change that is made in the faithful when they are united into Christ.³⁰ Taylor argues that Suarez asserts that the term traselementation, along with other terms used by the Fathers, such as mutation, conversion or transfiguration do not imply transubstantiation. These terms are acceptable to Taylor as descriptions of sacramental change and are also patristic in origin.³¹ Hunsinger tells us:

The image which illustrated traselementation was that of an iron rod thrust into the fire. Just as the iron was transformed by its participation in the fire, so was the consecrated element transformed by its sacramental union with Christ’s flesh. In and with this transforming union, the distinction between the two was maintained. Just as the iron did not cease to be iron, or the fire fire, so did the bread not cease to be bread, or Christ’s flesh his flesh. In the mystery of their sacramental union they formed a unique distinction-in-unity and unity-in-distinction.³²

²⁶ Hunsinger, p. 40.

²⁷ Hunsinger, p. 40.

²⁸ Hunsinger, p. 41.

²⁹ Hunsinger, p. 41.

³⁰ Taylor, VI, p. 132.

³¹ Taylor, VI, p. 132.

³² Hunsinger, p. 41.

In a footnote, Hunsinger tells us that Gregory of Nazianzen was the first to use this simile.³³ Hunsinger shows also that Vermigli made a clear statement of belief in sacramental change in which he affirms both Theophylact's term and that the Fathers from Augustine onward taught that the sacrament of the body of Christ 'in a way both is and is called the body of Christ' and that what is given is both bread and the body of Christ. The cause of this conversion is the 'inexpressible' work of the Holy Spirit.³⁴

We can see from this summary of Vermigli's understanding that we could ascribe similar views to Taylor. He believed that there was a sacramental change, brought about by the action of the Holy Spirit, and that both bread and Christ's body were given simultaneously to the worthy recipient. Hunsinger tells us that both Bucer and Cranmer appear comfortable with the term transelementation, and Cranmer uses the image of iron heated by fire, and attributes it to Theophylact.³⁵ Nevertheless, his argument is that although the reformers did not completely adopt this understanding of eucharistic change neither did they reject it.³⁶

In an earlier chapter we looked at the eucharistic theology of Lancelot Andrewes, a figure from the generation before Taylor. In his study of Andrewes, Jeffrey Steel argues that transelementation or transmutation is an appropriate term to use to describe Andrewes' understanding of eucharistic transformation.³⁷ Steel argues that Andrewes believed in the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the transelemented elements. The body and blood are united with the bread and wine (again using the analogy of hypostatic union) and so the 'divine and creaturely elements in the sacrament cannot be separated.'³⁸

We could simply say that it is possible to characterise Taylor's theology as transelementation, following on from Andrewes, if we see this as a general term, which does not

³³ Hunsinger, p. 41fn.

³⁴ Hunsinger, p. 42.

³⁵ Hunsinger, pp. 42–43.

³⁶ Hunsinger, p. 45

³⁷ Jeffrey H. Steel, 'Eucharist and Ecumenism in the Theology of Lancelot Andrewes (1555-1626): Then and Now' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of St. Andrews, 2012), p. 90.

³⁸ Steel, p. 91.

make precise metaphysical demands. But general terms, whilst inclusive, can be so broad as to offer little clarity. Hunsinger's approach is such that he wishes to draw Reformed, Orthodox and Roman Catholic Christians into agreement by use of the term transelementation. Hunsinger quotes the Orthodox theologian Kallistos Ware on the differences between transelementation and transubstantiation and then lists a set of contrasts. One of his points is this: 'Transubstantiation asserts that the body of Christ is enclosed in the consecrated bread; transelementation, that Christ by his spirit assimilates the consecrated bread into his life-giving flesh so that it becomes one with the bread by which it is imparted.'³⁹ It is this pair of contrasts which alerts us to the difficulty in ascribing this term to Taylor.

We turn to another Orthodox writer, Sergius Bulgakov, for further clarification. In his essay on the eucharistic doctrine,⁴⁰ Bulgakov sets out the Orthodox position. Bulgakov begins with a long critique of Western theology, with its reliance on Aristotelian metaphysics. In particular, he is highly critical of the Western idea that the ascended Lord is present in a place.⁴¹ Bulgakov argues that the Orthodox view of the resurrection body, which is a key concept for the doctrine of *transmutation*,⁴² (Bulgakov uses the word transmutation rather than transelementation) is that the body is transformed by resurrection and ascension into a 'glorified and spiritual state'.⁴³ We have seen in Taylor's description of the resurrection body that he understands the risen Jesus to have a body that is alike as possible to the body that died. Because of this, Taylor has great difficulty explaining the resurrection appearances and argues that the risen Christ might have needed the stone to be rolled away from the tomb entrance to leave. He also has a slightly amusing discussion about the appearance in the Upper Room – was the door unlocked at the time?⁴⁴ Bulgakov argues that the resurrection

³⁹ Hunsinger, pp. 74–5.

⁴⁰ Sergius Bulgakov, *The Holy Grail and The Eucharist*, trans. and ed. by Boris Jakim (Hudson, New York: Lindisfarne Books, 1997)

⁴¹ Bulgakov, pp. 68–83.

⁴² Bulgakov, p. 63.

⁴³ Bulgakov, p. 102.

⁴⁴ Taylor, VI, p. 122.

body has undergone an ‘essential change’ that removes it from the realm of materiality.⁴⁵ The risen body retains the power of corporeality, but has become a spiritual body, the body has dematerialized, but has the possibility of rematerialization.⁴⁶ The risen and ascended body is not present in any place, it is supraspatial, above place, although it can enter into space and manifest Christ in a particular place according to his will.⁴⁷ Taylor’s discussion of the risen and ascended Christ gives the impression that it would, in theory, be possible to set out on an expedition to find him, the ascended Christ has local presence in Taylor’s understanding.

It is this quality of the risen body which is essential to the Orthodox doctrine of transmutation or transelementation. The Lord takes the bread and wine into his body to transmute them. Whilst at table with his friends, bread and wine were transmuted into the body of the Lord by the process of eating and drinking and then digestion; in the eucharist the bread and wine are transmuted by being taken into his spiritual body.⁴⁸ The transmutation is a process in which two realms of being interact. The bread and wine remain bread and wine in the life of the world, the body of Christ, which is manifested in the consecrated elements remains a spiritual body abiding above the world.⁴⁹

It is because Taylor appears to believe in a local presence of the risen Christ which is corporeal, that we cannot ascribe the Orthodox understanding of transelementation or transmutation to him. There are ways in which transelementation fits well with Taylor’s view of the sacrament: the definite stress on the unchanged substance of bread and wine, and the identification of the bread and wine with the body and blood of Christ for the purposes of holy communion. Like Taylor, the Orthodox view is that the sacrament is given to us for holy communion, and this purpose ‘determines and *limits* the appearance of the Lord in the bread and wine.’⁵⁰ As we saw in Taylor’s defence of

⁴⁵ Bulgakov, p. 103.

⁴⁶ Bulgakov, p. 105.

⁴⁷ Bulgakov, p. 106.

⁴⁸ Bulgakov, pp. 107–9.

⁴⁹ Bulgakov, p. 110.

⁵⁰ Bulgakov, p. 118.

kneeling at holy communion, it is Orthodox understanding that at holy communion it is right to revere the Lord, but it is not right to expose the sacrament for adoration outside of this.⁵¹

Taylor *could* have developed his eucharistic theology in this direction. As Bulgakov argues, it is rooted in the patristic thought of the centuries before the eucharistic controversies of the West.⁵² He is limited by the eucharistic controversies of his age, which place so much emphasis on the local presence of Christ's body. It is Taylor's view of the risen body which makes it difficult to argue that this Eastern derived metaphysics is true to Taylor, despite Taylor having chosen Eastern material for his eucharistic rite. Taylor is conditioned by Western thought, and as Bulgakov notes,⁵³ the questions which the doctrine of transubstantiation entails shaped all Western controversies, both the Roman Catholic assertion of the doctrine and the various Protestant arguments against it. Aquinas argues that Christ's body is in heaven 'under its own species'⁵⁴ and the Council of Trent similarly understood the body of Jesus to be locally present 'in heaven'.⁵⁵ Much of the Reformation dispute centres on how the risen body of Christ can or cannot be both locally in heaven and simultaneously present in the sacrament. Taylor's questions and answers are shaped by a different worldview from the East, he is of his time and place. And, further, he has a natural disinclination to probe too deeply into metaphysical mechanisms. The opening section of *The Real Presence and Spiritual* is a plea for restraint, a plea for asking few questions and refraining from searching out precise metaphysical explanations. He shies away from making definitive pronouncements on the nature of eucharistic change or presence. He is more content with arguing against what he does not believe, transubstantiation, than making a precise case for what he does believe.

Nevertheless, despite the conclusion that we cannot use the term transelementation to describe Taylor's thought, it does offer us some insight into how we might proceed. Hunsinger argues that one of the advantages of this language is that transelementation sees the eucharistic change as

⁵¹ Bulgakov, p. 119.

⁵² Bulgakov, pp. 67–8.

⁵³ Bulgakov, p. 82.

⁵⁴ ST III Q76, A5.

⁵⁵ Waterworth, p. 77.

enhancement, something added, and the elements being ‘taken up into a higher order’ by the action of the Holy Spirit.⁵⁶ This leads us to a consideration of a different approach, which includes some of the positive aspects we have seen here: ‘Value Philosophy’ and the concept of *convaluation* espoused by Anglican theologians William Temple⁵⁷ and Will Spens.⁵⁸

7.3 Convaluation: a Description of Eucharistic Presence Based in Value Philosophy

Will Spens contributed a chapter entitled ‘The Eucharist’ to the 1926 collection *Essays Catholic and Critical*;⁵⁹ Spens’ contribution is the final essay in the collection, but it stands alone. He argues that the symbolism of the eucharist is effectual, not merely conveying a message but effecting a result.⁶⁰ He uses the analogy of a coin, the intrinsic value of the metal is not its purchasing power, the minting and the authority of the state give it value, and the coin is not thought of as a token with such and such a purchasing power, but as that value, e.g. we speak of ‘a euro’ as we hand over the coin.⁶¹ He argues that the properties of the eucharistic elements are not annihilated by the consecration, they remain bread and wine, yet they are given additional properties which so supersede the natural properties ‘that we can rightly speak of the objects themselves as wholly changed and transfigured.’⁶² He quotes Theodoret as an example of this patristic view of sacramental change: ‘They remain in their former substance and shape [...] but they are apprehended as what they have become’.⁶³

⁵⁶ Hunsinger, p. 81.

⁵⁷ William Temple (1881 – 1944) was Bishop of Manchester when he wrote *Christus Veritas*, he would become Archbishop of York in 1929 and Archbishop of Canterbury in 1942. He had been trained as a philosopher with E. Caird whilst at Oxford. ‘William Temple’ in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, p. 1347.

⁵⁸ Sir Will Spens (1882 – 1962) was an Anglican layman, trained in natural sciences at Cambridge. He became tutor, fellow and subsequently Master of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. Along with the essay ‘The Eucharist’ his 1915 book *Belief and Practice* (1915) established him as a liberal Anglo-Catholic thinker. ‘Spens, Sir William [Will]’ *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, eds. H.C.G. Matthew and Brian Harrison, Vol. 51 (Oxford: OUP, 2004), pp. 916–8.

⁵⁹ Will Spens, ‘The Eucharist’ in *Essays Catholic and Critical*, ed. Edward Gordon Selwyn (London: SPCK, 1926), pp. 425–448.

⁶⁰ Spens, p. 429.

⁶¹ Spens, p. 429.

⁶² Spens, p. 429.

⁶³ Spens, pp. 429–30.

Spens argues that the eucharist differs from baptism, because in the former there is a symbolic action only, whereas in the latter the consecrated elements become symbols, so there is a symbolism of objects.⁶⁴ Here he parallels Taylor, who argues in his comments about baptism that we do not argue for a change in the nature of the water, the effect of baptism is in the action of the rite.

In his consideration of the eucharist as sacrifice, Spens argues that for any action to be a true sacrifice it needs a ceremonial content, so the ceremonial actions of the eucharist invest the Lord's death with its sacrificial significance before God and before those present. 'What is asserted here is that the Eucharist is that part of the sacrifice of Calvary which, by our Lord's appointment, expressly invests His death with its significance'.⁶⁵ There is an echo here of Taylor's argument that the eucharist on earth re-presents the one sacrifice, although Spens does not use the idea of parallelism of the action on earth and the perpetual re-presentation of Christ to his Father in heaven that is a consistent feature of Taylor's treatment of eucharistic sacrifice.

When he moves on to discussing the real presence, Spens' presentation appears much closer to Taylor. He argues that the bread and wine, after consecration, have a new value, 'their devout reception secures and normally conditions participation in Christ's sacrifice, and therefore his life.'⁶⁶ Although the material of bread and wine remain their 'inward part and meaning' is that they have become the body and blood of Jesus given for us.⁶⁷ Here Spens echoes the language of the Catechism of the Church of England which we looked at in our second chapter. Spens argues that the bread and wine have become Christ's body and blood, given 'after a spiritual and heavenly manner'; there is no material change, but neither is the gift in any way separable from the bread and wine, it is not merely concomitant with visible administration. 'The act of reception requires appropriation by faith [...] but the opportunity for reception and appropriation is afforded by the sacramental Gifts.'⁶⁸ The

⁶⁴ Spens, p. 430.

⁶⁵ Spens, p. 436.

⁶⁶ Spens, p. 441.

⁶⁷ Spens, p. 441.

⁶⁸ Spens, p. 441.

elements have become effectual symbols, we do not separate the bread and wine from the body and blood, just as we do not separate a coin from its purchasing power.⁶⁹

These consecrated symbols render Christ our sacrifice appropriable to us, as our sacrifice, and this is possible through the eucharistic action because of the divine will.⁷⁰ It is thus appropriate to refer to the symbols as the body and blood of Christ, or if this seems too close an identification, the sacramental body and blood. The latter is important because it avoids the misunderstanding of any material change (the question of material change seems persistent, although it is not affirmed by the Roman Catholic Church in the documents of the Council of Trent), yet sacramental presence is affirmed. Nevertheless, as Taylor himself argues in *The Real Presence and Spiritual* we receive the body that was born of Mary and died and rose again; there is no ‘multi-corporal’ Christ. If we can think of the risen and glorified body of Christ as identical with his natural body, so we can think of the sacramental body as identical with it. This is because each offers an expression of the one body of Christ ‘directly determined by that nature which our Lord assumed at His Incarnation’.⁷¹ Spens suggests that the term ‘convaluation’ is an appropriate philosophical term to describe the nature of the sacrament.⁷² We saw in an earlier chapter that McAdoo suggested that this might well be an appropriate term to use to describe Taylor’s understanding of the sacrament. Spens tells us that this term comes from value-philosophy and draws on a book by William Temple, *Christus Veritas*,⁷³ published only a few years before his essay. Spens continues to discuss the proper reverence that might be given to the sacrament. We recall that Taylor argued that it was proper to kneel whilst receiving holy communion, not to worship the sacrament itself, but to give worship to Christ. Spens similarly argues that the sacrament is an expression of the Lord’s being and kneeling before the

⁶⁹ Spens, p. 441.

⁷⁰ Spens, p. 442.

⁷¹ Spens, p. 442.

⁷² Spens, p. 442.

⁷³ William Temple, *Christus Veritas: An Essay* (London: MacMillan, 1925).

sacrament is kneeling before the Lord who is present, not worshipping the object which is the sacrament.⁷⁴

Spens concludes by emphasising that holy communion is the culmination of the eucharist, and his doctrine is ‘rooted in, and dependent on the idea of communion as an integral and culminating part of the rite.’⁷⁵ As we saw in the previous section, insistence on the sacrament being given for the purpose of holy communion is fundamental to Eastern theology and it is also clear that Taylor understands this to be the case. Spens’ description of eucharistic presence parallels Taylor closely, although his arguments about eucharistic sacrifice are based on different arguments from those of Taylor. They do not contradict Taylor, however, and could be added to Taylor’s arguments.

7.4 Convaluation: William Temple and Value Philosophy

As we have seen, Spens chooses the term ‘convaluation’ to describe his eucharistic theology, a term which he derives from William Temple. Temple sets out his value philosophy in the first part of *Christus Veritas*.⁷⁶ He understands reality to consist of many grades of value, arranged in a hierarchy, the higher grades presuppose the lower grades, and the lower grade can only be fully complete if it is ‘possessed or indwelt’ by values above it.⁷⁷ This seems particularly appropriate in our discussion of Taylor, as it reflects his Platonic philosophy, with its hierarchy of value. Temple uses the example of the series: matter, life, mind and spirit. (It appears value can be a concrete object or an abstract quality.) Matter can only reveal what it really is when it receives life; life can only reveal itself fully when it is endowed with a mind and mind can only truly reveal itself when it is guided by spirit. Temple asserts that Spirit has a sense of absolute value because it has the capacity for fellowship with God.⁷⁸ Temple continues: ‘And, if Religion is to be trusted, even Spirit (as known in our experience) only reveals what it can be and do when it is possessed by that Highest Being, whom we

⁷⁴ Spens, p. 444.

⁷⁵ Spens, p. 445.

⁷⁶ Temple, Chapters 1–3.

⁷⁷ Temple, p. 4.

⁷⁸ Temple, pp. 4–5.

call Spirit because Spirit is the highest grade of Reality known to us.’⁷⁹ This is a particularly significant statement for our study because Taylor, in his introduction to *The Real Presence and Spiritual*, argues that what is spirit is more real than what is material, hence the spiritual presence of Christ in the sacrament is more real than if it were carnal or natural.⁸⁰

Temple defines Value⁸¹ as ‘The element in real things which both causes them to be, and makes them what they really are’; he further argues that this is equivalent to the philosophical term Substance, provided its use is carefully limited to mean ‘Real Thing’.⁸² In a paper on Anglican approaches to the eucharistic presence, Brian Douglas summarises Temple’s approach to substance and value in a section on recasting transubstantiation.⁸³ Temple makes clear that value can only be actual if it is appreciated by a conscious being.⁸⁴ ‘The reality of the objects in the world is not divorced from our sense of their significance.’⁸⁵ Value needs to be recognised for it to be actualised. This means that value philosophy takes into the account the observer, value remains only potential without an observer. This subjective element is ‘a constituent. Value exists in order to be appreciated; and though the appreciating mind finds rather than creates the value, yet the value is dormant or potential until appreciation awakes it to energy and actuality.’⁸⁶

Towards the end of *Christus Veritas* Temple considers ‘Worship and Sacraments’. He argues that the elements are both ‘instruments of the Lord’s purpose to give Himself to us, as well as the symbol of what He gives.’⁸⁷ The eucharist means what it sets forth and is a means of access to the Life of Christ; the consecrated elements are the medium of that Life and through them He is present

⁷⁹ Temple, p. 5.

⁸⁰ Taylor, VI, pp. 14–15.

⁸¹ Temple capitalizes Value, Substance and Real Thing in his text.

⁸² Temple, p. 15.

⁸³ Brian Douglas, ‘Transubstantiation: Rethinking by Anglicans?’, *New Blackfriars*, 93.1046 (2012), 426–45 (433 – 435).

⁸⁴ Temple, p. 15.

⁸⁵ Temple, p. 17.

⁸⁶ Temple, p. 18.

⁸⁷ Temple, p. 239.

to our souls.⁸⁸ Temple argues that Christ is not locally present, yet he is apprehensible in time by means of the sacrament.

The elements come by the act of consecration to be the vehicle to us of His Human Nature and Life. That is now their value, and therefore their true “substance.” [...] But there is here something possessed of as high a dignity as any miracle could ever be – a clear manifestation of the principle which informs the whole universe, the utilisation of lower grades of being for the purpose of the higher, even the highest.⁸⁹

Only those who approach in faith can benefit from this presence, the reality lies in the eucharistic action and the consecrated elements are the ‘permanent witness’ to the repeated action. The value is only actual ‘when it is appreciated or appropriated’, but the faithful receiver ‘finds, and does not make, this Presence.’⁹⁰

In a concluding note on eucharistic controversies, Temple argues that the mediaeval church’s doctrine of transubstantiation was an attempt to elucidate how ‘the objective Presence of Christ in the Eucharist is spiritual and is spiritually received’. He maintains that the argument throughout his book is such that what ‘St. Thomas ought to have meant when he said “substantia” was what we mean when we say “Value;” though of course, he did not mean this.’⁹¹ However, Temple argues that the only thing we can distinguish from the sum total of accidents in anything is its value. This means that transubstantiation can be construed as transvaluation; if this is the case then objections to the doctrine are much diminished.⁹² However, as the bread retains its value as bread, to retain the nature of the sign, then “convaluation” is the preferable term because the consecrated bread now has the value of the body of Christ added to the value of bread.⁹³

⁸⁸ Temple, p. 239.

⁸⁹ Temple, p. 240.

⁹⁰ Temple, p. 240.

⁹¹ Temple, p. 247.

⁹² Temple, p. 247.

⁹³ Temple, p. 248.

7.5 How Does this Fit with Taylor's Description of Eucharistic Presence?

At the end of Chapter 3 we made a summary of some of Taylor's beliefs about the presence of Christ in the sacrament. Taylor believes that the presence is real, but spiritual. Convaluation allows us to talk of real presence, Christ being apprehensible by means of the sacrament, and the term implies a spiritual addition to the material bread and wine. This spiritual addition is of a higher value than the material of bread and wine, so this parallels Taylor's assertion that what is spiritual is 'most real, and most true'.⁹⁴ The sacrament is still clearly understood to be bread and wine, these 'values' are not altered, but Christ is given to those who are 'truly disposed'. True disposition parallels correct apprehension of the value of the sacrament; Christ can only be received by those who apprehend the value of Christ's body and blood which has been added to the material elements. This apprehension has a dual nature, intellectual, we know it as Christ's body and blood, and faithful, we believe it is Christ's body and blood and it is thus that we receive him. There is no suggestion of corporal eating of Christ, yet there is effective sacramental change,⁹⁵ brought about by the eucharistic drama of prayer and action. That which was bread and wine is actualised by the new values of Christ's body and blood. We now apprehend them in those terms, because the higher value has actualised the lower, material, value. The language of convaluation also avoids the language of natural science which the language of substance and accidents sometimes appears to introduce. This means that the focus is not on the 'how' of eucharistic change, an area Taylor thought should be properly understood as mysterious and left unexplored. This also reduces the tendency to reify the sacrament, seeing eucharistic sacramental change in absolute terms, and the language of value always includes the observer, since value must be apprehended to be actualised.

We turn now to a third 20th Century Anglican, E.L. Mascall, whose concept of 'sacramental significance' forms a bridge to considering the writing of E. Schillebeeckx on transignification.

⁹⁴ Taylor, VI, p. 15

⁹⁵ Temple's argument that substance and value are equivalent means we could write here 'substantial change', although that would be foreign to Taylor's thought.

7.6 *Efficacious Signs: E.L. Mascall and Sacramental Signification*

In his collection of essays, *Corpus Christi*,⁹⁶ Mascall writes on eucharistic presence and eucharistic sacrifice; he draws on several 20th Century writers as they develop both Catholic and Anglican thought. He draws on the works of Masure to argue that we can regard the eucharist as an efficacious symbol.⁹⁷ That is ‘a sign instituted by Christ [...] rich enough to contain within it the reality which it resembles.’⁹⁸ This sign possesses its power and reality from the authority of Jesus who chooses it and invests it with its reality, ‘It is a sign possessing, in virtue of its author, the value which it signifies.’⁹⁹ Here is a sentence which ties together *value* and *significance*. Our previous authors have written about sacramental presence in terms of value; Mascall uses the term significance, but it is clear that these are terms with very similar meaning.

In a later chapter focusing on the theology of Thomas Aquinas, Mascall again invokes the concept of sacramental signification. He argues that this helps overcome some of the difficulties which are involved in Aquinas’ arguments which use the Aristotelian terms substance and accidents. Mascall believes that sacramental signification is a supplemental metaphysical principle that helps to overcome the difficulties he finds in Aquinas’ metaphysics. Mascall’s discomfort lies in the way he perceives Aquinas to treat presence separately from sacramental purpose. He argues that, for Aquinas, the real presence is ‘manufactured’ and then the body and blood are used either for sacrifice, for adoration or for communion. Instead, Mascall believes we should understand the eucharist thus:

as primarily the Christian Sacrifice, which just because it is a sacrifice, requires the presence of the victim, who being present is rightly adored and who by being received in communion imparts to the faithful the benefits of redemption.¹⁰⁰

For Mascall, Aquinas’ presentation of transubstantiation requires the accidents of the bread and wine to remain without a subject, sustained by divine power alone, with the substance of the bread and

⁹⁶ E.L. Mascall, *Corpus Christi: Essays on the Church and the Eucharist*, 2nd edn. (London: Longmans, Green and Co. Ltd., 1965).

⁹⁷ Mascall, p. 141.

⁹⁸ Mascall, p. 141.

⁹⁹ Mascall, p. 141.

¹⁰⁰ Mascall, p. 214.

wine being replaced by the substance of the body and blood of Christ. This destruction of the substance of the elements (although some will argue that it is not destruction but conversion) implies that here grace is not perfecting nature but destroying it.¹⁰¹ Mascall invokes ‘sacramental causality’, which is metaphysically distinct from non-sacramental causality, to overcome the limitation he has described. Through this mode of causality sacraments are signs which make present the realities they signify because they are ‘divinely ordained efficacious signs of them.’¹⁰² Mascall’s position is that bread and wine become ‘sacramental signs of the Body and Blood’. This is not simply through an act of divine power in the unmediated way that Aquinas suggests, but ‘by a mediated act of divine power using sacramental causality as secondary cause.’¹⁰³ Sacramental signification is not only a theory which describes how the eucharistic conversion is made, or what its effects are, but crucially it describes the nature of the sacramental conversion. Because of this metaphysical transformation, Mascall can argue that bread and wine are not destroyed, but instead have the status of being sacramental signs of the Body and Blood added to them. (Mascall continues to use the concept of substance; ‘bread and wine shall no longer have the status of substance but shall be the sacramental signs of the Body and the Blood’.) He argues that the metaphysical status of bread and wine is elevated by the sacramental change because ‘bread and wine have a higher metaphysical reality if they have the status of sacramental signs of the Body and Blood of Christ than if they have the status of substance.’¹⁰⁴ Again, we see the parallel between Spens and Temple arguing for a higher value through the sacramental change and Mascall arguing for a higher value of signification.

Mascall concludes his argument by remarking that his description of sacramental symbolism does not make it necessary to hold to Aquinas’ theology and metaphysics of transubstantiation, but it is necessary to have a theology which includes the concepts of sign and significance in any theology of sacramental change since that is an essential component of a sacrament.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰¹ Mascall, p. 223.

¹⁰² Mascall, p. 220.

¹⁰³ Mascall, p. 225.

¹⁰⁴ Mascall, pp. 224–225.

¹⁰⁵ Mascall, pp. 225–226.

7.7 Transignification: The Work of Edward Schillebeeckx

Following the Encyclical of Paul VI, *Mysterium Fidei*, published in September 1965,¹⁰⁶ Edward Schillebeeckx published a paper in which he sets out his understanding of the terms *transfinalization* and *transignification* in a paper entitled ‘Transubstantiation, Transfinalization, Transfiguration’.¹⁰⁷ (Schillebeeckx would expand on this paper in a book, *The Eucharist*,¹⁰⁸ published in English translation in 1968.) In a paper discussing *Mysterium Fidei*, Joseph Powers notes that the encyclical was seen in some sections of the Italian press as a criticism of Schillebeeckx.¹⁰⁹ This is because the encyclical stresses that transubstantiation alone is an adequate explanation for the mystery of Christ’s real presence in the eucharist¹¹⁰ and that the terms ‘transignification’ and ‘transfinalization’, which were terms associated with Schillebeeckx, do not offer a proper explanation of that presence.¹¹¹

Schillebeeckx begins by considering the historical development of the language of real presence before turning to the post World War II turn of Catholic thought towards sacraments as signs or symbols. In doing this he reminds his readers that both Bonaventure and Aquinas referred to the sacraments this way.¹¹² He also argues that the concept of *substance* which is used in the definition of transubstantiation had also been the subject of some discussion, rendering it less appropriate as a philosophical term.¹¹³ Further, he questions whether the term *substance* as used at the Council of Trent was used in its strict Aristotelian sense or as a looser philosophical term; the Fathers may well have been thinking in Aristotelian language without using this in strict philosophical grammar.¹¹⁴ A third factor which he believes should be taken into consideration is widening the *concept* of real presence, he argues that restricting the idea of real presence to the

¹⁰⁶ <http://w2.vatican.va/content/paul-vi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-vi_enc_03091965_mysterium.html> [Accessed 23rd August 2018].

¹⁰⁷ Edward Schillebeeckx, ‘Transubstantiation, Transfinalization, Transfiguration’, *Worship*, 40.6 (1966), 324–38.

¹⁰⁸ Edward Schillebeeckx, *The Eucharist*, trans. by N.D. Smith (London: Sheed and Ward, 1968).

¹⁰⁹ Joseph M Powers, ‘Mysterium Fide and the Theology of Eucharist’, *Worship*, 40.1 (1966), p. 20.

¹¹⁰ *Mysterium Fidei*, Paragraph 46.

¹¹¹ *Mysterium Fidei*, Paragraph 11.

¹¹² Schillebeeckx, ‘Transubstantiation, Transfinalization, Transfiguration’, pp. 326–327.

¹¹³ Schillebeeckx, ‘Transubstantiation, Transfinalization, Transfiguration’, p. 327.

¹¹⁴ Schillebeeckx, ‘Transubstantiation, Transfinalization, Transfiguration’, pp. 327–328.

consecrated elements dates only from Duns Scotus; we should also recognise Christ present in the church, in the proclamation of the scriptures, in all the sacraments and in the hearts of faithful believers.¹¹⁵

From his analysis of the Tridentine dogma, Schillebeeckx argues that the affirmation of an ontological change, the substantial change of bread and wine demanded by the eucharistic presence, is foreign to the Aristotelian philosophy of nature, even though the dogma was expressed in Aristotelian terms. However, the import of the Tridentine dogma is that it

obliges the Catholic to admit the profound realism, or the ontological dimension, of the eucharistic presence in such a way that after the consecration the reality present is no longer ordinary or natural bread and wine, but our Lord himself in the presence of bread and wine which has become sacramental.¹¹⁶

Schillebeeckx argues that, 'This leaves the door open to a conceptual presentation of the dogma different from the medieval and Thomistic conception.'¹¹⁷ Schillebeeckx discusses the tension between those who express the dogma in ontological or spiritual terms and those who effectively deny the understanding of sacrament as sign by arguing that transubstantiation means a change which is effectively 'chemical'; he cites Selvaggi, a professor at the Gregorian University, as an example of this latter, erroneous way of thinking.¹¹⁸ This seems to hark back to the arguments we found in Taylor assuming that transubstantiation argued for a corporal presence.

Schillebeeckx is careful to show that transfinalization and transignification are theories which can be used as interpretations of transubstantiation.¹¹⁹ He argues that it is essential to remember that the purpose of the real presence in the eucharist is in order that the real presence of Christ will be in our hearts. There had been a historical process by which this purpose had become marginalised and the focus became centred on the real presence in the consecrated elements to the extent that that appeared to become an end in itself. The consequence of this was: 'the blessed

¹¹⁵ Schillebeeckx, 'Transubstantiation, Transfinalization, Transfiguration', p. 328.

¹¹⁶ Schillebeeckx, 'Transubstantiation, Transfinalization, Transfiguration', p. 332.

¹¹⁷ Schillebeeckx, 'Transubstantiation, Transfinalization, Transfiguration', p. 332.

¹¹⁸ Schillebeeckx, 'Transubstantiation, Transfinalization, Transfiguration', p. 333.

¹¹⁹ Schillebeeckx, 'Transubstantiation, Transfinalization, Transfiguration', p. 334.

sacrament was adored; it was no longer eaten.¹²⁰ The development of the theories of transfinalization and transignification are consequences of a shift in emphasis away from the practices of the past where the priest celebrated mass on behalf of the people, who would adore the uplifted host and seldom receive it, to an emphasis on active participation by the whole Body of Christ culminating in holy communion.¹²¹

Schillebeeckx speaks of a new emphasis for the concept of eucharistic presence:

Because the “new” emphasis is concerned with the intimate presence of Christ in the hearts both of the individual believer and of the community of Christians, the eucharist must remain on the level of interpersonal relationship: of the presence of one person to another person. For man, each interpersonal presence is communicated by means of a spatial, visible, tangible, and even tasted presence. But in this case the spatial presence is integrated into the personal presence, that is, the body and the corporeal elements receive a new dimension: they become *signs* of a person who is present, signs which effect this presence, and signs which are real because they “realize” this presence.¹²²

The presence which is ontologically real in the consecrated elements is offered in these elements and completed when it is accepted: the presence is an interpersonal relationship. This relationship is accomplished by ‘means of earthly things transformed in such a way that these things become a sign effecting the offer of this real presence.’¹²³ Schillebeeckx describes this treatment of eucharistic presence as a theology which reacts against eucharistic materialism, the almost ‘chemical’ understanding of presence he argued against earlier in his paper. Sacramentality requires that the physical reality does not change, there can be no corporal presence (as Taylor also argues at length)

otherwise there would no longer be a eucharistic sign. But in its ontological reality, to the question “What is this bread ultimately, what is this wine ultimately?” one can no longer answer, “Bread and wine,” but instead, “The real presence of Christ offered under the sacramental sign of bread and wine.” Therefore, the *reality* (that is, the *substance*, because that is the meaning of “substance”) which is before me, is no longer bread and wine, but the real presence of Christ offered to me under the sign of food and drink.¹²⁴

¹²⁰ Schillebeeckx, ‘Transubstantiation, Transfinalization, Transfiguration’, p. 335.

¹²¹ Schillebeeckx, ‘Transubstantiation, Transfinalization, Transfiguration’, p. 335.

¹²² Schillebeeckx, ‘Transubstantiation, Transfinalization, Transfiguration’, p. 336.

¹²³ Schillebeeckx, ‘Transubstantiation, Transfinalization, Transfiguration’, p. 336.

¹²⁴ Schillebeeckx, ‘Transubstantiation, Transfinalization, Transfiguration’, p. 337.

The bread and wine have been *transignified* because they are no longer merely signs of bread and wine, they are now ontologically signs of the presence of Christ; they have been *transfinalized* because their new end is to be the body and blood of Christ.¹²⁵ The signs have been changed so that they now participate in the being of Christ, hence they are ontologically signs, not simply bare signs. The ontological change is brought about by the action of the Holy Spirit, ‘the Spiritus Creator who effects the ontological depth of Christ’s gift of self in the sacramental sign of bread.’¹²⁶ Schillebeeckx closes by arguing that this is congruent with the teaching of *Mysterium Fidei* because the encyclical argues that following transubstantiation the elements have both new meaning and new end, signs of sacred, spiritual food. This change is ontological, the consecrated elements point to a new reality. Schillebeeckx concludes by reminding his readers: ‘That is the very meaning of the dogma of transubstantiation.’¹²⁷

Schillebeeckx has argued that we can consider transubstantiation to be a change in reality, which is spiritual and real, but not entirely bound by the terms of Aristotelian metaphysics. In his larger treatment of the subject in *The Eucharist* he describes the Tridentine dogma as ‘historically determined’,¹²⁸ that is the context of the Council meant that it used the categories of accident and substance because that was the contemporary idiom, but it is now relativized. The contemporary philosophy and science of the 1960s did not understand substance in the same manner as Aristotle, and indeed the scientific approach led to either recognising that substance could not be applied to material reality at all, ‘or at the most that the whole of the cosmos could be seen as only one great substance.’¹²⁹ Here it is interesting to note that Taylor does not appear to question the grammar of substance and accidents, even though we know from the Conway correspondence that he had

¹²⁵ Schillebeeckx, ‘Transubstantiation, Transfinalization, Transfiguration’, p. 337.

¹²⁶ Schillebeeckx, ‘Transubstantiation, Transfinalization, Transfiguration’, p. 337.

¹²⁷ Schillebeeckx, ‘Transubstantiation, Transfinalization, Transfiguration’, p. 338.

¹²⁸ Schillebeeckx, *The Eucharist*, p. 57.

¹²⁹ Schillebeeckx, *The Eucharist*, p. 94.

received works by Descartes (and presumably read them). In Taylor's time the philosophical underpinning of transubstantiation was already in question.

As we saw with Spens' argument about convaluation, where he argues that value is given and apprehended, Schillebeeckx makes it clear that meaning is given by God: 'If God gives a different destination to this bread, then it *is* metaphysically something different'.¹³⁰ The sign is changed by God, but its meaning is discovered by human faith.

In the case of the Eucharist [...], a new meaning is given to the bread and wine, not by any man, but by the Son of God. The relationship which is brought about by the Son of God is, because it is divine, binding in the absolute sense and determines the being of the Eucharist for the believer. Anyone who does not believe, and consequently does not see it in this way, places himself outside of the reality which is *objectively* present — he is outside the order of being.¹³¹

Schillebeeckx's approach to the eucharistic transformation was not without its critics. Peter Beer criticises Schillebeeckx for relying too closely on Transubstantiation to underpin his position,¹³² whereas, as we shall see, Matthew Levering argues that Schillebeeckx strays too far from Aquinas, transubstantiation and the historical teaching of the church.

7.8 Critique of Schillebeeckx: Matthew Levering

In his book *Sacrifice and Community*, Matthew Levering offers a trenchant critique of what he terms, 'Eucharistic idealism', which he defines as: 'the linear-supersessionist displacement of the Jewish mode of embodied sacrificial communion by spiritualizing accounts of Eucharistic communion with God.'¹³³ In the book, Levering argues that Aquinas gives a proper metaphysical account of eucharistic presence and eucharistic sacrifice which allows the proper understanding of the

¹³⁰ Schillebeeckx, *The Eucharist*, p. 111.

¹³¹ Schillebeeckx, *The Eucharist*, p. 113.

¹³² Peter Beer, 'G B Sala and E Schillebeeckx on the Eucharistic Presence: A Critique', *Science et Esprit*, 38.1 (1986), 31–48.

¹³³ Matthew Levering, *Sacrifice and Community: Jewish Offering and Christian Eucharist* (Malden MA: Blackwell, 2005), p. 8.

relationship between the sacrifice of the cross, the sacrificial element of the eucharist and the communion that the consecrated elements offer.

Levering sees the beginning of the turn towards the separating of communion from sacrifice in Schillebeeckx's book *Christ the Sacrament of the Encounter with God* because he understands communion as 'flowing from the direct encounter with the risen Christ'.¹³⁴ For Levering, Schillebeeckx's argument that communion is primarily between the Christ who is alive now and not with the historical sacrifice of the cross is a clear move towards the idealism he repudiates.¹³⁵ In passing, Levering is scathing about Schillebeeckx's use of the term 'transignification' which he sees as having been 'debunked' by Jean-Luc Marion. He footnotes Marion's critique of Schillebeeckx's understanding of the real presence in the community of the church preceding the presence in the sacrament 'as constituting an idolatry of the community's self-consciousness'. For Marion, and by implication for Levering, only the real presence understood as independent of consciousness avoids this idolatry.¹³⁶ The footnote continues by critiquing Schillebeeckx's own critique of transubstantiation. Schillebeeckx's understanding of transubstantiation is incorrect, it is 'too physicalist'. Levering quotes Alister McGrath, who argues that Schillebeeckx has 'no need to invoke the notion of a physical change of substance of the bread and wine', and implies that although McGrath approves of this, he, Levering believes it to be untrue.¹³⁷ This implies in turn that Levering believes that the sacramental change, which he understands to be transubstantiation, does entail a *physical* change of substance. As Levering continues his own presentation, he refers to an article by David Fagerberg.¹³⁸ He argues that 'For Fagerberg, the key is that transubstantiation describes the change of the matter of the bread and wine into the matter of the body and blood of Christ'.¹³⁹ Here Levering again seems to be arguing for a corporal presence in the sacrament. This seems unlikely as

¹³⁴ Levering, pp. 19–20.

¹³⁵ Levering, pp. 20–22.

¹³⁶ Levering, p. 117. Marion's critique is found in J.L. Marion, *God Without Being*, trans. Thomas A. Carlson (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), p. 165f.

¹³⁷ Levering, p. 118.

¹³⁸ Levering, p. 128 fn.

¹³⁹ Levering, p. 130.

Aquinas (as we have seen) argues that transubstantiation is in the realm of the supernatural and substance is the object of the intellect.

There is not space to go into Levering's exposition of Aquinas, which is very detailed and argues that there is 'bodily contact' with Jesus which is necessary to share in the offering of his sacrifice.¹⁴⁰ Levering's position is that Aquinas' presentation of the eucharistic sacrifice, underpinned by the Aristotelian metaphysics of transubstantiation, gives a proper understanding of the eucharist: 'sharing in Christ's liturgical action means, in every way, "representing" Christ by imaging his sacrificial self-offering to God.'¹⁴¹ If the sharing is by means of representation then we are more clear that there is no physical presence, since representation implies some distance from the thing represented.

Levering's critique of Schillebeeckx is trenchant; it is ironic that he sees his theology as so distant from Aquinas; for, as we noted earlier, Peter Beer felt he was too close, requiring transubstantiation as a prerequisite to transignification. It is fair to argue that Schillebeeckx distances the eucharist from the cross; the primary sacramental locus for Schillebeeckx is the meal.¹⁴² The focus of this meal is Christ giving himself to the communicants, not in sharing Christ's sacrifice of the cross. The signs of bread and wine are transignified: 'bread and wine become the subject of a *new establishment of meaning*, not by men, but by the living Lord *in* the Church, through which they become the *sign* of the real presence of Christ giving himself to us.'¹⁴³ Schillebeeckx argues (notwithstanding the later withering criticism of this position) that it is because Christ is present in the Church he is received in the sacrament for the building up of the body which is the church. He reminds his reader that Augustine tells the newly baptised that 'we ourselves lie on the paten'. There is a reciprocity between the sacrament and the body of Christ which is the Church.¹⁴⁴

¹⁴⁰ Levering, p. 136.

¹⁴¹ Levering, p. 191.

¹⁴² Schillebeeckx, *The Eucharist*, p. 134-136.

¹⁴³ Schillebeeckx, *The Eucharist*, p. 137.

¹⁴⁴ Schillebeeckx, *The Eucharist*, pp. 138-144.

Although Levering's critique is stern, it is more a critique of Schillebeeckx than of transignification itself. Transignification, although closely identified with Schillebeeckx's teaching, is not limited by his use of it. There is more to the concept than Schillebeeckx's use of the term. One aspect of Levering's argument brings us to Taylor, possibly surprisingly since Levering is an advocate of transubstantiation as the only acceptable prism for understanding eucharistic presence. Levering is adamant that the eucharist should be seen not merely as a meal but as involved in the sacrifice of Jesus on the cross. We have seen that Schillebeeckx understands the eucharist primarily through the prism of a meal in which Christ is given to us in the sacrament. But we have also seen in our study of Taylor that, on the contrary, he consistently understands the eucharist as a sacrifice, not merely a meal. Levering's summary of Aquinas is very similar to Taylor's description of the sacrifice, Christ is represented as sacrificed and the elements on the altar are an image of the continuous representation of Christ as sacrificed offering himself to the Father. Naturally some of the details are very different, but there is a similarity which is striking. Taylor is not proposing a communion which is divorced from sacrifice, and Taylor is also arguing for a communion which joins the communicants in one body who, once they have received the elements and so are incorporated into Christ, offer themselves with Christ to the Father.

7.9 Transelementation, Convaluation, Transignification

We have investigated three lenses for looking at eucharistic presence, all three aim to move away from the debates of the Reformation and from the Aristotelian metaphysics which is associated with the doctrine of transubstantiation. George Hunsinger makes an enthusiastic proposal for transelementation to be considered as an ecumenical way forward. It is a term which has roots in Orthodox Christianity, stretching back as far as Gregory of Nazianzus and Cyril of Alexandria; it was introduced into Reformed language and thought by Peter Vermigli.¹⁴⁵ However attractive a concept this is, and Hunsinger writes persuasively on the topic, we have seen that the metaphysics

¹⁴⁵ Hunsinger, pp. 39–41.

of transelementation or transmutation (even though Taylor accepts them as acceptable terms for describing the consecration of the elements) requires an understanding of the ascended Christ very different from that held by Taylor. The doctrine argues for a change in the elements brought about by the Holy Spirit in which they are taken into the ascended Christ's non-spatial presence and become his body and blood: they are transmuted into Christ as bread and wine eaten by Jesus during his ministry were converted into his body and blood. Since Taylor is convinced of the corporal and local presence of the risen and ascended Christ, we may not adopt this term for Taylor. (Taylor's view of the ascended Christ is actually very similar to that of Aquinas and the eucharistic canons of the Council of Trent. The local presence of the body of Christ was a contested issue during the Reformation as it was argued that the body of Christ could not be in more than one place at once. Thus, there could be no local, carnal, presence of Christ in the sacrament.)

We then turn to the terms *convaluation* and *transignification*. Schillebeeckx argues that the Tridentine Fathers used the language of Aristotelian natural philosophy, but also dissociated themselves from Aristotle when they thought about faith.¹⁴⁶ He further argues that although Aquinas used the language of Aristotle this was only one level of his thinking about transubstantiation: he first affirmed the unique presence of Christ, 'peculiar to this sacrament', secondly he affirmed the change of substance, which he personally understood as a 'change of being' (*conversio totius entis*), becoming the body of Christ, and thirdly he used Aristotelian theory of substance and accidents to describe what he believed.¹⁴⁷ As Schillebeeckx remarks, the term transubstantiation is becoming less of a polemical marker because Protestant theologians have taken up the word transubstantiation and used it, with a cluster of meanings. The word 'has lost its function as a banner because it can now be used to fly over ships with different cargoes.'¹⁴⁸ The term, unfastened from the Aristotelian language of substance and accidents, can now be used to mean a real change, such that the elements can be described as the body and blood of Christ.

¹⁴⁶ Schillebeeckx, *The Eucharist*, p. 62.

¹⁴⁷ Schillebeeckx, *The Eucharist*, p. 63.

¹⁴⁸ Schillebeeckx, *The Eucharist*, p. 41.

In *Christus Veritas*, William Temple argues for the equivalence of Substance and Value. He suggests ignoring former uses and recognising that Substance means Real Thing. ‘Value is the element in real things which both causes them to be and makes them what they are and is thus fitly called Substance.’¹⁴⁹ Hence Temple can argue that transubstantiation can be properly thought of as transvaluation, although, because he understands the eucharistic consecration to be an addition, the bread and wine are unchanged in their material value but have spiritual value added, convaluation is a more appropriate term.¹⁵⁰ Temple distinguishes Substance from actuality, all Values are eternally realised in God, but Value is only fully actual when it is appreciated by a conscious being.¹⁵¹ Here we see a parallel with the way in which Schillebeeckx understands signification: significance is inherent in an object or action, but it needs to be discovered.

7.10 Can Convaluation and Transignification Help Us to Characterise Taylor?

In an earlier chapter we saw Taylor affirm that ‘the symbols become changed into the body and blood of Christ’ and that this change is *sacramental*, *spiritual* and *real*. In receiving the consecrated elements communicants *really* receive Christ, *effectually* and to all the purposes of his passion.¹⁵² Both convaluation and transignification affirm that the consecrated elements are Christ’s body and blood yet remain bread and wine. Taylor argues that it is ‘bread in substance’¹⁵³ so this condition is met by these two ways of looking at the sacrament. Further, Taylor argues that, following St. Bernard, Christ is given to us ‘in substance but after a sacramental manner’ and is received spiritually, not carnally.¹⁵⁴

Both transignification and convaluation allow us to affirm eucharistic presence in these terms. We saw Mascall argue that value and significance are effectively equivalent. Both terms insist

¹⁴⁹ Temple, p. 15.

¹⁵⁰ Temple, pp. 247–48.

¹⁵¹ Temple, p. 15.

¹⁵² Taylor, VI, p. 13.

¹⁵³ Taylor, VI, p. 14.

¹⁵⁴ Taylor, VI, p. 16.

that there is a real change in the elements which is objective, that is, the change does not depend on the observer. But both terms also require that the change be appreciated or apprehended to be actualised. Value and significance may be intrinsic, but they require a human observer to notice them. In this way they parallel Aquinas' understanding of *substance*, since substance is the proper object of the intellect,¹⁵⁵ 'whose object is "what a thing is"'.¹⁵⁶ Convaluation offers an understanding which has an inbuilt hierarchy, which reflects Taylor's argument that the spiritual is more real than the material.¹⁵⁷ The material values of bread and wine have the higher, spiritual values of the body and blood of Christ added to them, and so become actualised by them. Thus, it is correct to say *both*: bread and wine remain, *and*: this is the body and blood of Christ. Transignification has the advantage that it is a categorisation which is more widely discussed, debated and critiqued. Although Schillebeeckx uses the term in the context of understanding the eucharist primarily as a meal, this does not limit the use of the term. If the elements are transignified to be real signs of the presence of Christ's body and blood, they may also be used to illuminate Taylor's theology. This picture of altered significance illuminates Taylor's description of the sacrament as '*verbum visibile*'.¹⁵⁸ Something which conveys meaning. (Although, as we noted above, the word and element joined, and the visible word are part of the same quotation from Augustine.) As we have seen, Taylor understands the eucharist as a sacrifice which mirrors the perpetual offering of Christ to the Father. (A way of describing the eucharistic sacrifice which, as we have seen in our earlier chapter on *Sacrifice, Presence and Benefits*, runs through several of Taylor's works.) The eucharistic action represents Christ. As Thomas Carroll wrote: 'the risen and glorified Christ is made present through sacred signs and actions.'¹⁵⁹ In that case it is possible to argue that the consecrated elements exposed on the altar and offered to the Father in the parallel action of the eucharist signify Christ's body and blood in this action. As Schillebeeckx argues that transignification is a real change (and we saw this

¹⁵⁵ ST III Q75, A5 Reply to Objection 2.

¹⁵⁶ ST III Q76, A7 Answer.

¹⁵⁷ Taylor, VI, p. 15.

¹⁵⁸ Taylor, VIII, p. 23.

¹⁵⁹ Carroll, 'Jeremy Taylor: an Essay in Liturgical Ecumenics', p. 34.

underlined by Saba and Beer in Beer's paper), so we can see that elements understood as transigned would show forth Christ, and when they were received by the faithful they would join them with Christ and allow the communicants, once again united in the body of Christ, to offer themselves with Christ to the Father. Transignification has the advantage of emphasising the nature of sacrament as sign and mystery which Taylor endorses and is consistent with Taylor's Augustinian influence.

We can see convaluation and transignification as two sides of the same coin. They are terms which are effectively equivalent, but they bring different things into focus. *Convaluation* affirms change in value, the simultaneous presence of the value of bread and the value of the body of Christ, and the hierarchy of value, with the spiritual (the body of Christ) being higher than the material (bread). *Transignification* focuses on the concept of sign and meaning, the concept of sign going back to the teaching of Augustine, and meaning being both given and discovered.

In a paper on Taylor's use of language to describe the sacrament, which draws on *The Worthy Communicant*, Robert Schwarz lists the words Taylor uses for his primary metaphor: "Signify," "symbols," "similitudes," "represent," "understanding," "figure," and "perception". He tells us that Taylor 'has made the symbols (*qua* symbol) the conveyance of what they signify'.¹⁶⁰ Here Schwarz is investigating how Taylor's description, following Augustine, of the sacrament as a 'visible word' might be understood. Schwarz points to Taylor's use of 'signification', in which the Holy Spirit is the 'signifier, the agent of signification in the sign.'¹⁶¹ This investigation of how Taylor uses meaning is another aspect of understanding Taylor as speaking of the transignification of the elements. They have taken on new meaning and communicate this to the faithful communicant.

7.11 And What About Transubstantiation?

If we look at Taylor using Schillebeeckx's three lenses; the level of faith, the level of ontological change and the level of Aristotelian metaphysics, we see that Taylor understands the elements to be

¹⁶⁰ Schwarz, p. 507.

¹⁶¹ Schwarz, p. 508.

changed on the level of faith, we *believe* this is the body and blood of Christ (Aquinas argues that the change is seen by faith alone¹⁶²) and of ontology, it *is* the body and blood of Christ. We know that Taylor understands the ontological identity to be somehow distant, so that there is no question of material identity, but Aquinas also rules out any material or sensible change (he asserted that the change was entirely supernatural¹⁶³). Taylor would repudiate the arguments for substantial change based on Aristotelian metaphysics; we have seen his arguments in an earlier chapter. Further, the careful precision of Aquinas' presentation of transubstantiation, framed in Aristotelian metaphysics, makes it foreign to Taylor's continual assertion that this is a mystery which does not admit of detailed investigation. Nevertheless, Taylor's insistence that bread and wine remain is paralleled by the insistence that the accidents remain unchanged; all the aspects of the elements which can be apprehended by the senses are technically accidents.

Further, we have seen that Temple argued that substance and value are equivalent, and Mascall argued that value and significance are equivalent. Temple argues that transvaluation (or convaluation) can be understood as transubstantiation. Since we have concluded we can interpret Taylor's theology of eucharistic change as transignification or convaluation (and Mascall's argument means they are effectively equivalent) we can conclude that Taylor's description of presence is much closer to transubstantiation, as properly understood following Aquinas and the Council of Trent, than he would admit. Of course, Taylor insists that transubstantiation implies corporal presence which neither Aquinas nor the Council teach; which means he would insist that his beliefs about the sacrament are distant from transubstantiation.

7.12 Signs that Convey Reality

We have seen in this chapter elements which illuminate Taylor for us. He is rooted in Augustine and holds to the tradition of Berengar. Sacraments are signs which convey reality, but that reality is spiritual not material. Taylor, although familiar with the language and liturgy shaped by Cranmer is

¹⁶² ST III Q76, A7 Answer.

¹⁶³ ST III Q76, A7 Answer.

not bound by his vision of the eucharist: Taylor argues that the body and blood of Christ are spiritually offered when the consecrated gifts are given, and they are shown forth as a parallel with Christ's continual showing forth of himself as sacrificed in heaven.

The theological and philosophical developments of the 20th Century introduced new language into the debate over eucharistic presence, and, at the same time, natural science and philosophical endeavour made the language of Aristotle less easy to uphold. It is difficult to maintain the language of accident and substance in the face of the description of reality drawn from the world of atomic physics, where atomic theory is augmented by the study of subatomic particles. The philosophy of Value, promoted in the writing of William Temple and taken up by Will Spens, has given us the word convaluation and the understanding of a material value receiving a higher value and being actualised by it. Bread and wine receive the higher, spiritual, value of the body and blood of Christ, and so receive their name and identity from this higher value; they remain bread and wine but are now Christ's body and blood, an understanding consistent with Taylor's description of the sacrament.

The understanding of sacrament as sign links us with Augustine, and Schillebeeckx's argument for transignification, change of sign value and change of meaning or identity, gives us another way of understanding the eucharistic change in which, again, no ontological violence is done to the elements, they remain bread and wine, yet they both point to and convey a new reality, Christ's body and blood.

Taylor lived at a time when transubstantiation controlled the whole discourse about the sacrament, the formal doctrine, the popular understanding of what it meant, and its outworking in religious practice shaped the arguments. There seemed to be no route to understanding the sacrament which did not either embrace transubstantiation or repudiate it. The absolute certainty about the local presence of Christ's risen and ascended body was a huge influence on the argument, Taylor writes about the risen Christ in a way which seems sometimes absurd. Yet this shaped so much of the discourse; if the risen body was in one place, it could not be in another simultaneously. Our 20th century authors have recast the arguments and allowed us to look back on Taylor and recognise him

in their ideas and writing. McAdoo describes Taylor as ‘curiously modern’ and as someone who anticipates later developments in theology.¹⁶⁴ Perhaps this is why we can look back to him through the lenses of Spens and Schillebeeckx and find them helpful in our characterisation of his thought.

7.13 Taylor: From Augustine to Schillebeeckx

We have seen that Taylor’s theology of presence reflects Augustine’s theology of sacrament as sign. We have also seen that Taylor is in the line of Berengar, who argued forcefully for no change of substance in the nature of the consecrated elements. The twentieth century authors Spens and Temple and Schillebeeckx have given us complementary ways of understanding and characterising Taylor’s thought. In part this is because they themselves move away from the medieval debates around substance and suggest new ways of speaking about the sacrament; value and signification (which itself looks back to Augustine). Value philosophy has a hierarchical component which fits the strand of Platonic thought found in Taylor. Transignification highlights the strand which focuses on meaning, representation and sign. From the Seventeenth Century we have taken Taylor back to S. Augustine in the Fourth Century and forward to Spens, Temple and Schillebeeckx in the Twentieth.

¹⁶⁴ McAdoo, p. 2.

Chapter 8: Conclusions

In our journey through the writing of Jeremy Taylor we have encountered much of his prodigious output, although some of his works have been left completely untouched, including his major work *Ductor Dubitantium*, which is a guide for confessors. We have found that he is a recognised writer on the eucharist and referred to by a number of 20th century authors. The focus on Taylor came to its peak in the late 20th century in the studies of Thomas Carroll, H.R. McAdoo and Kenneth Stevenson. Since their deaths there has been little new material on Taylor. Despite the focus of these writers there is a refrain running through most of the commentators works: Taylor is hard to characterise. Some writers have a tendency to pounce on one or other section of Taylor and jump to a conclusion from that, rather than holding on to the larger picture of all his work, others simply follow the line of thought proposed by earlier commentators without making proper investigation themselves. In part this is because Taylor does not set out to write on the eucharist from a systematic perspective. Much of the material we have studied has a focus on the eucharist as part of a devout life. It is no accident that Taylor's *Rule and Exercises of Holy Living* is his best-known work, it exemplifies his central concern as a writer and pastor.

In *The Real Presence and Spiritual of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament* we discovered Taylor's abiding themes of sacramental conversion which is real, yet spiritual, and so neither carnal nor substantial, and sacrament as mystery, a mystery to be approached with due reverence and respect, rather than with the spirit of scientific enquiry and analysis. His careful section by section treatment of his argument refuting the evidence for transubstantiation and arguing in turn for a real yet spiritual presence gave us much material to work from, but it also provided some blind alleys and frustrating impasses. We can be certain Taylor does not believe in transubstantiation, even though what he argues against might not be how Aquinas or the Council of Trent define the doctrine. We are left with the impression that popular piety, and possibly, prejudice influence Taylor's views on transubstantiation as much as the logical difficulties encountered in the language of change of substance and remnant accidents.

What we also discover is ample evidence of Taylor's wide knowledge of and respect for the Fathers. He is able to support his arguments with quotations from multiple sources, and he is able to use them in a scientific way. His preference is for the earliest sources and draws from East as well as West. He shows the deep influence of Augustine and S. John Chrysostom as well as a view of eucharistic consecration which owes much to Greek influences. His final flourish in the work is a section which refers to the Fathers, showing they supported his view of sacramental change in which bread and wine remain unchanged in substance. Nevertheless, the consecrated elements can still be called the body and blood of Christ. He is equally clear that this corresponds with the scriptural witness in both I Corinthians and the Last Supper narratives. Taylor also inhabits the philosophical world of the Fathers, he is influenced by Plato and by Platonism, even though he stands at the dawn of a new period of philosophical expression. This new era will be ushered in by Descartes (who Taylor had read) and Spinoza's radical monism that disallows the possibility of the supernatural.

8.1 Presence: Real and Spiritual

Throughout Taylor's writing on eucharistic presence there is a consistent strand. It may get buried, the reader may be diverted by a particular section to another view, but the persistent strand is that Taylor believes that the elements of bread and wine are changed by consecration. They are brought to the holy table as bread and wine, after liturgical prayer they are now something more; they are the body and blood of Christ. They are changed in condition as well as in use. The presence of Christ is not corporal, of that we can be sure, but it is spiritual in such a way that the body born of Mary, who suffered, died, rose and ascended, is given in holy communion and received by the worthy communicant. Reception of Christ is by faith, for the presence is spiritual; Christ is not digested as bread and wine are digested, Christ is digested by faith to build up the believer into membership of the body of Christ for eternal life. What is more, Taylor believes that the spiritual is more real, of higher value and importance, than the mere fleshly carnal. (Here we see clearly the influence of Platonism on Taylor.) So, to speak of spiritual real presence is to mean something both real and of great value. In *The Worthy Communicant* we saw Taylor describe the sacrament as an 'edible

metaphor' and a 'visible word'. The latter draws from Augustine's description of a sacrament. These terms allow us to recognise that *significance* and *signification* is one way of interpreting Taylor's understanding of presence. The same work described the sacrament as *an extension of the incarnation*, leaving the reader in no doubt of its continuing efficacy in the life of the world.

8.2 Presence and Sacrifice

We have seen that Taylor is more consistent in his treatment of eucharistic sacrifice, perhaps because it is briefer. The earthly eucharist offers a parallel to the perpetual offering by Christ of himself to his Father. In the heavenly session Jesus eternally represents the offering made once and for all on the cross. The eucharist on earth represents this offering to the Father, by means of the action of the Holy Spirit. The consecrated elements, Christ's body and blood, exhibit Christ, as sacrificed, to his Father in a mysterious, sacramental manner. As the heavenly offering is an unending intercession, so the earthly representation is an intercession for the whole church. It is because the elements are transformed by consecration that they can represent Christ, they are his body and blood in a way that is mysterious, yet real.

8.3 Reimagining Spiritual Presence

The 20th century saw authors who wished to express eucharistic presence in ways which were true to history yet took account of contemporary philosophy and so attempted to overcome historic arguments. We have shown that the ideas of these authors are useful in characterising Taylor's thought. Taylor was seemingly trapped in the Reformation debates about presence which were framed by the language of transubstantiation. There seemed no way round the obstacle. Substance and accidents were *the* language for describing reality and they dominated discussion about the eucharist. Either the arguments around transubstantiation were accepted, or they were rejected. We have shown that by reframing the debate using value philosophy and signification philosophy we can translate Taylor's thought into a different idiom. There no longer needs to be a constant disavowal of carnal presence, there no longer needs to be the same insistence that, because bread and wine

remain the same, there can be no substantial change — leading to a suspicion that that means no change at all.

The language of transignification is true to Taylor's Augustinian roots, speaking of the change in sign value of the consecrated elements. A change made by the action of the Holy Spirit, which means we can speak of the elements as the body and blood of Christ.

Similarly, the language of convaluation is true to Taylor and reflects his insistence that the spiritual is of greater value than the material. The material bread and wine are actualised by the spiritual body and blood of Christ, the value added to them, such that that is now their identity. It is these contemporary lenses which enable us to escape from the language of Aristotle. Schillebeeckx himself, in his work on the eucharist, argues that it is not necessary to hold to Aristotelian metaphysics to believe in a real change in the consecrated elements, and it is not even necessary to believe in Aristotelian categories to affirm the doctrines of the Council of Trent; the Fathers of the Council may have used Aristotelian language without requiring technical precision.

Combining both terms offers us a description which has the effect of two sides of the same coin. Convaluation emphasises Taylor's understanding of a hierarchy of presence and value, the spiritual being more important than the merely material. It also allows for the concept of bread and Christ's body, wine and Christ's blood, the addition of properties onto the elements. Transignification emphasises the change in meaning; the concepts of visible word and edible metaphor which Taylor uses. Either term alone gives us a useful way of describing Taylor, both together bring a clearer picture.

8.4 Transubstantiation Itself Reimagined

We also saw that value, significance and substance are concepts which are very closely allied. Our authors have suggested that they are effectively equivalent, even if there may be slight technical differences. This means that, for all his apparent opposition to the doctrine of transubstantiation, which he views as a theological innovation rather than a development, Taylor is closer to believing it than he realises.

Spens, Mascall and Schillebeeckx each aim to present a picture of sacramental change which is real and accounts for both the presence of Christ in the consecrated elements and the fact that the elements clearly remain bread and wine to all means of investigating their properties. Aquinas himself asserts that the sacramental conversion is entirely supernatural and operates in the realm of understanding and faith. Thus, Taylor's argument for a supernatural, spiritual, presence is not distant from either Aquinas or our 20th century commentators.

8.5 *Jeremy Taylor, Priest and Bishop of the English Church*

In 1998 Christopher Cocksworth published an article, which was based in ecumenical dialogue, where he cites Taylor as one example of a developing 'particularly Anglican style of expression'.¹

He quotes from *The Real and Presence and Spiritual*:

The doctrine of the church of England and generally of the protestants in this article, is, that after the minister of the holy mysteries hath rightly prayed, and blessed or consecrated the bread and the wine, the symbols become changed into the body and blood of Christ, after a sacramental, that is, in a spiritual, real manner.²

He says this shows that Taylor encouraged 'a sense of the reality of the gift of Christ's presence through the eucharistic elements and to reaccommodate language about a real, though noncorporeal presence.'³ We met this quotation from Taylor at the beginning of our investigation into Taylor's writing back in chapter 3. Cocksworth argues that this is in line with the Articles of Religion⁴ of the Church of England. Taylor himself tells us that his description of the eucharistic doctrine of the Church of England, which Cocksworth quoted, is consistent with the Church Catechism and its definitions of sacraments⁵ (which we met in chapter 2, along with the Articles of Religion). We have seen Taylor's vehement arguments against transubstantiation, which is condemned in Article

¹ Christopher J. Cocksworth, 'The Presence of Christ in the Eucharist and the Formularies of the Church of England', *Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, 35.2 (1998), 197–209 (p. 200).

² Taylor, VI, p. 13–14

³ Cocksworth, p. 201.

⁴ Cocksworth, p. 201.

⁵ Taylor, VI, p. 14.

XXVIII.⁶ Also consistent with the article is his insistence that the consecrated bread and wine offer a partaking in the body and blood of Christ; the body and blood are given in a spiritual manner, not a corporal or natural way; and that they are received by faith, ‘in a spiritual, real manner’ in Taylor’s words. To complete Taylor’s alignment with Article XXVIII we can also note that Taylor tells us that the way in which the body and blood of Christ are received is by faith: ‘all that worthily communicate do by faith receive Christ’.⁷ Further, Taylor constantly maintains that the faithless do not receive the body and blood of Christ when they receive the consecrated elements, rather they receive condemnation, which is the teaching of Article XXIX.⁸ His teaching remains consistent with the Church of England as it is set out in its founding formularies. Cocksworth argues in his paper that the ‘*Book of Common Prayer* has been of considerably more influence in defining the character of the Church of England and forming the spirituality of its people than the Articles.’⁹ He suggests that, because the Prayer Book’s eucharistic rite has been interpreted in different ways throughout the intervening centuries, the doctrine of the Prayer Book ‘has set the *contours* rather than the *coordinates* of eucharistic belief in the Church of England.’¹⁰ So it is quite in order that Taylor can express his doctrine as rooted in the Prayer Book, even though it differs from the theology of Thomas Cranmer, its principal author (who we met in Chapters 2 and 7). Nevertheless, we can see that,

⁶ The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another; but rather is a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ’s death: insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ; and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ.

Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.

The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith.

The Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper was not by Christ’s ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped. *Book of Common Prayer*, p. 785.

⁷ Taylor, VI, p. 13.

⁸ The Wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as Saint Augustine saith) the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ: but rather, to their condemnation, do eat and drink the sign or Sacrament of so great a thing. *Book of Common Prayer*, p. 785–6.

⁹ Cocksworth, p. 203.

¹⁰ Cocksworth, p. 207.

looking back over the Articles of Religion and the Catechism, Taylor teaches a theology of eucharistic presence which is consistent with them.

Although we have seen that Taylor's own eucharistic rite contains an invocation of the Holy Spirit over the gifts that they might become the body and blood of Christ, he does not criticise the *Book of Common Prayer* for lacking this, and there is no hint that he was dissatisfied with the provisions of the Prayer Book as it was used in his time. In fact, Taylor wrote *An Apology for Authorized and Set Forms of Liturgy*¹¹ which sets out to defend the *Book of Common Prayer* against the attacks upon it by the Commonwealth. The title page lists the compilers, beginning with Archbishop Cranmer.¹²

Taylor also follows the pattern shown by Lancelot Andrewes, from the generation before him, which was noted by MacCulloch,¹³ of referring extensively to early church sources, rather than basing his arguments on the Continental and English Reformers. Here again, Taylor is consistent with the developing ethos of the Church of England.

It is in his teaching on eucharistic sacrifice that Taylor is less clearly aligned to the Articles of Religion; he clearly describes the eucharist as a sacrifice, although he sets out the sacrifice in terms of paralleling Christ's heavenly representation of himself who is both once sacrificed and risen. Article XXXI¹⁴ condemns the 'sacrifice of Masses' as 'blasphemous fables' because of its assertion of the completeness of Christ's sacrifice offered on the Cross. Taylor's teaching on sacrifice is clear that there can be no adding to the perfect sacrifice of Christ, and the eucharist is the representation of the sacrifice once offered. The priest offers Christ to the Father in the consecrated elements in imitation or as a mirror of Christ perpetually offering himself at the Father's right hand. Taylor

¹¹ Taylor, V, 227–314.

¹² Taylor, V, p. 227.

¹³ MacCulloch, p. 508.

¹⁴ The Offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits. *Book of Common Prayer*, p. 786

teaches the eucharist as a sacrifice in a different way from that condemned by Article XXXI, so his teaching is still consistent with the Church of England, although there would have been a general suspicion of any talk of eucharistic sacrifice.

In a lecture entitled *Jeremy Taylor: Anglican Theologian*¹⁵ H.R. McAdoo suggests that Taylor's Anglican ethos is demonstrated in the Anglican method, 'the threefold appeal to Scripture, tradition and reason by means of which Anglicans test the authenticity of a Church, or a dogma or a doctrinal opinion.'¹⁶ It was this threefold appeal we found Taylor to use in the *Real Presence and Spiritual* when he was setting out his arguments.¹⁷ McAdoo claims that 'Jeremy Taylor's whole theological synthesis [...] is totally at one with the Anglican ethos whose "distinctiveness lies in method rather than in content"'.¹⁸ He finds this basis to Taylor's theology in *The Real Presence and Spiritual*, in *Clerus Domini*, where Taylor ends with an appeal to this threefold method, and also in other works which have not been part of our study.¹⁹

Throughout his difficult life it is clear that Taylor was loyal to the teachings and practice of the Church of England and they run through his writing on the eucharist. There is no point in his writing on the eucharist that seeks to distance Taylor from the Church of England's teaching as set out in the Articles, Catechism and Prayer Book. He looks to demonstrate the sufficiency of the English Church and show it to be truly Catholic, inheriting the teaching of the Fathers and faithful to the scriptures. Cocksworth uses the metaphor of the game of cricket to describe the Articles of Religion, they set the boundaries within which theology is done.²⁰ Nevertheless, to continue the metaphor, Taylor is set close to the wicket, rather than in the outfield; he is not pushing the boundaries of Anglicanism but establishing the centre.

¹⁵ H.R. McAdoo, *Jeremy Taylor: Anglican Theologian*, (Armagh: Church of Ireland Historical Society, 1997)

¹⁶ McAdoo, p. 15.

¹⁷ Taylor, VI, p. 20.

¹⁸ McAdoo, p. 15.

¹⁹ McAdoo. pp. 18–19.

²⁰ Cocksworth, p. 199.

8.6 Taylor's Thought and the Contemporary Anglican Eucharist

As we have studied Taylor's writing on the eucharist we have gained a sense of his reverence for the sacrament and his insistence on the ordered reception of it. As our study of Taylor concludes we can reflect on how his concerns are reflected in the eucharist as it is celebrated in the Church of England and the Church of Ireland.

Taylor is adamant that repentance is a prerequisite for coming to the sacrament and we see that it is normative to confess and receive absolution as a preparation for the eucharist in contemporary Anglican practice.²¹ In his long argument around John 6 we learnt that Taylor believes we feed on Christ not only in the sacrament, but also by hearing the scriptures read and meditating on them. Unsurprisingly, it is usual to hear the scriptures read at the eucharist, one or two readings from the Old and New Testaments and a Gospel reading are prescribed for each celebration, and there may be part of a Psalm in addition as a commentary on the first reading.²² We have seen that Taylor argues that consecration of the elements is the work of the Holy Spirit. This is made explicit in the eucharistic prayers of the Church of England: 'grant that by the power of the Holy Spirit these gifts of bread and wine may be unto us his body and blood;'²³ and more open-ended in the Church of Ireland: 'as we eat and drink these holy gifts, grant by the power of the life-giving Spirit that we may be made one in your holy Church and partakers of the body and blood of your Son, that he may dwell in us and we in him.'²⁴

Both churches emphasise that one of the benefits of holy communion is confederation, being joined together in the body of Christ by the broken bread, using words which come from S. Paul (I Cor. 10.17).²⁵ And, despite any hesitation about the language of presence, the consecrated elements are given as the body and blood of Christ.²⁶

²¹ *The Book of Common Prayer*, pp. 202–3 and *Common Worship*, pp. 168–70.

²² *The Book of Common Prayer*, p. 204 and *Common Worship*, p. 172.

²³ E.g. *Common Worship*, p. 217

²⁴ *The Book of Common Prayer*, p. 211.

²⁵ *The Book of Common Prayer*, p. 218 and *Common Worship*, p. 179.

²⁶ *The Book of Common Prayer*, p. 219.

Taylor's insistence of the eucharist as a sacrifice is not reflected in current practice, some of the eucharistic prayers in the Church of England's Common Worship uses the description: 'Father we plead with confidence his sacrifice made once for all upon the cross'.²⁷ The preference is to speak of our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.²⁸ The phrases: 'he made there the one complete and all-sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the whole world';²⁹ 'his perfect sacrifice made one for the sins of the whole world'³⁰ and 'who made there by his one oblation of himself once offered a full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice'³¹ suggests that both churches wish to distance the eucharist from any suggestion of sacrifice in the present. Nevertheless, after holy communion the people offer themselves, united with Christ as a living sacrifice in lives lived to God's praise and glory.³²

8.7 *Jeremy Taylor, Priest of the Eucharist*

In all our investigations of Taylor's writing we have discovered a man who emphasised the importance of the eucharist. Unlike Lancelot Andrewes he was not a *preacher* of the eucharist, Taylor's sermons have not been studied in our investigation because they seldom mention the eucharist, and then only in passing, a sentence here or there. But in his devotional works there is always a profound section on the eucharist, only a minor part in *The Great Exemplar*, but more significant in *Holy Living* and the focus of *The Worthy Communicant*. These titles display Taylor's overriding concern; as a pastoral theologian and preacher he was firstly engaged with the business of encouraging devout lives. The eucharist is a necessary component of holy living, and it is important that the Christian should understand in faith the mystery that he or she partakes of. The holiness of the sacrament demands proper preparation for the gift of Christ's body and blood is received by faith, and unrepentant sin or a careless attitude towards what is offered leads to judgement. Nevertheless, the sacrament is of great value, it brings forgiveness to the repentant and

²⁷ *Common Worship*, p. 197, p. 203.

²⁸ *The Book of Common Prayer*, p. 211 and *Common Worship*, p. 187, p. 190, p. 193, p. 205.

²⁹ *The Book of Common Prayer*, p. 210. This phrase was used in the 1552 book of the Church of England.

³⁰ *Common Worship*, p. 190.

³¹ *Common Wroship*, p. 192.

³² *The Book of Common Prayer*, p. 221 and *Common Worship*, p. 182.

builds them up into the body of Christ, confederating them with the whole company of believers, and preserves them to everlasting life. The eucharist gives the communicants the opportunity to participate in the effective intercession of Christ to his Father and to join in Christ's self-offering by incorporating them into his body. Taylor is able to describe it as the 'extension of the incarnation'.

Taylor is willing to defend his position at length, marshalling all his arguments to show that the proper way to view the sacrament is in the spiritual, not physical realm. The elements of bread and wine remain, this much is clear and definite. Any change comes by way of blessing, which gives additional properties to the elements. The action of the Holy Spirit, invoked by the prayer of the priest, gives additional properties to the elements, they are now identified as Christ's body and blood, and are received with due reverence because Christ is here: 'for it is bread and Christ's body too; that is, it is bread naturally, and Christ's body spiritually'.³³

³³ Taylor, VI, p. 48.

Bibliography

Alexandria, Cyril of, *Commentary on the Gospel According to John*, Library of the Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church Vol. 43 (Oxford: Parker and Co., 1874).

Augustine S., *Homilies on the Gospel of John XXVI*, Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers I Vol. 7 ed. Philip Schaff (T & T Clark: Edinburgh, 1885).

———, Sermon 277, *The Fathers of the Church: A New Translation*, ed. Joseph Deferrari, trans. Sr. Mary Sarah Muldowney (New York: Fathers of the Church, 1959).

Aquinas, S. Thomas, *Summa Theologica*, Translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province (Benzinger Bros: New York, 1947).

Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, ed. & trans. by John Warrington (London: J.M. Dent and Son).

Askew, Reginald, *Muskets and Altars: Jeremy Taylor and the Last of the Anglicans*, (London: Mowbray, 1997).

Beer, Peter, 'G. B. Sala and E Schillebeeckx on the Eucharistic Presence: A Critique', *Science et Esprit*, 38 (1986), 31–48.

Bolton, F. R., *The Caroline Tradition of the Church of Ireland: With Particular Reference to Bishop Jeremy Taylor* (London: SPCK, 1958).

Bulgakov, Sergius, *The Holy Grail and The Eucharist*, trans. and ed. Boris Jakim (Hudson, New York: Lindisfarne Books, 1997).

Bullinger, H., 'The Decades of Henry Bullinger', trans. by H.I. ed. by Thomas Harding Vol. IV (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1852).

Calvin, Jean, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, ed. by John T McNeill, trans. by Ford Lewis Battles, 2 vols., The Library of the Christian Classics, 21 (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960).

Carroll, T.K., 'Jeremy Taylor: an Essay in Liturgical Ecumenics' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Pontifical University of St. Thomas Aquinas, Rome, 1970).

Chadwick, H., 'Ego Berengarius' *Journal of Theological Studies*, 40 (1989), 414–445.

Clairvaux, S. Bernard of, *Sermons for the Seasons & Principal Festivals of the Year: Translated from the Original Latin by a Priest of Mount Melleray*, Vol. III, (Westminster, MD: The Carroll Press, 1950).

Cocksworth Christopher J., 'The Presence of Christ in the Eucharist and the Formularies of the Church of England', *Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, 35.2 (1998), 197–209.

Conway, Anne, *The Conway Letters: The Correspondence of Anne, Viscountess Conway, Henry More and their friends 1642 – 1684*, ed. by Marjorie Hope Nicholson, rev. and introduced by Sarah Hutton (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992).

Cummings, Owen J., 'The Liturgical Jeremy Taylor'. *Worship* 77, 5 (2003), 425–438.

Cyprian, S., *Tractate on the Lord's Prayer* Ante Nicene Fathers Vol. 5 ed. Philip Schaff (T & T Clark: Edinburgh, 1885).

Davison, A., *Why Sacraments?* (London: SPCK, 2013).

Douglas, Brian, *A Companion to Anglican Eucharistic Theology*, 2 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 2011).

———, 'Transubstantiation: Rethinking by Anglicans?', *New Blackfriars*, 93.1046 (2012), 426–45.

Dugmore, C.W., *Eucharistic Doctrine in England from Hooker to Waterland: Being the Norrisian Prize Essay in the University of Cambridge for the Year 1940* (London: SPCK, 1942).

Ferguson, Everett, 'Sacraments in the Pre-Nicene Period', in *The Oxford Handbook of Sacramental Theology*, ed. Hans Boersma and Matthew Levering (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 126–139.

Gerrish, B.A., 'The Lord's Supper in the Reformed Confessions', *Theology Today* 23.2 (1966), 224–243.

Gordon, Bruce, 'Huldrych Zwingli', in *Christian Theologies of the Sacraments: A Comparative Introduction*, Edited by Justin S. Holcomb and David A. Johnson (New York: New York University Press, 2017), pp. 152–174

Hill, Christopher, *A World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the English Revolution*, (London: Penguin, 1991).

Hoopes, Robert, 'Voluntarism in Jeremy Taylor and the Platonic Tradition', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 13, (1950) 341–54.

Horton, Michael S., 'Theologies of Sacraments in the Reformation and Catholic Counter-Reformation', in *Christian Theologies of the Sacraments: A Comparative Introduction*, Edited by Justin S. Holcomb and David A. Johnson (New York: New York University Press, 2017), pp. 119–131.

———, 'Union and Communion: Calvin's Theology of Word and Sacrament', *International Journal of Systematic Theology*, 11.4, (2009), 398–414.

Hughes, H. Trevor, *The Piety of Jeremy Taylor* (London: Macmillan, 1960).

Humphries Jr., Thomas L., 'St. Augustine of Hippo' in *Christian Theologies of the Sacraments: A Comparative Introduction*, edited by Justin S. Holcomb and David A. Johnson (New York: New York University Press, 2017), pp. 41–58.

Hunsinger, George, *The Eucharist and Ecumenism, Current Issues in Theology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

Hutton, Sarah, *British Philosophy in the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015).

Kolb, Robert, 'Martin Luther', in *Christian Theologies of the Sacraments: A Comparative Introduction*, Edited by Justin S. Holcomb and David A. Johnson (New York: New York University Press, 2017), pp. 132–151

Levering, Matthew, *Sacrifice and Community: Jewish Offering and Christian Eucharist* (Malden MA: Blackwell, 2005).

———, 'Aquinas on the Sacramental Life', in *Christian Theologies of the Sacraments: A Comparative Introduction*, Edited by Justin S. Holcomb and David A. Johnson (New York: New York University Press, 2017), pp. 81–99.

Lindars, Barnabas, *The Gospel of John*, The New Century Bible Commentaries (Marshall, Morgan and Scott: London, 1981).

Lorizio, Giuseppe, 'The Eucharistic Doctrine of Luther, Read and Interpreted by a Catholic Theologian', *Lateranum*, 82, (2016), 35–54.

McAdoo, H.R., *The Eucharistic Theology of Jeremy Taylor Today* (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 1988).

———, *First of its kind: Jeremy Taylor's Life of Christ, A study in the functioning of a Moral Theology* (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 1994).

———, *Jeremy Taylor: Anglican Theologian*, (Armagh: Church of Ireland Historical Society, 1997).

———, and Stevenson, Kenneth, *The Mystery of the Eucharist in the Anglican Tradition: What Happens in Holy Communion?* (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 1995).

McCord Adams, Marilyn, *Some Later Medieval Theories of the Eucharist*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).

MacCulloch, Diarmaid. *Reformation: Europe's House Divided 1490 – 1700* (London: Allen Lane, 2003).

Mascall, E.L., *Corpus Christi: Essays on the Church and the Eucharist*, 2nd edn. (London: Longmans, Green and Co. Ltd., 1965).

Moxon, T. Allen, *St. Chrysostom On The Priesthood* (London: SPCK, 1907).

Newey, Edmund, 'The Form of Reason: Participation in the work of Richard Hooker, Benjamin Whichcote, Ralph Cudworth and Jeremy Taylor' *Modern Theology* 18:1 January (2002), 1–26.

Null, Ashley, 'Thomas Cranmer' in *Christian Theologies of the Sacraments: A Comparative Introduction*, Edited by Justin S. Holcomb and David A. Johnson (New York: New York University Press, 2017), pp. 209–232.

Otten, Willemien, 'Between Augustinian Sign and Carolingian Reality: The Presence of Ambrose and Augustine in the Eucharistic Debate between Paschasius Radbertus and Ratramnus of Corbie', *Dutch Review of Church History*, 80:2, (2000), 137–156.

Phelan, Owen M., 'Horizontal and Vertical Theologies: "Sacraments" in the Works of Paschasius Radbertus and Ratramnus of Corbie', *Harvard Theological Review*, 103:3, (2010), 217–289.

Porter, Harry Boone, *Jeremy Taylor: Liturgist* (London: SPCK, 1979).

Powers, Joseph M, 'Mysterium Fidei and the Theology of Eucharist', *Worship*, 40 (1966), 17–35.

Rubin, M., *Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge 1991).

Schillebeeckx, Edward, *The Eucharist*, trans. by Smith (London: Sheed and Ward, 1968)

———, ‘Transubstantiation, Transfinalization, Transfiguration’, *Worship*, 40 (1966), 324–38.

Schwarz, Robert C., ‘Metaphor qua Metaphor: Jeremy Taylor’s Eucharistic Theology’, *Sewanee Theological Review*, 50:4 (Michaelmas 2007), 495–520.

Siekawitch, Larry Daniel, ‘Calvin, Spirit, Communion and the Supper’, *Journal of The European Pentecostal Theological Association*, (2009), 14–35.

Slotemaker, John T., ‘Ontology, Theology and the Eucharist: Thomas Aquinas and William of Ockham’, *The Saint Anselm Journal*, 9.2 (Spring 2014), 1–20.

Spens, Will, ‘The Eucharist’ in *Essays Catholic and Critical*, ed. Edward Gordon Selwyn (London: SPCK, 1926) pp. 425–448.

Steel, Jeffrey H., ‘Eucharist and Ecumenism in the Theology of Lancelot Andrewes (1555-1626): Then and Now’ (unpublished PhD thesis, University of St. Andrews, 2012).

Stevenson, Kenneth, *Covenant of Grace Renewed: A Vision of the Eucharist in the Seventeenth Century* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1994).

Stone, Darwell, *A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, 2 vols. (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1909).

Stranks, C.J., *The Life and Writings of Jeremy Taylor* (London: SPCK, 1952).

Taylor, Jeremy, *The Whole Works of The Right Rev. Jeremy Taylor, D.D., Lord Bishop of Down Connor, and Dromore: with a Life of the Author and a Critical Examination of his Writings by The Right Rev. Reginald Heber, D.D.*, rev. and corrected by Charles Page Eden, M.A. 10 vols. (London: Longman, Brown Green, and Longmans, 1850).

———, *An Apology for Authorized and Set Forms of Liturgy*, Volume V, 227–314.

———, *A Collection of Offices, or Forms of Prayer in Cases Ordinary and Extraordinary*, (1658), *Whole Works*, Volume VIII, 571–701.

———, *Clerus Domini, or a Discourse of the Divine Institution of the Office Ministerial*, (1651), *Whole Works*, Volume I, 1–61.

———, *Dedication to Whole Volume*, fol. 1657 (Taylor’s dedication to a combined volume collecting together *Episcopacy Asserted* and other works on church discipline), (1657), *Whole Works*, Volume V, 1–8.

- , *Discourse on the Liberty of Prophesying*, (1647), *Whole Works*, Volume V, 341–605.
- , *On the Reverence Due to the Altar*, *Whole Works*, Volume V, 317–338.
- , *The Life of Our Blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, (The Great Exemplar)*, (1649), *Whole Works*, Volume II.
- , *The Real Presence and Spiritual of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament Proved Against the Doctrine of Transubstantiation*, (1654), *Whole Works*, Volume VI, 3–169.
- , *The Rule and Exercises of Holy Living*, (1650), *Whole Works*, Volume III, 1–254.
- , *The Worthy Communicant, or A Discourse on the Nature, Effects, and Blessings Consequent to the Worthy Receiving of The Lord's Supper*, (1660), *Whole Works*, Volume VIII, 3–239.
- Taylor Coolman, Boyd, 'The Christo-Pneumatic-Ecclesial Character of Twelfth-Century Sacramental Theology' in *The Oxford Handbook of Sacramental Theology*, ed. Hans Boersma and Matthew Levering (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 201–217.
- Tertullian, *On the Resurrection of the Flesh*, 23. Ante-Nicene Fathers Vol. 3 ed. Philip Schaff (T & T Clark: Edinburgh, 1885).
- Temple, William, *Christus Veritas: An Essay* (London: MacMillan, 1925).
- Torrell, J-P, *Saint Thomas Aquinas*, 2 vols., trans. R. Royal (Catholic University of America Press: Washington DC, 2005).
- Vaillancourt, Mark G., 'Sacramental Theology from Gottschalk to Lanfranc' in *The Oxford Handbook of Sacramental Theology*, ed. Hans Boersma and Matthew Levering (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 187–200.
- Vince, Ronald, 'Richard Hooker on the Eucharist: A Commentary on the *Laws* V.67', *Anglican Theological Review*, 89.3 (2007), 421–442.
- Zachman, Randall C., 'John Calvin', in in *Christian Theologies of the Sacraments: A Comparative Introduction*, Edited by Justin S. Holcomb and David A. Johnson (New York: New York University Press, 2017), pp. 191–208.
- Church of Ireland, *The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments* (Dublin: Columba Press, 2004).

4th Lateran Council, Canon I <<http://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/basis/lateran4.asp>>

A Following Holy Life: Jeremy Taylor and His Writings, ed. and introduced by Kenneth Stevenson (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2011).

Common Worship: Services and Prayers for the Church of England (Church House Publishing: London, 2000).

Concordia: The Lutheran Confessions, ed. by Paul Timothy McCain and others, trans. by William Hermann Theodore Dau and Gerhard Friedrich Bente, 2nd edn (St. Louis, Mo: Concordia Publishing House, 2006).

Hymnarium O.P.: Adapted from the books of the Friars Preachers, (Province of St. Joseph: New York, 2013).

Jeremy Taylor: Selected Works, ed. and introduced by T.K. Carroll (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist, 1990).

Mysterium Fidei <http://w2.vatican.va/content/paul-vi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-vi_enc_03091965_mysterium.html>

Ninety-Six Sermons by the Right Honourable and Reverend Father in God, Lancelot Andrewes, ed. by J.P. Wilson (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1841).

Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, ed. by H.C.G. Matthew and Brian Harrison, Vol. 51 (Oxford: OUP, 2004).

The Book of Common Prayer – 1549

<http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/1549/BCP_1549.htm>

The Book of Common Prayer – 1552

<http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/1552/BCP_1552.htm>

The Book of Common Prayer – 1559

<http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/1559/BCP_1559.htm>

The Cambridge Platonists, ed. and introduced by C. A. Patrides (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969).

The Canons and Decrees of the Sacred and Oecumenical Council of Trent, ed. and trans. by J. Waterworth (London: Dolman, 1848).

The Doctrine of the Real Presence as set forth in the works of divines and others of the English Church since the Reformation, ed. by E. B. Pusey (Oxford: Henry Parker, 1855).

The English Missal: Missale Anglicanum (London: Knott, 1934).

The New English Hymnal (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 1986).

The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church ed. by F.L. Cross and E.A. Livingstone (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983).

The Shorter Oxford Dictionary: On Historical Principles, prepared by William Little, H.W. Fowler and Jessie Coulson, rev. and ed. by C.T. Onions, 2 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973).

The Works of the Learned and Judicious Divine Mr. Richard Hooker with an Account of his Life and Death by Isaac Walton, Volume II Arranged by John Keble, rev. by R.W. Church and F. Paget (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1888).

Two Answers to Cardinal Perron and Other Miscellaneous Works of Lancelot Andrewes (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1865).

Writings and Disputations of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Martyr, 1556, Relative to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, ed. by John Edmund Cox (Cambridge: The University Press, 1844).

Zwingli and Bullinger ed. and trans. by G.W. Bromley, The Library of Christian Classics (Westminster Louisville, Kentucky: John Knox Press 2006).