

A PEOPLE'S SERVICEBOOK IN THE REFORM TRADITION

Bucer, Calvin and Knox, on "Common Worship" and
Sacramental Ministry
© Arlo D. Duba, 2008

The Reform Tradition originated the common servicebook for the hands, eyes and minds of people in the pew.¹ This is amply supported by historical research. In other words, we had a book of common prayer before the Anglicans! Whereas most folk in our tradition believe that our use of a worship book for the pew would be emulating the Episcopalians or the Roman Catholics, it is in fact they who have been imitating us all these years.

The Reform Tradition has from its beginning emphasized the dynamic nature of the eucharistic action, as over against the "thingly" focus on the material of the eucharist. John Knox used the phrase, the "ministration of the sacraments," a most insightful phrase that connotes a sacramental ministry and sacramental living. As we discuss a people's servicebook in the Reform tradition in this paper, we will follow the development of these concepts.

Servicebooks

Before 1525 there were Protestant and Catholic servicebooks, but they were only for clergy use. And they were in Latin. Neither Luther's Latin *Formula Missae* of 1523 which purged the mass of its "abominable additions," nor the *Deutsche Messe* of 1526, which translated the Mass into German, was intended for the hands of the assembled worshippers. Chorales and memorized hymns carried Lutheran worship. According to Frank Senn, only after 1545 is there evidence that orders of worship "were printed in the back pages of hymnals." But "the church orders . . . were not liturgical books that might be used at the altar." Only hymnals for the assembly and *cantionales* for choirs were printed and they by entrepreneurs. Authorized Lutheran service books appeared only in the nineteenth century.²

Before 1525 devotional books, in contrast to service books, were published, but these were "collections of prayers to be said privately while the priest was saying his prayers at the altar." The literature commonly says that during worship the people were "murmuring their devotions." These books were not written to have any direct relationship with the content or structure of the mass.³ Early reforming writers, both German and French, at first tried to provide similar "devotional books" in the vernacular that gave expression to reforming ideas to be contemplated during the service, but they also had no integral relationship with the order of the service.⁴

The reformed emphasis on literacy developed as the reformers saw the desirability of having every Christian able to read and understand both the scriptures and the prayers of the liturgy. Strasbourg was one such center of the Reform emphasis on literacy.⁵ The written word was a concrete expression of ministry to the minds, hearts and lives of Christians.

Liturgical reform moved rapidly after Diebold Schwartz celebrated the Mass in the vernacular in a side chapel of the Strasbourg cathedral on February 16, 1524. That mass was published, but was not yet for the congregation. It was soon followed by many editions, five within the first year. A much amplified edition was published in 1525, on a rush order to make it available for worshippers at the Easter service. A letter written in 1525 by Gerard Roussel to the Bishop of Meaux, a colleague in France, expresses his surprise and satisfaction at seeing worshippers in Strasbourg holding books in their hands from which they were reading and singing parts of the service, and not "murmuring their devotions."⁶

Hughes Oliphant Old refers to eleven such editions (with several sub-editions) before 1539;⁷ Bard Thompson counted the editions differently, saying that he used the 1539, which he called the eighteenth edition, for his translation found in *Liturgies of the Western Church*.⁸ Professor Old catalogs the changes in the liturgy during that time, noting that as of the 1525 edition, the word "mass" was replaced by "Lord's Supper." He also notes that those editions were to be in the hands of worshippers, not only "in church," but to be given voice in the homes of Christians, permeating their minds and spirits.

Both Word and Sacrament were to be remembered, and internalized, and then outwardly expressed. Neither was limited only to the occasion when Christians assembled for worship. Both were to be lived out in the daily life of the church and of individual Christians.

Martin Bucer (1491-1551)

Old emphasizes the importance of Martin Bucer's influence on successive Strasbourg editions from 1525 onward.⁹ Bucer was early at work promoting a uniform liturgy for the entire Church. Yes, for the church catholic! In the 1530s and 40s, it appears that he traversed all of Europe in this effort.¹⁰ By 1531 Bucer was in correspondence with Thomas Cranmer in England. In 1539 he was asked to draft an order of worship for the territory of Hesse.

Shortly thereafter he was called to Cologne by the Elector Archbishop Hermann von Wied to work with Phillip Melancthon on the formation of an ordinance, later published under the Archbishop's name as *A Simple Consideration Concerning the Establishment of a Christian Reformation*.¹¹ This was published in July 1543. As a model for the Cologne ordinance, the two reformers primarily used the Brandenburg-Nürnberg ordinance of 1533.¹²

Bucer and Melancthon wrote a liturgy that they hoped would be adopted by the Augsburg as well as the Helvetic branches of the European Reformation, and, they had hoped, also by the British. Although it had scattered use in Lutheran circles, perhaps pasted in the back covers of hymnals, it was never adopted by any of the Lutheran bodies.

Among the reformers (Bucer) played the role of mediator, trying desperately to create harmony between Luther and Zwingli, who were divided on the question of the Eucharist. . . .The difference was never bridged between Luther and the Swiss, but Bucer never abandoned

his middle position. . . . Bucer believed that none of these questions could be solved by learned theologians or by any one exegete but that the truth lay with the whole body of believers, the larger church, which was informed through the operation of the Holy Spirit. The Eucharist must be left a mystery, its true nature veiled. . . . This position won Bucer only scorn from his fellow reformers, who berated him as vacillating and obscurantist. In an age when doctrines were sharply defined, when men went to the stake for a word, Bucer had the misfortune to see that words, in themselves, were deceptive. . . . A component of his doctrine was an element of universality, stemming from the all-encompassing power of the Holy Spirit, and it was here that the influence of humanism was evident in his thought.”¹³

The Book of Common Prayer

James Hastings Nichols speaks of the *Book of Common Prayer* as the first English language prayer book. The second was Knox’s English liturgy used in Frankfurt and then in Geneva.¹⁴ The word “Common” in liturgical book titles always carries political overtones. King Henry VIII declared himself the head of the Church of England, and believed that a common language for worship would contribute to the unity of his kingdom. This concept was present in his Proclamation for Uniformity in Religion in 1536. Thomas Cranmer became the person chosen to effect this unifying commonality. The expectation was that if all the people knew and said the same prayers and developed the same spirituality, they would be good and happy subjects.

The relationship between Bucer and Cranmer intensified in the years following their 1531 correspondence. In 1536 Bucer dedicated his *Commentary on Romans* to Cranmer. In 1548, Cranmer now an archbishop, called Bucer to move to England, and subsequently to a teaching post in Cambridge University as Regius Professor of Divinity. Virtually all authorities, both those who favor Cranmer’s liturgical work and those who are critical of it, agree that Bucer was a driving force in the development of the Eucharist in both the 1549 and the 1552 editions of the *Book of Common Prayer* of the Church of England.¹⁵

The *Book of Common Prayer* had a very rocky beginning. The 1549 *Book of Common Prayer* was still an incomplete book. The Strasbourg 1525 and successor editions had been in use more than 27 years before the second Edwardian prayerbook was published in late 1552, but that prayerbook was short-lived. Edward died on July 6, 1553, a mere six months after its approval.

Queen Mary I ascended the throne on July 19, 1553, suppressed the *Book of Common Prayer*, commanded that all copies should be burned, reintroduced the Latin Mass, and forbade the use of the vernacular in the Church. The second Edwardian prayerbook had no opportunity to be circulated.¹⁶

After Mary’s death, Elizabeth ascended to the throne on November 17, 1558 and a slightly revised version of the *Book of Common Prayer* was published in 1559, though I recall reading that they had difficulty finding even one extant

copy of the 1552 book for reference. Now for the first time the *Book of Common Prayer* could begin to become the common prayer book of Britain.

However, it would still be years before such commonality could be achieved. At least four factors militated against such commonality: 1) numerous tribal groups prevailed throughout Britain, each with its own tongue or dialect; 2) illiteracy was rife throughout the Isles, a factor that also had to be dealt with in Strasbourg and Alsace, as noted above; 3) the technology of printing was in its early stages, and the production and the capability to produce and distribute books would not be available at least until the late 1560s; 4) also, the populace grew increasingly discontent and resistant to impositions from the Crown.¹⁷

Authors have long sought to ascertain the literacy level of the English at various periods. Judith Maltby provides a recent account, surveying previous studies.¹⁸

Tessa Watt, studying the influence of printing, states that “Reading was taught before writing, . . .” and even into the nineteenth century it was not unusual to find people who could read but not sign their names. But she also affirms that in 1600, the literacy rate ranged from 78% in scholarly and metropolitan areas, down to only 15% for men in the Diocese of Norwich over the entire period of 1580-1700, compared with 11% for women.¹⁹

Several authors have floated the hypothesis that central to the Reformation was “the shift of emphasis from a visual to an auditory register. In place of the Latin Mass, whose crucial moment of collective experience was the sight of the elevation of the host, the reformed English service was designed specifically to be heard. . . . Cranmer remarks in his preface to the 1544 English Litany “. . . the emphasis should fall on what ‘enters in their ears.’”²⁰

Maltby concludes “In one sense, none of this really matters. . . . As has been previously argued, a liturgical text exists principally to be used, not read. Repeated exposure to Common Prayer certainly meant that many must have had portions of it committed to memory . . .”²¹ In so saying, she confirms the purpose of a set liturgy: the provision of the words of the faith for the faithful that bear repeating until they are committed to the hearer’s memory. Notwithstanding, I have found no research indicating how many clergy were actually using the *Book of Common Prayer* in those several periods.

Considering all of the above, it may be considerably later than 1560 that the *Book of Common Prayer* came into common use in Britain. It was perhaps not until the seventeenth century that the desired commonness was achieved, though at the expense of a division of the kingdom in 1641 and 1662, a rift that is still evident today.²²

If the year 1560 is the earliest possible dissemination of the *Book of Common Prayer*, we note that by this time various editions of the Strasbourg liturgy had spread throughout most of central Europe, to some parts of Germany, to France, Switzerland, Holland, Hungary, and Slavik speaking Protestants!

John Calvin (1509 – 1564)

Having first studied the Latin language, rhetoric, and theology, Calvin switched to the study of law and received his

doctorate in that field by 1533.²³ He spent the following year in travel. He passed through Strasbourg, “where Bucer, Capito and Pastor Zell received him heartily.”²⁴ By that time Bucer had been in Strasbourg for ten years. During that visit Calvin certainly experienced Strasbourg worship as described by Bucer in *Grund und Ursach* that Bucer had written in 1524.

In *Grund und Ursach*, Bucer described what he called the “liturgical renovations” that were taking place there:

When the congregation comes together on Sunday, the minister [*Diener*] exhorts them to make confession of their sins and to pray for pardon; and he confesses to God on behalf of the whole congregation, prays for pardon, and proclaims the remission of sins to those that believe. Then the whole congregation sings several short psalms or hymns of praise, after which the minister makes a brief prayer and reads to the congregation a passage from the writings of the Apostles, expounding the same as briefly as possible. Thereupon the congregation sings again: The Ten Commandments or something else. The priest [*Priester*] then proclaims the Gospel and delivers the sermon proper. After this the congregation sings the Articles of our Faith. The priest then offers a prayer for the civil authority, in which he prays for an increase of faith and love, and grace to keep the remembrance of Christ’s death with profit.

Then he admonishes those who wish to observe the Lord’s Supper with him, that they would do so in remembrance of Christ, to die to their sins, bear their cross willingly, and love their neighbor truly, being strengthened in faith, which must then come to pass when we consider with believing hearts what unlimited grace and goodness Christ has shown us, in that He offered his body and blood to the Father on our behalf. After the exhortation he proclaims the Gospel of the Lord’s Supper, as the three evangelists, Matthew, Mark, and Luke, have described it, together with Paul in I Cor. 11.

Then the priest divides the bread and cup of the Lord amongst them, and also takes of it himself. Presently the congregation sings another hymn of praise. After that the minister closes the Supper with a short prayer, blesses the people, and bids them to go in the peace of the Lord. This is the manner and custom with which we now celebrate Christ’s Supper on Sundays only.²⁵

Calvin then went on to Basel where he published the first edition of his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*.²⁶ Calvin’s thesis as he expressed it in that 1536 edition of the *Institutes* remarkably matched Bucer’s pattern of worship. That liturgy had matured significantly when Calvin adapted it for the church in Geneva after his second, longer sojourn in Strasbourg. It was in Strasbourg that Calvin imbibed the knowledge and stimulus of that remarkable community described by Old. The key player in the development of the Strasbourg liturgy was Martin Bucer.

Jean Cadier asks in effect, what ever possessed Calvin to stop in a l’Auberge de l’Ours in Geneva in July of 1536?²⁷

No one knows. All we know is that that is where he met William Farel, twenty years his senior, who was serving as pastor to a group of Protestant Christians there. As Calvin puts it,

Farel, (burning with a wondrous zeal to advance the gospel) suddenly set all his efforts at keeping me. After having heard that I was determined to pursue my own private studies – when he realized he would get nowhere by pleas – he came to the point of a curse: That it would please God to curse my leisure and the quiet for my studies that I was seeking, if in such a grave emergency I should withdraw and refuse to give aid and help. This word so overwhelmed me that I desisted from the journey I had undertaken. Still, feeling my shame and my timidity, I would not undertake to discharge any particular function.²⁸

So Calvin stayed in Geneva where he continued his studying and writing. He undoubtedly experienced Farel’s worship, certainly using Farel’s *La Manière et Fasson* in which some say there is an orientation toward Ulrich Zwingli. In early October a dispute between representatives of the Catholic Church and the Reformers broke out in Lausanne. This dispute engaged Calvin and pulled him away from the pure scholarship of his books. He contributed to the Reformers’ cause by speaking a word that “stupefied its hearers by the abundance of his citations from the Fathers and his patristic knowledge.”²⁹

In early 1537 Calvin published a proposed draft of “Articles of the Church of Geneva,” and delivered several “sermons” simply entitled, “Readings in Holy Scripture” (he still did not consider himself a preacher). In those talks he referred repeatedly to the biblical and historical basis of weekly communion, the centrality of the internalizing of the faith in the burning heart of the Christian,³⁰ and the need for the exercise of discipline in the church.

Concerns arose over the Articles of 1537, and by January of 1538 the fat was in the fire. The clergy insisted that only those who had been baptized and had made a confession of faith could receive communion. The Council of Geneva said that they adopted the practice of Berne, that every baptized person should be admitted to the Supper, even not having made a confession. The clergy objected, and Council forbade them to preach.

On Easter Sunday, April 22, 1538, Calvin presided at the service in St. Peter’s and Farel at St. Gervais, and they barred certain ones from “profaning the holy Mystery,” barring them from the Table. On Monday, Council reconvened and ordered Calvin and Farel to leave within three days. They obeyed! Farel went to Basel and Calvin to Strasbourg. He had been invited there in the previous months, with invitations entreating him to come from Bucer, Capito, and Sturm. Under these circumstances Calvin went, but it appears as if he planned only a brief stop-over. As he himself says,

As a consequence of certain troubles I was banished. Then free, released by this means from my calling, I had planned to live quietly without undertaking any public responsibility, until that excellent servant of Christ, Martin Bucer, making use of a curse similar to that of Farel’s, removed me to another post. Terrified therefore by the example of Jonah that he set before me, I continued to

function in teaching. And even though I continued as always to keep to myself, that is, not to wish to appear at or to participate in the great assemblies, yet was I led as it were by force – I know not how! – to the imperial assembly. There willy-nilly, I was thrust into a great crowd of people.³¹

This great crowd of people included the incredible community of scholars in Strasbourg. At the time Calvin arrived, Strasbourg had had fourteen years of worship development, with significant input from more than a dozen significant scholars³² Calvin immediately became the student of Martin Bucer in the pastoral and worship dimensions of the church there. In turn, Bucer profited from Calvin's scholarship. Calvin came to value the contributions of Strasbourg and developed a very strong bond with Bucer.

As Old suggests, Calvin was not so much a creative thinker as a systematizer. Calvin recognized that the worship of Strasbourg, with the latitude expressed and permitted by Bucer, was indeed akin to his (Calvin's) developing theological system. Bucer had a warm, pervasive, and evident commitment to Jesus Christ, and he had an irenic spirit. The kinship was so close that Calvin, now the learner, immediately set about developing a French liturgy based on the Strasbourg model.

A number of Reform-minded francophones were in Strasbourg, and on September 28, 1538, Calvin, reticent as he was, preached in French in the Church of St. Nicholas. That group was soon worshipping with a printing of the *French Evangelical Psalm Book* developed by Calvin in the spring of 1539. This volume comprised thirteen Psalms set in meter by Clément Marot and five by Calvin himself. It also included musical settings of the Ten Commandments, the Kyrie, the Song of Simeon, and the Apostles' Creed. One year later this volume was followed by the *French Evangelical Psalm Book* of 1540, which included a full liturgy of the Lord's Supper. All congregation parts were said or sung at every service, with psalms interspersed.

Although Calvin's *Psalm Book* was a continuation of the Strasbourg tradition, Calvin made some significant additions. There were more Psalms, some prayers from the *Neuchâtel Service Book* of 1533, and a major change in the communion invocation. So, while one can say that the primary material comes from the community of scholar pastors surrounding Bucer, "it would be quite incorrect to call the liturgy of the French church at Strasbourg a mere translation of the Strasbourg Psalter of 1539."³³ Calvin took his *Psalm Book* with him when he was called back to Geneva in 1541. The adoption and development of the Strasbourg liturgies in Strasbourg itself continued with another edition, the *French Evangelical Psalter* of 1542.³⁴

The worship in Calvin's Geneva (1541-1557) continued the Strasbourg tradition, developing the genius of Bucer.³⁵

There was a continuing struggle in Europe with what is called the "Radical Reformation." Since that wing of the Reformation, which included the Anabaptists, had a general disregard for "outward forms", it is understandable that they did not share the careful, patristically-informed, and biblically-oriented approach that prevailed among the Reform

group. The Reformed were constantly searching for unanimous agreement on worship practice that would be common to all the churches. They encouraged common study and the ferreting out of historical and biblical evidence. They desired stricter adherence to "officially agreed upon" texts and rituals. "The fixing or formulation of the liturgy and the insistence that these forms be observed has through the whole history of the liturgy been one of the Church's first defenses against illuminism or enthusiast tendencies."³⁶ Calvin himself said, in a 1548 letter to Edward Seymore, Protector of Somerset in England, that every church needs an accepted catechism to give expression to belief and to guide it.

I say that it would be well, and even necessary, to bind the pastors and curates to a certain written form, as well for the sake of supplementing the ignorance and deficiencies of some, as the better to manifest the conformity and agreement between all the churches.³⁷

While resisting the excesses of the enthusiasts, the Reformed nonetheless stressed and insisted upon the inner appropriation of the gospel as proclaimed and enacted in Word and Sacrament. They resolutely resisted the mechanistic dependence on outward forms and things. One detects here a "middle ground" between the radical Reformers and the more conservative, including the Lutherans and Erasmus.

Calvin's irenic approach was and continues to be the vision behind liturgical development in the Reform tradition. It might be stated that a return to Calvin, (as opposed to Calvinism, of the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries) presents a generous orthodoxy that our worship today should express.

John Knox (1510-1572)

Knox came from humble beginnings, the son of a farmer, whose place and date of birth are nowhere recorded. However, his inclinations were academic rather than agricultural. Both the Universities of Glasgow and St. Andrews claim him, but there is no evidence that he received a diploma. One account hypothesizes that he was denied the degree for refusing to sign an oath rejecting the teachings of John Wycliffe. He knew Latin, French, Greek and Hebrew and was acquainted with the Fathers. He especially loved Augustine and Jerome.

Knox was forthright and abrupt. He preached fiery sermons, challenging royalty as well as religious leaders. He took pride in his rustic background and endured hardships, being exiled on repeated occasions, and once served nineteen months on a French boat as a galley slave. He was acquainted with kings and queens, serving for a time as Royal Chaplain to young King Edward VI and being condemned by Mary Queen of Scots.

Knox was a student of John Calvin. He made several extended visits to Geneva. He imbibed deeply of the Strasbourg worship ethos. While in Frankfurt in 1554, he served a congregation of Marian exiles, drafting an English order of worship based on Calvin's *La forme des Prières*. When he was expelled from Frankfurt he became the pastor for the English-speaking exiles in Geneva, publishing worship material for use there. The facsimile of the 1556 title page published in Geneva reads: *The forme of prayers AND MINISTRATION of the*

*Sacraments, &c. vsed in the Englishe Congregation at Geneua.*³⁸

Although Calvin consistently used the phrase, “administration of the sacraments,” I believe that the inner appropriation of both word and sacrament of which Calvin spoke was already a modification of the usual meaning of “administration.”

By dictionary definition, to “administer” is “to execute, manage, or dispense.” To “minister,” as in John Knox’s phrase, “the ministration of the sacraments,” is “to furnish, supply or impart . . . with immaterial obj.”³⁹ To be certain, there are administrative dimensions to the sacraments—their frequency, the functions of presiders and assistants in the service for example—but Calvin insisted that one must not be misled by the “occasional” and physical aspects of communion.

This is most evident in the Reformed *Sursum Corda*:

Let us lift our spirits and hearts on high where Jesus Christ is in the glory of His Father, whence we expect Him at our redemption. Let us not be fascinated by these earthly and corruptible elements which we see with our eyes and touch with our hands, seeking Him there as though he were enclosed in the bread or wine. Then only shall our souls be disposed to be nourished and vivified by His substance when they are lifted up above all earthly things, attaining even to heaven, and entering the Kingdom of God where He dwells. Therefore let us be content to have the bread and wine as signs and witnesses, seeking the truth spiritually where the Word of God promises that we shall find it.⁴⁰

Ministering sacramentally indeed has an immaterial object or objective. The objective is to nurture the Christian assembly to envision the invisible. It is to impart a spirit, an understanding. We must see beyond the water, beyond (or above) the bread and cup, and take that awareness into the political, social, and personal arenas. To minister sacramentally is to emphasize that the presence of the risen Lord is a constant in our lives. The presence that we celebrate sacramentally at every Lord’s Day service is a rehearsal for recognizing the presence in our everyday lives. The physical reality of the printed word in scripture and prayer, and the substance and physicality of the sacraments are incarnational prompts for a committed, very physical daily living.

I have found no scholar who mentions the significance of this use of the word “ministration.” The use of the upper case was simply a printer’s design, but it certainly serves to emphasize Knox’s interest in a shift of meaning. I find this usage instructive and evocative.⁴¹ In contrast to the picture of Knox as a brusque curmudgeon, I believe that here Knox is expressing his insight into the inwardness to which Calvin and the Strasbourg reformers were pointing when they affirmed that both Word and Sacrament must be lived out in daily life. It is obvious from the continued use of “ministration” in the literature of the Church of Scotland, that it regarded “sacramental ministration” in a different way than we ordinarily think of “administration.”⁴²

Upon his return to Scotland in 1559, Knox brought his *Forme of Prayers* with him. By 1560 the first *Book of*

Discipline of the Kirk “implied that the Sacraments were to be ministered after the Order of the Church of Geneva.”⁴³ By the year 1562 the General Assembly confirmed

that ane uniforme order shall be taken or kept in ministration of the Sacraments, and solemnization of Mariages and Buriall of the Dead, according to the Kirk of Geneva.⁴⁴

By 1564 the book had been published in Scotland, and the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland passed an Instruction

that everie minister, exhorter and reader shall have one of the Psalmes books latelie printed in Edinburgh, and use the order conteaned therein, in prayers, marriage, and ministration of the sacraments.⁴⁵

The book was required for all services beginning in 1564, and it recommended that every literate Christian should have a copy of the book for home and family use. The desire for commonality provided strong incentive for conformity.

That Assembly also adopted a new name: *The Book of Our Common Order*, then simply shortened to *Book of Common Order*.

The Church of Scotland was now a church of two books, the *Bible* and the *Book of Common Order*. Whereas Calvin’s service had only two places for extemporaneous prayer – the prayer for the illumination of the Holy Spirit just before the Scriptures were read and the prayer after the sermon – Knox provided a bit more freedom for the individual worship leader, but the majority of every service was still quite thoroughly scripted.

However, change was in the air. The covenantal theology that had had a strong centripetal, binding effect began to erode. The Calvinist emphasis upon the sole efficacy of God’s free grace was slipping, and by the 1630s dissenting groups of Baptists and Separatists required a pledge of “conscious conversion” and a commitment to discipleship and obedience by their members.⁴⁶

In 1632 the General Assembly took radical action, proposing to censure or depose from their ministry those ministers who had dropped the “Glory to the Father” after the Psalm, the saying of the Apostles’ Creed, especially at a Baptism, and other “individualistic departures” from the *Book of Common Order*. This indicates that clergy were still firmly expected to follow the 1564 General Assembly instruction. Yet, there was an anti-liturgical feeling abroad in the church “even before the great crisis of 1637.” Nichols reports that this

led to the massive revolution. The Glasgow General Assembly of 1638 defied the king and his military demonstrations, deposed his Scottish bishops, abolished episcopacy and everything now associated with it in the way of worship. The liturgical issues proper were almost entirely governed by the issue of the self-government of the church . . .⁴⁷

Nichols concludes: “Thus the Scottish influence at the Westminster Assembly (1643-1649) was likely to be open to some anti-liturgical suggestions.”

Anti-liturgical sentiments there were. The first committee formed by the Assembly was mandated to produce a liturgy for Britain, Scotland and Ireland. On that committee there was

only one Independent, Thomas Goodwin, but he was a very articulate, commanding, forceful and stubborn person. Although on at least two occasions the Presbyterian Puritans had recommended revised versions of the Knox Prayer Book, Bard Thompson notes,

When their chairman, Stephen Marshall, laid the first draft of the work before the full Assembly (May, 1644), he reported that “many serious and sad debates” had taken place over the crucial issue of form and freedom. To satisfy the desires and scruples of all the parties the subcommittee had found it expedient to produce a *directory*, as opposed to a liturgy⁴⁸

The Westminster Directory for Worship was adopted by the Westminster Assembly on February 6, 1645. This took place eighty-six years after Knox brought the *Forme of Prayers* to Scotland, and eighty-one years after the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland had mandated the use of *Common Order*. Yes, there was agitation about the “formalism” in the church and demands for more freedom were increasing, but, nonetheless, the Church of Scotland was a church of order. And that order died slowly.

The Westminster Directory seems not to have picked up on the centrality of Calvin’s emphasis on the flaming heart, and on the importance of the internalizing of the message of both Word and Sacrament.⁴⁹ The majority of the directives for preaching focus, quite clearly, on techniques to be used for the most convincing expression of the gospel. I find only one reference that perhaps can be interpreted as having the affections as its goal: the preacher should “bring it home to special Use, by application to his hearers.”⁵⁰

The section on the sacraments again seems to lay emphasis on concrete, administrative details. The only words that can be considered non-didactic or non-administrative are with reference to the prayer after communion where the prayer should include, “that he may be one with us, and we with him, that he may live in us, and we in him,” and that “they (members of the congregation) may be enabled to walk in the strength of that Grace, as becometh those who have received so great pledges of salvation.”⁵¹

This didactic, one could perhaps say non-existential, interpretation of Calvin is in sharp contrast to the interpretation of Brian Gerrish, among many other Calvin scholars, who sees Calvin’s work centering on God the Father’s great love for humanity, who desires nothing as much as the thankful response of children who perceive themselves as children in a loving family. The whole life of those children expresses itself in gratitude to God, primarily modeled in the Eucharist, and then lived every day.⁵²

When presented to the Scottish Parliament, the *Westminster Directory for Worship* was reluctantly accepted. Representatives of the Kirk made certain that the document as passed included as a demurrer this permissive caveat, that “this shall be no prejudice to the order and practise of this kirk,” and again expressed “the so much wished for uniformity in religion.”⁵³

There is evidence that the *Directory* had enthusiastic acceptance by some, but a slow reception among others who sensed that something important was being lost. For them the

Book of Common Order— for years or decades afterwards— continued in wide use as the practice of the Kirk and for the Reformed in all of Britain. The liturgy of John Knox continued to be used among a diminishing number of “traditional” Scots into the eighteenth century.

After Westminster.

In continental Europe Westminster had little or no effect. Hungary, the Netherlands, the Huguenots and the Hussites continued the use of a formal liturgy long after the 1645 Westminster Assembly *Directory* provided a “liturgy consisting of nothing but rubrics.”⁵⁴ Independency continued to gain acceptance and it appears that the Knox liturgy simply drifted into history. The “so much wished for uniformity in religion” went into eclipse.

The virus of Independency and individualism had infected the entire society, and people did “what was right in their own eyes” (Judges 17:6 21:25). The Christian Church in Britain was being drawn into the orbit of freedom and independency, while in the American colonies the declaring of independence led to a splitting into a myriad of denominations.

The abolishing of the *Book of Common Prayer* and then the drifting away from the *Book of Common Order* as well, exacerbated a separatist Independency movement that abolished all saints days, the festival days of the church year (basically the entire Christian calendar), the recitation of the creed and the Lord’s Prayer (though the *Directory* explicitly directed its use by the minister).

Christians caught up in the “rugged individualism” and the exuberant and idiosyncratic religious experience of the American frontier forgot about the unity of the church. Presbyterians could, whenever they were so inclined, refer to the *Directory* to support almost anything they chose to do in worship. As Professor John Leith said, “The *Directory* is a compromise. It is so replete with ambiguous directives that it could be interpreted in different ways.”⁵⁵

“Ministering the sacraments,” a central task of the shepherd of a flock, is lost when the sacraments are merely administered. The sacraments of Baptism and the Lord’s Supper are not juridically controlled events. Though they are text, they are more than text, more than a framework of words and actions, to be externally “observed.” If a mere “text-rubric mode,” or an arbitrary “once a month” observance prevails, the mechanical penchant that plagued the medieval church is inadvertently replicated, or unconsciously perpetuated, by the descendants of the founders of the Reform.⁵⁶

If members of the assembly were immersed in familiar text and sacramental ministry, they should go out into the world seeing its sacramental dimension.⁵⁷ The outward and visible would be a constant reminder of the inner, invisible, and metaphorical. They would understand that they themselves are sacramental ministers, dying daily to sin and rising to new life in Christ. Their own ministry would manifest that it is not the bread and the wine that has been changed, but it is we who are continually growing into, being changed into the Body of Christ. They would go out, bringing good out of evil, justice out of degradation, peace out of conflict, themselves bearers of the new life of Christ whom they meet in the sacraments.

Summary.

Worshippers who fell under the influence of Bucer and Calvin, in Strasbourg and in the entire Christian world, used some version of a fixed liturgy. The strongest statement is by James Hastings Nichols who says: “. . . service books . . . were not Roman Catholic in character, but a creation of the Reformation. . . . The conception of a book of ‘common’ prayer was a specifically Protestant idea.”⁵⁸

I believe that in the Strasbourg liturgies we find a nascent stress on sacramental ministering, and—when true to its origins—that emphasis pervades the Reform tradition. It is a dimension that must be recovered if we are to re-pristiniate that tradition and recapture its sacramental life-changing, and world-changing dynamism.

There have been standard bearers along the way. We think of persons like the Scottish Presbyterian, Edward Irving, and his Catholic and Apostolic Church and its liturgy; John Williamson Nevin and Philip Schaff and the Mercersburg Liturgy (one of the only liturgies that was for a time the official liturgy of an ecclesial entity); Charles Baird and his *Presbyterian Liturgies*; Charles W. Shields and his *Presbyterian Book of Common Prayer*; Eugène Bersier and his French liturgy of 1874.

This group includes Charles Hodge, with his statement in 1856 that a book of prayers and forms for worship would be desirable for the use of pastors in leading worship. He added the hope that a person of “large experience in pastoral life,” who was “familiar with the literature” and who possessed “high intellectual gifts, would step forward to compile such a book of prayers and forms.”⁵⁹ For the Presbyterians the fulfillment of his hope awaited the arrival of Henry van Dyke, Hugh Thompson Kerr, David Buttrick, and Harold Daniels, the editors of the Presbyterian worship books of the twentieth century. And still we wait.

It is most unfortunate, indeed a travesty, that we, who stand in such a distinguished line, have been slower than our Episcopal and Lutheran colleagues in leading our denominations to the reception of the words in worship intended for the eyes and hands, and thus the hearts, voices, and memories of members of the Christian assembly. More troubling is the tenuousness and the virtual disregard of the last two words of our ordination: “minister of Word and Sacrament.” Few pastors think of themselves as a minister of the sacraments or view theirs as a call to exercise sacramental ministry.

We of the Reform Tradition have a great legacy, and we of the Association for Reformed & Liturgical Worship have a significant and preeminently important task. Let us work to continue the reform of the Reform Tradition, bringing it back to the insights of our founders and their ideas. That task has two elements: First, let us get our liturgies into the pews, get them spoken, and get them understood; second, let us reform our understanding of sacramental ministry, by which we give support to the first. Then let us use both to give glory to the triune God, with faith in Jesus Christ, as we are led by the Holy Spirit!



Arlo D. Duba

Retired Dean, and Professor of Worship Emeritus,
Dubuque Theological Seminary

arloduba@cablelynx.com

-
- ¹ I speak of the “Reform Tradition,” using “Reformed Tradition” only when speaking of past liturgical practices. I believe that *semper reformanda* suggests that we are to be constantly reforming. We seek to develop our confession and our worship, always reforming our worship and our theology according to our understanding of scripture and the relationship of our confession of trinitarian faith in Jesus Christ as we are led by the Holy Spirit.
 - ² Frank C. Senn, “Books, Liturgical, Lutheran,” in *The New Westminster Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship*, Paul Bradshaw, ed. (Louisville/London: Westminster John Knox, 2002) 79-81.
 - ³ Hughes Oliphant Old, *The Patristic Roots of Reformed Worship* (Zurich, Theologischer Verlag, 1970) 10.
See also *Worship in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, Karin Maag and John D. Witvliet, eds. (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2004).
 - ⁴ Old, 15-16
 - ⁵ Miriam Usher Chrisman, *Strasbourg and the Reform* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1967) 46, 81. In a chapter entitled “The Intellectual Milieu of the City,” the author writes, “In the last decades of the fifteenth century, . . .” a group of young Christian scholars arrived, whose preaching of “the Pure Word of God” brought with it a “revival of learning.”
 - ⁶ A.-L. Herminjard, *Correspondance des réformateurs dans les pays de langue française, recueillie et publiée avec d’autres lettres relatives à la réforme et des notes historiques et biographiques, Volume 1* (Genève: H. Georg, 1878) 404. It was not long afterward that the Bishop was excommunicated from the Roman Catholic Church for his support of the reform movement.
 - ⁷ Old, *Patristic Roots*, 18-22, 39, 80-91 and 99-100.
 - ⁸ Bard Thompson, *Liturgies of the Western Church* (New York and Scarborough: The World Publishing Co, 1961) 160.
See also *Worship in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, especially chapters 1, 2 and 4.
 - ⁹ An edition entitled *Strassburg Psalter* was published in 1526, and for the first time the word “psalter” was used for the Reformed servicebook placed in the hands of the people for their use in common worship. The varied spellings (Strasbourg or Straszbourg, and *Teutsche Messe*, *Deutsche Messe* or *Deudsche Messe*) can be attributed to the recent introduction of the printing press. In an oral/aural culture, the spelling of words had been arbitrary. With the introduction of the printing press, the variety of spelling possibilities slowly moved toward uniformity.
 - ¹⁰ Chrisman, *Strasbourg and the Reform*, 83. She states: “The four men who were to change the lives and mores of the citizens of Strasbourg were Martin Bucer (1491-1551),

Wolfgang Capito (1478-1541), Matthaus Zell (1477-1548), and Caspar Hedio (1494-1552). . . . Each differed from the other in temperament, in interest, and in experience, and the Strasbourg Reform represented not the work of a single, powerful mind but the combined efforts of a disappointed Dominican, an ecclesiastical courtier, a university professor, and a self-effacing scholar. By this very diversity it drew to itself the major forces of German intellectual and ecclesiastical life.”

- ¹¹ The Archbishop was deposed and excommunicated by Pope Paul III in 1546.
- ¹² Amy Nelson Burnett, “Martin Bucer and the Church Fathers in the Cologne Reformation,” *Reformation & Renaissance Review: Journal of the Society for Reformation Studies*, 3:1&2 (June & December 2001) 109. Burnett provides documented evidence that the *Simple Consideration* of Archbishop Wied, along with the Strasbourg liturgy, had a great influence on the English *Book of Common Prayer*. Bucer and Melancthon also contributed to several other church ordinances.
- ¹³ Chrisman, *Strasbourg and the Reform*, 87.
- ¹⁴ James Hastings Nichols, *Corporate Worship in the Reformed Tradition* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968) 68.
- ¹⁵ Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996) 174-175. McCulloch here charts the course from Cranmer’s visit to Nuremberg in 1532, and his meeting with Bucer, Capito and Hedio, to Bucer’s arrival in England. At Cranmer’s invitation, Bucer moved to England in 1548, and in 1549 was elected to a chair at Cambridge University. We note that not only did Cranmer respect Bucer, but that the relationship was reciprocal. It was a *quid pro quo* relationship.
- ¹⁶ It is of note that during the reign of Queen Mary I (1553-1558), known as “Bloody Mary,” Cranmer was burned at the stake, March 21, 1556, and Bucer, who died of natural causes in 1551, was exhumed and ceremonially burned at Mary’s command.
- ¹⁷ Peyton Craighill, personal communication. Craighill is retired Professor of Liturgy and Dean of the School of Theology, Sewanee, Tennessee, and an authority on Anglican worship.
- ¹⁸ Judith Maltby, *Prayer Book and People in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England* (New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998) 26. The author names a section of her first chapter, “How Common was ‘Common’ Prayer?” She cites an annotated copy of the catalogue of the Bible Society, stating that out of 677 copies of the Bible published between 1550 and 1680, 105 copies include sections of the *Book of Common Prayer*, with 74 of those including the entire Prayer Book. She notes that prior to the 1580s, only the tables for finding the daily lessons were duplicated therein. She concludes that the printers included portions of the

Prayer Book in response to the desires of purchasers with reference to the portions to be included.

She also cites a passage from the journal of John Winthrop a New England Puritan, which twenty-first century folks may find whimsical:

- “Mice had eaten an entire Book of Common Prayer and, though it was bound with a Greek New Testament and a psalter, the rodents had left the portions of scripture without even a tooth mark. Winthrop related that the ‘common prayer [had been] eaten with mice, every leaf of it, and not any of the other [books were] touched, nor any of his other books, though these were over a thousand’. In a providential interpretation of events, even the mice of New England were instruments of the divine will.” 27
- ¹⁹ Tessa Watt, *Cheap Print and Popular Piety, 1550-1640*, (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press 1991) 7.
- ²⁰ Ramie Targoff, *Common Prayer: The Language of Public Devotion in Early Modern England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001) 23.
- ²¹ Maltby, *Prayer Book and People*, 29.
- ²² The British Civil Wars, The Commonwealth, Protectorate and Restoration (1638-1688) was a time of great upheaval. After Queen Elizabeth’s successful reign (1658-1603), there was a general lessening of royal power. In large part King Charles I’s reign (1625-49) was a disaster. He sought to impose the Scottish Prayerbook, a version of the *Book of Common Prayer*, on Scotland in 1637 (see endnote 47 below) and presided over several wars until he was beheaded. The causes for this upheaval were both religious and cultural. It inaugurated a series of wars, also known as “The wars of the Three Kingdoms,” and the end result was the division among England, Scotland, and Ireland, each with its own religious preference and form of government. It also meant a (temporary) end to the monarchy, the declaration of the Protectorate under Cromwell, and some say it was only resolved in 1660, with the restoration of the monarchy with a parliament in England.
- ²³ Jean Cadier, *Calvin: L’homme que Dieu a dompté* (Genève, Labor et Fides, 1963) 21-22. (The title of the book uses a word, “dompté” that Calvin used about himself. In English the title would be *Calvin: The man tamed by God*, as a trainer tames or trains a horse to ride. Cadier states that by 1535 Calvin was already quite well known for his religious views. He cited Calvin’s provision of the Preface to the French translation of the Bible by Pierre-Robert Olivétan. In response to those who said books are usually dedicated to the king or prince, Calvin’s 1535 dedication reads: “to all emperors, kings, princes and peoples under the empire of Christ, the King of Kings, Lord of heaven and earth.” 66-67.
- ²⁴ Emanuel Stickelberger *Calvin: A Life*, David G. Gelzer, trans. (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1954) 27.
- ²⁵ Martin Bucer, *Grund und Ursach* (1524), cited by Thompson, *Liturgies*, 161-62

²⁶ *The Piety of John Calvin: An Anthology illustrative of the Spirituality of the Reformer*, Ford Lewis Battles, trans. and ed. (Grand Rapids, (Baker Bookhouse, 1978) 32;. We are much indebted to Calvin for providing a brief autobiography in his “Introduction” to his *Commentary on the Psalms*, here translated by Ford Lewis Battles (total pages of “Introduction,” 27-42). Calvin provides his account of his brief sojourn in Basel and his writing of the Institutes. 31-32.

²⁷ Cadier, *Calvin*, 38-76. The author provides a very human account of Calvin’s life.

See also Richard Stauffer, *The Humanness of John Calvin* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1971), who counters the accusations that Calvin was obsessed with an image of God as a divine ogre, that he lacked affection and tact. Stauffer points out his marriage to a widow, his devotion to her two children long after her death. He cites voluminously from Calvin’s letters, affirming his faithfulness to his fellow reformers, especially to Farel, Bucer, Sturm, and Melancthon. He also cites Calvin’s encouraging letters to Geneva after having been expelled from the city, his refusal to entertain a grudge, and his twenty-seven years of pastoral commitment. Both those who agreed with him and those who disagreed spoke of his gentleness and friendliness.

²⁸ John Calvin, “Introduction” in *Piety*, 33.

²⁹ Cadier, *Calvin*, 81.

³⁰ See endnote 49 below.

³¹ John Calvin, “Introduction” in *Piety*, 33-34.

³² Old, *Patristic Roots*, 1-100. The author speaks of the Strasbourg series as the continuing effort of a community of scholars, developing an evolving masterpiece.

³³ Old, 92.

³⁴ Old, 74-96. Old deals with this development, including the exporting of the project to Geneva when Calvin was recalled to that city in 1541, and the publication of the *Genevan Psalter* of 1542.

³⁵ Nichols, *Corporate Worship*, 57. “Martin Bucer, consequently, as the leading Reformer of Strassburg, must be given credit as the chief architect of the Calvinist form of worship.”

See also Cadier, *Calvin*, 92-94. In this passage the author cites Jacques Courvoisier: “For three years Calvin had become the friend and the disciple of Bucer.” The author goes on to cite Calvin’s own acknowledgement in his “Adieux aux pasteurs de Genève:” “With reference to the Sunday prayers of the church, I borrowed the greatest part from the order of Strasbourg.” Cadier mentions other borrowed ideas and practices: Bucer’s, and later Oecolampadius’ insistence that the congregation needs not a single leader, but should have four categories of leadership: pastor, elder, deacon, and teacher; that the church itself and not the government, must name and appoint these leaders. He adds that having received all

these borrowings, “Calvin marked (them) with his own style and the grandeur of his expression.” 94.

³⁶ Old, *Patristic Roots*, 82, n. 1

³⁷ *Letters of John Calvin*, David Constable, trans. (Edinburgh: Thomas Constable and Co., 1855) vol. 2, 191.

³⁸ W.D. Maxwell, *The Liturgical Portions of the Genevan Service Book* (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1931), 9, 82.

It is interesting that Maxwell provides a transcription of that book into Latin. When the original English edition was translated into Latin it read: *RATIO ET FORMA PVBLICE ORANDI DEUM, ATQVE ADMINISTRANDI SACRAMENTI*. 82.

Maxwell makes no comment on the relationship between “ministration” as Knox used it, and “administrandi,” “administration,” which Calvin had used in his Latin writing. When Knox recast his own work into Latin, he again reverted to Calvin’s usage and used “administrandi.” In three of the seven appendices of Maxwell’s book he refers to what I would consider administrative issues: if and when kneeling is appropriate in worship, the frequency of the celebration of the Lord’s Supper, and the mode, order, and the receiving of the bread and the cup. 177-213. “Administration” is perhaps appropriate in those instances.

³⁹ *The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933).

⁴⁰ Thompson, *Liturgies*, 207. The author provides a note that “this final paragraph of the Exhortation probably came from Farel’s liturgy, *La Manière et fasson, editred by J. G. baum* (Strasbourg: Treuttel et Wurtz, 1859), pp. 64-65.” It has become known as the “Reformed Sursm Corda.”

⁴¹ Maxwell, *Liturgical Portions*, 105. In Chapter 8 titled “The ministration of Baptism” the rubrics state “. . . it is not permitted by Godswoord, that wemen should preache or minister the Sacraments . . . (and) Baptism shall be ministered in) the churche on the day appointed to comen prayer and preaching.

In commenting on this passage, Maxwell stresses Knox’s point: 112 “Baptism should always be administered in the church,” using “administer” there and on several other occasion,. though the English text upon which he is commenting always uses the word, “minister.” Though I have not combed the text to find every instance, I do not know of a single time that Maxwell used the word “minister” as a verb relating to the sacraments. It appears that it never occurred to Maxwell that there might have been possible significance in the change of words.

⁴² Robert Bruce, *The Mystery of the Lord’s Supper: Sermons on the Sacraments preached in the Kirk of Edinburgh* (St. Giles) A.D. 1589, Thomas F. Torrance, trans. and ed. (London: James Clarke, 1958). 39. Bruce, Knox’s successor at St. Giles in Edinburgh, continued to use Knox’s term: “There is nothing in this world, or out of this world, more to be wished by everyone of you than to be conjoined with Jesus Christ, and once for all made one with Him, the God of glory. . . . It is brought about by means of the Word and preaching of the Gospel, and it is

brought about by means of the Sacraments and their ministrations. The Word leads us to Christ by the ear; the Sacraments lead us to Christ by the eye. . . . That doctrine must be most effectual and moving which awakens and stirs up most of the outward senses, for that which awakens not only the ear, but the eye, the taste, the feeling, and all the rest of the outward senses must move the heart most and will pierce into the soul.”

Bruce then indicates the four ways the early church defined sacrament: 41 (first), Sometimes they took it for the whole action, that is for the whole ministry of the elements. (second) Sometimes they took it not for the whole action, but for the outward things that are used in the action of Baptism, and the Supper (washing, breaking, distributing and eating). Thirdly, only the material things, (water, bread, wine) . . . Finally, they took (the whole ministry of the sacraments to include “. . . everything signified by the action and the elements.”

Article XXIII of the XXXIX Articles of the Church of England of 1563 includes: “. . .the office of public preaching or ministering the sacraments in the congregation . . .”

⁴³ Maxwell, *Liturgical Portions*, 9.

⁴⁴ Maxwell, *Liturgical Portions*, 34, states that in the 1560s Archbishop Parker’s directions say: “The holie Comunion is mynistred ordinarylie the fyrste Sondaie of euerie moneth, thorough the yeare, at what time the Table is sett Easte and weaste,” citing Strype, *Parker* (Corpus Christi College MS. 122, 323).

⁴⁵ Maxwell, *Liturgical Portions*, 7-9

⁴⁶ Nichols, *Corporate Worship*, 97-98

⁴⁷ Nichols, *Corporate Worship*, 99. King Charles I and Archbishop Laud issued an edict and sought to impose a version of the *Book of Common Prayer* (The Scottish Prayerbook) on the Scottish church, forcing it to conform to the liturgical practice and government of the Church of England. When Charles and the Archbishop appeared in St. Giles in Edinburgh, Jenny Geddes (allegedly) yelled and threw her stool at the service presider, thus starting a riot. The Scottish churchmen, having refused the impositions of the King, were accused of treason by Charles who sent in troops, thus starting two Bishop’s wars and the English civil war, ending with the defeat and execution of Charles I in 1649 and many more years of unpleasantness. (also see endnote 22 above.)

⁴⁸ Thompson, *Liturgies*, 349.

⁴⁹ The “Calvin Crest,” made current in the mid-twentieth century, displays an outstretched hand, presenting a flaming heart to God. Around the crest are the words “My heart I give thee Lord, eagerly and sincerely,” a prayer attributed to John Calvin. The concept was picked up by William Sloan Coffin and expressed in the prayer, “Lord, take our minds and think through them; take our lips and speak through them; take our hearts and set them on fire,” thus emphasizing the intellectual dimension, the witnessing dimension, and the necessary

interiorizing of the faith. To these he often added, “take our hands and work through them,” and “take our lives and live your life through them,” but the prayer or benediction always ended, “take our hearts and set them on fire.” Coffin spoke of this as the epitome of Calvin’s theology in prayer.

⁵⁰ Thompson, *Liturgies*, 364

⁵¹ Thompson, *Liturgies*, 370-71.

⁵² Brian A. Gerrish, *Grace and Gratitude: The Eucharistic Theology of John Calvin* (Fortress, 1993) 20. “Calvin never wavered, right up to the final edition, of setting first the image of the spiritual banquet that the best of fathers spreads before his children. . . . The father’s liberality and his children’s answering gratitude or lack of it, is not only the theme of the Lord’s Supper, but a fundamental theme, perhaps the most fundamental theme, of an entire system of theology.” (Thus does Gerrish entitle his work *Grace and Gratitude*.)

⁵³ This statement is in the one paragraph preamble to the *Directory*.

⁵⁴ Walter Lowrie, *Action in the Liturgy: essential and unessential* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1953) 220. Cited by Nichols, *Corporate Worship*, 99. .

⁵⁵ John H. Leith, *An Introduction to the Reformed Tradition* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1977) 180.

⁵⁶ For this insight I am at least in part indebted to John Knox and, more recently, Fred R. Anderson. See a series of four Special Supplements in the *Newsletter* of the Association for Reformed & Liturgical Worship (AR&LW) by Fred R. Anderson and entitled: *Moving Toward Every Sunday Communion* (vol. II, no 2 [Fall, 2006], vol. III. No 1 [Spring, 2007], vol. III, no 2 [Fall 2007], and vol. IV, no 1 [Spring, 2008]. These articles have been seminal for my thinking about “ministering sacramentally.” They provide a record of the ministering exercised by Dr. Anderson in two congregations, First Presbyterian Church of Harrisburg, PA, and the Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church in New York City, NY. That sacramental ministering preceded the consideration of every-Sunday communion in each of those congregations. It was that sacramental ministering that led to the decisions by the sessions of those two congregations and its members for that every-Sunday celebration of the Lord’s Supper at every regularly scheduled Sunday service. It appears that if one were to ask about the marks of the church in those two congregations, they now would include sacramental living along with hearing the Word preached, benevolent outreach, and the exercise of discipline.

⁵⁷ Calvin said that the Christian should delight in every mundane detail of daily living, finding Christ there. He quotes Bernard’s admonition: “The name of Jesus is not only light but also food; it is also oil, without which all food of the soul is dry; it is salt, without whose seasoning whatever is wet before us is insipid; finally, it is honey in the mouth, melody in the ear, rejoicing in the heart, and at the same time medicine. Every discourse in which his

name is not spoken is without savor.” *Institutes*, 2:16.1.

See also 1:14.20-21.

⁵⁸ Nichols, *Corporate Worship*, 54.

⁵⁹ Charles Hodge, “Presbyterian Liturgies,” cited by in Julius Melton, *Presbyterian Worship in America*, (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1967) 75.

