

Strathclyde University Lecture.

Liturgy: The Sacramental Soul of Jacobitism.

In his novel Guy Mannering Sir Walter Scott wrote that the Episcopal Church had “become the shadow of a shade”.¹ This, as you all well know, is a much hackneyed phrase, and has become the epithet of the Episcopal communion in Scotland in the 18th Century.

I do not need, amongst this august company, to stress the enthusiasm for the Jacobite cause which was evidenced amongst non-juring Scottish Episcopalians. My illustrious predecessor in office, Dean John Skinner (Tullochgorum), who was one of the smaller group of jurors, attempted to dissuade several of his congregation from joining the 1745 Rising, including his own servant Alexander Henderson. It was a cause which Skinner had referred to as “a hazardous and almost romantic enterprise, which had for some months held all Scotland in awe”.² However the result deeply affected him, he penned the following.....

‘But long shall Scotland rue the day,
She saw her flag so proudly flying,
Culloden Field is fraught with wae,
Her honours lost her warriors dying’³

In fact Tullochgorum and his pregnant wife Grizell were turned out of the parsonage at Longside on July 26th 1746, and his papers, including his Letters Orders and books were carried off. Subsequently he himself on the 26th of May 1753 was imprisoned in Old Aberdeen Gaol which was located in the Town House building before the present structure which now occupies the site.

The majority of Scottish Episcopalians in the eighteenth century were for the Cause, even though by 1745 there were more qualified or juring Episcopalians. That was probably due to the *real politique* of the situation as a result of the persecution. One could be a public juror and attend St Paul’s Loch Street in Aberdeen with its English Office, pray for King George, sing praise accompanied by its fine organ, yet quietly pray for the “King over the Water”.

Adherence to the Jacobite cause cost the Episcopal Communion greatly.

The Revolution of 1689 and subsequent seizure of the throne by William of Orange had caused the Episcopal party in the Scots Kirk to be extruded. Episcopal clergy were forced out of parishes although this in some cases took several decades. The failure of the Risings was attended by subsequent persecution. The Penal Laws enacted in 1746 and 1748 were intensive and practically destroyed Episcopacy in Scotland. An Episcopalian whether a juror or non-juror was to all intents and purposes an inveterate Jacobite. Colonel Yorke in the aftermath of Culloden was convinced that Episcopalians of whatever flavour would simply not do.⁴ Cumberland in his forays in

¹ Walter Scott, Guy Mannering (Thomas Nelson & Son, London, 1900) p.313.

² J. Skinner, Ecclesiastical History of Scotland Vol II (TEvans, London, 1788) p.661.

³ Aberdeen Diocesan Archives, MSS 3230 5

⁴ P.C.Yorke, The Life & Correspondence of Philip Yorke Earl of Hardwicke Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain in 3 Volumes (University Press, Cambridge 1913 Volume I p.513.

the North and North-East post Culloden was out to extirpate Episcopacy from Scots soil.

He almost succeeded.

If support of Jacobitism was a physical, political, temporal, ecclesiastical disaster for Episcopalianism then there was another side. As far as theology, ecclesiology and liturgy was concerned then the story could only be said to be the opposite.

The recent British General Election gave rise to some amusing anecdotes about Prime Ministers who had lost elections. One was when Churchill lost the General Election after the War. Apparently he was inconsolable. Clementine his wife came through to him and said.... "Oh don't worry Winston it's probably a blessing in disguise!" To which he replied... "It is so well disguisedI cannot feel the blessing!"

The fateful interview of Bishop Rose of Edinburgh with William of Orange when William walked away from Rose, in an ecclesiological and liturgical sense, may have been a blessing in disguise. Gone were the bad old days of Erastianism. The Church, no longer shackled to the State, certainly after 1731, was free to elect its own Bishops (a privilege of the pre-Constantinian Church) and also almost immediately liturgical experimentation began. When Samuel Seabury after his consecration at Aberdeen took return passage to America on the Captain Dawson¹, he took with him a gift from the Scots Bishops, "that a free, Valid and purely Ecclesiastical Episcopacy may, from them pass into the Western World."² In addition Article V in the Concordate signed at Aberdeen on 15th November 1784 ensured that the Scottish Communion Rite would be taken back by Seabury to America. Consequently, this for many in America, has been regarded as the greater gift. "In giving the primitive form of Consecration, 'Scotland gave us a greater boon than when she gave us the Episcopate'".³ Seabury was also given liturgical books by the Bishops including Rattray's 1744 Liturgy which we will mention later.⁴

The early 18th century was a time when the minds of Episcopalian Divines were concentrated on the Liturgy. The Church had been extruded from its temporalities: parsonages, churches and cathedrals.

The question in reality was and is: What is it that holds the Church together? quite simply the Liturgy. The **Λειτουργία**, the **λάος εργον**, the work of the people. Liturgical experimentation moved forward apace. It was also a time when Episcopalians in the North East like Lord Forbes of Pitsligo and George Garden turned to Quietism and the works of Mme Guyon and Antionette Bourignon. In the previous century mysticism had fired up Henry Scougal and John Forbes of Corse. For Alexander Lord Forbes of Pitsligo: "An absolute submission to the Divine Will both in ourselves and others is the only thing to be prayed for, as it was the only true religion"⁵ It was almost like you turn towards the thing that truly matters to the soul when the things of this world are working against you.

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer published during the First Episcopate in 1637 had an unfortunate debut: The Bishop of Edinburgh was assailed with the immortal

¹ Scottish Record Office MSS CH12/12 2018

² Seabury to Miles Cooper quoted in Allan to Petrie-14th September 1784-Scottish Record Office MSS CH/12/24/P535-6

³ American Church Review, July 1882 quoted in John Dowden The Annotated Scottish Communion Office, R Grant and Son, Edinburgh 1884 p117.

⁴ Samuel Seabury, Discourses on Several Subjects, Vol I Hudson 1815 p 159.

⁵ G.D Henderson, Mystics of the North-East, The Spalding Club, Aberdeen 1934) p.46.

words “Dinna cry mass in ma lug” reputedly from the lips of Jenny Geddes. The Liturgy contained therein had been an attempt to recover the liturgical position of the English 1549 Book. In some ways the Book was the start of a process of the Scots Liturgists, with an eye to the Scottish situation, to look towards the East: the Early Fathers and the Ancient Eastern Rites, with the inclusion of an Epiclesis and Prayer of Oblation.

The Book was reprinted in 1712 by the Earl of Winton and was used by some of the non-jurors. In the previous century, in the Second Episcopate there was little to differentiate between a Presbyterian Service and an Episcopalian one. The Episcopalians always used the Lord’s Prayer and said Doxologies after the psalm, but in many ways worship in the Second Episcopate was worship in a liturgical vacuum. Freedom from state control changed all that.

The liturgical scholarship and understanding possessed by the non-jurors can be traced back to the Aberdeen Doctors in the reign of Charles I. In the First Episcopate John Forbes of Corse taught in his work called Irenicum that the faithful receive in their hands a sign and memorial of the proper body of Christ. He noted the importance of the Epiclesis in the Eucharistic prayer and argued that the power of the Eucharist lies in it being the memorial of Christ’s death, and all the benefits come not from, but through the memorial, from the one sacrifice of Christ on the cross. Forbes rejected transubstantiation and consubstantiation. The Fraction to him was important. Christ was the perfect oblation. We read in Spinks’ work Sacraments, Ceremonies and the Stuart Divines that for Forbes “The breaking which takes place in the celebration of the Eucharist is the body of Christ dying on the Cross; in the same manner also that which in the Eucharist is called the body of Christ, is that very true same body of Christ which was taken of the Virgin Mary, and broken for us on the Cross. Christ Himself, indeed, is immolated in that celebration, yet not in Himself, but in Sacrament”¹ In the Eucharist we offer the commemoration of that unique immolation of Christ made once, “suppliantly praying God that, looking on it, He will be propitious to us sinners: *not on account of this our commemoration*, but on account of that bloody, truly and properly sacrificial and propitiatory oblation; which we commemorate and offer to God by an offering not sacrificial but commemorative; not propitiatory and meritorious, but supplicatory and Eucharistic”.² Forbes also believed in the Eucharist as Sacrifice and an occasion of intercession of a personal nature.

John Forbes of Corse regarded the Patristic writers as equally, or even more authoritative than the magisterial Reformers and tended to put an emphasis on sacraments as instruments of Christ’s virtue and grace.

John Calvin was as we all know a key figure in Reformed theology. I was recently advised by Fr Douglas Kornahrens, Rector of Holy Cross, Davidson Mains, Edinburgh to consult Tom Torrance’s book Space, Time and Incarnation. Torrance’s work is also quoted in Spink’s book, and in that he mentions that Calvin operated with a dynamic view of space, composed of waves of tensions and dissonances rather than constituting a static container or product. By virtue of his concentration on God and the activity of God in Christ- on things invisible and unlocatable except in the transformed self- he was naturally suspicious of what is visible and externally locatable. Hence he was critical of Luther’s apparent Aristotelian receptacle concept of space, and for that reason rejected the Wittenberg reformer’s Christology and his

¹ Bryan D Spinks, Sacraments, Ceremonies and the Stuart Divines, Sacramental theology and liturgy in England and Scotland 1603-1662, Ashgate, Aldershot. 2002. p.91.

² Bryan D Spinks, Ibid, p.91.

understanding of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist. Indeed as Spinks claims, “his Augustinian preference encouraged a Neoplatonist hermeneutic”¹. But Calvin also appreciated the force of Luther’s trust in the divine promise, and insisted that in the Lord’s Supper Christ’s body and blood are truly present.

Dare I say I suspect that this is where there is a divergence between Anglo-Catholicism and High Church Episcopalianism: that the former is Aristotelian and the latter probably Neo-Platonic in respective understanding of the Eucharist. On the one hand the Aristotelian position was *ex opera operato* and transubstantiation, teaching a metaphysical contradiction, resulting in a carnal or corporeal presence-physical; and earthly. In contrast the Neo-Platonic asserted ‘real’ or ‘spiritual’ or ‘mystical’ or ‘sacramental presence’. The elements according to Spinks, the words of institution, words of divine promise, and the Holy Spirit able to give what was promised, without either crass, or sophisticated ideas of metaphysical change. Faithful trust was required that God would disclose the bread and the wine as an invisible depth of Body and Blood. The ‘real presence’ was far more real than transubstantiation. The Scottish Tradition would approximate to the Neo-Platonic.

In England the usages controversy had split the non-juring movement. The usages were admixture, epiclesis, oblation, prayers for the departed, also chrism for confirmation and the sick, and immersion in baptism. Thomas Rattray of Craighall one of the keenest minds in the Episcopal Church was in England whilst this controversy was raging. He was a laird, but was ordained priest in 1713 and was consecrated bishop in 1727. Chosen as Bishop of Brechin, but became Bishop of Dunkeld in 1731 and Primus in 1738.²

Jeremy Collier the leading light in England regarded the usages as essential in the conduct of Liturgy. The usages were opposed by those who, while loyal to the Stuarts, were prepared to work with EBCP 1662 as sufficiently Scriptural and Catholic, even if not ideal. The “Usages Controversy” spread to Scotland, but was abated eventually, and quietened by the general acceptance of them by the Scots Kirk.

Bishop Jeremy Collier is held responsible for the Liturgy of 1718, two Scots Divines, Bishop Archibald Campbell and Bishop James Gadderar could have given Collier counsel³ in the production of the work which included all the usages, and he went as far as to forbid communion with those who held to the BCP, thus generating open schism among the non-jurors. It was Rattray and Nathaniel Spinks who translated into Church Greek the non-juror’s overtures to the Eastern Patriarchs in 1716. This of course was all due to the arrival in London of Arsenius of Thebes, but that of course is another story. We know that Rattray brought the 1718 Liturgy back to Scotland and used it in Craighall.

Rattray recommended Dr Brett’s Collection of Liturgy used by the Christian Church published in 1720, which included two forms of St Basil (Constantinopolitan and Alexandrian) the Ethiopic, liturgies attributed to Nestorius and to Severus of Antioch, fragments of Gothic or Gothico-Gallican, and of Mozarabic, the Roman Missal, Communion Office of 1549, and the Non-Jurors Rite of 1718.

Rattray had been invited by Bishop Alex Rose and Bishop John Falconar to go to London to help heal the breach in the non-juring party in England. Since the non-jurors were no longer, in Rattray’s mind under obligation to the State, then freedom

¹ Bryan D Spinks, Ibid, p.173.

² David M Bertie, Scottish Episcopal Clergy 1689-2000, T&T Clark Edinburgh, 2000. p.118.

³ John Dowden, Annotated Scottish Communion Office, R Grant And Son, Edinburgh 1884. p.72.

from State interference in the affairs of the Church, meant that the Usages could be used.¹

The summation of Rattray's liturgical investigation and scholarship are to be found in The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem being the Liturgy of St James freed from all latter Additions and Interpolations of whatever kind, and so restored to it's original purity: By comparing it with the Account given of that Liturgy by St Cyril in his fifth Mystagogical Catechism, And with the Clementine Liturgy. The Work was posthumously published in London 1744.

The Admixture : the adding of water to the wine at the Offertory (one of the Usages) was advocated by Rattray. This practice was around in the Celtic Church² and certainly had obtained in the Diocese of Aberdeen pre –Reformation and subsequent to it.³

In the Canon of the Liturgy we read..... “In like manner after Supper, He took the Cup, and having mixed it of Wine and Water he gave thanks”⁴ And further we read “So it was also in Lit Clem, Mar and Basil not to mention many other latter Liturgies and the Testimonies of the Mixture of Wine and Water in the Eucharistick Cup are so many and so early, that there can be no doubt of its being an Apostolic Tradition, and consequently derived from the Practice of Christ himself”.⁵

In the Pittenweem Manuscript deposited in St Andrew's University Library a prayer was inserted in Latin from the Roman Rite. “Deus qui humanae substantiae dignitatem mirabiliter condidisti, et mirabilius reformasti, da nobis per hujus vini, & aquae mysterium ejus divinitatis esse consortes qui humanitatis nostrae fieri dignatis est particeps Jesus Christus”⁶

Professor Stuart Hall translated it..... “God who wonderfully constituted the dignity of human nature and more wonderfully restored it, grant us through the mystery of this wine and water to be partners of the divinity of him who designed to become a partaker in our humanity, Jesus Christ”

Rattray following Clemens Alexandrinus, Cyprian of Carthage and Irenaeus of Lyons asserted that the water being added to the wine represents our humanity.⁷ In the ancient world water was always added to the wine. Blood and water came out of the side of Christ on the Cross when he was speared by Longinus. This imagery features in the ancient prayer Anima Christi.

The Eucharistic Theology of Rattray is quite clearly defined in his Works..... “that we might have a right understanding of this tremendous and mystical service (the Eucharist) we must observe:

- (1) That Our Lord Jesus Christ, as Our High Priest after the order of Melchizedek, in the same night in which He was betrayed did (while at his own liberty, and before He was in the hands of his enemies) offer Himself a free and voluntary sacrifice to his Father, to make satisfaction, for the sins of the world, *under the*

¹ Aberdeen Diocesan Archives, AUL MSS 2180/1 Letter of March 11th 1720.

² F E Warren, The Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church , Clarendon Press, 1881. Oxford. p.131.

³ F C Eeles, Traditional Ceremonial and Customs connected with the Scottish Liturgy, Longmans Green and Co London. 1910. p.38 also Dowden, Op Cit p53.

⁴ Thomas Rattray, The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem, James Bettenham, London. 1744. pp 32.

⁵ Thomas Rattray, Op Cit, p30

⁶ Stuart G Hall, Patristics and Reform: Thomas Rattray and the Ancient Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem in Continuity and Change in Christian Worship (Studies in Church History 35). Edited by R N Swanson, published for The Ecclesiastical History Society by the Boydell Press 1999 p246.

⁷ Aberdeen Diocesan Archive Letter of Thomas Rattray to John Falconar 6th Oct 1718, AUL MSS 2180/1

symbols of the bread and wine. The bread representing His Body and the wine His Blood: and being eucharistized or blessed them, that is not only given thanks to God over them, and praised Him as Creator and Governor of the world, and the Author of bread and all other fruits, for His making such plentiful provision of good things for the use of man: and for the signal instances of his providence towards the Jewish nation in particular, as was the custom of the Jews, and towards all mankind also in general, especially for their own redemption by His own death, but likewise offered them up to God, as the symbols of His Body and Blood, and invoked a blessing, even the Divine power of the Holy Spirit, to descend upon them; having I say thus eucharistized or blessed them, He gave them to His disciples as His Body broken, and His Blood shed for them and for many, as many as should believe and obey Him, for remission of sins.

- (2) That this sacrifice of Himself, thus offered up by Him as a High Priest, was immediately after slain on the cross, after He had, by the power of the Spirit, raised Himself from the dead He entered into Heaven, the true Holy of holies, there to present His sacrifice to God the Father, and in virtue of it, to make continual intercession for His Church whereby he continueth a priest for ever.
- (3) That He commanded the Apostles, and their successors, as the Priests of the Christian Church, to do (i.e. to offer) this (bread and cup) in commemoration of Him, or as the memorial of His one sacrifice of Himself once offered, and thereby to plead the merits of it before His Father, here on earth, as He doth continually in heaven.
- (4) Then the priest rehearseth the history of the institution, not only to shew the authority by which he acteth contained in the words 'Do this' (i.e. offer this bread and cup) in commemoration of Me; but also, that by pronouncing over them these words 'This is My Body' 'This is My Blood, he may consecrate this bread and this cup to be the symbols or anti types of the Body and Blood of Christ.
- (5) Besides, it is by virtue of these words spoken by Christ, that the following prayer of the priest is made effectual for procuring the descent of the Holy Ghost upon them whereby they become the spiritual and life-giving Body and Blood.
- (6) Then as Christ offered up His Body and Blood to God the Father under the symbols of bread and wine as a Sacrifice to be slain upon the Cross for our redemption; so here the priest offereth up his bread and cup as the Symbols of His Body and Blood thus once offered up by Him; and thereby commemorateth it before God with thanksgiving; after which he prays that God would favourably accept this commemorative Sacrifice by sending down upon it His Holy Spirit, that by His descent upon them He may make this bread and this cup (already so far consecrated as to be the symbols or anti types of the Body and Blood of Christ and offered up as such) to be verily and indeed His Body and Blood; the same Divine Spirit by Which the Body of Christ was formed in the womb of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and Which is still united to these elements, and invigorating them with virtue and power and efficacy thereof, and maketh it one with It. Then the Priest maketh intercession in virtue of this Sacrifice of Christ, for the whole Catholick Church, and pleadeth the merits of this one Sacrifice in behalf of all estates and conditions of men in it, offering this memorial therof not for the living only

but for the dead also”¹

So then as a quick summary, what was believed was that Christ’s “once and for all” Sacrifice was re-presented before God, that because the elements of bread and wine were eucharistized and blessed by the Holy Spirit, Christ is there in mystical and real presence, we are in receiving at-one with him, offer our lives as a sacrifice, and because we receive, our sins are forgiven.

Considering the admixture it would be tempting to put a modern gloss of total inclusiveness on the concept of the water being our humanity mixing with Christ in the wine. That would have a huge appeal to the contemporary mind. However I would have to say that that would not have been Rattray’s understanding. His introduction to the 1744 Volume states clearly that “None but the Faithful” should participate: unbelievers, hearers, catechumens, penitents, heretics and schismatics are explicitly excluded from the Liturgy. As Professor Stuart Hall noted Rattray was in step with contemporary Church of Scotland practice. There was a “fencing of the prayers and table, and requiring penance Rattray was in step with contemporary Presbyterian practice.”² However, there was no doubting Rattray’s Jacobitism, he preached against “the Execrable usurper, and the Banishment of the righteous Heir”.³

Bruce Lenman in his Essay The Scottish Episcopal Clergy and the Ideology of Jacobitism wrote the Scottish Episcopalians “political militancy was rooted in a struggle for a sacramental view of life. On the stricken field of Culloden, with its brutal butchery, an Episcopal clergyman gave the last rites to a dying Jacobite officer, using for the elements all that was available-oatmeal and whisky”⁴.

I suspect that that officer did not die alone. He died in the total and absolute conviction of the Eucharistic oblation that he was “made one body with him” that “he (Christ) may dwell in us and we in him.”⁵

When one celebrates the eucharist (and especially if you have had opportunity to use the Appin Chalice used at Culloden, as I have done on several occasions) one is reminded of words written about Rattray which enshrine our Eucharistic offering and spirituality.....

“See there his holy Hands,
His Eyes up-rais’d with reverential Joy,
His Soul intent on Heav’n, in Rapture high
Of mental Pray’r, th’unbloody Sacrifice,
Soul strengthening Food! he takes,
He takes with Exstasy, he takes and feels
Each pang of dying Love, of Love Divine,
Dying for mortal Man, sees Justice crown’d
With Godlike Mercy blooming by her side;
He takes,-he wonders,-he adores.”⁶

¹ Thomas Rattray, Works, p.14 Quoted in Dowden, Op Cit, pp. 336-338.

² Stuart G Hall, Op Cit, p.259.

³ Thomas Rattray, Liturgy and Loyalty, Asserted and Recommended in Two Sermons Preach’d the 13th of May AD 1711,p.51.

⁴ Bruce Lenman, The Scottish Rpiscolal Clergy and the Ideology of Jacobitism contained in Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1759. Edited by Eveline Cruicshanks, John Donald,. Edinburgh.1982. p.47.

⁵ Scottish Liturgy 1929.

⁶ Dr Drummond, A Poem to the Memory of the Right Rev’d Father in God, Dr Thomas Rattray of Craighall, Edinburgh. Printed in the Year M.D.CC.XLIII.

