

NASHOTAH HOUSE

**AN ANGLICAN UNDERSTANDING
OF THE THEOLOGY AND PRACTICE OF SANCTIFICATION
IN THE THOUGHT OF CHARLES CHAPMAN GRAFTON
SECOND BISHOP OF FOND DU LAC**

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF NASHOTAH HOUSE

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT

OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF SACRED THEOLOGY

BY

THE REVEREND JOHN BERNARD PAHLS, JR, B.MUS., M.DIV.

NASHOTAH, WISCONSIN

MAY, 2005

With undying love and gratitude

to the memory of my parents

John Bernard Pahls and Mary Louise Johnson Pahls

who never lost faith in their son

and gave him unfailing support in all his struggles

et soli Deo gloria

Copyright ©2005 by John B. Pahls, Jr.
All rights reserved.
Reproduced online through Anglicanhistory.org 2011

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

THE WRITER wishes to acknowledge the Trustees and Administration of Nashotah House, especially The Very Reverend Gary W. Kriss, D.D., XVII Dean and President, for the revival in 1991 of the summer S.T.M. program which provided him the venue and welcome opportunity for undertaking this project.

Thanks are due The Reverend E. Charles Miller, Jr, D.Phil.(Oxon), sometime Associate Professor of Historical and Ascetical Theology in the Michael and Joan Ramsey Chair, the original director of thesis studies, who offered much initial encouragement in the pursuit of the project; The Reverend Charles R. Henery, Th.D., William Schaff Helmuth Professor of Ecclesiastical History and John Maury Allin Distinguished Professor of Homiletics, for his welcome guidance as director following Father Miller's departure from the faculty of the House, having served originally as second reader; and Canon Joseph A. Kucharski, RSCM, D.Mus., Associate Professor of Church Music, for his kind help as second reader at the time of the project's completion.

The writer also acknowledges The Reverend Canon A.M. Allchin, D.D., whose Petertide 1995 course, "The Reciprocity of the Human and Divine in Classical Anglican Theology," together with his book, *Participation in God*, first inspired the project.

Thanks are also due The Reverend Pastor G. Thomas Osterfield, Ph.D., sometime Associate Professor of Bibliography, and the staff of the Frances Donaldson Library, Nashotah House, and Ms. Sylvia Rail and the staff of the Archbishop Urban J. Vehr Theological Library, the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Denver, for their invaluable

assistance in allowing access to their collections, particularly the Vehr Library's E.M. Womack Anglican Studies section; The Right Reverend Russell E. Jacobus, D.D., VII Bishop of Fond du Lac, and Miss Marjorie Goelz, Secretary to the Bishop, for their generosity in allowing access to the Archives of the Diocese of Fond du Lac for research into the collection of unpublished Grafton documents; and the late F. Garner Ranney, Ph.D., Archivist of the Diocese of Maryland, for his kind assistance in providing materials on Bishop Grafton's Maryland years and his relationship with and influences on him of Bishop William Rollinson Whittingham.

The writer wishes to express his appreciation to the staff of Nashotah House for their kind assistance and hospitality, especially Mrs. Sherri Kuehn, sometime of the Business Office, who arranged housing and amenities and provided welcome tea breaks and congeniality on many a long and busy afternoon during summer terms.

The writer acknowledges with great affection the hospitality and encouragement of the Sisterhood of the Holy Nativity, of which the writer is an Associate, and their Superiors, The Reverend Mothers Boniface and Maria, SHN, respectively, who over the years provided at their late convent in Fond du Lac welcome lodging and a wonderful setting in which to study, pray, and derive spiritual refreshment.

Finally, a special word of profound gratitude to those many and dear friends who gently kept encouraging and prodding the writer when, during a protracted period of profound grief, stress, and increasingly fragile health, he felt weak, exhausted, and unequal to the task. Their loving friendship and kind concern are more precious to him than they will ever know.

May God shower His richest blessings on them all!

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments.	v
List of Abbreviations.	viii
Preface.	ix
Chapter I. Introduction: The Nature of the Question and Purpose of the Project	1
Chapter II. Sanctification in Anglican Thought: Sixteenth to Eighteenth Centuries . . .	7
1. Richard Hooker: “Man Is an Associate of Deity”	11
2. Lancelot Andrewes: “Our Participation of His Divine Nature”.	16
3. John Donne: “Onely the Meere Goodnesse of God”	21
4. Jeremy Taylor: “Holy Living” and Sacramental Discipline.	26
5. William Law: “A Renovation of Some Divine Birth”	32
6. John Wesley: “The Heaven to Which We Are Going”.	35
Chapter III. Grafton the Man: Beginnings of the “Journey Godward”.	39
1. The Church of the Advent: Crosswell and Prescott	45
2. Maryland: Whittingham; Ordination; St. Paul’s, Baltimore	49
3. Cowley: “To Be With R.M.B.”.	54
Chapter IV. Pusey and Benson: Influences on Grafton’s Thought.	59
1. Pusey: Impartationary Process and Catholic Synthesis	63
2. Benson: Impartationary Process and Religious Life.	69
3. Resonances in the Grafton Corpus	78
Chapter V. Grafton on the Theology and Practice of Sanctification.	82
1. The Call of Christ and the Soul’s Response	83
2. The Holy Spirit as Sanctifier	87
3. The Church: Mystical Body and Deifying Community	90
4. The Sacraments: Means of Grace and Participation in Christ	95
5. Prayer	118
6. The Religious Vocation: Surrender to the Divine Will	121
Chapter VI. Conclusion: Grafton’s Place in Anglican Thought on Sanctification. . . .	126
1. His Understanding of Sanctification: <i>Theosis</i> ?.	128
2. His Message for Anglicans Then and Now	130
Appendices	139

ABBREVIATIONS

+CCFdL	John Mark Kinney, “+C.C. Fond du Lac: The Life of Charles Chapman Grafton, Second Bishop of Fond du Lac” (S.T.M. Thesis)
CMAEC	George E. DeMille, <i>The Catholic Movement in the American Episcopal Church</i>
Do.	Ditto (identical title, subject, or date)
EcclPol	Richard Hooker, <i>Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity</i> , in <i>The Works of Richard Hooker</i> , ed. John Keble (WRH, q.v. below)
EcclPol/EL	Richard Hooker, <i>Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity</i> (Everyman’s Library ed.)
Eirenicon	E.B. Pusey, <i>The Church of England a Portion of Christ’s One Holy Catholic Church, and a Means of Restoring Visible Unity: An Eirenicon, In a Letter to the Author of “The Christian Year”</i>
In pag.	<i>In [ibidem] pagina</i> , footnote within a citation, on the same page in the cited work and directly referring to the material quoted in the principal footnote
OxDict	<i>The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church</i> , ed. F.L. Cross
ParAdv	<i>The Parish of the Advent in the City of Boston: A History of One Hundred Years, 1844-1944</i> , pub. Parish of the Advent
PiG	A.M. Allchin, <i>Participation in God: A Forgotten Strand in Anglican Tradition</i>
TLC	<i>The Living Church</i> (periodical)
WCCG	<i>The Cathedral Edition: The Works of The Rt. Rev. Charles C. Grafton, S.T.D., LL.D., Second Bishop of Fond du Lac</i> , ed. B.T. Rogers
WRH	<i>The Works of That Learned and Judicious Divine, Mr. Richard Hooker</i> , ed. John Keble

PREFACE

IN HIS thesis “C.C. Fond du Lac: The Life of Charles Chapman Grafton, Second Bishop of Fond du Lac,” The Reverend John Mark Kinney wonders that there had not up to that time (1967) been written a biography of Grafton, given his reputation as a parish priest, his participation in the founding of the Cowley Fathers, and his episcopate marked by firm teaching of orthodox faith, as well as his undisputed leadership of the Catholic movement in the American Church.

Given the large scope of Grafton’s writings, it is similarly a puzzle that there seems not to have been undertaken some sort of comprehensive appraisal of the works, the subjects addressed, and their theological content. Grafton has been treated in monographica and articles in scholarly journals, primarily as a matter of American Church history; but in recent years he seems with a few exceptions to have been relegated to entries in historical footnotes. In any event, he is far less well known in the American Church today, at any rate outside the Diocese of Fond du Lac where his memory is still revered and his remains enshrined in the Cathedral church. In his own time, however, he was widely known and highly respected as a preacher and teacher, though in some quarters feared and reviled as a dangerous Anglo-Catholic extremist. The thought occurs that perhaps now, nearly a century after his death, Grafton is due for some kind of re-examination, specifically as a theological writer and an apologist for traditional Anglicanism. This project will, perhaps, be at least a modest beginning of such an effort—to analyze his works and the influences on his thought and, in short, to find out what he looks like as theologian and as guardian of the “deposit of the faith.” Specific to

the project is an examination of Grafton's understanding of the theology and practice of *sanctification*, of the Christian soul's process of growing into God-likeness and eternal communion with God. Evidence of the practice of sanctification is abundant in the personal holiness of Grafton's own life.

The writer began to hear about Bishop Grafton early on in his journey as an Episcopalian and postulant for Holy Orders. Visits to Grafton's tomb in the Cathedral at Fond du Lac while a divinity student at Nashotah House, reading and listening to the body of accounts and legends that had inevitably grown up around him in the rarified Anglo-Catholic atmosphere of the Church in Wisconsin, and work later on as a parish priest in the Diocese of Fond du Lac for several years, brought him to count Grafton as one of his personal heroes. In 1995, while sitting for a course under Canon A.M. Allchin, he was also introduced to the idea of an Anglican interpretation of the patristic doctrine of *theosis*. Thus the idea began to emerge of treating the subject, and especially Grafton's thought on it—perhaps devotee honoring hero, if you will.

Grafton's own rather extensive writings, in books and tracts, especially the posthumously published eight-volume *Cathedral Edition* of his complete works, edited by Canon B. Talbot Rogers (1914), provide an invaluable library on Christian spirituality. In addition there exists in the Archives of the Diocese of Fond du Lac a sizeable collection of unpublished documents, including a largely intact body of over 150 manuscripts of sermons preached in St. Paul's Church, Baltimore, during Grafton's curacy there between 1856 and 1864. These provide an important insight as to his early theological understanding and development of style. While Grafton (as Kinney suggests) can be at times a rambling, labored, and even turgid read, his outlines rudimentary and

his hand often hard to decipher, one finds that, though neither the most systematic of thinkers nor the most original of writers, he was possessed of considerable intellect and spiritual acumen. More importantly, he reveals himself a passionately evangelical Christian apologist, writing single-mindedly out of devotion to Christ and an unquenchable zeal for the Gospel, the faith of the Church Catholic, and the salvation of souls. Thus for the theologian, as well as for the inquisitive scholar or the pious seeker, it is possible to discover both a commentary on the faith and an understanding of the mind of the man and the era in Church life of which he was part.

Given the controversies that surrounded Grafton in his own lifetime, it must be discovered how his thought reflects not only the Anglo-Catholic ethos of his time but as well the broad pattern of Anglican thought from its emergence as a distinct theological system. If Grafton is not to be dismissed as a kind of “high church” extremist, or an historical oddity, it must be shown that he stands integrally within the mainstream of the Anglican tradition. In undertaking this examination the writer hopes to contribute both to an understanding of Grafton as a theologian and to a rediscovery of the spirit and substance of Anglo-Catholicism, both as a doctrinal and an ascetical system, as it was embraced by Grafton and as it has been taught, prayed, and lived down to our time by many faithful witnesses (and, it is to be hoped, into the future). He hopes that something may be discovered of the riches that have, though for many years as it were hidden in a field, always remained an integral part of our system of belief as Anglican Christians.

CHAPTER I.

Introduction: The Nature of the Question and Purpose of the Project.

Shew me thy ways, O LORD: and teach me thy paths. Ps. 25:3

THE PURPOSE of the thesis is to discover Charles Chapman Grafton's understanding of the doctrine and practice of sanctification, and to see at what points on the subject he stands within the Anglican mainstream. The principal theological trajectory of thought on the subject, which appears early in the tradition in the writings of Richard Hooker and other divines, is that of *impartation*, i.e., the grace of God imparting *Divine character* through the infusion of sanctifying grace and through the soul's active participation in a lifelong process of growth into holiness, the soul acting in synergy with God and becoming a partaker in the Divine nature itself, by restoration to man's original state as *eikon Theou*, the "image and likeness" of God (Gen. 1:27). A.M. Allchin terms this "participation in God."

The central affirmation of the Christian faith declares that God himself has entered into our human situation and in doing so has totally transformed it. In the early Christian centuries this affirmation was frequently expressed in the succinct form "God became man so that man might become God."¹

¹A.M. Allchin, *Participation in God: A Forgotten Strand in Anglican Tradition (PiG)*. Wilton, CT: Morehouse-Barlow, 1988, 1. After giving his Athanasian paraphrase (from "Refutation of the Gentiles," *De Incarnatione Verbi Dei*, VIII, §54; St. Athanasius, *St. Athanasius on the Incarnation*, ed. & trans. by a Religious of CSMV. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1982, 92-93), Allchin continues, "Such a statement necessarily implies that the Christian gospel cannot be simply fitted into the world as it now is. It involves its radical transformation. It means a revolution not only in our idea of God but also in our idea of humankind and of the world in which we live." While Allchin is addressing a post-Christendom Church in a late twentieth century materialist and post-modernist society, one asks, is it not to be inferred from Scripture and the Fathers that this "radical transformation," not only of humanity but of the cosmos entire, has been a consistent and primary imperative in essential Christian thought all along?

The early Church Fathers referred to this process as *theosis*, or deification. It is directly tied to two doctrines: of human nature created as *eikon Theou*, but marred by the fall; and of the Incarnation of Christ, the eternal and pre-existent Logos, for the redemption of man and the restoration of the Divine image. St. Athanasius says,

You know what happens when a portrait that has been painted on a panel becomes obliterated through external stains. The artist does not throw away the panel, but the subject of the portrait has to come and sit for it again, and the likeness is re-drawn on the same material. Even so it was with the All-holy Son of God. He, the Image of the Father, came and dwelt in our midst, in order that He might renew mankind after Himself. . . . This also explains His saying to the Jews: “Except a man be born anew . . .” (John 3:3). He was not referring to a man’s natural birth from his mother, as they thought, but to the re-birth and re-creation of the soul in the Image of God.²

In their reverence for the faith of the “undivided Church,” many Anglican divines of the late sixteenth to eighteenth centuries, particularly those called the “High Churchmen,” sought out the teachings of the early Fathers. The patristic doctrine of sanctification resonated within their sensibility and quickly became a predominant theme, addressing not only a spiritual but also a primary *moral imperative* involving response to the call of God, acceptance of His grace, especially as found in the “helps” of prayer, reflection on the Word, and reception of the Sacraments, cleaving to His Church as His mystical and supernatural body, and the living of an ordered, disciplined, and morally upright Christian life, whereby the soul is made a worthy and ready dwelling for the Divine presence. In this last regard, as we shall see later on, Grafton makes specific and

²“The Divine Dilemma and its Solution in the Incarnation,” *St. Athanasius on the Incarnation*, II, §14, 41-42. Athanasius emphasizes that the process is God’s, not man’s, initiative: “Once more, then, it was the Word of God . . . who alone could meet the needs of the situation. It was His part and His alone. . . .”—or, as St. Paul says, “of grace . . . not of works, lest any man should boast” (Eph. 2:9). God initiates the process by the proffered infusion of prevenient grace. Man responds to this prevenient grace and by submitting to God’s will acts in synergy with God, becoming “elect . . . through sanctification of the Spirit . . . to an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away” (I Pet. 1:2, 4).

pointed reference to the religious life and to the ascetical struggle as particular manifestations.

As this view began to predominate within the first generation of divines, they recognized that this moral imperative is indispensable in any desire for and process of growth into God-likeness. Jeremy Taylor and John Wesley, for instance, both of whom write from the impartationary perspective, place particular emphasis on the disciplined life of ordered spirituality as essential to attaining Divine communion (Wesley's "entire sanctification of the believer"). What they perceived was a necessity for human action, as H.R. McAdoo describes it, "in eternity and in time,"³ in anticipation of the beatific vision; and this became integral to the spiritual thrust of Anglican spiritual writing, from Anglicanism's emergence as a distinctly separate theological system in the latter half of the sixteenth century.

Charles Chapman Grafton stands firmly, the writer believes, within the Anglican tradition of thought on sanctification, conditioned and predisposed to view the subject through the eyes of the Catholic revival. His predisposition derives from Tractarian adherence to like patterns of interpretation in earlier impartationary writers, e.g., Edward Bouverie Pusey's insight into the relation of Christ to the redeemed, both as Savior and Deifier, a word of pastoral comfort in the struggle against the reality of sin.

As Christ died, so He rose again, not for Himself, but for us. . . . "Thee thy God recalled to peace; thee He brought to the Father; thee He advanced in glory; thee He clothed with the robe of immortality. Thy body He renewed in spirit that He might re-form thy spirit in Himself." Christ, Who is our life, took this our body,

³H.R. McAdoo, *The Structure of Caroline Moral Theology*. London, New York, Toronto: Longmans, Green & Co., 1949, 16. "Moral theology is, in Taylor's words, 'the life of Christianity.' . . . it is concerned not simply with the assessment of value in human actions, but with human actions as may have repercussions both in eternity and in time, with the ultimate perfecting of human life in eternal beatitude, the vision of God. . . ."

that through the life which He Himself is, He might impart life to us, and make us to share all which He is. . . .⁴

It is proposed to devote attention to the works of Pusey and of Richard Meux Benson, as Grafton's mentors, to discover how particular themes on the response to the evangelical counsels, the Sacraments, prayer, and the moral and ascetical disciplines which profoundly influenced Grafton's work were developed in their thought. Without their influence, particularly Benson's, it is unlikely that Grafton would have developed the spiritual maturity that marked his later life, ministry, and theological thinking.

The relevant material within the Grafton corpus itself will then be reviewed at some length, subject by subject, in the areas of the soul's response to the call of God, the Church, the Scriptures, prayer, the Sacraments, the ascetical struggle, and the religious life. The primary source material is the posthumously published eight-volume *The Cathedral Edition: The Works of The Rt. Rev. Charles C. Grafton, S.T.D., LL.D., Second Bishop of Fond du Lac* (1914), as well as a series of manuscripts of sermons preached in St. Paul's Church, Baltimore, between 1856 and 1864, and other manuscript materials housed in the Archives of the Diocese of Fond du Lac. It is hoped to discover the implications of Grafton's impartationary understanding and his interpretation of the spiritual disciplines and methodology whereby the soul achieves union with God. Particular attention will be paid to his reflection on the Sacraments and on the ascetical struggle.

The sacramental life and ascetical disciplines were for Grafton matters of enormous importance. Perhaps more than anywhere else in his writings, it is there,

⁴Edward Bouverie Pusey, "Victory Through Loving Faith," *Parochial Sermons*, I. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1852, 297.

grounded in his own Christian experience as a priest, religious, and bishop, and above all as a redeemed human being, that Grafton shows his insistence on the necessity of surrender to Divine love. It is also the ground of his passionate appeals to his hearers as a fellow sinner saved by Christ, and of his love for souls. That love constrains him to point the way for others by the example of his own struggle for salvation and holiness. In the study of his life, we are confronted with the picture of a man striving to overcome his own temperament, inclinations, and pride, and to submit his considerable self-will to that of Christ. He begins the first chapter of *Christian and Catholic* by saying,

Let me in love put myself beside a soul whose condition was once my own. The stones over which one has stumbled may prove perhaps stepping-stones to another.⁵

Grafton's view of religion and the spiritual life is *a priori* a view of the being and nature of God, and of the soul's need for eternal union with God. His vision is focused on the attainment of that union, based on the being and eternal activity of God, and the process by which the soul works with God towards it, and shows itself early in his preaching. Hope is found, and sanctification and union with God realized, alone in the person of Christ. He is the foundation, the rock upon which Christian hope stands, in and through whom the soul is made partaker of Divine nature.

The foundation of the Christian's hope lies in Christ. Christ is the source to him of every blessing. There is no other Name, than the one given whereby we must be saved. There is merit in no other wedding garment than the righteousness with which He clothes His guests. There is reliance on no other source of forgiveness for sins than His Who blotted them out nailing them to His Cross. Christ is our all—He is our Saviour and we are saved in Him. . . . We are saved in union with Him. Christ came to restore and save us. We consist in body and soul. Each part, matter and spirit, was originally created good and designed to manifest

⁵Charles Chapman Grafton, *The Cathedral Edition: The Works of The Rt. Rev. Charles C. Grafton, S.T.D., LL.D., Second Bishop of Fond du Lac (WCCG)*, ed. B. Talbot Rogers, I, *Christian and Catholic*. New York, London, Bombay, Calcutta, Madras: Longmans, Green and Co., 1914, 1.

Christ's glory—God does not let His plan fail, by failing to recover any part. . . .
 “Ye are members of His Body, of His Flesh and of His Bones—Christ dwelleth in
 you. Ye are partakers of the divine nature. . . .”⁶

Of course, Grafton reminds us, one has to begin by positing an understanding of
 the doctrine of sanctification. One must, first of all, define what one means by
 “Religion.” Again, in *Christian and Catholic*,

Let me begin with a very rudimentary inquiry,—What is your definition of
 Religion? There have been many given. The one I suggest as a working
 hypothesis is this,—A personal union of an intelligent and spiritual nature with a
 personal God. It is somewhat of a large definition, and it involves these three
 factors: God, man, and the union between them.⁷

In the course of this study the understanding of the synergy between God and the
 soul, as Grafton treats it, will be examined in detail, subject by subject, and his continuity
 with the thought of those who have gone before him in the Anglican tradition established.

Finally, it will be shown where, and the extent to which, Charles Chapman
 Grafton stands within the mainstream of the tradition of classical Anglican thought in
 regard to sanctification. And the question will be asked, What message may be found in
 Grafton's words for Christian people living a century after his death and in the beginning
 years of a new century and millennium? Does he say something of substance that will
 help modern Christians in seeking and living the holy life? It is the writer's conviction
 that indeed he does, if modern Christians have ears to hear, and that this may be his
 greatest and most enduring gift to the Church, both for his time and for our own.

⁶Ms. Sermon 113 (of 156), St. Paul's, Baltimore, 1861. “S. Luke 7.23. And He said unto them
 all, if any man will come after Me, let him deny himself and take up his cross daily and follow Me.” Fond
 du Lac, WI: Archives of the Diocese of Fond du Lac. The phrase “partakers of the divine nature,” from II
 Peter, is particularly notable at this early stage. We may suppose that he learned this impartationary view
 under Bishop William Whittingham's tutelage. Whittingham was an ardent disciple of the Tractarians,
 who stressed the spiritual heritage of the earlier divines and the ancient Fathers.

⁷WCCG, I, 1.

CHAPTER II.

Sanctification in Anglican Thought: Sixteenth to Eighteenth Centuries.

Stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught. II Thess. 2:5

IN SEEKING to arrive at an Anglican understanding of Grafton's thought on the theology of sanctification, it is necessary first to understand the English divines' thought on sanctification, especially in light of their reverence for the doctrines of the patristic era in the life of the Church. This chapter will survey the writings of a select group of English divines from Anglicanism's emergence as a distinct theological system in the late sixteenth century to 1800, examining both their metaphysical understanding of the doctrine of sanctification and of the active spiritual and synergistic work undertaken by the soul toward the attainment of God-likeness which is its final state.

The Church of England was at the accession of Elizabeth I in 1558 badly fragmented theologically, seemingly with no authentic doctrinal identity of its own, and pulled to and fro by the conflicting opinions of Lutheran, Calvinist, and recusant Roman factions, all in the setting of an essentially conservative mediaeval ecclesial structure. The first and second Books of Common Prayer compiled by Edward VI's archbishop, Thomas Cranmer, and a third version shortly to appear under Elizabeth's new primate, Matthew Parker, though profoundly beautiful and masterfully crafted expressions of *lex orandi est lex credendi* ("the law of praying is the law of believing"), could hardly be styled the basis of a comprehensive or systematic theological *schema*.

At the end of the sixteenth century, according to Christopher Morris,

A vaguely Protestant theology had been adopted to placate the Protestant intellectuals, who had to be given high office in the Church. . . . Schemes to increase the number of educated clergy had been discountenanced for fear of causing ‘disputaciousness’. . . . Anglican propaganda had been largely ineffectual because it had been largely negative. It had concentrated on saying what Anglicans did *not* believe. Anglicanism appeared to lack positive intellectual content and, significantly, many of the bright young men from the universities had been listening with more attention to voices from Rome or from Geneva.¹

It was specifically to posit an authentic Anglican systematic (or at least, as Andrew Louth comments, to “explain their separation from the rest of the Western Catholic Church”),² that the academics turned their attention to the “undivided Church” and to the Church Fathers of the era of the first four Ecumenical Councils, particularly of the Orthodox east. In the Fathers they found the rationale for a theological construct in accord with their own particular genius for comprehensiveness, combining historical awareness, doctrinal acuity, and judicious pragmatism with a mystagogy largely lost over the centuries in the West. Working essentially within the framework of a late mediaeval ecclesiology, the English divines planted their theological roots within the more ancient *milieu*. Resonating in their religious mindset especially was the Fathers’ reliance on and continual reference to Scripture in nearly every aspect of doctrinal formulation and argument.³

¹Christopher Morris, pref., Richard Hooker, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity: In Two Volumes (EcclPol/EL)*, Everyman’s Library edition. London: J.M. Dent & Sons, Ltd, 1968, I, vi-vii. Morris also notes that the Church had literally “come into existence [?] to save a political situation” (Ibid.) and must have been, however tenuously, one of the few moderating influences in a society which, for most of the rest of the century, seems to have been constantly on the brink of political anarchy and cultural collapse. The “negativism” Morris cites may, it occurs to this writer, be reflected in the often reactionary tone of the Articles of Religion.

²“Manhood into God: The Oxford Movement, the Fathers and the Deification of Man,” Kenneth Leech & Rowan Williams, eds., *Essays Catholic and Radical*. London: Bowerdean Press, 1983, 70.

³It must be borne in mind in the course of this overview that the *historical continuity* of the Christian faith was of paramount importance to the academics; hence the patristic appeal. They were aware that the Fathers of the first millennium were the first great defenders of the Gospel and preachers and commentators upon it (“Patristics,” F.L. Cross, ed., *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*

Beginning with Richard Hooker, we see in Anglican divines an appreciation in the patristic texts of an active *synergy* between God and man in the salvific process, bringing the *impartation* of Divine character, termed “sanctification,” “deification,” or *theosis*.⁴

The doctrine of deification, or *theosis*,⁵ is for believers rooted in the biblical account of the creation of man as *eikon Theou*, the “image and likeness” of God (Gen. 1:26-27). As interpreted by the early Fathers, it emphasizes the Divine mercy and generosity, both in bestowing the Divine character on the human race *ab initio* in creation and in restoring it after the fall through the Incarnation and redemptive sacrifice of the Son, who is like man in all dimensions and characteristics “save without sin” (Heb. 4:15). The archetype of sanctification is in fact the Incarnation. St. Athanasius says in *De Incarnatione Verbi Dei*,

God is good—or rather of all goodness He is Fountainhead, and it is impossible for one who is good to be mean or grudging about anything. Grudging existence to none, therefore, He made all things out of nothing through His own Word, our Lord Jesus Christ; and of all these His earthly creatures He reserved especial mercy for the race of men. Upon them . . . He bestowed a grace which other

(*OxDict*). London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1967, 1027). The divines always viewed the Church of England as a part of the historic Christian framework entire.

⁴F.W. Worsley says, “In the Church of England [Justification and Sanctification] are distinct. Justification being the attitude of God towards us which makes our efforts for Sanctification possible. . . . The answer that man makes to this splendid overture from God is termed Sanctification” (F.W. Worsley, *The Theology of the Church of England*, X, iv-v. New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., 1913, 241-242).

⁵“Apotheosis,” *OxDict*, 75. *Theosis* is a contraction of *apotheosis* (from ἀποθεόω or ἀποθειόω, to deify, or place with the gods) or *theopoeisis* (from θεοποιέω, to make into gods), similar to the terminology employed in pagan Greek religion to describe the *post mortem* introduction of human persons into the Pantheon. St. Gregory Thaumaturgus is known to have used it to describe “union with God.” It was logical for early Christian writers to use familiar mystagogical language to explain sanctification and participation in the nature of God. But, as Louth reminds us, “. . . what we have here is rather echos [*sic*] of their hellenic heritage than the very heart of the Christian faith. (It is a fact, however, that the language of *theosis* and *theopotesis* is Christian language, newly coined, not borrowed from pagan sources.)” (*Essays Catholic and Radical*, 71). St. Paul, it may be noted, uses a similar approach addressing the Athenians on their worship of the “unknown god” (Acts 17:22 ff.).

creatures lacked—namely, the impress of His own Image, a share in the reasonable being of the very Word Himself. . . .⁶

For Athanasius, God’s action in “bestowing a share in the reasonable being of the Word” is directly tied to His love for the creation. In fact, he intimates, God’s own nature of goodness and love impels the Divine action.

What, then, was God to do? What else could He possibly do, being God, but renew His Image in mankind, so that through it men might once more come to know Him? And how could this be done save by the coming of the very Image Himself, our Saviour Jesus Christ? Men could not have done it, for they are only made after the Image; nor could angels have done it, for they are not the images of God. The Word of God came in His own Person, because it was He alone, the Image of the Father, Who could recreate man made after the Image.⁷

Further, St. Gregory of Nyssa says that God’s action is the restoration of that which man is from the very beginning of creation, and a repudiation of that which wrought his destruction.

The rejection of what is alien means the soul’s return to the state that is properly and naturally its own. There is no other way for us to attain this except by becoming again as we were when we were first created. . . . This, therefore, is the meaning of the finding of what was lost: the restored original state of the divine image which is now concealed by the filth of the flesh. We are to become that which the first man was in his first state of life . . . it is possible for us to retrace our steps and return to the original state of blessedness.⁸

⁶“Creation and the Fall,” *St. Athanasius on the Incarnation*, I, §3, 28. This is similar to St. Peter: “According as his divine power hath given unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness . . . that by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature. . . .” (II Pet. 1:3-4).

⁷“The Divine Dilemma and its Solution in the Incarnation,” *Ibid.*, III, §14, 41. We shall see a bit further on similar references to Divine impulsion in Hooker’s reference to natural and Divine law.

⁸St. Gregory of Nyssa, *On Virginity*, 12-13, Panayiotis Nellas, *Deification in Christ: The Nature of the Human Person*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1987, 208-209. Man, as “a rational animal, endowed with intelligence,” was created as “a product and imitation of the undefiled nature of God;” and, Gregory says, the original image which man was “could not have been preserved if the beauty of the image had contradicted the archetype” (*Ibid.*).

Further, in the *Philokalia*, St. Maximos the Confessor says, “God is the origin, intermediary state, and consummation of all created things . . . when God in His supernal goodness creates each soul in His own image, He brings it into being endowed with self-determination . . . every soul that cleaves to God is softened like wax and, receiving the impress and stamp of divine realities, it becomes ‘in spirit the dwelling-place of God’” (I Cent. 10-12, *The Philokalia*, ed. & trans. G.E.H. Palmer, Philip Sherrard, Kalistos Ware. London, Boston: Faber & Faber, 1981, II, 116). Maximos continues, “The Logos bestows adoption on us when he grants us that birth and deification which, transcending nature, comes by grace

The heart of the doctrine of sanctification, then, is man's response to the gift of sanctifying grace and his lifelong ascetical journey toward mystical union with God, the perfect reintegration between the human and Divine, the recapitulation of man's original state in creation, which is the soul's chief end. The understanding of the doctrine, and the fourfold pattern posited in Chapter I (i.e., of response to God's call, cleaving to His Church, acceptance of His grace, and the living of a disciplined spiritual life) resonate severally in these early Anglican thinkers, in varying degrees of emphasis, and set a general pattern of thought carried through to Pusey and Benson, and which we shall ultimately see in Grafton.

1. Richard Hooker: "Man is an Associate of Deity."

THE IMPARTATIONARY trajectory of thought on sanctification is really exemplified first in the writings of Richard Hooker (1554-1600), fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and later Master of the Temple Church, London, considered the first great Anglican theologian. Clear references to the deification of man in Christ are found later on in the writings, among others, of Lancelot Andrewes and John Donne, and particular emphasis on Christian asceticism in the works of Jeremy Taylor and John Wesley, as well as Pusey and Benson. But Hooker, one senses, is the real progenitor among Anglicans, and the impartationary view in the other writers is traceable to him.

from above through the Spirit. . . . Moreover, by emptying themselves of the passions they lay hold of the divine to the same degree as that to which, deliberately emptying himself of his own sublime glory, the Logos of God truly became man" ("On the Lord's Prayer," II, 287). An inevitable tension lies between man's original reality as *eikon Theou* and sin rising from the misuse of his God-given free will. Maximos' reference to "emptying the passions" is of note here. Dispassion (*ἀπάθεια*) is a theme common to patristic and mediaeval Christian ascetical doctrine and may be detected, at least implicitly, in the reflections of a number of Anglican thinkers, Donne, Taylor, and Law among them.

Like other divines of the Reformation period, Hooker is concerned *a priori* with the redemption and justification of the sinner by grace. But he shows a specific and finely articulated understanding of sanctification as the integration of the human and Divine. He is the first of the Anglican writers to refer to “deification” explicitly.

Hooker first of all posits natural law as the basis not only of ecclesiastical law, but also of the fundamental law of relationship between man and God, who works the sanctification of mankind out of the fundamental nature of His goodness. The law of God is the basis for the function of creation; God’s essential nature, everlasting love, is revealed in His creative acts.

All things that are, have some operation not violent or casual. Neither doth any thing begin to exercise the same, without some fore-conceived end for which it worketh. . . . God hath eternally decreed when and how they should be. Which eternal decree is that we term an eternal law. . . . Which thing, doth first take place even in the works of God himself. . . .⁹

Further, says Hooker, law is the basis of the essential unity of the Godhead, and of the created order. Reason and order are the hallmarks of creation and of the mind of God, in fact revealing God’s being—as declared by Athanasius and Gregory of Nyssa.

The being of God is a kind of law to his working, for that perfection which God is, giveth perfection to that he doth. . . . Our God is one, or rather very Oneness, and mere unity, having nothing but itself in itself. . . . In which essential Unity of God a Trinity personal nevertheless subsisteth . . . from the Father, by the Son, through the Spirit, all things are. . . . They all confess therefore in the working of that first cause, that Counsel is used, Reason followed, a Way observed; that is to say, constant Order and Law is kept. . . . Being the first, it can have no other than itself to be the author of that law which it willingly worketh by.¹⁰

⁹Richard Hooker, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity (EcclPol)*, I, ii.1-2, 197, *The Works of That Learned and Judicious Divine, Mr. Richard Hooker (WRH)*, ed. John Keble. Ellicott City, MD: Via Media, Inc., 1994, I, 200.

¹⁰*EcclPol*, I, ii.2-3, *Ibid.*, 201-202. He also observes (citing Jn. 6:13-15): “That which the Son doth hear of the Father, and which the Spirit doth receive of the Father and the Son, the same we have at the hands of the Spirit as being the last, and therefore the nearest unto us in order, although the power the same with the second and the first” (ii.2). Thus, if the concept of Divine law is applied to the creation account in Genesis, the creation of man as *eikon Theou*, i.e., as an “express image” partaking of the Divine

Furthermore, the working of God as the first principle is for the perfection of the creation and, within that, “the working of his most glorious and most abundant virtue . . . oftentimes in Scripture express by the name of *riches*.”¹¹ The “riches” of God are bestowed on humanity by the working of His nature, which is that ultimately of love. The love of God desires to work the perfection of all things.

We see, therefore, that our sovereign good is desired naturally, that God the author of that natural desire had appointed natural means whereby to fulfil it; that man having utterly disabled his nature unto those means hath had other revealed from God, and hath received from heaven a law to teach him how that which is desired naturally must now supernaturally be attained.¹²

The “disability” of which Hooker speaks is the outcome of human sin. Necessity is laid on the soul to acknowledge this disability and to seek the grace of God for the supernatural attainment of redemption and sanctification. The confession and presence of Christ within is, however, a matter of the intellect’s perception and response—an impossibility, since the intellect of finite humanity is incapable in itself of discerning Divine reality. God, then, as is His nature, takes the initiative to restore the soul’s image as that perfect image of God revealed in Divine law; and it is the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, Hooker says, that implants the transforming and noetic gift in the intellect.

Christ is in us, saith Gregory Nazianzene, not κατά τὸ φαινόμενον but κατά τὸ νοούμενον, not according to that natural substance which visibly was seen on earth, but according to that intellectual comprehension which the mind is capable of. . . . And for as much as we are not on our parts hereof by our own inclination capable, God hath given unto his that Spirit which, teaching their hearts to acknowledge and tongues to confess Christ the Son of the living God, is

nature, must be, as an act of God himself, in full accord with Divine law, as must Divine revelation to believers. It follows that, despite the Fall, the end of all things under Divine law, wrought by the Incarnation and Resurrection of Christ, is the full restoration and re-entry of humanity into participation in the Divine nature, per Athanasius’ and Gregory of Nyssa’s assertions (see nn. 6-8).

¹¹*EccIPol*, I, ii.4, *Ibid.*, 203; q. Eph. 1:7; Phil. 4:19; Col. 2:3.

¹²*EccIPol*, I, xii.3, *Ibid.*, 264.

for this cause said also to quicken. . . . This altereth and changeth our corrupt nature. . . .¹³

On Christ therefore is bestowed the gift of eternal generation, the gift of union, and the gift of unction. . . . The honour which our flesh hath by being the flesh of the Son of God is in many respects great . . . sith God hath deified our nature, though not by turning it into himself, yet by making it his own inseparable habitation, we cannot conceive how God should without man either exercise divine power, or receive the glory of divine praise. For man is in both an associate of Deity.¹⁴

The Church is the setting for the granting of the sanctifying gift. Hooker declares the Church the supernatural “mystical body of Christ,” in which the Christian is bound together by grace and fellowship with all other Christians, fulfilling his spiritual duty.

Laws that concern supernatural duties are all positive, and either concern men supernaturally as men, or else as parts of a supernatural society, which society we call the Church. To concern men as men supernaturally is to concern them as duties which belong of necessity to us all. . . . The Church being a supernatural society doth differ from natural societies in this, that the persons unto whom we associate ourselves, in the one are men simply considered as men, but they to whom we be joined in the other, are God, Angels, and holy men.¹⁵

Furthermore, the Church, as that visible entity on earth, is the archetype prefiguring the invisible Church in heaven. The Church is that community in which Christians are called into fellowship with one another, precisely in order that in the

¹³“Sermon III, Symptoms of Spiritual Life in Christ,” *Ibid.*, III, 612-613. This passage closely echoes St. Paul’s “. . . no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost” (I Cor. 12:3).

¹⁴*EccPol*, V, liv.2, 5, *Ibid.*, 232, 235. The comment “. . . sith God hath deified our nature . . . man is in both an associate of Deity” is indicative of Hooker’s understanding of the active synergy between Divinity and humanity; this is likely the first use of the term “deified” in the normative Anglican corpus, representing a focus upon the patristic interpretation. He says further, “Thus we participate Christ partly by imputation, as when those things which did and suffered for us are imputed unto us for righteousness; partly by habitual and real infusion, as when grace is inwardly bestowed while we are on earth, and afterwards more fully both our souls and bodies made like unto his in his glory. The first thing of his so infused into our hearts in this life is the Spirit of Christ. . . . From hence it is that they which belong to the mystical body of Christ . . . are notwithstanding coupled every one to Christ their Head . . . as if both he and they were so many limbs compacted into one body, by being quickened all with one and the same soul” (V, liv.13, 255). Again, by “infusion” Hooker may be enunciating the concept of impartation for the first time in the Anglican corpus.

¹⁵*EccPol*, I, xv.2, *Ibid.*, I, 273.

visible Church's *esse* the Christian presence in the world may be preserved, and the message of Christ proclaimed.

God hath ever and ever shall have some Church visible upon earth. . . . By the Church therefore in this question we understand no other than only the visible Church. For preservation of Christianity there is not any thing more needful, than that such as are of the visible Church have mutual fellowship and society one with another. . . . But a Church, as now we are to understand it, is a Society; that is, a number of men belonging unto some Christian fellowship, the place and limits whereof are certain. That wherein they have communion is the public exercise of such duties as those mentioned in the Apostles' Acts, *Instruction*, *Breaking of Bread*, and *Prayers*. As therefore they that are of the mystical body of Christ have those inward graces and virtues . . . they have also the notes of external profession, whereby the world knoweth what they are. . . .¹⁶

The Church also, as a supernatural body composed of those who are supernaturally redeemed and sanctified, has a supernatural power; and as such it has the authority of spiritual discipline given it by Christ. Hooker looks at ascetical discipline largely in terms of governance, but he also unmistakably recognizes the spiritual good.

. . . we are to make no doubt or question, but that from him which is the Head it hath descended unto us that are the body now invested therewith. He gave it for the benefit and good of souls, as a mean to keep them in the path which leadeth unto endless felicity, a bridle to hold them within their due and convenient bounds, and if they do go astray, a forcible help to reclaim them. . . . I therefore conclude, that spiritual authority is a power which Christ hath given to be used over them which are subject unto it for the eternal good of their souls, according to his own most sacred laws . . . by bringing them to see and repent their grievous offences committed against God, as also to reform all injuries offered with the breach of Christian love and charity. . . .¹⁷

The Church likewise is the repository of spiritual means of grace, offering them to the Christian as helps in attaining to God-likeness. The Sacraments are means to the union between God and man, and the Christian is commanded to participate in the

¹⁶*EccI*Pol, III, i.8, ii.2, *Ibid.*, I, 343, 351-352.

¹⁷*EccI*Pol, VI, ii.2, iii.1, *Ibid.*, III, 4-5. The Church is provided authority to administer discipline in its common life, and to encourage Christians individually to a life of discipline and the "fruit of the Spirit . . . love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance" (Gal. 5:22-23).

sacramental life as the means to sanctifying grace. In Baptism, God establishes the union, and in the Eucharist He nurtures it and brings it to fullness. The union of the believer with Christ in the Sacraments is, for Hooker, a type of the hypostatic union of the Divine and human in Christ Himself, and a channel of life to the believing soul.

That saving grace which Christ originally is or hath for the general good of his whole Church, by sacraments he severally deriveth into every member thereof. Sacraments serve as the instruments of God to that end and purpose . . . we take not baptism nor the eucharist for *bare resemblances* or memorials of things absent, neither for *naked signs* and testimonies assuring us of grace received before, but (as they are indeed and verity) for means effectual whereby God . . . delivereth into our hands that grace available unto eternal life. . . .¹⁸

With Hooker we see clear evidence of *theosis* becoming an integral and authentic component of the Anglican systematic. His extensive and detailed reference to the Fathers is unmistakable, and he stands at one with them in the ancient tradition.

2. Lancelot Andrewes: “Our Participation of His Divine Nature.”

HOOKER’S CONTEMPORARY Lancelot Andrewes (1555-1626), fellow of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, and later Bishop of Winchester, provides in his *Preces Privatae* perhaps the earliest practical example in the Anglican corpus of *lex orandi* apart from the Prayer Book. He also enjoyed a reputation as a moralist and confessor.¹⁹ His sermons, though less well remembered in our time than the *Preces*, as Nicholas Lossky reminds

¹⁸*EccIPol*, V, lvii.5, *Ibid.*, II, 258. Hooker’s references to “bare resemblances” and “naked signs” are a reaction to the memorialism prevalent in Puritan sacramental thought and reassert the older interpretation of sacramental efficacy found in the Schoolmen (Thomas Aquinas, Albert the Great, John Duns Scotus, *et al.*) and even more markedly in the early Fathers—though Hooker is careful to note that the Sacraments “are not physical but moral instruments of salvation” (V, lvii.4, 257).

¹⁹Nicholas Lossky, *Lancelot Andrewes the Preacher (1555-1626): The Origins of the Mystical Theology of the Church of England*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991, 13. In his rôle as moralist and confessor, Andrewes is a kind of precursor to Jeremy Taylor. As we shall see, they share a common sacramental and ecclesial vision as well.

us,²⁰ combine intellectual acuity and mystagogical language in addressing the truth of the Divine communion.²¹ The metaphysical understanding of the doctrine of sanctification, but more, the ascetical spirit in Andrewes' work, shows the means of the soul's growth into the holiness of God, by seeking and cleaving to the grace of God and its transforming power.

The basis of Divine communion is the Incarnation. In the virginal conception and Divine *kenosis* of the Logos, a way is made for the transformation of humanity "abhorred by God, *filius irae* . . . by this means made beloved in Him."²² Andrewes continues:

With them He was even thus, in this very *Immanu*; but how? in the future tense, *concipiet pariet*; as things to come are made present to hope. But now, *conceptus est, partus est; re, not spe*. . . . "So 'with us' as even of us now," of the same substance, nature, flesh and bone that we.²³

²⁰Ibid., 1. Lossky concedes that "even among students of Anglican theology . . . few read [Andrewes'] sermons," but says that he is remembered for the *Preces Privatae* and as "a champion of the Anglican cause." He also notes Andrewes' "lack of originality," but reflects that if "to make a theology more and more truly one's own, by experience, the mystery of the relation of God to man that has been traditionally lived by the Church, then originality will consist not so much in innovation, as in enabling a whole era to grasp the genuine essence of the Christian message . . ." (6).

²¹T.S. Eliot, "Lancelot Andrewes," Lancelot Andrewes, *The Private Devotions of Lancelot Andrewes*, trans. F.E. Brightman. New York: Living Age Books/Meridian Books, Inc., 1961, xii-xiv. Eliot says, "[A] Church is to be judged by its intellectual fruits, by its influence on the sensibility of the most sensitive, and on the intellect of the most intelligent. . . . The English Church has no literary monument equal to that of Dante, no intellectual monument equal to that of St. Thomas. . . . But the achievement of Hooker and Andrewes was to make the English Church more worthy of intellectual assent (see also n. 1). No religion can survive the judgment of history unless the best minds of its time have collaborated in its construction. . . . The writings of both Hooker and Andrewes illustrate that determination to stick to essentials, that awareness of the needs of the time, the desire for clarity and precision on matters of importance."

²²*Lancelot Andrewes the Preacher*, 49. Sermon 9, Christmas 1614.

²³Ibid. Lossky notes, "And this sermon ends quite naturally with a vision of the consequences of this consanguinity of Christ with man: our participation in the divine nature by the sacrament of Baptism and our fleshly union with God in the sacrament of the Eucharist." The transforming character of the Sacraments is a place where the reality of the Incarnation can be grasped. Andrewes, preparing for Communion, quotes this prayer of St. John Chrysostom: ". . . as Thou didst not repel/even the harlot like me, . . . in like sort vouchsafe to accept me withal . . . to the touch and partaking/of the immaculate, awful, quickening/and saving mysteries/of thy allholy Body/and precious Blood" (*Private Devotions*, 121). And

He left *gloriam in excelsis* for ἔυδοκία ἐν ἀνθρώποις, “His glory on high,” for “His good-will towards men.” It was a sign of love too this. . . . For the birth of the world then; for the new birth of it now by the birth of Him by Whom the world at first was made, and now *ne perderet quod condidit*, made again, created anew, and many a new creature in it.²⁴

As Allchin notes, in Andrewes’ parallel between the Incarnation and baptismal regeneration (and with the clarity of his pneumatology), both mysteries manifest the operation of the Holy Spirit, revealing the meaning and verity of “Emmanuel.”

There is the interconnection of the doctrines touched on, incarnation, adoption, deification, the virgin birth of Christ, the new birth in baptism of the Christian, the action of the Holy Spirit as life-creating in both cases, the parallel of the womb and the font as the place of new life. . . . God’s Son becomes the son of Mary, so that the sons of men may become the sons of God. Here already is the marvellous interchange of human and divine which the whole Christian mystery celebrates. . . . “And this indeed was the chief end of his being ‘With us’; to give us a *posse fieri*, a capacity. ‘a power to be made the sons of God’, by being born again of water and the Spirit; for *Originem quam sumpsit ex utero Virginis posuit in fonte Baptismatis*. . . . So his being conceived and born the Son of man doth conceive and bring forth (*filiatio, filiationem*) our being born, our being sons of God, his participation of our human, our participation of his divine nature.”²⁵

What was begun in the Incarnation is fulfilled in the Resurrection; humanity becomes, Andrewes says, a “new brotherhood,” the Church, the mystical body of Christ, of whom Christ Himself is, as St. Paul declares (Rom. 8:29), the first fruits.

A brotherhood we grant was begun at Christmas by his birth, as upon that day. . . . But so was he also at Easter; born then too, and after a better manner born. . . . By the *hodie genui Te* of Christmas, how soon he was born of the virgin’s womb he became our brother, sin except, subject to all our infirmities. . . . By the *hodie genui Te* of Easter . . . he begins a new brotherhood, founds a new fraternity

after the consecration, this of St. Basil” “. . . receiving our share of thy hallowed things,/we . . . may have Christ indwelling in our hearts,/and be made a temple of thy Holy Ghost. . . .” (123-124).

²⁴*Lancelot Andrewes the Preacher*, 51-52. Lossky notes that in the Incarnation, “We see once again affirmed the fulness of the mystery of the natures united without confusion in the Person of Christ, with the extension of this union in the regeneration of the whole of creation through the human birth of the Creator.” Christian cosmology has, of course, always asserted the fall of the cosmos entire, through Adam’s sin and its particular consequences (disease, illness and disorder, disaster, war, crime, social and religious corruption, and ultimately universal death); hence the need for *cosmic* restoration.

²⁵*PiG*, 16-17 (q. Andrewes, *Complete Works. Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology*, I, 122).

straight; adopts us, we see, anew again by his *fratres meos*; and thereby he that was *primogenitus a mortuis* becomes *primogenitus inter multos fratres*; when ‘the first-begotten from the dead’, then ‘the first-begotten of many brethren’. . . . But half-brothers before, never the whole blood till now.²⁶

It is in his preaching on the Holy Spirit that Andrewes most clearly addresses the question of *theosis*. As Allchin has said, his pneumatology is clear; the gift of the Spirit is the seal of that “new brotherhood,” the Church, whereby the Divine image is restored within the believer. The Spirit also bestows spiritual nurture and actual grace through the Sacraments, especially the Eucharist. The Sacraments impart the “very breath” of the Spirit, making the soul the Spirit’s temple. At Communion Andrewes prays:

Remembering therefore, o sovran Lord, even we, (in the presence of thy holy mysteries) . . . beseech Thee, o Lord, that with the witness of our conscience clean, receiving our share of thy hallowed things, we may be united to the holy body and blood of thy Christ, and receiving them not unworthily may have Christ indwelling in our hearts, and be made a temple of thy Holy Ghost.²⁷

The outpouring of the Spirit’s gift, however, is not a random act, nor occurring in chaos. The proper venue for the bestowal of that gift is the Church, which Andrewes calls “Sion,” and the Church alone, for it is in the Church that the Spirit’s wind blows.²⁸

²⁶Ibid., 17. The expectation perceived in Andrewes’ writing is that the Christian, cleaving to the life of the Church, will partake of actual grace bestowed in the Sacraments, and will observe the cycles of the Church’s teaching and calendar, as an assumed outgrowth of the ongoing transformation wrought in the soul by the Spirit through the sanctifying grace bestowed in Baptism. It is by Divine grace “[predestinating] to be conformed to the image of his Son,” and furthered by living the ascetical disciplines of the Christian life, that the soul is brought into mystical union and brotherhood with Christ the “firstborn,” and comes ultimately to its original God-like state.

²⁷*Private Devotions*, 123. Quoting verbatim from the Liturgy of St. Basil and the Horologion, Andrewes prays for “hallowing, enlightenment, strengthening . . . an increase of thy divine grace, and an appropriation of thy kingdom” (Ibid.). Brightman’s notes cite Sermon 6 (for Whitsun): “And by and with these [the body and the blood], there is grace imparted to us; which grace is the very breath of this Holy Spirit, the true and express character of his seal, to the renewing in us the image of God whereunto we were created. . . . Be careful to ‘stir it up’ (2 Tim. i 6), yea to grow and increase in it (2 Pet. iii 18), more and more, even to the consummation of it, which is glory—glory being nothing else but grace consummate, the figure of this stamp in his full perfection” (342).

²⁸*Lancelot Andrewes the Preacher*, 273-274, Sermon 1 for Whitsun. Lossky says: “The Church is the heart of this new creation. It is in fact the place where the Spirit blows *par excellence*. Certainly, ‘the Spirit bloweth where it listeth’ (John 3:8). However, that does not mean that it blows in an anarchic

And, as the Church is the new Zion, it is futile to seek the Spirit's presence elsewhere, for it is the "apostolic place" that houses apostolic truth and Divine blessing. It is within the Church, perfectly ordered by Christ and empowered by the indwelling and gift of the Holy Spirit, that souls are enabled to come to Christ to be transformed. The Spirit is poured out on the Church as God's gracious gifts and anointing for ministry; Christian *askesis* is the stamp of ongoing renewal of souls in the image of God, of the process of full perfection and ultimate deification. As the place "where the Spirit blows," the Church is also especially that place "where the Apostles sat" and the place where the soul can find mystical fellowship with other souls traversing the same path towards God. Thus it is the place where sanctification and eternal peace in Christ are truly to be found, lived out, and realized.

Ubi vult spirat, is most true. And that *ubi* is not anywhere, but where these men sat; that is, a peculiar wind, and appropriate to that place where the Apostles are, that is, the Church. Elsewhere to seek it, is but folly. The place where it bloweth in, is Sion . . . where there is concord and unity, the dew of Sion, *ibi mandavit Dominus benedictionem*; there God sendeth this wind, and 'there He sendeth His blessing', which never leaveth us till it bringeth us to life for evermore, to eternal life. . . . So doth this; it cometh from heaven, and it bloweth into the Church, and through and through it, to fill it with the breath of Heaven; and as it came from Heaven to the Church, so it shall return from the Church into Heaven, *per circuitos suos*; and whose sails it hath filled with that wind, it shall carry with it along *per circuitos suos*; even to live with Him and His Holy Spirit for ever.²⁹

fashion; on the contrary, Andrewes insists on the fact that He blows in accordance with His divine will. . . . The Church is then the privileged place of the Spirit."

²⁹Ibid. Lossky says that the Church, while the "privileged place of the Spirit," is in *esse* open to all souls: "However, for Andrewes this does not entail a closed, exclusive definition of the Church. In fact, the gift of Pentecost is open to all, even to God's enemies. Consequently, no one is excluded save for him who freely excludes himself by a voluntary refusal of God, be he 'unbeliever' or 'Christian'. . . . Instead of the Church's being defined by its visible and perceptible limits, by relation to those who are outside it, the Church is defined positively, in its essence, as the place where the Spirit of Truth blows who is to be distinguished at once from the 'private spirit' and the 'spirit of the world'. . . . 'From Christ It comes, if It be true; He breathes It. It cannot but be true, if It comes from Him, for He is "the Truth" [John 14:6]. And as the Truth, so the "Wisdom" of God [I Cor. 1:30].'"

Lossky says, finally, that life sanctified by Christ requires the living of a virtuous life: “Theology and life are inseparable; there is no orthodoxy without orthopraxy. Christianity demands the four virtues [mercy, truth, righteousness, and peace].”³⁰ Understanding the doctrine must lead to the living of a holy life, seeking always to become more conformed to the will of God, and to the mind of Christ. Lossky reminds us that Andrewes insists on such a disciplined life as the outgrowth of faith. To be in Christ, Andrewes says, is to live the life and do the works of Christ.

Mercy leads to Truth, the knowledge of it; and Truth to Righteousness, and the practice of it; and Righteousness to Peace, and the ways of it—“guides our feet” first “into the way of peace” [Luke 1:79]. And such a way shall there always be, do all the controversy-writers what they can, a fair way, agreed upon of all sides, questioned by none, in which whoso orders his steps aright “may see the salvation of our God.” Even the way chalked out here before us; to shew Mercy, and speak Truth, do Righteousness, and follow Peace.³¹

3. John Donne: “Onely the Meere Goodnesse of God.”

IN THE metaphysical poet John Donne (1572-1631), scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge, lawyer, *bon vivant*, Member of Parliament, Royal favorite, and finally priest, renowned preacher, and great Dean of St. Paul’s, London, we find recurrent themes of

³⁰Ibid., 78 (q. *Works*, I, Nativity 11). Lossky also marks Andrewes’ understanding of theology as a unitive way. He says, “For Andrewes, an authentic witness to the apostolic faith is not simply someone who is content to think more or less correctly. It is someone who, like him, has made deeply his own the experience of the Church. It is someone for whom theology is not a system of thought, an intellectual construction, but a progression in the experience of the mystery, the way of union with God in the communion of the Church. In this perspective, theology is for the understanding an ascetic way, a way of the cross. . . .” (Ibid., 345).

³¹Ibid. Andrewes sees the Christian life as supremely a course in putting to death the old life, nothing less than transforming the old body from a pagan temple and making it a fit dwelling for the Spirit. “A course must then be taken, that while we are here, we do *solvere Templa haec*, ‘dissolve these Temples’ of Chemosh and Ashtoreth, and upon the dissolution of them we raise them up Temples to the true and living God; that we down with Beth-aven, ‘This house or shop of vanity [Josh. 7:2]’, as by nature they are, and up with Bethel, ‘God’s house’, as by grace they may be. For a *solvite* and an *excitabo* we are to pass here in this life, and this, this *excitabo*, is the first resurrection here to be passed. ‘He that hath his part in this first, he shall not fail but have it in the second [cf. Rev. 20:6]’” (Ibid., 178).

human frailty, the reality of sin and concomitant fear, and the arousal of the soul to repentance. A fundamental rhythm is discerned in Donne's writings, an awareness of the tension between God's justice and mercy; and it is in the soul's consciousness of that tension that the stage for transformation is set. As the soul turns to God in repentance, it receives His mercy with joy; and as it perceives His justice, that Divine mercy becomes the source of even greater wonder, joy, and thankfulness.

Donne disagrees fundamentally with many of the earlier reformers on the doctrine of justification by faith alone. Salvation *sola fide* is for him in fact a major stumbling block. Donne perceives the operative concept, fundamentally, as the goodness and love of God, whose initiative redemption is. Itrat Husain says,

Though Donne believed that faith was necessary for salvation, he does not seem to hold the doctrine that righteousness could only be achieved through "faith and not for our owne workes or deservynges." Donne argues that neither faith nor works alone could be the *cause* of our salvation; they are interdependent, and that God alone is the cause of our Justification. . . . "It is truly said of God, *Deus solus justificat*, God alone justifies us . . . nothing can effect it, nothing can worke towards it, but onely the meere goodnesse of God."³²

Another difficulty for Donne with the earlier reformers arises on the issue of free will, which many of the continental reformers had either declared limited or had denied

³²Itrat Husain, *The Dogmatic and Mystical Theology of John Donne*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press Publishers, 1970, 96. Donne, speaking of God's justice says: "And that our Mercifull God, as he made no Creature so frail and corruptible as the *first* Beginning, which being but the first point of time, dyed as soon as it was made, flowing into the next point; so though he made no creature like the *last* Beginning, (for if it had been as it, eternall, it had been no creature;) yet it pleased him to come so neer it, that our soul, though it began with that *first* Beginning, shall continue and ever last with the *last*" (*Essays in Divinity by John Donne*, ed. Evelyn Simpson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952, 17). "And then at last God interposed his *Justice*; yet not so much for *Justice* sake, as to get opportunitie of *new Mercy*, in promising a Redeemer; of *new Power*, in raising again bodies made mortall by that sin. . . ." (Ibid., 86).

Donne's view of God's "meere goodnesse" as the cause of salvation, and of faith's and works' interdependence, reflects strongly the sentiment in St. James' epistle (Jas. 2:14-18).

Note that Husain renders Donne's texts in their original seventeenth-century spellings and syntax, which appear idiosyncratic to modern eyes. Italics are also Donne's own and the writer has kept these throughout.

outright. This view Donne rejects, as does Article XVII of the Articles of Religion.³³

Donne rather sees redemption as God's call "out of sleep" and the soul's answer as an act of the will, in surrender of the will, reaching out for the gift of Divine grace and love.

The soul is awakening to its need for God's grace.

Now every repentance is not a resurrection; it is rather a waking out of a dreame, than a rising to a new life. Nay it is rather a startling in our sleep, than any awaking at all, to have a sudden remorse, a sudden flash, and not constant perseverance. *Awake thou that sleepest*, sayes the Apostle, out of the Prophet: First *awake*, come to a sense of thy state; and then *arise from the dead*, says he, from the practice of dead works, and then *Christ shall give thee light*; life and strength to walk in new wayes. It is a long work and hath many steps.³⁴

This realization by the soul of its condition, and resulting repentance, is the prerequisite act for conversion. It is the first step of the "many steps" in the "long work" of sanctification. Without it the sinner remains helplessly bound in the chaos of his sin.

I acknowledged in myselfe, I came to a feeling in myselfe, what my sinfull condition was. This is our quickening in our regeneration, and second birth; and till this come, a sinner lies as the Chaos at the beginning of the Creation, before the *spirit of God had moved upon the face of the water, Dark and voyd, and without forme*.³⁵

For Donne (and the "holy sonnets" reflect this), it is precisely in repentance, confession, and submission that the soul is empowered to see the Divine image inwardly—

³³Ibid., 105. Article XVII states, "Predestination to Life, is the everlasting purpose of God. . . . As the godly consideration of Predestination, and our Election in Christ is full of sweete, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons, and such as feele in themselves the working of the Spirite of Christ . . . because it doth establish and confirme their fayth of eternal salvation to be enjoyed in Christ." Donne comments (101): "So is this salvation wrought in the will, by conforming this will of man to the will of God, not by extinguishing the will itselpe, by any force or constraint that God imprints in it by his Grace; God saves no man without or against his will" (*LXXX Sermons*, 64).

³⁴Ibid., 128 (*LXXX Sermons*, 19). The "long work [having] many steps" alludes to conversion in Worsley's sense (see n. 14), but also (this writer believes) to the entire dynamic of Divine-human synergy.

³⁵Ibid., 127 (*LXXX Sermons*, 58). Husain adds, "After this 'sinful condition' has been realized, the need of repentance becomes an urgent necessity; and this process of purgation is a long and painful one. . . . The first step according to Donne in the cleansing of the self is to receive sincerely the 'helps', the Word and the Sacrament, which Christ has offered to the Soul in the Church" (129).

“Marke in my heart, O Soule, where thou dost dwell,/The picture of Christ crucified.”³⁶

Moreover, purgation from sin is not only an indispensable, but indeed a desired act in the drama of salvation. In the “holy sonnets” he yearns for purgation and Divine correction. The very fact of God’s anger marks His *cherissement* of the soul; by His correction the Divine image is restored, and union with Christ, the soul’s true end, bestowed.

O Saviour, as thou hang’st upon the tree;/I turn my weary back to thee, but to receive/Corrections, till thy mercies bid thee leave. O thinke me worth thine anger, punish mee/Burne off my rusts, and my deformitie,/Restore thine image, so much, by thy grace,/That thou may’st know mee, and I’ll turne my face.³⁷

So Donne’s “mark in the heart” and “restoration of God’s image” within are one and the same. After acknowledgement of and repentance for sin, God works in the Christian soul the restoration of the *eikon Theou* of its original state in creation—in effect, the image is “repainted on the original panel,” as Athanasius asserts. In the sermon “Of Creation, the Trinity, and the Nature of Man,” Donne says,

[In heaven] we shall have this Image of God in Perfection . . . with God in that state of glory. . . . I shall be so like God, as that the Devil himself shall not know me from God . . . for, though I shall not be immortal, as God, yet I shall be as immortal as God. And there’s my Image of God; of God considered altogether, and in his unity, in the state of glory. I shall have also then, the Image of all the three Persons of the Trinity. . . .³⁸

Moreover, in Christ’s Incarnation the body, as well as the soul, is transformed and glorified, and is made inseparable from His glorified body. Donne declares:

But in heaven, it is *Caro mea, My flesh*, my souls flesh, my Saviours flesh. As my meat is assimilated to my flesh, and made one flesh with it; as my soul is

³⁶“170, Holy Sonnet (‘What if this present were the worlds last night?’),” John Donne, *The Complete Poetry of John Donne (Anchor Seventeenth-Century Series)*, ed. John T. Shawcross. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books (Doubleday & Company), 1967, 343.

³⁷“185, Goodfriday, 1613. Riding Westward,” *Ibid.*, 368.

³⁸“Of Creation, the Trinity, and the Nature of Man, II,” John Donne, *The Showing Forth of Christ: Sermons of John Donne*, ed. Edmund Fuller. New York, Evanston, London: Harper and Rowe Publishers, 1964, 27-28.

assimilated to my God, and *made partaker of the divine nature*, and *Idem Spiritus*, the same Spirit with it; so there my flesh shall be assimilated to the flesh of my Saviour, and made the same flesh with him, too. *Verbum caro factum, ut caro resurget* . . . which shall be mine as inseparably, (in the *effect*, though not in the *manner*) as the *Hypostaticall union* of God, and man in Christ, makes our nature and the Godhead one person in him. . . .³⁹

The ascetical disciplines are of paramount importance, particularly that of prayer; and the Church itself is the “house of prayer.” Though he is remembered as an eminent preacher, Donne counts prayer as more essential to the wellbeing of souls than preaching, in what Husain terms the “development of mystical consciousness.”⁴⁰ Even more, the spirit of prayer is of greater value than the place or even than the words of prayer.

I can build a Church in my bosome, I can serve God in my heart, and never clouth my prayer in words. God is often said to heare and answer in the Scriptures, when they to whom he speaks, have said nothing.⁴¹

When I pray in my chamber, I build a Temple there, that houre; And, that minute, when I cast out a prayer, in the street, I build a Temple there; And when my soule prays without any voyce, my very Body is then a Temple.⁴²

Nonetheless, the Church, as the mystical Body of Christ, is above all the place where God maintains continual presence with His people through Word and Sacrament. It is God’s eminent temple, its fellowship a constant resort, from which to absent oneself is to suffer deep and perhaps irretrievable spiritual loss.

And shall I not come to his Temple where he is alwaies resident? My chamber were no Temple, my body were no Temple, except God came to it, but whether I

³⁹Sermon XIV, “The Sight of God,” L. Pearsall Smith, ed., *Donne’s Sermons: Selected Passages*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964, 226.

⁴⁰*The Dogmatic and Mystical Theology of John Donne (LXXX Sermons, 9)*, 124. Donne says, “The Church is the house of prayer, so that as upon occasion preaching may be left out, but never a house of preaching, so as that prayer may be left out.”

⁴¹*Ibid. (LXXX Sermons, 26)*, 124.

⁴²*Ibid. (LXXX Sermons, 4)*, 124.

came hither or no this will be God's temple: I may lose by my absence; he gains nothing by my coming.⁴³

Finally, the matter of an ordered life is found, for Donne, in what Husain calls the "mystic way in three definite stages, Purgation, Illumination, and Union." Donne sees conversion as preceding purgation, illumination, and union; it instills faith in the soul.

Man in his conversion, is nothing, does nothing . . . but grace finds out mans naturall faculties, and exalts them to a capacity, and a susceptibleness of the working thereof, and so by the understanding infuses faith.⁴⁴

The soul is then constrained to live a life of patience, reliance on the will of God, and good works, in a spirit of repentance but also of confidence in God's mercy. To distrust God's mercy is to give way to despair; the soul must never think itself beyond Divine forgiveness and deliverance.

God has not only given you a natural day, from period to period to consider your birth and your death . . . but he has given you an artificial day, and a day which he has distinguished into hours by continual benefits, and a day which you have distinguished into hours by continual sins . . . it was late before God came to correct Adam, but he has filled us with mercy in the morning that we might be glad and rejoice all the day. . . . [Sorrow for sin] must not be an immoderate sorrow that terrifies, or argues a distrust in God's goodness. Drown that body of sin which have built up in you. . . . But when that work is religiously done . . . drown it no more, suffer it not to lie under the water of distrustful diffidence, for so you may fall too low to be able to tug up against the tide again, so you may be swallowed in Cain's whirlpool, to think your sins greater than can be forgiven.⁴⁵

4. Jeremy Taylor: "Holy Living" and Sacramental Discipline.

THE QUESTION of ascetical practice in the sanctifying process is a matter of special importance in considering the Church during the Commonwealth and Restoration

⁴³Ibid.

⁴⁴Ibid. (*LXXX Sermons*, 61), 125.

⁴⁵"Of Patience in Adversity, Awaiting the Will of God," *The Showing Forth of Christ*, 191.

periods. The Puritans, from the latter stages of the Tudor period on, were moral rigorists, certainly, and insisted on a devotedly Christian life. But their sense of the need for an ordered ascetic and the Sacraments as means to a holy life differed from that of the divines of the established Church. At the cusp of the period, Anglican divines began again to stress the Church's teaching of the necessity for the ascetical disciplines of a "holy life," especially of regular resort to the Sacraments.

Jeremy Taylor (1613-1667), fellow of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, and later Bishop of Down and Connor in Ireland, presents a highly developed view of sanctification in terms of both the moral and the ascetical imperatives. His understanding of sanctification reveals a clear vision of the soul's ultimate end as reigning with Christ in glory. In his exposition of the need for a disciplined spirituality he stands in common with many of his contemporaries. His sacramental awareness is particularly acute.⁴⁶

Taylor viewed the entire matter of spiritual discipline (as he said) as resting on and responding to the life of Jesus, the "Great Exemplar" of holiness. One also finds resonances of Hooker's "natural and eternal law." H.R. McAdoo writes,

As a moral theologian, [Taylor] has led up to this by considering the Christian religion in relation to the whole human family and so the key-concept is the eternal law governing human acts through the natural law, the law of reason. . . . Natural law, says Taylor, is "unalterable" and "the law of nature, being thus decreed and made obligatory, was a sufficient instrument of making men happy, that is, in producing the end of his creation."⁴⁷

⁴⁶McAdoo, *The Structure of Caroline Moral Theology*, 10. Robert Sanderson (1587-1663), Bishop of Lincoln, wrote, "But when all is done, *Positive* and *Practick Divinity* must bring us to Heaven: that is it must poise our *judgments*, settle our *consciences*, direct our *lives*, mortifie our *corruptions*, increase our *graces*, strengthen our *comforts*, save our *souls*" (pref. to Taylor's *Unum Necessarium*, 1665; spellings and italics Sanderson's).

⁴⁷H.R. McAdoo, *First of its kind: Jeremy Taylor's Life of Christ: A Study in the Functioning of a Moral Theology*. Norwich: The Canterbury Press, 1994, 19. In *The Great Exemplar*, Taylor wrote, "I have prepared *considerations* upon the special parts of the life of the holy Jesus. . . . For I have so ordered the considerations, that . . . they are made *doctrinal and little repositories of duty* . . . for, *since the understanding is not an idle faculty in the spiritual life*, but hugely operative to all excellent and reasonable

Taylor's principle of Christian morality is grounded in the Christian's duty of ongoing struggle against sin and toward holiness. The soul is confronted by the specter of the last judgment. If moral theology is "concerned with human actions both in eternity and in time, with the ultimate perfecting of human life," sanctification is attained by unrelenting penitence and by purposeful struggle against the world, the flesh, and the devil. This becomes for Taylor the primary moral imperative.

It concerns us, therefore, to consider in time that he that tempts us will accuse us, and what he calls pleasant now, he shall then say was nothing. . . . God hath put it into our power, by a timely accusation of ourselves in the tribunal of the court Christian, to prevent all the arts of aggravation, which at domesday shall load foolish and undiscerning souls. . . . By accusing ourselves we shall make the devil's malice useless, and our own consciences clear, and be reconciled to the Judge by the severities of an early repentance, and then we need to fear no accusers.⁴⁸

For Taylor, the discipline of a dedicated, ordered, and holy life within the Church, cleaving to its fellowship and accepting the grace given in the Sacraments, is indispensable for the soul's wellbeing and growth into godly perfection. In the fellowship of the Church, begun in Baptism, nurtured in the Eucharist, and maintained in prayer and confession, such a life opens the path of access to the Christian's ultimate union with God.

The Sacraments—Baptism, the Eucharist, and Confession, upon which Taylor places special emphasis—are the instruments of sanctification, administered and received within the fellowship of Christ's mystical body, the Church. Together with the church

choices, it were very fit, that this faculty were also entertained *by such discourses*, which God intended as instruments for hallowing it, as he intended it towards *the sanctification of the whole man*" (17-18, Taylor's pref.; italics his). Hooker's teaching, from which Taylor derives his moral construct, "places human acts firmly within the law of nature which is the law of reason" (20).

⁴⁸Sermon 47, "Self-Judgement as Preparation for the Last Judgement," G. Lacey May, ed., *Wings of an Eagle: An Anthology of Caroline Preachers with 60 Extracts from their Sermons*. London: SPCK, 1955, 129-130. The "court Christian" refers, of course, to sacramental confession. May says that in 1657 Taylor ministered to Anglican friends in London, "who (one was John Evelyn) supported him in return for his ministrations as celebrant or confessor" (121). The Puritans were inimical to sacramental confession as to all "popish" and "corrupt" practices; during the Commonwealth particularly, one suspects that it had

year and the Church's rites and ceremonies, they form for him an indispensable structure for the living of the holy life. Taylor wrote a series of treatises on sacramental, ritual, and ascetical subjects between 1643 and 1654. Attempting to impart order and reason in a nation and Church unsettled by civil war was undoubtedly vexatious and discouraging.⁴⁹

Baptism is the locus not only of regeneration but also of sanctification, because in the baptism of John, Jesus, by “[inserting] Himself” into humanity's midst, has wrought its spiritual transformation.⁵⁰ In the water of Baptism itself the purifying power of Christ is made present and the *eikon Theou* restored to its original fullness. Taylor prays:

With the abundance of Thy grace . . . open this holy fountain of baptism, for the reformation and sanctification of all the nations of the world; that thy blessed spirit sanctifying these waters, a new and heavenly offspring may hence arise, full of health and light; that human nature, which was made after Thine own image, being reformed and restored to the honour of its first beginning, may . . . reign with Thee for ever in the blessed inheritance of our blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus.⁵¹

gone into major eclipse, even more so than in the previous hundred years. Certainly the ministry of trained confessors, though of necessity exercised underground, must have been highly valued.

⁴⁹“Heavenly Sacrifice and Earthly Sacraments,” Jeremy Taylor, *Jeremy Taylor: Selected Works*, ed. Thomas K. Carroll. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1900, II, 193. Carroll says, “Taylor's years of conflict and affliction, the storm after the calm, began with his departure from Golden Grove (the Carbury estate in Wales where he was exiled during the Commonwealth) in 1654 and never really ended. Consequently, the writings of this period show their wounds and are, for the most part, defensive and polemical, while at the same time liturgical and theological” (193).

⁵⁰*Ibid.*, I, “Jesus Christ—The Great Exemplar,” I.ix.2, 119. Taylor says, “He confirmed the baptism of John; He sanctified the water to become sacramental and ministerial in the remission of sins; He by a real event declared, that to them who should rightly be baptized the kingdom of heaven should certainly be opened; He inserted Himself by that ceremony into the society and participation of holy people, of which communion Himself was head and prince; and He did in a symbol purify human nature, whose stains and guilt He had undertaken.” McAdoo notes the integrality of sacramentalism to Taylor's religion, “a constantly recurring element, as in Section IX . . . where Taylor emphasizes the ecclesial content of the sacrament. . . .” (H.R. McAdoo, *The Eucharistic Theology of Jeremy Taylor Today*. Norwich: Canterbury Press, 1988, 57).

⁵¹“Heavenly Sacrifice and Earthly Sacraments: A Form of Administration of the Holy Sacrament of Baptism,” *Ibid.*, II, 240. Prayer over the font, i. The exhortation calls Baptism “a well of grace springing up to life eternal” and an “entry into the mystical Body of Christ our head” (239). This holds both metaphysical and ecclesial implications; the Church has always been called the “mystical Body” (per I Cor. 12:12-27), as the earthly type of Christians' participation in the Divine union.

It is in his teaching on the Eucharist that Taylor makes perhaps his most dramatic affirmation of sacramental efficacy. The Eucharist is sacrament but also sacrifice, a real recapitulation of the saving passion of Christ. By partaking of the Eucharist the Christian partakes of the passion and, by the fruition of the one perfect sacrifice which the passion effects, of the being of Christ Himself. Christ is truly and objectively present in the Sacrament; as High Priest he offers Himself on the altar as on the cross, by the hand of the Church's ministers and the whole priestly body of the faithful.

The sacraments and symbols, if they be considered in their own nature are just such as they seem . . . 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.⁵²

It is by participation in the mystical sign wrought in the Sacraments, he says, that the soul's sharing in the resurrected glory and immortality of Jesus is made possible. The soul is made capable of attaining to the sanctification intended by God in the redemptive act of Christ, and is thus united to Christ.

By the means of this sacrament, our bodies are made capable of the resurrection to life and eternal glory. For when we are externally and symbolically in the sacrament, and by faith and the Spirit of God internally united to Christ and made partakers of His body and His blood, we are joined and made one with Him who did rise again; and when the head is risen, the members shall not see corruption for ever . . . we shall rise again, and we shall enter into glory.⁵³

While affirming the presence of Christ in the Eucharist and its efficacy for the communicant, Taylor also emphasizes the necessity of receiving with a penitent heart.

⁵²“The Worthy Communicant,” *Ibid.*, I, 205.

⁵³*Ibid.*, IV.5, 212. McAadoo says that Taylor also insists it is not the ordained alone who offer, but indeed the entire Church: “If we consider this, not as the act and ministry of ecclesiastical persons, but as the duty of the whole church communicating; that is, as it is a sacrament, so it is like the springs of Eden. . . . For whatsoever was offered in the sacrifice, is given in the sacrament; and whatever the testament bequeaths, the

For the holy sacrament operates indeed and consigns our pardon, but not alone, but in conjunction with all that Christ requires as conditions of pardon; but when the conditions are present, the sacrament ministers pardon, as pardon is ministered in this world; that is, by parts, and in order to several purposes, and with power of revocation, by suspending the divine wrath, by procuring more graces, by obtaining time of repentance, and the powers and possibilities of working out our salvation . . . that Christ in heaven perpetually offers and represents that sacrifice to His heavenly Father, and in virtue of that obtains all good things for His church.⁵⁴

Himself an experienced confessor and spiritual director,⁵⁵ as has been mentioned, Taylor saw sacramental confession as a major part of the cultivation of holiness. Given the grace danger of unworthy communicating, he insists that acts of penitence must carry moral and disciplinary, as well as metaphysical impact. He particularly stresses the importance both of the strictness of the confessor and the honesty of the penitent.

When a penitent confesses his sin, the holy man that ministers to his repentance and hears his confession, must not without great cause lessen the shame of the repenting man; he must directly encourage the duty, but not add confidence to the sinner. For whatsoever directly lessens the shame, lessens also the hatred of sin. . . . He that confesseth his sins to the minister of religion, must be sure to express all the great lines of his folly and calamity; that is, all that by which he may make a competent judgment of the state of his soul . . . for else he can serve no prudent end in his confession.⁵⁶

The key to the access to Divine grace, finally, lies for Taylor in the cultivation of an ordered, simple, and pure life, and in practiced *confidence* toward God. All the soul's

holy mysteries dispense . . . and every holy soul having feasted at his table, may say, as St. Paul, 'I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me'" (*The Eucharistic Theology of Jeremy Taylor Today*, 66-67).

⁵⁴Ibid., IV.3-4, 209. But he also admonishes on communicating unprepared, or while in sin: "[Even] the death of Christ brings no pardon to the impenitent persevering sinner, but to him that repents truly: and so does the sacrament of Christ's death . . . therefore let no man come with his guilt about him" (208). This recalls St. Paul's warning (I Cor. 11:27-32) and the Communion Exhortation in the Prayer Book of 1549: ". . . or els let him not come to this holy table, thinking to deceyue God, who seeth all meñes hartes. For neither the absolucion of the priest, can any thing auayle them, nor the receiuing of this holy sacrament doth any thing but increase their damnacion" (*The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI* (Everyman's Library ed.). London: J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd; New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., Inc. 1957, 217).

⁵⁵Ibid., 453. Carroll says that like St. Francis de Sales, Taylor was "a director of souls and a spiritual guide, especially of holy women," and had written *Holy Living* and *Holy Dying* for Lady Carbury.

⁵⁶"Faith and Repentance: Of Ecclesiastical Penance and Confession," Ibid., III, 105-106, 336.

ascetical struggles have their culmination in its being gathered into the presence of God and in reliance on His just and loving judgment and assessment of its worth.

Simplicity in our intentions, and purity of affections, are the two wings of a soul, investing it with the robes and resemblances of a seraphim [*sic*]. Intend the honour of God principally and sincerely . . . in just subordination to God, and to religion, and thou shalt have joy, if there be any such thing in this world. For there is no joy but in God, and no sorrow but in an evil conscience. . . . Thou art neither better nor worse in thyself for any account that is made of thee by any but God alone: secure that to thee, and He will secure all the rest.⁵⁷

5. William Law: “A Renovation of Some Divine Birth.”

EVELYN UNDERHILL described William Law (1686-1761), fellow of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, Non-juror, and tutor to the famed Gibbon family, as “the only spiritual thinker of the first rank among the English mystics of the post-Reformation Church.”⁵⁸ Thomas ÷ Kempis and others influenced his mystical theology and he urged the embrace of Christian asceticism.⁵⁹

Law’s spirituality is based on the creation of man as “a mirror of the divine nature: where Father, Son, and Holy Ghost each brought forth their own nature in a creaturely manner.”⁶⁰ This divine state is recapitulated in Baptism, “a renovation of

⁵⁷“Discourse and Prayer: Friday, The Sixth Decad,” *Ibid.*, IV, 59-60.

⁵⁸William Law, *Selected Mystical Writings of William Law*, ed. Stephen Hobhouse. London: C.S. Daniel Company, 1940, viii. A letter received by the editor from Miss Underhill. Caroline Spurgeon and W.R. Inge both evaluated Law as “the great English prose mystic” (*Ibid.*).

⁵⁹“William Law,” *OxDict*, 791. Law was undoubtedly reacting to the rationalism and spiritual torpor of the time, as John Wesley was to do. Initially orthodox, in his later years he became enamored of the theosophy of Jakob Boehme, whose mysticism resembled the Quaker notion of “Inner Light.” His contemporaries were disturbed at his view of sin and evil and, consequently, he became estranged from many former disciples, Wesley included. The question is sometimes raised as to Law’s legitimately being called a “mainstream” Anglican theologian at all, though he retained his orders and remained within the Church’s communion.

⁶⁰“Christian Regeneration,” *Selected Mystical Writings of William Law*, 11. “Now by [man’s] transgression this image of the Holy Trinity was broken; the generation of the Son, or Word, and the

some divine birth that we had lost.”⁶¹ He also explicitly rejects Calvinist dual-predestinarianism, and further interprets the “wrath of God” as man’s own reaction to his transgression and fallen state, not Divine anger, since

God is love, yea, all love; and so all love, that nothing but love can come from Him.⁶²

The Church, its community, and its sacramental life seem not to play a large part in Law’s mystical thought; he seems more concerned with the purely metaphysical, and on an individual spirituality rather than a corporate one.⁶³ Nonetheless, in his thinking the Church and the external practice of religion remain integral parts of the plan of redemption; and there is a decided awareness of the reality and the value of the Church and its practices and disciplines. “Inward and outward religion” are for him inseparable.

He that thinks or holds that outward exercises of religion hurt or are too low for his degree of spirituality shows plainly that his spirituality is only in idea. The truly spiritual man is he that sees God in all things and all things in God. Every outward thing has the nature of a sacrament to him. To such an one the outward institutions of religion are ten times more dear and valuable than those that are less spiritual. As the truly charitable man loves to meet outward objects of charity, as the truly humble man loves to meet outward occasions of being abased,

proceeding of the Holy Ghost in him were at an end, in that day he died this death. And therefore, what was he as to his soul? . . . it wanted that spirit which was its amiable life, and which was to be that to it which the Holy Ghost is to the Father and the Son.”

⁶¹Ibid., 12. “And our being baptized in or into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost . . . may make us again what we were at first, a living, real image or offspring of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost” (11). Law’s “renovation” resembles Athanasius’ “redrawing of the likeness” (see n. 1.2).

⁶²Ibid., 15.

⁶³Martin Thornton, *English Spirituality: An Outline of Ascetical Theology According to the English Pastoral Tradition*. Cambridge, MA: Cowley Publications, 1986, 283. Thornton says that Law “rode very lightly to the Prayer Book system” and that *A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life* pays little attention to the daily Offices and public worship—“Here is the right emphasis on moral integrity in recollection, but torn away from the ascetical system which nourishes it.” May it have been a sense of resentment stemming from his deprivation and isolation from the mainstream of the Church’s life that produced this seeming off-handedness? J. Brazier Green comments on the “individualistic” or mystical ideal in Law as over against the “social” or pastoral model in Wesley (see n. 74).

so the truly spiritual man loves all outward objects and institutions that can exercise the religion of the heart.⁶⁴

The mystery of redemption, when all is said and done, is for Law that of living in the reality of God's creative love. Religion, external or internal, is a state of the heart. The heart, darkened by self-tormenting wrath, is restored by God's loving self-oblation.

As man lives and moves and has his being in the divine nature . . . so the wrath of man, which was awakened in the dark fire of his fallen nature, may, in a certain sense be called the wrath of God. . . . And this wrath which may be called the wrath of God is not God, but the fiery wrath of the fallen soul. And it was solely to quench this wrath, awakened in the human soul, that the blood of the Son of God was necessary, because nothing but a life and birth, derived from him into the human soul, could change this darkened root of a self tormenting fire into an amiable image of the Holy Trinity as it was at first created.⁶⁵

God is the Good, the unchangeable, overflowing fountain of Good that sends forth nothing but good to all eternity. . . . Review every part of our redemption, from Adam's first sin to the resurrection of the dead, and you will find nothing but successive mysteries of that first love which created angels and men. All the mysteries of the gospel are only so many marks and proofs of God's desiring to make his love triumph in the removal of sin and disorder from all nature and creation.⁶⁶

Redemption embodies the ascetical process of the soul's seeking and finding its true home. This Law sees as the distinction between the "natural" and "inner" man.

But now Christian redemption is quite of another nature; it has no affinity to any of these arts or sciences; it belongs not to the outward natural man, but is purely for the sake of an inward heavenly nature that was lost or put to death in Paradise and buried under the flesh and blood of the earthly, natural man. It breathes a spark of life into this inward, hidden, or lost man; by which it feels and finds itself and rises up in new awakened desires after its lost Father and native country. . . .

⁶⁴"Inward and outward religion," Robert Llewelyn & Edward Moss, eds., *Daily Readings with William Law*. Springfield, IL: Templegate Publishers, 1986, 87. Extract from ms. q. by Hobhouse.

⁶⁵*Selected Mystical Writings of William Law*, 16. Here Law seems to posit an incipient universalism, likely explaining the distancing by Wesley, who espoused the normative Reformation view of sin and for whom "the wrath to come," i.e., Divine judgment, was an ever-present reality to be dreaded, the flight therefrom a life-and-death necessity and indeed the supreme moral imperative. Is Law here perhaps making a reference to Jas. 1:20, "The wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God?"

⁶⁶"God, the fountain of all good," *Daily Readings with William Law*, 48. Extract from *The Spirit of Prayer*, 1749. Law's characterization of "disorder" in creation is interesting, predating as it does modern medical-psychological definition and terminology.

This is Christian redemption; on the one side it is the heavenly divine life offering itself again to the inward man that had lost it. On the other side, it is the hope, the faith, and desire of this inward man, hungering and thirsting, stretching after and calling upon this divine and heavenly life.⁶⁷

6. John Wesley: “The Heaven to Which We Are Going.”

JOHN WESLEY (1703-1791), scholar of Christ Church and fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford, renowned as the founder of Methodism, for our purposes closes the formative period. A child of the rectory, he first learned the Bible and the Fathers in his father’s study at Epworth.⁶⁸ Ordained in the Church of England, his Arminian sympathies were pronounced, undoubtedly due to his father’s influence.⁶⁹

Wesley does not enunciate *theosis* explicitly, but the implication is manifest. Themes of the transforming power of God in Christ, the end of the Christian life as a growth in holiness into inner peace, the sure hope of heaven, the Divine image inwardly planted, and final union with God, are clear. The goal, Wesley says, is

. . . nothing short or different from “the mind that was in Christ”; the image of God stamped upon the heart; inward righteousness, attended by the peace of God and “joy in the Holy Ghost.” . . . that “being justified by faith,” we taste of the

⁶⁷“The Way to Divine Knowledge,” *Selected Mystical Writings of William Law*, 125. Debate between “Academicus” and “Theophilus.”

⁶⁸Allan Coppedge, *John Wesley in Theological Debate*. Wilmore, KY: Wesleyan Heritage Press, 1987, 28. Wesley wrote of his early formation, “From a child I was taught to love and reverence the Scriptures, the oracles of God; and next to these to esteem the primitive Fathers, the writers of the first three centuries.” At Oxford he also read Thomas ÷ Kempis’ *Imitation of Christ*, Taylor’s *Holy Living*, and Law’s *Christian Perfection* and *Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life*. Coppedge says this “convinced Wesley that ‘holiness of heart and life’ was the essence of New Testament Christianity” (25).

⁶⁹*Ibid.*, 21, 25. Arminianism, posited by the Dutch reformer Jakob Hermandszoon (“Jacobus Arminius,” 1560-1609), held that Divine sovereignty is compatible with free will, that Christ died for all men and not merely for the elect, and that the Calvinist doctrine of predestination was unbiblical (“Arminianism,” *OxDict*, 87-88). V.H.H. Green says that The Rev’d Samuel Wesley’s moderate Arminian sympathies and abhorrence of Calvinism, especially of predestination and reprobation, made him “an almost rabid royalist and pernicky high churchman,” though Puritan in background (V.H.H. Green, *John Wesley*. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd, 1964, 9).

heaven to which we are going, we are holy and happy, we tread down sin and fear, and “sit in heavenly places with Christ Jesus.”⁷⁰

The “[flight] from the wrath to come” and striving to “taste the heaven to which we are going” became, for Wesley as for Taylor, a matter of moral and spiritual imperative; an obligation is laid on the soul to respond to God’s summons. He wrote:

. . . there is an inward Sufficiency of Power given by God to everyone, to hearken to the Calls of God’s Grace, and by Faith to receive that Salvation.⁷¹

Wesley’s sense of the Church as the place where holiness is to be lived out is absolute. He sees the social and communal dimension found in the Church, both for godly fellowship and charitable action, as indispensable. Here he departs significantly from Law, for whom the Church seems of secondary importance and the mystical the only real concern.⁷² For Wesley, James C. Logan says,

The Kingdom of grace . . . is not individualistic. It is profoundly communal. The church is the parable of the Kingdom of Grace. Wesley sensed in the revival the importance of the social dimensions of justification and sanctification. . . . The process of sanctification takes place in community of accountability. . . . The goal of the evangelical imperative was the Kingdom experienced as sanctification and

⁷⁰Frederick C. Gill, ed., *Selected Letters of John Wesley*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1956, 66-67. Letter to the Rev’d Vincent Perronet, 1748. Perronet, perhaps Wesley’s closest friend, was Vicar of the Shoreham parish, which was “run on Methodist lines.” This letter, setting forth “a plain account of the whole Methodist plan,” recalls Wesley’s preaching in London some ten years earlier. Wesley’s “method” involves, among other particulars, “only one condition previously desired in those who desire admission into this Society,—‘a desire to flee from the wrath to come, to be saved from their sins’” (Ibid., 68). “The image of God stamped upon the heart” is reminiscent of Maximos the Confessor’s description of the soul “softened like wax . . . receiving the impress and stamp of divine realities, [becoming] ‘in spirit the dwelling-place of God’” (*Philokalia*, II, 166; see n. 8).

⁷¹*John Wesley in Theological Debate*, 63.

⁷²J. Brazier Green, *John Wesley and William Law*. London: Epworth Press, 1945, 197. Green says that Wesley and Law agreed: “1. That Christian perfection is God’s will for all men; 2. That it can be lost; 3. That the goal is *complete communion with God*” (italics mine). But he also highlights fundamental differences: “1. Law’s ideal was individualistic, Wesley’s was social; 2. Law’s involved world-renunciation, Wesley’s called for service; 3. Law’s prepared men for the Hereafter: Wesley’s comprised also the present world.” This may be seen as a mystical, as over against a pastoral, model. Given Wesley’s zeal for souls, and the impoverished and beleaguered segments of society in which Methodism first made an impact, one suspects Wesley had little time for pure mysticism in the face of the immediate needs of the flock. The real thrust of Wesley’s ministry was “to preach the Gospel to the poor” (Isa. 61:1; Lk. 4:18) and to lead them into fellowship with one another and “complete communion with God” as he comprehended it.

perfection in the company of Christ's followers. A Kingdom existence is dependent on the means of grace, ordinary and extraordinary, while at the same time it is active in apostolic living.⁷³

It is most expressly within the fellowship of and obedience to the Church, which St. Paul calls the mystical body of Christ⁷⁴—both the community of the saved and the saving community—that the Gospel is preached and souls won to Christ. It is within that setting that the Holy Spirit's gifts are poured out, believers are transformed by a disciplined life of prayer, resort to the Sacraments, and acts of love and social action, and the process of “entire sanctification” is lived out. Wesley's high sense of the need both to respond to the evangelical counsels and to strive for “entire sanctification” represents his vision of the ultimate consummation of the soul in the beatific vision. Hence his spiritual ascetic (or “method”); the soul comes to perfection through struggle.⁷⁵

Wesley also sees worship and resort to the Sacraments as essential and as gifts of God's grace. The sentiment of “tasting the heaven to which we are going” has a strongly sacramental connotation within the Wesleyan construct. Wesley's insistence on

⁷³James C. Logan, “Theology and Evangelism,” James C. Logan, ed., *Theology and Evangelism in the Wesleyan Heritage*. Nashville, TN: Kingswood Books/Abingdon Press, 1994, 30-31. One must appreciate Wesley's concern with life in the community of faith. It is the patristic ideal, and he must have understood this from his reading of the Scriptures and the Fathers, in which the Church is clearly a *sine qua non* of the sanctified life. We shall see in Grafton's writings a like emphasis on the Church as the Kingdom of God, and the necessity of union with it as the way to sanctification.

⁷⁴I Cor. 12:12-13: “For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also is Christ. For as by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body . . . and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.” St. Paul's ethical command, “That there should be no schism in the body; but that the members should the same care one for another . . . [since] ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular. . . .” (25, 27) is consistently echoed in Wesley's ecclesiology.

⁷⁵*John Wesley and William Law*, 204. Green posits the Methodist doctrine of “entire perfection” thus: “1. . . . the fulfillment of the Evangelical law with the effusion of Divine Love in the heart. . . . 2. . . . the possibility of the destruction of the carnal mind, or the inbred sin of our fallen nature. . . . 3. . . . the blending of the Divine and human elements in the process of entire sanctification . . . the Divine efficacy and . . . the co-operation of man. 4. . . . not absolute perfection . . . it is a perfection that has come up from much tribulation, and bears the scars of infirmity to the end . . . a perfection which is no other than a perfectly self-annihilating life in Christ: A perfect union with His passion and His resurrection . . . the perfection of being nothing to self and all in Him.”

sacramental connectedness is integral, not only to personal holiness but as well to the Church's fellowship; and it is a consistent theme, as in this hymn:

. . . We see the blood that seals our peace,/Thy pardoning mercy we receive:/The bread doth visibly express/The strength through which our spirits live. Our spirits drink a fresh supply,/And eat the bread so freely given,/Till borne on eagle's wings we fly/And banquet with our Lord in heaven.⁷⁶

This was, one senses, a reason for Wesley's increasingly harsh disputes with, and ultimate estrangement from the Moravian Brethren, with whom he had originally felt a deep spiritual kinship. The Moravian doctrine of "stillness," or refraining from church attendance and Communion until one had received with certainty the "faith of assurance," became an insurmountable point of contention; Wesley perceived it as an uncertain view of sacramental efficacy.

Although this expression of our church, "means of grace", be not found in the Scripture; yet, if the sense of it undeniably is, to cavil at the term is a mere strife of words. But the sense of it is undeniably found in Scripture. For God hath in Scripture ordained prayer, reading or hearing of Scripture, and the receiving of the Lord's Supper as the ordinary means of conveying grace to man.⁷⁷

For Wesley, the power of the Spirit, in the communal dynamic of the Church as the mystic "parable of the kingdom of Grace," resort to the Sacraments, prayer, and the spiritual nurture of the Scriptures, brings consolation and the promise of God's love to the soul, speeding it to its final "perfection of being nothing in self and all in Him."

⁷⁶"I. As it is a Sign and Means of Grace," J. Ernest Rattenbury, *The Eucharistic Hymns of John and Charles Wesley*, London: Epworth Press, 1948, 204. The Wesleyan view of sacramental grace accords with the definition of a Sacrament in the Prayer Book catechism: ". . . an outward and visible sign of an inward and spirit grace given unto us, ordained by Christ himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof" (*The Book of Common Prayer*, 1662. Oxford: University Press, 1969, 356). Wesley understood and embraced the doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist. His spiritual "method" encouraged frequent, indeed daily Communion if possible.

⁷⁷*John Wesley in Theological Debate*, 60. Wesley also seriously disagreed with the Moravians' interpretation of Scripture: "You receive not the Ancients but the modern Mystics as the best interpreters of Scripture, and in conformity to these, you mix much of man's wisdom with the wisdom of God" (61). Consequently he wrote his brother Charles, "As yet I dare in no wise join with the Moravians" (Ibid., letter to Charles Wesley, 04.21.1741).

CHAPTER III.

Grafton the Man: Beginnings of the “Journey Godward.”

O LORD, thou hast searched me out and known me. Ps. 139:1

OWEN CHADWICK has observed that the Oxford Movement’s importance to English religion was not primarily an intellectual one. Its mind, he says,

. . . is not a mind which can be best studied or examined by asking for its philosophical conclusions (if any); even though at least two of its principal thinkers had the training and the makings of a philosopher. Nor can it best be studied or examined by asking for a list of its doctrinal propositions . . . it was more a movement of the heart than of the head. If the generalization be allowed, it was primarily concerned with the law of prayer, and only secondarily with the law of belief. . . . It always saw dogma in relation to worship, to the numinous, to the movement of the heart, to the conscience and the moral need, to the immediate experience of the hidden hand of God.¹

The Tractarians were not aesthetes. The religion to which they pointed was nothing like a mere exercise in esoterica; their religious observance was in fact rather austere. Their attempt, rather, was that of genuine ecclesial reform and of spiritual transformation, as the revelation of the action of God in human life and society and of the Church as the kingdom of God. Robert B. Slocum says in fact that, though the esoteric style was reflected in their language and emphases, “Their faith was in Jesus Christ, and not merely the result of a tendency or style that was in vogue during their time.”² This

¹Owen Chadwick, *The Spirit of the Oxford Movement: Tractarian Essays*. Cambridge: University Press, 1990, 1.

²Robert B. Slocum, “Romantic Religion and the Episcopal Church in Wisconsin: A Consideration of James DeKoven and Charles C. Grafton,” *Anglican and Episcopal History*, Vol. LXV, No. 1, 1996, 82. In the article Slocum describes nineteenth-century religion as a kind of high Romanticism “characterized by its appreciation for symbol and mystery.” A reasonable assessment, though the risk is run of pejoration on the one hand and sentimentality on the other. Slocum adds that the romantic gospel “served as ‘a specific

concession would appear to affirm Chadwick's premise of dogma's relation to the "immediate experience of the hand of God."

Charles Chapman Grafton was a product of, utterly at home within, and became, in the annals of the American Church, a pre-eminent example of the mind and ethos of faith and practice expounded and brought to fruition by the founding members of the Oxford Movement and the first generation of their disciples. The beginning and flowering of the Movement was essentially coterminous with his own life. He was three years old when John Keble's 1833 Assize Sermon "On National Apostasy," preached in the University Church at Oxford, gave Tractarianism its birth, triggering a pattern of reform that over the course of the next century impacted immeasurably the life of the English Church and of Anglicans outside Britain.

Grafton as a young man became gradually conscious of a developing vocation to a specifically Christian life. He found the call of God persistent and ultimately irresistible and embraced his vocation with all the passion and devotion of a lover who has just discovered that his love means his life. He retained the same passionate devotion up to his death, and his writings reflect it. Hand in hand with his love for God, and especially notable, is his evangelical zeal. He continually sounds the note both of personal conversion and of the evangelization of those whom Christians meet. But, in order to evangelize, the Christian must himself first be a converted person.

In closing this address, let us bring ourselves face to face with Jesus Christ. If we are to do any good work for God, the first work to do lies within ourselves. The Word, to be victorious, must sound forth from those who have been transformed by it. Much indeed is said in our days and in some quarters about character and

prescription for the spiritual paralysis brought on by a diet of common-sense rationalism'" and that (q. B.M.G. Reardon) "Romantic theology conveyed the sense of 'the infinite beyond' relative to the finite and concrete, the 'paltry this-and-that' of existence" (*Religion in the Age of Romanticism*, Cambridge 1985).

conduct, but the character we must seek to cultivate, is Christian character. . . . It is to be seen in the supernaturalized lives of the Prophets and Apostles. . . .³

Further, he enunciates the sense of an inner spiritual and ascetical struggle, which has to mark the life of the Christian soul if spiritual progress is to be made and which, he is conscious, too often does not mark the lives of his hearers. Not that he looks down on other people with any sort of opprobrium or disdain. He speaks rather from the depths of his own experience, as a Christian, as a priest and bishop, and as a professed religious, knowing first-hand from the ups and downs of his own pilgrimage the lifelong struggle for holiness and the spiritual pitfalls that confront the soul. He mediates that experience to all whom he tries to convince, particularly to those for whom he has pastoral responsibility, and even then not so much as pastor to disciple as pilgrim to pilgrim. Indeed, John Mark Kinney remarks of *A Journey Godward of a Servant of Jesus Christ* that Grafton's humility of character is often a stumbling block to good writing.

Its rambling, haphazard style makes a poor book and his modesty makes a poor biography. . . . He unwittingly gives us a picture, not of the physical journey of his life, but of the character of a servant of Jesus Christ.⁴

Yet it was this "character of a servant" that most pointedly marked Grafton's personality and thus most directly the style and content of his thinking and writing. If one is to attempt anything like an apt analysis of his theological thought, it is impossible to do so without looking at the man; for the thought reflects the essence of the man.

³WCCG, VIII, *Addresses and Sermons*, 29. Address to the annual Council of the Diocese of Fond du Lac, 1891. The theme of this particular address was diocesan unity and the expansion of mission work, especially among the Indians and large numbers of immigrants. The implication that untransformed souls cannot convert others is unmistakable. Grafton goes on to say that the Church is the instrumentality of Christian character—"All the gifts of God come through ordained instruments. The Church is a spiritual organism. The Sacraments are the ordained instruments of life. Without their use the full development of Christian character is not attained."

⁴John Mark Kinney, "+C.C. Fond du Lac: The Life of Charles Chapman Grafton, Second Bishop of Fond du Lac" (+CCFDL). S.T.M. Thesis, Nashotah House 1967, 1.

Charles Chapman Grafton was born in Boston in 1830; his father, Joseph Grafton, was a decorated veteran of the War of 1812 and surveyor of the Port of Boston.⁵ His early sense of vocation may have been due to an ordered but not severe upbringing by his parents, and to time spent in the pious home of a “good Congregational uncle and aunt.”⁶

He attended Boston Latin School 1843-46 and, briefly, Philips-Andover Academy, whence he was forced to withdraw by eye ailments.⁷ He seems as a child to have had a sensitive personality, was eager to please, wanted to be liked, and was at times not above buying friendship. On the other hand his generosity of spirit seemed in the main heartfelt and entirely genuine.⁸ Less attractively, he was easily hurt, took rebuffs and criticism as personal attacks, and held grudges often for years. In 1882, while rector of the Church of the Advent, he abruptly withdrew from the Society of St. John the Evangelist in a disagreement with Father Benson of Cowley over establishing an

⁵John T. Maltsberger, *The Church of the Advent, First Years*. Boston: Church of the Advent, 1986, 74.

⁶*WCCG*, IV, *A Journey Godward of Δουλος [sic] Ιησου Χριστου*, 55-56. Grafton recalls strictly kept Sundays, with playthings put away and sections of the Westminster Catechism memorized by dint of bribery with sweets. He also says that his uncle and aunt “much desired my ‘conversion,’” but seems to have given them little credit for the end result! The reader is left to gauge the reality.

⁷+CCFdL, 1-2. Was this a tendency towards hypochondria, perhaps, or the first portent of genuine lifelong health problems? We cannot precisely tell. In *A Journey Godward* he tells of an illness after ordination which incapacitated him from parish work for a time (*WCCG*, IV, 65-67) and inferred from his illness a “cross,” citing Edward Bouverie Pusey’s assertion that “Crosses . . . were sure tokens of God’s love.” Grafton says that he had yearned for “stigmata of some kind” but admits this was a presumption and “more likely to be a prompting of nature rather than of grace” (65).

Grafton did become seriously diabetic in his last years. Kinney notes (+CCFdL, 276) two falls the last year of his life, at a visitation to Grace Church, Sheboygan in the fall of 1911 and in his library at home in April 1912 leading to a gangrenous infection of his foot. His journal entry for July 18, 1912 notes, “Had a most favorable report from Dr. Wiley as to the diabetis [*sic*]—it is apparently gone.” In those pre-insulin days he must have felt huge relief. Nonetheless, his death on August 30, 1912 was reported in *The Fond du Lac Reporter* as due to chronic kidney trouble and an infection in his legs—both unmistakable signs.

⁸*WCCG*, IV, 56. Grafton comments: “I think I was as a little boy very fond of popularity, drawing playmates to me by gifts of candy, which I would surreptitiously obtain” (315). But in a memorial in his 1912 address to the Annual Council of the Diocese of Milwaukee, Bishop William Walter Webb observed: “It was always said of him that he gave everything away, and his brother hesitated to give him anything because, he said, ‘Charles gives it away at once.’”

American province of the community, and mended the breach only shortly before his own death.⁹ Later, as Bishop of Fond du Lac, he never forgave the erratic and notorious Joseph René Vilatte, a priest of the Diocese, for defecting to Old Catholicism over not being made his suffragan bishop.¹⁰ He also ended what in those pre-ecumenical days had been an unprecedentedly cordial friendship with the Russian Orthodox Archbishop Tikhon of the Aleutians and North America, over the question of the reordination of The Reverend Ingram Irvine as an Orthodox priest.¹¹ It can be reasonably speculated that

⁹+CCFdL, 277. Grafton had returned to America in 1871 and had become rector of the Advent, Boston, which became the Cowley Fathers' American headquarters. Grafton believed that founding an American province would at least partly ease resistance to the SSJE by American Bishops (*WCCG*, IV, 68-69). Oliver Prescott, sometime curate at the Advent under William Crowell and an early mentor and friend of Grafton's who had eventually followed him into the SSJE (at this time serving St. Clement's, Philadelphia), also resigned. Grafton and Prescott continued their correspondence, though a certain strained formality, not evidenced earlier, shows in Grafton's letters. Despite the estrangement and long silence between Grafton and Benson, Grafton still loved and revered his old superior; one of his last requests was for someone to "Give him [Benson] my deep personal love" (*Letters of Richard Meux Benson, Student of Christ Church, Founder and First Superior of the Society of S. John the Evangelist*, sel. & arr. C. Congreve & W.H. Longridge. London, Oxford: A.R. Mowbray & Co., Ltd; Milwaukee: The Young Churchman Co., 1916, 219).

¹⁰+CCFdL, 149-159. Originally a Roman Catholic, Vilatte, a Frenchman who had emigrated to Canada, had been by turns a Methodist and Congregational minister, and was a Presbyterian minister when he decided to enter the Episcopal Church. Studying at Nashotah with the permission of Bishop John Henry Hobart Brown (first Bishop of Fond du Lac, 1875-1888), he was ordained by the Old Catholic Bishop of Berne. Under Grafton he was in charge of Precious Blood, Gardner, St. Agnes', Algoma and St. Mary's, Duvall. Vilatte's demand to be made "suffragan bishop for the Old Catholics" was at that time contrary to Episcopal Church canons. After leaving the Episcopal Church he was consecrated by Archbishop Alvarez, an Antiochian schismatic and *episcopus vagans*, as "Old Catholic Bishop in North America" with the name "Mar Timotheos" ("Vilatte, Joseph René," *OxDict*, 1421). Notably, he ordained "Father Ignatius" (Joseph L. Lyne) to the priesthood in 1898. Vilatte died in 1929, having ultimately reconciled with the Roman Church in 1925 (Peter F. Anson, *The Call of the Cloister: Religious Communities and Kindred Bodies in the Anglican Communion*. London: SPCK, 1964, 67; see also "Ignatius, Father," *OxDict*, 678).

¹¹Peter C. Haskell, "Bishop Grafton and the Orthodox Church 1900-1905." M.A. Thesis, University of Minnesota, 1970, 59-70. Irvine had been deposed by Bishop Ethelbert Talbot of Central Pennsylvania in 1900 in an apparent attempt to soothe ruffled feathers over his refusal to communicate a wealthy parishioner who was a divorcée and remarried. In any event, since there had long been uncertainty in Orthodox minds over the lack of a clear Anglican statement on Holy Orders as a Sacrament (E.R. Hardy, ed., *Orthodox Statements on Anglican Orders*. New York: Morehouse-Gorham Co.; London, Oxford: A.R. Mowbray & Co. Ltd, 1946, xii), reordination would probably have been a normative step with the Orthodox, as with Rome. Following a series of angry letters from Grafton (who had, ironically, only just engineered the granting of an honorary D.D. to Tikhon by Nashotah House in 1905) and serious *ad hominem* attacks in *The Living Church* and other Episcopal publications, Tikhon and Grafton had no further communication after November 1905. Tikhon was elected Patriarch of Moscow at the Grand Sobor of 1917, which revived the Patriarchate, and died in 1925. He was canonized as St. Tikhon of Moscow in 1988 as part of the millennial celebration of the Baptism of the Kievan Rus'.

Grafton was a thorough introvert, not unlike many clergy. Consonant with a withdrawing personality, introverts typically are often given to defensiveness and reaction. Grafton was no exception. While he could bear himself with enormous dignity (and at times with a certain flamboyance), the tone of a number of his letters and addresses reveals a degree of self-absorption, moodiness, defensiveness, and proneness to discouragement. Yet, as is also often the case with introverts, he appears to show highly developed gifts of intuition and introspection—indispensable qualities in a contemplative or mystic.

Kinney's picture of "the character of a servant of Jesus Christ" reveals characteristics of humility and obedience, but these characteristics appear never to have come very naturally or easily. His life was that of a man deeply aware of his own faults and of his need for the disciplines of Christian spirituality. He seems to have disciplined himself rigorously, and to have expected no less of anyone else. While self-effacing, on the other hand he was possessed of tremendous self-conviction in matters of faith and practice, and tended to stubbornness about the rightness of his position—explaining, no doubt, the perception by others of intolerance, aloofness, or *hauteur*. As is clear from his writings, however, his motivation sprang from his passion for union with God and, in his love for souls, from a desire to impress that passion on his hearers. It is in looking at his life and personality, for he was writing not theoretically but experientially, that one is able to explore his understanding of the theology and practice of sanctification.

The Grafton revealed in the writings and whose thought we seek to interpret was the product of several seminal figures in his early Christian experience. William Crosswell, his rector at the Church of the Advent, fired his early imagination toward seeking the ministry. Oliver Prescott, Crosswell's curate, became his close friend,

confidant and mentor and ultimately followed him into the Society of St. John the Evangelist. William Rollinson Whittingham, fourth Bishop of Maryland, guided his studies, ordained him to the priesthood, and gave him his signal assignment as curate at St. Paul's Church, Baltimore. And Richard Meux Benson, founder of the SSJE, formed him spiritually in the monastic tradition and provided the pattern of a disciplined life that was to remain his guiding principle to the end of his days. More than the others, it was probably Benson who ultimately produced the Grafton we know. A disciple of the saintly Edward Bouverie Pusey, and part of the second generation of Oxford Movement adherents, Benson in turn immersed the young American priest in the full theological and ascetical flowering of the Anglo-Catholic revival.

1. The Church of the Advent: Croswell and Prescott.

IN 1847 Grafton, then seventeen years of age and recovering from the eye ailment that had forced his withdrawal from Philips-Andover, began worshiping at the Church of the Advent in its new building in Green Street, being confirmed in 1851.¹² The illness, he wrote afterward, "enabled me to attend the services frequently."

What we think a misfortune turns thus to a blessing. I had long been battling with the ordinary problems of life, when, through my own failures, I was led to Confirmation.¹³

The rector, William Croswell, was the son of an old High Church family; his father had been rector of Trinity Church, New Haven, Connecticut. He was rector of Christ Church, Boston (1829-40), then of St. Peter's, Auburn, New York (1840-44),

¹²Erving Winslow, in *WCCG*, IV, 1-5. Excerpt from a paper given at Grafton's Jubilee, 1909; printed as a preface to the volume.

¹³*Ibid.*, 22.

whence he was called to the Advent.¹⁴ The first services, on Advent Sunday, December 1, 1844, were in rented rooms in Merrimac Street. Within six months, despite official disapproval and popular ridicule, seventy communicants were listed, and by November 1847 the congregation had moved to its new permanent home in Green Street. Despite the parish's success, however, relations with the Bishop of Massachusetts, Dr. Manton Eastburn, a violently "low" churchman, had been from the first highly problematic. Requests for visitations and Confirmation were repeatedly refused despite Croswell's assurances that he was prepared to obey his diocesan,¹⁵ and troubles continued to assail him including the charging of his curate, Oliver Prescott, with heresy.¹⁶

It was into this turbulent atmosphere that the young Grafton was introduced to the Tractarian ideal, experiencing its controversies first-hand, and in that atmosphere that his

¹⁴*Parish of the Advent: A History of One Hundred Years, 1844-1944 (ParAdv)*. Boston: Parish of the Advent, 1944, 12-13. Grafton's parents seem to have had some connection at Christ Church during Croswell's rectorate there and Grafton remembered his "taking me up in his arms and blessing me" as a small child (*WCCG*, IV, 21).

¹⁵*Ibid.*, 28 ff. Among other inconveniences, Croswell was forced to take his confirmands to Trinity in 1847, Christ Church in 1848 and 1849, Trinity in 1850, and St. Stephen's in 1851 (in which class Grafton was confirmed).

Eastburn had become enraged and made a scene at his first visitation to the Advent, specifically over kneeling facing the altar rather than one's chair; using the Prayer Book Psalter instead of the metrical Psalm-book; wearing the surplice instead of the black gown in preaching; and the arrangement of the altar with frontal, candles, and the depiction of a cross in the window behind the altar. He refused to visit again. It was Eastburn's recalcitrance over the Advent that eventually (at the General Convention of 1856, five years following Croswell's death) triggered new canons requiring episcopal visitations at least once each three years (George E. DeMille, *The Catholic Movement in the American Episcopal Church (CMAEC)*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2005, 81-82).

¹⁶Maltsberger, *Church of the Advent, First Years*, 71, 74-77. Prescott had been a member of the short-lived Valle Crucis community founded in 1844 in North Carolina on the Nashotah pattern by Bishop Levi Silliman Ives (1797-1867), and came to the Advent in 1848, leaving in 1850. The presentment, actually brought after Prescott's departure, specified teaching "worship" of the Blessed Virgin and addressing prayers to her, the practice of auricular confession, and Transubstantiation. The presentment was not sustained, but Prescott was suspended until he certified his renunciation of absolution except at visitation of the sick or in the event of contagious disease. Though Prescott was the ostensible target, the action was almost certainly a calculated attempt to discredit Croswell. In any event, Prescott had already moved to Maryland and was in effect safe from the Massachusetts ecclesiastical court. He became rector of the Church of the Ascension, Westminster, Maryland in 1854, from which parish Grafton was officially received as a candidate for Holy Orders.

vocation began to germinate. The witness of Croswell's devotion to the faith in the face of real official persecution likely first fired Grafton's conviction and made him a firm adherent of the Oxford Movement; the example of faithfulness, patient bearing of reproach, and sheer force of presence he must have found irresistible. Hero worship it undoubtedly was in part, but the perception of a call to Holy Orders had begun to be stirred. Though he had begun to read law at Harvard, the question of vocation was to haunt him over the next several years.

While at the Church of the Advent, a powerful influence came over me. One day, on seeing Dr. Croswell pass up the aisle to his place in the chancel, I heard, as it were, a Voice saying unto me as I looked at him: "And why shouldn't you be a priest?" I took no steps at the time, but the impression remained with me.¹⁷

The relationship, sadly, was not to last much past Grafton's confirmation in 1851; Croswell died on November 9 of that year.¹⁸

To Grafton, Croswell must have seemed an exemplar of all that was good in the Tractarian mind in terms of steadfastness in religious conviction while remaining obedient, within reason, to lawful authority. It was that example that first aimed him, however subtly, indirectly, or at a distance, into the inexorable path to ordination and a

¹⁷*WCCG*, IV, 22.

¹⁸*ParAdv*, 35. Croswell had likely been in poor health for some time. Maltzberger says, "Seven years of struggle had surely wearied Croswell. After 1849 his handwriting is more difficult to read. . . . His facial grimaces worried him and did not get better" (*Church of the Advent, First Years*, 79). There had been visits by the Canadian Bishops Medley of Fredericton and Field of Newfoundland (both of whom Eastburn had refused to meet), reportedly a "source of greatest pleasure" to Croswell. He preached on All Saints' Day, 1851: "The sermon almost prophetic, on that occasion [footnote *in pag.*: "His sermon was from the text, 'Wherefore, seeing we are also compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus'"]; his preparation for the sermon to the children, which was to be his last (November 9); his last entry in his journal, in which he noted his ineffectual search after a poor woman, who had incorrectly given her place of abode,—all these touching incidents mark the character of this devout and saintly man." At Evensong on November 9, Maltzberger tells us, he faltered during the sermon with tears in his eyes, collapsed at the altar after giving a blessing, and was taken home by carriage. "After an attack of vomiting consciousness faded. The seventy-three year old Dr. Eaton pronounced the commendatory prayers; Dr. Croswell was dead within an hour" (*Church of the Advent, First Years*, 79-80).

life lived unto God. More importantly, it may also have been that influence that formed his lifelong conviction on the sanctity of the Church and the necessity of loyalty to its institutions and obedience to the authority bequeathed to it in Christ's patrimony.

It was Prescott who finally brought Grafton to a decision. The anti-slavery controversy, fueled anew by the publication of Harriet Beecher Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin* in 1852, led Grafton "from the legal point of view to believe that the slave relation, as established by law as a 'thing', was inconsistent with his duty as 'a man' to his Creator." He became involved to the extent of writing a pamphlet published by Wendell Phillips and says that he was drawn to Phillips, though not "originally an Abolitionist."¹⁹

But by his own account, Grafton was in an agonizing moral struggle over the direction his life was to take.²⁰ Was he to become a lawyer and take an active rôle in the anti-slavery struggle? Or was he to enter the priesthood and pursue the life of pastoral ministration and growth in personal holiness? He simply could not make up his mind, and in the midst of this dilemma contacted Prescott, now rector of the Church of the Ascension, Westminster, Maryland, asking for his advice. Prescott convinced him that "if God intended me to be a third-rate clergyman rather than a first-class lawyer, my duty was to enter the ministry."²¹

That advice sealed Grafton's decision. As he later recalled,

¹⁹*WCCG*, IV, 29.

²⁰*Ibid.*, 59.

²¹*Ibid.*, 30. Nonetheless, Grafton's social consciousness remained a strong component in his mind and temperament the rest of his life. In Baltimore he nursed Civil War wounded in military hospitals; and his first few years in England were spent, among other pastoral work, in slum ministry with Pusey in London in the midst of cholera epidemics (Glenn Johnson, "Battling Bishop," *The Living Church (TLC)*, Vol. 198, No. 17, April 23, 1989, 8-9; see also App. II, DM06, letter of Grafton to Whittingham, 10.05.1866).

Bishop Southgate, my rector, gave me his blessing on my choice. I went to Maryland . . .²²

Grafton himself took the initiative of writing from Cambridge to Bishop William Whittingham of Maryland, now Prescott's diocesan, on Ascension Day 1855:

On this day a year since I humbly conceived the desire to be, if such is the will of my Heavenly Father, a laborer though of necessity an unworthy one in Christs [*sic*] vineyard. Taking counsel of those set over me in the Lord, trusting myself to His guidance, by prayers and through the blessed sacrament [*sic*] I sought my vocation. The way thereto did not seem clear, but this seemed properly rather a second consideration. . . . And thus step by step timorously feeling my way, lest rashly I should thrust myself among His ministers . . . I came Reverend Father to make application to you.²³

Thus the doorway was opened for Grafton's entry into the life and work of ordained ministry and ultimately the religious life, the stage for his spiritual struggle.

2. Maryland: Whittingham; Ordination; St. Paul's, Baltimore.

WILLIAM ROLLINSON Whittingham (1805-1879), consecrated Bishop of Maryland in 1840, had been St. Mark's-in-the-Bowery Professor of Ecclesiastical History at the General Theological Seminary, New York (1836-40), and had served from 1829 as editor of an ambitious serialized edition of the standard works of the Church of England.²⁴ Reared in the old High Church tradition, and in the classical Anglican soil of Andrewes

²²Ibid., 61. Horatio Southgate, consecrated first missionary Bishop to Constantinople in 1844, resigned his jurisdiction in 1850. (His election in 1844 had been opposed by a number of Low Church bishops who considered him "Puseyitish.") A sermon preached in the Advent on the Fourth Sunday in Advent 1851 led to his unanimous election as rector on New Year's Eve of that year; he was to remain until 1858 (*ParAdv*, 40). DeMille tells us that "Boston under Bishop Eastburn was no place for a postulant of Grafton's [Tractarian] views" (*CMAEC*, 135); and we may assume that Southgate had already pointed him toward Maryland, where clergy of "advanced" thinking were finding refuge with Whittingham.

²³DM01, Archives of the Diocese of Maryland. Letter from Grafton to Whittingham, 1855.

²⁴William Francis Brand, *The Life of William Rollinson Whittingham, Fourth Bishop of Maryland*. New York: E. & J.B. Young & Co., 1886, 96.

and the Restoration divines, he became also a particular admirer of the spiritual poetry of John Keble.²⁵

Whittingham, it is notable, also had a direct influence on James Lloyd Breck, William Adams, and John Henry Hobart (son of the third Bishop of New York) in their decision in 1841 to follow Bishop Jackson Kemper to Wisconsin, where they became founders of the Nashotah Mission.²⁶

As Bishop of Maryland, Whittingham also achieved singular respect for his learning, and though entering the episcopate at a young age served long enough (1840-79) to become a venerable figure within the House of Bishops. He employed his intellectual powers in theological debate, reasserting the ancient doctrines, and was a particular champion of baptismal regeneration²⁷ and of the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist. Grafton recalls:

Bishop Whittingham had taught me that “one ought to go to the death for the doctrine of the Real Presence.”²⁸

²⁵Ibid., 195. “From the time they first appeared, Keble’s poems were his constant companion, and many a lonely hour when he was abroad was solaced by the sweet Christian poet. He read over and over again what he was perfectly familiar with, not as many did who praised the book because their ear was soothed, but appreciating the truth intended to be conveyed. . . . Having always repudiated the name High Churchman, that he would have refused to be called Anglo-Catholic one may well suppose; but what the Anglo-Catholics implied when they so called themselves, such he was, holding firmly to Catholic truths as set forth by the great English divines.”

²⁶Thomas C. Reeves, intro. to *James Lloyd Breck: Apostle of the Wilderness* (abridged ed. of Charles Breck, *The Life of The Rev. James Lloyd Breck, D.D.*, 1883). Nashotah, WI: Nashotah House, 1992, 10-11. Charles Breck recalled that his brother had called Whittingham “the very life of the Seminary” (8). Whittingham, while at General, strongly supported the Nashotah project. “Adams communicated to me the fact that six, besides himself, are seriously thinking of forming a Society of Protestant Monks [footnote *in pag.*: “It is not probable that this term was ever used by the students themselves.”] for a mission to the West. . . . For this God’s holy name be praised” (*Life of William Rollinson Whittingham*, 193).

²⁷*The Doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, as held by Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley; and as Taught in the Book of Common Prayer, a Discussion between Bishop Whittingham and the “Southern Churchman”, by the Editor of “The Southern Churchman”*. New York: John A. Gray, 1860. In common with other High Churchmen, Whittingham in this controversy insists on the efficacy of the sign itself, while the editor, part of the Low Church party, repudiates this as contrary to reformed evangelical principle.

²⁸WCCG, IV, 80.

Whittingham's frontispiece portrait in Brand's *Life* shows a sober, earnest, and spare face with finely chiseled features and piercing eyes and a full flowing mane of hair. Henry Codman Potter, seventh Bishop of New York, recalled Whittingham as pious and strict and utterly humorless,²⁹ but notes,

Like most men of great gifts, he was a person of rare modesty, and no one who could understand him could be ignorant how much pain it gave him to contend for a prerogative, nor how much, when loyalty to a principle obliged him to contend for it, to surrender it. But, as he ripened in years, his vision expanded, rather than contracted, and so it came to pass that among those who knew him latest were those who loved him best.³⁰

It was to the Bishop of Maryland, then, that Grafton came seeking to be made a candidate for the priesthood. He recalled that Whittingham “received me very kindly, but made a strict examination as to my motives in seeking Holy Orders.”³¹ In other ways great and small, it seems that Whittingham was both a competent teacher and a significant spiritual and practical exemplar in his ordinand's formation. One gets the impression that he provided healthy doses of reality to the mind and attitudes of a young, zealous, and romantic idealist!³²

²⁹Henry Codman Potter, *Reminiscences of Bishops and Archbishops*. New York, London: G.P. Putnam's Sons/Knickerbocker Press, 1906, 18-20. Potter recalls the review in the House of an episcopal election and Whittingham's rejoinder to the description of the bishop-elect's “present wife” with the words, “St. Paul says ‘A bishop must be the husband of one wife.’” Potter comments that there was loud laughter when the question was put as to bishops who have *no* wife, and says that Whittingham, a lifelong celibate, flushed angrily—“The humour of his blunder was wholly unperceived by him.”

³⁰*Ibid.*, 21.

³¹*WCCG*, IV, 30. It was at this interview, Grafton also recalled, that he offered Whittingham a cigar. The gentle rejoinder, “I can't imagine an Apostle smoking,” Grafton attributed influencing his own decision to give up the habit!

³²*Ibid.*, 32. “On one occasion I said to him: ‘Is it proper for one who is a priest to do menial work, as I think in religious orders one must do?’ ‘Dear Grafton,’ he said, ‘I've always reserved to myself the duty of blacking my own boots. I *want* to do some menial work.’ . . . I remember getting into a stagecoach, when we were going to travel some twenty-eight miles over a rough and hilly road, and I said, ‘Dear Bishop, you have taken the worst seat in the coach.’ ‘Well, Grafton,’ replied he, ‘somebody must take it.’ I constantly learned lessons of denial and self-sacrifice from him.”

It was Whittingham who prepared Grafton for ordination, made him deacon and priest, gave him his first title as assistant at All Saints, Reisterstown, and blessed his milestone call as curate under the very senior and venerable Dr. William Wyatt at St. Paul's, Baltimore with the words, "I can't ask you to go to it, but if you will go you can save it."³³ Grafton was to remain at St. Paul's from 1856 to 1864. It was an important phase of his life, learning the disciplines and exigencies of pastoral work from Wyatt, to all reports a humble and saintly priest. He also assumed more and more of the administrative responsibilities of the parish in the last several years of the rector's life marked by increasing illness and debility.

One begins to perceive and appreciate Grafton's developing vision of God's call and the necessity of the soul's response, and of the implications of a sanctified life. Examining Whittingham's sermons, one sees his influence in content and style on the young Grafton, in the themes of Divine voice, Divine light, and God's call to the soul to emerge "out of darkness into light."

The call of God is a call "*out of darkness into light.*" The reason for it is the condition of man by nature in a state of spiritual ignorance and incapacity of which *darkness* is the symbol, and therefore made in the Scriptures the designation. His need of light, his inability to find it, his indisposition to seek it, his ignorance that it is to be looked for, make him absolutely dependent on help from a source without himself and higher than himself. . . . A *voice* says to him, "Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light." That voice is the *voice of God.*³⁴

The sermons of the St. Paul's years are filled with a like fervor and evangelical appeal for the soul's response to the Divine call. The *raison d'être* and goal of the

³³Ibid.

³⁴William Rollinson Whittingham, Sermon IX, "Our Calling," *Fifteen Sermons by William Rollinson Whittingham, Fourth Bishop of Maryland*. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1880, 168-169 (italics Whittingham's).

Christian life are union with God and the transformation of the soul into God-likeness. Thus for Grafton, as for Whittingham, the call to the soul is that of becoming a partaker in the nature of God.

Being a “partaker of the divine nature” was, however, for Grafton never to be presumed, but achieved at a price involving the slow and painful giving up of self-will.³⁵ For him ultimately the ground for the struggle would lie in the monastic setting, and it was there that he saw his fulfillment. For some years he had been thinking about entering the religious life, though there was no venue for him in the American Church. Despite the fact that he had been *de facto* in charge of St. Paul’s for about a year and a half, as he recalls,³⁶ in 1864, following Wyatt’s death, he finally spoke at length with Whittingham about the matter. The original intention seems to have been to found an order in America, and Whittingham, a lifelong celibate and unflinching follower of the Tractarian ideal, was highly sympathetic and gave Grafton his encouragement and blessing.

He was one with me in the desirability of having such a religious order in our Church. We had a number of conferences on the subject. After dear Dr. Wyatt had passed away, I again went to my Bishop. “Am I not free now,” I said, “to give myself up to the religious life?” He said: “I would gladly give up all the surroundings here in my house thus to live with God.” . . . He gave me his blessing and told me that, as I was now free to give myself up to the religious life, the best thing would be to go to England to study up the subject.³⁷

³⁵It is interesting to note that when Grafton returned from England in 1871 and sought admission to the Diocese of Connecticut, Bishop John Williams wrote to Whittingham opposing the introduction of the SSJE into his diocese and asking whether it was canonically imperative for him to accept letters dimissory. He adds the lament, “Alas! for the self will of these men. . . .” (DM9, Archives of the Diocese of Maryland. Letter, Williams to Whittingham, 12.08.1871). Williams was of the very old High Church school, which had great reverence for the authority of the bishop, but he was also implacably hostile to the “advanced” thinking of the Tractarians, especially to ideas like monasticism. Given that, and Grafton’s tendency to bluntly stated self-conviction on matters of faith and practice (concomitant with what Michael Ramsey has called his “imperious temperament”), one suspects an eventual clash to have been inevitable. Williams undoubtedly perceived such conviction as willfulness and arrogance. His refusal to accept Grafton must have been humiliating and hurtful in the extreme.

³⁶*WCCG*, IV, 34.

³⁷*Ibid.*, 36-37.

Thus Grafton began the next step of his spiritual journey.

At this point Prescott again enters the picture. He and Grafton undertook a time of “retreat” that winter in a shack on Fire Island, in the Long Island coastal waters, living on a subsistence diet and reciting an adapted Office. The exercise was clearly intended to set the stage for Grafton’s entry into the religious life.³⁸

Grafton departed for England in 1865. On his arrival he met with Edward Bouverie Pusey, a leading light of the Oxford Movement, and later participated in a meeting on the religious life called by Pusey and Alexander Forbes, the Bishop of Brechin, at All Saints, Margaret Street, London. Together with S.W. O’Neill, a former master at Eton and then W.J. Butler’s curate at Wantage, he was finally directed to Oxford to meet with Richard Meux Benson, a disciple of Pusey and vicar of Cowley, two miles outside Oxford. Benson agreed to begin a religious order provided, Grafton recalled, they agreed to remain with him “for some years in England. . . . I threw in my lot with the learned and saintly man.”³⁹ The making of “Father Grafton” the monastic, which would have such lasting impact on his life and thought, was about to begin.

3. Cowley: “To Be With R.M.B.”

IN 1850 Richard Meux Benson was appointed to the living of Cowley, following a brief curacy at Surbiton, and embarked on a hardworking pastoral life. He also became deeply

³⁸Ibid., 37-40. The exercise was for the two men nothing if not a test of endurance and resolve. At one point a Navy patrol party, who suspected them of being Confederate spies, detained them and their baggage was rifled! They finally abandoned the exercise when their water ran low; after difficulty getting off the island due to ice, they spent the night at a country hotel and next day took train for New York. We may also assume Prescott was thinking with some seriousness about his own vocation as well as supporting his old protégé and friend. Ultimately he was to follow Grafton into the SSJE.

³⁹Ibid., 40-41.

involved in efforts for the spiritual renewal of the Church, following the example of his bishop, Samuel Wilberforce.⁴⁰ It was during this period that religious communities for women had begun to be founded in England, notably the Park Village community by Pusey (1845), the Community of St. Mary the Virgin, Wantage, by William J. Butler (1848), and the Society of St. Margaret, East Grinstead, by John Mason Neale (1855).⁴¹ Following his mother's death in 1859, Benson in fact proposed to go to India to found a missionary college and community for men there, but Wilberforce dissuaded him, insisting he must remain in Cowley.⁴²

It was at Cowley in 1866, finally, that a community for men became a reality. Benson, O'Neill, and Grafton—all men of real ability, as Allchin reminds us, and combining the best of Anglo-Catholic and evangelical sensibilities—came together to form the Society of St. John the Evangelist.⁴³ Grafton had attended Mass in the “Iron Church over Muadelain [*sic*] Bridge” on June 16,⁴⁴ and on July 17 wrote to Prescott,

As soon as we can . . . will meet at a place near Oxford, Mr. Benson's parish, and commence living by Rule and receiving instructions in the spiritual life and rules of a community. One will act as superior (Mr. Benson probably, but one or two other persons may join, of great prominence in the church and in holy living, and they will settle it among themselves) and direct. The formation of the fuller rule will not be made til [*sic*] after a year.⁴⁵

⁴⁰A.M. Allchin, in *Benson of Cowley*, ed. Martin Smith, SSJE. Cambridge, MA: Cowley Publications, 1983, 7.

⁴¹“Religious Orders in Anglicanism,” *OxDict*, 1150-1151.

⁴²Allchin, in *Benson of Cowley*, 7.

⁴³*Ibid.*

⁴⁴+CCFdL, 9. Entry in Grafton's diary. In a letter to Prescott in May 1865, he had written, “I went into a little church near Oxford, and I was more impressed with the sacrifice than ever in my life. . . . The priest [Benson] had begun to look like a Saint, and I knew was indeed a very holy man. . . .” (*Ibid.*, 10; also *WCCG*, VII, *Letters and Addresses*, 30).

⁴⁵*Ibid.*, 15. Letter to Prescott (also *WCCG*, VII, 41).

An entry in Grafton's diary dated August 22, 1865 states simply but with awe, "Came to Cowley to be with R.M.B."⁴⁶ As predicted, Benson emerged the clear leader and on December 22, 1866 made his life vow, followed in turn by the others in like form:

I, Richard Meux Benson, promise and vow to Almighty God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, before the whole company of heaven, and before you, my Fathers, that I will live in celibacy, poverty, and obedience as one of the Mission Priests of St. John the Evangelist unto my life's end. So help me God. *Richard Meux Benson.*⁴⁷

Between July 1865 and the founding Grafton expressed general agreement with the concept as Benson outlined it—"a Congregation of Priests and Laymen, giving up the world, living by simple rule, and devoting ourselves to prayer, study, and mission work" and laying down a "fundamental principle of our common action that we shall not only be loyal to the Church of England, but also careful to act in harmony with her ecclesiastical system."⁴⁸ In fact, he specifically regarded the primary task of the community as parochial work.

I have seen the Bishop of Brechin, and I think that he prefers a modern to a monkish order. . . . [Mr. Chamberlain's] view was that we want an order like that of the Society of Jesus. This is my own view. They form a body of parish priests.⁴⁹

⁴⁶Ibid., 16.

⁴⁷*Benson of Cowley*, 8.

⁴⁸M.V. Woodgate, *Father Benson: Founder of the Cowley Fathers*. London: Geoffrey Bles, 1953, 64-65. Letter to Bishop Wilberforce, July 1865. Benson continues, "[For] this, amongst other reasons, I have felt it best that I should retain my incumbency . . . in order that it may be evident that the Superior of the Order is fully amenable to the discipline of the Established Church." A community was definitely envisioned, but not a cloistered one; its life was conceived from the first as a mixed life. The giving of preaching missions, "[more] settled mission work in London," "[a] house in Oxford for scholars, who wish to live by rule, while getting a University education," foreign missions and retreats were all part of Benson's vision. A distinctive habit was not part of his original concept except within the community's precincts, but vows were; though Wilberforce objected (August 7, 1865), Benson affirmed the vows as "not of nature or time, but of grace." He states, "Faith knows *to Whom* we give ourselves up" (Ibid., 68-69).

⁴⁹*WCCG*, VII, 63. Letter to Prescott, 1866. Grafton here also echoes Benson's attitude. From the time of his abortive plan for the India work, Benson's real zeal was for the missionary life; and even in the "iron church" and house at Cowley the ideal remained the hardworking parish ministry, as Allchin will remind us (see n. 53).

Grafton was particularly concerned that the SSJE not be like the eccentric “Father Ignatius” and his neo-Benedictines at Llanthony Priory in the Welsh mountains near Offa’s Dyke.⁵⁰ He insisted, in fact, that they must not be monks at all but an entirely new kind of community, for, he maintained, in doing parish work,

. . . you cannot be confined, as the older orders were, to the repetition of so many offices publicly in choir; but you must say them privately, and in proportion as you are obliged to give up something of the severe asceticism of the monk, and wear other clothing and use not so severe fasts, in proportion the inward, mental discipline of obedience must be practiced to a more severe and exact extent and the voice of the Superior to be to us as the voice of God.⁵¹

This last comment is a testament to Benson’s obvious authority and the spiritual quality of his life. Such a conviction regarding obedience to lawful authority was instilled in Grafton’s mind that even after his withdrawal from the SSJE in 1882 he was to maintain a form of monastic observance personally until his death.

It was Benson’s commitment to the life of austerity and holiness, together with his missionary zeal and pastoral work in Cowley, which provided a cumulative construct for Grafton’s own spirituality. The spirituality of the mature Grafton is clearly traced to his “[coming] to Cowley to be with R.M.B.” He also confided to Prescott that it was at Benson’s feet that he learned that his only hope lay in the goodness of God.

God in His goodness would not let me go; somehow He has kept me. I must commence again. God does not give me up, I must humble myself more. I must dig deeper, as the words are of St. Simon “Stylites.” . . . It is certainly a struggle with me now to go to Father Benson with my smaller sins. It is as hard to self sometimes to confess a little act as a great one. But I believe God is leading me on. . . .⁵²

⁵⁰Ibid., 65. Letter to Prescott, May 1865. “Father Ignatius” was Joseph Leycester Lyne (see n. 10).

⁵¹Ibid., 63. Letter to Prescott, 1866 (see also n. 49).

⁵²Ibid., 66-67. Grafton here seems to echo Donne’s sense of “the meere goodnesse of God.” Doubtless he was coming to understand, like Donne, that the holy life “is a long work and hath many steps.”

The survival and success of the Cowley community, and thus of the setting for Grafton's own spiritual maturation, lay above everything else in its successful integration into the life of the Church of England. Allchin says that when the first disciples, and those later to follow, joined him, Benson "remained outwardly the hard-working conscientious Vicar of Cowley,"⁵³ even while spiritually forming and directing the band of professed men sharing the religious life with him. Grafton cannot have missed the point. He saw that for any such work to bear fruit it must remain as closely as possible within the structures and mainstream of the Church as a whole, not devolving into what Allchin calls "that secret, quasi-sectarian note which marked a number of nineteenth-century Anglo-Catholic ventures."⁵⁴ As a member of the SSJE, later as rector of the Advent, and finally as Bishop of Fond du Lac, he never compromised his Anglo-Catholic principles. But he had learned well the lessons of stability and faithfulness under persecution from the examples of Pusey and Benson, as earlier he had from that of Croswell. He remained unswervingly loyal to the Church, in the face of oft-renewed hostility, and while working steadily and faithfully for clarity of doctrine and practice within—as Pusey had done, as Benson had done—he commended that loyalty to, and demanded it from, the clergy and congregations committed to him.

⁵³Allchin, in *Benson of Cowley*, 9.

⁵⁴Ibid.

CHAPTER IV.

Pusey and Benson on Sanctification; Influences on Grafton's Thought.

My heart shall muse of understanding. Ps. 49:3

EDWARD BOUVERIE Pusey and Richard Meux Benson, as has been mentioned, must be considered the ultimate immediate influences on the emergence of the mature Grafton as priest, religious, and theological thinker. They form for him the link to an authentic theological pedigree, built on his earlier experiences, in particular by virtue of their relationship to him between 1865 and 1871—Pusey as Benson's mentor and Grafton's initial confessor and Benson as Grafton's mentor, later confessor, and superior.¹ It was in the years at Cowley that Grafton advanced from earnest curate to spiritual seeker to trained religious and ascetic. In that setting also his intellectual abilities were shaped, honed, and brought to a maturity, bought at the cost of constant and intense spiritual struggle, that was to make him a formidable presence in the life of the American Church.

¹WCCG, VII, 66-67. Grafton said of confession, "What has helped me more than any previous thing has been Confession. The power of evil seemed broken since I went to Dr. Pusey." But, in fact, he hesitated going to Benson with his "smaller sins". "It is as hard to self sometimes to confess a little act as a great one" (67; see also n. III.52). Grafton struggled with what he called "a double current in my life. My efforts have been increasing, but then when a fit came, it seemed worse" (66). He saw his struggles with the "filthy, humble loathsome object in me, my old self . . . petulant, self-conceited, intensely vain, and proud" (Ibid.) as part of the stripping away of the pride of self-sufficiency, indispensable to one professed in religion. Grafton regarded Benson with huge awe for his obvious holiness; and it is known that Benson was easily grieved in the confessional by the realization of the breach of knowledge, as Allchin reminds us, "which is inseparable from love" (*Benson of Cowley*, 21). But the desirability of honest openness is discerned in Benson's own words: "The great gift is when we lose ourselves and have nothing but Him. We must be learning to find our joy, our whole life in Jesus alone. We can conceive nothing more in the way of happiness than to be forever with Him" (Woodgate, *Father Benson*, 54). Similarly, words of Marie de l'Incarnation: ". . . I have done nothing about this but to submit to the divine will. . . . For myself, when I see myself in this powerlessness, I try to lose myself in him. I do my best to forget myself in order to see only him. . . ." (*Marie of the Incarnation: Selected Writings*, ed. Irene Mahoney, OSU. New York; Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1989, 236. Letter to her son, 10.03.1645).

Pusey recognized the prevenient grace of God, wrought in the passion and resurrection of Christ, as the basis of deifying transformation in the soul of the believer.² But he also regarded the discipline of ascetical labor as indispensable to the process, as leading to the attainment of inner subduement of the human will to the will of God, that God's grace might gain in the soul a venue and opportunity to work that transformation. Inner subduement is in fact the Christian's one true work and, as Pusey terms it and continually commends it to his hearers, a miraculous work.

Labour then, whatever thou doest, to please God, and He will teach thee to do miracles, not without but within, in thyself, in that He will teach thee by His grace to do that which no power of nature can do,—subdue thyself.³

Like the other impartationary thinkers before them, Pusey and Benson retain the dual theme of sanctification: God imputes His grace and love to the sinful soul in redeeming it; and He engages with the soul in a Divine-human synergy, presumed as a necessity, thereby imparting Divine character. As for Taylor and the other earlier writers, the process of sanctification holds both mystagogical and moral dimensions, and necessity is laid perforce on the soul to labor for growth into God-likeness. If understanding Pusey correctly, we must take it that seeking is foremost a question of the will, specifically of the subordination of man's will to God's. Thus the Christian who does not "labour . . . to please God" and learn subduement of the will is not only deprived of more intimate union with God, but is also guilty of a devastating if not fatal moral and

²E.B. Pusey, "Victory Through Loving Faith," *Parochial Sermons*, I, 297 (see also n. I.5).

³Pusey, "Saintliness of Christians," Sermon XII, *Parochial and Cathedral Sermons (PCC)*. London: Walter Smith, 1883, 166. Andrew Louth offers an interpretation of the implications of deification in Maximos the Confessor: ". . . that as the Word of God became man by *kenosis*, by emptying himself of his glory, so we are to become God by responding to that *kenosis* with our own *kenosis*, an emptying of our passions, the pursuit of *apatheia*, a detachment and *disponibilite*, through which the divine is manifest within us" (*Essays Catholic and Radical*, 73). Benson, in writing "The greatest gift is when we lose ourselves and have nothing but Him. . . ." (see n. 1) must have had Pusey's words in his memory.

spiritual failure. The choice is clearly set before the soul and demands a moral choice, a positive exercise of the will to be conformed to the life and image of Christ.

He willed that we, through His grace, should become perfect. But what he willed that we should be, *that*, if our will fail not, we must become.⁴

This imperative, of the genuine and substantive role of “works,” i.e., of Christian *askesis*, is ignored in much of Christian life. The effect of this disregard, whether intentional or not, is very often an arrogance or sense of moral and spiritual superiority or, conversely, spiritual complacency or torpor. The soul, receiving the grace of God, has by no means arrived at its final consummation; the journey has but begun. Perfection is the soul’s God-given task; and the cost of the ultimate reward is hard spiritual labor.

This truth rings true in Pusey and in Benson in its appeal to the ascetical writings both of the Fathers and of the classical Anglican thinkers of the formative period. It is also in these two men specifically, the one rooted in the academy and the other in the cloister, that a new dimension now begins to appear, unlikely to have been considered by their predecessors save for purposes of refutation: drawing on continental Roman Catholic mystical writings. Following his wife’s death, Pusey edited a number of continental works; and as early as 1842 Charles Marriott had adapted St. Ignatius’ *Spiritual Exercises*.⁵ Such works as Jean Pierre de Caussade’s *L’Abandon a la providence divine* had long been a standard of the spiritual library. Nor, likely, were Pusey and his contemporaries unaware of François de Salignac de la Mothe Fénelon’s

⁴Ibid., 167. This very closely echoes Wesley’s sentiments (see nn. II.74, 77).

⁵Gabriel O’Donnell, OP, “The Spirituality of E.B. Pusey,” Perry Butler, ed., *Pusey Rediscovered*. London: SPCK, 1983, 237. O’Donnell says that most of Pusey’s Roman sources were post-Reformation and thus “represent the development of a detailed systematization of the spiritual life and a definite movement towards practical spirituality best exemplified by the *devotio moderna* of the fifteenth century” (Ibid.).

Perfection Chrétienne, Marie de l'Incarnation's *L'École sainte*, and other similar works in the French mystical tradition. A major project, later in Pusey's life, was a heavily annotated translation (1877) of the Abbé Gaume's *Le Manuel des confesseurs*,⁶ to provide a much-needed resource for clergy functioning as confessors in a Church which distrusted sacramental confession.⁷ Thus in Pusey we may perceive a reaching beyond normative Anglican sources to that of contemporaneous continental Roman writers. This was precisely due, one suspects, to a marked paucity of available pastoral and ascetical material within the Church of England. Pusey must have felt that exploring continental writings would provide for the English Church a needed link with the wider Christian tradition, and would assist clergy and lay people in the deepening of their own spiritual lives. This reaching beyond was, however, to place a particular stamp on the Anglo-Catholic revival, at least in popular opinion, as a "papist" movement inimical to the Reformation and a danger to the established Church. The result was not only heated controversy (and occasional riot) but also frequent official persecution, particularly evidenced in criminal proceedings connected with the Public Worship Regulation Act of

⁶*OxDict*, 542. Jean Joseph Gaume (1802-1879), Vicar-general of Rheims and Montauban, had gained particular notoriety by his advocacy of eliminating pagan classics from Christian schools and substituting patristic texts (not without marked resistance!). Among others of his published works was the 30-volume *Bibliothèque des classiques chrétiens* (1852-1855).

⁷Chadwick, *Spirit of the Oxford Movement*, 215 ff. Tractarian clergy were increasingly being asked to hear confessions, Pusey included (from 1838), despite marked disapproval from the established Church hierarchy. Chadwick says that by 1846 "the name of Pusey stank in the Church" over the issue of confession. From at least 1846 Pusey made his own confession (to Keble) and found it "a powerful help to him in his spiritual life."

H.P. Liddon got himself into deep trouble over the matter as an undergraduate at Christ Church; as a priest and tutor at Cuddesdon by 1854 he promised Bishop Wilberforce, who "distrusted Pusey's public advocacy of the sacrament of penance," not to commend confession to students "indiscriminately" (227). Wilberforce's attitude, and that of the C. of E. at large, seems ironic given its marked contrast with earlier Anglican counsels, first evinced in the Communion exhortation of the 1549 Prayer Book (*The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI*, 217) and later in Taylor's writings.

1874.⁸ But it also showed that the Roman and Anglican traditions *au fond* shared a very strong common awareness of the genuine spiritual need for that disciplined and systematic ascetic that over a lifetime brings the soul, through struggle and growth in personal holiness, into the likeness of God.

1. Pusey: Impartationary Process and Catholic Synthesis.

IN EDWARD Bouverie Pusey (1800-1882), fellow of Oriel College and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, we find an unmistakable grasp of the impartationary trajectory of sanctification, and, as in Taylor, of the necessity for a well-developed ascetical discipline, particularly in sacramental penitence and frequent resort to Holy Communion. Both his efforts on Gaume's *Manuel des confesseurs* and his preaching of the Eucharist as a "comfort to the penitent," which brought him official condemnation and disciplinary action, are themes echoed later both in Benson and in Grafton. They reveal his sense of "Catholic synthesis," involving Anglican and Roman thought on the spiritual life, and his willingness to draw upon both classical and contemporaneous sources.

⁸"Public Worship Regulation Act," *OxDict*, 1123. Drafted by Archbishop Archibald Campbell Tait of Canterbury (as amended by Lord Shaftesbury) in an attempt to suppress ritualism, the Act provided for appointment of a Judge to the provincial courts of Canterbury and York (from 1874 to 1899 Lord Penzance) with power to try ritual cases. The imprisonment of Arthur Tooth and other priests under the Act's provisions ultimately discredited the Act—one suspects, due to revulsion at its very clear lack of justice and "fair play" and the coercion of conscience. Resistance to manifestations of "popery" has nonetheless remained constant and highly vocal (and at times violent) in certain quarters of the Church of England even to the present day, particularly among the "Protestant Truth Society" and similar groups.

During the same period, it may be noted, similar controversies and (after 1874) canonical penalties, though certainly without the power of the criminal courts, assailed Anglo-Catholic adherents in the American Church. Accusations of "popery" had been leveled at Nashotah House from Breck's time onwards, despite his own protestations to the contrary (*Apostle of the Wilderness*, 9-10, 14-17 (Reeves), 126). A canon on ritual was in fact passed at the General Convention of 1874, but seems from the outset not to have been very effective and was not widely enforced. It was eventually dropped in 1904 (*CMAEC*, 121-125). James DeKoven was condemned as a "ritualist" at the General Conventions of 1871 and 1874. He was denied election as bishop in the Dioceses of Wisconsin (1874) and Fond du Lac (1875), and consents to his election in the Diocese of Illinois (also 1875) were refused, due largely to his impassioned affirmation of the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist (*Ibid.*, 130, 152; also Slocum, "Romantic Religion and the Episcopal Church in Wisconsin," 85-86).

Thematically prior in Pusey's writing and preaching is the necessity the soul's conscious choice of obedience to Christ. The unique position of Christ in the economy of salvation renders all other systems and philosophies of no account; Christ, and Christ alone, can restore in humanity the *eikon Theou* which is its original glory. To that end, the soul's responsibility is obedient response to God's leading.

One lodestar there is, the End of our being, our God: one compass there is, whereby to direct our being, loyalty to God. . . . The voice of nature, i.e. God's voice within us, tells us, that the end of our being is not speculative, but practical. It is, not to theorise about things, not to *know*, apart from the end of that knowledge, but to become—what? Like Him Who made us, in Whose “own Image and likeness” He made us.

To this end, Christ came. He came, not to bring in a philosophy, about which men should dispute; not to bring a doctrine which men might modify, enlarge, curtail, square with their previous convictions or opinions; which they might use as a scaffolding to some construction of their own. . . . He came to be Himself an absolute Rule of life, of faith, of truth.⁹

Justification by faith in the sacrificial death of Christ is sequentially prior in the process of sanctification; but justification also proceeds out of the pure, prevenient grace which God in love bears toward His creatures, disposing the soul towards faith and bringing it to hope and to a hatred of sin, that it may answer love with love. Faith is not alone and of itself the cause of salvation, but comes to the believer as a pure gift of God.

Again, all will hold that in this living, justifying faith, there is, (at least in a healthy state of the soul,) combined a trustful hope or confidence in God, whereby we believe that our sins shall be forgiven us for the sake of Christ, that we ourselves are children of God, adopted through His grace, and that He Who hath loved us so as to make His, will, unless we forsake him, love us unto the end.

And yet all believe that this justifying faith does not justify us by any quality of its own, but simply brings us to God, Who, of His own free bounty and

⁹“Jesus the Way, the Truth, and the Life,” *Sermons Preached Before the University of Oxford Between A.D. 1859 and 1872*. Oxford, London: J. Parker and Co.; London, Oxford, and Cambridge: Rivingtons, 1872, 213-214. This is similar to Donne: “And therefore for this point, we are not under the insinuations and mollifyings of perswasion, and conveniency; nor under the reach and violence of Argument, or Demonstration, or Necessity; but under the Spirituall, and peaceable Tyranny, and easie yoke of sudden and present Faith . . . to advance Faith duly above Reason, he assignes this with other mysteries only to her comprehension” (*Essays in Divinity by John Donne*, 16).

love, justifies those who believe in Him, and who, being drawn by Him, hold not back from Him . . .¹⁰

Justification, then, leads inexorably to sanctification, the love of God drawing the human soul ever closer to complete and total union with Himself.

The love of God is the fountain, the love of man the stream in which it flows. Both are parts of one whole, threads of one cord, so intertwined that thou canst not have the one without the other, links of one chain which binds us to Almighty God, descending from Him to us, and lifting us up to His very Being, which is love.¹¹

But union with God is not achieved save with great struggle. The Divine-human synergy embodies that struggle. “Scripture says not, ‘we shall be He,’ but ‘we shall be like Him’. . . . If we would be ‘like Him’ in glory, we must in our degree be ‘like him’ here by grace.”¹² Human life, says Pusey, is “one great warfare” demanding hard choices, upon which the soul’s ultimate end depends. Will it choose to labor with Christ, who leads it to eternal life, or to surrender to Satan, who carries it to eternal death?

¹⁰“Justification,” *University Sermons*, I, 7 [footnote “f” in pag.: “The place given to ‘fiducia’ in reformed writers is well known. But the Council of Trent also acknowledges it as entering into the preparation for justification, De Justif. c. 6. ‘They are disposed unto that same righteousness, when, quickened and assisted by Divine grace, conceiving “faith by hearing,” they are freely moved towards God . . . [and] are raised unto hope, *trusting that God will be propitious to them for Christ’s sake*, and they begin to love him as the fountain of all righteousness, and are therefore moved by a certain hatred and detestation against sin.”]. Fénelon says that God’s chief aim, and indeed sole end, in wishing our happiness is the showing of His glory—“Our happiness is only a lesser aim, which he connects with the last and essential aim, which is his glory. He himself is his chief and only end in all things. To reach this main aim of our creation, we must prefer God to ourselves, and only wish for our own salvation for the sake of his glory. . . . It is on the contrary, the desire for his glory which should make us desire our blessedness. . . .” (François de Salignac de la Mothe Fénelon, *Christian Perfection*, trans. Mildred Whitney Stillman. New York, London: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1947, 137). Nonetheless, if God’s glory and His being the soul’s all in all is the sole Divine (and ought to be the sole human) disposition in both the redeeming and sanctifying process, as Fénelon implies, then His glory of necessity reveals, as in Donne’s words, His “meere goodnesse.”

¹¹“The Power and Greatness of Love,” *Parochial Sermons*, 3rd Edition. Philadelphia: Richard McCauley, 1870, 316. Pusey’s reference “the fountain” echoes the Decrees of the Council of Trent (n. 10).

¹²“Bliss of Heaven, ‘We shall be like Him,’” Sermon XV, *A Course of Sermons on Solemn Subjects, Chiefly Bearing on Repentance and Amendment of Life, Preached in St. Saviour’s Church, Leeds, During the Week After Its Consecration on the Feast of S. Simon & S. Jude, 1845*. Oxford: John Henry Parker; London: Burns; Leeds: Green, 1845, 267, 269-70.

Great indeed is the seeming change, and in any way an awful picture of our nature. . . . O miserable sinfulness of our sins! which needed that He Who humbled Himself for us, to become Man though without sin, should be, by us, not numbered with the transgressors only, but beneath them. . . .

All of life is one great warfare. . . . On the one side God offers us His Will, that we should will as He wills; and that, since His Will is all Good, we should find in it our perfection, be like Himself. . . . On the other side, Satan offers us our own will, to claim to ourselves, out of God, all which God would give us in Himself, a counterfeit, slavish freedom of the will, to have no other lord. . . . The one question of life or death before us, is, “whom we will obey,” God or Satan. “His servants are ye whom ye obey, whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness.”¹³

It is precisely because of that hatred of sin, rousing in the Christian soul the need to come to God in continual and heartfelt repentance, that God *through the Church* has provided relief for sin’s burden and a means to the restoration and the deepening of intimacy of the soul’s union with God.

There is an old saying that “confession is good for the soul.” Sacramental confession indeed is the Church’s one reliable remedy for the particularity of each person’s sin; and Pusey, himself both confessor and penitent, commends this pastoral office with an almost evangelical fervor.

Consciences *are* burdened. There is a provision, on the part of God, in His Church, to relieve them. They wish to be, and to know that they are, in a state of grace. God has provided a means, however deeply they have fallen, to replace them in it. They feel that they cannot take off their own burden, loose the chains of their past sins, and set themselves free to serve God. They look for some act out of themselves, if there be one, which shall do this. God has provided it. . . . By His absolving sentence, God does efface the past. . . . He has provided Physicians of the soul, to relieve and judge for those who “open their griefs” to them. They wish to know how to overcome besetting temptations; God has

¹³“Barabbas and Jesus,” *Parochial Sermons*, I, 204-211. Similarly, this: “As you love your own souls, think on these things, for surely they are true, and the time is short. And may He by His Holy Spirit make good in us that Prayer, which we offer to Him daily in His Church: ‘We believe that Thou shalt come to be our Judge. We therefore pray Thee, help Thy servants, whom Thou hast redeemed by Thy precious Blood. Make them to be numbered with Thy Saints in glory everlasting’” (“The Last Judgment,” Sermon I, *A Course of Sermons on Solemn Subjects*, 87).

provided those, experienced in the sad history of man's sins and sorrows, who can tell them how others, through the grace of God, have overcome them.¹⁴

The one indispensable predisposition for the sinner is to recognize the reality of his spiritual bondage and those things in life of which he has to repent. The beginning of grace, Pusey declares, is in fact to acknowledge one's self to be a sinner in need of that grace. It is a necessity, psychologically as well as spiritually, for an honest opening of self to each particular problem and offence before any real benefit can be worked.

It might seem no great thing to own ourselves "miserable sinners," when we know that we are such, or to think that others are not so great sinners as we. But so, I believe, it is with those who have great graces of God . . . they know His gifts are their own sins, negligences, shortcomings, failure to that grace. What good there is in themselves, they know to be God's work. . . . They know that any good they have, although *in* them, is the gift and grace of God.¹⁵

¹⁴"Entire Absolution of the Penitent," *University Sermons*, I, iii. Pusey had a particular sensitivity to the burden of hidden or "undiscovered" sin, especially in the lives of young persons (e.g., with sexual perversion often known among boys in England's "public" schools). He told E.D. Coleridge, tutor at Eton (1843), "Discipline has to do with discovered faults, confession with undiscovered and mostly undiscoverable" (Keith Denison, "Dr Pusey as Confessor and Spiritual Director," *Pusey Rediscovered*, 219). In another letter, to The Ven. Benjamin Harrison, Archdeacon of Maidstone (1846), he recounted, "'If I had but known confession then,' (it has often been said to me, and now is written to me), 'I should not have had all this misery.' And I know that confession became a remedy against this evil, when its victim had long struggled in vain" (Ibid.). The confidentiality of confession he recognized as God's key to open not only sexual sin, but all the dark, unseen places and circumstances of the penitent's soul.

Pusey, acutely aware at first hand of official resistance and widespread distrust for the use of absolution in the Church's ordinary life, and of policies that would restrict it to times of sickness and death, leveled particularly sharp criticism at those who would deny sacramental confession save *in extremis*. "The words of our Church are very large; 'a full trust in God's mercy and a quiet conscience,' if any by this means cannot quiet his own conscience herein, but requireth further comfort and counsel, 'to the avoidings of all scruple and doubtfulness.' What Minister of Christ, then, should take upon himself to drive away 'His lambs'? . . ." ("Entire Absolution of the Penitent," viii). He also presses on confessors that they "Seek to have an ardent longing for the salvation of souls" (*Advice for Those Who Exercise the Ministry of Reconciliation and Absolution: Being the Abbé Gaume's Manual for Confessors*. Oxford, London: James Parker & Co., 1878, 23), and reminds them that "He which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins" (q. Jas. 5:20; Ibid., 1).

¹⁵*Humility: A Sermon*. New York: F.J. Huntington & Co., 1872, 13. The primary gift of confession lies in its forcing the penitent to face honestly the particularities of his sins (in fact, Church authorities have traditionally considered that overlooking or suppressing sins adversely affects the matter of a penitent's confession, and may even negate absolution). As we have seen, Jeremy Taylor requires that "He that confesseth his sin to the minister of religion, must be sure to express all the great lines of his folly . . . for else he can serve no prudent end in his confession" (*Jeremy Taylor: Selected Works*, 105-106, 336; see n. II.56). Pusey says further, "'If we would judge ourselves,' says Holy Scripture, 'we should not be judged.' Yet 'judge ourselves' not with a slight superficial judgment, 'after the manner of dissemblers with GOD,' but by a strict, searching, thorough, judgment, as far as man is capable; (διεκρίνομεν) not judging himself only, but sifting himself through and through. . . . Strict must that judgment be, which is to forestall

The grace of God to the sinner is twofold: hand in hand with Confession, and inextricably joined to it in the rhythm of the life of holiness, is the Eucharist. The one absolves from sin, the other nourishes unto eternal life. The Eucharist affirms the Church's teaching of the perfect offering of Christ on the Cross for humanity's redemption, and a continual pleading of that sacrifice for each and every soul.¹⁶ Pusey further says that the reality of Christ's presence in the Eucharist brings hope to the thankful heart redeemed from sin, and is the source of transformation and deepening union with God.

And as Holy Scripture, so also the Ancient Church, when alluding to the fruits of this ineffable gift, speak of them mostly as they would be to those, who, on earth, already live in Heaven, and on Him Who is its life and bliss. They speak of those "clothed in flesh and blood, drawing nigh to the blessed and immortal nature;" . . . The same reality of the Divine Gift makes It Angels' food to the Saint, ransom to the sinner. And both because It is the Body and Blood of Christ. . . . To him its special joy is that it is His [*sic*] Redeemer's very Broken Body, It is His Blood, which was shed for the remission of his sins. . . .

Approach to Him and be filled, because He is bread; approach to Him and drink, because He is a Fountain; approach to Him and be enlightened, because He is Light; approach to Him and be freed, because, where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty; approach to Him and be absolved, because He is Remission of sins.¹⁷

Thus sanctification is attained by the soul through ever humble and penitent acknowledgment of its fallenness and its dependence solely on the love of God, and

and turn aside the judgment of GOD" (*Penitence: With Rules and Guidance and Hints for a First Confession*. London: Walter Smith, 1884, 25).

¹⁶*The Church of England a Portion of Christ's One Holy Catholic Church, and a Means of Restoring Visible Unity: An Eirenicon, in a Letter to the Author of "The Christian Year" (Eirenicon)*. New York, D. Appleton and Company, 1866, 34-35. "But that sacrifice, once made, lives on in Heaven. There our Lord, who shall come down to judge, as He went into Heaven, still bears the marks of the wounds which for us and our salvation He received, effulgent with the glory of His Godhead, irradiant with His Divine love. There He pleads that all-atoning Sacrifice; there for these 1800 years, has He lived to make intercession for us, generation after generation, yea, for each one of our sinful race."

¹⁷"The Holy Eucharist, a Comfort to the Penitent," *University Sermons*, I, 17-19. Pusey here footnotes heavily from Ss. Cyril of Jerusalem, Ignatius, John Chrysostom, and Augustine.

resorting to His mercy through Confession and the Eucharist, which bring Divine forgiveness and life-giving nurture. All is the prevenient initiative of God. He “recalled the soul in peace . . . clothed it with the robe of immortality,” says Pusey, and deepens that spiritual communion which leads ultimately to the recovery of the Divine image within, “that He might impart life to us, and make us to share all which He is.”¹⁸

2. Benson: Impartationary Process and Religious Life.

RICHARD MEUX Benson (1824-1915), student of Christ Church and Vicar of Cowley, was as the founder of the SSJE and a restorer of the religious life in the Church of England aware of the need for a disciplined ascetic in achieving the ordered sanctity which necessarily marks the dimensions of that life. The peculiar mark of monasticism from its beginnings has been a rhythm between the solitary and the communal, between prayer, work, and study, all within the ethos of striving for deep communion with God and charity with one’s brethren. Life within a close community, like that within any family, involves the testing of one’s forbearance with others, as well as the testing of faith. The ancient Fathers of monasticism saw a balanced life within the monastic setting as an indispensable part of the struggle for detachment, dispassion, and above all knowledge of and love for God—to quote Pusey, learning to “subdue thyself.” The religious community is, St. Benedict says, a “school for the service of the Lord.”¹⁹

¹⁸“Victory Through Loving Faith,” *Parochial Sermons*, I, 297 (see n. 1.4).

¹⁹*St. Benedict’s Rule for Monasteries*, trans. Leonard J. Doyle, OSB. Collegeville, MN: St. John’s Abbey Press, 1949, 5. “And so we are going to establish a school for the service of the Lord . . . if a certain strictness results from the dictates of equity for the amendment of vices or the preservation of charity, do not be at once dismayed and fly from the way of salvation, whose entrance cannot but be narrow. For as we advance in the religious life and in faith, our hearts expand and we run the way of God’s commandments with unspeakable sweetness of love.” Likewise, this of Elpidios the Presbyter: “Love is a holy state of the soul, disposing it to value knowledge of God above all created things. We cannot attain

Benson focuses his thought on the “love of Almighty God for souls individually” and on the struggle for inner perfection, which “consists in being identified and filled with the love of God.”²⁰ He stresses that the Divine work within the soul is rooted in the innate value God places upon it. This is, if one will, the great marvel of humanity’s creation. We shall focus on Benson’s attention on the specific areas of self-abnegation, the vows in religion as the construct for the soul’s “losing itself in God,” the life of prayer, and the sacrificial character of the Christian life. He posits at the outset a fundamental question: *What is a soul?*

It almost takes away one’s breath to think of it; yet the thought is the groundwork of any estimate of its value. One hardly knows, wherewith to begin, wherewith to end; yet since the soul was made by God, and God made it for Himself, we had best begin by its relation to Himself. So magnificent is the soul, such a marvellous creation of God, that thoughtful but misled minds of old have thought that, where it is said, “God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul,” Scripture meant that God breathed man’s soul into his body, as something of Himself. . . . Yet what Holy Scripture does speak of, is a very near close relationship of the soul to God.²¹

lasting possession of such love while we are still attached to anything worldly. Dispassion engenders love, hope in God engenders dispassion, and patience and forbearance engender hope in God” (*Philokalia*, II, 53). The monastery indeed, but more, one must believe, the Church entire, is the “school” wherein the knowledge of God, valued above all, is learned and lived out in growth into holiness—according to God’s plan for the restoration of the cosmos.

A paraphrase of Benedict is especially notable in these words of Grafton: “O Venerable Church! Apostolically descended! Early planted in Britian [*sic*]. . . . *Ripe*, with the balanced wisdom & experience of the ages. *Holy* throu’ [*sic*] the indwelling Spirit & Sacraments. Our *Spiritual Mother*, Tried & afflicted & by afflictions purified. . . . The Church is a School of Sanctity. . . .” (Misc. Loose Mss., Archives of the Diocese of Fond du Lac, App. I.B., P5.11).

²⁰“The Religious Life,” Instruction I, *Instructions on the Religious Life, First Series, Edited from Notes*. Oxford: Society of St. John the Evangelist, 1927, 7. Benson goes on to say, “Love expresses the completeness of the Religious Life in which we are united to God. Love is the energy of the soul in which perfection consists.”

²¹Address II, *Eleven Addresses During a Retreat of the Companions of the Love of Jesus*. Oxford: J.H. Parker, 1908, 13-14. Benson provides an expository note to the “frightful heresy” of “God [breathing] man’s soul into his body, as something of Himself” [footnote “a” *in pag.*: “Some of the Greek Fathers understood the words of the inbreathing, not of the soul but of the Holy Spirit into or with the soul of man, already created. . . . In this way, the words would express the truth of the Gift of original righteousness to Adam by the Indwelling of God the Holy Ghost, which man lost by Adam’s fall. But in this sense, it would rather be an application of the words, than their literal meaning.”].

That “very close relationship” is grounded in the prevenient and all-pervasive love of God for His creation, and humanity particularly as the crown of creation. God’s love is the impetus for “inbreathing the Holy Spirit” into the human soul, thus restoring its original state of God-likeness. Deification, for Benson, is not man “becoming God,” but rather becoming God-like and partaking of all that dynamic implies, conformed by spiritual discipline to the *eikon Theou* revealed in the *kenosis* and glorification of Christ.

Our being in His “image” consisted perhaps in the created correspondence of our being with His Divine Nature. Our mind, our knowledge, or love, have been thought to be a created image of the All-holy Trinity. And our “likeness” has been thought to be in those moral qualities, which are shadow of the infinite perfections of God. . . . He made us likenesses of Himself, not in those incommunicable attributes of All-Mightiness, Omniscience, Incomprehensibility, &c.; but He made us like Him in all His attributes, which are communicable to the creature. . . .²²

The goal of the Christian life is, Benson says, to “live in the flesh . . . by the faith of the Son of God.” The soul’s being is transformed into God-likeness even as its lifelong struggle for growth into Christian perfection goes on. The key is *surrender of the will*.

We might thus truly taste the powers of the world to come, even while living in the flesh, and find the power of CHRIST’s glorified life in our humanity, holding down the impulses of our own flesh in subjection to Himself. This is that death unto sin and new birth unto righteousness, which is our baptismal gift. We have not got to conquer an enemy in our own strength, but to die to our own will, our own thoughts, our own impulses, by losing ourselves in CHRIST glorified. The life which we live in the flesh should thus be by the faith of the SON OF GOD. Thus we must give ourselves up to contemplate the Body of CHRIST, so that we may be absorbed out of our own life into His.²³

²²Ibid., 15.

²³“Joy in the Lord,” Letter xiii, to Father Page, *Letters of Richard Meux Benson*, sel. & arr. G. Congreve & W.H. Longridge. London: A.R. Mowbray Co., Ltd; Milwaukee: Young Churchman Co., 1916, 48. He goes on to say, “But our death unto self must not be a mere negation. We must rise to experience the joy wherewith He is glorified, and He will teach us increasingly of this joy. The unction which teacheth us is the oil of gladness wherewith He is anointed, and we cannot have the teaching without the rejoicing. . . . By a real living sympathy with Him in the joy of His Holy Kingdom we acquire the holiness which belongs to His people. We must not merely *hope* for it. That is only a kind of enlightened Judaism. We must *live* in it. We do not believe in the Church which is to be holy, but as being holy now. And yet there are great sins hiding the holiness of the Church. So we are to realize the present sanctity of our own life in CHRIST, and not merely hope to be holy when our natural sinfulness has passed away” (49).

Christian faith involves both salvific faith and a spirit of obedience, not of the law, relying not on desired outcomes but on the pure grace of God, to accomplish the soul's spiritual transformation. Faith brings the soul through the trials of life to its final consummation; but "life in the flesh" is, by grace, as well holiness and union with God *now*.

Christian faith is not a mere reliance upon GOD to give us hereafter what He has promised us, but it is the knowledge of a higher sense—the perception by a Divinely communicated faculty . . . of the present "glory of the elect" who are chosen "out of the world" that they may "abide in CHRIST." Our acts of worship, as the expression and exercise of this faith, are consequently to be considered as steppings forth into the abyss of Godhead. . . . It is the simple surrender of ourselves that is wanted, just as we are, to become transformed by being brought under the influence of His holiness. . . . The trials of earth, the repose of paradise, were in [the Saints'] consideration but different expressions of one substantial joy, the joy of union with CHRIST. "The Son of God was revealed within them."²⁴

The action of worship and "stepping forth into the Abyss of Godhead" involves, among other aspects, the enduring of all sorts of trials and obstacles to spiritual growth. A particular trial Benson addresses is an especially dangerous one, that of spiritual inertia or dryness. Many writers have treated this issue extensively because of the very strong temptation on the soul to "let down" or to relax its vigilance out of discouragement or weakness, especially after previous times of great exaltation or "mountaintop

²⁴"The Consummation of Worship," *Redemption: Some of the Aspects of the Work of Christ*. London: J.T. Hayes, 1861, 390-391. This resonates with his, "The great gift is when we lose ourselves and have nothing but Him" (see n. 1). The spirit of self-surrender and obedience is for Benson *the* key to the whole concept of the Christian life (and especially for those in the life of religion), expressing the "completeness . . . in which we are united to God" (see n. 20). "Is it not just thus that we ought to judge of everything, long for everything, simply in subjection to the will, the mind, of CHRIST?" (Letter xiii (Page), *Letters of R.M.B.*, 47). This sense of surrender to the will of God for the sake of living in His love is similar to words of Fénelon: "Happy is the man who gives himself to God! He is delivered from his passions, from the judgements of men . . . because, placing his will entirely in the hands of God, he wants only what God wants, and thus he finds his consolation in faith, and consequently hope in the midst of all his sufferings. . . . Happy are they who throw themselves with bowed head and closed eyes into the arms of the 'Father of mercies,' and the 'God of all consolations,' as St. Paul said! Then we desire nothing so much as to know what we owe to God, and we fear nothing more than not to see enough what he is asking for" (*Christian Perfection*, 65).

experiences.” Benson offers encouragement, but also strongly exhorts resistance, persistence, and constant renewal of the spirit of humility.

We must not be disheartened if we do at times feel the state of spiritual inertness which you describe. We must try and resist it. It may be the very means of stirring us up to greater watchfulness. Seasons of spiritual joy and unnatural excitement are more apt to deceive us. When we feel our nothingness, we have at any rate got one important truth. And in this nothingness the very desire to be something different is the echo of God’s voice. He calls us out of our nothingness, and He is able to do with us what He wills. . . . In action and in suffering, in weariness and in energy, in depression and in joy, His unchanging love must be our continual stay, and He will overrule all for our sanctification.²⁵

The religious life, as a primary setting of the soul’s working toward God-likeness, is a life inextricably bound up with the struggle for self-subduement. Self-abandonment and the soul’s lostness in God is, as we have seen, a Caussadian theme, and seems in fact to have become Benson’s one great and pervasive theme. The whole business of living by rule, of disciplines of prayer, worship, study, and even of external work and contact with the outside world, is for those professed in religion to be governed by the principles of self-effacement, self-negation, and of recollected silence and self-restraint. A great deal of Benson’s writing, specifically in the series of *Instructions on the Religious Life*, consists in treating the issue of self-subduement and in warning the religious of the hazards posed to the soul in the pursuit of perfection by disregard of the principles presented. His awareness of the great and ongoing dangers in the spiritual struggle, and

²⁵“Letter to a Friend—On Spiritual Inertness,” *Letters of Richard Meux Benson*, 243-244. These are similar to words of St. Teresa of Avila (citing Matt. 19:16-22): “Ever since I began to speak of these Mansions I have had that young man in mind, for we are exactly like him; and this as a rule is the origin of our long periods of aridity in prayer, although these have other sources as well . . . they cannot be patient when the door is closed to them and they are unable to enter the presence of the King. . . . Let us test ourselves, my sisters, or allow the Lord to test us . . . the Lord will make them clear to you, so that these periods of aridity may teach you to be humble, and not make you restless, which is the aim of the devil” (“Third Mansions,” I, *Interior Castle*, trans. & ed. E. Allison Peers. Garden City, NY: Image Books (Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1961, 59-62). Both Benson and Teresa see spiritual aridity as a supreme *opportunity* for the cultivation of humility and giving God space to work His loving-kindness and good

his alarm at the destructive implications of non-subduement and spiritual self-absorption, account for his particular austerity and severity of tone.

The object of the Vows is that we may attain to self-abnegation, self-annihilation, so emptied of self that we may be filled with God. The Son of God “emptied Himself,” took upon Himself our nature in order that it might be “filled with all the fullness of God,” took our nature in its nothingness that it might be perfected in Himself. God laid aside His glory, and we have to empty ourselves. . . . We are to become nothing.²⁶

Mortification also plays an important part in Pusey’s ascetic construct. But as he reminds us, the mortifications common to the pious are not ends unto themselves, nor are they done in isolation from the interior intent. Christians are not called to be spiritual masochists, but to use various tools of external *askesis* as the means to inner humbling and spiritual transformation. The authentic rôle of mortification is that of achieving inner humiliation, not coming from the outside world, but from within the heart, and must be undertaken with inner transformation as the object and focus. And, Benson says, they may come from everyday experience as well as from pious imposition.

Mortification is the great means by which we obtain an idea of our own nothingness. It is valuable as an act of penance and of humiliation. But then it must be of such a kind as really to humble us. . . . Outward acts of mortification

pleasure in the soul in the sanctifying process—it is, one may posit (and Benson and Teresa imply), *the* significant dimension of the soul’s learning to trust God and “[step] forth into the Abyss of Godhead.”

²⁶“The Object of the Vows—Self-Abnegation,” Instruction XV, *Instructions on the Religious Life, First Series*, 49. Benson further elaborates on the vows specifically: “The vow of Poverty empties us of the world’s wealth, the instrument of this world’s power, that we may be filled with the power of God. The vow of Chastity empties us of all earthly affections, the ‘circumcision of the heart’ from all the delights of sense, that we may be free to exult in the perfections of God. The vow of Obedience empties us of this world’s judgements and wisdom, that we may be conformed to the mind of God” (Ibid.). This echoes both Paul’s teaching on the Divine *kenosis* (Phil. 2:5-11) and his further words, “. . . I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord . . . and do count them but dung, that I may win Christ, And be found in him. . . . That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable to his death. . . .” (3:7-10)—an especially cogent counsel for those who “work out your own salvation with fear and trembling. For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure” (2:12-13). Benson sees the observance of the vows as a means to “come to a fuller knowledge of our own nothingness . . . being nothing we can be changed” (Ibid., 52). Thus, conversion of the soul has its roots in *kenosis*, and before all else in the knowledge of this “nothingness.”

must always be accompanied by some interior act,—by some definite act of the mind whereby we may humble ourselves before God. Seek especially to make the best use of all those little daily mortifications which are as numberless as the occasions of life, and strive to welcome them.²⁷

Silence also occupies a central place in Benson's thought, precisely because it is a means not only of devotion, but more, of watchfulness and deepened communion with God. Keeping silence is, and always has been, perhaps the most difficult of mortifications and ascetical disciplines, given human beings' tendency and desire for conversation, other speech, and the presence of sound generally. Benson treats sound, and talk in particular, as a distraction; he warns that, even when the religious is necessarily occupied with external work, dignified silence is to be the hallmark of the religious demeanor. The discipline of regular silence within the religious house is a normative one, and Benson says that silence in all things is to be desired, that the soul may wait on God. This he sees as indispensable to the pilgrimage toward sanctification.

He [the religious] watches therefore in an intent silence and registers the movements of the divine life in the contemplation of a retentive memory. The silence of the religious therefore is a necessary feature of that life absorbed in the contemplation of God. And so we must be very careful not to let the value of our religious life be destroyed by our association with the world. We may often in our mission life have to go into the life of the world. We may often have to appear in various societies. We may often have to meet with different classes of individuals, but there must always be this silence distinguishing our character. It is a silence of divine joy; it is a silence of divine discipleship, and therefore it is a silence of divine dignity. . . . Many there are who will speak well for Christ, and

²⁷“Our Nothingness, the Principle of Mortification,” Instruction XVI, *Ibid.*, 54. “What is there on earth more lovely than the mortified life?” he suddenly cries. “It is truly the life of Christ” (*Woodgate, Father Benson*, 89). Benson's own austerity, testified by many, may in fact be the most telling *prima facie* evidence of a mortified life. Father Basil Maturin recalls a retreat in the Mission House: “The Father wore an old-fashioned neckcloth, his feet were stockingless and his girdle drawn very tightly round his waist. . . . The chapel, like the preacher, was stern, unadorned, uncompromising—no ornament except a Byzantine mosaic of Our Lord over the altar. There was certainly nothing inspiring in the surroundings. Yet the speaker was inspiring beyond anyone I have ever heard before or since” (*Ibid.*, 81). His austerity and evidence of a mortified life, one thinks, must have lent a particular spiritual clarity to his teaching and preaching, many distractions and encumbrances having been burnt and scoured away over many years.

yet fail in winning hearts to him because there is not this sweetness of divine love speaking with the ineffable voice of divine silence.²⁸

The hours of silence are of the greatest possible importance. It is not merely that the work of the house may go on quietly, but that each may have his soul inwardly dwelling in a reverent homage before almighty God.²⁹

The life of prayer Benson sees as central to the ascetical life of the religious, and of all Christian souls, regularizing and ordering communion with God by the continual dynamic of both speaking to God and hearing Him. Moreover, the Christian's prayer is a joining of the soul with the continual intercession of Christ for the soul. This is the *prima facie* evidence of the unending love that Christ and God the Father bear for humanity, and of the Father's eternal fatherhood toward the soul. Precisely, he says, because all are children of God through Christ's eternal sonship and Christians' membership in Christ, they can pray to the Father, knowing that He hears His children.

Our Lord intercedes for us, but He does not pray for us. He says expressly, "I say not that I will pray the Father for you, for the Father Himself loveth you" (St. John 17:26-27). We can say *our Father*, praying in the Name of Christ. God is our Father because He is Christ's Father, and we are Christ's members; but we have to speak to God with all the confidence of God's children. . . . We often use the phrase that He pleads for us, but pleading is not the same as praying. While we pray, He pleads for us as claiming for us what we require. The Father gives to us as His members, while He the Head gives efficacy to our prayers.³⁰

²⁸"Silence," *Instructions on the Religious Life: Third Series*, intro. by F.B. Dalby. London: A.R. Mowbray & Co. Ltd; New York: Morehouse-Gorham Co., 1951, 124, 127.

²⁹Ibid., 125. Benson admits that varying rules of communities differ in the nature and degree of regular silence, but insists, "As they are truer to their religious character, so will the intensity of their silence be deepened. It may be impossible for us to live in the perfect silence of some whom God has called in the marvel of his love to contemplation. . . . We must take great care that we cherish the silent hours of our life as being the true, the most religious hours from whence the strength of all the rest is derived" (126-127).

³⁰"Letter to a Friend—Our Prayer, and the Intercession of Christ," *Spiritual Letters of Richard Meux Benson*. London, Oxford: A.R. Mowbray & Co., Ltd; Milwaukee, Morehouse Publishing Co., 1924, 164-166. Christ's intercession and the soul's prayer are distinct, but (as Benson implies) inextricably connected. All is the fruit of the Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension. The soul is constrained to live by that fruit by continual prayer in union with the intercession of Christ.

The life of prayer is also (and this is particularly true for the religious) the maintenance of the life of mortification which is indispensable to spiritual transformation. As the soul journeys toward perfection, the spiritual ascetic which marks the dying to self and living toward God must be rigorously practiced. Prayer must never be self-asserting, but self-denying.

So the spirit of Mortification must be maintained by prayer. There must be the continual abiding in God in the life of constant prayer. The heart that knows its own nothingness prizes Heaven. We naturally strive to get our self-abnegation mitigated. We pray for that which will be a gratification of self, rather than because it concerns our Lord Jesus Christ. But our true prayer, the prayer that mortifies ourselves, is the prayer for the glory of God's Name. "Glorify Thy Son that Thy Son may glorify Thee." Have we learnt in our retreat to approach God in more earnest, self-denying prayer? The time must be one of supernatural change. We have got to submit our inner lives to be transformed by the workings of His supernatural power.³¹

Regularity of prayer is essential, for without it the soul is subject to its own devices and wastefulness of time (and of other resources as well). Benson commends the Divine Office, of course, as the foundation, but stresses the need for prayer in all its forms. The religious life, indeed all Christian life, is a life of prayer, and prayer must be embraced in its totality and in all its facets, as the means of the soul's union with God.

As Religious we must be especially given to a life of prayer. We have our Offices. They are not to be said formally, but as acts of Religion binding the soul to God. The saying of our Office is the means of bringing out into action the life of Christ to which we are pledged. It must be the spiritualising of our life. The heart must rise up habitually towards it. . . . We are called out of the world to devote ourselves to it. . . . We are to look to prayer as the great instrumentality in the work of Christ.³²

³¹"Mortification," Instruction XVI, *Instructions on the Religious Life: First Series*, 56.

³²"The Religious Life, a Life of Prayer," Instruction XVII, *Ibid.*, 57. Besides the Office, he says, there are "our personal habits of intercession and special devotions, rising up by the inspiration of God according to our special needs . . . our private prayer, vocal and mental, meditation and contemplation. Neglect none. Strive to rise to the higher, but neglect not the lower. Our life must be dedicated to prayer" (*Ibid.*). This would seem to reflect aspects of a "fundamental spiritual rhythm of contrition/repentance and praise/thanksgiving" noted by John Booty in an analysis of the writings of Jewel, Andrewes, and Hooker (*Three Anglican Divines on Prayer: Jewel, Andrewes, and Hooker*. Cambridge, MA: Society of St. John

All of Benson's thought on Christian life, finally, may be summed up in the word "sacrifice." A sacrificial life is joined to the sacrifice of Christ, and enables detachment from the world. Christ, Benson says, offers His sacrifice in our sacrifice, and in transformed humanity offers Himself to the Father. It is to be habitual. All is self-oblation, and all is to be done to the glory of God, enabling the soul to live in God and God alone.

Prayer, silence, and recollectedness are all to be practised for the purpose of forming the habit of sacrifice. We present the sacrifice before God, and we must do it in all our acts, for it is Christ doing all our acts and offering Himself in us. We must have that detachment which He had. . . . Our sacrifice must be an offering which has a continual claim on our whole being. We cannot offer a sacrifice to God in so far as we are bound to the world. Our Blessed Lord had ever before Him this idea of sacrifice, doing all to the glory of God. . . . However much our life is sacrificed, we must remember that that which we give up to God lives with the life of God.³³

3. Resonances in the Grafton Corpus.

AS WE have seen, Grafton was influenced by a number of mentors. Certainly the most profound influences came from Pusey and Benson: Pusey as a great intellect and revered master of an earlier generation, and Benson as an immediate spiritual father and guide.

When Grafton refers to the Church as "Apostolically descended . . . *Ripe*, with the balanced wisdom and experience of the ages,"³⁴ he sees the Church as continuing

the Evangelist, 1978, 4) and that rhythm of Divine justice/mercy to which the writer refers in Donne (see Ch. II, 22).

³³"Sacrifice," Instruction XX, *Ibid.*, 65, 67. He says, "The results of life are to be found in the aftergrowth of Divine grace, in the coming forth of the wondrous power from the grave. We must die with Christ, and when dead His gifts will begin to show themselves. The brightness is not to be gathered from without, but developed from within" (*Ibid.*). This recalls the Orthodox doctrine of the "uncreated light."

³⁴See n. 19.

uninterrupted in the apostolic faith and order, and Anglicanism as the true expression of that faith and order. This reflects exactly Pusey's assertion:

But there is this difference between the teaching of the Apostles and that of the Church after them, that what the Apostles taught as the original and Fountain-head, *that* the Church only transmitted. . . . Thenceforth, then, it was the office of the Church, under the guidance of God the Holy Ghost, to transmit, guard, defend that truth, which our Divine Lord, and God the Holy Ghost, teaching the Apostles what, during our Lord's Bodily Presence, they had not been able to receive, gave to the Church once for all. Again, within the post-Apostolic Church, God the Holy Ghost has been pleased to operate, in a twofold way, for the preservation of that truth, which He first gave, ordinary and extraordinary. . . . He operates also in sacraments; He ordains the succession of pastors, doctors, bishops, through whom He continually propagates the truth. . . .³⁵

Grafton makes continual reference to the sacramental life, particularly in regard to the Eucharist and to Confession, and here we also may see a reflection and echo of Pusey.

Christ begins as before by saying I am the Bread of Life. But now He is the Giver and Donor. He says, "The Bread that I will give is my Flesh." The gift He states to be His Flesh, "For my Flesh is meat indeed, and my Blood is drink indeed." The duty is not that of believing merely, but eating. "He that eateth my Flesh and drinketh my Blood dwelleth in Me and I in him . . . he that eateth of this Bread shall live for ever." . . . If, therefore, you desire a security of that eternal happiness, begin now by receiving the Body and Blood of your Lord which will prepare you for the final union with Him in glory.³⁶

And, in regard to Confession, again we are reminded of Pusey.

No sinner is so vile but the Sacred Heart is open to him, no sins are so black and loathsome that the Precious Blood cannot cleanse. No matter how obdurate and rebellious, how old in sin, how inveterate in relapses, the abounding mercy persistently offers pardon. . . . It was not to be their privilege only who knelt at His Feet, to hear His life-giving words, "Son, Daughter, thy sins be forgiven thee," but everywhere, and till the end of time, penitents should have given them by Christ, speaking through His priests, the same blessed assurance of pardon.³⁷

³⁵Pusey, *Eirenicon*, 86-87.

³⁶"II. The Holy Communion: A Brief Exposition," *Fond du Lac Tracts*, WCCG, VI, 171, 176. Cf. Pusey: ". . . those 'clothed in flesh and blood, drawing nigh to the blessed and immortal nature;' . . . The same reality of the Divine Gift makes It Angels' food to the Saint, ransom to the sinner. . . ." ("The Holy Eucharist, a Comfort to the Penitent," *University Sermons*, I (see n. 17).

³⁷"IV. Absolution in God's Word," *Ibid.*, 233. Again, cf. Pusey: "There is a provision, on the part of God, to relieve them. . . . They feel they cannot take off their burden, loose the chains of their

Moreover, in the *Works* an entire volume is devoted specifically to religious vocation,³⁸ and there we may see both a reflection and the overawing authority of Benson, the austere and godly superior who had so shaped Grafton personally. In a “Commentary on the Rule,” Grafton’s words on humility and obedience are of note.

Our lives and character are to be changed. We cannot be what we once were. Nature must be transformed by grace. The old Adam must be put to death. We must not cease our conflict until self-love is subdued. Our old nature must be cast out. With deep humility, we must seek after perfection.³⁹

As pride is the principal root of all sins, so humility is the foundation of all virtues, and its foundation is laid in the sure stronghold of holy obedience. Now, the great means is the discipline of obedience to the Rule, and to the Superior as the interpreter and administrator of it.⁴⁰

The theme of mortification also echoes Benson’s thought. Grafton here specifically dismisses any notion of mortification involving Manichaeism.

Concerning mortification, I would first point out a mistake often made concerning its character and purpose. There is a wrong view concerning it, based on an error concerning the nature of matter and the functions of the body . . . an old Manichaeism error which regarded matter as evil in its nature. . . . The Christian

past sins. . . . God has provided it. . . . He has provided Physicians of the soul. . . .” (“Entire Absolution of the Penitent,” *University Sermons*, I (see n. 14).

³⁸*WCCG*, V, *Vocation: Or the Call of the Divine Master to a Sister’s Life, and Other Writings on the Religious Life*. While the bulk of the volume is devoted to Sisterhood (certainly the SHN), the general principles are unmistakable and applicable to all religious vocation. Consider Grafton’s words on the vows, for instance, “But if vows are a help in the marriage state they are also in the Religious. They are the expression of love and devotion. . . . We give thereby not only what we do, but all we are. . . .” (107). We hear echoes of Benson: “. . . that we may attain to self-abnegation, self-annihilation, so emptied of self that we may be filled with God. The Son of God . . . took our nature in his nothingness that it might be perfected in himself” (see n. 26). This “Voice of the Disciple:” “If I know myself I *would* give up all to follow thee” (109), is interesting as it may be even a distant and fond recollection of a conversation about his vocation with Whittingham years earlier (see n. III.37). Grafton’s tone is here less severe than Benson’s, but the thrust is the same. Grafton was, as we must remember, commending the religious life to an American Church whose members at that time distrusted and resisted any manifestations of “popery.” (This writer himself remembers Church people still often denying or ridiculing the notion of religious orders in the Church!)

³⁹“Meditation X: The Resurrection Victory,” *Ibid.*, 214. This also strongly reflects Benson’s call to “self-abnegation” (nn. 26, 31). Here Grafton’s tone is more insistent and more reminiscent of Benson’s.

⁴⁰“A Commentary on the Rule: Obedience,” *A Religious Order for Men*, *Ibid.*, 330. Cf. also his description of regarding “the voice of the Superior . . . to us as the voice of God” (see n. III.51).

belief is that all God has made, matter and body included, is good. . . . The prodigality with which God bestows His gifts of nature is to fill our hearts with thankfulness and provide for material sacrifice. Sacrifice in the way of any mortification is an offering to God. While in its lower office it is an instrumentality for self-control, in its high spiritual purpose it is a sacrifice to God. As a sacrifice or offering to Him, it is a means of union with Him.⁴¹

What Grafton says on the subject of the holy life is due to his own immersion in the religious life. The monastic balance of prayer, study, and work formed a construct of deeper regularity and order to the life of a priest who had already learnt piety and diligence. Under the influence of Pusey and Benson, as we note in these few resonances, and under the stability of the religious community, Grafton was enabled to explore the deeper implications of the sanctified life and to be formed into both a disciplined ascetic and a well-trained theological thinker. With these influences in mind, the stage is now set for a detailed examination of Grafton's own thought and the assessment of his place among Anglican theologians on the subject of sanctification.

⁴¹“A Commentary on the Rule: Mortification,” *Ibid.*, 342. Grafton's sense of God's “[filling] our hearts with thankfulness and [providing] for material sacrifice” is similar to Benson: “But our true prayer, the prayer that mortifies ourselves, is the prayer for the glory of God's Name. . . . We have got to submit our inner lives to be transformed by the workings of His supernatural power” (see n. 31). Benson, of course, regards mortification as part of the overall purpose of submission “to God's calls in whatsoever way they may come to us. . . . If we have come to recognize Jesus with the hearing of faith, we shall rest upon him though our outward does not see him, and with regularity surrender all things to him” (“Submission,” *Instruction VII, Instructions on the Religious Life*, I, 80).

CHAPTER V.

Grafton on the Theology and Practice of Sanctification.

It is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure. Phil. 2:13

WE HAVE seen the formative influences in Charles Chapman Grafton's life and ministry, and how those influences resonate in his thinking. It is now our task to take his writings, subject by subject, and to see how those writings reflect his view of the theology and practice of sanctification, and how they accord overall with the patristic tradition and with the impartationary trajectory within mainstream Anglican thought.

The Christian life is, as Donne says, "a long work [having] many steps," and in fact it is a highly complex metaphysical process, all the steps interrelated and interdependent. The steps of the spiritual life have to be taken one at a time, and in a definite sequence, very much like finding the turns and paths in a maze. The entire process begins with Christ and His call to the human soul, demanding a faith response. It continues with spiritual struggle and discipline, and culminates in ultimate surrender to the Divine will, sealing the soul's perfection. This is similarly an order to be followed in considering Grafton's words on sanctification, a path that leads us deeper into his thought, as living the Christian life leads the soul deeper into the being of God: Christ's call and the soul's response; the Holy Spirit as Sanctifier; the authority of Scripture; life in the Church as the mystical Body of Christ; the life-giving character of the Sacraments; prayer and worship; the ascetical struggle; and the religious life as a life of surrender to

God's will. Finally, we shall arrive at a sense of Grafton's understanding of sanctification as it relates to the question of the patristic view of *theosis*.

1. The Call of Christ and the Soul's Response.

THE CALL of Christ and the soul's response to that call is sequentially prior to any other aspect in the soul's journey to perfection. Grafton begins by positing the unique character of Christ, the eternal Word of God. Creation, he says, acknowledged Christ in both His creative and salvific activity.

Nature acknowledged Him as its Maker and Lord. At His advent all creation was representationally Present. At his triumphant Exit & in like manner during His Life on Earth. He is GOD visible. All things were made by Him. He is in all things. The Laws of nature are the thoughts of GOD. Nature kneels down before Him. In all its departments nature acknowledges Him.¹

But the human soul is fallen from its original and natural state given in creation, and until the soul realizes its need for Christ, nothing further can happen. Christ, Grafton declares, is implacably hostile to sin, but bears withal the "warmest love for sinners." Christ is in fact the beginning and end of the soul, the "Author and Finisher" of its faith, and constantly calls the soul to His gift of life. The first sign of response to Christ's call is penitence of spirit (see Ps. 51); the soul must come to Christ in honest repentance.

He is the Author and Finisher of our faith, without and within us. . . . Whatever knowledge of Him we have, whatever fear of self & horror for sin, whatever faith however weak & feeble is or not through His Favour & grace. We must thus ever look to Him, Who . . . stood without the door, & waited long & quickened our dull ear to the hearing of His knock & gave us strength that we might open unto Him, and so thank & bless Him as the *Author* of our faith. . . .²

¹Misc. Loose Mss./Fond du Lac, P1.10. Outline, short address or homily, entitled "God Manifest in Christ."

²Ibid. Grafton describes Christ's love thus: "He is *tender* without false sentiment. *Benevolent* without a trace of weakness. His *condescension* never degenerates into mere familiarity. His incomparable *dignity* never touches [?] pride. His lofty *freedom* from the world's tyranny never becomes contempt for man. His implacable hostility to *sin* is always allied to the warmest love for sinners."

He says also that the soul must be united to Christ, both in His death and burial. In Christ's death, the natural order is subordinated to the supernatural, and obedient acceptance of this truth is the source of our victory.

United to Christ crucified—the world crucified him. --- crushed body soul & spirit. We are buried with Xt, risen with Xt—live within the Church—united to an ascended Lord. . . . Xt reigns in us & the natural order is suberrent [?] to Him. . . . We meet the unbelieving --- by the manifestation of the Supernatural. Faith [is] the victory.³

Moreover, being united in Christ, especially in the Eucharist, the soul must, he says, be brought to an abiding sorrow for sin. It must be buried with Him. From this burial the soul rises anew in His image and penitence brings increased devotion to Him.

Looking to Him & partaking of Him through His Blessed Sacrament, to calm the first tumultuous emotions of grief into a deep abiding sorrow for sin. . . . Look we thus to Him for loving penitence, & quiet endurance, & true devotion.—1. Penitence comes first in the spiritual life . . . we must lay the old man in the tomb of Xt, & ere the new can be retraced [?] in us. . . .⁴

For Grafton, humanity was at creation indeed *eikon Theou*, innocent and perfect and the crown of creation; but it had in the fall become marred and subject to death.

How do we say then that “By *Adam* came death?” We must remember that there are three kinds of death: 1. *Physical death*, the cessation of animal life, the

³Ibid., P1.12. Fragmentary outline, “The critical and unbelieving spirit. It rejects the supernatural, inspiration, miracles. . . .” The text is an obvious allusion to two particular passages in Paul's letter to the Romans: (1) “Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death. . . . For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection. . . .” (6:3-5), and (2) “The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God: And if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we may suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together” (8:16-17).

Grafton's hand is by turns very florid or very crabbed, often within a single document, and his spelling and syntactical errors are numerous. His mss. are difficult to decipher, at times totally illegible, hence occasional gaps in transcription.

⁴Sermon 114, St. Paul's, Baltimore, 22nd Trinity 1861. “Heb. 12.2. Looking unto Jesus the Author and Finisher of our Faith.” Grafton says further that Jesus Himself makes the soul aware of its need: “He has made us conscious of His Presence and turned His wounded Look of sorrow yet of pardoning Love upon us and brought us, penitents, to His Cross, so must we ever remain looking to Him, & to His Hand outstretched in Absolution, His side outpouring its living tide, as the Finisher of our faith.”

separation of the soul from the body. 2. *Spiritual death*, the separation of the soul and spirit from God. 3. *Eternal death*, which comes to human nature, which was made for glory: when it misses its end, it sinks back into a state of eternal loss. . . . Now what was it that happened to Adam. . . . He had been created in the very Image of God, and had received this gift of supernatural grace. By his sin, he did not separate himself from the power of God.⁵

Temporal punishment upon Adam, and all of humanity, resulted from Adam's sin, and temporal punishment (including death) was, Grafton declares, a tool, designed by God to "teach him of his spiritual state or loss." Hope for recovery, restoration, and reinstatement is found in God's love, by the Incarnation of Jesus Christ.

Physical death was to teach him this truth, but the grace by which he was to win eternal life was gone. God, in His dear love, may punish us with death, or take away His grace from us, but it is to show us our sin. . . . But in Christ all may be made alive. God sent His only Son, Who came to the world, wrapping the same human nature about Him. Our failures were not to baffle the Divine Work. . . . And in Christ God's Light was embodied in the Sun of Righteousness. He took our nature, and uttered His Word . . . we need more than light and truth . . . and we needed something more than an Example. There must be reconciliation, restoration, and this was wrought on Calvary. . . . The Cross was the manifestation of the Love of God . . . if the At-one-ment were all, our Lord might have suffered on Calvary, and then laid our nature aside, but No!—He took it, wears it now, and will wear it forever—a continual source of union between us and God.⁶

Union with God, he declares, is entirely rooted in God's love for the soul. Omnipresent, omniscient, and omnipotent, nonetheless God remains close to His creation in His love. He does not desire the death of humanity, but in love presents Himself freely

⁵WCCG, VIII, *Addresses and Sermons*, 312. "The Second Adam." Sermon, October 1883. He says of the uniqueness of human nature, "Human nature was created at once as an entity. God made it as one beautiful thing, and it stood in perfection before Him. He gave it the law of perfection and development, in order to manifest it in the law of His own Being, for His Own Life was in it. He gave it a work to do, to conquer the earth, and unite in itself the two natures, and He crowned it with supernatural grace, and all that followed or happened to Adam and Eve happened to human nature as a whole, and so 'in Adam all sinned and died.'"

Grafton in several places in his writing seems to imply an acceptance of the late Victorian notion of "inevitable progress." Part of sin's breach, in his view, lies precisely in the frustration of that progress, and it may be argued that he sees redemption and sanctification at least in part as involving the resumption and completion of that progress.

⁶Ibid., 314-316.

and openly to the soul, desiring it to seek and find Him. God's majesty and power are inseparable from His love.

He Who dwelt not in temples made with hands but was Illimitable, Omnipresent, Unconfined—Who needed not the worship of men to add to His Greatness or Dignity but was Complete in Himself, Perfect Absolute & Whose offspring we were—S. Paul declared unto them the One Only Unconditioned, Unlimited, Infinite, Perfect, Absolute Being, the Giver of all life & health & all things, the Determiner of all times, limits & bounds, the Lord desirous His children should seek after Him . . . [Who] is not far from every one of us, Who [*sic*] if we but feel after & seek we shall find, for in Him we live & move & have our being.⁷

Not only “desirous his children should seek after Him,” God gives the soul the gift of life by adopting it as His own and, as Grafton perceives, investing it with participation in the Divine nature. Divine adoption is the vital initial step in the deifying process. In an address given to students at Grafton Hall, he says,

In Christ we are brought in a new relation with God. By nature we are His creatures. By grace we are Christ's children. We are made members of Christ, partakers of the divine nature, and an adopted son. Our heavenly Father gathers us, little and needy outcasts, into his own new family. By a divine illumination, and power of love, we become partakers of that divine nature. . . . Made children or members of Christ, we have all the privileges of our adopted state. . . . The adopted relationship is only a moral and legal one. But the divine adoption makes the adopted partake of the divine nature by way of knowledge and love and gift. He is born anew, receives a new nature, a divine illumination, and made worthy to obtain a heavenly and eternal inheritance.⁸

⁷Sermon 131, St. Paul's Church, Baltimore, 11.26.1862, “The Acts 17 ch. 28 v. ‘In Him we live and move and have our being.’” The sermon is an expository on St. Paul's discourse to the Athenians. He goes on to say, “God is seen—Creating spiritual beings capable of loving & worshiping & finding their delight in Him. He, so far as they were able to bear it & could be created capable of discerning Him, did in His Love make a revelation of Himself to them. . . . My standing in any locality does not prevent God being in the same place. . . . We can also be *in* Him—in another a nearer, closer, more Blessed Way, before the world was.—one in Christ, He came. Makes us one with Him—He takes us into Himself. . . .”

⁸WCCG, VII, *Letters and Addresses*, 308-309. Date not given. It is an address to the young female graduates of the Hall at their commencement. He commends religion to his hearers as “the happiest of all lives.” He tells them, “It does not secure us from troubles, but it alone knows how to meet them, and the Christian has no fears of the future is this life” (310). Yet he also calls it “austere, strong, yet jealous and sensitive” and says it is the happiest of lives, “for it lives not for itself alone. In this it becomes God-like and divine. It rises above self in its growing unselfishness. . . . Filled with this divine spirit, it finds in service its highest joy. No day without a loving duty, and no duty without its reward” (312).

In another address, he declares that the full revelation of Christ to humanity can only be known

. . . by one's becoming a little child in mind and heart and entering within the Spiritual Kingdom of the Church of Jesus Christ, wherein He dwells wherein He illuminates its members with His Holy Spirit . . . and in whom He fulfils His blessed promise concerning Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; that we will love him, and that we will come unto him, and make our abode with him. Devout and faithful Churchmen do not merely hold religious opinions, but they know with divine certainty the truth and are by union with the deified humanity of Christ elevated into a higher participation of the Divine Nature than [*sic*] comes from the immanence of God, and are made the Sons of God and inheritors in Christ of Eternal Life.⁹

2. The Holy Spirit as Sanctifier.

GRAFTON WRITES little expository material specifically on the Person of the Holy Spirit, save in treating the Trinity. His sense of the rôle and *work* of the Spirit, however, is a pervasive theme. The Spirit reveals Christ as “temple of the Holy Ghost” and “Moulder” of the soul's new life, bringing union and enlightening the understanding.

The tendency or activity of the H. Spirit is towards Union. The Holy Spirit binds together in mutual love. . . . *In Creation*, is a progressive work. . . . In Christ, At last comes & indwells in Xt. . . . Christ --- a Temple. In the Church, Baptism—Confirmation—*Absolution*. *Consecration of the Elements*. In the Individual, He reveals Christ to us as our *Example*—the *Mould* of our new Life & the Moulder of it. *He enlightens our understanding*.¹⁰

Being in Christ by the Incarnation, Atonement, and Resurrection, human souls likewise become “temples of the Holy Ghost,” who brings Divine union. The Spirit bears witness to our union with and deification in Christ.

⁹Ibid., 320-321. “The Reasonableness of the Church's Faith,” speech at a Church Club dinner. Date not given. [Note: Grafton surely means “a higher participation of the Divine Nature *that* comes from the immanence of God.”]

¹⁰Misc. Loose Mss./Fond du Lac, P1.04. Outline of a sermon or address, entitled “We Are Temples of the Holy Ghost” (alluding to I Cor. 3:16).

In the Christian—We have the witness in ourselves. The Spirit beareth witness. We have been gathered into union with Xt. & have His Mind. The Spirit reveals what the Law & the Ps[alms] & P[rophet]s say of Him.¹¹

Grafton in several places refers to the Holy Spirit as the principle, energy, or guarantor of Divine love within the Godhead. In his 1909 Diocesan Council address, in giving a short definition of the Being and Persons of the Holy Trinity, he says,

There is one God, and in God there are three persons . . . there are necessarily in the Divine Nature these eternal activities, i.e. God is, God knows, God loves. These actions are eternal, and are related one to another. First, God is. As the Source within the Divine Life He is called Father. In other words, He is pure activity. Secondly, He is intelligent, or a knowing energy. This knowledge is wisdom itself. It is begotten of the Source. It is therefore called the Son. Again, God is love, and love is God. This act of loving proceeds from the Father, and through the Son, and returns to its Source. It is known as the Holy Spirit. . . .¹²

Grafton treats the work of the Holy Spirit at some length in *A Journey Godward*, in his advice to priests as “confessors and spiritual guides.” Again, his primary focus is on the Spirit as the binding force of love within the Godhead.

Our Christian life would not be complete without a realization of the work of the Holy Ghost. . . . Now the external work of God, as manifested in Creation is the work of all three Persons of the Blessed Trinity. But by what is theologically called the Doctrine of Appropriation, the Holy Ghost is the uniting and sanctifying principle or energy. His work within the Blessed Trinity is to unite the three in love. . . .

His gifts were those of prevenient and actual grace: *Prevenient*, as going before and calling to penitence; *actual*, as bestowing gifts for the performance of His purposes. But during all this time the Holy Spirit did not dwell in humanity. For humanity was uncleansed from its sin. It was not yet reconciled by the Atonement to God. But at last a home was made for the Spirit. When the pure

¹¹Ibid., P1.12.

¹²WCCG, VIII, 270-271. In similar terms, in the Church Club dinner speech (see n. 9) Grafton paraphrases Thomas Aquinas: “God . . . is pure activity or force. He is Spirit. He is Being. In Him are two internal and eternal activities, viz., knowing and loving. . . . The Being or primal source is known as the Father, the wisdom or knowing which is begotten of the source is called the Son, the love that binds them together is the Holy Ghost” (VII, 314).

In his 1910 Council address Grafton says, speaking this time of the Church, “Only God can make an organism. An organism is something that has life in itself, and can communicate life. Of this spiritual organism, which is the Church, the God-Man, Jesus Christ is the Head and the Holy Ghost is its heart” (VIII, 290).

and sinless humanity of Christ was united to the Divine Nature, the long-sought desire of the Holy Ghost was fulfilled. He could unite humanity to Himself by entering in and dwelling in it. . . . He not only could enter in because the humanity of Christ was sinless, but that humanity, united to the Divine Nature, was capable of receiving His incoming. . . .

The Holy Ghost, having thus dwelt in Christ, without being separated from Him, comes from Him into us who are members of His Body . . . to reveal Christ in us and unite us to Him. . . . The Christian state is thus a supernatural one, and the Christian is filled with a supernatural life . . . the great “Becoming” movement which leads the Christian on to a further and consummated union with God.¹³

Grafton, inevitably, places a special emphasis on the religious life as a particular evidence of the Holy Spirit’s activity in the overall life of the Church. He begins with the descent of the Spirit on the Apostles at Pentecost, as recorded in Acts 2, declaring that the Spirit’s coming “. . . changed their characters. They were all natural men, but supernaturalized. They became Religious.”¹⁴

While the characterization of the Apostles as anything approaching professed religious in the modern sense has no basis, historical or otherwise, the Gospels do affirm that these men formed with Jesus a dedicated band doing God’s work, and received the indwelling of the Holy Spirit at His hands (Jn. 20:22). The implication therefore that

¹³“As a Confessor and Spiritual Guide,” Ibid., IV, VI, 150-151. Grafton is, of course, in saying, “when the . . . humanity of Christ was united to the Divine Nature,” in no way denying the pre-existent reality of Christ as the eternal *Logos*, but referring to the humanity which He assumed at the Incarnation and brought into union with Divinity by the Atonement and Resurrection. His interpretation of the Holy Spirit as the unifying agency between Godhead and humanity in the journey to deification is unmistakable.

Grafton sees the Holy Spirit as the bearer not only of prevenient or sanctifying grace, but of actual grace and virtues as well. “The Holy Spirit comes from Christ’s humanity into His body the Church and into every individual member, uniting them to Christ and revealing Christ to them. By the inbreathing of the Spirit at Baptism, the germs of the theological virtues are given. The Spirit comes to dwell in our spirit, and the three virtues tend to the healing of ignorance in the intellect, weakness in the will, disorder in the affections. . . . The Spirit not only brings home to us the words of Christ but also His miracles and parables with special application to ourselves, ever working in us a deeper conviction of sin, and more complete transformation of the character” (“The Life of the Spirit,” Ibid., III, *A Catholic Atlas*, III, “The Christian Life,” 194).

¹⁴“Meditation I. The Religious Life: Prelude,” Ibid., V, *Vocation: Or the Call of the Divine Master to a Sister’s Life*, 124. This is a bit of a reach—perhaps Grafton is indulging in hyperbole here in order to make a point. But apostolic self-abandonment to follow Christ remains an unmistakable and paramount example, both for professed religious and all Christians.

their example lends spiritual weight to the ideal of the consecrated life in a community, and that dedication to that life involves total surrender to the promptings of the Spirit, rings true, particularly to those immersed in the religious vocation, as Grafton had been for so many years.

3. The Church: Mystical Body and Deifying Community.

IT IS within the Church as a whole, however, as the mystical Body of Christ, that the work of Christ and of the Apostles is really manifest. Christ's Gospel was that of a kingdom, and the Church embodies the kingdom. Christianity, he says, was "not only a truth or influence," but "embodied and organized . . . a walled city, a visible temple, a kingdom."

Happy is that day to any devout soul when the bright vision of the Catholic Church, as the eternal and glorious bride of Christ, dawns upon it. The soul is lifted up out of the narrow and contracted technicalities of theological disputation, and is bathed in the divine sunlight, and with the blessed saints and angels rejoices in God. . . .

Next, it becomes apparent that this city, temple kingdom, was divinely founded and established. It was not a mere voluntary association of believers. It did not spring up like a human-made society. It was . . . an organization founded by Christ. . . .

It does not confine its vision to the Church on earth. It begins with Christ. He is not apart from His Church. He is the head of it. He is the sun of this system of light and life. . . . He is surrounded by His multitudinous cohorts of angels and the innumerable company of His saints. Beside these there is that vast number of souls in the purificative or expectant sphere of advancement. Lastly, there is that small number who are as yet wayfarers, and confined to the earthly state of trial. . . . This is the Church Christ founded and which is to endure throughout eternity. It is a vast spiritual organism whose centre is Christ, whose life-giving atmosphere is the Holy Ghost.¹⁵

This "vast spiritual organism" is the collective manifestation of the Body of Christ in the midst of human society. Its members constitute the Body of Christ in His ongoing

¹⁵Ibid., I, 242-243.

work of bringing all humanity to redemption. Thus, all its members are bound to live together in unity by the ongoing life of Christ in its midst. That unity, says Grafton, is indestructible because it is the essence of belonging to the Body, and because the unity of any body is, he says, “as lasting as the body itself.”

Next it must be admitted that any true principle of unity of a body must be by its own nature as lasting as the body itself. The principle of unity consequently, of a body that is endowed with an eternal existence as the Church is, must be itself eternal. . . . Again, the principle of unity of any body must be as indestructible as the body it proposes to unite in oneness.¹⁶

The unity of the Catholic Church is further determined, not by submission to any single jurisdiction or individual leader, but by unity within its faith and life. The Catholic principle of unity, Grafton declares,

. . . applies to the whole body of the Church wherever any of its members may be, and it will last as long as the Church lasts, and it is in itself indestructible. It is like the unity that binds a family together. A family is one because the same common life is to be found in all its members. . . . Now as the principle of organic unity is the common participation in the nature of Christ, so the living bond of the Church’s union is not submission to the papacy, but to the rule and guidance of the Holy Ghost. . . . The true principle of bond of union in the Church is divine love, the love that is effective through the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. This is seen in Christ’s prayer for union. . . . The bond which holds the Blessed Trinity in unity is the living bond of the Holy Ghost. He was to be the bond of union in his Church.¹⁷

Moreover,

The Holy Spirit dwells in the Church and expresses his mind in the Ecumenical Councils. They define the faith and give the law to the Church. . . . And

¹⁶Ibid., 245. The context of this entire section is Grafton’s repudiation of the principle of Papal ordinary jurisdiction. This undisguised and vehement anti-Romanism recurs throughout his writings. He is highly offended by Papal claims: “In the monarchical principle of the papacy no witness is given to the love of the Father for the Son. The union it enforces is a human-made one of a mechanical order and has nothing of a divine or supernatural character to it” (248). One suspects that, while he had held a view of Anglicanism as *the* true Catholic Church in the West, there may be here a particular reaction to the encyclical *Apostolicae Curae* (Leo XIII, 1896), which appeared early in his episcopate and declared Anglican orders “absolutely null and utterly void” (“*Apostolicae Curae*,” *OxDict*, 74-75). He may also have inherited some of his outlook from Whittingham, whose anti-Romanism DeMille notes (*CMAEC*, 52).

¹⁷Ibid., 245-247.

fellowship is cemented by the divine charity that binds them in loving subordination and co-operation together. Thus was the Church united before the popes claimed absolute dominion. The same bond to-day holds the Russian and the Constantinople churches together. It unites in one communion the various branches of the Anglican Church. It could unite all.¹⁸

The unity brought by the power of the Holy Spirit is essential not only to the Church's life and essence, but to its mission as well. At the Church's heart lies a seminal spiritual imperative: that of winning a fallen world and sinful souls to Christ's saving grace. This, Grafton says, is Catholic Christendom's great gift and charge. It is through the Church Catholic, and its magisterial office, that the Holy Spirit speaks. The Holy Spirit's great work, continually regenerating the Church, empowers its anointed shepherds and faithful members to bring souls to redemption. The Spirit's witness, through the life and example of the Church's members, causes human souls to hear and respond to God's grace (by the life and witness of the redeemed within the Church's fellowship), enabling them to attain salvation and their ultimate destiny of deification in Christ. Recovery of those separated from the Church by schism is an imperative of special import set before the whole Church.

¹⁸Ibid., 248. Grafton had a passion for Christian unity. It seems, however, that here he is indulging in a bit of romantic idealism about the perfection of unity among the Eastern Churches. He had, at the time of the publication of *Christian and Catholic* (1905), returned from his 1903 grand tour of Russia and had engineered the granting of Archbishop Tikhon's D.D. from Nashotah (see n. III.11). It has been this writer's experience that the ethnic Orthodox Churches, despite their unity of faith, are often divided by their ethnic or national consciousnesses, both in the Old World and among immigrant or ethnically enclosed communities in America as well.

Nonetheless, Grafton's vision of the "divine charity uniting all" is the Gospel imperative and an ideal devoutly to be wished. For him, unity is the great virtue, schism the great besetting sin of the Church. The sin of schism he lays directly at Rome's door with heated polemic, drawing a contrast between the struggles of the Church of England and of the Church in France: "The two contests differ radically. The English Church is trying to free herself in things spiritual from State control, while the papacy is trying to recover her lost temporal sovereignty. . . . The English Church is struggling to resume her spiritual rights; the papacy is plotting to regain her earthly sovereignty. . . . Moreover, as the sin of schism lies with that party that compels withdrawal, by demanding uncatholic or uncanonical terms of communion, the Church of Rome is in schism everywhere. She is in schism in the city of Rome, though not equally and for the same reasons that she is in London . . . while the Anglican Church is succeeding in recovering the faith as once delivered, and by all everywhere received, the Romans by late additions and the turning of what were once acknowledged to be but opinions into dogmas of the faith, are failing in holding fast to it" (360-361).

O! dear Brethren; I feel most keenly that it is not by word or by argument that we can lure our separated brethren into the Fold. No! It can only be by our lives as living examples of the marvelous truths and grace which we possess. O! let us go forth to live the Catholic Faith in union with our Blessed Lord, and then the Holy Ghost will so speak through us that many shall say, "We will go with you, for we see that you can do us good."¹⁹

The Church is also the mediator and interpreter of Scripture and the message of redemption contained in it. Grafton's reverence for, continual quotation of, and teaching from Scripture, is obvious; but appeal to the authority of, or analytical references to Scripture are *per se* few. In fact there is little if any apologetic for or specific writing *about* the Bible in the *Works* at all, save to reassert the teaching and tradition of the Church Catholic. He insists that it is the authority and duty of the Church, not of individual Christians, to interpret Scripture, and warns particularly against the general Protestant tendency toward individual Biblical interpretation and its inevitable division of the Christian community. By indulging their own opinions, they place themselves outside the hegemony of the Church Catholic, their opinions worthless in formulation of doctrine.

Rejecting the Church's authority and traditions and governing themselves by the individual interpretation of the Scriptures, they became hopelessly divided into various sects, holding beliefs which are absolutely contradictory."²⁰

¹⁹Ibid., VIII, 252-253. Council Address, 1908. The theme of this part of the address was "The Divisions in the Christian Church." Again, Grafton inveighs heavily against Romanism (and against Puritanism which, he says, gave birth to sectarianism, as well). In fact, he seems to lament the Reformation's having occurred at all; but he lays blame squarely on the Roman Church and the claims of a "monarchical" Papacy.

Grafton's particular anti-Roman bias is undisguised and, as has been said, apparent throughout his writings. "I would not deny that the Reformation was forced on by the evils existing in the Latin Church. . . . In England, the continuity of the Church and the Catholic Faith, the priesthood and the sacraments, were [*sic*] preserved. . . . The Church found herself, however, assaulted by Puritanism, which soon expressed itself in various sects. Persons who were once members of the Church . . . formed sectarian bodies by themselves and are known as Independents or Congregationalists, Unitarians, Baptists, Methodists, and others" (250-251).

²⁰Ibid., 251. "But breaking away from the authority of the Church, they took the position that the Bible, and the Bible alone, was the sole basis of the faith." Here Grafton makes a rather unfortunate remark: "The fact that printing was not invented till [*sic*] the fifteenth century, and therefore it could not have been in the hands of the people generally, is one proof that Christ did not intend that His religion should be so known." Grafton is decrying Biblical fundamentalism, but the reference to printing seems to the writer an oblique and convoluted bit of reasoning, lacking both historical perspective and logic. He is

The Church, finally, militant, expectant, and triumphant is one organism, formed by Christ through the power of the Holy Spirit, and bound together, whether on earth, in paradise, or in heaven, by “the principle [of] . . . its united action, and that principle is love.”²¹ The faithful in each of these dimensions of the Church’s life have a duty concerning the others, for the Church is “one body” (I Cor. 12:13), and “all are one in Christ” (Gal. 3:28). The love of Christ is the binding force.

Hence it is the duty of the bishops to voice the teaching of the solidarity of the episcopate, as heard from the beginning, and not to give out as authoritative their own private opinions . . . it is the duty of the laity to listen to their bishops so speaking to them, and obey their godly admonitions . . . and so to “press on the kingdom. . . .”

Our duty to the Church expectant is to pray for the faithful departed. . . . The soul that after death happily finds itself among the saved is secured from falling away . . . [but] . . . it must be purified by God’s disciplinary and loving remedial processes. In this it is aided by the offering of the holy sacrifice and the suffrages of the faithful. . . .

What is our duty to the Church triumphant and the saints in glory? . . . love expresses itself in the Church by the mutual prayers of all the members for one another. There can be no such thing as common prayer between Christians without mutual prayer. No Christian can say the Lord’s Prayer for himself alone, for that prayer embraces in its petition, “Thy kingdom come,” not only himself and his brethren on earth, but even the Mother of God and all the saints. So the

not advocating withholding the Bible from the laity, certainly, but his words may for some be susceptible of that impression. The statement simply is unworthy of him, both as a scholar and pastor, and he has, one thinks, badly misspoken himself.

He further says that “the private opinions or wishes of the reformers are absolutely worthless in determining what morally or legally is the teaching of our Church. Legally, for any law enacted by a body of men cannot be interpreted by the private intentions or opinions of its framers, but by its words alone. Morally, for two reasons: those who compiled our formularies were, unlike an ordinary body of legislators, an ecclesiastical one, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, who used them to express His mind and not their own. Again, morally, for if the Church is Catholic as she claims to be (and to doubt it would prove us disloyal), we are bound in honor to her to interpret her prayer-book and formularies in accordance with the teaching of the whole body of Christ” (Ibid.). Here is Grafton’s lawyer’s mind at work. His words, obviously, are aimed at “dissenters” or “nonconformists,” who formulated their own systems of belief, not at the classical Anglican divines.

²¹Ibid., 253. “For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body . . . and all have been made to drink into one Spirit” (I Cor. 12:13). “For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ . . . ye are all one in Christ Jesus” (Gal. 3:27-28). Also, from the Letter to the Romans: “For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life . . . nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord” (Rom. 8:38-39). Since all are one in Christ, they cannot be separated one from another, any more than they can be separated from God’s love in Christ.

saints in their desire for the increase of Christ's kingdom pray for us, and we, desirous of their increase in bliss, pray for them.²²

Grafton's sentiment here expresses explicitly and evocatively the Church as embodying the Divine love, pervading all dimensions of her life, both in life and in death. It binds together unbreakably all those found in Christ, whether on earth, in paradise, or in heaven, in one Body, and from that communion of love spring the spirit of prayer and acts of charity—that *agápe* that flows from the heart of God to all His creation.

4. The Sacraments: Means of Grace and Participation in Christ.

GRAFTON DEVOTES a major part of the *Works* to the Sacraments. He sees them as the means of receiving the benefits of Christ's Passion and Resurrection, integral to the living of the Christian life and to the attainment of holiness and complete union with God.

Christian sacraments do “effect what they figure,” because in their several ways they are the means whereby the Holy Spirit applies to us the benefits of Christ's victory over death and of His heavenly priesthood.

The suitability of the sacramental method of imparting grace is certain, because (a) man is by nature unable to lay hold of the invisible except by the visible; (b) the body as well as the soul is involved in the salvation to which sacraments minister; (c) the immediate heavenly source of grace for us is the glorified Manhood of Christ, consisting still of body and spirit. The sacraments presuppose, and are adapted to the purpose of securing and fostering, our mystical union with Christ, in the nature which he assumed of the Blessed Virgin. In this

²²Ibid., 251-253. The last comment shows something of Grafton's understanding of Orthodox doctrine on the dead. It sounds perhaps a little ambiguous to western ears, seeming to imply that the saints *need* the prayers of the faithful. According to western Catholic doctrine, being glorified and enjoying the beatific vision, they strictly are no longer in such need, full perfection having been attained. But, “St. Thomas argues that holy souls gravitate to the source of their holiness, and enjoy the beatific vision as soon as they become perfect, although their perfect consummation and bliss is delayed until the reunion of soul and body in the resurrection” (*Summa*, III, suppl. lxix, 2; xciii, 1. Francis J. Hall, *Theological Outlines*, 3rd ed., rev. F.H. Hallock. New York: Morehouse-Barlow Co., 1933, 287). In the Orthodox tradition, the canonization ceremony for a saint includes both the final *parastása* (prayer service for the dead) and the first *akathistos* (praise service in honor of the new saint). The Orthodox doctrine seems somewhat less strictly defined than in the West. There is less sense of separation of the saints in heaven from souls on earth or in paradise, though the souls in paradise, saved undoubtedly, have not yet attained the beatific vision. St. Epiphanius says, “And the souls of the righteous will also rest in the Intermediate Region—for nothing soulish can enter the Pleroma” (*The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis*, Book I, (Sects 1-46), Section II, 21.11, trans. Frank Williams. Leiden, New York, K'n: E.J. Brill, 1997, 177).

aspect they are frequently described as constituting an “extension of the Incarnation.”²³

More than that, he says, they are also channels of Divine grace and power which bring the Christian soul to its ultimate deified reality as partakers of the Divine nature. Unlike the ordinances of Israel, which could not convey grace, Christ “instituted sacraments which were to convey grace and unite us to Himself.”

There are channels of grace. By these we are united to Christ, and the Christ Life flows into us. They are communications of the Precious Blood, of the power of the Resurrection; by them we are made sons of God, partakers of the Divine Nature, and grow up by their power into the perfect man, into the fulness of the stature of Christ.²⁴

In *Christian and Catholic* and *A Catholic Atlas* he deals also with the technical and canonical aspects of the Sacraments (form, matter, minister, etc.). These, however, do not fall within the scope of the present project, save as they may touch on a specific question of spiritual efficacy.

²³“The Sacramental System,” *Ibid.*, I, 249. Grafton here footnotes heavily from Thomas Aquinas (*Summa*, III, lx, lxx; also Hooker, *EccIPol*, V, lvii).

Hooker says (in the section cited), “Sacraments, by reason of their mixed nature, are more diversely interpreted and disputed of than any other part of religion besides. . . . But their chiefest force and virtue consisteth not herein so much as in that they are heavenly ceremonies . . . first, as marks whereby to know when God doth impart the vital or saving grace of Christ unto all that are capable thereof, and secondly as means conditional which God requireth in them unto whom he imparteth grace. Sith God in himself is invisible, and cannot by us be discerned working, therefore it seemeth good in the eyes of his heavenly wisdom, that men . . . should take notice of his glorious presence, he giveth them some plain and sensible token whereby to know what they cannot see. . . . In like manner it is so with us. Christ and his Holy Spirit with all their blessed effects, though entering into the soul of man we are not able to apprehend or express how, do notwithstanding give notice of the times when they use to make their access, because it pleaseth Almighty God to communicate by sensible means those blessings which are incomprehensible. . . . Seeing therefore that grace is a consequent of sacraments, a thing which accompanieth them as their end, a benefit which he that hath receiveth from God himself the author of sacraments . . . it may be hereby both understood that sacraments are necessary, and that the manner of their necessity to life supernatural is not in all respects as food unto natural life. . . .” (*EccIPol*, V, lvii, 2-4; *WRH*, II, 256-257).

Grafton’s analysis is reminiscent of the Prayer Book Catechism definition of a Sacrament as “an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us; ordained by Christ himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof” (*Book of Common Prayer* (PECUSA) 1789. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1868, 249; *Do.* 1892. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1893, 270).

²⁴Sermon, “The Law and Grace,” *Ibid.*, VIII, 321.

Baptism and Confirmation.

GRAFTON'S THOUGHT on Baptism and Confirmation will be examined together, as they were originally one rite. He treats Baptism, first of all, as an "extension of the Incarnation." It is the first sustainer of Gospel truth and Trinitarian faith.

He is to Israel the great I AM. He is to Christians, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. For the effective preservation of this truth our Lord connected it with the initial sacrament of Baptism.²⁵

Grafton clearly stands within Catholic tradition by his insistence on the doctrine of Baptismal regeneration which, he says, was highly controversial in the Church during the nineteenth century, particularly at the rise of the Oxford Movement.

Christianity has its objective and its subjective side. While the Sacraments are means through which Christ acts and bestows His gifts, faith and repentance are the subjective and necessary conditions for their profitable reception.

The controversy in England and America began to be very fierce. . . . The contest first raged about the doctrine of the Apostolic Succession, and the remission of sins in Baptism. . . .

The doctrine of baptismal regeneration was also clearly stated, for after every baptism the minister gives thanks to God that "this person is regenerate." The Articles were shown by the Tractarians, and especially by "Tract 90," to be patient, in their true literal and historical meaning, of a Catholic Interpretation . . . and the new birth from above was ever associated, in Holy Scripture, with the one act of water and the Spirit.²⁶

²⁵Ibid., VIII, 271. Council Address, 1909. The address focuses on the fundamental truths of the faith as taught by the Episcopal Church (and moral issues such as marital indissolubility). Baptism is presented here as connected to faith in the Triune Godhead. Recitation of credal faith in the Trinity has been part of the Baptismal liturgy from earliest times, first recorded in the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus where the Creed was recited in three parts at the three immersions (Hippolytus, XXI; E.C. Whitaker, *Documents of the Baptismal Liturgy*. London: SPCK, 1970, 5-6.

²⁶"Can These Bones Live?" Ibid., IV, 74-75. The Low Church party long denied the doctrine and the controversy led, among other particulars (which Grafton mentions), to the formation (1873) of the "Reformed Episcopal Church," whose official formularies appear to this day to deny baptismal regeneration. Grafton goes on to say, "The advances . . . became more and more distasteful to the extreme low churchmen. They saw, however, at last, and admitted, that the high church doctrines had support in the Book of Common Prayer. They said it contained 'Romish germs.' They admitted that it taught Baptismal Regeneration. One of their leaders explained how he came to this conclusion . . . on the occasion of his administering baptism privately, he saw that no sponsors were required, and the Church in her prayers stated the same truth, that the person was regenerate" (Ibid., 81).

Baptism, regenerating by “the one act of water and the Spirit,” carries with it God’s authentic promise of deification. By making us “children of God and heirs of the kingdom of heaven,” it accomplishes many gifts and benefits within and for the baptized. Grafton gives a detailed overview in *Christian and Catholic*, giving implications of God’s deifying process.

Conversion is the turning of man to God. Remission of sin in baptism is the gift of God to man.

In respect of our past, it heals the wounds of inherited or original sin, and remits all our actual sins. . . . This gift of God is bestowed upon us for the merits of Christ by the operation of the Holy Ghost. . . .

As related to the present time; by baptism we are born again, or “born from above.” . . . We are begotten anew by the Holy Spirit, which, blowing where it listeth, works the soul’s conversion; and . . . we receive a new nature by our incorporation into Christ. “For as many of you as were baptized unto Christ did put on Christ.” We discern here a distinction between our relation to God by nature and that formed by baptism. By the act of creation we are God’s creatures; by baptism we are the sons of God as members of Christ . . . by which we are made members of Christ and so children of God.

Next as to the future . . . a prospect is opened before us of attaining to the further lights of the beatific vision of God. We are made children of the light. We are incorporated into this new kingdom as living stones of a living temple. And so we are not merely born into and immersed in it, but it is also in us.²⁷

Baptism, however, is only the first step in the salvific process. Conversion of life must follow, and this Grafton realizes full well. One cannot rest upon one’s Baptism and expect any true growth in holiness or into the likeness of God. One of Grafton’s greatest criticisms of the High Church movement was their making the sacramental act of

²⁷“The Seven Mysteries,” *Ibid.*, I, 219-222. Grafton’s comment, “Conversion is the turning of man to God. Remission of sin in baptism is the gift of God to man” seems in part imprecise, or incomplete. Conversion is the turning of man to God, certainly; but conversion is also in itself a gift of God, springing from His love and, as Augustine implies, prodding human souls with restlessness “until they rest in Thee.” Paul tells the Athenians, “[God] hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation; that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him, though he be not far away from every one of us: For in him we live, and move, and have our being” (Acts 17:26-28). The process is God’s initiative first to last; as Worsley reminds us, “Justification [is] the attitude of God towards us which makes our efforts for sanctification possible” (*Theology of the Church of England*, X, iv-v; 241-242; see n. I.4).

Baptism the “core and apparent consummation of the Gospel system . . . practically [omitting] the need of conversion.”

They largely rejected the necessity of being convicted of sin, and the work of the Spirit, and of salvation by Christ’s cross and passion, and of a conscious acceptance by Him. Indeed, in cases, they rejected it as Methodism. I remember being taken to task for preaching it.

But baptism, without a vitalized union with Christ, could not save men. Consequently their own spiritual life and perceptions declined. In the developments that succeeded, they easily fell under the influence of the new rationalizing, easy-going, and popular Broad Church system.²⁸

Thus, he posits the need for an ongoing, synergistic *askesis*, as the soul works together with God toward growth in holiness of life and transformation of the soul into the Divine image and participation in the Divine nature.

The next step in the Christian life is the impartation of the gifts of the Holy Spirit. In the West, this is embodied in the sacrament of Confirmation. As is commonly known, the laying-on of hands/anointing with chrism was originally an integral part of the baptismal rite (and is still the norm in the East). But it was seen as a separate rite as early as Tertullian and Cyprian, and this had become universal in the West by the fourth century, when bishops were no longer able to baptize personally all the faithful under their care.²⁹

Grafton counts Confirmation as “the second Gospel mystery” and says it belongs to the Apostolic tradition.

²⁸Ibid., VII, 235-236. Letter to the Editor of *The Southern Churchman*, 04.10.1906. Grafton begins by blessing the publication for its defense of the doctrine of the Virgin Birth. After the quotation above he adds, “I have always thought that the old Evangelicals and the conservative High Churchmen were agreed in essentials more than they realized. The one is drawn more to the subjective, the other to the objective, side of the Gospel revelation. They are, however, reconcilable.” Nonetheless, he admits he is likely to be considered an “extremist” by the *Southern Churchman* editors! One is reminded of the dispute between the *Southern Churchman*’s editors and Bishop Whittingham over Baptismal regeneration many years previously (see n. III.27).

²⁹“Confirmation,” *OxDict*, 327-328.

It belongs to the general Apostolic ministrations of laying on of hands, which is spoken of as one of the principles of the doctrine of Christ.

It is also referred to as an anointing or unction. “Ye have an unction from the Holy One and ye know all things. And the anointing which ye have received of Him abideth in you. . . .”

Again, it is known as the seal of the Lord. “Now He which stablisheth us with you in Christ (by baptism) and hath anointed us is God; who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts.”³⁰

He draws a distinction between the charisms of Baptism and Confirmation. They are both rooted in the indwelling of the Spirit, but bear different significances. Baptism is “the sacrament of our new birth in Christ,” he says, conferring sanctifying grace and the presence of the Holy Spirit to make souls partakers of the humanity of Christ; whereas Confirmation is “a sacrament of the gifts of the Spirit,” conferring participation in the royal priesthood of Christ and “our mission to work for Christ in the world.”

We receive in baptism both sanctifying grace and the Holy Spirit. Sanctifying grace, which is necessary for our justification, the Holy Spirit, who unites us to Christ. If we did not receive the Holy Spirit then confirmation would be a sacrament necessary to salvation. We pray in the baptismal office, “Give thy Holy Spirit to this infant,” and what we pray for, that we believe we receive.

Confirmation . . . does not merely increase the gifts received in baptism. . . . So gifts, different in kind, are bestowed by confirmation. Born anew in baptism and made a child of God, in confirmation we are ordained and receive our first degree of priesthood and kingship. All the laity are made kings and priests unto God. . . .

In confirmation we are also sealed and receive a character . . . by the power of the Spirit we are *sealed* . . . like unto the giving a person a ring to wear as a token of friendship, or the impressing of the ring engraved with its arms upon the wax. Confirmation imprints an ineffaceable character on the soul.³¹

³⁰“The Seven Mysteries,” *WCCG*, I, 223.

³¹*Ibid.*, 225. The reference to the indelible character “like unto . . . the impressing of the ring engraved with its arms upon the wax” recalls Maximos the Confessor’s typology of the soul “softened like wax and, receiving the impress and stamp of divine realities, [becoming] ‘in spirit the dwelling-place of God’” (*Philokalia*, II, 116; see n. II.8). The “impressing of the ring upon the wax” is thus a mark of the Divine character, which not only empowers the Christian soul as king and priest but also brings it along the path of holiness to its ultimate union with God.

Grafton also sees Confirmation as a gift to forestall the temptations of adolescence, the time of life in which the sacrament is commonly administered. He is aware of the inevitability of struggle for holiness of life, and commends Confirmation as a gift of God through the Church, which strengthens the soul in its journey.

Last the Church trains souls in sanctity, and points them to the way of perfection. . . . Just at the time when temptations begin to invade the youthful soul, she comes with the gift of the Holy Ghost in Confirmation. She does not leave the young to wander as they will without her care, hoping that in some way they may be converted, but she trains them up as baptized children of the Lord. She comes to the adults who have learned to feel their weakness or failure or sins. . . .³²

Confession.

GRAFTON CONSIDERS sacramental Confession as equally vital, with Baptism and Confirmation, to the attainment of holiness, much as Taylor does. Baptism confers sanctifying grace and washes away original sin. Confirmation confers special marks of grace and strengthening against actual sin and the mark of the universal priesthood of believers. Confession brings remission of actual sin and restoration to the state of grace.

The third gospel mystery is known in Eastern and Western Christendom as the sacrament of penitence. It is the sacrament of restoration. It restores to the soul the spiritual life lost or injured by sin. . . . The three acts of penitence which may be regarded as the matter, are contrition, confession, and satisfaction or amendment. The absolution of the priest is the form. Together these signify and

³²Sermon, "Some Characteristics of the Episcopal Church," *Ibid.*, VIII, 407. Grafton does not explicitly address the matter of adult confirmands, but one assumes that he realizes full well the efficacy of the Sacrament for adults as well as for adolescents. In fact he does speak (referring specifically to sacramental Confession) of the Church also coming "to the adults who have learned to feel their weakness or failure or sins with the absolving grace of the Precious Blood" (*Ibid.*). We perceive in his thinking an interconnection of Baptism, Confirmation, and Confession in the purging away of the old life and growth in the new, a theme common in most Catholic dogmatic and mystical writings.

We remember also that when Grafton was confirmed he was already at an "age of discretion" and, as he said, came to Confirmation "battling with the ordinary problems of life [and] through my own failures," hard upon the illness which had forced his withdrawal from Phillips-Andover (see n. III.13). The illness may, one thinks, have impressed itself on his mind as a symptom of other, deeper personal problems, or perhaps as a sign of Divine judgment (?).

effect the sinner's reconciliation with God; his spiritual resurrection and restoration in grace.³³

The first necessity in the sacrament, Grafton asserts, is the honest facing of sin, horror of its reality, and sincere contrition with purpose of amendment. Contrition comes, he says, by knowledge of God's love and the soul's seeing itself in the light of that love.

Contrition demands first a knowledge of God's love to us in Christ, and a knowledge of ourselves. This latter can only be obtained by self-examination and prayer. We must ask God to show us ourselves and Himself. . . . We must examine ourselves in the light of God's commandments, the seven deadly sins, the precepts of the Gospel, the duties of our station, our privileged weaknesses and faults. We must try to see ourselves in the light of God's justice, holiness, and of His love, for, out of His love, who could bear so ghastly a sight?

Contrition combines sorrow for having offended God with a fear and hatred of sin. . . . For contrition must be an act of the heart and will, and be inspired by motives based on religion. There must also be with our sorrow a fear and hatred of sin; a fear, because our nature is so composite, our hearts are so self-deceiving, temptation is so subtle, our falls have been so many. Because also we grow in the love of God just in proportion as we grow in the hatred of sin; because this hatred develops the strength of will, enabling us to contend successfully with this deadly enemy.³⁴

Grafton also stresses the need for the formal step of confessing sin. The priesthood is given the authority to dispense Divine forgiveness and ecclesiastical pardon, since forgiveness has both individual and ecclesiastical implications. Confession is always made to God, "in the person of Jesus Christ, for to Him all judgment has been

³³"The Seven Mysteries," *Ibid.*, I, 226.

³⁴*Ibid.*, 226-227. This recalls Taylor's counsel to confessors: "He that confesseth his sin to the minister of religion, must be sure to express all the great lines of his folly" and, "the holy man that ministers to his repentance . . . must not without great cause lessen the shame of the repenting man. . . . For whoso lessens the shame, lessens also the hatred of sin. . . ." (*Jeremy Taylor: Selected Works*, 433; see n. II.58). Examination of conscience, rightly practiced, does bring a certain "ghastly sight," and if the Christian perceives himself in the light of God's perfection, a pain and "hatred of sin" must ensue if true repentance, real remission and determination of amendment of life are to follow. The writer is reminded of an old Act of Contrition: ". . . I detest all my sins, because I fear the loss of heaven and the pains of hell, but most of all, because they have offended Thee, my God, Who art all good and deserving of all my love." Grafton's "deadly enemy" is sin itself, to be sure; but, one thinks, he regards the devil as a more profound enemy, the author of sin.

committed,” and to the ministers of the Church who “can communicate to us His pardoning grace.”³⁵

Penitence and confession, however, are not a matter of condemnation or punishment. They are rather God’s instruments, in His love, for restoring the fallen soul to a state of grace and redirecting it on the road to sanctity. “Souls are burdened,” as Pusey says, and Grafton sees in the sacrament of Confession the picture of the Good Shepherd,

. . . seeking His wandering sheep. He comes to gather it up, trembling and with bleeding feet, and take it in His arms and bear it back to the fold. No sinner is so vile but the Sacred Heart is open to him; no sins are so black that the precious blood cannot cleanse. The reason given why frequent communions often do not advance the soul more, is that persons venture into the King’s presence uncleaned and unabsolved. . . . The tribunal of penitence is the covenanted seat of mercy. It is the way of rehabilitation: “Take away his filthy garments and give him a change of raiment.”³⁶

³⁵Ibid., 228. The upshot of this dynamic lies precisely in the Church’s being the mystical Body of Christ. There are both individual and corporate ramifications and consequences to sin and, as Grafton says, “Forgiveness of sins has reference both to sin in its relation to God and in its relation to the Church’s discipline and to those whom we have injured” (Ibid.). Paul tells the Corinthians, “And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honoured, all the members rejoice with it” (I Cor. 12:26), and, “Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular” (12:27). It must follow then that sin affects adversely not only the individual sinner, but the general health of the Body as well, since the members are bound inextricably together in one communion and fellowship under the headship and lordship of Christ.

There is arguably, in fact, for the Christian no such thing as a completely “private sin”; we by our sin, however secretly done, bring spiritual injury to the life and effectiveness of the Body corporately and thus to our fellow Christians individually, and indeed, it may be said, *cosmic* injury to all of creation.

³⁶Ibid., 229. He also says in *A Journey Godward*, “The power [to absolve from sin] was extended through all time, for, since Christians are always liable to fall into sin, there is just as much need for their comfort and assurance now as in the days of the Apostles. . . . While perfect contrition of the baptized brings forgiveness, absolution by the priest brings assurance plainly, and fortifies the soul against further fall” (“As a Confessor and Spiritual Guide, Ibid., IV, 145). Further, “No matter how obdurate and rebellious, how old in sin, how inveterate in relapses, the abounding mercy persistently offers pardon. . . . It was not to be their privilege only who knelt at His feet to hear His life-giving word, ‘Son, daughter, thy sins be forgiven thee,’ but everywhere, until the end of time, penitents should have given them by Christ, speaking through His priests, the same blessed assurance of His pardon” (146-147; see also n. IV.37). This is a reassuring comfort to those struggling with the burden of old sins, or those often repeated, and recalls Christ’s word, “Neither do I condemn thee: go, and sin no more” (Jn. 8:11). It also recalls Pusey’s defense of the sacrament in regard to those long tormented, and his urging its allowance in ordinary life, not just in times of major or fatal illness (see n. IV.14). The “tribunal of penitence” recalls Taylor’s “court Christian” (see n. II.50).

This finding, healing, and restoring work of Christ is not, however, without pain. It is a probing and cleansing work that Christ works upon the soul, before it can be restored and redirected. Restoration by penitence, Grafton says, is also a prerequisite if the Christian is to approach Christ in the Eucharist and receive His life-giving nurture; Baptism and Absolution provide “the wedding garment” in the Christian’s preparation for receiving Our Lord in the Eucharist, without which the soul stands in peril.

In this holy mystery Christ comes seeking us. As if we were His only care, He makes search for us as the Good Shepherd. He comes to find us in our wandering . . . and in His own arms to bear us safely back to the Fold. He comes as the good Samaritan to save us, robbed and wounded and ready to perish. But ere He bears us to the shelter and care of the Inn He first probes and cleanses our wounds, and pours in the oil and wine, and setting us on His own beast, reconciles us to Himself. We are wanderers from Jerusalem, and Christ must come and walk beside us and light again the torch of Faith in our hearts ere He can enter in and abide with us and we discern Him in the breaking of bread.³⁷

He says that sacramental Confession is “the specific for mortal sins. It is the life preserver after shipwreck . . . the renewal of energy to the running athlete.”³⁸

Holy Unction.

HOLY UNCTION contains specific and clear parallels with sacramental Confession.

“As Penitence is concerning with the healing of the soul, unction is concerned primarily

³⁷“As a Confessor and Spiritual Guide,” *Ibid.*, IV, 147. Grafton in all his arguments presupposes the goodness of God and His constant care for the soul’s wellbeing, not Divine judgment or the threat of damnation. In this he clearly reflects the “Predestination to Life . . . the everlasting purpose of God,” as stated in Article XVII (see n. II.33) and as implied in the majority of mainstream Anglican thinkers.

³⁸“Penance, or Spiritual Resurrection,” *Ibid.*, *A Catholic Atlas*, II, 119. Grafton counsels that confession “should be resorted to immediately after a fall into any mortal or grievous sin” (119) and that “This sacrament of loving mercy differs from the others in that the recipient must not only put no barrier in the way of its reception, but must actively co-operate with it” (118). This is an ascetic imperative, consistent with the need to join in synergy with God in the salvific and sanctifying process. It is not, however, dependent upon works, but on grace; for finally, “If . . . Christ has made a full satisfaction to God for our sins, no debt can remain in the absolved, due to the justice of God for the wrong done Himself. As the satisfaction of Divine Justice, even for a single sin, requires a reparation of infinite value, only the God-Man can make it, and as His acts are of infinite value the satisfaction must have been complete” (116)—

with the healing of the body.”³⁹ For Grafton the importance of this sacrament is rooted in the body as “the tabernacle of the soul . . . the garden in which the soul dwells.”

We are placed in it to take care of it, to rule over it, and keep it in subjection. It is to be our servant, not our master. By the discipline thus imposed our souls are trained in Christian knighthood. Our bodies being the temples of the Holy Ghost, we stand guard over His honor who trusts Himself to our care. . . . But the body is not only to be kept under the sceptre of the will. It must be cared for in its weakness, disorder, and pain. “A merciful man,” said S. Francis, speaking of the body, “must be merciful to his own beast.” The body and its soul must, however, cease to be companions. We all have to pass through the dark valley and bear its sorrow.⁴⁰

Healing is one of the charisms of the Holy Spirit given the Church at Pentecost. Grafton cites both the Gospel of Mark and the Epistle of James as sources of authority for the implementing of the sacrament, but stresses that spiritual dangers accompany searching out those with “miraculous powers;” rather, he says, the sick were “to send for the elders or priests.”

So far as the care of the body was concerned no specially gifted person was necessary. Let the faithful trust themselves to the prayers of the ordained priesthood. The ordained elder was a righteous man whom God would hear just as He did His prophet Elijah. The order taken by the Apostles was to do away with the excitement of miracle or faith healing, and substitute a regular method promulgated by the Church.⁴¹

even though “It delivers us from eternal punishment, but not from the temporal consequences of our sins” (117) and temporal punishment (penance, restitution, etc.) may be required as part of the ascetical struggle.

³⁹“The Seven Mysteries,” *Ibid.*, I, 230.

⁴⁰*Ibid.* The stress on the aspect of care for the body here is notable, and has not, as we know, always been common in ascetical thought, in which “discipline of the body” often implied physical self-denial if not physical punishment (flagellation, sleep deprivation, rigorous fasting, etc.). In light of Grafton’s own physical and medical problems, certainly he speaks from his own experience, and with a remarkable degree of concern, even tenderness.

⁴¹*Ibid.*, 231. Grafton appears generally skeptical of any healing charism outside the purview of the Church’s ordained ministry and official formularies. The principal worry he evinces is of the “excitement of miracle or faith healing” causing a spiritual distraction, not only from decency and good order, but in fact from the needed focus of attention on Christ and from the soul’s immediate need and ultimate goal of union with Him through and with His mystical Body.

Healing of the body, Grafton says, is connected to the Christian's spiritual state. The body and soul are bound together, thus the priest of the Church has a primary rôle in the care of and ministrations to the sick. Physical sickness is often rooted in spiritual sickness. The priest is needed to care, first of all, for the soul's health.

The priest could deal with the soul as a faith-healing or miracle-working layman could not. If the body was to be cured, the first and most important thing for its recovery was to bring the soul into harmony with God. So the sick was to make his confession, and prayer was to be made over him, and then he was to be anointed. The peace and healing of the soul would aid in the healing of the body.⁴²

Finally, Grafton tells us, this sacrament's effects are part of God's plan and the working of Christ for the sanctification of the soul, its final preparation for entry into eternal union with God.

The effects are forgiveness, if aught remains unforgiven; the restoration to health, if it is for the soul's good or the benefit of Holy Church; the support of the soul in its passing; the establishing it in its hold on Christ; the giving it a victory over its last temptations; the casting out all fear by love; and bestowing a final adornment for presentation at the Court of the Great King.⁴³

Holy Orders and Matrimony.

GRAFTON ADDRESSES Holy Orders and Matrimony together because of their similar rôles and vital importance in the safeguarding of the fabric both of Church and society. Both sacraments are equally indispensable to ecclesial and societal life and function. They also are Divinely ordained sacramental tools for salvation and sanctification, as

⁴²Ibid., 232. Again, the primary attention is on the soul's union with God. The link drawn between forgiveness and healing (anointing *with* confession and absolution) points up the relationship of sin to sickness.

⁴³"Holy Unction," Ibid., III, 130. Note Grafton's linking of the restoration of health to the good of the Church, rather than solely to that of the individual. Again, we perceive a connectedness of the individual to the rest of the mystical Body.

they share spiritually and (in marriage) physically in the mystery of God's creating and redeeming work.

Holy order is for the generation and preservation of the priesthood. Marriage was ordained for that of the race. Holy order is indispensable to the existence of the Church, marriage to that of society. By holy order a spiritual paternity is established between priest and people; by marriage a natural one between parent and children. Order provides for the Church's spiritual needs; marriage for the support of the family's natural wants. Holy order secures to the Church good government; marriage is for the preservation in society of good morals.⁴⁴

Holy Orders, especially the ministerial priesthood, has its origin and *raison d'être* in the anointed high priesthood of Christ Himself. "When the great Messiah should come," Grafton says, "he would be at once a prophet, priest, and king."

"The Lord God," so the great lawgiver declared, "will raise up unto thee a prophet like unto me, unto whom ye shall hearken (Deut. 18:15)." "He shall be a priest," said Zechariah (Zech. 6:13), and king. "Behold thy king cometh unto thee: He is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass (Zech. 9:9)."

Into the threefold office of Messiahship Jesus was anointed. He took not upon Himself this honor, but was called by God by a formal consecration, as was Aaron. . . . Jesus was sealed from on high. . . . At His baptism Jesus was anointed with the Spirit as the Messiah or Christ. . . .

As God He touches the divine life, for He is of one substance with it. As man He touches the side of creation, with which by His incarnation He has identified Himself. There is no other possible way of our entering into and being made partakers of the divine life, and so attaining to eternal bliss, saved by an incorporation into Christ, who is the living way.⁴⁵

Grafton's implication is very clear: If participation in the Divine nature demands "incorporation into Christ," this must include incorporation into His *sacerdotium*.

⁴⁴"The Seven Mysteries," *Ibid.*, I, 233. Grafton here posits an ideal view of both sacraments. He is undoubtedly aware that there are both bad clerics and hierarchs and bad marital partners and situations, both of which result in abuses and corruption and which, at the most extreme, are destructive of faith and, indeed, of human life itself. It is here, however, possible to perceive his sense of the redemptive quality in both sacraments as they are lived out "in the Lord," and their interconnection with the other sacraments and the general plan and path to holiness.

⁴⁵"The Christian Ministry," *Ibid.*, 171-172. He also says, "As the Messiah, He is the anointed one, exercising the three offices of prophet, priest, and king."

Indeed, this implication resonates with the clear statement of John the Divine that Christ “hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father” (Rev. 1:5-6). All Christians, whether ministerially ordained or not, share in the high-priestly *character* of Christ.

The Church is the mystical body of Christ, and as such is identified with His priesthood and sacrifice. . . . So it is said of them, “they shall be priests of God and of Christ (Rev. 20:6).” Thus from the oneness of the Church with Christ, her Head, comes her priestly character.⁴⁶

The sacramental priesthood, however, has a particular character, though derivative from the general priestly character of the whole Church, a particular task and burden, and a particular and distinctive charism. Unlike secular organizations, Grafton says, the Church “is an organism welded into oneness by the indwelling Spirit.”

It possesses as such that which it has received from Christ and acts in its corporate capacity. In her highest act of worship she presents Christ as her all-sufficient oblation, and offers herself up as a living victim in union with Him. Sacrifice is the law and means of her union with God, and priesthood is essential to it. . . . If then the head of the Church is our high priest, and the Church is a body of priests, it follows that the officers of the body would be priests . . . clothed with all the special powers of priesthood which their offices required . . . to be teachers, rulers, and priests, under Him; and . . . were to transmit their authority to others.⁴⁷

It is in the exercise of spiritual ministry, in the priestly work of reconciling, absolving, healing, and blessing, but above all in the rite of sacrifice (i.e., the Eucharist), that Grafton sees explicit evidence of Christ’s own work of sanctification. He draws parallels between Jewish and Christian priesthood, but sees the Christian priesthood on a higher spiritual plane.

Has, then, the Christian presbyter the powers which distinguish the Jewish priest? The answer is, he has, only in a higher degree. Did the Jewish priest give torah, or

⁴⁶Ibid., 173.

⁴⁷Ibid., 174. Grafton traces the history of ordained ministry in Apostolic times (176-180), and then in some detail each order: Diaconate, presbyterate, and finally episcopate (176 ff.). He considers bishops a kind of “Apostolic delegate” with power to ordain, e.g., as Paul in relation to Timothy and Titus (182).

judgment? was he a directing priest? did the people seek the law at his mouth? did he exercise ecclesiastical rule? Of the Christian priest it is said, “Whosoever heareth you, heareth me, and whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.” Had the Jewish priest the power of reconciliation or excommunication? To the Christian priesthood was given the ministry of reconciliation, that “whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted.” . . . Did the Jewish priest once stand with his censer between the living and the dead and stay the plague? To the Christian it is said, “Is any sick among you? Let him call for the elders of the Church and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith shall save the sick.”⁴⁸

Thus the Christian priesthood, while it bears similarity to that of Israel, differs from it precisely because of its derivative nature from the *sacerdotium* of Christ. It derives its character, its power, and its effect from the great “High Priest of our profession” (Heb. 3:1) and it is He who undergirds, anoints, and enables it to perform His own work. By this earthly priesthood Christ ministers the gifts of grace that save, sanctify, and deify.

In *A Catholic Atlas* Grafton characterizes Holy Matrimony as a sacrament with “the distinguished honor of having all three persons of the Blessed Trinity severally engaged in its formation” and, in fact, as in itself a “type of the Trinity.”

The Holy Father created human nature in the dual form of man and woman. . . . Marriage was established in man’s state of innocence, and by it God made a revelation of His own image. In the man as beginning and source, and the partner begotten from the man, and the offspring proceeding from the twain, we have a type of the Trinity. On this marital union, as an outward sign of Himself, God the Father gave His blessing. It was a sacrament of nature.

Jesus Christ . . . republished its sacramental character and restored it in the Christian system to its original dignity. Christ not only reasserted its divine institution, but by virtue of His divine authority, its elevation as a divine mystery of the gospel. He begins His miracles at a marriage, to teach that the Incarnation was itself a marriage between the human and divine natures. . . . In the union of the man

⁴⁸Ibid., 186. Grafton says that “sacrifice is the essence of religion and priesthood is a necessity of it,” but reiterates with great care that Christian priesthood does not assert “inequality between man and man.” Rather, he says, the world and sectarianism are “ignorant of the Church’s doctrine, that the Church is a body of priests, and that her officers are not different in kind from the laity but only in the degree of powers they possess. . . . When true to its calling priesthood is not to be feared, but loved and honored as one of God’s best gifts to man” (187).

and woman . . . there is an outward sign of the dual natures in the Incarnation united in oneness. . . .

The sacramental character of Holy Matrimony, as a state significant of a mystery and coupled with a grace, is revealed by the Holy Ghost. . . . The elevation of matrimony under the gospel implies, as setting forth a divine mystery, a gift of grace. . . . There are thus the divine author, the symbolic state, the grace of the sacrament, and the increase of sanctifying grace bestowed for its duties.⁴⁹

Marriage, like the whole of Christian life, is rooted in the person and work of Christ; and since Baptism “lies at the foundation of this as of all other sacraments,” it is necessary that both parties be baptized. On this Grafton is insistent. The parties, he says, . . . must be baptized into Christ and made members of Christ in order to be united together “in the Lord.”⁵⁰

It is the union of two Christian souls in the bond of Matrimony, given grace “to enable them to live in love and peace together ‘until death do us part,’”⁵¹ that for Grafton renders the bond indissoluble. He declares that the union, “being a sacramental one, cannot be dissolved by civil courts.”⁵² He says that separation may be granted, but makes no provision whatever for remarriage, and even dismisses the exception in St. Matthew 19, which he regards as “too corrupt or uncertain to allow us to base an argument upon it.”⁵³ Even in cases of faithlessness, abuse, etc.,

The unfaithfulness of a partner does not annul the bond. . . . In those passages where our Lord speaks to the Apostles, and clearly in relation to the Christian state, no provision is made for any dissolution of the bond. The great underlying reason is that Christian marriage is to be a witness of the indissoluble union between Christ and His Church.

The hardness and suffering thereby entailed on the innocent party is to be met by reliance on Christ’s promise, “My grace is sufficient for thee.” For

⁴⁹“Marriage as a Sacrament,” *Ibid.*, III, 127.

⁵⁰*Ibid.*, I, 233.

⁵¹*Ibid.*, 234.

⁵²*Ibid.*

⁵³*Ibid.*, 235 [footnote *in pag.*: “Watkins, ‘Holy Matrimony’”].

marriage is not to be considered merely in relation to our earthly state, but to our eternal reward. God calls His servants to suffer in various ways, all of us in some way. And when our sufferings are borne for Him the soul increases in sanctity and secures an increment of future bliss.⁵⁴

One, as always, must see this in the light of Grafton's view of death unto self and growth into holiness which permeates so much of his thinking. To allow easy digress from "the straight and narrow path" is to endanger the soul and impede its growth into God-likeness. For him, this is particularly true of the moral issues surrounding marriage, for marriage is both a sign of the union between Christ and the Church, and of the Church as a new creation by which Christian souls are bound to Christ.

The Church regards holy matrimony as a Sacrament. It was originally ordained by God for natural ends. It has since received from Christ a further end and been endowed with a special grace. . . . It was to be a living object lesson to three supreme facts regarding that union, namely: (1) The oneness of the Bridegroom. There is but one Lord. (2) The oneness of the Church. There is but one bride. And lastly, the inseparability of the union. . . .

The third great fact which the children of the Kingdom are, to the race of natural men, to bear witness to, is the indissolubility of Christ's union to His Church. The Church . . . is the new creation evolved out of the natural one. By means of it and in it, our union of God in Christ is secured and becomes eternal. This truth the Christian Church publishes by regarding marriage as indissoluble. . . . Teach we therefore the baptized, that it is part of their duty as soldiers of Christ on this brief battlefield of time, to bear witness, by suffering, if need be, to the one Lord and his inseparable union to the one Church.⁵⁵

⁵⁴Ibid. Grafton goes on to identify three kinds of marriage—of the laity, of the clergy, and of consecration in the religious life. All are to be a witness to God's grace and to the indissolubility of the soul's being bonded to Christ. Grafton's own dedication to celibacy and the ideal of the religious life will be dealt with further on.

In an address to the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament (1902), Grafton expresses deep concern over proposed canonical changes to be presented at the coming General Convention. He sees the proposals as a concession to secularism. "You know that the question of divorce will again be presented. Which side is going to triumph? Shall Christian marriage be declared by its indissolubility a witness, as the word of God says, to the indissolubility of Christ's union with His Church, or shall sensuality and worldiness [*sic*] and ignorance triumph?" (Ibid., VII, 264). He reiterates many of the same thoughts as given above in a sermon in the Church of the Advent, Boston in October 1904: "Under the Gospel, Christian marriage was to bear witness to Christ's union with His Church, and however hard it may be in certain cases for a Christian to bear the witness, Christ has promised that 'My grace shall be sufficient for thee'" (Ibid., VIII, 432).

⁵⁵Ibid., VIII, 95-97. Council Address, 1896. He characterizes the Church as "not an organization. It is a spiritual organism . . . that has life in itself" (96). Hence human law cannot supercede Divine law.

The Holy Eucharist.

IN *CHRISTIAN and Catholic* Grafton treats the Eucharist last of all “The Seven Mysteries;” and throughout the *Works* he devotes preponderant attention to it. For him it is the crown of the sacraments, the means of the closest and most intimate union with Christ.

The Holy Eucharist is the greatest of all mysteries. It is the most grand and worthy of honor of all the sacraments; for while they convey grace, in the Eucharist we have Jesus Christ Himself, the author of grace. It is an ever-living witness of the incarnation, sacrificial death, resurrection, and ascension of the Lord. It is the consummation of religion on earth, as it affords us the most intimate and perpetual communication with Jesus Christ. It is the essence of Christianity, as being the sacrifice, in union with which the Christian makes that of Calvary applicable to himself. It is the possession of the Church on earth of Jesus Christ’s real but veiled presence, as she waits adoringly for His unveiling in the state of glory.⁵⁶

The Eucharist contains several characteristics, in Grafton’s thinking, all of which point and convey the soul to union with Christ and enable its transformation into God-likeness. It is the representation of the sacrifice of the cross, wherein the Church, Christ’s mystical Body, pleads anew corporately and individually the fruits of that sacrifice and thereby receives pardon and peace. It is thus likewise a type of the Christian soul’s death

⁵⁶“The Seven Mysteries,” *Ibid.*, I, 237. In *Fond du Lac Tracts*, in affirming the Real Presence, he addresses a particular question held by those who deny it: “Some have tried to puzzle simple Christians by asking: With which Body do you communicate, the Body on the cross, or the glorified Body of our Lord? The answer is, that Christ had only one Body, and that the Body which is now in a glorified condition is the same Body that hung on the cross. We are to be incorporated into that one Sacred Humanity, whose Blood was shed for our redemption, and which rose for our justification. . . . ‘How,’ it is asked again, ‘if the doctrine of the Real Presence be the true one, can Christ’s Body be in Heaven and at the same time be on earth and on so many altars at the same time?’ The answer is, our Lord does not need to move, to do this. He is the centre of the spiritual organism which is His Body, the Church. His own Body is not ubiquitous, but by reason of its union with His Omnipotent Divine Nature, He can make It manifest in His Church where He will and at many altars at the same time. He gave us a proof of this after His ascension to the Right Hand of the Father, where He permanently abides by appearing and talking to S. Paul in the roadway” (“The Real Presence,” *Ibid.*, VI, II, *The Holy Eucharist in the New Testament*, 91). This is probably an answer to an objection based on the so-called “Black Rubric” of the English Communion service, which states, “For the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored . . . and the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ’s natural Body to be at one time in more places than one” (BCP 1662, 321). This rubric has never been included in any of the American Prayer Books. However, the “Reformed Episcopal Church,” founded in 1873 by members of the Low Church party, adopted the 1662 English Book, which remains officially the basis of its sacramental and doctrinal formularies to this day.

in union with Christ's death, and of its hope of sharing in His Resurrection and the glory of heaven. It is the source of Divine nurture, which feeds the soul on its "journey Godward." It is in its sacramental reality the presence of Christ among His people, and thus the focus of the Church's adoration. Finally, it is the Church's witness to the world of the truth of the Atonement, and of the way to redemption and sanctification by the sacrifice of the cross.

The Eucharist, Grafton says, is not only a representation of the death of Christ, but also the image of, and dependent for its power on, the reality of the Resurrection. Without the Resurrection, the Eucharist is only the memory of a tragedy, and a "falsification."

The Holy Eucharist bears the same witness [as Baptism] to the resurrection. It commemorates, as we all know, the death of Christ. But why should the Church do it, if Christ rose not from the dead? Why celebrate this tragedy in which Christ closed His life, which, if He rose not according to His promise, was only a tragic failure? If He rose not, the words and action of the Eucharist are a meaningless sham and a horrible falsification. For in that Holy Service are necessarily said the words, "This is My Body which is given for you," and "This Cup is the new covenant in My Blood." The words give the lie to the theory that our Lord did not resume His body and does not now wear it. For if His body saw corruption and disappeared, then the words, "The bread which we break is it not a participation in the Body of Christ," would not be true. For there would be no body in existence, spiritually or otherwise, of which we could be partakers. There could be no communion of body and blood that had ceased to exist.⁵⁷

It stands in Grafton's reasoning, therefore, that the sacrifice of the Church depends on the reality of the Resurrection, because what the Church partakes of is the living reality of the resurrected Christ.

The Eucharist is a "gospel sacrifice" and the vehicle whereby the Church pleads for remission of sins and its members offer themselves. The Church pleads Christ's

⁵⁷"The Great Credential," *Ibid.*, 58-59.

merits in its self-offering in union with Christ and, he says, Christians “appropriate that sacrifice to themselves.”

The Eucharist is the gospel sacrifice and it is a sacrifice of fourfold aspects. It is a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, for in the canon the priest asks God to accept it as such. It is also a sacrifice of prayer or the calves of our lips. “We pray that we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins and all other benefits of His Passion.” It is a sacrifice of ourselves. “We offer ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice unto Thee.” The Church also offers and presents Him, her Head, and pleads His death and merits for herself and her children. On the cross Christ died for humanity; by the offering of the Eucharistic sacrifice we as individuals plead, and appropriate that sacrifice to ourselves. Once the command concerning sacrifice was “touch not,” now it is “offer;” once it was “eat not,” now it is “eat and live.”⁵⁸

The particular point concerning sacrifices and blood is of special import as it focuses on the essential difference in character between the sacrifices of the Old Testament and the one perfect sacrifice of the New. The tasting of blood was strictly forbidden, since “the blood is the life” (Deut. 12:23). Grafton draws a mystagogical contrast between the forbidding of the people of Israel, under sin and judgment, to taste blood and the mandate of Christ to His disciples, now under grace, to partake of His Body and Blood in the sacrament. Israel could not receive that which gave life, being under the law of death; but Christians in the Eucharist receive that which gives life, as the free gift of Christ Himself.

Man, being by transgression under the law of sin and death, was forbidden to take of that which was the symbol of grace and life. But when Christ, the Life, came, the command was changed. Now it is, “Drink ye all of It.” For the blood of Christ by its union with His Eternal Spiritual Nature is possessed of a quickening power. He, through His own “Eternal Spirit” (which does not here mean the Holy Spirit) “offered Himself without spot to God.” His Blood therefore was, by

⁵⁸“Sacrifice,” *Ibid.*, 165. Grafton contrasts the Eucharist to the sacrifice of the Temple cultus of the Old Testament. “As the Jewish atonement restored to the nation the privilege of offering its daily sacrifices,” he says, “so that made by Christ gave to His people the right of offering the more acceptable gospel sacrifice. And that sacrifices were to continue, S. Paul tells us when he says that the ‘heavenly things,’ that is the members of the new Christian dispensation, should, in contrast with the members of the former one, ‘be purified with better sacrifices’ (Heb. ix.23)” (164-165).

reason of its union with His Spiritual Nature, endued with a spiritual power. . . . It can purge his conscience from dead works, works done without grace, and make it serve acceptably the Living God.⁵⁹

The Eucharist also, in an objective way, signifies the spiritual reality of the presence of Christ with His Church. Grafton says that there “have ever been two ordained modes of approach [to God], viz., by word only, and by act.”⁶⁰ He commends the Prayer Book retention of both the worship of “the synagogue and that of the temple,” but declares that “the higher, the more important and efficacious is the sacrifice of the altar.”⁶¹ There, he says, the presence of Christ, always a reality, becomes a visible manifestation. The Church’s worship becomes an embodied icon of the heavenly Jerusalem and of a restored cosmos.

There Christ, always abiding in the midst of His Church, in a special way manifests Himself. The bread becomes His body, wine becomes His blood. He veils His glory under sacramental forms, and the whole Church in heaven and earth, with angels and archangels, unites in jubilant worship. She presents Christ as her Head, and presents herself, in Christ, before Almighty God. It is the worship of the Church in the Church by the Church. It is an act performed, not in the domain of nature, but in that of Christ’s mystical body. It is neither governed by any known physical laws, nor can it be sounded by human metaphysics. From first to last everything connected with the Blessed Sacrament and the holy sacrifice belongs to the spiritual order of the new creation. The Church and Altar by their consecration have become incorporated into it, and are covenanted meeting-places between God and man.⁶²

⁵⁹“The Real Issue,” *Fond du Lac Tracts*, “II. The Holy Eucharist in the New Testament,” *Ibid.*, VI, 134. He goes on to say, “May we not be thankful that we can separately partake both of that Blessed Blood that was shed and that Flesh that was triumphant over death?” This, we may presume from other references in the *Works*, refers to the Roman Catholic withholding of the chalice from the laity, which he consistently condemns, defending Anglican practice and, as he perceives, likewise that of the primitive Church.

⁶⁰“Sacrifice,” *Ibid.*, I, 166.

⁶¹*Ibid.*

⁶²*Ibid.*, 166-167.

Moreover, it is in Eucharistic worship, partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ, that Christian souls are drawn into Christ and move forward on their path to deification. They are, by incorporation into Christ in Baptism, “spiritually endowed persons.”

The faithful are not mere ordinary natural beings, but are spiritually endowed persons and living stones of the spiritual temple. Christ’s body and blood which are present are now in a glorified condition, and emancipated from that of His visible earthly state. By the words of Christ and the Holy Spirit the earthly elements are transmuted into the heavenly realities. By faith we spiritually partake, to our body and soul’s health, of the spiritual food of the body and blood of Christ. By spiritual but real incorporation into Christ, the whole body of the faithful rises into the divine fellowship and progresses in its union with God.⁶³

It is precisely for this reason, he says, that the Church’s sanctuary is adorned and beautified, and its Liturgy celebrated in grand fashion. The mystery of the Eucharist, and the real presence of Christ to feed His people, constitute true worship in the beauty of holiness and demand the best that God’s people can provide. It is, above all, not only a sign of worship outwardly celebrated, but, more vitally, a sign of souls inwardly consecrated. In the Church’s worship the external and the internal are joined and Christians are lifted from the cares of earth, and are inspired and raised to heavenly courts, becoming one with Christ in His eternal and perfect sacrifice—the external liturgy expressing internal deification.

It was not a copy of heathen rites or a survival of Jewish traditions that led the Church to make her sacrificial offering liturgical, choral, symbolical. Her illuminated visions had caught sight of the heavenly service and the Divine Spirit taught her to mould her liturgy after it. . . . as God took Moses up and showed him the things in heaven, which were to be the pattern of the tabernacle, so He took up S. John, and the glory of the worship with its lights and incense and anthem and antiphonal choirs and musical instruments and priestly hierarchy and devout prostrations and song of the redeemed and prayers of saints and dazzling splendor of throne and circling rainbow and the shining sea, became a directory for the Church. She learnt from heaven itself how to worship God in spirit and in truth. . . . True to her heavenly guidance, the Church must hold fast to her inherited faith and worship. . . . There must be an enthusiastic revival of the spirit of entire

⁶³Ibid., 167.

consecration. Men and women must . . . become living sacrifices in union with that of Calvary.⁶⁴

The Sacraments bear witness to the Christian and to the world of God's unending faithfulness to His creation. More than that, Grafton says, they are the source of inner illumination, enabling Christian souls to become one with Christ, who fills each soul with His abiding presence and sheds His uncreated light upon an often skeptical world.

But the splendor of the interior illumination is surpassingly greater. Filled with the divine light of sacramental grace, the reason not only believes, but the spirit sees and lives and rejoices in God its Saviour. Christ is not a Christ on paper, or a Christ in history, or a Christ in a far-distant heaven, but a Christ, God of God, and Light of light, within one.

The Sacraments are witnesses. Science can demonstrate no more certainly any of its hypotheses concerning the existence of any force or operation of matter by its test of verified experiment, than by the experience of millions of Christians in the Catholic Church is demonstrated the reality of the real Presence in the Blessed Sacrament, the operations of the Spirit, and the indwelling within us of Christ. This life of Christ in the Church is the most potent evidence to those without, in the formless, creedless, worldly, unmeasured court, that the Church is a living, spiritual, divinely-inspired organism.

By her recognized meeting of the needs and longings of the human heart . . . by the love which binds, in spite of outward divisions, the household of faith in one; by . . . the illustrious sanctity of its religious orders, the supernatural lives of its saints, and the joyous consciousness which fills her children of their union with God, the Church, filled with sacramental life, bears witness to the world.⁶⁵

⁶⁴Ibid., 167-168. This mystagogical view of the splendor attaching to Liturgy, and concomitant uplifting of the soul to the heavenlies, is universal among the Orthodox Churches. In the Great Entrance in the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom is sung the *Cherubicon*, or "Hymn of the Cherubim." "Let us the cherubim mystically representing, and unto the life-giving Trinity the thrice-holy chant intoning, now lay aside all earthly care: That we may raise on high the King of all, by the angelic hosts invisibly attended" (*The Orthodox Liturgy*. Oxford: University Press, 1982, 59, 63). Grafton had undoubtedly read Orthodox liturgical material earlier, and during his 1903 Russian tour must have been deeply struck by Orthodox hymnody and his experience of the Liturgy. While in St. Petersburg he copied the texts of several liturgical hymns, including the *Cherubicon* (Misc. Loose Mss., Archives of Diocese of Fond du Lac, P5.04a-c; spec. P5.04c). This view of liturgical sacredness is undoubtedly the reason for his emphasis on the adornment of worship in *Plain Suggestions* (VI) and in a number of his sermons and addresses.

⁶⁵"The Living Temple of Christ's Church," Ibid., VIII, 341. Sermon preached at the Consecration of Isaac Lea Nicholson as Bishop of Milwaukee, 1899. He says further, "Oh! on this solemn day, as we feel the Spirit's power and realize as Churchmen the responsibility to be living witnesses of the sacramental life, and the heart glows with Christ's love, let us one and all break forth in earnest, heart-felt, entire self-consecration and declare ourselves—henceforth and forever—consecrated to holiness, consecrated to the

5. Prayer.

GRAFTON, WHILE a priest, was under the discipline of regular prayer commonly expected of all clergy, and later as a professed religious further trained into a deeper discipline of prayer, particularly mental prayer, and sacred reading, or *lectio divina*. It seems strange, therefore, that he does not devote more attention in the *Works* to the study of prayer, aside from a short, comprehensive but fairly rudimentary outline contained in *A Catholic Atlas*, and some pages in *Writings on the Religious Life*. He treats on the nature, effects and benefits of prayer, but what is missed is a precise *methodology* of prayer, or an evocative reference to the actual *practice* of prayer or to his own experience of it. He is conscious of the need, undoubtedly—the outline shows it, as do the directives to religious; but in his correspondence, even in his sermons and addresses, he speaks of it little firsthand. On the other hand he speaks often to the need for the soul's disposition to know and to trust God, and without doubt prayer is a vital part of that equation, i.e., of a reaching out in childlike love, adoration, and petition to God whom the soul seeks.

In other questions a stern impartiality is a prerequisite [*sic*] to a right conclusion. The mind must be unbiased to form a correct judgment. It must preserve a delicacy of poise & nicety of balance, which disturbed, will unconsciously tremble to a wrong result. But Christian truths require something more—an abiding sense of our finite capacities—an humble trust in God—a willingness to receive, even without comprehending, what it may please Him to reveal—the simple mind of the little child.⁶⁶

Lord" (342). This call for self-consecration echoes Benson's, "The great gift is when we lose ourselves and have nothing but Him" (Woodgate, *Father Benson*, 54; see n. IV.1).

⁶⁶Misc. Loose Mss., Archive of Diocese of Fond du Lac, II.1. Incomplete sermon or address. The last phrase appears an implicit reference to Mark 10:15: "Whoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein." He says further, "Knowledge is the gift of God. Man does not attain it by his own unaided strength. His nature is that of a dependant [*sic*] being—dependent upon his Maker for all things—continually dependent." Acknowledging this dependency, and quickening the spirit to come to the knowledge of God, one thinks, is at the heart of prayer. Again, apart from the *Atlas* Grafton simply does not address the matter at as much length as other subjects. A partial exegesis of other parts of his writing, perhaps unavoidable, sheds at least some implicit light on his sense of the meaning of prayer as a personal and experiential dynamic. This writer prefers to think that it was such an assumed part of his spirituality that he did not think it necessary to treat the methodology explicitly at any great length.

In the section in *A Catholic Atlas* we see something of Grafton's thinking on prayer. Here he provides a normative and basic, treatment in very much the old catechetical style. He characterizes prayer as a "natural instinct, expressive of man's dependent nature," springing from humanity's "old home" in the being of God. This is a crucial consideration, because it points up not only humanity's origin in God, but also its ultimate goal of union with God. Prayer is an habitual spiritual tool that enables the soul to draw closer to God in intimate converse.

Prayer is the act of a rational and spiritual nature communing with God. "God is man's old home," from whose eternity we come. . . .

By the practice of prayer we come to know God, just as living and conversing daily with a friend we come to know him. Habitual prayer preserves us in our true attitude of constant dependence and self-surrender to God. . . . It secures to us God's providential protection, and brings us the strength of daily manna for our heavenward way. . . .

Man owes to God, as the sovereign of the universe, an allegiance as his Maker which expresses itself in acts of submissive adoration. . . . Man is a dependent creature, and for all the gifts of nature and grace, owes the good God heartfelt praise and thanksgiving. . . . God has made His giving, dependent largely on our asking. We are, for the aversion of evils and obtaining goods, to seek them from His Fatherly Hand, who knows how to give good gifts to them that ask Him. . . . Prayer may be addressed to any one of the persons of the Blessed Trinity, as we prayerfully energise in union with God, moving about in Him with childlike familiarity, but all prayer has for its object the One God.⁶⁷

To the often-raised objection to prayer, that "God knows our needs," Grafton in his rebuttal reiterates that God's giving "depends largely on our asking," and that the asking of God's favor fulfills a basic need to ask and prepares the soul for thankfulness.

Prayer includes praise and thanksgiving, and as to our needs, our telling them to God helps us to realize His blessings and prepares us to receive them. Besides our Father likes His children to tell Him. We cannot, it is urged, change God's will. We do not seek to change His will, but His will is that His giving depends largely on our asking.⁶⁸

⁶⁷"Prayer," XI, *WCCG*, III, 145.

⁶⁸*Ibid.*, 149. God's giving of good, predicated on asking as a condition, is a consistent reiteration here and, Grafton also says, is connected to, though separate from, prevenient or sanctifying grace. "God,

Grafton focuses primarily on petition in the outline, but in all aspects he sees prayer as the lifting of the soul to God. As has been mentioned, it is the means for intimate converse with God, as a child to a parent, the heart marked by filial love. It must be seen as a disposition sown in the adoration of God, “which expresses itself in acts of submissive adoration” (see n. 67). “Prayer is life,” he says, and brings all of life into union with the interior life of Christ Himself.

In its comprehensiveness it can invest with communing power every action, the resistance of temptation, the bearing of sorrow and pain, and can make life a prayer of good works. It is, the Fathers have said, the ascent of the soul to God. It is the lifting up of heart and mind to him. It is communion with God by love. It is thus like the chariot of fire bearing the soul Godward.⁶⁹

Some souls have at times the blessing of the gift of the “prayer of quiet,” in which it is so gathered up into union with God that it speaks not, but is held in the embrace of the Spirit. . . . Prayer is life, for it is the inbreathing of God in the soul, and the soul’s continued repose and ascent in God.⁷⁰

It is in his directions to religious that he focuses more deeply on the meaning and method of prayer in the context of religious profession. Prayer, he says, goes hand in

apart from the inceptive sufficient grace given to all, grants His gifts and grace on the condition of their being asked for” (146). It is also connected with the necessity of self-surrender to deepen the union of the soul to God, who in love for His creatures desires to act. “Prayer enables God to act, by putting ourselves at His disposal; it moves Him to do so; it obtains His benediction, the graces asked for, and in some way is always answered. He discerns the harmony or disagreement of our petitions with His designs, the nature of our requests, and our motives in asking” (Ibid.). But increase of grace also results. “Prayer also increases sanctifying grace, and, if habitual, secures us in final perseverance” (Ibid.).

⁶⁹Ibid., 145.

⁷⁰Ibid., 149. This is Grafton’s only explicit reference in the *Christian Atlas* entry to the “prayer of quiet” or, as ascetical writers classify it, adoration or mental prayer.

Donald J. Parsons says, “Experience testifies also that adoration has a wonderfully cleansing and liberating power. It sets us free from so much—from nagging preoccupation with self, from corrosive self-pity, from gnawing remorse, and from deadening discouragement at our spiritual lumpishness. The mind and heart are turned toward God, and we have a glimpse of what is meant by ‘the peace of God which passeth all understanding.’ . . . Yet as companionship deepens, the need for words is less compelling. We find we can communicate silently, and we discover gladness in simply being with someone we love” (IV, “Prayer and Christian Growth;” V, “Mental Prayer,” *A Lifetime Road to God*. Fond du Lac, WI: Parish Press, 1977, 28, 31).

hand with mortification, both tools for the development of the religious life and the good of the Church. He calls prayer “the great work of the Religious.” He also draws the differences between vocal and mental prayer.

[And] now we would speak of the great work of the Religious, which he undertakes for the Glory of God, the good of the Church, and the transformation of himself. To become a good Religious, he must study prayer and its different kinds, and pray for the gift and grace of it, love it, and grow into union with God by its use. . . . The first of these instruments [to acquire charity, purity of heart, and humility] is prayer, which is defined to be “an act of the practical reason, by which we ask God for whatever is either useful or necessary for us; or it is an ascent, or lifting up of the mind and of the affections to Him. It is usually divided into vocal and mental prayer. It is called mental when the faculties of the soul only are used in communing with God, and vocal when the acts of the soul and its emotions find expression in words also. . . . When we pray mentally, we are simply thinking in the presence of our Almighty Father, and laying before Him the thoughts of our soul.”⁷¹

There are, we have noticed, higher degrees of prayer, like contemplation . . . an earnest soul may humbly look forward to their acquisition, ever remembering that they are God’s gifts and not of man’s acquirement. In mental prayer, the soul realizes its union with God. . . . We ought, therefore, to approach our meditation with a real hope that God will reveal Himself to us, not merely that He will enable us to acquire a clearer view of this and that truth, which we have prepared, but that He will reveal Himself to us. Lord, show me Thy glory. This must be our one desire. Revelation is the coming forth of the Eternal God to the living soul.⁷²

6. The Religious Vocation: Surrender to the Divine Will.

RELIGION’S EFFECT, Grafton says, is perfection. Christianity is the perfection of revealed religion, and religion brings many blessings to the human soul.

Reconciliation with God. Forgiveness of man’s sin, the blotting out of a guilty past. The elevation of man’s nature, through union with the nature of the God-Man, Jesus Christ. The partaking of the divine nature, the becoming a son of God, and an inheritor of the Kingdom of heaven. The proffered possibility of

⁷¹“Commentary on the Rule,” *Writings on the Religious Life*, Ibid., V, 360-361. (The close-quote, possibly intended at the words, “. . . affections to Him” (?), is omitted, either by Grafton or the editor.)

⁷²Ibid., 365-366.

attaining through union here by grace, a supernatural end or further union with God in bliss and glory.⁷³

To Grafton, there is finally no more singular vehicle for perfection and “the elevation of man’s nature” and “partaking of the divine nature” than that of the religious life. It is where an ordered, disciplined Christian life is most expressly lived out. The professed religious, withdrawing from the world, entering upon a specific and devoted consecration of one’s life and will to the will of God, giving up control of property, time, and personal ambition, enduring mortification and ascetical struggle, and living dedicatedly within a community of people subject to its ups and downs, unity or disunity, draws closer into union with God by transformation of one’s life, dying daily to self and rising in Christ. As a religious himself, Grafton regards both the graces and the ascetical struggles inherent in the life, and religious profession in itself, as a spiritual sign of sacrificial self-giving commended by and marked in the earthly life of Christ Himself, and as a sign of God’s blessing upon the Church and a validation of its Catholicity, a means by which the Church is strengthened.

The revival of Religious life in our midst is one of the surest tokens of God’s blessing upon us. It is one of the most signal proofs of the validity of our Orders and the efficacy of our Sacraments. It is only within the Catholic Church that this type of sanctity has been produced, for it is only within the Church that there are the Sacraments which can produce it. The religious life is based upon the three Evangelical counsels uttered by our Lord, of poverty, chastity, and obedience. By a life of an entire self-consecration it bears witness to the supreme importance of our eternal interests and the royal pathway of self-sacrificing love by which they may be attained. The Church everywhere is stronger by virtue of the prayers and labors of her Religious.⁷⁴

⁷³“Revealed Religion: The Blessings Religion Brings,” *Ibid.*, III, 7. While Grafton is speaking of the effects of religion generally, he regards the religious life as the primary exemplar of all religion.

⁷⁴Council Address, 1896, *Ibid.*, VIII, 105. In a meditation on the religious life, Grafton addresses the “Evangelical counsels” of the life and why they are given. “The three counsels are remedies for [the roots of evil in the soul]: for sensuality, chastity; for covetousness, poverty; for pride, obedience. In this world are three good forces: the Kingdom of Heaven; our Blessed Lord, the second Adam; the Holy Ghost. Opposed to them are three evil forces: the world, the flesh and the devil, attacking the different parts of our

Grafton also likens the religious to an athlete under training. The sacrificial character of the religious life is rigorous and demanding. This rigor, however, is the means of tempering, testing, and transformation; and, while the world misunderstands the motive and method, Grafton says the life of sacrifice and trial brings about close union with Christ.

“So then,” your opponent replies, “you are actuated by a cowardly motive; you are running away to escape the trials and discipline and temptations of life by shutting yourself up in a cell.” . . . This life is not free from trials and temptations. The life is a hard one. It is a life of sacrifice. It is a union to a crucified Lord by a life of crucifixion. It is a special union with Him wrought out through special trials. The spiritual trials which God sends in it are the means of sanctification. The life of a Religious is that of a Christian athlete. He goes to give battle, not to avoid it. It is not to escape temptations Christ summons him into His companionship, but that He may abide with him in His temptations. Christ calls souls into union with His own conflict against evil that He may extend His victories through them. . . . I go because He calls me.⁷⁵

The ethos and goal of the religious life is, above all, the giving up of self-will and the mortification of human nature, that it may be transformed and brought under the obedience of Christ and closer to the nature and being of God. Obedience and mortification are the way to peace even in the midst of trial and ascetical struggle. The will that is not under obedience, Grafton says, is “prone to be governed by self-love and to be the victim of secondary motives, [acting] thoughtlessly, on impulse, without seeking the guidance of the Holy Spirit.”

nature: soul, body and spirit. So, faithfully carrying out the three Counsels is the quickest way of obtaining perfection” (Ibid., V, 229). These counsels are, of course, general to Christians, but specific by vow to professed religious; hence the religious life being the example and sign to the Church entire.

⁷⁵“Vocation: Words of Help and Comfort,” Ibid., V, 104-105. Here Grafton recalls Paul’s words, “Know ye not that they which run in a race run all, but one receiveth the prize? . . . I therefore so run, not as uncertainly; so fight I, not as one that beateth the air: But I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection” (I Cor. 9:24, 26). Likewise, the writer to the Hebrews: “Let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith” (Heb. 12:1-2).

It is necessary that we should surrender our wills to God in Christ, as a Holy sacrifice. His Will should become the rule of our life. . . . It is by obedience that our wills are subjected to Christ. Every act of obedience to Superiors or Rule strengthens the will, while every act of neglect tends to weaken it. . . . It is by the practice of mortification that tranquillity of mind is established and preserved in us. Every act of mortification disposes us for a better and more quiet recollectedness of spirit. . . . As our wills become more one with His Will, a peace and joy unspeakable enter into the soul, and we rest in Him.⁷⁶

Trials and the submission of self-will are the means of drawing the soul of the religious into union with Christ's suffering, and of helping it to grow into Christ's life. Further, within religious communities, mortifications and trials lead not only to growth in love of Christ, but in love of neighbor; the cultivation of the spirit of *agápe* that lies at the heart of the Gospel itself.

Within our Religious House there are many trials; it would be unreal without them; they are only opportunities by which we may learn to grow into His Life; we are to expect many in the Religious Life, they are what make it so blessed. We are called to be united to our Lord through special trial, and not merely through the Sacraments. He puts His own chalice to our lips, and gives of it to all His loved ones.

We love to suffer for Jesus' sake in little things, internal or external. We must use all worries, all interruptions, all difficulties, misunderstandings, anything that pierces the heart, as something to offer up to the Lord; it is a blessed work. . . . We do not know how to love, till we love Jesus, till we love all in Him; and it outshines mere natural affection, it will overpower all dislikes, and unite us to one another, as it is the cementing power to our Spouse.⁷⁷

Finally, Grafton says, the religious life is above, the expression of the desire for God alone. It is also brought into the setting where the soul "is forced to imitate [Christ's] life of mercy." This life of hardship, trial, and struggle, so signal to the truth of the Christian religion, is enabled solely by God's supernatural and sanctifying grace.

"The innate principle of monasticism . . . is the life of God." The devout soul desires God above all things, and God alone. It seeks solitude that it may better

⁷⁶"A Benedictine Abbey: Commentary on the Rule," Ibid., 358-359.

⁷⁷"The Religious Life: Meditations; 16th Instruction—Chastity," Ibid., 278-279.

commune with God. As it grows in likeness to Christ, it is forced to imitate His life of mercy for the bodies and souls of men. “They do not flee away from the world in order to escape duties, trials, or temptations, but to meet them as valiant soldiers of Jesus Christ.” . . .

What is it, the worldly man says, that upholds these persons in the great sacrifices they certainly make? What enables them to persevere in their life of hardness, self-sacrifice, and devotion? There can be but one answer: it is the supernatural grace which comes to them from Christ. . . .

The Church realizes, as never before, that her true strength lies in her saints. It is the hands lifted up in prayer that sustain the warriors in the field. It is the spiritual life and devotion developed in our own Church, that bring down increasingly God’s blessings on it. . . .

We have said that Christ founded the life. He exemplified it in His own Person. . . . Why did Christ so denude Himself? Man had lost by sin his union with God and the grace to attain a beatific end. Christ came as man to fight over again man’s lost battle. He took His place, therefore, alongside of man as his brother and defender. He took His place alongside of man as an outcast, stripped of everything. . . . Poverty, chastity, and obedience—these lay at the foundation of His inner life.⁷⁸

Thus Grafton returns, as it were, to first principles—man’s fall, the hope of human restoration to the state of *eikon Theou* wrought by the Incarnation, Passion, and Resurrection of Christ, and the ultimate union of the soul with God and participation in the Divine nature. The religious life, like the Church itself, is a type of God’s love and this Divine work of deifying of the soul. It comes only through great struggle, but after the lifelong race comes the fulfillment of the soul’s destiny in God-likeness and eternal life. And for Grafton, the great glory of professed life in religion is in being a signpost to point the world toward that deified destiny.

⁷⁸“The Religious Life,” *Ibid.*, IV, 90-97.

CHAPTER VI.

Conclusion: Grafton's Place in Anglican Thought on Sanctification.

For now is our salvation nearer than when we believed. Rom. 13:11

THE QUESTION raised at the beginning of this project was whether, and to what extent Charles Chapman Grafton stands within the Anglican theological tradition on the subject of sanctification. The question is of vital import as this is being written; for it seems that a consciousness of what constitutes “Anglican tradition” has in a real sense been lost, or at least mislaid. But this in fact is nothing new. Grafton wrestled with the same issues a hundred years ago—materialism, self-indulgence, easiness with sin, tepidity of devotion, paucity of real and saving faith, lack of charity and forbearance—and his words have dramatic impact when read in the light of the present controversies affecting the Anglican Communion. The examination of Grafton's thought will be, this writer believes, at least for the American Church an integral component in the recovery of our sense of the Anglican tradition, and what it means to be in communion within what he calls

. . . one spiritual organism, embracing all Church members, in whatever state in heaven or earth they are, united sacramentally to the indwelling Lord, while here preserved from schism by canon law and united to one another by divine charity.¹

In regard to the theology and practice of sanctification, we have seen that Grafton stands solidly within the impartational pedigree. He echoes in his evangelical and

¹“The Reunion of Oriental and Orthodox Churches,” *Fond du Lac Tracts*, VI, WCCG, VI, 327. Grafton here is commenting specifically on the difference between the Roman and Orthodox Churches in their views on Church authority and jurisdiction. He repudiates throughout the *Works* the Roman view of universal and ordinary jurisdiction accruing to the Papacy, and insists that all the Bishops and faithful throughout the world comprise the community of faith and the “one spiritual organism.”

ascetical counsels the sense of that Divine-human synergy which ultimately brings the transformed soul into complete union with God. In saying, “The divine adoption makes the adopted partake of the divine nature,”² he echoes not only the assertion of St. Peter, but also those of Anglican luminaries like Richard Hooker, that “God hath deified our nature” and made man “an associate of Deity;”³ and of John Donne, that God grants him “a present, an immediate possession of the Kingdome of Heaven”⁴ in which “my soul is assimilated to my God, and made partaker of the divine nature, and *Idem Spiritus*.”⁵

Grafton also, perhaps unwittingly, but poignantly, provides us an example of the long “journey Godward” by his own life of ascetical struggle. The journey begins in repentance and contrition, and continues lifelong, God and the soul working together for the soul’s growth through spiritual discipline and in constant meeting in “all the changes and chances of this mortal life.” Michael Ramsey says,

Grafton’s spiritual counsels spring from his own interior struggles, the struggle between his own imperious temperament and the call to humility, the struggle to see pain and disappointment as a way of being near to the Crucified. He writes:—
“Working for our good, God has sent checks and disappointments and afflictions. . . . Oft-times He withholds His spiritual favours, that, like the bride in the Canticles, we may arise and with self-abandonment seek Him.”⁶

Thus we see in Grafton the image of a pilgrim, traveling with difficulty and often with pain on his journey, and struggling daily with the downward pull of his own nature

²“The Adopted Sonship,” Grafton Hall address, *Ibid.*, VII, 308-309 (see n. V.8).

³*EccI Pol*, V, liv.2, 5, *WRH*, III, 212, 215 (see n. II.14).

⁴*Dogmatic and Mystical Theology of John Donne*, 141.

⁵*Donne’s Sermons: Selected Passages*, 226 (see n. II.39).

⁶Michael Ramsey, “Charles C. Grafton, Bishop and Theologian,” *Nashotah Quarterly Review*, Vol. 8, No. 3, Spring 1968, 9. The self-abandonment motif reflects that commonly seen in Benson: “We have not got to conquer an enemy in our own strength, but to die to our own will, our own impulses, by losing ourselves in Christ glorified” (*Letters of Richard Meux Benson*, 48; see n. IV.23).

and personality, but never pessimistically. His journey proceeds always with the knowledge that, if he persists in the life of penitence and mortification, God will be merciful to him for Christ's sake and grant him rest and the final gift of Divine union. The Christian, he says, "has no fears of the future in this life."

He knows he has God always on his side. He is therefore bright, hopeful, faithful in the midst of adversity. No sorrow or affliction can blot out the bright vision of future glory. No cross is so heavy, but the Burden Bearer will not help him bear it. On the other hand, the world is full of calamities and sorrow. Man is born to sorrow as the sparks fly upward. No wonder the natural man therefore is wont to be pessimistic. . . . But Christ, the victor of death and hell, reverses all this. He condemns this pessimism. "Pessimism," says Liddon, "which is common sense in a heathen, is, in a Christian, disloyalty to Christ. Optimism, which in a heathen is sheer folly, is in a Christian mere common sense. For a Christian believes in a divine providence. . . ." ⁷

1. His Understanding of Sanctification: *Theosis*?

THE WORD *theosis*, as has been mentioned, appears as a specific theological term nowhere in the classical Anglican corpus; thus any interpretation in regard to the term itself is implicit. Its meaning, however, is clearly affirmed in the writings of the classic impartationists from Hooker on, and this writer is satisfied that Grafton understands the essentials of the doctrine. Union with God has its beginning in creation, its recovery in the mystery of the Incarnation; by the redemptive death of the cross the restoration of man to that union is accomplished. Christ "took our nature . . . wears it now, and will wear it forever—a continual source of union between us and God."⁸ Because of the Incarnation and Hypostatic Union, not only does God, through Christ, wear the nature and likeness of man, He transforms it. Man is redeemed, sanctified, and restored to his

⁷"Religious Life the Happiest," Grafton Hall address, *WCCG*, VII, 310-311 (see also n. 2).

⁸"The Second Adam," *Ibid.*, VIII, 314-316 (see n. V.6).

original nature, that of the *eikon Theou* of creation. However hard the journey, Grafton understands the end of it.

Creation was already united to God by God's indwelling power, but the Incarnation was a new and different mode of union. It was not something done which was to be laid aside. God joined human nature to Himself indissolubly. He will wear that nature for all eternity. . . .

There is another union with God, and that is by union with the humanity of Christ. . . . It implies a different union with God than by way of His power. It is a union with God through union with the God-Man, Christ. . . .

The third way of union with God is by way of glory. It is based on the union of the human nature of Christ with the divine nature. If we are united to Christ and perfected in Him, we shall finally in Him attain the sight of God, or the Beatific Vision. . . . While our personality will be preserved, in this union with God in glory, we shall be upheld in sinlessness, and so preserved in eternal bliss.⁹

Thus Grafton posits the synergy between God and man that is needful for the soul's ultimate union with God in glory and its transformation into its original state as the Divine "image and likeness" bestowed in creation. The soul has come full circle and finds itself partaker of the Divine nature. If the soul submits itself in penitence and enters the redemptive work of the cross through following Christ, in whom the Divine and human natures are inseparably joined, then its eternal deification will surely be attained.

2. His Message for Anglicans Then and Now.

"THE MORE things change, the more they stay the same." This old saying is applicable to our society today as it was a century ago. Grafton decried the materialism, greed, sensuality, and ambition that marked the "Gilded Age." The "Computer Age" in reality

⁹"Final Words," *Ibid.*, IV, 295-298. He adds, "Yet, if reconciliation completed Christ's work, why should He not have laid aside His humanity after He had made it? Because man not only needed to be reconciled, but to be restored, elevated, created. . . . In union with Christ, thus man is reconciled now and elevated finally to the union of God in glory" (301).

Grafton's words on the Hypostatic Union and its implications for deification are reminiscent of Donne: "*Verbum caro factum, ut caro resurget . . . which shall be mine as inseparably, (in the effect, though not in the manner) as the Hypostaticall union of God, and man, in Christ, makes our nature and the Godhead one person in him*" (*Donne's Sermons: Selected Passages*, 226 (see nn. II.39, VI.5).

is no different, from the point of view of the human soul. The problems are the same, and so are the root causes—vanity, jealousy, lust, and greed—in short, human sin. What has changed in our present time, concomitant with a loss of the moral impulse of religion in societal life, is the exacerbation of sinful impulse by improvements in technology. The same destructive behaviors can be indulged, and the same brutalities visited on others as in the past, but through the vehicles of mass media entertainment, the Internet, and other technologies, they are accomplished more quickly, more pervasively, more anonymously, and nearly totally unshackled by any attitude of concern, charity, or forbearance toward one's neighbor or even toward one's self.

Nor is the Church immune from this danger. Decisions of General Conventions of the Episcopal Church since 1976, particularly in 2000 and 2003, have shown a significant degree of departure from the doctrinal and ethical-moral standards of the Christianity of the ancient Fathers. The Church not only reflects the modern culture; it has largely embraced it, together with its relaxed ethical-moral norms. In their 1992 book *New Millennium, New Church*, Richard Kew and Roger J. White point up a confusion of outlook that has arisen within the Church regarding its organization, its methodology, its message, and even its fundamental *raison d'être*.

In recent years, the Episcopal Church has given the impression it is more fascinated with modern ideas shaped by the prevailing culture than with exploring the implications for today of the ancient formularies of the faith. This had made that segment of the Church's leadership that is theologically orthodox appear dull and unexciting. . . . It has been the James Pikes, Paul Moores, and Jack Spongs who have set the agenda and been able to command media attention.¹⁰

We have turned bishops into administrators and priests into therapists, with the result that the building up of the People of God has been ignored. . . . This

¹⁰Richard Kew & Roger J. White, "Groundswell Towards Creedal Orthodoxy," *New Millennium, New Church*. Cambridge, MA: Cowley Publications, 1992, 37.

confusion is further compounded by the muddled and conflicting expectations that the laity lay upon their clergy.¹¹

The image of the Church has, in fact, in the popular view too often seemed more that of a “religious corporation,” run like a business, than that of the “mystical body of Christ” (Grafton’s “spiritual organism . . . united sacramentally to the indwelling Lord”). Insofar as this has become a reality, the sense of the Church’s Gospel imperative and its own vision of its identity and mission are thus fundamentally and negatively impacted.

In the clerical sphere, this secular-leaning view has often led to inordinate concern with “career,” “status,” and “advancement.” The Church is perceived as a venue in which one’s career is built, rather than that in which one gives up one’s life in God’s service and in service to God’s people. The measure of ministry becomes the degree of “success” in one’s “career,” and the attainment to high office (e.g., the episcopate) the “summit” of one’s “career.” Moreover, as Claudia Kalis suggests, ordination itself is often now seen as a “civil right” or as a *cause célèbre* for various special interest groups within the Church’s body politic.¹²

In the lay sphere, likewise, this attitude has made the Church a theater for the grossest kind of politicking, whether at parish or diocesan levels, as a means of asserting individual or group power, on vestries, standing committees, deputations, etc., or of

¹¹“New Ministers for a New Millennium,” *Ibid.*, 79.

¹²Claudia C. Kalis, “Ordination Has Lost Meaning,” *TLC*, Vol. 229, No. 18, October 31, 2004, 13. Ms. Kalis, an ordained woman, writes, “Our understanding and appreciation of ordination as the claim of Jesus upon one’s life, accompanied by a sacred responsibility to guard the faith, was being redefined as a civil entitlement accompanied by human privilege. The very primacy of Jesus and his gospel, which lies at the heart of ordination, was trumped. What was once ‘a sacred call’ was now a civil right. What was once understood to be a sacred responsibility was now being set forth as a human privilege. The call to serve our Lord and Savior in total and complete abandon and submission to him in humbled awe and adoration was gone.” The number of enraged letters following the article’s publication seemed to indicate something of a raw nerve touched in certain circles within the Church, and to show that there is perhaps at least a grain of truth in Ms. Kalis’ contentions.

gaining platforms for pet agenda on various issues of faith, morality, social theory, or politics. Laity often also perceive themselves as “paying customers,” with the right to demand “full value for their money” and to “call the shots” in the teaching, worship, life, and work of the parish or diocese.

The real root of the problem seems to lie in the modern secular obsession with self and the gratification of self, an overt narcissism and a posture of “self-actualization,” “self-assertion,” “self-empowerment,” or “self-fulfillment,” with little or no regard for God’s word or will and, perhaps, even no real acknowledgment of His existence. Leon Podles says,

The saints went out into the desert to wrestle with demons but also to find God. Skeptics suspect there is nothing to find, that God is just a phantasm with which we people the emptiness so that it is less frightening. Even an angry God is better than nothing at all.

“Be still, and know that I am God,” we are commanded as the first step of wisdom. Man weaves his own world around him and forgets that he is not the Creator.¹³

Thus the spiritual laws of obedience, self-abandonment, and godly consecration have been set aside, or conveniently forgotten. The self becomes man’s only reality. What is good is what is good for *me*, what furthers *my* desire for “self-fulfillment,” the attainment of *my* goals, what enhances *my* self-image. Conversely, what is evil is that which hinders my desire or frustrates my goals, or fails to enhance my self-image. It is narcissism on a grand scale, reflecting the confusion and secularism within our culture.

The Church, in embracing this secularist outlook in its life, affairs, and teaching, seems at the same time clearly to have departed from adherence to Scriptural norms, not only in doctrinal but in behavioral and moral standards. The controversies surrounding

¹³Leon J. Podles, “The Matter at Hand: Empty Spaces of the Word,” *Touchstone: A Journal of Mere Christianity*, Vol. 18, No. 1, January/February 2005, 12.

the issues of abortion, blessing of same-gender relationships, and the like show an uncertainty of mind not only on the authority of the Scriptures, but indeed on the very authority of God Himself. Nowhere, it seems, is the rush to self-fulfillment more alarmingly evident than in the area of sexual mores. It is yet another indication of the narcissistic obsession of the present age. Bryce Christensen recalls the disappearance of self-sacrifice during the “Woodstock Generation.” This phenomenon he calls “the adoration of the Sovereign Self,” and the moral and metaphysical ramifications are huge.

As religious faith declined in the seventies and eighties, “hedonistic values” sharply rose and people showed an increasing desire for self-gratification and an increasing absorption in the imperatives of self-actualization. This insistent emphasis could only weaken marriage, regardless of whether homosexuals were ever permitted to take vows. . . .

By the end of the twentieth century, many Americans no longer worshiped the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob—the Deity who summoned husbands and wives to selfless devotion within the conjugal bonds of marriage—but rather adored only the Sovereign Self, unfettered by religious or moral restraints.¹⁴

C. Fitzsimmons Allison calls this the modern incarnation of Adoptionism or Sabellianism, and its child, Monism; like all heresies, rooted in *hubris*, or overweening human pride, which makes man the end of all things. This involves a faulty doctrine of God, particularly a flawed Christology and a distorted perception of Christian soteriology.

As pride is the root of disobedience, self-centeredness, or the desire to be gods, is the root of all sin. . . . All sin stems from the original disobedience rooted in the self-centeredness of pride which seeks to be as gods.

Adoptionism is the glove that fits the hand of self-centeredness. Reducing the meaning of Christ’s atonement merely to an example for us to follow does not necessitate the giving up of self as center . . . the “exemplary” doctrine which we can easily wear over our unchanged, unrepentant, and uncleansed self-centeredness.¹⁵

¹⁴Bryce Christensen, “Rush to Alter,” *Ibid.*, 35. Christensen’s particular focus is on the sanctity of Christian marriage and the negative impact upon it both of marital infidelity and of the movement to legitimize same-gender relationships; but in fact his arguments are applicable to the entire issue of fidelity to God.

¹⁵C. Fitzsimmons Allison, “Short Beds and Narrow Blankets,” *The Cruelty of Heresy*. Harrisburg, PA: Morehouse Publishing, 1994, 40.

The so-called “New Age” movement . . . [sees] no real distinction between God and human beings, between persons and things, between you and me, or even between good and evil. . . . As a philosophy it is called monism.¹⁶

Contemporaneous with this “adoration of the Sovereign Self” was the rise of the “Death of God” theology of the 1960s and ’70s, spearheaded by such thinkers as Thomas Altizer and Paul Van Buren. This thinking posited that God had actually died, or at least that He was no longer an effectual reality in modern life and thinking and therefore could be taken or left alone. If God no longer lives, it follows, then He is no longer an authority with which we have to do. Worse, if God no longer lives, then humanity is left without hope of redemption. Alister E. McGrath says:

While most of the philosophy and theology contained in the “Death of God” literature seems to be very second-rate or worse, it is very necessary to reflect on how absolutely deadly must have been the experience which the writers of this literature must have had, both in the worshipping and in the theological lives of their churches. For example, the God whose death is proclaimed in Thomas Altizer’s *The Gospel of Christian Atheism* is a very sick God indeed. But someone must have given him this idea of God. The evidence suggests that it comes from a very sick church.¹⁷

It occurs, to this writer at least, that the “very sick church” of which McGrath speaks is a Church which, under the influence both of the eighteenth-century *Einleitung*, and of the nineteenth-century view of “inevitable progress” (which even Grafton himself partially espoused), had embraced a rationalistic view of God, creation, and nature. Culminating in the “Gilded Age,” so shortly to be followed by the bloodbath of world war and its resultant disillusionment with things sacred, the Church, along with western society at large, let itself be led into a gradual rejection of Divine norms and authority. The moral depravity of post-World War I life in European capitals, the rise and inhuman

¹⁶“Orthodoxy and Pagan Religions Revived,” *Ibid.*, 166.

¹⁷Alister E. McGrath, *The Renewal of Anglicanism*. Harrisburg, PA: Morehouse Publishing, 1993, 4.

barbarity of Nazism in Germany and the Communist dictatorship in Russia, the incipient anarchy and “drug culture” of the anti-war movement in the United States during the Vietnam era and decades following, and the “conspicuous consumerism” of the 1980s and ’90s, as well as “post-modern” secularist/hedonist mentalities, are all evidence of the absence of a vital and authoritative Christian spiritual and moral teaching in increasingly secularized societies. Enamored of popular secular views, many churches simply failed to call society to its religious duty. Losing a scriptural worldview, they had in the end no real or compelling message about the things of God with which to reach a broken, suffering, and disillusioned world starved for hope. If, it was reasoned, there is no living God, then the Church has nothing to say and there is no core standard of belief or behavior which mankind need obey.

To this Grafton stands as a contrary witness. He pointedly condemns thought that elevates rationalism or denies supernatural truth. Rationalism denies the reality of the living God; and for him, it is a clear and eternal danger to souls, and must be resisted at all cost. We can discern his mind in this particular attack on the secularized liberalism of what he terms the “Broad theology.”

While the Broad Churchman, governing himself by reason, neglected the value of tradition and authority in attempting to satisfy the unbelief of the world, the school was led, by its rationalism, to impute an ignorance to our Blessed Lord, which involved a denial of His Deity. With a diminished belief in the supernatural, it has largely rejected the miraculous in the Old and New Testament [*sic*]. . . . The Broad theology pleases the worldly and rationalistic mind. It makes no great demand upon faith, it presents an easy course of life, and it satisfies the natural religious spirit by the philanthropic works in which it is engaged. It is championed by men of large wealth and by many of the wealthier Churches throughout the East. It has captured many sources of influence. It covers up its heresies by posing as liberal. It manifests little experience of the Gospel system of salvation or of the higher walks of the Saintly life. It is by its rationalism a formidable and threatening power to the inherited Catholicity of our Church.

What, dear Brethren, in this aspect of the case shall we do? First, let us gratefully remember the marvelous Providence of God. . . .¹⁸

While Grafton here obviously paints with a broad brush, and though many in the liberal camp were and are decent and caring people, the rationalizing doctrine in much modern religious thought has largely left human society in confusion, cynicism, and hopelessness. What is wanted, Grafton says, is the recovery of genuine, living faith. Humanity needs to recover a childlike faith and trust in God and His love. It is by “becoming a little child” through faith that Christians are “by union with the deified humanity of Christ elevated to a high participation of the Divine nature” within the “living organism” of the body of the Church. The soul is to be transformed by humility. Here Grafton would certainly commend the life of obedience and spiritual mortification, that “as our wills become more one with His Will, a peace and joy unspeakable enter into the soul, and we rest in Him,”¹⁹ and not in narcissistic self-absorption.

Forceful pronouncements such as these, by a soul which has struggled through to holiness, give strong evidence to the Church today of the real value of the old truths and the old ways of the Christian faith and Gospel. However the old truths and the old ways are interpreted, the truths themselves remain forever because they are founded on Christ. It is the Church’s duty, Grafton declares, to proclaim the old truths and the old ways, no

¹⁸“The Catholicity of the Anglican Communion,” *WCCG*, VII, 284-285. Superior General’s Address to the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament, 1907. Most Broad churchmen, though liberal, were essentially reasonable. No less a luminary than Phillips Brooks, who was accused of Arian and Unitarian leanings (*CMAEC*, 138-139), was personally devoted to Christ and to the Incarnation. Nonetheless, “Broad churchmanship” remains a consistent target of Grafton’s opprobrium as a danger to the Church’s faith throughout his writings.

What is lost today, moreover, is a common spiritual vocabulary. In fact, the post-modern society does not speak the same language at all, or even comprehend the fundamental terminology of religion, as was, despite philosophical disagreement, still common a century ago.

¹⁹*Ibid.*, V, 359-359 (see also n. V.77).

matter the discouragement. And it is the duty of the Christian to remember that the Church is still the repository of Apostolic faith, priesthood, and ordinances.

Whatever changes were made at that time [the Reformation], the Church preserved the ancient Faith, the ancient Priesthood, and the ancient Worship. It was on this profession on the part of the Anglican Church that you and I, my Brethren, were led to give our lives and all that we have to the Church's service. . . . We must, therefore, with all the powers we possess, stand by her in this great emergency, and be willing, if so it is God's pleasure, to die as martyrs in her cause. Here, Christ by His Providence has placed us, and as it is as great an act of desertion for a soldier in battle to leave one post for another as to run away, so would it be for us to leave the position in Christ's Church assigned us by our great Commander.²⁰

This is Grafton's constant caution to the Church, clergy and laity alike: they must stay in the Church, witness to the Church's faith and the teaching of Scripture, and look with "childlike faith" for the consummation of all things in God's time and according to His will. To do less, he says, is to desert Christ. To the question, "What shall we do?" he reminds the Church that prayer and the Sacraments are its most formidable weapons against evil. In an address to the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament, he says:

Dear Brethren, you and the Confraternity have a great mission from God. He has given you the enlightenment of the Catholic Faith and placed the great weapon of the Eucharistic Sacrifice in your hands, and you can daily plead the great memorial before the Almighty God, whose power nothing can resist. . . .

We must encourage ourselves by the remembrance that we are living in the last times, and if the last final conflict with Anti-Christ is dawning upon us, we must lift up our heads, knowing our redemption draweth nigh.²¹

²⁰Ibid., VII, 283-284. "This great emergency" was the 1907 General Convention's consideration and (as amended) passage of the so-called "Open Pulpit Canon," which allowed ministers of other denominations to give addresses from Episcopal pulpits on special occasions. Though *The Living Church* called the canon relatively "innocuous," many, including almost the entire body of the Congregation of the Companions of the Holy Saviour (the CSSS), and a number of students at Nashotah (several of them CSSS members), left the Episcopal Church and went to Rome (*CMAEC*, 167-168).

²¹Ibid., 288-289. This overtly apocalyptic utterance of Grafton's is unusual, given his generally optimistic outlook about human progress. But it accords strongly with his unshakable belief that God is sovereign over His creation, and that He is near to redeem and sanctify His people, preparing them for their final consummation in Divine union and God-likeness.

It has always been devout, humble, and struggling prophets, priests, and ascetics, like Charles Chapman Grafton, who have given the message voice, and who by their lives have been signposts to those multitudes in every age seeking to meet God in spirit and in truth and striving for the transformation of their souls. One of Grafton's own prayers (which Michael Ramsey quotes) best sums up the thrust of his spiritual thought and aspirations Godward, as well as the ascetical struggle which so marked his life.

O God, dearest and best, may the increase of Thy accidental glory be the chief end of my life! May Thy ever blessed making will be the law of my being and of all my actions and desires! May Thy transforming and uniting love be the permanent and imperative motive of all my actions, duties, labors, thoughts, and words! May the life of my blessed Lord be the model and mould of my own, that being melted by penitence, I may be recast and recreated in Thee! May the Holy Spirit so rule and govern my interior, all my emotions, fears, hopes, sorrows, and joys, that I may rest peacefully in Thee, and be an instrument for the conversion of others!²²

F I N I S

²²Ibid., IV, 63, q. in Ramsey, "Charles C. Grafton, Bishop and Theologian," 9. Grafton called this "my prayer" and says of it, ". . . in varied forms used it, and have continued to do so, till my later years." The Sisterhood of the Holy Nativity still uses similar forms in daily prayers for the Sisters and Associates.

APPENDICES.

I. Unpublished Grafton Documents, Archives of the Diocese of Fond du Lac.

A. Sermons, St. Paul's Church, Baltimore, 1856-1864.

[Numbers are listed as they appear in the corpus, with liturgical days/dates where shown, Scriptural citations, and themes or significant quotations.]

- 1-4. [Missing.]
5. *1st Sun. in Lent, 02.10.1856.* “Jer. 6.2b. The Desire of Society is one of the instinctive principles of man’s nature.”
- VI. *Undated.* Rom. 7:4. “Married to Christ.” Item inserted in file order, purpose unclear.
6. *2nd Sun. in Lent, 02.17.1856.* “Duty to God”—hindrances.
7. *03.11.1856.* Matt. 20:6; Phil. 2:12. The age of Enterprise and Inquiry—man’s restless search for truth. Item out of chronological sequence, date given would have been a Tuesday.
8. [Missing.]
9. *1st Sun. after Easter, 03.30.1856.* 2 Tim. 2:8. Blessings of God little felt and appreciated.
10. *3rd Sun. after Easter 04.13.1856.* “Ye now therefore have sorrow, but I will see you again and your heart shall rejoice and your joy no man taketh from you. John 16.22.”
11. *7th Sun. after Trinity, 07.06.1856.* 1 Cor. 14:15. “I will pray with the Spirit, and I will pray with the understanding.” Liturgics. “The tribute of our praises and prayers is the dictate of Nature and the teaching of Revelation.”
12. [Missing.]
13. *9th Sun. after Trinity, 07.20.1856.* Mk. 10:4, Matt. 19:14. “Suffer the little children . . .” On infant Baptism.
- 14-18. [Missing.]

19. *Innocents Day, 12.28.1856.* Matt. 2. Contrast of Christmas and Holy Innocents.
20. *Sunday next before Easter, 04.05.1857.* Outline of the events of Holy Week.
21. *Undated.* Matt. 1:23. On the incarnation of Christ and the human will.
22. *Undated.* Isa. 49:6. On the season of Epiphany.
23. *Undated.* Ps. 29:2. On the “utility of set forms of worship.”
24. *2nd Sun. after Trinity, 06.13.1858.* 2 Tim. 2:20-21. On the “visible and invisible Church.”
25. *4th Sun. after Trinity, 06.27.1858.* Ps. 84:6. “Pools in the Valley”—the vale of tears.
26. *“08.1858.” (date incomplete).* Matt. 14:15-16. On Christ’s feeding of the multitude; typology of the Blessed Sacrament.
- 27/28? [Number seq. uncertain] *Undated.* Mk. 14:4-6. On “Costly Churches.” Commends the adornment of churches.
29. *25th Sun. after Trinity [sic], 11.21.1858.* Mic. 7:8. “The Church has knit you to the Cross.” On the examination of conscience. [Liturgical day was correctly “Sunday next before Advent.”]
30. *1st Sun. in Advent, 11.28.1858.* Cant. 2:8. On the season of Advent.
31. Do. Possibly an alternative sermon, or given in the evening.
- 32-36. [Missing.]
- 37? [Number uncertain] *01.10.1859.* Isa. 49:6. On the season of Epiphany (date given would have been a Monday). See also 22.
38. *Septuagesima, 02.20.1859.* Rom. 1:14. “Popular Objections Against Christians.” On Christians being “always the object of censure and attack.”
39. *Sexagesima, 02.27.1859.* “The True Principle of Life.” “The state of Man is one of labour and toil.”
40. [Missing.]
41. *2nd Sun. in Lent, 03.20.1859.* Lk. 7:47-48. On the Pharisee and the penitent [woman].

- 41c. *Wed. after Passion Sunday, 04.13.1859.* “Lent Lectures: 3) Condemnation.” Jn. 19:6. Item is out of liturgical and chronological sequence; may have been reused.
- 41d. *3rd Sun. in Lent, 03.27.1859.* John 6:66-68. On the rejection of Christ—why Christianity “is not successful as in early times;” combat with “worldly age.”
42. *Passion Sunday, 04.10.1859.* Jer. 13:23. “Habits.” “Man was born in society and there he remains.”
43. *Palm Sunday, 04.17.1859.* Lk. 19:41-42. “The Approach to Jerusalem.”
44. *Good Friday, 04.22.1859.* Isa. 53:5. “Man is by inheritance of a fallen nature alienated from God . . . the Holy God must have established Man in holiness.”
- 45/45b. *2nd Sun. after Easter, 05.08.1859.* “Christ our Stay in Every Trouble.” Lk. 24:29, “Abide with us.”
46. [Missing.]
47. *Sun. after Ascension, 06.05.1859.* “The Ascension.” Heb. 9:24.
- 48-52. [Missing.]
53. *5th Sun. after Trinity, 07.24.1859(?)*. Rom. 15:4 “The Church’s Authority is the proof of inspiration and its interpretation.”
- 53a. *10th Sun. after Trinity, 08.28.1859.* 1 Jn. 5:21. “Keep yourselves from idols.”
54. *11th Sun. after Trinity, 09.04.1859.* Acts 24:16. “The Duty to Conscience.”
55. [Missing.]
56. *15th [sic] Sun. after Trinity, 09.18.1859.* 1 Thess. 5:25. “Pray For Us—The Ember Season.” Liturgical day incorrect; was 13th Sun. after Trinity that year.
- 57-58 [Missing.]
59. *16th Sun. after Trinity, 10.09.1859.* Lk. 7:14-15. “The Raising of the Widow’s Son.”
60. [Missing.]
61. *21st Sun. after Trinity, 11.13.1859.* Ps. 42:6-7. “Religious Depression.”
62. *3rd Sun. in Advent, 12.11.1859.* 1 Cor. 4:1. “The Priest, Christ’s Minister.”

63. *4th Sun. in Advent, 12.18.1859.* “The Advent Into Us: Christ Present in His Ordinances.” Jn. 1:26. “There standeth One among you Whom ye know not.”
64. *The Circumcision, 01.01.1860.* Isa. 38:19. “The Privilege of Life: New Year’s Day.”
65. [Missing.]
66. *3rd Sun. after Epiphany, 01.22.1860.* Jn. 3:34. “The Manifestation of Divinity in Christ’s Teaching and Character.”
67. *4th Sun. after Epiphany, 01.29.1860(?); day and date uncertain.* Deut. 29:29. “Secret things belong unto the Lord” but “revealed things belong unto us.”
68. *Sexagesima, 02.12.1860.* Jn. 7:17. “Willingness the Condition of Enlightenment.”
69. *Quinquagesima, 02.19.1860.* 2 Tim. 1:13. “Hold fast the form sound words [sic] which thou hast heard of me, in faith and love in Christ Jesus.”
- 70-72. [Missing.]
73. *Passion Sunday, 03.25.1860.* Mk. 10:32. “Steadfastness of purpose.”
74. *Palm Sunday, 04.01.1860.* Jn. 12:12-13. “The Approach to Jerusalem One of Sorrow.”
75. [Missing.]
76. *1st Sun. after Easter, 04.15.1860.* Col. 3:1. “The Resurrection is not a mere subordinate incident in Our Lord’s life . . .”
77. *2nd Sun. after Easter, 04.22. 1860.* Acts 8:19. “Confirmation.”
78. *4th Sun. after Easter, 05.06.1860.* 2 Cor. 1:10. “As Sorrowful . . .” On “a distempered view of God’s character which makes the dread of punishment the highest form of piety.”
79. *Sun. after Ascension, 05.20.1860.* Heb. 9:24. “The Intercessor.”
80. *Whitsunday, 05.27.1860.* Acts 2:1-4. “The Correspondence Between Feasts of the Jewish and Christian Dispensations.”
81. *Trinity Sunday, 06.13.1860.* Matt. 28:19. “Thus with the great Doctrine of the Eternal and Ever-Blessed Trinity does the Church sum up her course of doctrinal teaching.”

82. *1st Sun. after Trinity, 06.10.1860.* Matt. 5:48. “A. Be ye therefore perfect—after the manner of God’s perfection.”
83. Do. 1 Thess. 5:17. “Pray Without Ceasing.” This may have been for an evening service, or for teaching.
84. *4th Sun. after Trinity, 07.01.1860.* Matt. 9:21. On the recording of miracles “for comfort and hope.”
85. *10th Sun. after Trinity, 08.12.1860.* Matt. 26:26-28. “The Holy Eucharist: A Commemoration—A Communion—A Sacrifice.”
86. *11th Sun. after Trinity, 08.19.1860.* Matt. 21. On “not feeling at all religious.”
87. *12th Sun. after Trinity, 08.26.1860.* Mk. 10:9. “The Principle of Ritualism Maintained.”
88. [Missing.]
89. *15th Sun. after Trinity, 09.16.1860.* Lk. 11:1. “Lord, Teach Us to Pray.” “To pray well is one of the highest tokens of Christian perfection.”
90. *16th Sun. after Trinity, 09.23.1860.* Heb. 10:25. “God carefully revealed the duty of worship.”
- 91-92. [Missing.]
93. *22nd Sun. after Trinity, 10.04.1860.* Phil. 3:13-14. “Forgetfulness [*sic*] of the Past.”
94. *Uncertain.* Lk. 21:19. “Patience.” [Note: This sermon was preached at St. Paul’s thrice.]
95. *4th Sun. in Advent, 12.23.1860.* Rev. 2:12.
96. *Christmas Day, 12.25.1860.* Lk. 2:14. “The Angelic Anthem.”
97. *1st Sun. after Christmas, 12.30.1860.* Gal. 4:4-5. “In the fullness of time . . .”
98. *Epiphany, 01.06.1861.* Matt. 2. “The Calling of the Gentiles.”
99. *1st Sun. after Epiphany, 01.03.1861.* Lk. 2:40. “Christ in the Temple.”
100. *2nd Sun. after Epiphany, 01.20.1861.* Jn. 2:11. “The Beginning of Miracles.”

101. *Septuagesima, 02.17. [sic] 1861.* Matt. 20. “Our work in Christ” (the parable of the vineyard. [Note: Date incorrect, should be 01.27.]
102. *Quinquagesima, 02.10.1861.* 1 Cor. 13:2, 4. “Charity.”
- 102a. *02.20.1861.* “Lent Lecture no. 1: The Lord’s Prayer.”
- 102b. *02.27.1861.* “Lent Lecture no. 2: The Lord’s Prayer—the Invocation.”
- 102c. *Undated—03.06.1860(?).* “Lent Lecture no. 3: The Lord’s Prayer—The First Petition.”
- 102d. *Undated—03.13.1860(?).* “Lent Lecture no. 4: The Lord’s Prayer—The Kingdom.”
103. *2nd Sun. in Lent; undated—date was 02.24.1861.* 2 Cor. 7:10. “Godly Sorrow Worketh Repentance Unto Salvation.”
104. *Uncertain.* 2 Cor. 7:11 ff. “For behold, this selfsame thing, that ye sorrowed after godly sort [*sic*], yea, what clearing of yourselves . . .”
105. *Uncertain.* “Jer. 17.9. The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked.”
106. *1st Sun. after Easter; incomplete date—was 04.17.1861.* 1 Cor. 15:17. “The Truth of Christ’s Death and Resurrection.” Also preached 3rd Easter 1861 at Mount Calvary, Baltimore.
107. *Uncertain; v.61.* “What blessed, comforting, soothing words are these. To how many in the long ages have they not brought balm to the wounded heart . . . men have heard the persuasive tones of the gracious invitation and bent themselves to the sweet slavery of His yoke.”
108. *Undated.* Heb. 7:12. “The Priesthood and the Law.”
109. *7th Sun. after Trinity, 07.14.1861.* Rom. 6; 1 Pet. 2:25. “Our Lord the Giver of All Good Things.”
110. *9th Sun. after Trinity, 07.28.1861.* Judg. 8:28. “Sources of Strength.”
111. *11th Sun. after Trinity, 08.11.1861.* Lk. 18:13 (the Publican and the Pharisee). “The one . . . looks to the mere requirements of the law and the letter, asks whether these have not been fulfilled . . . [the other] looks not toward earth but heaven, asks not how much he has fulfilled, but like S. Paul forgetting the things behind . . .”

112. *12th Sun. after Trinity, 08.18.1861.* 1 Cor. 1:23-24. “Christ Our Only Teacher and Guide.”
113. *21st Sun. after Trinity; date incomplete—was 10.20.1861.* Lk. 9:23. “Union to Christ and His Cross.” “And he said unto them all, If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself and take up his cross daily and follow Me.” Also preached 21st Trinity 1863, and at St. Andrew’s, Baltimore, 20th Trinity 1863.
114. *22nd Sun. after Trinity; date inc.—was 10.27.1861.* Heb. 12:2. “Fruits of the Cross. Abiding Sorrow, Endurance, Devotion.” “Christ is the Beginning and the End of our salvation.”
115. *23rd Sun. after Trinity; date inc.—was 11.03.1861.* Jn. 12:32. “Progress is the law of the Christian life . . . naught in nature or in grace stands still.”
- [115.] *Extra loose ms. Inserted in sermon booklet; date unknown.* “Vii.14. Rev. S. Jn. And he said unto me, These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.” Three sections: I) “. . . the conclusion of the Church’s creed” versus “the popular creed;” II) “It is for this supernatural end for which [*sic*] the Church is fitting us. The end supernatural. A Deliverance from self union with God in Xt, the Incarnate God;” III) “Each adorned with some particular grace. . . . The Glory of God seen in all. The clay molded by Him.”
116. *25th Sun. after Trinity; date inc.—was 11.17.1861.* Rev. 22:3-4. “The Great Reward.” “Little can we know of heaven . . .”
117. *Thanksgiving Day, 11.28.1861.* Gen. 32:10. “Jacob’s Thankfulness in Time of Distress.”
118. *3rd Sun. in Advent, 12.15.1861.* Mal. 3. “Seasons of Grace.” “Our Advent duty of looking for Christ comes as you know from no mere ecclesiastical arrangement of seasons. The Church brings before us one of those great gospel precepts which Christ so inculcated in His disciples. He knew what was in the heart of man, how prone to go back from Him . . .” Originally numbered 118, then renumbered as 119 but retained in the folder in present order.
119. *1st Sun. in Advent, 12.01.1861.* Rom. 13. “Waiting for Christ—Advent.” Originally numbered 119, then renumbered as 118 but retained in the folder in present order.
120. *4th Sun. in Advent, 12.22.1861.* Jn. 1:23. “St John Baptist.” Originally numbered 119b, then renumbered as 120.
120. *Christmas Day, 12.25.1861.* Matt. 1:23. “The Restored Presence to Mankind.” “They shall call His Name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with

us.” “All our a) being & b) happiness depends on God’s Presence with us: nothing created can exist without His Will calling it into existence.” Numbering duplicates the item directly preceding, renumbered from 119b.

121. *2nd Sun. after Epiphany; date inc.—was 01.19.1862.* Jn. 2. “The Water Changed to Wine.”
122. *4th Sun. after Epiphany; date inc.—was 02.02.1862.* Ezek. 1:10; Rev. 4:7. “The Manifestation of Christ in the Differences in the Evangelists.”
123. *Sexagesima; date inc.—was 02.23.1862.* Lk. 8:5. “The Sower.” Also preached Sexagesima 1864.
124. *Palm Sunday, 04.13.1862.* Gen. 49:10-12. “The Mystical Meaning of Christ’s Entry into Jerusalem.”
- 125-129. [Missing.]
130. *14th Sun. after Trinity, 09.21.1862.* Jer.(?) 8:7,14,16. “War a Punishment From God.” Citation unclear, reads simply “J”.
131. *22nd Sun. after Trinity, [11.16]/1862.* “The Acts 17 ch. 28 v. In Him we live and move and have our being.” “The Altar erected to the Unknown was to Him Who alone was God, Maker of heaven & earth. He who dwelt not in temples made with hands but was [?], Omnipresent, Unconfined—Who needed not the worship of men . . . the Giver of all life & health & all things, the Determiner of all times, limits & bounds, the Lord desires His children should seek after Him. . . . God is seen—Creating Spiritual beings capable of loving & worshiping & finding their delight in Him.”
132. *Sunday Next Before Advent, 11.23.1862.* Ps. 139:14. “God Our Maker, Master and End.” “Why did such a Being ever bring anything into existence?”
133. [Missing.]
134. *4th Sun. in Advent, 12.21.1862.* Mk. 9:47-48. “HELL.”
135. *2nd Sun. after Epiphany, 01.18.1863.* Jn. 2:5. “Whatsoever He saith to you, do it.” Contrast of Eve and Mary.
136. *Septuagesima, 02.01.1863.* Rom. 8. “Justification.”
137. *Sexagesima, 02.08.1863.* Matt. 7:7. “Ask and it shall be given.” We are saved in Christ; contrast of Adam and Christ.
138. Do. Jn. 17:20-21. May have been used at another service or in the evening.

139. *Ash Wednesday, 02.18.1863.* Ps. 19:12. “Self-knowledge is the most difficult of acquirements.”
140. *2nd Sun. in Lent, 03.01.1863.* 1 Kgs. 17:18. “Sin Called to Remembrance.”
141. *4th Sun. in Lent, 03.13 [sic] 1863.* Jn. 11:28. “The Master’s Call.” “God doth what He will with His own.” Correct date was 03.15.1863.
142. *Palm Sunday, 03.29.1863.* Jn. 12:3. “The Feast at Bethany—S. Mary Magdalene a Type of the Church.”
143. *Easter Day, 04.05.1863.* Matt. 28:5-6. “Fear Not . . .”
144. *1st Sun after Easter, 04.12.1863.* Rev. 5:9-10. Christ Our Prophet, Priest, and King.”
145. *4th Sun. after Easter, 04.26.1863 [sic].* Heb. 4:9. “Our Rest in Christ.” Correct date was 05.03.1863.
146. *Undated—Whitsunday (?).* Jn. 14:16. “The Work of Christ Completed by the Holy Spirit.”
- *Trinity Sunday, 05.31.1863.* Matt. 28:19. On the Holy Trinity.
147. *2nd Sun. after Trinity, 06.14.1863.* Jn. 15:5. “I Am the Vine.”
- 148-150. [Missing.]
151. *17th Sun. after Trinity, [10.04]1863.* Lk. 14:11. “Humility.”
152. *20th Sun. after Trinity, [10.25]1863.* Eph. 4:13. “The World’s True Progress.” [Also preached at Calvary, NYC, 1864; Cowley 1865; Emmanuel, Boston, 1865; Advent, Boston, 1872.]
- 153-154. [Missing.]
155. *Ash Wed., 02.10.1864.* Rev. 4:5. “Spiritual Declension [*sic*] . . . Wickedness of Declining in Grace.”
- 155a. *1st Sun. in Lent, 02.14.1864.* 1 Kgs. 18:21. “Halting Between Two Opinions.”
156. *1st Sun. after Easter, 04.03.1864.* Rev. 5:8-10. On the worthiness of Christ.
- *14th Sun. after Trinity, 10.21.1864.* “Duty of the Baptized.” Unnumbered.

B. Miscellaneous Loose Manuscripts.

NOTE: These documents are contained in five manila folders in the archival collection. Items listed are those containing material directly relevant to the project; the numeration is personal and provisional to the writer and items are numbered according to folder number and sequence within the folder. In many cases the items are fragmentary and Grafton's hand is in places nearly illegible. Dates are uncertain unless otherwise noted.

- P1.01. Fragment of outline, sermon or address, citing Acts 4:12. Headings: I, "The Imagined Contrast Concerning the Race;" II, "The Effect of Sin."
- P1.02. Fragment, "D.B. Do not measure your --- by what others are doing—It is not by others [*sic*] conduct we shall be judged. Rather be --- in Xt for so I am willing (?) to address you . . ."
- P1.03. Sermon or address, 12.26.1893, titled "Changes in Life's [?]," 10 pp., citing Joshua 3. "One marked feature of life which effects the development of character is its frequent changes."
- P1.04. Outline, sermon or address, titled "We Are Temples of the Holy Ghost." "The tendency or activity of the H. Spirit is towards Union—the Holy Spirit binds together in mutual love."
- P1.05. Outline, titled "Love of Beauty—in Nature, Art & Character." "I. Nature. The world made by One Who knows what beauty is. & the beauty of Nature a real communication made to us concerning the Mind & Will Which is behind Nature . . ."
- P1.06. Outline, titled "Sacrifice is the Law of Worship", citing Ps. 50:5. "It is the ordained means of man's approach to God. It is the medium of God's gift to man . . ."
- P1.07. Sermon or address, titled "The Conversion of Saul." "The windows in the cathedral." Outline of St. Paul's background and conversion process.
- P1.08. Typed fragment, heading "II", with penna numbered and added note (8). "5. A Faithful Heart, Believing, in spite of doubts. . . . 6. The heart of the little child in simplicity. . . . 7. A heart full of self-renunciation. . . . 8. An ever growing nearer . . ."
- P1.09. Outline, titled "Penance—Article", citing Ps. 119:59. "When & how—He gave the Power. The resort to it is either Necessary—or the part [?] of wisdom—or election . . ." "II. It is a school of Self knowledge. Repentance is a necessity. What is a gospel repentance . . ."

- P1.10. Outline, short address or homily, titled “God Manifest in Christ.” “We can follow and understand Him & His life as the Apostles could not when He was on earth— --- why . . .” “I. Nature acknowledged Him . . .” Notes on the character of Christ.
- P1.11. Outline, citing Ps. 50:5 “Sacrifice the law of worship in all dispensations.” Similar to 1.06 above, added exposition: “What its [*sic*] relation to Calvary?”
- P1.12. Fragmentary outline, “The critical and unbelieving spirit. It rejects the supernatural inspiration, miracles. It regards the Old T. as composed of unhistorical legends. . . . How is this spirit to be met? . . .”
- P1.13. Fragmentary outline, heading “II,” “Characteristics of the Carnal Mind.”
- P1.14. Fragmentary notes on Cathedral stationery, “The Introduction. The Interpretation—is literal or figurative. . . . Sacrifice. The Religion of Our Lord’s action at Calvary—of the Eucharist to Calvary [*sic*] . . .”
- P1.15. Fragmentary notes, “Holy Places—the Church the meeting place between Son (?) and Man. . . . The Meaning of the Temple . . .”
- P1.16. Outline on Bishop’s House stationery, titled “The Freedom of the Spirit.” “Our religion is a narrow one. . . . It says ‘no other way’ [?] because the Gospel comes to man making him an offer of a supernatural end. . . .”
- P1.17. Outline, 3 headings, “I. Some Signs of progress . . .” “II. Discouraging signs . . .” “III. Our Normal State. a Struggle—& Rest. a. [*sic*] We are Soilders [*sic*] . . .”
- P2.01. Incomplete sermons or address, “of life. In Him was life and the Life was the Light of men. He is the light as the enlightener of His creatures . . .”
- P2.02. Typed sermon notes, titled “Christ’s entire sympathy with each of us.” “He is touched, as the Apostle says, with a feeling of our infirmities. [addition in ms.] He knows whereof we are made . . .”
- P2.03. Notes on Cathedral stationery, title “The Call of Lent. to [*sic*] Repentance.” “I. Repentance. Requires some Knowledge of Son. . . . We must Know Son, His Nature & our relation to Him . . .”
- P2.04. Copy of letter, undated and addressee unnamed, “My very dear— I have often had you in mind & wondered how you were getting on—Finding yourself knocked down at times & getting discouraged I dare say, but looking away from self to Christ & getting up again . . .”

- P2.05. Incomplete sermon or retreat (?) address, “. . .and make haste & delay not the time to keep the commandments. And the nearer we draw to Him & the more of Him we know, the greater will be our amasement [*sic*] of that love & mercy . . .”
- P2.06. Fragment of sermon or address, “man demanded the incorporation of Deity with itself— The organic evil demanded an organic remedy— A new head must be given to the race . . .”
- P2.07. Fragmentary outline, “We have presented the contrast between the Jewish & the Xtn Systems or the O. & N. Dispensations, the Law & the Gospel. Let us consider in what they were alike & in what they differed.”
- P2.08. Fragmentary notes, “distinction, as it must in the order of nature for the Christian soul shall within him [*sic*] a well of water springing up into everlasting life.”
- P2.09. Fragment of sermon or address, “and as conveyed in His looks of His ‘loving him’. He looks round in the synagog [*sic*] ‘with anger being grieved at the hardness of their hearts’ . . .”
- P2.10. Fragmentary notes, “Why does not one act of sin injure this new relation to God as the one sin of Adam die [?] that of the old? Why does not one sin [?] produce a rupture of relation . . .”
- P4.01. Fragmentary notes, “The Scene below. Strange contrast. Above the pure heaven—the words of divine attestation—the form of Saints floating in light. The glory of Jesus . . .”
- P5.01. Fragment of outline titled “Inner Life of Xt.” “Three ways of studying His life: 1. The literary way. 2. The usual Xtian way (‘copyists’). 3. The studying it with His power within . . .”
- P5.02. Fragmentary note on Cathedral stationery, possibly copied from a magazine. “The universe in all its parts is the visible manifestation of an underlying Mind, and all interpretation by us of the phenomenon of nature should therefore be guided by the assumption of underlying purpose—The Century.”
- P5.03. Meditation outline, title “Meditation. The Heavenly Bridegroom.” “The joy of the Bride is in her Lord . . .”
- P5.04a. Copy, on Grand H^{tel} d’Europe stationery, from 1903 Russian tour, of Orthodox “prayer” (Troparion of the Holy Friday Entombment service and Holy Saturday Matins), “Honorable Joseph took Thy spotless Body from the Cross . . .” Illegible notes at top.

- P5.04b. Copy, on same stationery, of Orthodox “prayer” (Megalyrnarion of the Theotokos), “Blessed art thou ever Virgin, entirely spotless & Mother of our God . . .” Includes the notation “Memorial of the Incarnation.”
- P5.04c. Copies, on same stationery, of Orthodox liturgical hymns “O only-begotten Son & Word of God” (Anthem of the Incarnation at the Second Antiphon) and “Let us who mystically represent the Cherubim” (Cherubicon at the Great Entrance).
- P5.05. Notes on S.S. *Deutschland* stationery, from 1903 tour, “The visible Church collectively to the individual indirectly & independently to each several soul . . .”
- P5.06. Notes, possibly for a retreat, October 1886, titled “Law: An Evidence of God.” “All must recognize the reign of law. The world has developed out of a primal condition . . . by the operation of law steadily working toward this final result.”
- P5.07. Fragmentary address notes, citing Heb. 4:15. “Various reasons contribute to diminish the practical application to ourselves of our Lord’s temptations . . .”
- P5.08. Fragmentary notes, labeled “Page II” (partly typed with ms. additions), “Instances. To Abraham, in thy seed shall all nations be blessed. To the Jews. Their condemnation for rejecting Christ and so a living monument to Christ. The Gospel to be a witness to Christ in all nations . . .”
- P5.09. A note, “The Gospel itself is but the beginning of that voluminous speach [*sic*], of that crowded epic of works of love & wonder. Christ is not merely the central figure of the Galilean idyll . . .”
- P5.10. Fragmentary note, “God became incarnate for the elevation of man’s nature & the removal of man’s sins . . .”
- P5.11. Notes, “O Venerable Church! Apostolically descended! . . . The Church is a school of Sanctity . . .”
- P5.12. Notes, citing Prov. 10. “When a young person falls away [?] it is sometimes said by way of consolation that he was led astray. . . . All we can expect is that every one should start in life with fixed purposes and dispositions . . .”
- P5.13. Partial notes, “2. Conscience must always present to man a law wh. he feels should be & might be, but which he knows is not obeyed.”

II. Selected Unpublished Documents, Archives of the Diocese of Maryland.

These items, almost entirely correspondence addressed to Bishop William Whittingham and most from Grafton, are intended to illustrate to some degree the relationship between Whittingham and Grafton and Whittingham’s influence on Grafton’s development and

thought. Sadly, no correspondence *from* Whittingham *to* Grafton appears to have survived (possibly due either to monastic disciplinary rules at Cowley regarding humility or to constraints on storage space). The Diocese of Maryland has assigned no archival numbers to these documents; therefore the numbers assigned by the writer are personal and provisional.

- DM01. Letter from Grafton to Whittingham from Boston, Ascension [05.17]1885 applying for consideration for Holy Orders. “On this day a year since I humbly conceived the desire, if it be the will of my Heavenly Father a laborer [*sic*], though necessarily an unworthy one in Christs [*sic*] vineyard . . .”
- DM02. Letter from G. to W. from Reisterstown, MD, 05.17.1856, in regard to a prospective call to the Catoctin parish. Expresses a willingness to stay or go as the Bishop directs, “having no other wish than his pleasure.”
- DM03. Fragmentary letter from G. to W. from Miles Town, 06.14.1858, in regard to his reasons not to accept an assignment to Dr. Pyne of St. John’s [Lafayette Square], Washington. Misgivings about serving as a curate in “a *fashionable, pew church*” rather than helping found a mission. Also references to the “melancholy news” of the Bishop’s recent bereavement which had prevented a personal interview.
- DM04. Announcement of schedule of “Retreats for Clergy,” July-September 1865 for Hurstpierpoint, Cuddesdon, Harlow, Horbury, and Ditchingham. Commends avoidance of other engagements, also a manual available through J.H. Parker.
- DM05. Letter from G. to W. from Cowley, 11.20.1865. Describes his life and work in England as a member of the SSJE and expresses his “desire and prayer . . . that by God’s grace I might 2 [?] kept true to the benediction you bestowed upon my journey & training. . . . [God] has dealt graciously with me . . .”
- DM06. Letter from G. to W. from Bethnel Green and Spitalfields Temporary Cholera Hospital, Whitechapel, London, 10.05.1866. Joy at W’s arrival in England though concerned for his frail health, expresses hopes of meeting with him, but “if you fear [?] the excitement of it, I must wait a little . . .” Hopes for cold weather to bring an abatement of the epidemic.
- DM07. Letter from G. to W. from Cowley, 11.07.1866. Has met with his brother “who was passing through England on his way to the Continent” and thus missed meeting with W. Preparing for a retreat at the Clewer Sisterhood. He will be free after the 24th and hopes for a meeting at that time.
- DM08. Letter from G. to W. from Mission House, Oxford, 11.17.1871. Work in England is “so far advanced that I feel it is my duty to return to the States.” A “Mr. Bishop” in Bridgeport, CT has provided a house “for collegiate purposes

& the Church adjoining.” Request for letters dimissory with thanks “for all these past years of kindness and consideration . . .”

- DM09. Letter from Bishop John Williams of Connecticut to W., 12.11.1871. Opposes introduction of the SSJE into his diocese and asks whether the Canons compel him to accept letters dimissory for G. “Alas! for the self will of these men . . .”
- DM10. Letter from G. to W. from Boston, 02.22.1872, returning letters dimissory and reporting his rejection by Bishop Williams. Announces his acceptance of a call to the Church of the Advent and asks that letters be sent to the Bishop of Massachusetts (Eastburn). Mentions election of [Fr.] Joseph Richey to Mount Calvary, Baltimore to which G. was also called and “will not stand in the way.”
- DM11. Letters from G. to W. from Boston, 03.01.1872, reporting on his health and stating that he is “on the mend.” Thanks W. for “all your kind and fatherly advice to me in the years past” and saying that he wants “to be clear & open, & keep straight with you.” Apprehension re: prejudice in Massachusetts about establishing the SSJE and assuring W. that he is *not* a ritualist!
- DM12. Letter from G. to W. from Boston, 11.25.1872, asking for W.’s review of Pusey’s book on the Councils. Asks advice on procedures in electing a bishop (Eastburn had died in September), presumably apprehensive about a coming election.
- DM13. Letter from G. to W. from Boston, 11.11.1873(?), reporting contacts with Italians who “want to be Catholics but not Romans,” though apprehensive about public reaction. Asks W. to send him a list of books that would help in his dealings with them.
- DM14. Letter from G. to W. from Boston, 01.11.1875. Reports Mrs. [Adeline Blanchard] Tyler’s death after a long illness and asks W. to send a notice to *The Churchman*. G. had been in Baltimore but had not been able to call on W. “Your care, advice, & counsel I always remember. Your words have been greater help to me than you can know.”
- DM15. Letter from G. to W. from Boston, 02.09.1875. Asks prayers for “a soul (a lady counselee) long bound with a habit of sensuality. . . . I do not know how victory can be obtained . . .”

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Published Works.

- Allchin, A.M., *Participation in God: A Forgotten Strand in Anglican Tradition*. Wilton, CT: Morehouse-Barlow Co., Inc., 1988.
- Allison, C. Fitzsimmons, *The Cruelty of Heresy: An Affirmation of Christian Orthodoxy*. Harrisburg, PA: Morehouse Publishing, 1994.
- Andrewes, Lancelot, *The Private Devotions of Lancelot Andrewes*, trans. with intro. & notes by F.E. Brightman (reprint “with minor excisions” of orig. ed. of Brightman trans., Methuen, London, 1903); incl. “Lancelot Andrewes” by T.S. Eliot. New York: Living Age Books/Meridian Books, Inc., 1961.
- Anson, Peter F., *The Call of the Cloister: Religious Communities and Kindred Bodies in the Anglican Communion*. London: SPCK, 1964.
- Athanasius, St., *St. Athanasius on the Incarnation (De Incarnatione Verbi Dei)*, ed. & trans. by a Religious of CSMV, intro. by C.S. Lewis. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1982.
- Benedict of Nursia, St., *St. Benedict’s Rule for Monasteries*, trans. Leonard J. Doyle, OSB. Collegeville, MN: St. John’s Abbey Press, 1949.
- Benson, Richard Meux, *Eleven Addresses During a Retreat of the Companions of the Love of Jesus*. Oxford: J.H. Parker, 1908. [NOTE: Bookplate, “American Branch C.L.J., 1-99 Carroll Street, Brooklyn 31, N.Y.” with penned revised address “7 E. 95th St., N.Y.C. 28” pasted over publisher information on title page.]
- _____, *Instructions on the Religious Life: First Series, Edited from Notes*. Oxford: Society of St. John the Evangelist, 1927.
- _____, *Instructions on the Religious Life: Third Series*, intro. by F.B. Dalby. London: A.R. Mowbray & Co. Ltd; New York: Morehouse-Gorham Co., 1951.
- _____, *Letters of Richard Meux Benson, Student of Christ Church; Founder and First Superior of the Society of S. John the Evangelist, Cowley; with an Introductory Memoir by The Rt. Rev. A.C.A. Hall, D.D., Bishop of Vermont, USA; sel. & arr. C. Congreve & W.H. Longridge*. London, Oxford: A.R. Mowbray & Co. Ltd; Milwaukee, WI: The Young Churchman Co., 1916.

_____, *The Life Beyond the Grave: A Series of Meditations upon the Resurrection and Ascension of Our Lord Jesus Christ*. London: J.T. Hayes, 1885.

_____, *Redemption: Some of the Aspects of the Work of Christ, Considered in a Course of Sermons*. London: J.T. Hayes, 1861.

_____, *Spiritual Letters of Richard Meux Benson, Founder and First Superior of the Society of S. John the Evangelist Cowley, with a memorial sermon by The Rt. Rev. Charles Gore, D.D., D.C.L., sometime Bishop of Oxford*, sel. & ed. W.H. Longridge. London, Oxford: A.R. Mowbray & Co. Ltd; Milwaukee, WI: The Morehouse Publishing Co., 1924.

_____, *Spiritual Readings for Every Day: Advent*. London: J.T. Hayes, 1879.

_____, *Spiritual Readings for Every Day: Christmas*. London: J.T. Hayes, 1880.

_____, *Spiritual Readings for Every Day: The Manifestation of Christ*. London: J.T. Hayes, 1882.

_____, *The Way of Holiness: An Exposition of Psalm Cxix Analytical and Devotional*. London: Methuen & Co., 1901.

The Book of Common Prayer (1662, Church of England); with Amendments to rubrics in accordance with Clergy (Ordination and Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure 1964, Prayer Book (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure 1965, Prayer Book (Further Provisions) Measure 1969. Oxford: University Press, 1969.

_____ (1789, Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America). London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, for the “New-York Bible and Common Prayer-Book Society” (no pub. date; certification by Horatio Potter, V Bishop of New York, 1868). Prayer Book in force during most of Grafton’s life and for the first four years of his episcopate.

_____ (1892, Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America). London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, Queen’s Printers; New York: E. & J.B. Young & Co., 1893. Prayer Book in force during most of Grafton’s episcopate. [NOTE: Volume in writer’s possession bound with Lessons for Sunday and Holy Day Morning and Evening Prayer under cover title *Church Services*.]

Booty, John E., *Three Anglican Divines on Prayer: Jewel, Andrewes, and Hooker*. Lectures given for the Society of St. John the Evangelist, November 1977. Cambridge, MA: Society of St. John the Evangelist, 1978.

Brand, William Francis, *The Life of William Rollinson Whittingham, Fourth Bishop of Maryland, in Two Volumes*, 2nd ed. New York: E. & J.B. Young & Co., 1886.

Butler, Perry, ed., *Pusey Rediscovered*. London: SPCK, 1983.

- Caussade, Jean Pierre de, *Abandonment to Divine Providence (L'Abandon a la providence divine)*, ed. J. Ramiere, SJ, trans. E.J. Strickland. Exeter: The Catholic Records Press, 1921.
- Chadwick, Owen, ed., *The Mind of the Oxford Movement*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1967.
- _____, *The Spirit of the Oxford Movement: Tractarian Essays*. Cambridge: University Press, 1990.
- Christensen, Bryce, "Rush to Alter." *Touchstone: A Journal of Mere Christianity*, Vol. 18, No. 1, January/February 2005.
- Coppedge, Alan, *John Wesley in Theological Debate*. Wilmore, KY: Wesley Heritage Press, 1987.
- Coxe, A. Cleveland, et al., eds., *Ante-Nicene Fathers: The Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325* (reprint of orig. ed., Christian Literature Publishing Company, 1887). 10 vol. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1994.
- Cross, F.L., ed., *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (reprint of 1st ed., 1957). London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1966.
- DeMille, George E., *The Catholic Movement in the American Episcopal Church* (reprint of 2nd ed., Church Historical Society, 1950). Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2005.
- Donne, John, *The Complete Poetry of John Donne (The Anchor Seventeenth-Century Series)*, ed. with intro., notes, & variants by John T. Shawcross. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books/Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1967.
- _____, *Essays in Divinity by John Donne*, ed. Evelyn M. Simpson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952.
- _____, *The Showing Forth of Christ: Sermons of John Donne*, sel. & ed. with intro. by Edmund Fuller. New York, Evanston, London: Harper & Row Publishers, 1964.
- Epiphanius of Salamis, St., *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis: Book I* (Sects. 1-46), trans. Frank Williams. Leiden, New York, Köln: E.J. Brill, 1987.
- _____, *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis: Books II & III* (Sects. 47-80; *De Fide*), trans. Frank Williams. Leiden, New York, Köln: E.J. Brill, 1994.
- Fénelon, François de Salignac de la Mothe, *Christian Perfection (Instructions et avis sur diverse points de la morale et de la perfection Chrétienne)*, ed. Charles F.

Whiston, trans. Mildred Whitney Stillman. New York, London: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1947.

The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI (Everyman's Library Edition), intro. by E.C.S. Gibbon. London: J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd; New York: E.P. Dutton & Co. Inc., 1957.

Flowers, James E., Jr, "Something More than Feelings." *The Living Church*, Vol. 229, No. 14, October 3, 2004.

Gill, Frederick, C., *Selected Letters of John Wesley*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1956.

Grafton, Charles Chapman, *The Cathedral Edition: The Works of The Rt. Rev. Charles C. Grafton, S.T.D., LL.D., Second Bishop of Fond du Lac*, ed. B. Talbot Rogers. 8 vol. New York, London, Bombay, Calcutta, Madras: Longmans, Green & Co., 1914.

- I. *Christian and Catholic.*
- II. *The Lineage of the American Catholic Church and Pusey and the Church Revival.*
- III. *A Catholic Atlas, or Digest of Catholic Theology.*
- IV. *A Journey Godward of Δουλος Ιησου Χριστου.*
- V. *Vocation, or The Call of the Divine Master to a Sister's Life; and Other Writings on the Religious Life.*
- VI. *Plain Suggestions for a Reverent Celebration of the Holy Communion and Fond du Lac Tracts.*
- VII. *Letters and Addresses.*
- VIII. *Addresses and Sermons.*

Green, J. Brazier, *John Wesley and William Law*. London: Epworth Press, 1945.

Green, V.H.H., *John Wesley*. London: Thomas Nelson & Sons Ltd, 1964.

Hall, Francis J., *Theological Outlines*, 3rd ed., rev. Frank Hudson Hallock. New York: Morehouse-Barlow Company, 1933; sixth printing, 1961.

Hardy, E.R., ed., *Orthodox Statements on Anglican Orders* (for the Advisory Council to the Presiding Bishop on Ecclesiastical Relations). New York: Morehouse-Gorham Co.; London, Oxford: A.R. Mowbray & Co. Ltd, 1946.

The Holy Bible with the Apocrypha: King James Version. New York, Chicago, Los Angeles: American Bible Society, 1965.

Hooker, Richard, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity: In Two Volumes* (Everyman's Library ed.), intro. by Christopher Morris. London: J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd, 1968.

- _____, *The Works of That Learned and Judicious Divine, Mr. Richard Hooker: With an Account of His Life and Death, by Isaak Walton*, ed. John Keble (facsimile reprint of 7th ed., 1887). 3 vol. Ellicott City, MD: Via Media, Inc., 1994.
- Husain, Itrat, *The Dogmatic and Mystical Theology of John Donne* (reprint of 1st ed., 1938). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press Publishers, 1970.
- James Lloyd Breck: *Apostle of the Wilderness*, intro. by Thomas C. Reeves (abridged from Charles Breck, *The Life of The Rev. James Lloyd Breck, D.D.*, 1883). Nashotah, WI: Nashotah House, 1992. Published for the Sesquicentennial of the founding of Nashotah House.
- Johnson, Glenn D., "Battling Bishop." *The Living Church*, Vol. 198, No. 17, April 23, 1989.
- Kalis, Claudia C., "Ordination Has Lost Meaning." *The Living Church*, Vol. 229, No. 18, October 31, 2004.
- Kew, Richard & White, Roger J., *New Millennium, New Church: Trends Shaping the Episcopal Church for the 21st Century*. Cambridge, MA: Cowley Publications, 1992.
- Law, William, *Selected Mystical Writings of William Law: Edited with Notes and Twenty-four Studies in the Mystical Theology of William Law and Jacob Boehme*, ed. Stephen Hobhouse. London: C.W. Daniel Company Ltd, 1940.
- Leech, Kenneth, & Rowan Williams, eds., *Essays Catholic and Radical*. London: Bowerdean Press, 1983.
- Llewelyn, Robert, & Edward Moss, eds., *Daily Readings with William Law*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd Ltd, 1986; Springfield, IL: Templegate Publishers, 1987.
- Logan, James C., ed., *Theology and Evangelism in the Wesleyan Heritage*, ed. James C. Logan. Nashville, TN: Kingswood Books/An Imprint of Abingdon Press, 1994.
- Lossky, Nicholas, *Lancelot Andrewes the Preacher (1555-1626): The Origins of the Mystical Theology of the Church of England (Lancelot Andrewes le prédicateur, 1986)*, trans. Andrew Louth, foreword by Michael Ramsey, afterword by A.M. Allchin. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.
- Lossky, Vladimir, *In the Image and Likeness of God (A l'image et a la ressemblance de Dieu, 1967)*; ed. John H. Erickson & Thomas E. Bird, intro. John Meyendorff. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1974.
- _____, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church (Essai sur la theologie mystique de l'Église d'orient, 1944)*; trans. members of the Society of St. Alban and St.

- Sergius. London: James Clarke & Co. Ltd, 1957; Greenwood, SC: Attic Press, 1968.
- MacQuarrie, John, ed., *A Dictionary of Christian Ethics*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967.
- Marie of the Incarnation, *Marie of the Incarnation: Selected Writings*, ed. Irene Mahoney, OSU. New York; Mahway, NJ: Paulist Press, 1989.
- Maltsberger, John T., *The Church of the Advent, First Years*. Boston: The Church of the Advent, 1986.
- A Manual of Eastern Orthodox Prayers*, foreword by Alexander Schmemmann. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1983.
- May, G. Lacey, ed., *Wings of an Eagle: An Anthology of Caroline Preachers with 60 Extracts from Their Sermons*. London: SPCK, 1955.
- McAdoo, Henry R., *The Eucharistic Theology of Jeremy Taylor Today*. Norwich: The Canterbury Press, 1988.
- _____, *First of its Kind: Jeremy Taylor's Life of Christ: A Study in the Functioning of a Moral Theology*. Norwich: The Canterbury Press, 1994.
- _____, *The Structure of Caroline Moral Theology*. London, New York, Toronto: Longmans, Green & Co., 1949.
- McGrath, Alister E., *The Renewal of Anglicanism*. Harrisburg, PA: Morehouse Publishing, 1993.
- Moorman, John R.H., *The Anglican Spiritual Tradition*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd Ltd, 1983; Springfield, IL: Templegate Publishers, 1985.
- Nellas, Panayiotis, *Deification in Christ: The Nature of the Human Person*, trans. Norman Russell. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1987.
- The Orthodox Liturgy: Being the Divine Liturgies of S. John Chrysostom and S. Basil the Great and the Divine Office of the Presanctified Gifts, together with the Ordering of the Holy and Divine Liturgy, the Office of Preparation for the Holy Communion, [and] the Prayers of Thanksgiving after the Holy Communion*, ed. and/or trans. unidentified. Oxford: University Press, 1982. Original copyright by the Stavropegic Monastery of St. John the Baptist, Tolleshunt Knights, Essex.
- The Parish of the Advent in the City of Boston: A History of One Hundred Years, 1844-1944*, foreword by Henry Knox Sherill, Bishop of Massachusetts. Boston: The Parish of the Advent, 1944.

- Palmer, G.E.H., Philip Sherrard, and Kallistos Ware, eds. & trans., *The Philokalia: The Complete Text, Compiled by St. Nikodimos of the Holy Mountain and St. Makarios of Corinth*. 4 vol. London: Faber & Faber, 1979-1995.
- Parsons, Donald J., *A Lifetime Road to God* (reprint of orig. ed., 1967). Fond du Lac, WI: Parish Press of the Cathedral Church of St. Paul the Apostle, 1977.
- Plain Sermons, by Contributors to the "Tracts for the Times"*, Vol. III (nos. lxxiii-lcii). London: J.G.F. & J. Rivington, 1841. Writers unnamed, some attribution to E.B. Pusey, but not certain.
- Podles, Leon J., "The Matter at Hand: Empty Spaces of the Word." *Touchstone: A Journal of Mere Christianity*, Vol. 18, No. 1, January/February 2005.
- Potter, Henry Codman, *Reminiscences of Bishops and Archbishops*. New York, London: G.F. Putnam's Sons/The Knickerbocker Press, 1906.
- Pusey, Edward Bouverie, *Advice for Those Who Exercise the Ministry of Reconciliation Through Confession and Absolution: Being the Abbé Gaume's Manual for Confessors or his Extracts from the Works of S. Francis de Sales, S. Charles Borromeo, S. Philip de Neri, S. Francis Xavier, and Other Spiritual Writers, Abridged, Condensed, and Adapted to the Use of the English Church*. Oxford, London: James Parker & Co, 1878.
- _____, *The Church of England a Portion of Christ's One Holy Catholic Church, and a Means of Restoring Visible Unity: An Eirenicon, In a Letter to the Author of "The Christian Year"*. New York: D. Appleton & Company, 1866.
- _____, *A Course of Sermons on Solemn Subjects: Chiefly Bearing on Repentance and Amendment of Life, Preached in S. Saviour's Church, Leeds, During the Week After its Consecration on the Feast of S. Simon and S. Jude, 1845*. Oxford: John Henry Parker; London: Burns; Leeds: Green, 1845.
- _____, *Entire Absolution of the Penitent, Sermon II: Judge Thyself, That Thou Be Not Judged of the Lord; A Sermon Preached Before the University in the Cathedral Church of Christ, in Oxford, on the First Sunday in Advent, 1846*. Oxford: John Henry Parker; London: F. & J. Rivington, 1846.
- _____, *The Holy Eucharist a Comfort to the Penitent: A Sermon Preached Before the University in the Cathedral Church of Christ, in Oxford, on the Fourth Sunday After Easter*. Oxford: John Henry Parker; London: J.G.F. & J. Rivington, 1843.
- _____, *Humility: A Sermon*. New York: F.J. Huntington & Co., 1872.

- _____, *Lenten Sermons, preached Chiefly to Young Men at the Universities, Between A.D. 1858-1874.* Oxford, London: John Henry Parker; London, F. & J. Rivington, 1874.
- _____, *Parochial and Cathedral Sermons.* London: Walter Smith, 1883.
- _____, *Parochial Sermons, Vol. I: For the Season from Advent to Whitsuntide.* Oxford, London: John Henry Parker; London: F. & J. Rivington, 1852.
- _____, *Parochial Sermons, Vol. II.* Oxford, London: John Henry Parker; London: F. & J. Rivington, 1857.
- _____, *Parochial Sermons Preached and Printed on Various Occasions, Now Collected into One Volume.* Oxford, London: John Henry & James Parker; London, Oxford, Cambridge: J. & F.H. Rivington, 1865.
- _____, *Penitence: With Rules for Guidance and Hints for a First Confession*, ed. "E.H. and F.H.," pref. by C.W. Furse. London: Walter Smith, 1884.
- _____, *Sermons Preached Before the University of Oxford Between A.D. 1859 and 1872.* Oxford: James Parker & Co.; London, Oxford, Cambridge: Rivingtons, 1872.
- Ramsey, Arthur Michael, "Charles C. Grafton, Bishop and Theologian." *The Nashotah Quarterly Review*, Vol. 8, No. 3, 1968.
- Rattenbury, J. Ernest, *The Eucharistic Hymns of John and Charles Wesley.* London: Epworth Press, 1948.
- Richardson, Alan, ed., *A Dictionary of Christian Theology.* Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969.
- Rowell, Geoffrey, ed., *The English Religious Tradition and the Genius of Anglicanism.* Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1992.
- _____, *The Vision Glorious: Themes and Personalities of the Catholic Revival in Anglicanism.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.
- Sales, Francis de, St., *Introduction to the Devout Life*, trans. Michael Day. London: J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd—Everyman's Library, 1961.
- _____, *The Love of God*, trans. Vincent Kerns. Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1962.
- Schaff, Philip, ed., *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: A Select Library of the Christian Church, First Series* (reprint of orig. ed., Christian Literature Publishing Company, 1886). 14 vol. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1994.

- _____, & Henry Wace, eds., *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: A Select Library of the Christian Church, Second Series* (reprint of orig. ed., Christian Literature Publishing Company, 1898). 14 vol. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1994.
- Slocum, Robert B., "Romantic Religion and the Episcopal Church in Wisconsin." *Anglican and Episcopal History*, Vol. LXV, No. 1, March 1996.
- Smith, Logan Pearsall, *Donne's Sermons: Selected Passages with an Essay*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964.
- Smith, Martin, SSJE, ed., *Benson of Cowley*. Oxford: Society of St. John the Evangelist, 1980; Cambridge, MA: Cowley Publications, 1983.
- Southern, Richard with Sr. Benedicta Ward, SLG, Kathleen Lea, & Mary Chitty, *The Beauty of Holiness: An Introduction to Six Seventeenth-Century Anglican Writers* (Archbishop William Laud, Lancelot Andrewes, Jeremy Taylor, Mark Frank, George Herbert, Henry Vaughan); *Fairacres Publication No. 57*. Fairacres, Oxford: SLG Press, 1976.
- Sykes, Stephen with John Booty and Jonathan Knight, *The Study of Anglicanism*. London: SPCK; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1988, rev. ed. 1998.
- Taylor, Jeremy, *The Rule and Exercises of Holy Living*, abridged & with pref. by Anne Lamb. New York, Evanston: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1970.
- _____, *The Rule and Exercises of Holy Living, Vol. Two and The Rule and Exercises of Holy Dying (Treasures from the Spiritual Classics)*, comp. Roger L. Roberts. Wilton, CT: Morehouse-Barlow Co., Inc., 1981.
- _____, *Jeremy Taylor: Selected Works (Classics of Western Spirituality)*, ed. Thomas K. Carroll, pref. by John E. Booty. New York; Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1990.
- Teresa of Avila, St., *Interior Castle*, ed. & trans. E. Allison Peers. Garden City, NY: Image Books (a division of Doubleday & Company, Inc.), 1961.
- _____, *The Way of Perfection*, ed. & trans. E. Allison Peers. Garden City, NY: Image Books (a division of Doubleday & Company Inc.), 1964.
- Thornton, Martin, *English Spirituality: An Outline of Ascetical Theology According to the English Pastoral Tradition*. Cambridge, MA: Cowley Publications, 1986.
- Wallace, R. Edgar, ed., "Press On the Kingdom:" *The Centenary of the Consecration of The Right Reverend Charles Chapman Grafton, The Second Bishop of Fond du Lac*, foreword by The Rt. Rev. William Louis Stevens, VI Bishop of Fond du Lac. Fond du Lac, WI: Diocese of Fond du Lac, 1989. Pamphlet published for the Centenary celebration; contains contemporaneous articles, news items, etc.

- Whittaker, E.C., *Documents of the Baptismal Liturgy*. London: SPCK, 1970.
- Whittingham, William Rollinson, *Fifteen Sermons of William Rollinson Whittingham, Fourth Bishop of Maryland*. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1880.
- Whyte, A., ed., *Character and Characteristics of William Law*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1898.
- Woodgate, M.V., *Father Benson: Founder of the Cowley Fathers*. London: Geoffrey Bles, 1953.
- Worsley, F.W., *The Theology of the Church of England*. New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., 1913.

Unpublished Documents and Manuscripts.

- Grafton, Charles Chapman, Sermons preached in St. Paul's Church, Baltimore *et al. eccl.* 1856-1864. Individually entered in ms. in individual copybooks, items approx. 156. Useful as they reveal developments in the style and substance of Grafton's thought prior to his departure for England in 1865. Fond du Lac, WI: Archives of the Diocese of Fond du Lac.
- _____, Manuscript documents, miscellaneous (sermon and address notes, outlines for lectures, few private letters). Collected but mostly uncatalogued in five manila folders. Documents used for this project are numbered by folder and item number in sequence of removal for copying. Not all documents in the folders were used, thus the numbering as shown in Appendix I.B. is personal and provisional to the writer. Fond du Lac, WI: Archives of the Diocese of Fond du Lac.
- Haskell, Peter C., "Bishop Grafton and the Orthodox Church 1900-1905." M.A. Thesis, University of Minnesota, 1970. Nashotah, WI: Collection of the Frances Donaldson Library.
- Kinney, John Mark, "+C.C. Fond du Lac: The Life of Charles Chapman Grafton, Second Bishop of Fond du Lac." S.T.M. Thesis, Nashotah House, 1967. Nashotah, WI: Collection of the Frances Donaldson Library.
- Manuscript documents, Whittingham Papers, Archives of the Diocese of Maryland. These selected items, with few exceptions all correspondence from Charles Chapman Grafton to Bishop William Rollinson Whittingham, illustrate the relationship between Whittingham and Grafton. Useful for gauging the influence of Whittingham on Grafton as bishop, friend, and exemplar. Little on theological thought except by inference. No archival numbers appear on items, thus the numbering as shown in Appendix II is personal and provisional to the writer. Baltimore, MD: Archives of the Diocese of Maryland.