

**ELEVATION IN THE
EUCHARIST ITS HISTORY
AND RATIONALE**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649572595

Elevation in the Eucharist its History and Rationale by T. W. Drury

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

T. W. DRURY

**ELEVATION IN THE
EUCHARIST ITS HISTORY
AND RATIONALE**

Elevation in the Eucharist
its History and Rationale

Elevation in the Eucharist
its History and Rationale

by

T. W. Drury, D.D.

Principal of Ridley Hall, Cambridge, and
Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Liverpool

CAMBRIDGE :
at the University Press

1907

C 10825.37
v

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
TREAT FUND
May 9, 1927

0

Cambridge:
PRINTED BY JOHN ULAY, M.A.
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

TO MY WIFE

C. B. D.

PREFACE.

A FEW words must be said as to the origin and purpose of this book. Frequent mention was made, in the evidence given before the recent Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, of the elevation of the Bread and Wine immediately after Consecration, and not unfrequently the practice of "elevation" was denied, even where the witness distinctly alleged that some such ceremony had taken place¹. It further appeared, from the evidence of several of the clergymen who were examined, that this discrepancy arose from a distinction drawn between elevating the elements after consecration so as to make them visible to the people, and the practice of a more moderate elevation, either when taking the paten and chalice into the hands, or at the words "Do this in remembrance of Me."

It is beyond dispute that, whatever name may be assigned to it, both types of this ceremony are now practised in many Anglican churches². Yet there is

¹ This occurred in twenty-seven instances. *Report of Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline*, p. 36.

² See the letters from clergymen published in the *Minutes of Evidence taken before the Royal Commission*. Vols. I.—III.

an entire absence of any direction in the rubrics to lift up the elements, except so far as is necessary in order to perform those manual acts, which were specified with such deliberate care at the last revision.

In the absence of any rubrical authority, the ceremony is defended on the ground that the "elevation or showing to the people," which was expressly forbidden in the first Prayer Book, had an exclusive reference to the lifting up with a view to worship, which had been introduced after the rise of a belief in Transubstantiation, and is specially referred to in Article XXVIII. Accordingly, other explanations of the purpose of elevation are put forward by those who practise it. Even extreme elevation in view of the congregation is justified as enabling the manual acts to be made visible, when the eastward position is adopted, while a slight elevation is interpreted to signify a presentation to God of the memorial of Christ's sacrifice¹.

These varying accounts suggested a more exact enquiry into the various types of elevation which have been practised in the Church, and into the several shades of meaning which they have been taken to represent. I have endeavoured to collect and arrange the evidence available on the subject, and to present a fair and impartial, if not a complete, statement of the main issues which are involved. I have thought

¹ *Minutes of Evidence*, i. pp. 268, 269, 274, 414, 440, 476, 533, 541: ii. pp. 57, 114, 118, &c., &c.