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Book 1

Anglican Eucharistic Theology: A Multiformity of Philosophical Assumptions

The notion of sacramentality is at the heart of any discussion of the sacraments and yet this has always been an area of dispute within the Christian Church. Basic to this notion of sacramentality is the belief, as David Brown expresses it, in a generous God where the sacraments, such as the Eucharist, are seen as the means of grace, mediating divine generosity. On the other hand some deny this analysis. For those who accept that God works generously through the sacraments, the sacraments become a powerful means of grace. For those who deny this, the sacraments function only as mental reminders of a past and completed transaction, such as the work of Christ on the cross at a particular point in time which cannot be contextualised in any sacrament in the present. Brown argues that from the sixteenth century onwards there was a lessening of the sacramental resulting in what he describes as ‘the disenchantment of the world’ or an undervaluing of the mediation of God’s generosity through things of this world. This has resulted in some theologies of the Eucharist which lessen notions of realism and which emphasise notions of memorialism instead. Concepts of the real presence of Christ in the eucharist or the dynamic remembrance of Christ’s sacrifice as anamnesis are denied and the focus becomes on the enquiring mind rather than seeing divine grace and presence mediated through signs of this world: elements like bread and wine. In more modern times, there has been significant recovery of ‘enchantment’ where ‘God relates to human experience in its totality through a reinvigorated sense of the sacramental’.1 The increase in scholarship has resulted in the recovery of the theology of the early church Fathers, many of whom expressed deeply realist concepts of sacramentality. Ecumenical convergence and the work of the Second Vatican Council have led to a recovery of mystery and enchantment based on a developed notion of sacramentality. At the same there remains in some Reformed churches a disenchantment of the world, where things of this world are seen as suspect and having no power to show us God outside the strict confines of the biblical text.

Sacramentality remains a disputed concept in the Anglican Communion with some arguing for sacramental mediation of God’s grace and others denying it. This is partly to do with history and theology but I want to argue in this article that it also has to do with philosophy as a way of conceptualising Anglican eucharistic theology. The sixteenth century Reformation was a major reaction against the piety and theology of the Middle Ages and in many parts of the Christian Church the witness of the Bible alone came to be valued, above and beyond any notion of sacramentality. Reformed thinking within the Anglican Church led to an emphasis on the reading and proclamation of the word, such that God could only be fully known through the text of the Bible. In modern times this type of Reformed thinking is found in the Evangelical wing of Anglicanism where there can be devaluing of any sacramental means of knowing God’s grace and presence. Others within Anglicanism valued more a catholic theology of the sacraments, such as the Divines of the seventeenth century, the nineteenth

century Oxford Movement. In modern times this divergence within church parties, Evangelical and Catholic, has continued with different philosophical assumptions underlying the theology of the eucharist within these different traditions within Anglicanism. This debate on sacramentality continues in present day.

Another way of examining the variation in Anglican eucharistic theology is to examine the philosophical assumptions, tacitly and implicitly adopted by the varying parties, Evangelical and Catholic, within Anglicanism. This other way of examining Anglican eucharistic is the focus of this paper and it is argued here that philosophical analysis of eucharistic theology allows for a more developed understanding of what is held within the various church parties of Anglicanism.

Anglican eucharistic theology is multiform in nature, with different theological and philosophical assumptions. The discourse of the Anglican eucharistic tradition varies between those who adopt what can be called a realist understanding of the eucharist and those who do not accept this analysis and accept what is called a nominalist analysis. I have argued elsewhere that the philosophical assumptions of the eucharist in Anglicanism vary between that of moderate realism and nominalism.

Anglicans who adopt a realist analysis see the signs of the eucharist, bread and wine and the offering of these signs in the eucharist, as linked in a real way to Christ’s body and blood and Christ’s once and for all sacrifice. Christ is said to be present in the elements and the eucharistic celebration and in the dynamic remembrance of Christ’s sacrifice in the eucharistic offering. Moderate realism implies that the linking of the sign and the signified is not fleshy, corporal or carnal but rather functions as an enchantment which is real yet mysterious, spiritual and supernatural. Typically these realist philosophical assumptions are associated with a more Anglican Catholic understanding of the eucharist.

Nominalists do not accept this analysis and instead argue that the signs are not linked to what they signify in any real way but rather by a linguistic and textual analysis centred on the faith of a believer and typically as revealed in the text of Scripture in a propositional manner. Often these nominalist philosophical assumptions are associated with a more Evangelical or Reformed Anglican understanding of the eucharist. Nominalists sever the participatory link between the earthly sacrament and the heavenly reality. As Hans Boersma argues, nominalists in denying the participatory relationship between earthly objects and the heavenly reality, no longer see ‘earthly objects (as sacramentum)’ receiving ‘the reality (res) of their being from God’s own being. Rather, earthly objects possessed of their own being’. Such univocity ‘renders the created order independent from God’. This means that in a nominalist analysis the natural and the supernatural become two distinct orders, rather than one that is intimately linked, where nature could pursue its own ends without any supernatural involvement. The result in terms of sacramental theology is that it becomes

---


5 Boersma, Heavenly Participation 76.
impossible in a nominalist analysis to follow the sacramental principle or to discern a sacramental character in the created order as a divine imperative.

Christopher Cocksworth⁶ suggests that on an empirical level, there can be no such thing as Anglican eucharistic theology, because Anglicanism is such an amorphous phenomenon and its eucharistic theology is inherently multiform such that the real characteristic of Anglican eucharistic theology is its ‘multiformity rather than uniformity’.⁷ Such multiformity derives not only, in part, from the absence of an authoritative magisterium in Anglicanism, such as exists in the Roman Catholic Church, which clearly defines eucharistic doctrine, but also from the varying understandings by Anglicans of what happens in the eucharist. Not only, says Cocksworth, is Anglicanism doctrinally diverse, but it is also ideologically diverse since:

Anglicanism has never seen itself as a self-sufficient unit isolated from the wider Church. Whether through a Protestant eye (as an expression of the Reformation faith) or through a Catholic eye (as a branch of the Church Catholic) or through both eyes (as Reformed Catholicism), Anglicanism has always seen itself as part of a bigger whole. Because of this it is reticent about claiming a distinctive theological content in regard to anything. The most which it has been willing to admit to is a distinctive theological method by which it interprets Reformation truth and Catholic faith.⁸

Cocksworth’s analysis of the Anglican eucharistic tradition is based on distinctions between church parties such as Reformed or Catholic expressions that are found within Anglicanism and as such limited. Parties are controlled by particular interest alone and defining Anglican eucharistic theology by such particular interests seems inadequate in light of the multiformity of theological and philosophical assumptions underlying Anglicans eucharistic theology and practice. For this reason a philosophical analysis of assumptions underlying the Anglican eucharistic tradition may be more useful and robust since it moves the debate beyond the more entrenched nature of party positions.

Distinctive theological and philosophical assumptions, based on realism and nominalism, establish the multiformity of eucharistic theology within Anglicanism rather than party interest. Pusey in his writings on the eucharist was very aware of this multiformity and acknowledged the presence of a Reformed and a Catholic philosophical and theological dimension within Anglicanism which significantly influenced Anglican eucharistic theology, even though he himself consistently adopted a moderate realist position in relation to Anglican eucharistic theology.⁹

Cocksworth, while suggesting that this ‘multiformity’ is based in part on party position within Anglicanism, that is, Protestant and Catholic or on Catholic and Evangelical interests, does at the same time concede that such party positions are ‘too vague and effacing about Anglican identity’¹⁰ and so there emerges a need for Anglicanism to place its ecclesiology ‘on a firmer footing than pragmatic convenience’¹¹ of party interest. Ecclesiology, for Cocksworth, deserves fuller and deeper analysis than commitment to a particular pragmatic view and so looks beyond the immediate interests of church parties. He goes on to argue that this fuller and deeper analysis may involve consideration of what he
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calls ‘the deep structures of Anglican eucharistic theology’. For Cocksworth these ‘deep structures’ exist alongside what he also calls ‘unitive categories’ by which he means various doctrinal positions, which have developed within Anglicanism, and which exist as Anglicans are united in common worship. These ‘deep structures’ have also served not only to unite Anglicans but also to divide various church parties and have traditionally formed the particular interests of the various church parties. These deep structures or categories include the real presence of Christ in the eucharist and eucharistic sacrifice within the Catholic expression of Anglicanism and emphasis on personal and propositional faith uniting the communicant to Christ in the Evangelical expression of Anglicanism. In A Companion to Anglican Eucharistic Theology I have argued that these ‘deep structures’ within Anglicanism are also related to the philosophical assumptions underlying eucharistic theology, realism and nominalism, more so than the pragmatic interests of church parties. It is on the basis of these philosophical distinctions and commitments as deep structures that Anglicans come to form their particular theological position within their own hermeneutic and in relation to the eucharist and it is on this basis that Anglican eucharistic theology can be explored more satisfactorily in its multiformity.

Multiformity of eucharistic theology and practice creates tension for the Anglican tradition as individuals and parties prosecute different positions on eucharistic theology and as these individuals and parties operate out of different theological and philosophical assumptions, however as Cocksworth and I conclude, this multiformity of eucharistic doctrine is inherent in Anglicanism and at the very heart of the nature of Anglican eucharistic theology.

At times these differences and tensions between parties and individuals are acrimonious, but at other times the multiformity is acknowledged and dialogued. The idea of multiformity or plurality is integral to the patterns of Christian tradition and more fundamental to the doctrine of God as a Trinity of unity in diversity than any particular issue, such as eucharistic theology, although of course, eucharistic theology shares in that plurality. Rowan Williams has argued that it is difficult to understand the patterns of Christian experience if such patterns are ‘reduced to a single form underlying their differences, or that one strand alone is valid or authentic’. For Williams ‘we need an account of God that grounds them [patterns of experience] in their plurality and so demonstrates their unity in diversity’. For Williams the Trinity appears as a comprehensive model for making sense of the patterns of experience in human spirituality since ‘only such a “pluralist” doctrine of God can allow for the equal validity of finding God as the fundamental and indescribable ground of all’. Such multiformity or plurality as found in the unity of the Trinity provides an
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account for Williams of the multiformity found and dialogued more generally in Christian experience and this of course can include eucharistic theology. This does not mean however that multiformity or plurality is relativism and in fact Williams argues that it is the opposite of relativism, since despite the variety of the world’s forms as experienced by the human mind, there is still an underlying and absolute oneness for which perceptible difference is completely irrelevant.18 Oneness and unifying structure in this sort of scheme cannot be separated from differentiation as is found in the multiformity and plurality of the patterns of Christian experience.

Many Anglicans in their theological reflection on the eucharist have adopted a sacramental principle based the doctrine of the incarnation and drawing on the work of the early church Fathers and on the philosophical notion of realism, connecting signs with what they signify in a real way.19 Others reject these notions and adopt a nominalist separation of entities where signs are not seen to be connected in any real way to what they signify.20 It is such reflection that holds the potential of moving towards what Cocksworth describes as the ‘deeper structures’ of Anglican eucharistic theology and which I describe as the different theological and philosophical assumptions underlying Anglican eucharistic theology.

Realists argue that sacramental signs function as more than bare signs in that they are instances or vehicles of what they signify and as such participate in or instantiate or convey what they signify in a real way.21 Realists therefore see the possibility of what philosophers call multiple exemplification or localisation22 and instantiation23 of sacramental grace. Rowan Williams, speaking of the eucharist and using such realist assumptions based on an incarnational theology, argues that the signs of the eucharist are as much carriers of Christ’s life and identity as are Jesus’s literal flesh and blood.24 Williams’s theology and its philosophical assumptions have much in common with the modern secular philosophy of David Armstrong,25 although Armstrong’s treatment of realism, by its secular nature, has not reflected on the eucharist. At the same time however Armstrong’s work has significant application and meaning in any study of Anglican eucharistic theology.

The secular philosopher, David Armstrong, setting out the dimensions of a realist philosophy, says that ‘it is an intelligible possibility that there should be two particulars with exactly the same nature’,26 where, for example, two different particulars such a white pen and a white piece of paper share the same universal: whiteness. Armstrong argues that ‘the central idea of a universal is that it is a one (the one property in the monadic case) that runs

18 Williams, ‘Trinity and Pluralism’ 169.
19 For comment on realism in the Anglican eucharistic tradition see Douglas and Lovat, ‘The Integrity of Discourse’ 848-850 and 856-859 and Douglas, A Companion to Anglican Eucharistic Theology, 1, 20-25.
20 For comment on nominalism in the Anglican eucharistic tradition see Douglas and Lovat, ‘The Integrity of Discourse’ 848-850 and 856-859.
21 See the case studies of realist eucharistic theology extending throughout the expanse of Anglican theological reflection from the Reformation to the present in Douglas, A Companion to Anglican Eucharistic Theology, Volumes 1 and 2.
25 Armstrong’s philosophical reflection does not mention eucharistic theology but has been applied to the eucharist. See Douglas, A Companion to Anglican Eucharistic Theology, Volumes 1 and 2, chapter 1.
through many particulars’. The two, the pen and the paper, are not strictly or numerically identical, that is, a pen is not a piece of paper, even though the two share the same nature and instantiate the universal: whiteness. For Armstrong, ‘particulars are confined to space-time and universals are all instantiated by these particulars’ and ‘particulars are things that are subject to change, actual or possible, but universals are not’.

In extrapolating this realist analysis to eucharistic theology, two strict or numerically different particulars, that is bread and wine on the one hand and Christ’s body and blood on the other, both particulars subject to change and existing in space-time, share and convey exactly the same universal, that is, Christ’s life and identity, even though they do not share strict or numerical identity. This means that bread is not strictly or numerically identical to Christ’s real or corporal flesh and wine is not strictly or numerically identical to Christ’s real or corporal blood, although they both share the same universal property, what Williams calls Christ’s life and identity. Christ’s life and identity is seen to be present in both instantiations of bread and wine and body and blood as a spiritual, mystical or supernatural entity, but nonetheless in a real way, which is not a physical, corporal or carnal entity.

Armstrong in further developing his realist model goes on to argue that: ‘It is universals [properties and relations] that give a thing its nature, kind or sort’, meaning that universals are strictly identical in their different instantiations. To put this another way the essence of a thing is strictly identical in different instantiations. This means, crucially for any exposition of a realist sacramental theology, that universals are therefore ‘strictly identical in their different instances and the “powerful truism”, entails that for two instantiations of the same universal, the sameness of type involved must be strict identity’, that is, for the universal but not the particular. Christ’s identity of nature, that is, Christ’s essence, is strictly or numerically identical as a universal in both instantiations of bread and wine on the one hand and Christ’s body and blood on the other, even though the particulars of bread and wine and body and blood are not in themselves strictly identical. In such a scheme there is a difference between particulars in that the particular sign is not strictly or numerically identical to the particular signified entity, even though the universal is strictly identical in both instantiations of sign and signified, such that each particular shares a universal property. Whereas there is no strict or numerical identity between particulars, such as Christ’s literal body and blood and the signs of the eucharist, there is a strict or numerical identity of the universal, Christ’s life and identity, in its different instantiations. Christ’s nature or essence, his life and identity, as Williams calls them, are strictly identical in both particulars. This means that there can be both ‘identity in nature’ and ‘numerical identity’, but that identity of nature is strictly identical in both instantiations, even though the particulars themselves (bread and wine on the one hand and Christ’s body and blood on the other) do not possess numerical identity. Confusion between the strict identity of particulars and universals is at the heart of much misunderstanding of realist sacramental theology in Anglicanism.

Williams, also making this distinction clear, argues that Christ’s life and identity, is strictly identical in both instantiations, that is, whatever it is that Christ is, his life and identity, is in both instantiations: the signs of the eucharist and the signified body and blood.
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of Christ. The particulars or the signs of the eucharist, however, and the particular of Christ’s body and blood are not numerically or strictly identical even though the signs share a strict identity of nature. The life and identity of Christ are therefore to be found in both his literal body and blood and in the signs of the eucharist, but the signs of the eucharist, the bread and wine, can never be strictly identical with his literal body and blood in the sense that bread cannot turn into flesh and wine cannot turn into blood. Williams says, in an attempt to exclude such fleshy or immoderate realism implied by numerical or strict realism, while at the same time attempting to affirm identity of nature, that:

The force of the Gospel text . . . seems to be more to do with a kind of extension of the reality of Jesus’ presence to the bread and wine. They too bear and communicate the life of Jesus, who and what he is. By eating these, the believer receives what the literal flesh and blood have within them, the radiant action and power of God the Son, the life that makes him who he is.  

Realists, therefore, are careful to distinguish between a corporal, carnal or fleshy presence and sacrifice of Christ in the eucharist, what has been called immoderate realism, and a real, spiritual, mysterious, supernatural and not fleshy presence and sacrifice, which has been called moderate realism. Immoderate or fleshy realism is excluded in the Anglican tradition as it is in all other Christian traditions, occurring only in corrupted versions of realism, although of course Armstrong has used it as a logical possibility in his model. Moderate realism has been a significant philosophical assumption underlying Anglican eucharistic theology and frequently employed by Anglican theologians.

In the twentieth century, the Anglican theologians John Macquarrie speaks of a sacramental universe and a sacramental principle where material things of this world reveal the presence and activity of God amongst people. Macquarrie can therefore say that ‘the material world can become a way to God, joining us to him rather than cutting us off. It can become a door or channel of communication, through which he comes to us and we may go to him’. For Macquarrie ‘the sacramental system of the Church’ is the means ‘whereby what we encounter with Christ is continually renewed in rites which employ visible and otherwise sensible means’. This realist theology is based on the incarnation of Christ as word or logos in such a way that there is, as Temple says, ‘belief in a living God who, because he is such, is transcendent over the universe, which owes its origin to his creative act, and which he sustains by his immanence’.
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33 Williams, Tokens of Trust 116.
37 See Douglas, The Eucharistic Theology of Edward Bouverie Pusey. Here I present an extended discussion of Pusey’s consistent use of moderate realist eucharistic theology deriving from scripture, the early church Fathers, the Anglican Divines and formularies and philosophical reflection.
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Following this line of argument Macquarrie is also able to argue a moderate realist notion of eucharistic sacrifice where the eucharist is not a new or supplementary sacrifice of Christ, but rather the same sacrifice with its effects brought into the present, since ‘the sacrifice of Calvary is not tied to a moment of time, but touches all time’.42 This notion of ‘remembrance’ defined theologically as anamnesis43 depends on a moderate realist analysis where remembrance means there is more than a mere calling to mind of Christ’s past sacrifice, but a re-presenting of it or re-calling of it and its benefits in the present, in the context of Church, where that once and for all sacrifice participates in or is instantiated in the eucharist. The Anglican Benedictine, Dom Gregory Dix, in speaking of this word anamnesis, saw Christ using this word anew in the Last Supper, drawing on the Jewish notion of remembrance and where Christ took bread and wine and used them ‘for the anamnesis of Me.’44 For Dix anamnesis is seen as having the biblical sense ‘of “re-calling” or “re-presenting” before God an event in the past so that it becomes here and now operative by its effects’.45 The effect of anamnesis in the eucharistic celebration was not merely concerned with a distant memory in the corporate psyche of the Church, such that it is merely brought to mind again with the words of thankful praise, as a nominalist analysis would imply, but, using moderate realist assumptions, Dix saw it as being a real and operative remembrance with a dynamic and life-giving quality, where the effects of Christ’s sacrifice are identified with the eucharistic celebration and instantiated in the present.

This moderate realist analysis of both Christ’s presence and sacrifice in the eucharist implies as Rowan Williams argues that ‘Jesus “passes over” into the symbolic forms of his own word and gestures, a transition into the vulnerable and inactive forms of the inanimate world’ where ‘the material elements of bread and wine are to be made holy by the prayer that associates them with the flesh and blood of Jesus’.46 This means for Williams that ‘the eucharist hints at the paradox that material things carry their fullest meaning for human minds and bodies – the measuring of God’s grace and of the common life this formed – when they are the medium of gift’.47 For Williams, in this type of realist analysis, the signs of the eucharist are much more than mere reminders of the past and completed event of Christ’s presence and sacrifice, as a nominalist analysis implies. Rather, moderate realism implies that material things are the means by which that presence is known in the eucharist in the here and now and by which that sacrifice is renewed and made available as a gift to all who receive it.

Nominalist analysis of the assumptions underlying Anglican eucharistic theology rejects the notion of a real presence of Christ in the eucharist and of anamnesis and the concept of eucharistic sacrifice in particular, emphasising instead a theology of justification by faith alone. Nominalists deny any realist identification between the sacrifice of Christ and the present celebration of the eucharist, such that this mediates the grace of God to the communicant, since they reject the notion of multiple exemplification of Christ’s nature or localisation as incoherent and focus instead on personal and propositional faith.

Peter Jensen following this line of thinking in modern times describes the eucharist as a meal that takes place at millions of places around the world on a weekly basis where the

43 Literally ‘remembrance’.
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aim is to ‘share a meal in memory of a certain man’. 48 This meal is described as ‘a sort of perpetual wake’ which ‘has lasted for two thousand years so far’. 49 He also describes the eucharist as ‘a projectile launched from antiquity into our own time; it constantly turns up amongst us and says, “never forget this man”’. 50 Jensen’s central thought here seems to concern remembering and eating and drinking as an act of faith and will by the enquiring mind in a propositional manner: a bare memorialism. He speaks of ‘remembering’ in the sense of bringing to mind an event, completed in the past but subjectively remembered in the present with thanksgiving but without sacramental instrumentality or dynamic remembrance and without the idea of multiple exemplification or localization. For Jensen, the eucharist functions as ‘a perpetual and effective reminder of the sheer stature of Jesus Christ’. 51 The eucharist therefore is principally a reminder only, acting as the moment of remembering a past and completed action and the giving of thanks and praise for the benefits of that action in people’s lives without any realist linking between the signs and what they signify. It therefore remains fixed within a past context rather than transcending the hermeneutic of human thought.

Paul Zahl argues in this way against the idea that Christ can ever be present in any objective manner in the elements of the eucharist on the grounds that ‘no physical object can be impregnated with divinity’. 52 For Zahl it is ‘the Word that alone carries the weight of externally defined truth’. 53 He explores and rejects the idea that Christ is present in the sacraments. This he describes as the ‘idea … that Christ is present objectively in the “elements” of the eucharist, that is, in the bread and wine, and in the water of baptism’. 54 This he describes as ‘objectification’ or ‘the human attempt to locate a tangible object in the tangible world that carries the intangible universality of the divine, invisible God’. 55 Any thinking based on what is called ‘objectification’ Zahl describes as ‘thinking equivalent to magical thinking’ and thinking that can be compared to voodoo. 56 It seems that Zahl is rejecting the sacramentality and realist analysis and the idea that the divine can be made present in particular objects such as bread and wine in the eucharist. In Zahl’s opinion the only objective presence of Christ as a manifestation of God is to be found in the presence of Jesus in the first century CE without any contextualisation in the present. In so rejecting the notion of sacramentality, Zahl is using a theology based on a nominalist separation of entities. Christ was present at a point in time but cannot be present in any real way through the sacraments in the present.

Robert Doyle also presents a nominalist analysis of the eucharist and rejects the idea of the sacramental principle based on realism. He argues that ‘we only participate in Christ in a real and substantial way, by faith, for he does not offer himself either sacramentally or as a sacrament but directly by his promise’. 57 Doyle therefore denies what he calls a
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‘sacramental ontology’ and asserts instead a nominalist ‘word ontology’\textsuperscript{58} or what one Anglican writer from the more catholic tradition of Anglicanism, Catherine Pickstock, calls ‘a textual calculus of the real’\textsuperscript{59} or ‘textual spatialization’.\textsuperscript{60} Doyle’s analysis subordinates sacrament to word by assuming that word is God’s only way of working in the world and that sacraments function merely to remind us of that. Such an analysis is propositional and accessed only through the activity of the enquiring mind without any realist conception of a sacramental world view. As such sacramentality is effectively relegated to a much less important theological concept than the promises of God as expressed in scripture.

Anglicanism has always had a diverse theology of the eucharist. This is partly due to historical circumstances in reacting against the thinking of the past, resulting in the lessening of sacramentality in the Reformation and an emphasis on coming to know God and know God’s grace through the text of Scripture alone. A disenchantment of the world, in the more Reformed party of Anglicanism, has led to increasing nominalism for some in the assumptions that underlie eucharistic theology. In such a model there is a prioritorising of a word ontology at the expense of sacramental ontology. At the same time there have always been Anglicans who value not only the Scriptures but also the sacraments and who believe that they also come to know God through sacramental mediation. For these Anglicans the enchantment of the world is important since it is through the things of this world that the divine is known and where realist assumptions underlying sacramental theology are important. While any consideration of Anglican eucharistic theology needs to consider history and theology seriously, including the varying practice of church parties within Anglicanism, it is also possible to conceptualise the multiformity of Anglican eucharistic theology using the philosophical notions of realism and nominalism. This has been the aim of this paper.

---

\textsuperscript{58} Doyle, ‘Word and Sacrament’ 12.
\textsuperscript{60} Pickstock, After Writing 3.