mind a stronger impression of the perfect sincerity and integrity of the man. In the next of the famous prebendaries of Sarum we encounter a divine of a different fibre.

G. D. BOYLE.

ART. IV.—ON THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE FIRST AND LAST PRAYER-BOOKS.

I HAVE been asked to write a short exposition of the material differences with regard to doctrine and ritual between the first Prayer-book of Edward VI. (1549) and the present one. There are several well-known books exhibiting them in parallel columns, as far as may be, viz., the Rev. W. Keeling's, of which the first edition was in 1842, taking the Prayer-book of 1662 as the standard. It also gives the unauthorized book of 1604, the date of our Canons, but contradicting them, and the unauthorized ornaments rubric printed in Elizabeth's book throughout her reign, and the alterations in the Scotch Prayer-book (Laud's) of 1637. But from the arrangement of it you may easily miss the several ornament rubrics, which were in a different place in the first book; viz., at the end of the Communion. Another book (anonymous), in 1883, with a very full index to all the important words, has the converse arrangement, making 1549 (which I will call E. 1, and Edward's second book, E. 2) the standard. And lately the Rev. W. M. Myers published the first and last books only, in full, for comparison, with a short preface by Bishop Mackarness, and also an index, and introduced it by saying that "at the Church Congress in 1882 a proposal was made by the President of the English Church Union, and in many quarters since, to legalize the use of the first book as an (optional) alternative with the present one," which he dates 1886; but the slight alterations made by one or two Acts lately have no doctrinal or ritual significance, and therefore I shall keep the date of 1662, which is so well known.

All these publications necessarily involve the trouble of going through the whole services and rubrics to find out the important differences, even when you have them, which few people are likely to have; and what is now wanted is to have the comparison done for them as shortly and plainly as it well can be, and troubling them with nothing that is not likely to be thought of consequence in present controversies. There is no occasion for the intermediate Prayer-books generally, because very few doctrinal or ritual alterations were made upon E. 2 by any of the later books, except that in the delivery sentences at the Communion, and the ornaments rubric, in 1662. It is, how-

ever, necessary to remind those who are always denying the validity of anything of that kind not done by the Convocations (which they are pleased to call "the Church"), that they did sanction E. 2, which made all the most material changes, and abolished the several ornaments rubrics of E. 1, and substituted the surplice only for the "vestments"; and that no Convocation ever sanctioned the thing printed as an ornaments rubric in Elizabeth's book, nor did Parliament either; for the order about them in her Act of Uniformity was essentially different from that illegally printed rubric. It is therefore indisputable that "the Church" of the Ritualists made and kept the E. 2 book, and its rubric abolishing the vestments, for 110 years at least, and, according to all the Privy Council decisions, the Church has never yet altered it. I am not going into that question now, beyond saying that every document that has been discovered since the Ridsdale judgment (2 Prob. and Div., 304) tends to confirm it. I refer specially to those lately published by Mr. J. T. Tomlinson in various clerical papers. The shortest summary of the reasons of that judgment that I know is that in my "Letter to the Archbishop of York," on the Ecclesiastical Courts' report in 1883, or in the article "Advertisements" in the last (fourteenth) edition of "Hook's Dictionary;" where you may see also the arguments on the other side by another hand, and I am far from unwilling that they should be compared. I only mention here, in connection with the Convocation question, that the E. 2 rubric was practically reaffirmed by Convocations in 1571, though the Queen did not ratify those Canons; in 1603-4, when the present ones, nearly the same, were duly ratified; and in 1640, by some others of a very High-Church kind, which Charles I. ratified, but the Parliament annulled. Also that all those sets of Canons expressly recognised "the Advertisements of 7 Elizabeth" as valid, under her Act of Uniformity, and they were at once and continuously acted on, as the Privy Council decided, without any doubt, until it was invented the other day, as we may say. Nothing can be more illogical or absurd, and, I must add, dishonest, than to go on discussing that question and trying to sink the fact that it turns entirely on the word "retained" in the 1662 rubric; or pretending that it must mean the same when the things in dispute had been out of use for many years, and nobody doubted that they were legally so, as when they were in use, as at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, and were to be "retained until further order"—the order of the Advertisements.

As the Advertisements are still less within ordinary reach, I give the articles "for administration of prayers and sacraments: (1) In ministration of Holy Communion in Cathedrals

and Collegiate Churches the principal minister shall use a cope (with gospeller and epistoler agreeably), and at all other prayers at the Communion table to use no copes, but surplices; (2) Deans and prebendaries to wear a surplice with silk hood in the choir, and when they preach in Cathedral or Collegiate Churches to wear their hoods; (3) Every minister saying the public prayers or ministering the sacraments or rites of the Church shall wear a comely surplice with sleeves, to be provided at the charge of the parish." They are silent about Bishops; and therefore it seems doubtful whether their copes at Communion, and crosier or pastoral staff, authorized by E. 1, but not by E. 2, may not have been revived for good by Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity, and come within the word "retained" of the 1662 rubric.

The rubrics on the position of the priest at the beginning of the service, though not quite in the same words in the two rubrics, have no necessary difference of meaning. But it is material that the first book kept the "Altar," which was necessarily a fixture, and implied a sacrifice thereon, but all the later ones drop that word and adopt a "Table," which was evidently sometimes actually moved, as they prescribe that "the table at the Communion time shall stand in the body of the church or in the chancel." And again, the universally enforced rule after 1552 proves that altars were in fact abolished for tables.

I may as well here correct the popular impression that the table is, or ever was, directed to be always covered. In 1549, while altars remained, there was no mention of any altar-cloths except the Corporas at the Communion, corresponding to our "fair linen cloth." And now the only altar-cloth recognised is a "carpet of silk or some other decent stuff as shall be thought meet by the Ordinary, during Divine Service" only. The Privy Council decided, in Liddell *v.* Westerton, that the Bishop is the person to determine that, and not the clergy. I suppose nobody would understand by a "carpet" either a great cloth which is flat when opened out, and therefore falls in folds at the corners, like a pall on a coffin, or one with close sides, imitating a box-cover; especially when the top nine inches or so of it still more resembles the cover of a box-lid, which one expects to open with hinges behind. That lid cover is called an *antependium*, an article which every Prayer-book and Canon hitherto has ignored; as also "super-altars," which, like altars themselves, the Supreme Court has always decided to have no existence in the Church of England, though the word "altar" did get into one or two Acts of Parliament, where no theological question was involved, through carelessness. Clerical laymen (as lawyers call them) cannot be taught that former Acts of Parliament are not repealed or altered except by express legislation to that effect. Such words as "altar-rails" and "altar-cloth" have survived

for convenience, because "table-cloth" and "table-rails" would sound incongruous and absurd.

From altar we naturally pass to the word "sacrifice," on which there has been an unlimited quantity of discussion, but I do not see that either side can make anything of the slight differences between the first and later Prayer-books as to that. One of the differences makes E. 1 rather against the sacrificial theory; for it calls the altar also "God's board," which the present book does not. But taking the word "sacrifice" independently, I think it would puzzle the Ritualists to say how the notion of any sacrifice on the altar is more favoured by the first book than the last. And I add, for the benefit of those who have not the first book at hand, that such passages as "Christ made by His death upon the cross, by His one oblation of Himself once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient *sacrifice*, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world," are equally in both books. And E. 1 alone has this sentence just before "Ye that do truly and earnestly repent"—"Christ our Paschal Lamb is offered up" (meaning has been, *oblatus est*) "for us *once for all*, when He bare our sins in His Body upon the cross," which looks to ordinary readers rather stronger than any in our book, though of course our "once" is the original ἅπαξ and means "once for all."

Again, the words "We do celebrate and make here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, the *memorial* which Thy Son willed us to make; having in *remembrance* His blessed passion, mighty resurrection, and glorious ascension, rendering unto Thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same, entirely desiring Thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our *sacrifice of praise* and thanksgiving," gives no more support to the altar-sacrificial theory than the corresponding passage in our book. Both equally show what the only present sacrifice is, and both speak of doing it in "memory" or as "a memorial" of the former once-for-all sacrifice. I am not discussing the altar-sacrifice theory in itself just now, but only seeing whether the first book gave any sanction to it, and I can neither find that it did (being quite indifferent whether it did or not), nor remember ever seeing any rational argument that it did. Quotations from writers ever so distinguished, merely using the word "sacrifice" in connection with the Communion, prove nothing at all, even if any logical argument or interpretation of language can be proved by mere authority. If the first book gave no support to that theory, it is an *a fortiori* conclusion that the notoriously more Protestant later ones do not, nor can anybody make out from their words even a plausible argument that they do. They only think they ought, which in theological minds is often much the same.

The other sacramental proposition of the Ritualists is certainly more supported by the first Prayer-book than the later ones, and that of course is why they want to fish it up and set it on its legs again, on which it only stood for two whole years, and then went to sleep for three and a half centuries, and doubtless legally for ever. The retention of the word "mass" at once implies all Roman doctrine of the Sacrament which is not altered by the service. That doctrine had not been materially altered by any Act of Henry VIII., and E. 1 was the first attempt both at uniformity and doctrinal reformation, and naturally retained a good deal of what had prevailed before. For instance, it had not the Commandments, which I suppose were not read in the Roman services, on account of the incompatibility of the second with their image-worship, which they vainly attempt to conceal by a different division of them, and Dr. Littledale tells us that many Roman catechisms omit it altogether, and the E. 1 catechism has only the first part of it. Considering the revived Ritualistic passion for images, and of the most idolatrous kind, it is easy to understand their preference for E. 1 on account of that omission.

Besides the retention of the word "mass," E. 1 leans in the following respects more or less in the direction of some kind of transubstantiation, either physical or metaphysical, or some kind of magical operation on the elements by a priest reciting over them certain historical words, not as a prayer or as a pronouncement of anything, but simply as part of a story.

In both the exhortations to come to the Communion there are sentences to which we have nothing similar. The fullest is in the second exhortation: "Wherefore our duty is to come to these holy mysteries with most hearty thanks to Almighty God for His infinite mercy and benefits given to and bestowed on us, His unworthy servants, for whom He hath not only given His body to death and shed His blood, but doth also vouchsafe in a sacrament and mystery to give us His said body and blood to feed on spiritually." After the offertory sentences, those that do not mean to receive the Communion are directed to "depart out of the quire, except the ministers and clergy," to which also we have no similar rubric; but I do not see that that has any theological significance, though some persons apparently do.

On the other hand, the second exhortation in E. 1 contains this: "For neither the absolution of the priest can anything avail them [who do not repent, etc.], nor the receiving of this Holy Sacrament doth anything but increase their damnation." And then comes the invitation to confession, substantially in the same words as ours; but it adds again what we have not, a distinct intimation that private confession is not necessary, "requiring such as shall be satisfied with a general confession not

to be offended with those that do use to their further satisfying the auricular and secret confession to the priest; nor those which think needful or convenient for the quietness of their own consciences particularly to open their sins to the priest to be offended with them that are satisfied with their humble confession to God and the general confession to the Church." So that even the first Prayer-book negatived both the absoluteness of private absolution and the previously supposed necessity for getting it. In E. 1 there is no confession and absolution at morning and evening prayer. They begin with the Lord's Prayer, and then, after a sentence or two, come the Psalms.

What is called in our book the prayer of consecration, is amalgamated in E. 1 with that for the Church Militant, besides being varied in language, and both come after the Proper Prefaces and their doxology, and before the general confession and absolution, and the "Comfortable words," and "We do not presume." The most important of all are the different words of consecration, and the continuation of it by the prayer from which I have already quoted. After the words "or any other adversity" in the Church Militant prayer, comes this: "And especially we commend to Thy merciful goodness this congregation which is here assembled in Thy Name, to *celebrate the commemoration* of the most glorious death of Thy Son. And herein do give unto Thee most high praise and hearty thanks for the wonderful grace and virtue declared in all Thy saints from the beginning of the world; and chiefly in the glorious and most blessed Virgin Mary, mother of Thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord and God, and in the holy patriarchs, prophets, apostles and martyrs, whose examples (O Lord) and steadfastness in Thy faith and keeping Thy holy commandments grant us to follow. We commend unto Thy mercy, O Lord, all other Thy servants which are departed hence from us with the sign of faith, and now do rest in the sleep of peace. Grant unto them, we beseech Thee, Thy mercy and everlasting peace, and that at the day of the general resurrection we and all they which be of the mystical body of Thy Son may altogether be set on His right hand," etc. I keep this prayer for the departed saints in its place in E. 1, though it has no relation to the sacramental question. After a sentence like ours, except that "celebrate" appears instead of our "*continue* a perpetual memory of that His precious death until His coming again," it goes on, with this more important difference: "Hear us, O merciful Father, we beseech Thee, and with Thy Holy Spirit and Word vouchsafe to bl✠ess and sanc✠tify these Thy gifts, and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ. Who in the same night," etc. (as to the end of our consecration prayer). "Wherefore, O

Lord and heavenly Father, according to the institution of Thy dearly beloved Saviour Jesus Christ, we, Thy humble servants, do *celebrate* and make here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, the memorial," etc. (as quoted at p. 243 for another purpose).

It is not necessary to examine the E. 1 consecration prayer minutely to see that it went much further in the direction of affirming some Divine operation on the elements before reception than ours does, which intimates nothing of the kind, and that theory is also contradicted by several Articles and the catechism ; both of which, therefore, must be condemned by all that hold the ritualistic and popish doctrine of some change by saying certain words. And if unity of faith on important points is essential to membership of any "particular Church" (as the thirty-fourth Article says), it is hard to deny the dictum of the president of the E.C.U., that the same Church cannot hold the asserters and deniers of such an important doctrine as that, though they may both say that they belong to it. The common cant about unity means nothing, and is not worth using, if it only means that persons holding contrary opinions may legally use the same churches and pulpits to teach them in, and that everyone who goes to church must take his chance of what he is to see and hear and participate in, from the highest Popery down to the barest Unitarism, if not Mahometanism, which in a way does acknowledge Christ, perhaps as much as many who now call themselves Christians, but deny all the miracles which are the foundation of Christianity.

Perhaps the most significant of all the alterations is the addition of "the black rubric" at the end of the Communion service, against both transubstantiation and adoration of the consecrated bread and wine. Since 1552 that has been so clearly illegal that Pusey told Bennett he must withdraw his adoration doctrine to escape conviction, and he did. His acquittal on his new form of it by a bare majority (if the Ritualistic papers were right) was due to Mr. Gladstone's having put the editor of the *Guardian* into the judicial committee a few days before the trial.

It is still more natural that the sacrificialists should prefer the delivery sentences of E. 1, which are only the first half of ours, omitting the "eat (and drink) in *remembrance* that Christ died for thee, and feed on Him *in thy heart, by faith*, with thanksgiving." E. 2 had the latter half only. The only material alteration made by Elizabeth's Prayer-book and Act of Uniformity was combining them as at present.

One of the final rubrics of E. 1 orders the bread to be unleavened round pieces, "as it was afore, but larger," to be capable of division into two at least. This was a certain

amount of reformation on the Roman practice of giving whole or unbroken "wafers;" but I need not say that our rubric, according to the legal decisions, went farther in prescribing common fine leavened bread. If the Ritualists choose to cut or stamp it into rounds instead of squares, the Privy Council held that there is no prohibition of that childish game of imitating Popery with such sham wafers. Probably many of them enjoy a little more law-breaking by boldly using real ones, and trust the episcopal veto on law-enforcing to protect them. And if anybody carries one off, which has no business to be eaten or to be there at all, they set up a howl all over the kingdom about "sacrilege," while they are the real offenders themselves, and ought to have been told so then.

The last of the E. 1 rubrics orders the priest to put the bread into the mouth and not the hands; but for a very different reason from that absurd superstitious one of preventing a crumb from falling which Ritualists make such a fuss about. It is: "Although it be read in ancient writers that the people many years past received the Sacrament of the body of Christ into their own hands, and no commandment of Christ to the contrary; yet forasmuch as they many times conveyed the same secretly away, and kept it with them, and diversely abused it to superstition and wickedness; lest any such thing should hereafter be attempted, and that an uniformity might be used throughout the realm, it is thought convenient that the people commonly receive the Sacrament of Christ's body in their mouths at the priest's hands." That also did not survive E. 1. If it were even optionally restored, we should soon have the majority of the clergy refusing to administer in any other way, and the majority of the laity refusing to take it in that way, and therefore going somewhere else.

In connection with this we had better notice the very qualified permission of reservation for a few hours at the most of the Communion for the sick in E. 1: "If *the same day* there be a celebration in the church, then shall the priest reserve at the open Communion so much of the Sacrament of the body and blood as shall serve the sick person, and so many as shall communicate with him (if there be any); and *as soon as he conveniently may* after the open Communion ended, shall go and minister the same, first to those that are appointed to communicate with the sick person (if there be any), and last of all to the sick person himself. . . . But if the day be not appointed for the open Communion in the Church, then (upon convenient warning given) the curate shall come and visit the sick person afore noon. And having a convenient place in the sick man's house, shall" (in short) celebrate the Communion as usual. That was altogether different from general reservation, and keeping "the

Sacrament standing on the altar," according to Popish and Ritualistic notions. Even that permission was evidently for mere convenience, and must have been found to lead to some other evils, for it was very soon abolished in E. 2, and never revived, and there has not been the smallest scrap of authority for any reservation since. On the contrary, all that remains of the consecrated elements is to be eaten and drunk by the communicants, and all the rest that was put upon the table may go to the vicarage for dinner. I add that, because Dr. Littledale, who never stuck fast for want of a good bold assertion, and would not say a word against Transubstantiation in his book against Rome, and told me it was not a practical question (in the *Times*), answered my statement that "consecration" of inanimate things never means more than setting them apart for sacred use, by asserting that the "setting apart" at the Communion is done by putting the elements on the table; which is simply nonsense in the face of the rubric just now referred to.

Another difference between the books is that E. 1 directs the priest to "pour a little pure and clean water into the cup" with the wine, which was repealed in E. 2 and all the others. But the Ritualists imitate the Papists in this also, under the pretence that the wine at the original Lord's Supper probably was watered. The real motive is to celebrate the water and blood from our Lord's side. They might as well quibble about the particular kind of wine that was used then, and ought to be used now. But whatever the motive is, the question was legally unarguable, and the practice inevitably pronounced unlawful. The water was abolished in 1552, because it was known to have a superstitious object and meaning. If that book were allowed to be used, pure wine would soon be abolished at the Communion in nine out of ten Churches, from either Ritualism or fashion, without the laity having the smallest control over it; and that is what the Ritualists always mean by "the Church" being allowed to govern itself. It means their being allowed to govern the Church.

It is a small matter—but they seem to think it a great one—that E. 1 gives some kind of support to their favourite practice of getting congregations to be silent through "Therefore with angels and archangels," until they come to the "Holy, Holy, Holy," which is separated in E. 1 only by a comma and the mark ¶.[1] One of their leading writers, with unusual candour, says the erasure of the ¶ in the later books must have been a mistake; which is a very comfortable way of getting rid of any

[1] In the same way, it is a piece of Low Church Ritualism, not quite extinct—like changing the surplice for a gown to preach in—for the congregation to say the General Thanksgiving, for which there is no direction whatever in either case.

legislation that you dislike. The concluding rubric to the whole sentence was: "This the clerks shall also sing." This ambiguity was deliberately removed in 1552 by putting the rubric at the beginning, besides erasing the ¶. If a Church has the right to "decree rites and ceremonies so that they be not contrary to Scripture," surely it has more right than individual clergymen to decree such things as these. The opposite theory would not be listened to seriously for five minutes in any other Church, which has that right by its own fundamental laws, or in any Court which has to decide on the execution of them.

It is curious that E. 1 gives no support to the new theory of "Oblations" meaning or including the elements. It does not even use the word. There are plenty of other reasons against that unauthorized interpretation of the word in our Church Militant prayer, as I have shown in the articles on "Oblations" and the "Latin Prayer-book" in "Hook's Dictionary."

These are the only important differences, I think, in connection with the Communion. And it is hardly necessary to go through all the other services, as it is plainly for this one that the Ritualists want E. 1 to be revived. But it is right to mention that it also allowed extreme unction "if the sick person desires it." And the Burial Service contains two prayers for the dead man. But the Ordination Services present no difference, except that E. 1 makes the Bishop deliver "the chalice or cup with the bread," besides the Bible, to those who are ordained priests. The variations in other parts of the book affect no questions of doctrine or ritual that I can see except the addition of the sacramental part of the Catechism.

I have now enabled anyone to follow with the least possible trouble the advice of Bishop Mackarness in his preface to Mr. Myers's book, "That all who pronounce an opinion on the merits of the first Prayer-book ought to be well acquainted with it," *i.e.*, with its material differences from ours. As he was at one time a member of the E.C.U., it is worth something that he also said, "I should deprecate the return to an office-book now long disused, for better for worse." He thought "some of the changes in the second book were for the worse, and others much for the better." It is for that reason that I quote his opinion. It is useless to quote mere opinions of persons who are wholly partisans on your own side, but I might say that not one person of eminence, except notorious Ritualistic partisans, has expressed a desire to return to that merely temporary and experimental attempt at producing a reformed Prayer-book, and so to "run" two different religions as authorized for this "particular church." The Church Unionists are trying it for a beginning, as a plausible and innocent-looking proposal to allow the optional use of one Prayer-book of an eminently Protestant King instead of the

other, and they hope that ignorant or indifferent lay legislators will not find out the meaning and object of it. Anyone who takes the trouble to read these few pages will see that it means, that without the consent of a single layman or congregation any clergyman may repeal, throughout his parish, all the doctrinal and ceremonial legislation since 1549, and every judgment of the Privy Council against Ritualistic ceremonies. That is a tolerably bold scheme, even if it stopped there; but we have now to look at all such things by the further light of recent speeches of the president of the E.C.U., who has told his unionists that "the practice of the Primitive Church (by which he means a *multo post primitivam* one) in important respects condemns our own;" and again, that the same Church cannot hold both those who affirm and those who deny what he calls the Catholic faith about the sacraments; and tells them that above all things they ought to "strive for union with the great Apostolic Church of the West, which has done so much to guard the true faith about the sacraments." If such schemes and such announcements as these do not open the eyes of the blind and wake up the lazy before it is too late, nothing will.

GRIMTHORPE.

ART. V.—THE DEATH OF CHRIST.

(*Continued from page* 211.)

THE theological tendencies which are seen to be deducting from the importance given to the Cross of Christ in the theology of Holy Scripture, will be found to aim also at correcting popular views of the relation of the death of Christ both to the moral and ceremonial law of God. In other words, our new teachers are dissatisfied with the doctrines of the Reformation in their bearing on the connection of Christ's death both (1) with the justification of man, and (2) the sacerdotal office of Christ.

In the present paper we must confine ourselves to the first of these points. Our aim must be very briefly to touch upon the matters in controversy between the old and the new, or between the (so-called) popular and scientific, theologies on the matter of the relation of Christ's death to the justification of the sinner.

There are three words in this connection which seem to be specially obnoxious in the view of modern thought. Those words are *substitution, imputation, vicarious penalty.* We proceed to submit some considerations which we regard as very important in their bearing on this subject.