

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

friends of Evangelical truth, to strengthen the hands of those who are entrusted with its administration.¹

Some insight into the inner life of Christian fellowship, of which the Society is the centre, may be derived from an interesting reference in the memoir of Bishop Wilson, of Calcutta, by his son-in-law, Rev. Josiah Bateman, who relates an interview between that venerable prelate and the members, in 1845, during his visit to the Vicarage at Huddersfield:

“On one of the days of their meeting they presented him with an affectionate address, which was read by the Director, Archdeacon Musgrave. He (the Bishop) was so much affected by it as to be incapable of reply, but the address itself was carefully preserved to the day of his death, and found marked among his papers.”

“The Elland Society,” he (the Bishop) notes in his diary, “met here for discussion. Archdeacon Musgrave, Revs. Bull, Knight, Gratrix, Redhead, Tripp, Sinclair, Crosthwaite, Meek, Haigh, Hope, Bateman, etc. I was much edified and comforted.” Again, in a letter, after his return to India, he writes: “Present my tenderest love to the Elland Society, my introduction to which I consider among the many blessings of my visit home. I trust I shall continue to have their prayers. The prayers I collected in England are like a covering cloud, distilling showers of blessing on me in the heat of India. Yes! I remember the dear Archdeacon and the clergy present, to all whom, and more especially to Archdeacon Musgrave, my love.”

T. ALFRED STOWELL.



ART. V.—THE HISTORY OF OUR PRAYER-BOOK AS BEARING ON PRESENT CONTROVERSIES.

PART II.

IN the former article I endeavoured to show that the first Prayer-Book of Edward VI., while distinctly rejecting what belonged to the doctrine of Rome, gave an uncertain sound as regards the doctrine of the Corporal Presence, using language which might seem to be conciliatory towards the Lutherans, but which did not necessarily involve the teaching of the doctrine of Luther.

In the present article we have to deal with the second Prayer-Book of Edward. We have again two questions to

¹ The present secretary and treasurer is the Rev. W. Meredith Lane, Beeford Rectory, Hull, by whom contributions will be thankfully received.

ask; and in answering these, it is important for us to bear clearly in mind what we have learnt in answer to our questions concerning the first book.

1. Our first question is: In what relation did Edward's second book stand to the first?

There appears to have been much misunderstanding on this point.

Yet about the answer to this question, when fairly examined, we can hardly suppose that there is, or will be—we are quite sure there ought not to be—any doubt or hesitation whatever.

But the answer is so important for the purpose we have now in view, that we must be allowed to emphasize the fact that it was just Edward's first book, divested of whatever had sounded a doubtful note—a note which might have grated on the ears of the Reformed, and seemed to any to harmonize with, or be suggestive of, the doctrine of Luther. If it is evident that there was in the first book a steadfast purpose to take quite out of the way whatever could tend in any degree to support the doctrines of Transubstantiation, it is not less evident that the revision which gave us the second book was carefully carried out with a fixed design to let nothing remain that could lend encouragement to the doctrine of a Corporal Presence. If the first book was distinctly anti-Papal, the second book was distinctly and unmistakably anti-Lutheran.¹

¹ It may be said to have a mediæval (or, rather, *ancient*) basis, with the mediæval superstructure carefully removed, then built upon with a Lutheran framework, from which the interior of Lutheran doctrine has been forcibly and laboriously discarded.

Thus the very remains of what had been received by tradition from the Middle Ages testify to the deliberate rejection of Popery. And the very Lutheran form of the formulary bears clear witness to the evident *design* of altogether eliminating the Lutheran doctrine.

The claim made for the Mozarabic Liturgy as influencing our Reformed Formularies must await the result of further research. There are difficulties in the way of supposing that Cranmer had access to a copy of this rite. But so long as it is admitted that the form of blessing the font (in the Baptismal Service of 1549) "must have been obtained either directly or indirectly from the Spanish Liturgy" (Gasquet, "Edward VI.," p. 185; see also Mr. Burbidge's Letters in the *Guardian* of February 6, 1895), it cannot be regarded as impossible that the Communion Service also may have been similarly affected. And there are not lacking indications that it was so affected (see Burbidge's "Liturgies and Offices," pp. 175, 177, 230; and "Papers on the Eucharistic Presence," p. 511).

It should be noted, however, that with very slight and unimportant variations, the recital of the "words of institution" (which exhibits so striking a similarity to the Mozarabic Liturgy: see Mr. Warren's Letter in the *Guardian*, March 22, 1890) is found to correspond with the formula of the Nuremberg order of 1533, as well as with that given in the Latin version by Justus Jonas of the Catechism of Nuremberg (see Droop's "Edwardian Vestments," p. 44), and with Cranmer's translation of this (see Gasquet's "Edward VI.," pp. 446-448).

Where was the declaration about receiving in each part the whole Body of our Saviour Jesus Christ? It was gone. Where now was the petition for sanctifying the gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of the Saviour?¹ They were nowhere. Where was the statement, "He hath left in these holy mysteries . . . His own Blessed Body and precious Blood"? It had been struck out.² Where were the words of thanking

And it seems not altogether improbable that this formula may have had its origin in an attempt to make "a harmony of all the four narratives of the institution contained in the New Testament" (Gasquet, p. 446); and we know that Cranmer had long before been studying the Nuremberg form (see Brewer's "State Papers," vol. v., p. 410; see also Gasquet's "Edward VI.," p. 207). Still, there seems no great force in the argument that Luther cannot have derived it from the Mozarabic, because that rite, "in its continual expression of the idea of sacrifice" (Gasquet, p. 445), would have been distasteful to him.

As regards the Greek Liturgies, it is not doubtful that they were in part known to our English Reformers (see Dowden's "Annotated Scottish Com. Off.," pp. 11, 12), but by some they seem to have been doubtfully regarded (see Gasquet, "Edward VI.," pp. 168, 186, 187). They can hardly be said to have made any very decided or very marked impress on our English Communion Service. Their influence cannot be spoken of with any certainty. Yet certain features seem to indicate some probable derivation (see Burbidge, p. 194).

I much regret that in an article in the *CHURCHMAN* of February, 1892, I was misled by an error of Palmer in stating that the Liturgy of St. James had been printed at Rome in 1526. I am indebted to Mr. Tomlinson for kindly pointing out this mistake (see Swainson's "Greek Liturgies," Introduction, p. ix). It was published (with others) in Latin at Antwerp, 1560; and in 1562 it was quoted in the Council of Trent (see Theiner, ii., pp. 69, 91; see also Jewel's Works, "Sermon and Harding," p. 114, P.S.).

¹ See the reason for the change as given by Bishop Guest (Dugdale's "Life," pp. 147, 148), Cosin (Nicholl's "Additional Notes," pp. 45, 53; and "Works," A.C.L., vol. v., pp. 470, 471). The effect of the change was pointed out by Bishop Scott, of Chester, in his speech before Parliament, 1559 (see Cardwell's "Conferences," p. 113). The change had been urged by Bucer (see "Scripta Anglicana," p. 468).

² In 1549, in the exhortation, when "the people be negligent," we have these words: "Wherefore our duty is to come to these holy mysteries with most hearty thanks to be given to Almighty God for His infinite mercy and benefits given and bestowed upon us His unworthy servants, for whom He hath not only given His Body to death and shed His Blood, but also doth vouchsafe, in a Sacrament and mystery, to give us His said Body and Blood to feed upon spiritually" (Cardwell, p. 276).

In the exhortation to be said "some time" in the book of 1552, we have a corresponding statement, but with a sentence altered (and very awkwardly expressed in the alteration), obviously for the purpose of avoiding anything like a Lutheran sound, thus: ". . . most hearty thanks, for that He hath given His Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, not only to die for us, but also to be our spiritual food and sustenance, as it is declared unto us, as well by God's Word as by the Holy Sacraments of His blessed Body and Blood" (Cardwell, p. 286).

God "for that Thou hast vouchsafed to feed us *in* these holy mysteries with the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ"? They have been changed into the words, "for that Thou hast vouchsafed to feed us who have duly received these holy mysteries."¹

Labour and learning and ingenuity indeed have been expended, and taxed to the utmost, in the endeavour to find yet some dens and caves in which the doctrine of a Corporal—*i.e.*, a local (called "supra-local")—Presence may still find a lurking-place. But surely the very shifts to which they have been driven in these attempts afford an evidence of the carefulness and thoroughness with which our Reformers eliminated everything that had a sound or a semblance of anything beyond the doctrine of the Reformed.²

The change made in this at the last review not only removed the awkwardness of the expression, it was also *doctrinally* preferable (see "Papers on Eucharistic Presence," pp. 433, 484-488). The carefulness to shun anything like the Corporal Presence had given to the awkward expression something too much like a (so-called) Zwinglian sound. It might have seemed to some to look like an ignoring of the true *Unio Sacramentalis*, as taught by "Reformed" divines (see "Eucharistic Worship," pp. 182-184).

¹ This post-Communion thanksgiving is a Lutheran form with the words of Lutheran sound thus extracted. It is taken from the Brandenburg-Nürnberg Order (see Jacob's "Lutheran Movement in England," p. 243). So also the words of distribution in the first book, "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee," "shed for thee" (which were unknown to the Mass), were adopted from the Nürnberg formula (*ibid.*, p. 242); and their omission in the second book was doubtless owing to some (needless) suspicion that they might be capable of suggesting the idea of the Lutheran doctrine of the Presence. The words substituted in 1552 were strongly anti-Lutheran in sound—sufficiently so to correct any misapprehension from the use of the earlier form, when the two forms were combined in the book of Elizabeth. It seems to have most resembled the form of John a Lasco (see Cardwell, "Two Liturgies," Preface, pp. xxx, xxxi).

Dean Aldrich declares, "'Tis manifest that neither form single, nor both of 'em together, either owns a *Corporal* or denies a *Real* Presence" ("Reply to Two Discourses," p. 7, Oxford, 1687).

² The idea that the revising hand was a foreign hand, and the revision an un-English work, must be altogether abandoned. It is nothing but a prevalent misconception that we have to think of the changes as owing to the guidance and direction of Continental Reformers. Peter Martyr's letter to Bucer (of January 10, 1550-1551; see Gorham's "Reformation Gleanings," p. 229) makes it evident, not only that he had not been consulted, but that he had not even been well informed as to the "many alterations" which had been concluded on (see Collier's "Ecclesiastical History," vol. v., p. 434). He did not even presume to ask Cranmer for information as to "what these corrections were" (see Burbidge's "Liturgies and Offices," p. 166). But it by no means follows that the English action in the matter had received no impulse from the influence of Reformers from abroad. In the same letter Peter Martyr "gives God thanks for making himself and Bucer instrumental in putting the Bishops

Some may perhaps think that this carefulness was excessive, and allowed to run to extremes. But its aim, its purpose, its design, is too manifest to admit of any fair question for those

in mind of the exceptionable places in the Common Prayer." It must not, however, be supposed that Bucer's "Censura" was taken as a guide to be followed in the revision (see Cardwell's "Two Liturgies," Preface, pp. xxvii, xxviii).

There is good reason to believe that our English Reformers, in preparing the second book, were entering heartily into a *perfecting* work, which was in view in their original design (see "Papers on the Eucharistic Presence," pp. 513-516, 497-501).

It has been said by a learned writer: "What we are concerned to show is that there was no sudden and abrupt change after the publication of the first Prayer-Book, as if different parties and different interests had been concerned in the drawing-up of the two Prayer-Books, but that there was a scheme deliberately planned from the first, the idea being to get rid at all hazards of the service and doctrine of the Mass, and the sacrifice, by representing the matter as one of reform, and not of abolition" (*Church Quarterly Review*, October, 1892, p. 58).

"It [the book of 1549] was designed as a half-way house towards a second Prayer-Book, which should be more unequivocally Protestant in tone. And that this was so is abundantly evidenced in the correspondence of the day" (*ibid.*, October, 1893, p. 137).

If the leading foreigners "affected for a time the whole character of Liturgical worship in England" (Luckock, "Studies," p. 65), it was only because our English Reformers were at one with them in their "Reformed" views, and were willing from any quarter to accept suggestions which might commend themselves to their judgments (see Cardwell's "Two Liturgies," Preface, pp. xxviii-xxx).

As regards the very improbable report "carried about in Frankford" that "Cranmer had drawn up a book of prayers a hundred times more perfect," Jenkyns observes that Strype "is fully justified in treating it as altogether unworthy of credit" ("Cranmer's Works," Preface, p. liv). Dr. Cardwell, indeed, considers the report "an exaggerated statement rather than as entirely groundless" ("Two Liturgies," Preface, p. xxxv); and he thinks "we may infer that he [Cranmer] was not satisfied with it [the book of 1552] in all respects from the order of Council, which was issued soon afterwards in explanation of the kneeling at the Communion" (p. xxxvi). But, then, Dr. Cardwell had not seen the letter of Cranmer which Mr. Perry has printed from the STATE PAPER OFFICE in his "Declaration on Kneeling" (pp. 77, 78), which shows clearly, not only how little disposed Cranmer was to sympathize with the objections to kneeling reception, but also how little inclination he had to yield to the pressure for further innovation from "these glorious and unquiet spirits, which can like nothing but that is after their own fancy; and cease not to make trouble and disquietness when things be most quiet and in good order." He adds: "If such men should be heard, although the book were made every year anew, yet should it not lack faults in their opinion."

The great value of this letter consists in this—that it shows that Cranmer (while he had willingly set to "his hand and his axe" with the rest at the perfecting of the Prayer-Book by giving it a distinctly "Reformed" character) was sensible of the danger to the Reformation from the violent tendencies of extremists, and was resolved, as far as in him lay, to protect the Church of England from the floods which might result from the rising tide of Puritan innovation.

who will honestly look at the facts. And this carefulness did not stop at the Lutheran doctrine of consubstantiation. It did not confine itself to the matter of the Eucharistic Presence. We are familiar in our day with the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice,¹ and with that doctrine as made dependent on the doctrine of the so-called Real Objective Presence. The claim is made on behalf of a Christian *sacerdotium*, that its function is in this Sacrament to offer sacrificially a sacrificial and propitiatory memorial before God (with the really present Body and Blood of Christ on the altar) of the one sacrifice on the Cross. And this claim is too often made to rest on forced interpretations of our Blessed Lord's words in the institution of the Lord's Supper. This claim, indeed, has been abundantly disproved. It is actually void of any scriptural warrant; and we may be well assured our English reformers, with Cranmer at their head, would never have allowed it. They were dead against any such teaching of the Eucharistic sacrifice. They saw in it the roots of all the vain superstitions and blasphemous delusions of the Papacy.²

But if the words of Edward's first book,³ which spoke of "making here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, the memorial which Thy Son hath willed us to make," had been allowed to remain, they might have afforded something like a colourable pretext as a shelter for a doctrine making something like an approach to such a perversion of the truth.⁴

¹ In this connection it should be observed that, whereas in the first book there had been a prayer "for the whole state of Christ's Church," which ended with a recommending the dead to the mercy of God. This *recommendation* was omitted in the second book, and the words "militant here on earth" were added in the prefix, "to show that the Church not only did not practise intercession for the dead, but even carefully excluded it" (Cardwell, "Two Liturgies," Preface, p. xxxiv).

² In this matter Luther and the Lutherans would also have agreed with them (see, e.g., "Historia Comitiorum, MDXXX., Augustæ Celebratorum," Frankfort-on-Oder, 1597, folios 53, 54).

³ It has been said "Cranmer substituted a new prayer of about the same length as the old Canon, leaving in it a few shreds of the ancient one, but divesting it of its character of sacrifice and oblation. Even the closest theological scrutiny of the new composition will not detect anything inconsistent with or excluding Luther's negation of the sacrificial idea of the Mass" (Gasquet's "Edward VI.," pp. 223, 224). This is true; and the words quoted in the text, as interpreted by the animus which governed the revision, would convey no idea of the *Mass-sacrifice*. But, as regarded by themselves, they must be allowed to be also not incapable of conveying a sense not inconsistent with a sacrificial idea. Indeed, they are appealed to by Canon Luckock ("Studies," p. 45) as evidence to show that the Revisionists of 1549 "were extremely careful to avoid bringing the sacrificial view into discredit."

⁴ The words of Institution constitute the Lord's Supper an *ἀνάμνησις*—

It is true, indeed, that the sting of such teaching may be said to have been taken away in the taking away of the doctrine of the Corporal Presence. Nevertheless, the vigilance of the Revision could not suffer such language to remain. And in the second book not only is this language rejected, but with it is rejected whatever could be regarded as being accessory to such a system of teaching. Everything that could possibly be accounted as a clothing of this doctrine, or a suitable accompaniment to it, is carefully removed. The name of Mass is gone; the altar is turned into a table;¹ the sacerdotal

i.e., simply "a perpetual memory" to be *continued*—not a *μνημόστυνον*—*i.e.* (in the technical terminology of the LXX.), a sacrificial memorial to be *offered* by a *ιερείς* on the altar to the Lord (see "The Eucharist considered in its Sacrificial Aspect," Elliot Stock, pp. 23, 24).

The language of the second book admits only the idea of *ἀνάμνησις*. The rejected language of the first book was certainly capable (as we think) of suggesting the idea of *μνημόστυνον*.

If this is so, the doctrinal significance of the change is not to be depreciated, especially when viewed in connection with what is sometimes called the *dislocation* of the Prayer of Oblation, the design of which was evidently to separate its sacrificial language from any possible connection with the consecrated elements (see "Papers on Eucharistic Presence," No. VII., pp. 454, 555).

The *μνημόστυνον* may be said to ask for (if not to demand) some sort of Real Objective Presence. For the *ἀνάμνησις* any such Presence is superfluous. The *μνημόστυνον* is co-related to a *θυσιαστήριον*. The *ἀνάμνησις* needs only a *τραπέζα Κυρίου* (1 Cor. x. 21).

The word *ἀνάμνησις*, when standing alone, never (we believe) makes approaches to the signification of *μνημόστυνον* (see "Eucharist considered in its Sacrificial Aspect," Note I, p. 23; and "Some Recent Teachings concerning Eucharistic Sacrifice," pp. 10, 15, 16).

¹ An order of Council had been issued for changing altars into tables in 1550. This order was perhaps in conformity with law; but some earlier episcopal orders had gone before the law. While the name "altar" remained, it was explained as referring to the "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving" (see Edward's letter to Ridley in Bulley's "Variations," p. 147). One of the "reasons" given by the order in Council for the change is this, that "the form of a table shall more move the simple from the superstitious opinions of the Popish Mass unto the right use of the Lord's Supper. For the use of an altar is to make sacrifice upon it; the use of a table is for men to eat upon" (Foxe, "Acts and Monuments," vol. vi., p. 6, edit. Townsend, 1838).

The second "reason" justifies the change on the ground that the Book of Common Prayer calleth the thing "indifferently a table, an altar, or the Lord's board, without prescription of any form thereof."

It has not, perhaps, been generally noted how the first Prayer-Book had prepared the way for the removal of altars. For while it retained in five places the word "altar," it introduced (besides the term "God's board") twice the name "Lord's table" ("for the first time," says Mr. Walton, p. 52, "in the rubrics of any Catholic Liturgy"), probably from Hermann's "Consultatio," in which it is also found side by side with the occasional term "altar." It had been used also in the "Order of Service of the Church of Denmark." "No one," says Mr. Walton, "acquainted with these two foreign manuals can have any doubt as to the thoroughly

vestments¹ are not to be seen; last, not least, the eastward position² is to be used no more.³

2. Now, whatever we may think of this very bold and decided, not to say *slashing*, work from the Liturgiologist's

Protestant and non-sacrificial intention of their language. It is important, then," he adds, "to trace this term 'Lord's table' to its true source, because generous attempts have been made to assign it a strictly Catholic sense; but its immediate derivation from foreign Protestants, together with Bucer's use of 'Mensa Domini,' when speaking of the 'altar' of the English Liturgy of 1549 ('Censura,' p. 459, etc.), seems quite conclusive against this higher view" ("Rubrical Determination," p. 52, enlarged edition).

Attempts are sometimes made to represent the omission of the word "altar" from the Prayer-Book of 1552 as having no doctrinal significance, or as indicative only of a desire to restore the "Communion" aspect to the service without excluding the Mass sacrifice. But the other corresponding changes, if we knew nothing of the history of the revision, would suffice to refute every such plea. The change did not, of course, imply that the word "altar" could not be used (as by the ancients) in a sense which might be innocent. But it did imply that there was danger of its being understood in a sense suggestive of false doctrine, and that the revision which was to make the book "fully perfect" should use all caution to shun the danger.

And when Laudian divines defended the use of the word, it was at a time when the danger might by some be regarded as past. So the canons of 1640 assume that, as applied to the holy table, it cannot be understood in a "proper" sense, and that the Corporal Presence (now regarded by some as essential to the Eucharistic sacrifice of the altar) can have no place in the Liturgy of the English Church.

Mr. Warren assures us (*Guardian* of March 4, 1891) that in Western Liturgies *altare* is the rule; *mensa* is the exception. In Eastern (Greek) Liturgies *τράπεζα* is the rule, *θυσιαστήριον* the exception.

¹ It should be observed that the first book of Edward left the use of the vestment (or chasuble, the essentially sacrificial vesture) optional. "It may be taken as certain," says Gasquet, "that those attached to the ancient custom would vest as before, whilst those who desired change would adopt the cope, which broke with past ecclesiastical tradition and the universal practice, and enabled them to display their rejection of the sacrificial character of the service" (p. 190). Cramer himself officiated "in a cope, and no vestment, nor mitre, nor cross, but a cross staff was borne afore him" ("Grey Friars' Ch.," p. 60; quoted from Gasquet, p. 241).

It is evident that the service drawn up in 1533 for Brandenburg and Nuremberg had its influence on the book of 1549. And in that order it is directed that "the priest is not to wear a chasuble, but a cope only; or in village churches, where there are no copes, a mere surplice, lest simple folk should imagine it was intended to celebrate Mass after the former fashion without communicants" (see *Church Intelligencer*, January, 1891, p. 12).

But, then, it must be observed that the book of 1549 differed from the German in that it at least allowed the chasuble.

It may probably be that the sacerdotal character of the chasuble was not always ascribed to it (see *Church Quarterly Review*, January, 1891,

² See note ² on p. 434.

³ See note ³ on p. 434.

point of view, it ought certainly to be admitted that it makes the answer to our second question very easy.

“What was the doctrinal position of Edward’s second book?”

Can any doubt that it was not only distinctly, but strongly, anti-Lutheran? Is it possible to question that it set forth the Eucharistic doctrine of the Church of England as strictly and straitly adhering to that of the so-called Sacramentaries?¹

Some years since an English clergyman was met in the

pp. 460, 461). But it will hardly be questioned that (at the date of the Reformation) the distinction between the chasuble and the cope was pretty generally recognised (see Scudamore’s “Notitia Euch.,” pp. 66-75, second edition; see also Marriott’s “Vestiarium Christianum,” pp. 224, 225).

² The rubric at the commencement of the first book ordered the priest to stand “humbly afore in the midst of the altar,” which in the second book is changed to “the north side of the table.” This is what we mean by the rejection of the eastward position, not any rubrical direction concerned only with the prayer of consecration.

Archbishop Laud’s Prayer-Book for Scotland (1637) allowed the presbyter *for that prayer* to stand so as he could most conveniently use both his hands. And Bishop Wren’s own reason for standing on occasion *for that prayer only* with his back to the people was that, being little of stature, he could not otherwise well reach over the book for the manual acts.

None, it may be presumed, would ever think of objecting to the occasional convenience of such a posture *in this part* of the service if all doctrinal significance were removed by the ministers really turning to perform the manual acts visibly before the people.

It may, however, be observed that none of the eleven reasons given by Durandus for the eastward position cover the significance attached to that position by those who value it as teaching the Eucharistic sacrifice (see “Rationale,” lib. v., cap. ii., § 57, p. 340; Neapoli, 1859).

³ These changes should be viewed in connection with corresponding changes in the ordinal (see papers “On Eucharistic Presence,” No. 7, p. 533, *sq.*).

What was strictly Roman in the ordinal had been eliminated before. Now there is no longer the delivery of the chalice or cup with the bread.

It should also be observed that in the second book there is no place for what in the first was “the very qualified permission of reservation for a few hours” for sick communion.

¹ M. Gasquet truly says: “It is . . . not a little significant that everything in the first Prayer-Book upon which Gardiner had fixed as evidence that the new Liturgy did not reject the old belief was in the revision carefully swept away and altered” (“Edward VI.,” p. 289). And of other changes he truly says: “The only reason which it seems possible to give is that the innovators resolved that it should henceforth be impossible to trace in the new Communion office any resemblance, however innocuous, to the ancient Mass” (p. 291). In spite of Bucer’s most earnest desire that the words, “Whosoever shall be partakers of the Holy Communion may worthily receive the most precious body and blood of Thy Son Jesus Christ,” might be retained, even at the risk of their being interpreted of a Corporal Presence, they were left out, though “the parallel passage in the prayer of humble access, now removed to a part of the service before the canon, was allowed to remain” (p. 293).

streets of Berlin by a learned Lutheran Professor, who accosted him, saying, "Mr. Ayerst, I have been studying your English Communion Service. Why, *you are Reformed!*"

In England (unhappily, perhaps) the study of the difference between the confessions of the Reformed and the Lutherans is almost out of date. In Germany it is well understood still, and the Professor's language intimated very clearly that he found no trace of Lutheran doctrine in our English Liturgy.

It need not be supposed for a moment that we are claiming for the Church of England to be the champion of opinions now commonly stigmatized (though probably in error) by the name of Zwinglian.¹ There were doubtless some Reformed divines on the Continent who, by the dread of Lutheran doctrine, were driven sometimes towards an opposite extreme. But in England it would seem that (notwithstanding some exceptions) neither did the Lutheran doctrine, nor what may be called the doctrine of bare *significance*, ever obtain any very influential or conspicuous following.

There were never wanting among the Reforming divines abroad those who were vehemently opposed to any teaching which might seem to have a suspicious sound as tending to reduce the sacraments of the Gospel to anything like empty signs. And at home the voices of our English divines, strongly and distinctly anti-Lutheran, were lifted up almost as the voice of one man in strong and distinct renunciation and repudiation of any such tendency to degrade the holy ordinances of Christ.

But the point we wish to insist upon very strongly is this, that not only is the "reformed" character of Edward's second book prominent on the face of it; its true doctrinal position is singularly confirmed and established by the very history of its revision. If the record of the changes made in our Liturgy in the reign of Edward VI. had been the account of one revision only, we should have missed an argument the force of which is now not to be evaded. If all the changes effected in that reign had been made at once—made with one sweep—

¹ They should rather be called Schwenkfeldian. But it should be remembered that Zwingle's tendencies and some of his earlier utterances gave occasion for that which "some did exceedingly fear" (Hooker, "Ecc. Pol.," vol. lxxviii., § 2). After the "consensus Tigurinus" (1549), the Swiss doctrine was less open to misrepresentation, and should have been better understood. There was then "a general agreement concerning that which alone is material" (Hooker, "Ecc. Pol.," V., ch. lxxvii., § 2). It bridged the chasm which had separated the two sections of the Reformed, though some still stood aloof. Our English Reformers generally were very strong in repudiating any sympathy with the views which would have reduced the Sacraments to empty signs (see papers "On Eucharistic Presence," No. V., pp. 269-279).

we should not have been able to distinguish, as we can clearly do now, two distinct steps, with two separate designs (the result of caution¹), in the matter of our revision. It might then have been just possible, perhaps, that all the changes might have been set down to an excessive caution in eliminating everything that could favour the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation.

As it is, we see *that end* evidently aimed at and accomplished in the first revision. We have another and a further end evidently aimed at and accomplished in the second revision. That further aim was, beyond question, the fully perfecting our Prayer-Book by casting out everything that by a doubtful sound could seem to find harbour for the Eucharistic doctrine of Luther.² The first revision was the result of a fixed purpose, whose word of command was, "Let nothing remain that savours of the transubstantiation of Rome." The second revision was as the perfect obedience to a steadfast determination, whose orders were, "Let everything be utterly cast away that can seem to favour the doctrine of a Real Objective Presence in or under the elements."

Now, if this be so, it is a fact which ought to be made prominent. We must be permitted to say that the mists which have been of late years allowed to becloud it ought to be cleared away. The Reformed Church of England has a right to expect of us that we should vindicate her "Reformed" doctrine, and make her true doctrinal position perfectly unambiguous—as unambiguous as it was when Archbishop Whitgift³ declared before the world that this Church of England had, thank God! been reformed to the quick, and had "refused the doctrine of the Real Presence."⁴

Every Church's Eucharistic Service ought to teach the Eucharistic doctrine to the full, and the Church of England declares in her canons⁵ that her Communion Service does

¹ The order for the use of the first Prayer-Book had been followed by risings in Devonshire, Essex, Kent, Norfolk, and Suffolk.

² See the opinion of Cornelius Schulting of Cologne, as quoted in Gasquet's "Edward VI.," p. 306.

³ "Mr. Martyr nameth the Popish things which the Lutherans observe to be the *Real Presence*—images, all the Popish apparel which they used in their Mass (for so doth he mean), which *this Church has refused*. What his opinion is of this apparel that we retain I have declared, Tract VII., chap. v., Division 4, where he of purpose speaketh concerning the same. God be thanked! religion is wholly reformed, even to the quick, in this Church" (Whitgift's "Works," P.S. Edit., vol. iii., p. 550).

This was published when Whitgift was Master of Trinity College. Whitgift became Archbishop of Canterbury in 1583 (see papers "On Eucharistic Presence," pp. 34, 37-39).

⁴ That is, of course, in the Romish sense. In another sense "the Real Presence" was maintained even by Puritan divines.

⁵ See papers "On Eucharistic Presence," No. VII., pp. 462, 463.

teach it to the full. And yet that Service knows absolutely nothing, and the history of that Service makes it abundantly manifest that it has designedly determined to know nothing, has of set purpose refused to know or teach anything of any Real Presence locally under the form of the consecrated elements.

In view of the language of our Liturgy, and in view of what we know from history to have been rejected from our Communion Service, it is now impossible to doubt to which of the two great divisions, "Lutheran" and "Reformed," we belong. In externals, indeed, the Church of England has conformed to neither. And in her independent action she has declined the controlling guidance of both, and she has withstood the dictation of those who, in misdirected zeal for the truth, were sowing discord among brethren.

But not the less is her doctrinal standpoint unmistakable. And even for those resolved to mistake it the history of our Prayer-Book gives evidence which should be decisive. The German Professor said right, "*You are Reformed.*"

I am quite sensible, indeed, that in such matters it is possible, and unhappily rather common, to make a good deal too much of historical arguments. Our responsibility in respect of our symbolical and liturgical standards is to be measured by the plain, natural, and honest interpretation of language, not by recondite historical researches.

The arguments of much plausible special pleading as against the obvious sense of our formularies might be easily dispersed by the force of Lord Selborne's statement: "The propositions embodied in that law [*e.g.*, an Act of Parliament] may have recommended themselves for different reasons to different minds. What was proposed, but not adopted, may have been either disapproved on its merits or simply deemed superfluous. Even, therefore, if the proof of the intention of the mover of a particular proposition were direct and demonstrative, it is *immaterial*, unless it appears *on the face of the law*. Its irrelevancy is still more manifest when . . . the proof is conjectural and imperfect" ("Notes on Liturgical History," pp. 4, 5).

Nevertheless, patent facts of history may very well be summoned as witnesses in support of the natural meaning of our formularies. And the value of their testimony may sometimes be rated high for the defence of those formularies against misunderstanding and misrepresentation.

It is what may be called its indefinite character which has made it possible for the first book to be so differently regarded from different points of view. Thus (1) there are some who would speak of it as Popish, even as Bishop Gardiner (who

had a purpose to serve) claimed for it a "Catholic" character. These have failed to take account of the conspicuous absence of all that could give support to the Mass sacrifice. All "oblation" is absent, and absent because "left out." There are (2) others who regard it as Lutheran, even as strong anti-Lutherans condemned it in its own day. These have not sufficiently noticed the ambiguities of the language which seemed to have the strongest Lutheran sound. It was capable, as Cranmer showed, of a sound sense. (3) Others have pronounced it to be Reformed, even as Latimer regarded its doctrine as not differing from that of the second book. These have scarcely given sufficient attention to the shelter or tolerance (at least) which its ambiguities certainly afforded for Lutheran (occasionally perhaps for more than Lutheran) doctrine.

Those who understood its language in an anti-Reformed sense might fairly be pronounced to be "mistakers." But it cannot fairly be charged against them that the book afforded no loopholes for their mistakes.

But whatever loopholes for mistake there were in the first book, it is obvious that the revision which we have in the second was distinctly designed to stop them. It can no longer be said that there is fair room for mistake. When the second book is fairly compared with the first—and the first is to be viewed as made perfect in the second—it is impossible not to see that its perfecting consists in its dealing with ambiguous language, and that its ambiguities have been dealt with in the way of firmly and of set purpose closing the door against the approaches of Lutheran doctrine.

The well-informed among those who most strongly objected to what they regarded as the dangerous ceremonies retained in the English Church did not (I believe) venture afterwards to charge the Communion Service with being anything but a "Reformed" Liturgy.

It was intended, indeed, to minister to a great National Church, which was well known to contain a considerable variety of opinion. But we must insist upon it that it was intended to *teach* only the doctrine of the "Reformed." And, still more, we must insist upon it that a sidelight from history makes it perfectly clear that it was of set purpose and of fixed design intended to *unteach*, not only the "dangerous deceits" of the Mass, but also the Real Presence as held and taught in the Churches of the Lutherans.

Another question remains to be dealt with in our next article.

N. DIMOCK.

