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

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

The Reformers and the Communion Service.

ANYONE who compares the public liturgy of 1549 with that of 1552 will observe many important differences. Nobody denies that some of these changes were in the direction of improvement, such as exhortation, general confession, and absolution, which stand at the beginning of Morning and Evening Prayer, and which were taken mainly from the service-books of Calvin and Alasco. But, without doubt, it was in the Communion Office that changes of deepest significance were effected, and we are limited by the title of our paper to an examination of these alterations. We notice that they were of a twofold character—changes in the text, and changes in the arrangement of the prayers.

We shall begin by considering the former. In the title of the Office we observe the first difference. It has been said that the name of the Mass was retained for the Holy Communion in the First Prayer-Book. It was retained, but not as a correct or proper designation. The words of the title in 1549 were, "The Supper of the Lord, and the Holy Communion, COMMONLY CALLED the Mass." That is to say, the name of the Mass was treated as a vulgar misnomer, to which we may find a parallel in *vulga dicebatur* of Article XXXI. But this word, associated as it was with rejected medieval beliefs, was not to be countenanced or encouraged, and in 1552 the words, "commonly called the Mass," were struck out. The next thing we notice is that, after the Collect for purity, the Ten Commandments, with responses, were inserted in 1552. Passing on from this, we come to the central act of the Service, known as the Canon. According to the Book of 1549, this included prayer for the Church on earth, commemoration of the Virgin Mary, and prayers for the dead. In 1552 all prayers for the dead were removed. Not to mention other evidence, the reasons for this are given in a very interesting report furnished to Cecil, Secretary of State, by his friend Geste, Vice-Provost of King's College, Cambridge, in the first year of Elizabeth. This report on Prayer-Book revision states: "Praying for the dead is not now used in the Communion, because it doth seem to

make for the sacrifice of the dead. And also because (as it was used in the First Book) it maketh some of the faithful to be in heaven, and to need no mercy; and some of them to be in another place, and to lack help and mercy." He then goes on to say that this usage was not in Christ and His Apostles' time, nor in Justin's time; and he concludes this part by quoting the significant words of Tertullian: "That is true which is first; that is false which is after; that is first which is from beginning; that is from beginning which is from the Apostles." Besides prayers for the dead, the name of the Virgin Mary, the Prophets and Martyrs, and the Invocation of the Holy Spirit for the sanctification of the bread and wine, were also omitted from the Second Prayer-Book.

Following the order of 1549, this brings us to the words of Consecration. Let us notice first the important change from the Sarum Missal made in 1549. According to the Sarum Missal, the prayer is that the oblation "may be MADE unto us the body and blood of Christ;" whereas, in the Book of 1549, the prayer is that the "gifts and creatures of bread and wine may BE UNTO US the body and blood of Christ." What is the meaning of this deliberate alteration, and why was it made? Its import was to do away with the old conception, so prominent in the sacrifice of the Mass, that a great, positive, and mysterious change was wrought in the elements. And it points to the fact that already, before the First Prayer-Book was drawn up, the reformers were possessed by a belief which transferred the seat of the Divine "presence" from the lifeless elements to the recipient. Further testimony will be adduced on this point in another connection. Despite this definite change, however, the language of the Prayer of Consecration in 1549 was not entirely free from ambiguity. Bishop Gardiner, leader of the Roman party, argued from it in favour of Transubstantiation, saying "the creatures of bread and wine cannot be unto us the body and blood of Christ unless God worketh it and maketh them so to be." Cranmer replied, asserting the prominence of the subjective element in the words "unto us:" "We do not pray absolutely that the bread and wine may be made the body and blood of Christ, but that UNTO US in that holy mystery they may be so—that is to say, that we may so

worthily receive the same that we may be partakers of Christ's body and blood. . . ."[1] But, that there might be no further opportunity for such wilful "mistakers," the Prayer of Consecration was altered in 1552 into the form with which we are all familiar.

The doctrinal bearing of these changes can better be appreciated if we turn our attention to the important structural alterations already mentioned. In 1549 the great central prayer, called the Canon, included our present Prayer for the Church Militant, Prayer of Consecration, and Prayer of Oblation. This was now broken up. Some of it, as we have stated, was left out, the remainder was divided into three parts and distributed over the Service. It was a momentous action in a great crisis, an alteration of a tradition which existed for a thousand years. In attempting to appreciate its significance, we must not forget that the reformers had a twofold task to accomplish. They had to purify the Church, and they had to carry the Church with them. We hardly care to think of what might have happened if they had lacked the courage of their convictions. In the words of Bishop Moule: "It was a bold thing to do. But the change was made with watchful care and consummate skill, and multitudes of Churchmen to-day, of varying schools, agree in thinking that the ritual of the most sacred Ordinance of our faith has gained greatly, both in dignity and intelligibility, by what was thus done in 1552."[2]

We have now to consider in detail the changes made in the order and arrangement of the Service. According to the disposition of the Office in 1549, the Prayer of Consecration stood near the beginning; and there intervened between consecration and reception the Prayer of Oblation, the Lord's Prayer, the declaration that occupied the place of the *Agnus Dei* in the Latin Mass, the invitation, the general confession, the absolution, the comfortable words, and "the prayer of humble access." This long interval between consecration and reception, during which the consecrated elements lay on God's board in the eyes of the people, left room for some of the old thoughts of sacrifice and adoration.

[1] Cranmer on the "Lord's Supper," p. 79.
[2] "Story of the Prayer Book," p. 11.

In 1552 the invitation, general confession, absolution, and comfortable words were placed BEFORE consecration, with the result that consecration and reception were made one, being placed in immediate juxtaposition. This was probably due to Lutheran influence, the consistent Lutheran doctrine being, to quote the words of Martensen, that "the words of institution are inseparable from the distribution and the receiving of the bread and wine." Again, the language and position of the Prayer of Oblation suggested the idea that the "reasonable sacrifice" of ourselves was offered concomitantly with a sacrifice of the priest at the "Altar." Every expression which supported such a view was deliberately expunged, and the prayer itself was placed AFTER the reception of the elements. Further, the fact that the "prayer of humble access" stood after the consecration and before the distribution admitted of its being regarded as an act of adoration paid directly to the flesh of Christ, then lying upon the Altar. This was, in fact, claimed by Gardiner. Cranmer regarded such adoration as idolatry. And in 1552 the "prayer of humble access" was placed BEFORE the Prayer of Consecration, so as to be used only while the elements remained UN-consecrated.

It remains, before leaving this discussion, to notice briefly the words of distribution and one of the rubrics. According to Estcourt and Scudamore, there was no form of administration in the Mass. It would appear, however, that the words used were identical with the form provided in 1549, except for the addition of a clause. The words, "which WAS given for thee," were then inserted. It has been said that the words of distribution in the First Prayer-Book were ancient. But the facts are against this representation. These words, referring as they do to the sacrifice on Calvary sixteen centuries before, are not found in any ancient liturgy; they were taken from a form drawn up by Bucer. Gardiner claimed them to teach his doctrine of the "Real Presence." There was really no ground for the claim; yet the words were changed in 1552. As we all know, our present usage is a combination of both forms. With regard to the sacramental bread, the rubric in 1549 directed that the wafers "be divided in two pieces, at the least, or more, by the discretion of

the minister, and so distributed. And men must not think less to be received in part than in the whole, but in each of them the whole body of our Saviour." This language might easily be interpreted to allow of Christ's body residing in each particle of the consecrated bread, and Gardiner was not slow to apply this interpretation. In the Second Prayer-Book this rubric found no place.

Having investigated the principal changes, both textual and structural, it remains for us to consider the question as to which Prayer-Book was really representative of the reformers' views. Did the First Prayer-Book fully and properly express the mind of the Reformation, and was the Second Prayer-Book merely a concession to the scruples of interfering foreigners? The question is not unimportant, in view of certain present-day tendencies and developments. Indeed, it is of much direct and practical interest, when we remember that the Book of 1552 has, in substance, remained the authorized liturgy of the Church unto this day. Some few alterations were made under Elizabeth, under James I., and under Charles I. Some additions were made in 1662. Still, as Bishop Moule says: "The Book was no more made a new Book by these additions and other changes than a church becomes a new church because a new vestry or even a new aisle is added to it."[1] It is the purpose of this paper to show that there are evidences, abundant and incontrovertible, which must compel any candid judgment to conclude that the First Prayer-Book was but a tentative, transitional effort, a temporary compromise, and that the Second Prayer-Book was the true expression of the "reformed" beliefs, the final settlement of the questions of the time.

In support of this proposition, the "Great Parliamentary Debate on the Lord's Supper" furnishes most weighty and convincing testimony. Mr. J. T. Tomlinson has earned the gratitude of students by placing this valuable document within their reach. The Great Debate was held in the House of Lords, and in the presence of the Commons, during three days in December, 1548. On the following day, December 19, the Bill for Estab-

[1] "Story of the Prayer Book," p. 14.

lishing the English Prayer-Book was introduced, and read a first time; so that this was a public disputation immediately preceding the authorization of the First Prayer-Book. Its importance, which has not yet been generally appreciated, lies in the fact that it presents us with the actual views of the reformers BEFORE the Book of 1549 was drawn up. The reforming prelates who took part in the discussion were Cranmer, Ridley, Holbeach, Goodrich, and Barlow. On the other side, defending the Missal, were Tonstal, Bonner, Heath, Rugg, Aldrich, Skyp, Thirlby, and Day. We now proceed to quote from Cranmer's statements. "They be two things, to eat the Sacrament and to eat the body of Christ. The eating of the body is to dwell in Christ, and this may be though a man never taste the Sacrament. All men eat not the body in the Sacrament. Only good men can eat Christ's body. When the evil eateth the Sacrament, he neither hath Christ's body nor eateth it. I believe that Christ is eaten with heart. The eating with our mouth cannot give us life. *To have Christ present* REALLY (*i.e., corporeally*) *here, when I may receive Him in faith, is not available to do me good.* Christ is in the world in His divinity, but not in His humanity. The property of His Godhead is everywhere, but His manhood is in one place only." In like manner Ridley spoke as follows: "The carnal substance sitteth on the right hand of the Father. *After this understanding of the presence He is not in the Sacrament. He is absent,* for He saith He will leave the world. And in another sense He will be with us until the end of the world. The manhood is ever in heaven; His divinity is everywhere present. Christ sits in heaven, and is present in the Sacrament by His working." Not to quote any further, it is manifest from these utterances of the leading reformers that they had at this time thoroughly broken with Transubstantiation, asserting, as they did, in an unmistakable manner, a "*real absence*" in the sense in which the Roman doctrine affirmed a "real presence," and that they had already taken up the distinctive positions of the Second Prayer-Book.

How, then, are we to account for the ambiguous statements and mixed character of the Book of 1549? The only satisfactory supposition is that that Book was a compromise, due to the fact

that the Romish prelates had not yet been removed, and that the reformers were thus prevented from giving full effect to their own convictions. Nor is this a mere conjectural explanation. It is the view expressed in letters written by prominent men at this very time. In a letter written in April, 1549, Bucer speaks of having received assurance that the liturgical "concessions made to the infirmity of the present age are *only to be retained for a time*, lest the people should be deterred by too extensive innovations." Richard Hilles wrote to Bullinger in the same year: "Our Bishops and governors seem, *for the present*, to be acting rightly." And Roger Hutchinson, the Provost of Eton, preaching on the administration of the Sacrament, spoke to the same effect: "The King commandeth the same indeed *for a time and season*, and for an uniformity, and to bear with thy infirmity and weakness, until thou shalt have more knowledge."

Further evidence in support of our proposition is to be found in the language of the Second Act of Uniformity. Before examining this in detail, however, there are some facts of much importance which we must bear well in mind. The Second Act of Uniformity passed both Houses in 1552. The first Parliament of Edward VI. lasted from 1547 to 1553. Therefore the SAME Parliament enacted the First Prayer-Book, rescinded it, and established the Book of 1552. We may be sure that Parliament would never have taken such a course of action had not strict necessity dictated it. The truth is that the First Book of Edward VI. was a failure. Some, even, of its compilers disliked it. Eight Bishops spoke and voted against it in the Lords, and its lot was the usual result of compromises. It pleased nobody. "Religious" rebellions followed in many places. The people of England evidently would not have it. This is no more than is admitted by some modern ritualists. Mr. Frere recognized "how unstable it was as a basis for a new and lasting régime. The Book was unpopular everywhere, though conservative priests made the best of it for the moment by retaining the old ceremonial." As Mr. Walton says: "The First Prayer-Book, in fact, under the circumstances, and at the time of its actual publication, was an expedient, or temporary compromise, which can have really

satisfied no one." Turning now to the language of the Act of 1552, we find that the third section speaks of "a very godly order set forth by authority of Parliament, to be used in the Mother-tongue within this Church of England, agreeable to the Word of God and the primitive Church."

Canon George Perry describes this as part of "a handsome tribute which the moderate party were able to insert to the merits of the First Book."[1] But this is an error, due to the fact that he omits the very clause which gives the point of the sentence—"to be used in the Mother-tongue within this Church of England." When we compare the language used in the same connection in our Article XXIV., there can be no mistaking the special allusion. Divine Service in the mother-tongue was a practice not encouraged by the Papal party, but it was highly popular, and is therefore reaffirmed in the passage quoted. The Act continues: "And because there hath arisen in the use and exercise of the aforesaid common service divers doubts for the fashion and manner of administration of the same, rather by *the curiosity of the minister and mistakers* than of any other worthy cause; therefore, etc." Before proceeding to quote any further, we must endeavour to determine what is meant by "the curiosity of the minister and mistakers." It is plain that the Act attributes to this cause the necessity for revision, and the theory has been put forward that the persons thus stigmatized were the foreign divines, to whose scruples, it is suggested, the Second Prayer-Book was due. This, however, is an impossible explanation; for Bucer and Martyr were not "ministers" under the Book of 1549, and Alasco never held office of any kind as a "minister" of the Church of England. There is sufficient evidence to leave it beyond question that "the curiosity of the minister" meant, as Mr. Tomlinson puts it, "the crochetty scrupulosity of the ordinary incumbent."[2] Three months after the use of the First Prayer-Book was made compulsory Bonner was indicted before the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for non-conformity. One of the articles stated "that the rites of the common service of the Church, now

[1] "The Reformation in England," p. 93.
[2] "The Prayer-Book Articles and Homilies," pp. 21, 22.

set forth, be in some parts of your diocese *diversely performed;* and you, knowing or hearing of the same, have not called any ministers of the service before you for the redress of such diversity, nor corrected the misusers thereof."[1] Early in 1550 Hooper wrote complaining of the reprehensible conduct of the Bishops in neglecting to enforce the authorized practice, as prescribed by the new Book: "It is only the fear for their property that prevents them from reforming their churches."[2] It is rather strange to find this very letter quoted in Canon Perry's work as evidence of Hooper's antagonism towards the First Prayer-Book.[3] Again, Bucer wrote during the same year: "All the Divine offices are recited by many pseudo parish priests or vicars so frigidly, slovenly, and mumblingly, that they are understood by the common people just as well as if they had been read in an African or Indian dialect. In many places the Lord's Supper so takes the place of Mass that the people do not know in what respect it differs from it, except that it is celebrated in the vulgar tongue."[4] So much for the "curiosity" of the crypto-Papal incumbents who were at that time violating uniformity. Who, now, were pointed to as the "mistakers" of the Book of 1549? The persons thus designated were those who "mistook" or wilfully perverted its meaning. Of these, Gardiner was the chief. He avowedly disliked the Book; but since it was set forth by law, he sought to make the best of it by putting a Roman gloss on the Book wherever its language could by any possibility allow of such.[5] In examining the differences between the two liturgies, we noticed how Gardiner "mistook" certain passages. *In every instance* in which this was done the Prayer-Book was altered. There can be no question, then, that the "mistakers," mentioned in the Act were the Roman party, who defended the Missal and opposed the Prayer-Book, or, as Mr. Frere describes them, "the moderate party—and especially Gardiner."

The remainder of the third section of the Act gives us the estimate of the relative merits of the Service-Books formed by

[1] Foxe's "Acts and Monuments," V. 763.
[2] "Original Letters," p. 71.
[3] "The Reformation," p. 88.
[4] Gorham's "Reformation Gleanings," p. 201.
[5] See Tomlinson, pp. 28-32.

the men who compiled both, and is therefore worthy of notice. It declares that the Second Book is the First Book "godly perused and made fully perfect," particularly in the places where it was "necessary to make the same more earnest and fit to stir Christian people to the true honouring of Almighty God." From this marked preference of the Second Book by the very framers of the First we may judge how much truth is contained in the statement which is sometimes made, that the reformers were perfectly satisfied with the Book of 1549, and that the Book of 1552 was due to the fact that they suffered themselves to be overborne by self-assertive foreigners.

Only one other question calls for discussion. The Second Prayer-Book had been enacted April 14, and was to come into use on the first day in November. In the interval, however, something occurred which tended to disturb things. About the end of September Knox, one of the King's Chaplains, preached a fiery sermon before the Court, inveighing against all relics of idolatry, particularly against kneeling at the Lord's Supper. This was unfortunate, for the newly revised Prayer-Book contained a rubric enjoining kneeling reception. The Council ordered the printing of the Book to be suspended till this matter should be reconsidered. Cranmer promised the Council to reconsider the question in concert with Ridley and Martyr, but pointed out that it was *ultra vires* for the Council to alter what had been approved and enacted by Parliament, with the King's consent. In this latter he protested against those "glorious and unquiet spirits which can like nothing but that is after their own fancy," and strongly defended the new rubric, pointing out that to stand or sit at reception, when kneeling is the posture both before and after, "should rather import a contemptuous than a reverent receiving of the Sacrament." For the result, an Order of Council, dated October 27, directed that a "certain Declaration signed by the King's Majesty be joined unto the Book of Common Prayer lately set forth." This Declaration, now known as the "Black Rubric," vindicated Cranmer's position, while it enabled Knox to conform. Before this time Cranmer had been engaged in drawing up an authoritative con-

fession of the Church's faith, known as the Forty-two Articles; and if we compare the twenty-ninth of these Articles with the Black Rubric, we can hardly doubt that the latter came from Cranmer's hand. Indeed, the reason given in Cranmer's letter is the second reason assigned in the rubric—" for the avoiding of such profanation and disorder as might otherwise ensue."[1] The teaching of the rubric is directly opposed to the worship of the Host prescribed by the Council of Trent in October, 1551, and we know that the transactions of that Council did not escape Cranmer's notice. But, it may be asked, if the teaching of the Black Rubric was according to the mind of the Church, how are we to account for the fact that it found no place in Elizabeth's Prayer-Book? This might be thought to indicate that it was an " ill-starred mark " of which the Church was ashamed. The explanation lies in the circumstance that the Black Rubric was not part of the Book of 1552, as authorized by Parliament, but was *appended* to that Book by Order of Council, and rested on no other authority than a " Royal Proclamation." Now, the Second Prayer-Book of Edward VI., alone and in its entirety, with the exception of certain specified alterations, was restored by the Elizabethan Act of Uniformity; therefore, to have inserted the Black Rubric under this Act would have been a mistake.[2]

When, however, the rubric became part of the Prayer-Book in 1662, some of its words were altered. Originally, it declared that to kneel at the reception of the elements does not mean " that any adoration is done, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental bread and wine there bodily received, or unto any real and essential presence there being of Christ's natural flesh and blood." In 1662 the words " real and essential presence " were changed into " corporal presence." It has been said that through this alteration the rubric became a defence of the doctrine which before it denied. But this is an untenable position, for the doctrinal statements at the foundation of the rubric remain unchanged. " The natural body and blood of our Saviour ARE in heaven, and NOT here, it being against the truth

[1] See Tomlinson, pp. 256-260.
[2] Rev. N. Dimock, " The Black Rubric."

of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one." "The natural body" can only mean the present glorified body of our Lord, as this body alone can be said to be in heaven; therefore, the declaration, as at present framed, precludes the idea of a bodily presence in the elements—a fact emphasized further by the insertion of the word "ANY" before corporal, which excludes any *mode* of corporal presence. No CHANGE of meaning was intended by the verbal alterations of 1662, as Scudamore, Stephens, Perry, and Freeman admit. "Real and essential" gave place to "corporal," because of the change which had taken place in terminology. The realistic philosophy of Aquinas had lost its hold in the seventeenth century—men were no longer familiar with the language of the schools—so that the denial of any "real and essential presence" might be considered a denial of any true presence whatever. But, as we have seen, the reformers firmly upheld what might be called THE "Real Presence"—namely, *spiritual* Presence—and the Black Rubric stands as a witness to that belief.

From the evidences which have been adduced it is contended that we may reasonably and justly conclude that the Second Prayer-Book of Edward VI. embodies in its most perfect form the mature convictions of the reformers. The Great Debate shows that as early as before the publication of the First Book they had, in the words of the late Mr. Dimock, "clearly and strongly taken their stand on one side of a doctrinal gulf, on the other side of which stood the teaching of *the* real presence of the body and blood of Christ in or under the form of bread and wine." So that there is every reason to believe that the Twenty-ninth Article, drawn up by Archbishop Parker as the touchstone of Eucharistic doctrine, would have been fully accepted by Cranmer and his colleagues at the beginning of the Reformation movement.

R. MERCER WILSON.