

THE ORDER OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER OR HOLY COMMUNION

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION.

As an aid to devotion the English Communion Office is its own recommendation, needing no other support than that of the New Testament with which it claims to be in absolute accord in all things essential. Nevertheless, as an historical document it has points of contact with primitive precedents and teaching, and points of contrast with mediæval doctrine and practice, the knowledge of which is as helpful in the appreciation of its incomparable beauty, as it is essential to the interpretation of its form and substance. Further, its very arrangement and wording enshrine the progress of the English Reformation, and illustrate the religious differences of the period of the Restoration. Finally, it has been for many years the battlefield of conflicting schools of thought in the English Church, the story of which is not yet concluded.

This introduction must therefore include a summary, however concise, of the doctrinal and liturgical history of the Lord's Supper itself. That history is, in brief, the account of the gradual loss of scriptural simplicity, of its costly recovery at the Reformation, and of the struggle to preserve it in succeeding centuries. Two distinct yet closely related questions determine the main course of historical inquiry: (1) Are the Body and Blood of the Lord literally present in, under, or with, the consecrated elements? (2) Is the Lord's Supper the commemoration of a finished sacrifice, or is it itself a sacrifice? In the search for such an answer to these questions as will adequately explain the Communion Office, the following sources of information will be successively laid under contribution:—

	PAGE
1. Scriptural references to the Lord's Supper:	211
2. Sub-Apostolic writings.	222
3. Early Liturgies and Patristic Literature.	228
4. Mediæval doctrinal pronouncements.	238
5. Liturgical products of the English Reformation:—	251
(1) The Order of Communion, 1548.	252
(2) The Communion Office of 1549.	255
(3) The Communion Office of 1552.	261
6. Liturgical changes at the Restoration.	264
7. Interpretative principles of the Tractarian Movement	269

1. Scriptural References to the Lord's Supper.

If, as some have thought, there are traces of early hymns in the N.T. which may have been used liturgically, these are the only traces of anything like a 'liturgy,' in either its general sense of 'a form of worship,' or its later restricted one of 'an office for Holy Communion.*' The command 'This do in remembrance of Me' was given to the Church to obey, without the inculcation of any manner or method of ritual observance, beyond what obedience to the command necessarily implies. This divinely permitted freedom is of primary importance in estimating what is obligatory in this service, and in opposing the rigid system of uniformity which was increasingly enforced as the rite became more and more unlike the original institution. The suggestion that ritual and liturgical details constituted part of 'the things pertaining to the kingdom of God,' which the Risen Lord made known to His disciples (Acts i. 3), is sufficiently met by the fact that the N.T. writers appeal to no such 'traditions,' even when, as in 1 Cor. x., xi., the subject was to the fore. The existence of any divinely ordered liturgical requirements is contradicted by the great variety of use in early centuries.

The N.T. passages referring to Holy Communion are:—

* The word 'liturgy' is found in LXX. and N.T., where it signifies 'ministry.' It originally meant a public or state duty, from *leitros* and *εργον*. 'In later ecclesiastical use it has been sometimes attempted to limit its use to those prayers and offices which stand in more immediate relation to the Holy Eucharist; but there is no warrant in the best ages of the Church for any such limitation.' Trench, *Synonyms*, § xxxv.

a. THE FOUR ACCOUNTS OF THE INSTITUTION.

MATT. xxvi. 26-29.	MARK xiv. 22-25.	LUKE xxii. 19, 20.	1 COR. xi. 23-26.
And as they were eating	And as they were eating		The Lord Jesus, in the night in which he was betrayed, took a loaf
Jesus having taken a loaf and having blessed brake and having given to the disciples, said :	having taken a loaf having blessed he brake and gave to them, and said :	And having taken a loaf having given thanks he brake and gave to them, saying :	and having given thanks he brake, and said :
Take ye, eat ye, This is my body.	Take ye ; This is my body.	This is my body which is given on your behalf ; This do in remembrance of me.	This is my body which (is) on your behalf ; This do in remembrance of me. Likewise also the cup after supper
And having taken a cup	And having taken a cup	And the cup likewise after supper	
and having given thanks he gave to them	having given thanks he gave to them and they all drank of it and he said unto them	saying	saying
Drink all ye of it for this is my blood, that of the covenant, which is being poured out concerning (περι) many unto remission of sins	This is my blood of the covenant which is being poured out on behalf of (ὕπερ) many	This cup (is) the new covenant in my blood which is being poured out on your behalf.	This cup is the new covenant in my blood :
But I say unto you that I will not henceforth drink of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it with you new in the kingdom of my Father.	Verily I say unto you that I will never any more drink of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God.	(vv. 15-18 in St. Luke's account contain a similar reference, but before the Lord's Supper, and expressly referring to the Passover.)	this do, as oft as ye drink, in remembrance of me. (in v. 26 the rite is linked to the Lord's Second Coming, some think in the Lord's own words) For as oft as ye eat this loaf, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come.

The following liturgical and doctrinal points emerge from the above :—

(1) The Materials employed.

A loaf of bread and a cup of wine are alone mentioned. The 'bread' was more accurately a 'loaf,' somewhat of the shape of an English 'tea-cake,' and unleavened at the original institution, but not necessarily afterwards. The wine may very possibly have been diluted with water, as such dilution was frequent ; it is, however, no ritual requirement, such dilution not being expressed.

(2) The Words used.

None are strictly requisite, however naturally used to express the meaning of the rite. The variations in the records of the Lord's words sufficiently prove them to be of secondary import, as words, to the institution. The differences existing from the first centuries to the present day, as to the use of the words of institution, and as to the stress to be laid upon them, corroborate this conclusion.

They are of three kinds :—

(a) Devotional.

The words used by the Lord over the loaf and the cup are not recorded ; we are simply told that He 'gave thanks,' or 'blessed.' The identity in meaning of these two expressions is clear from their being used to describe the same action in the different accounts. Precisely the same words are used, with similar indiscriminateness, to express the Lord's 'saying grace' over the five loaves and two fishes, the seven loaves and the few small fishes, and the bread broken at Emmaus.

The word 'blessed' is literally 'spoke well of' (εὐλόγησας, cf. English 'eulogy'). Strictly speaking, the bread and wine cannot be 'blessed,' any more than they can be 'thanked,' though the figure is well enough understood, and common to-day in the phrase 'asking a blessing' upon our food. There is no word governed by the verb 'blessed' in Matthew and Mark, the A.V. has introduced the word 'it.' St. Paul, in 1 Cor. x. 16, mentions 'The cup of blessing, which we bless,' where the accusative is probably an accusative of respect : 'the cup of blessing in respect of which we bless God.' But, if the elements are to be considered as direct objects of the verb, the blessing here is precisely identical with the blessing of the five loaves in Luke ix. 16, εὐλόγησεν αὐτούς, and conveys no idea of consecration, save for the ordinary purpose of consumption as food.

(b) Descriptive.

'This is my body which is being given on your behalf,' 'This cup is (the new covenant in) my blood, which is being poured out on your behalf.'

The interpretation of the recorded words of our Lord is of the

utmost importance as determining the meaning of the whole rite, for it is universally acknowledged that the Lord's Supper must mean now what it meant at its original institution. The meaning of the word 'is' in the words 'This is my body' may be said to lie at the root of all the divergent views of the Holy Communion. It is, however, agreed that the verb 'to be' is used to denote symbolical as well as literal identity; e.g. 'this Agar is mount Sinai' (Gal. iv. 25): and in the accounts of the Lord's Supper probably no theologian, at any rate, now desires to press the literal identity of the 'this' which the Lord distributed to His disciples, with the body which was being given on their behalf. Those who believe that the bread and wine are the body and blood of Christ after consecration, do not believe that the body of the Speaker was transmuted into that 'loaf' before the disciples' eyes; and strict identity of the 'This' with 'My Body which is being given for you' demands no less. It is therefore a question as to what kind of limitation is to be assigned to the word 'is.' Had the Lord meant to teach that the bread and wine were miraculously changed in any way, there was a word used in the Gospel for such a miracle of change, a word which would have made ambiguity impossible, viz., the word 'become,' employed to describe the miracle at Cana of Galilee, John ii. 9. The following considerations should be carefully noted:—

- i. The Lord refers to His natural body and blood, 'given and 'poured out,' for the remission of sins.
- ii. The bread and wine are, therefore, given separately, with a considerable time intervening, the separation of the body and blood constituting the essence of sacrificial death.
- iii. The Aramaic words used by our Lord are unknown, but, as interpreted by St. Luke and St. Paul, the identity of the wine with His blood is not stated or intended: 'This cup is the new covenant in my blood.'
- iv. The words are spoken at a Passover Feast, with which the whole rite is so closely associated that the words used by St. Matthew, (xxvi. 29), and St. Mark, (xiv. 25), of the wine, are by St. Luke spoken of the Passover as such (xxii. 15-18). At the Passover Supper, the Lord, as President (cf. Justin Martyr's account of Holy Communion, where there is a 'president,' *προεστώς*—not a ministerial designation), would take an unleavened loaf, and distribute it, saying: 'This is the bread of affliction which our fathers ate when they came out of

Egypt,' where identity could be neither intended nor understood.

- v. The disciples had already been familiarized with the phraseology, 'eating His flesh, drinking His blood,' and its explanation, viz., 'believing on Him,' John vi., esp. vv. 47, 54.
- vi. The words 'this do in remembrance of me' identify the original institution with every succeeding observance, so that what it meant then it means now, and what it means now it meant then. Now the institution preceded the Crucifixion, so that had the bread and wine become in any sense the body and blood of Christ, separated in Sacrifice and offered for the remission of sins, both the Sacrifice of Calvary and its redemptive effect were anticipated, and rendered unnecessary, the night before!*

(c) *Preceptive.*

There are two preceptive utterances, one that all should partake, the other that the rite was to be repeated. The importance of the first command is intensified by the strange disregard paid to it both in 'non-communicating attendance,' and in withholding from the laity the cup, in connexion with which the word 'all' was used.

The other direction demands special attention for two widely different reasons, its bearing upon frequency of observance, and its interpretation by some as stamping the rite with sacrificial meaning.

i. *Frequency of Observance.*

There is here no strict regulation, but the words 'as oft' in St. Paul's account, seem at least to contemplate some amount of frequency. With this agrees the N.T. practice so far as it can be traced, cf. Acts ii. 42. There is no Scriptural justification for daily observance, the reference of Acts ii. 46 to the Lord's Supper being more than doubtful: 'And they continued daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread at home (R.V.), did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart.' The proximity of v. 42, where 'breaking of bread' comes between 'Apostles' doctrine and fellowship' and 'prayers,' might seem to suggest that in v. 46, too, a religious 'breaking of bread' is implied; but the reference to taking their food with cheerful content removes that implication; and the word 'daily' (R.V. 'day by day') is not necessarily con-

* For the importance of this point at the Council of Trent, see below, p. 250.

nected with anything but their gathering in the Temple. It is remarkable that the N.T. is so silent in regard to the frequency of observance of the Lord's Supper. Acts xx. 7: 'Upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread,' suggests definitely that the observance was on Sunday, and, possibly, that it was a weekly occurrence.

ii. Sacrificial Meaning.

The attempt to fasten the idea of Sacrifice upon these words would seem to be sufficiently answered by the identity of the original institution with every subsequent observance of it, for if 'do this' means, as is alleged, 'make this sacrifice,' the original institution must have been a sacrifice, and that expressly for the remission of sins, in which case Crucifixion was unnecessary.

However, as the idea still holds in some quarters, the following notes are necessary:—

'This do' (τοῦτο ποιείτε).

(a) 'Do' is the ordinary meaning of the word.

(β) All the Greek Fathers so understood it.

(γ) The LXX for 'offer,' of a sacrifice, uses not ποιῆν but προσφέρειν. The word ποιῆν is used of the 'keeping' of the Passover, of Matt. xxvi. 18, 'I keep the Passover at thy house with my disciples.'

(δ) Modern Commentators find no support for the notion of Sacrifice in the word; Bishop Gore, *Body of Christ*, p. 318, abandons the idea.

'Remembrance' (ἀνάμνησις).

The contention to be met is that 'the primary thought suggested by the word "memorial" (ἀνάμνησις) is that of a memorial before God'; Darwell Stone, *Hastings' Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, Art. 'Lord's Supper.' The following is the reply:—

(a) The word for 'memorial before God' in LXX is μνημόσυνον not ἀνάμνησις.

(β) The common meaning of ἀνάμνησις is 'calling to mind,' 'recollection.'

(γ) That is its meaning in the only other place in which it is used in N.T., Heb. x. 3, 'remembrance of sins.'

(δ) All the Greek and Latin Liturgies support the translation 'remembrance.'

(ε) The four passages in LXX, cited by Darwell Stone as conveying the sense of 'memorial,' are all capable of the idea of 'remembrance'; cf. T. K. Abbott, *Reply to Criticisms*, p. 41: 'Most certainly ἀνάμνησις is not

a sacrificial term; it never means or can mean "memorial offering."'

The all-important idea connected with such an interpretation could scarcely have been hidden away in words usually bearing another meaning, and not to be found at all in two of the four accounts of the institution.* If Papias be correct, and St. Mark's Gospel is St. Peter's teaching, both he and those who depended upon his teaching were ignorant of these words altogether.

(3) The Manual Acts performed.

i. *Breaking the bread.*

The early introduction of the word 'broken' into MSS. of the N.T. in 1 Cor. xi. 24, was doubtless due to the idea that the breaking of the bread was intended to symbolize in some sort the death of the Lord. No such dramatic action accompanied the use of the wine; it was not 'poured out' at the institution. The discovery that the word 'broken' is an interpolation is therefore of great importance in assisting the recovery of the true symbolism of the 'breaking.' † The division of the 'loaf' into pieces for the disciples to eat, conveyed precisely the same idea as the 'loving cup' of which all were to drink, viz., communion, fellow-partaking. St. Paul, in 1 Cor. x. 16, calling attention to this 'fellow-partaking,' refers to 'the cup of blessing which we bless,' and 'the bread which we break'; it is noteworthy that he does not say of the bread 'which we bless,' 'breaking' being more important for his purpose, viz. to show that (v. 17) 'we being many are one loaf, and one body; for we are all partakers of that one loaf.' The recognition of this idea of 'communion' as underlying the 'breaking' from the earliest days, is plainly visible in the phrase 'breaking of bread,' which, though not exclusively used of the Lord's Supper, is apparently employed in that sense in Acts ii. 42, and with κοινωνία, the word translated 'communion' in 1 Cor. x. 16: 'and they continued stedfastly in the Apostles' teaching and the fellowship (κοινωνία), the breaking of bread, and the prayers.' There is no conjunction between 'the fellowship' and 'the breaking of bread' in the best MSS., this omission suggesting that the 'breaking of bread' describes the 'fellowship.' In the Didachè, directions are given concerning 'the cup' and 'the thing broken,' περί τοῦ ποτηρίου . . . περί δὲ τοῦ κλάσματος, the 'breaking' being so important as to displace the word 'bread' ‡ altogether.

* This interpretation, be it understood, is quite late it arose long after the practices for which it is supposed to find sanction.

† St. John lays stress upon the prophetic promise that breaking should not accompany the Lord's death, (xix. 36); His body was given for us, not broken.

‡ See p. 224

ii. *Distribution.*

This needs no explanation, but only emphasis, in view of the maiming of the rite in later ages.

(4) *The Circumstances accompanying the Institution.*

The fact that the Lord's Supper was instituted in the midst of a Passover meal, besides declaring the Lord's intention in calling the bread His body, also condemns superstitious regard to fasting in connexion with the rite. The Lord's Supper was instituted 'as they were eating,' and St. Paul refers to the 'cup of blessing,' the name commonly given to the third cup at the Passover feast (1 Cor. x. 16). That the accompaniment of a common meal is not indeed obligatory, is clear from the advice to the Corinthians to satisfy hunger at home (1 Cor. xi. 22, 34); but this very command would lend weight to the Lord's example (if weight could be lent to teaching so directly divine), for St. Paul does not bid the Corinthians sup *after* the Lord's Supper. Whatever the N.T. teaching in regard to fasting may be—and it is notorious that the MSS. have been tampered with in several places to enforce the practice—there is not only no association of it with this rite, but the very reverse. The investigation of this question is indissolubly bound up with another much debated matter, the time of observance, with regard to which the original institution is equally clearly a sanction of the evening hour. Both at Corinth, and at Troas (Acts xx. 7), N.T. practice still further sanctions the evening hour, though it has been, and is, seriously contended that the irregularities at Corinth put an end to the custom, and that at Troas St. Paul purposely preached until midnight, that in regard to both the hour of communion and the fasting condition of the communicants, the supposed apostolic rule might be observed. The great name of Augustine, who claims apostolic authority for 'fasting communion' (*Ep.* ii. liv. § 8: Edn. 1679), has doubtless been instrumental in perpetuating what is now known to be historically erroneous. He argues that so general a custom as fasting reception had by his time become, could not have arisen without divine authority; and that St. Paul's words 'the rest will I set in order when I come' (1 Cor. xi. 34) are to be taken as referring to this matter amongst others. In addition to the negative evidence afforded by the absence of any reference to any such apostolic tradition, there is positive evidence that the theory is untenable:—

(a) St. Augustine himself, strangely enough, permits a late reception on Maundy Thursday, in the very Epistle cited above.

(b) Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.*, v. 22, states that evening communion, after supper, was the practice in the Thebaid. He mentions it

as a peculiarity, but without any suggestion of blameworthiness. The well-known asceticism of the Thebaid, which would have sufficiently explained fasting communion, renders the prevalence of the contrary practice an all the more forcible argument against the existence of any apostolic order to fast.

(c) Chrysostom, though acquainted with the custom of fasting, blames abstinence from the Lord's Table on the part of those who were not in a fasting condition.*

(d) Cyprian, finding fault with the Aquarians for using water only at their morning Communion, acknowledges that they used wine in their evening observance. He has no fault to find with the hour, but rather regards the general abandonment of that hour as needing explanation (see Bingham, *Ant.* xv. vii. § 8).

(e) The 3rd Council of Carthage, 397, which ordered a fasting celebrant, is cited in support of Fasting Communion; why an ecclesiastical regulation if already apostolic?

(f) The Didachè, whether its date be as early as 90, or as late as 200, knows no separation of the 'Agapè' † and the Lord's Supper. The attempt to refer §§ 9, 10 of that work to the 'Agapè' only, would, if successful, bring about the strange result that the Didachè knows nothing of the Lord's Supper at all, or does not think it worth even a mention. It expressly enforces fasting before Baptism, but not before the Lord's Supper.

(g) Ignatius, c. 110, calls the Lord's Supper by the name 'Agapè': 'it is not lawful apart from the Bishop either to baptize or to hold an Agapè.' This can only be denied by conceding that Ignatius attached more importance to the 'Agapè' than to the Lord's Supper.

The question remains: How did the practically universal custom arise? ‡ The records of the sub-apostolic age are exceedingly scanty, but they afford an intelligible explanation:—

(a) Trajan had a jealous fear of clubs of every kind, as probable hot-beds of sedition; this is well known, *cf.* his letter to the

* Dimock, *Hour of Holy Communion*, p. 7.

† The 'Agapè' is mentioned in two N.T. passages, showing considerable verbal resemblance, 2 Pet. ii. 13; Jude 12. There are MS. variations, but the older MSS. support the reading ἀγάπη. Festal gatherings were associated with the social, commercial and religious life of the age, and Christians, being debarred from heathen feasts, would make all the more of their own. The feast outlived its separation from the Lord's Supper, though more and more restricted to commemorative festivals of the dead. Its observance in Churches was forbidden in the East by Conc. Laodic., Canon 28, 361; but the prohibition needed renewal in the Council of Trullo, so late as the seventh century.

‡ It should be borne in mind that the burden of proof rests upon those who claim authority for Early and Fasting Communion, not upon those who claim liberty in that regard.

younger Pliny granting an exemption in the matter of club-gatherings to the city of Amisa, concluding: 'in all the other cities which are subject to our laws, anything of the kind must be prohibited.'

(b) Christians were accused in Trajan's time of horrible crimes at banquets, the charge being doubtless due to misunderstood or misrepresented references to the body and blood of Christ.

(c) St. Paul's directions to the Corinthian Church made it clear that the association of a banquet with the Lord's Supper was not essential.

(d) The regular teaching of the N.T. in regard to loyal citizenship on the part of Christians would inculcate readiness to forego what was not essential.

(e) Pliny's letter to Trajan (110), concerning the Bithynian Christians, expressly states that the evening meeting for a meal had been abandoned in response to Pliny's edict carrying out Trajan's commands.

(f) The reasons which compelled the abandonment of the Agapè, also interfered with freedom for any kind of evening gathering, so that the Lord's Supper was more conveniently held at the morning gathering.

(g) The rapid growth of asceticism, exemplified by the early regulation for fasting before Adult Baptism, helped to attach a religious significance to what arose purely from considerations of expediency.

(h) These considerations are not affected by the fact that the Agapè is mentioned by Ignatius as still practised c. 110. Imperial Edicts were not enforced with the same rigour in every part of the Empire; and, in fact, the Agapè survived not only Trajan's commands, but the condemnation of councils.

b. THE N.T. REFERENCES TO THE LORD'S SUPPER.*

(1) Acts ii. 42; xx. 7, 11:—'the breaking of bread,' see above, p. 217. This phrase does not always refer to the Lord's Supper, e.g. Acts xxvii. 35.

(2) 1 Cor. x. 14-22:—'a joint-partaking of the blood . . . the body of Christ.'† St. Paul's point is the double fellowship of believers with one another, symbolized in their joint-partaking of the one loaf (see above, p. 217), and of believers with Christ.

* The Lord's address at Capernaum, in John vi., is not directly connected with the Lord's Supper; the institution does, indeed, embody the same teaching, but the address explains the rite, the rite does not explain the address. Cf. Westcott, *Commentary, in loc.*

† The cup precedes the bread in the Didachè also. Compare the incisiveness in the Gospel accounts in regard to the cup of which our Lord will not partake 'till He come.'

Such fellowship must not be defiled by similar fellowship with demons. The impossibility of deducing from these words any idea of literal partaking of the body and blood of Christ is most clearly seen by the context, where the noun and adjective are used as follows:—

v. 16, joint-partaking of the blood . . . the body.

v. 18, joint-partakers of the altar (spoken of 'Israel after the flesh').

v. 20, joint-partakers of demons.

If v. 16 must mean that the literal body and blood are partaken of, then the altar in v. 18, and demons in v. 20 must be literally devoured. In truth the only possible point to be drawn from St. Paul's parallel, is that participation in a religious feast implies fellowship with the object of worship in that feast, Christ or demons.

The avoidance of the word 'altar' in this passage is notable. Used for Israel's religious feasts in v. 18, it is carefully suppressed for the Christian feast in v. 21, where 'table' is substituted. For convenience, Heb. xiii. 10 may here be mentioned: 'we have an altar': a passage often misquoted in support of a sacrificial idea of the Lord's Supper. Even Thomas Aquinas interprets that 'altar' of the Cross; it would be strange indeed if that Epistle, written to prove the supersession of all altars by the Cross, should conclude by re-establishing them.

(3) 1 Cor. xi. 20-34. This passage has been largely dealt with already (for the designation, 'the Lord's Supper,' see p. 287); there only remains to note the Apostle's commentary upon the institution:—

(a) v. 26:—'shew the Lord's death': this emphasis upon preaching the death of Christ in the rite has been grievously overlaid by an unwarrantable misinterpretation of the word 'shew,' *καταγγέλλετε*. It can only mean that by partaking of the bread and wine, the symbols of the body and blood separated in sacrificial death, that sacrificial death is preached to the world; there is absolutely no idea of presentation before God. Nor is there any need to find in the words a custom of describing the death in words (Godet, *Commentary, in loc.*, arguing from the *Haggadah*, or historical explanation, given at the Passover); the partaking is the preaching. The later, though still early, custom of treating the rite as a mystery to be hidden from unbelievers, finds no countenance here, but rather the reverse.*

* Perhaps it should be said that such preaching to unbelievers by the rite is quite another and different thing from the fancy that benefits attach to the non-communicating attendance of believers.

(b) *v.* 26 :—‘till He come.’ These words echo the Lord’s own statement that He would not partake of the fruit of the vine till the Kingdom comes. Their bearing upon the ‘bodily absence’ of Christ in the rite is obvious.

(c) *vv.* 27-34. Here the bread and wine are expressly distinguished from the body and blood; careless misuse of the former is guilt in regard to the latter, visited in this life with condign punishment. In *v.* 29 ‘not discerning the body,’ (not ‘the Lord’s body’), where the ‘blood’ is not mentioned, refers to the mystical body of Christ, the communion or fellowship of the faithful.* The guilt of the Corinthians was precisely failure to recognize that organic oneness of the mystical body, cf. *vv.* 21, 22.

(4) 1 Cor. *v.* 7, 8 is a possible reference, the mention of the Passover sacrifice and the Feast together suggesting the true relation of the Cross and Holy Communion; but, like John *vi.*, it covers more than the rite—all the faithful life of a believer in a feasting upon Christ.

Summary of N.T. requirements.

- i. A loaf of bread and a cup of wine.
- ii. Thanksgiving for the gift of bread and wine.
- iii. Breaking of the loaf.
- iv. Distribution and partaking of the bread and wine.

Summary of N.T. teaching.

- i. Remembrance of the death of Christ.
- ii. Partaking of the Body given and the Blood shed.
- iii. Fellowship in that partaking.
- iv. Preaching the death ‘till He come.’

The attempt to find more than these in Holy Scripture, especially to find a teaching of identity of Christ’s body and blood with the bread and wine, and a propitiatory sacrifice in the Sacrament, is rendered vain both by the absence of any such estimate of the Sacrament in the time of the Apostles, and by the fact that those dogmas preceded the search for Scriptural support, and did not arise from the plain interpretation of the words.

2. Sub-Apostolic Writings.

Although the Reformers expressly asserted the unique and paramount authority of Holy Scripture, they were by no means blind to the interpretative value of genuine records of the Early

* The usual explanation of *v.* 29 is that the Corinthians failed to discriminate between the sacred symbols of the Lord’s Body and Blood and the ordinary food provided at the Love-Feast.

Church. For example, Jewel’s famous *Apology*, a more than semi-authoritative document, was based upon the incompatibility of certain rejected tenets of the unreformed Church with the teaching of the first six centuries. Unhappily falsifications, both by interpolation and by excision, together with the too common attempt on the part of later writers to enhance the authority of their books by attaching to them earlier and more authoritative names, complicate the question; but nevertheless it is possible to see the comparative simplicity and purity of the first centuries, and to detect the first beginnings of tendencies which foreshadowed later corruptions.

The earliest patristic documents are largely silent in regard to the Lord’s Supper, Clement (Rom.) (96),* *Hermas* (140 (?)), Polycarp (*d.* 157), and the writer of the *Epistle to Diognetus* (*c.* 150), make no allusion thereto;—a significant comment upon the disproportionate attention it has received in ages more remote from the Apostles.

Ignatius mentions Holy Communion at least four times, (if the ‘middle recension,’ the seven letters, be authentic):—

(a) *Ad Smyrn.* vii. : ‘They abstain from Eucharist and prayer, because they do not confess that the Eucharist is flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which (τῆν, flesh) suffered for our sins, and which the Father of His goodness raised.’

The Docetæ, who denied the reality of the Lord’s body, naturally found a serious difficulty in the Lord’s Supper; how could there be a figurative representation of something which had no real existence? At a later date this passage was quoted by Theodoret against the Eutychians, whose belief involved them in a similar difficulty. Theodoret either made or preserved a significant misquotation, viz., ‘offering’ (προσφορὰς) for ‘prayer.’ It is difficult to be sure of Ignatius’ intention in the first use of the word ‘Eucharist,’ for it has there no article, and is conjoined with ‘prayer.’ In the following words the meaning must be ‘the Eucharist.’

This passage has been often cited in support of the dogma of a ‘Corporal Presence,’ but the words need not mean more than the Lord’s own utterance at the institution, they carefully retain the Lord’s reference to His body which suffered, they even exclude the idea of any kind of identification by the mention of the Resurrection. Moreover, they are explained by the figurative

* It is unfortunately still necessary to protest against the citation of Clement as supporting the ‘sacrificial’ idea of Holy Communion. His reference to the O.T. priesthood, as illustrating God’s provision of decency and order, is not obscure enough to justify the continuance of a long-exploded misuse of his words.

use in *Ad Trall.* : viii. 'be ye renewed in faith, that is the flesh of the Lord, and in love, that is the blood of Jesus Christ.'

(b) *Ibid.* viii. : 'Let that be considered a valid Eucharist which is under the bishop or him to whom he entrusts it . . . it is not allowable without the bishop either to baptize or to hold an Agapè (ἀγάπην ποιεῖν).'

The Lord's Supper, now called 'Eucharist,' is still one with the Agapè (see above, p. 219).

(c) *Ad Philadelph.* iv. : 'Be zealous then to use one Eucharist ; for one is the flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup for the oneness of his blood, one altar, as one bishop, together with the presbytery and deacons, my fellow-servants, in order that whatsoever you do you may do it in accordance with God.'

The word 'altar' here, though in such close proximity to the words describing the Eucharist, has no ritual connexion therewith. It is used figuratively of the Christian faith, as in *Ad Trall.* vii. : 'He who is within the altar is clean, but he who is outside is not clean.' Again, in *Ad Magnes.* vii., the word is figuratively used : 'Do ye all therefore come together (agree) as to one altar, as to one Jesus Christ.' Polycarp, in *Ad Philip.* iv. adds yet another figurative use,—widows are the 'altars of God.'

(d) *Ad Eph.* xx. ' . . . breaking one loaf, which is the medicine of immortality.' This new idea, probably drawn from John vi. 53, 58, became enshrined in liturgical use.

(2) One document, of unknown authorship and disputed date, is probably to be ascribed to early days :—the recently discovered *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, commonly known as the 'Didachè.' Some date it as early as 90, others as late as 120, 200, and even later. Its references to Holy Communion are :—

c. 9. 'But concerning the thanksgiving (εὐχαριστίας) thus thank (εὐχαριστήσατε) ; first concerning the cup : We thank thee, O our Father, for the holy vine of David thy servant (παῖδος), which thou hast made known to us by Jesus thy servant (παῖδος) ; to thee (be) the glory for ever. And concerning the fragment (κλάσματος) : We thank thee, O our Father, for the life and the knowledge which thou hast made known to us by Jesus thy servant ; to thee be the glory for ever. As was this fragment once scattered over the mountains and became gathered into one, so may thy church be gathered from the ends of the earth into thy Kingdom ; for thine is the glory and power by Jesus Christ for ever. And let no one eat or drink from your Eucharist, but those who have been baptized into the name of the Lord ; for concerning this the Lord has said : Give not that which is holy to the dogs.'

c. 10. 'And after being filled (μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἐμπλησθῆναι) thus give thanks : We thank thee, O holy Father, for thy holy name, . . . thou hast given both food and drink to men for enjoyment, that they may thank thee, but to us thou hast given spiritual food and drink and life eternal

through thy Son. For all things we thank thee. . . . If any one is holy, let him come ; if any one is not, let him repent ; Maranatha. Amen. But suffer the prophets to give thanks as they will.'

c. 14. 'And on each Lord's Day when assembled together break bread and give thanks, after you have confessed your transgressions in order that your sacrifice may be pure. But let none that hath strife with his comrade come together with you until they be reconciled, that your sacrifice be not defiled. For this is that which was spoken by the Lord : In every place and time bring me a clean sacrifice ; because I am a great King, saith the Lord, and my name is wonderful among the nations.'

Forms of thanksgiving are here provided, for the cup and the bread (in that order, as in 1 Cor. x.), and also for use after partaking, but with express latitude in regard to their use ; if a 'prophet,' anyone able to conduct worship, is present, he is not to be tied to forms. The word 'sacrifice' is also introduced, though without any closer association with the Lord's Supper than with the rest of public worship. Regulations are given to warn unfit communicants, and general confession of sins is inculcated to prevent unworthy communicating. The Lord's Day is the only day for such worship. The 'breaking' is so essential that the bread is called 'the fragment,' or 'thing broken,' and the Eucharistic prayer in regard to it dwells solely upon the communion of believers.*

(3) Some light is thrown upon early Christian worship by a writing whose heathen authorship lends peculiar value to its witness, Pliny's letter to Trajan (*Ep.* x. 96) :—

'They protested that this was the sum of their fault or error, that they were wont on a fixed day to meet before daylight, and to sing (*dicere*) together in turn a hymn to Christ as God, and to bind themselves by an oath (*sacramento*), not to any crime, but that they would commit no thefts, robberies, adulteries, would not break their faith, would not deny a trust when challenged (*ne depositum appellati abnegarent*) : which things completed it was their custom to disperse, and come together again to take food, common however and harmless : and that they had ceased to do even that after my edict by which, following your orders, I had forbidden club-meetings (*hæterias*) to be held.'

If any allusion to Holy Communion is to be found here (as every one is ready to admit), it is only on the assumption that the 'food' mentioned relates to it or includes it. For the impossibility of the reference of the word *sacramento* to the rite see p. 289, and for the importance of this passage in accounting for the general abandonment of Evening Communion see p. 220.

* The connexion of these passages with the Lord's Supper is denied by some. Frere, *History of B.C.P.* (1910), is curiously uncertain. On pp. 506, 7, he gives the passage as the first of 'Three early accounts of the Holy Eucharist' ; on p. 432, note 1, he says the Lord's Supper is called Eucharist 'probably in the Didachè' ; note 2, 'the forms very possibly refer only to the Agapè.'

The information is otherwise of a very negative character, giving no hint of any 'liturgy' in connexion with the Lord's Supper. One positive element is important; the Lord's Supper becoming compulsorily connected with the morning meeting, the antiphonal hymn and mutual pledge thus became accidentally associated with the Sacrament.

(4) One other author of the early period deserves special notice, Justin Martyr, c. 140. His accounts of services are very full, the most important being:—

(a) *Apology* i. 65, 66: 'Having ceased from the prayers (for a newly baptized convert) we greet one another with a kiss; then is brought (*προσφέρεται*) to the president (*προεστώς*) of the brethren bread and a cup of water and wine (*κράματος*), and he, receiving them, sendeth up praise and glory to the Father of all, through the name of the Son and the Holy Spirit, and makes a thanksgiving (*εὐχαριστίαν*) at some length for that He has granted us these blessings. When he hath ended the prayers and thanksgiving, the whole people present join in with one voice saying Amen. And after the president has given thanks and the people have assented, those called among us deacons give to each of them present to partake of the bread and wine and water, over which thanksgiving has been made, and carry it to those not present.

'And this meal is called with us Eucharistic, of which none is permitted to partake except one who believes that the things taught by us are true, and who has passed through the washing for remission of sins, and new birth, and so lives as Christ commanded. For we receive these not as common bread or as common drink, but, just as Jesus Christ our Saviour, being incarnate through the word of God, possessed both flesh and blood for our salvation, so also we were taught that the food over which thanksgiving has been made by the (utterance in) prayer of the word which is from Him (*τὴν δι' εὐχῆς λόγον τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφήν*)—that food from which our blood and flesh are by assimilation nourished—is the flesh and blood of Him, the Incarnate Jesus. For the Apostles, in the memoirs which they wrote which are called Gospels, transmitted to us that Jesus Christ thus charged them, that after taking bread and giving thanks He said: Do this in remembrance of Me; this is My body: and that likewise having taken the cup and given thanks, He said: This is my blood, and gave to partake to them alone . . .'

(b) *Ibid.* c. 67, the same account is given in an abbreviated form: 'On the day called that of the Sun there is a congregation of all who dwell in town or country into one place, and the reminiscences of the Apostles or the writings of the prophets are read so far as time permits; then, the reader ceasing, the president by an address admonishes and exhorts to the imitation of these noble deeds (men?); afterwards we all stand up together and offer prayers; and, as we said before, when we cease from prayer, bread (a loaf) is brought and wine and water; and the president sends up prayers likewise and thanksgivings to the best of his ability, and the people assent saying the Amen. And the distribution of and participation in the things which have been made objects of thanksgiving (*τῶν εὐχαριστηθέντων*) takes place for each, and to those not present they are sent by means of the deacons. And the prosperous and willing each according to his own previous purpose, contribute each what they will; and that which is collected is laid by with the president, and he helps orphans.' etc.

(c) *Dial. cum Trypho*, c. 70: 'In this prophecy allusion is made to the bread which our Christ gave us to do in remembrance (*ποιεῖν εἰς ἀνάμνησιν*) of His being made flesh in behalf of those who believe in Him, for whom also He became subject to suffering; and to the cup which He gave us to drink in remembrance of His own blood, with giving of thanks.'

(d) *Ibid.* cc. 116, 117. 'Now God receives sacrifices from no one, except through His priests. Therefore God anticipating all the sacrifices which we do through His name, and which Jesus the Christ enjoined us to do, i.e., in the Eucharist of the bread and of the cup, and which are done by Christians in all places throughout the world, bears witness that they are well-pleasing to Him. . . . You assert that God . . . is pleased with the prayers of the individuals of that nation then dispersed, and calls their prayers sacrifices. Now that prayers and giving of thanks (*εὐχαριστίαι*) when offered by worthy men, are the only perfect and well-pleasing sacrifices to God, I also admit. For such alone Christians have undertaken to do, and in the remembrance made by their food, both solid and liquid, in which the suffering of the Son of God which He endured is brought to remembrance.'

Summary of Justin's liturgical teaching:—

- (1) Worship, including Holy Communion, is on Sunday.
- (2) The kiss of peace.
- (3) A president, ministerial qualification unspecified.*
- (4) Reading of O.T. and N.T. Scriptures.
- (5) A Sermon.
- (6) Prayers, by the congregation.
- (7) The bringing to the president of bread and mixed wine and water.†
- (8) A long prayer of thanksgiving.
- (9) The response of the people, Amen.‡
- (10) Administration.
- (11) Distribution to the Sick.
- (12) Almsgiving, according to the regulation of 1 Cor. xvi. 2.

Doctrinal references:—

- (1) Sacrifices are prayers and thanksgivings, the latter including those offered at the Lord's Supper. In describing the rite the

* It deserves a passing protest that Blunt, *Annotated Prayer Book*, should have rendered the colourless word *προεστώς* by the highly coloured word *sacerdos*.

† Frere, *History of B.C.P.*, p. 433, denominates this 'the oblation,' trading on the double meaning of the verb *προσφέρεται*, which can only mean 'is brought' here, seeing that 'to the president' immediately follows. It is unfortunate that in his quotation from Justin, p. 507, he omits the passage containing this addition, and only preserves the more brief repetition of these words: 'as we have said, when we cease from prayer bread is brought,' etc. The 'as we have said' refers to the context, where the words 'to the president' are expressed. The verb cannot mean both 'bring' and 'offer' in one passage.

‡ For the attempt to derive from this that St. Paul called the Lord's Supper 'Eucharist,' see p. 288.

word 'sacrifice' (*θυσία*) is not used.* Other sacrificial terms are absent.

(2) Bread and wine are still called bread and wine when distributed, though Justin is not afraid of sacramental identification with the body and blood of Christ.

(3) Justin's parallel between the Incarnation and the figurative body and blood in Holy Communion, innocently enough used by him, is nevertheless one of those vague and unscriptural analogies peculiarly liable to be superstitiously misused.

3. Early Liturgies and Patristic Literature.

I. LITURGIES.

The efforts to obtain satisfactory historical evidence by comparisons of ancient liturgies and sacramentaries, and the liturgical hints to be found in patristic writings, have been notoriously unproductive of trustworthy positive results. The negative teaching, however, is of great importance as furnishing indisputable evidence that some particular development was not in vogue when and where the particular liturgy was in use; it is possible on such grounds alone to disprove the claims to catholicity of most mediæval doctrine and ritual. But to establish positive teaching as to the age or prevalence of any rite contained in these documents is not possible. When undisputed facts and statements of patristic writers are so continually tortured into giving evidence to suit the biassed inquisitor, it is not to be expected that in this region, where the difference between early and late is a matter of delicate weighing of probabilities and possibilities, the results obtained by liturgiology will do much more than reflect the predilections of the liturgiologist. Moreover, even were a greater measure of success obtainable, the earliness or lateness of the introduction of any doctrinally important liturgical novelty is a matter of no practical importance, save as teaching a melancholy lesson upon the rapidity with which purity of doctrine is lost as the stream becomes remote from its scriptural source. Carelessness in the use of unscriptural phraseology, largely borrowed from Jewish and Pagan religion: the proneness of human nature to find substitutes for the exacting demands of spiritual devotion in the fatally easy refuge of an æsthetic cult: the well-meant but ill-starred efforts to embrace hordes of heathen within the Christian fold by accommodating Christianity to their superstitious ideas of religion: the combined tendencies of priestly ambition on one side, and ignorant

* Yet Frere (p. 432) cites Justin, *Dial.* c. 41, 117, as the authority for *θυσία*, as one of 'the principal early titles of the service,' with how much (or how little) justice, can be seen from the quotations above given.

indifference on the other, to evolve a hierarchical and sacrificial system for which there were parallels on every side: these, and such like reasons, writ large in the experience of all ages, sufficiently explain the comparatively early transmutation of the simple worship of the New Testament into the superstitious, more than semi-heathen, displays of later times.

One further precaution should precede any consideration of the liturgies. They are not doctrinal treatises, though they involve doctrine. This needs emphasizing in view of the too common practice of treating the rhetorical expressions of devotion as though they were found in a volume of dogmatic theology. Such procedure is as unwise and as unfair as would be an attempt to trace the course of Anglican theological belief by means of a popular hymn-book. At the close of the following outline of the comparatively reliable data of liturgical research, will be found some typical quotations from doctrinal writings of the periods to which the earliest liturgical relics can be ascribed; those quotations will serve to refute hasty doctrinal deductions often made from the fervid language of public worship.

In the Table on p. 230 an attempt has been made to indicate the most probable relations of the more important liturgical compilations to one another and to modern uses, with brief notes of the dates of their earliest extant MSS., etc. Free use has been made of the Article 'Liturgies' in *Encyclop. Britann.*, 11th Edn., where may be found justification of the arrangement, and reference to sources of fuller information.

i. The Clementine Liturgy.

There is a long gap between the simplicity and freedom of the service described by Justin, and the earliest known liturgy, which is probably that in the eighth book of the so-called 'Apostolical Constitutions,' a work emanating from the neighbourhood of Antioch, in the fourth century or later. From its claim to be the *ipsissima verba* of the Apostles, written down by Clement, the account of the Lord's Supper therein is called the 'Clementine Liturgy,'* which enshrines the following important changes introduced in the two centuries or more since 150 A.D. :—

- (1) A sharp division of the service into two parts, one for catechumens, etc., the other for the faithful.
- (2) Prayer for the Church, including the faithful departed.
- (3) Gifts are now brought to the 'Altar.'
- (4) The sign of the Cross is introduced.

* For some account of this work see *Protestant Dictionary*, Art. 'Apostolical Constitutions,' where it is proved to be tinged with Arianism and full of absurd anachronisms.

TABLE OF LITURGIES.
EMBODYING THE MOST RECENT THEORIES AS TO THEIR RELATIONS.

I. EASTERN.

1. SYRIAN (<i>St. James</i>)*	St. James (Syriac) St. James (Greek) Clementine Cyril (Jer.)	Monophysite (Jacobite) Use; earliest extant form dates from 10th or 11th century. Orthodox Use, largely supplemented by Byzantine and Roman Uses. Occurs in <i>Apostolical Constitutions</i> , viii. Occurs in <i>Catechetical Lectures</i> ; authenticity doubted.
2. EGYPTIAN (<i>St. Mark</i>)	St. Mark (Coptic and Greek) St. Basil " " St. Gregory " " Serapion of Thmuis " "	Coptic, Ethiopic, and Abyssinian Jacobite Uses derived from these; earliest extant form 11th or 12th century. Authenticity doubtful; recently discovered 11th century MS.
3. PERSIAN (<i>St. Thaddaeus</i>)	St. Addai and St. Mari Theodore of Mopsuestia Nestorius }	Nestorian Uses; the Liturgy of St. Thomas, used on Malabar Coast, assimilated to Roman Use by Jesuits c. 1600.
4. BYZANTINE (<i>St. Chrysostom</i>)	St. Chrysostom } St. Basil } St. Athanasius } [St. Peter (Greek)]	Russian Use; earliest extant form 8th or 9th century; influenced Cranmer in 1549 B.C.P. Armenian Uses; disappearing before Russian Use. Roman Use in Byzantine framework]

II. WESTERN.

1. HISPANO-GALLICAN (<i>St. John</i>)	Mozarabic Gallican Ambrosian-Milanese Celtic	Spanish Use, ousted by Hildebrand 11th century, restored in Reformed Episcopal Church of Spain. Influence traced in 1549 B.C.P. French Use, ousted by Charlemagne. North Italy, ousted by Charlemagne. British Isles, ousted by Roman influences. Eastern origin through Milan, best theory; earliest extant form 7th or 8th century.
2. ROMAN (<i>St. Peter</i>)	St. Peter Sacramentaries :— St. Leo St. Gelasius St. Gregory	Origin unknown; earliest extant form 7th to 8th century; Roman Use, influencing Anglo-Saxon (Leofric), and Anglo-Norman Uses. Authenticity of Sacramentaries unknown; present earliest forms date from 9th century, and all MSS. come from north of the Alps.

* The use of an Apostle's name to designate a Liturgy connotes no Apostolic authorship or sanction; the Liturgy used in a church traditionally associated with an Apostle frequently assumed his name, though composed long after his death.

- (5) The *Sursum Corda*, and *Ter Sanctus*.
- (6) Prayer, including :—
 - (a) Account of the Institution (inexcusably travestied).
 - (b) Oblation of the Bread and Wine.
 - (c) Invocation of the Holy Spirit upon 'this sacrifice,' that He may 'show forth this bread the body of thy Christ, and this cup the blood of thy Christ.'
 - (d) 'Offering on behalf of' the faithful dead.
- (7) Words of Administration, 'The Body of Christ'; 'the Blood of Christ, the cup of life'; 'Amen' being the recipients' answer to both.

ii. Cyril of Jerusalem.

Side by side with the Clementine Liturgy should be set the Liturgical hints to be deduced from the *Catechetical Lectures* of Cyril of Jerusalem (348).* The following are the notable innovations :—

1. Ceremonial hand-washing before Kiss of Peace.
2. Invocation of the Holy Spirit that He may be sent forth on these (things) lying before Him, that He may make the bread the body of Christ, and the wine the blood of Christ.
3. Sacrificial terms used of the bread and wine : 'the spiritual sacrifice,' 'that sacrifice of propitiation.' †
4. Offering for the departed.
5. Prayers and intercession of the Saints mentioned.
6. The Lord's Prayer mentioned.
7. The Choir sings before Communion, 'Taste and see that the Lord is gracious.'
8. 'Altar' is frequently used. ‡

iii. Serapion.

In an eleventh century MS., discovered in the last decade of the nineteenth century, is contained what would be called in the West a Sacramentary. The name of Serapion, Bishop of Thmuis, and friend of Athanasius, is prefixed to part of the liturgy which it contains, but it offers no resemblance to his current works. It is conjectured to date from c. 350, and the Delta is the apparent place of its origin. The most important point to be noted here is its invocation of the Word upon the bread and wine : 'O God of truth, let thy holy Word settle upon this bread that the bread may become body of the Word, and on this cup that the

* In fairness to Cyril it should be observed that his authorship of these Lectures is doubted by Bishop Andrewes and Dean Goode.

† Similar language is found in Irenæus, but not in a liturgy.

‡ For the well-known direction to the communicants in the matter of reception, see p. 237, and p. 341.

cup may become blood of the truth. And cause all who communicate to receive a drug of life for healing of every disease and empowering of all moral advance and virtue.* The elements are called a 'living sacrifice, a bloodless offering'; the bread and wine are called 'likeness of his body and blood' before consecration. It is some indication of early date, that, though the invocation is capable of a meaning akin to later doctrines of a literal transformation of the elements, 'sacrifice' is used of the *unconsecrated* bread and wine, which are called 'likeness of his body and blood' before consecration.

iv. Chrysostom.

His writings contain outlines of the use at Antioch, in which the following words occur, paving the way for enhanced doctrine and ritual:—

(a) Sacrificial terms, *ιερεὺς* and *θυσιαστήριον*, 'priest' and 'altar,' are in use, but *τράπεζα*, 'table,' is also used.

(b) The Holy Spirit is invoked to 'come and touch the gifts lying before Him, that grace may fall on the sacrifice, and through it kindle the souls of all.'

v. Syrian practices.†

From the fifth to the eighth century the following liturgical changes came into use:—

(a) Lessons confined to Epistle and Gospel.

(b) Creed recited.

(c) In narrative of institution, 'and confess His resurrection' added to 'show His death.'

(d) Invocation of the Holy Spirit to come 'on us and on the gifts' to 'hallow and make this bread the holy body of Christ and this cup the precious blood of Christ,—that they may become to those who worthily partake by faith, for remission of sins, for life eternal, and for a guard of soul and body.'

(e) 'Unbloody Sacrifice'—*τὴν θυσίαν τὴν ἀνάμικτον*.

(f) Elevation of the bread.

(g) Burning of unconsumed bread and wine.

* As translated in *Encyclop. Britann.* The writer of the Article affords an instructive illustration of the way in which inferences can be drawn from such devotional passages, which would be repudiated by their Authors: 'Here the bread and wine become by consecration Tenements in which the Word is reincarnated as he aforetime dwelled in flesh. They cease to be now likeness of the body and blood, and are changed into receptacles of divine power and intimacy, by swallowing which we are benefitted in soul and body.' Proof will be forthcoming from the Fathers of later centuries that the fourth that such ideas as 'reincarnation,' 'tenements,' and 'receptacles,' and 'ceasing to be bread and wine' would have been quite unintelligible in the reputed period of this work.

† Extracted from various writings by Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*.

vi. Byzantine practices.

The following are stated to be earlier than 600:—

(a) Incense is used, possibly only as a fumigatory.

(b) Ritual bringing of bread and wine 'to the holy altar' ('table,' however, still used).

(c) The words 'showing to God' introduced.

(d) Eating and drinking the unconsumed bread and wine.

The justifiable conclusions to be drawn from the contents of these 'Early Liturgies' are that:—

(a) The earliest are the simplest, both in ritual and devotional language.

(b) Remembrance, Spiritual Feeding, Thanksgiving, and Fellowship, are still the explicit teaching of the rite.

(c) Faith is still the means of receiving: Baptism, Holiness, Charity, the qualifications for being present.

(d) The connexion of forgiveness of sins with the rite is becoming obscured, the rite itself being treated as a *cause* of forgiveness, instead of a thanksgiving for forgiveness.

(e) Sacrificial terms are assimilating the simple commemorative Feast of 'the Upper Room' to the Jewish and Pagan Sacrifices around, a process hastened by the influx of nominal Christians after the outward adhesion of the Emperor Constantine to Christianity.

(f) Mystery, in the modern sense of the word, is becoming attached to the bread and wine after consecration, and the practice of hedging the rite around is cultivated.*

(g) To justify the mystery, the Lord's simple thanksgiving for God's gift of food is dropped for invocations, varying in form and wording; but all asking for some effect upon the elements themselves.† The effect of this change is various; the Holy Spirit displays, shows, the bread to be the body (Clementine): makes the bread the body (Cyril?): touches the gifts that grace may fall on them (Chrysostom-Antioch): hallows and makes the bread body (Syrian): while, in Egypt, the holy Word is the agent by Whom the bread becomes the body of the Word (Serapion).

(h) Such language, apart from the unscriptural invocation and its implications, does not necessarily convey any change in the elements save for use; there is, as yet, neither a reasoned literal identification of the bread and wine consumed with the

* Even so early as Tertullian the idea had arisen of comparing the Lord's Supper to the Eleusinian mysteries, but it is perhaps unfair to him to press his comparison far.

† It will be remembered that the 1549 B.C.P. contained an invocation of the Holy Spirit and the Word, which was expunged in 1552.

body and blood of Christ, nor a sacrifice by the priest for the remission of sins apart from communicating, save that in the latter case, the idea of offering for the dead, who could not partake, logically leads to the idea of benefits obtainable by the living, through non-communicating attendance at a sacrifice.

II. PATRISTIC LITERATURE.

It remains to quote typical passages from the early Fathers containing their reasoned teaching upon the Lord's Supper. Here two all-important preliminary observations must be made:—

- (1) *The language of devotion is to be interpreted by that of doctrinal statement, and not vice versa*; cf. for example, the relation of the B.C.P. Baptismal Service to the Catechism and Articles.
- (2) *One indisputable passage by an author declaring certain language to be figurative, stamps as figurative any number of uses of such language by that same author, unless he himself states that he has altered his mind*; e.g. an astronomer's book on the Solar system is not to be explained away by his use of the words 'Sunrise' and 'Sunset,' however often used and used without explanation, once he has committed himself to the Earth's motion as the cause of Sunrise and Sunset.

The following passages will suffice:—

(1) **Tertullian** (early in third century): 'The bread, taken and distributed to the disciples, He made it His own body, by saying, This is my body, that is the figure of my body' (*Adv. Marc.* iv. 40).

The stock reply to such passages as this, in Origen as well as in Tertullian, is that these teachers were heretics, though Muratori tries to get rid of the obvious force of the above-quoted passage by interpreting it as meaning that bread was a figure of Christ's body in the Old Testament! This exegesis needs no answer; the question of heresy opens a very wide field. There were heretics, there were also refutations of heresy, in very early days, but neither Tertullian nor Origen was charged with heresy on the point in question. On the contrary, Tertullian and others refuted such heretics as the Docetæ, and that by citing figurative representation of the Lord's body in the Lord's Supper: 'There could not however be a figure, unless there were a body of truth; nay, an empty thing, a phantasm, cannot take a figure,' see, for other examples, Dimock, *Eucharistic Worship*, pp. 61, 62.

(2) **Augustine** (354-430): 'for the Lord did not hesitate to say, This is my body; when he was giving a sign (*signum*) of his body' (*Contra Adimant.*, xii. § 3). This passage occurs in a

proof that the word 'is' in 'The blood is the life' does not convey literal but figurative identity, 'that Rock was Christ' being quoted as illustrative, and reference being also made to Christ's mercy in inviting Judas 'to the banquet, in which He commended and delivered to the disciples the figure of His body and blood.'*

In view of the frequent teaching that 'the Word was made flesh' is to be understood as parallel to 'This is my body,' Dr. Harrison's words (*Answer to Pusey*, pp. 398, 399) should be weighed: 'No orthodox Father ever said of the phrase "The Word was made flesh," "that is, a figure of the flesh" . . . No orthodox Father ever affirmed that "St. John did not hesitate to say, The Word was made flesh, when he meant a sign of his flesh."' There is a true parallel to 'This is my blood' in 'I am the true vine,' and numerous parallels can be cited, from Clement of Alexandria to Ambrose, and from later writers still, where the Lord's words in regard to the wine, and of Himself as the vine, are brought into closest juxtaposition as explaining one another (Harrison, *ibid.* pp. 395-8).†

(3) **Augustine**, *De Doctrina Christiana*, iii. 16, commenting on the words, 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you': 'It seems to order a crime or an outrage: it is therefore a figure, commanding us to share in the Lord's Passion, and to store in our memory sweetly and usefully, that for us His flesh was crucified and wounded.'

Though the words of Scripture commented upon are not regarded, even by many Roman writers, as directly bearing upon the Lord's Supper, yet these latter admit that Augustine's comment makes their view of the identity of the consecrated elements with the body and blood of Christ 'a crime or an outrage' (*facinus vel flagitium*). The argument is precisely the same for the words 'This is my body,' 'this is my blood,' if they be interpreted of any presence of Christ's body given for us and His blood shed for us, in, under, or with the consecrated elements. The straits to which these words of Augustine have reduced adherents of a 'Real Corporal Presence' may be gathered from the following facts:—

- i. Paschasius, whose name marks an epoch in the development

* For similar teaching in Ephrem, Procopius, Jerome, see Dimock, *ibid.* pp. 70 ff.

† Yet Frere writes (*New History of B.C.P.*, p. 431): 'the Church at once . . . gave a quite different interpretation to the statement "This is my body," from that which it gave to such parallel statements as "I am the vine," etc. This statement is made without any allusion to the more than twenty quotations from Patristic literature to be found in Harrison, Dimock, etc., where the latter phrase is quoted to illustrate the former.'

of mediæval doctrine, could only say, in reply to Erudegard's citation of this passage, that if any one believed it (the Lord's saying) to be so a crime as they then believed it to whom He said (the words) . . . says that this flesh and this blood are themselves so to be taken without mystery and sacrament, not partly in figure, . . . being carnally understood carnally destroys the whole, and so therefore perhaps the blessed Augustine says that so to understand this is a great crime. This halting attempt at explanation, with its admission of 'partly in figure,' and its consciousness of insufficiency, 'has probably,' to quote [Harrison, 'never been repeated, and is beneath notice.'

ii. De Villiers published in 1608 an edition of the works of Fulbert of Chartres, who quoted with approval the words of Augustine. Confronted with the problem of dealing with so unequivocal a condemnation of the then received doctrine, de Villiers adopted a solution which sufficiently shows what he thought Augustine's words to mean. He interpolated *dicet hæreticus*, 'a heretic will say,' thus making Fulbert put St. Augustine's words into the mouth of a heretic! The interpolated words were certainly not in Petavius' MS. of Fulbert, which de Villiers was using, and their insertion is certainly not excusable as a 'typographical' error. The day of such interpolating without risk of detection having passed, in the list of *Errata* at the end of the book, amongst genuine errors which are one and all of the usual kind found in printed books, comes the statement that the interpolated words are not in Petavius, while to save the situation is added 'the interpretation is mysterious,' *interpretatio est mystica*. Nor is this all; subsequent reprints of Fulbert's Works, right down to Migne's *Patrology*, reproduce the interpolated words, with de Villiers' note from the *Errata*; this *suggestio falsi* being the only way of getting rid of Augustine's * plain condemnation of the Corporal Presence.

iii. Pusey, in 400 pages of quotations from the Fathers, containing one from the same little treatise of Augustine, omits all reference to this passage, one of the best known, and quoted in Eucharistic controversy from the days of Bertram and Paschasius. Perhaps this omission is more significant than any comment.

(4) Cyril of Jerusalem, if the *Catechetical Lectures* be his, may supply another illustration, different in kind, of the absence in the early Church of later mediæval ideas of the meaning of the

* For a full account of this strange procedure, see Dimock, *Ritual*, 1910, Edn., pp. 69-80, and for similar treatment of Chrysostom, *Eucharistic Worship*, pp. 105-112, of Elfric (c. 1000), *Ibid.* pp. 122-129.

Lord's Supper. In *Catech. Myst.*, v. 21, 22, occurs the following instruction: 'When you draw near do not come with your palms wide open or your fingers apart, but making your left hand a throne for the right, as about to receive a king, and making your palm hollow, receive the body of Christ, saying Amen; and when you have with care sanctified your eyes with the touch of the sacred Body, receive.' The directions for the wine are even more elaborately superstitious, viz. to apply the hands to the moisture on the lips, and with the moisture to sanctify eyes, forehead, and 'the rest of the organs of sense.' * Dimock, *Eucharistic Worship*, p. 53, records similar practices, e.g., wearing of the sacrament as a preservative against perils by land and sea, giving the consecrated bread to the dead, using it as a plaster or poultice, St. Basil's desire that a part of the sacrament, which he had waved over the altar, should be buried with him, use of the consecrated wine mixed with ink for solemn documents, etc. Roman divines recognize that such practices, though significant of a growing superstitious regard for the consecrated elements, are quite incongruous with any belief in their identification with the body and blood of our Lord; Muratori says they are 'too little in conformity with the institution and majesty of the Eucharist.'

(5) Cyril also supplies a valuable commentary upon the language of his time in regard to the invocation of the Holy Spirit, *Catech. Myst.*, iii. 3: 'for as the bread of the Eucharist, after the invocation of the Holy Spirit, is no longer simple bread, but body of Christ, so also this holy oil is no longer bare, (i.e. mere oil), nor as one might say, common, after invocation, but grace of Christ and of the Holy Ghost, becoming full of power by the Presence of His Deity.' The use of such language for the Chrism, or oil for anointing in baptism, is illustrative of the universal custom of applying the same dignity to the things connected with Baptism as to those connected with the Lord's Supper. Indeed frequently they are identified: 'each one of the faithful is then made a partaker of the body and blood of Christ, when in baptism he is made a member of the body of Christ': so Fulgentius, referring for his authority to Augustine's words: 'If therefore ye are the body of Christ and His members, the mystery of yourselves is placed upon the Lord's Table; ye

* Dowden, *Further Studies*, p. 230, whose translation is used above, adds a not unmerited rebuke of the widely prevalent attempt in the Church of England to create a rule out of part of Cyril's directions: 'we are only too familiar with the practice of citing from the Fathers only the snippets which make for one's own notions.' Cf. also Dimock, *The Doctrine of the Lord's Supper*, p. 12.

receive the mystery of yourselves.* Such passages could not occur in writers who held the bread and wine to be literally the Lord's Body and Blood.

The force of these five quotations, which could be multiplied indefinitely, is nevertheless absolutely independent of their number. Though it is not contested that extravagant language and unscriptural terms were freely employed at an early date to describe the Lord's Supper, yet it is contended that its very extravagances were inconsistent with the doctrines the rise of which will occupy the following section.

4. Mediæval Doctrinal Pronouncements.

'The very body of the tree—or rather the roots of the weeds—is the popish doctrine of transubstantiation, of the real presence of Christ's flesh and blood in the sacrament of the altar (as they call it), and of the sacrifice and oblation of Christ made by the priest, for the salvation of the quick and the dead; which roots, if they be suffered to grow in the Lord's vineyard, they will overspread all the ground again with the old errors and superstitions.'

These oft-quoted words of Cranmer (*True and Catholic Doctrine and Use of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*) serve not only to indicate the exact task set him at the Reformation, but also to summarize the teaching whose development is now to be traced. It is unnecessary to recapitulate the tendencies which, appearing at a comparatively early period, enable the modern student of Church History to see the germs of the later completed sacerdotal system.† Suffice it to remark that there is no difficulty in understanding the process; the difficulty is to trace it accurately. Judging by the experience of later centuries, it is most certain that popular extravagance of language and practice would precede anything like authoritative embodiment of such things in doctrinal formularies, even as to-day the established doctrines of the Roman Church owe their origin to unauthoritative and unauthorized impulses on the part of individuals and communities. The popular cult unchecked, a time arrives when to check it effectually is only possible with a disturbance of the body ecclesiastic which those in authority seldom care to encourage; the alternative course is followed, viz., to adopt the cult and its implications, and to force it into some kind of apparent conformity with existing institutions.

* Harrison, Vol. ii. pp. 175, 176; cf. Vol. i. pp. 161 ff. for other references.

† For words as early as Justin, Tertullian and Origen, capable of being used to support later theories, besides those given above, see Dimock, *Doctrine of the Lord's Supper*, pp. 49, 50.

A superstitious regard for the elements began at an early date; under its influence they gradually ceased to be symbols and signs by the faithful reception of which 'they be certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace'; the invocations of the Holy Spirit upon them naturally paved the way for conceptions of some miracle wrought in them whereby the benefits attaching to their reception were obtained. The region of surmise is left for that of definite fact at four chief periods, two marked by the names of John Damascene and Paschasius, two by those of Popes Hildebrand and Innocent III.

(1) John Damascene and the Augmentation Theory.

John Damascene entered history as the champion of images against the Byzantine Emperor Leo, c. 730, whose attempts to stem the advancing tide of revolting image-worship were opposed by Patriarch, priests, monks, and people, together with the Popes, Gregory II and III. Leo's son, in 754, summoned an Œcumenical Council at Constantinople, at which the 350 bishops present, (Rome sending no legates), sweepingly condemned image-worship, whereupon Pope Stephen III, in 769, retorted with 'a dreadful anathema' against all opponents of images.* In the Council's desire to attack images, it refers to the Lord's Supper, stating that Christ 'ordered the substance of bread to be offered, which does not resemble the form of man, lest idolatry might be dragged in, no other form or type being chosen by Him, as able to represent His incarnation': this alone is 'the God-given image of his flesh . . . the true image of the incarnate dispensation of Christ our God.'

In 787, under an Empress favouring image-worship, another Council was called, which ranks as the Œcumenical Second Council of Nicæa, the Pope being represented. It included some bishops who were present at the now disowned Council of 754, but they all denounced as unscriptural the idea of the bread being an image of Christ's Body: 'it is manifestly evident, as regards the unbloody sacrifice offered by the priest, that nowhere is it called an image or type, by the Lord, or by the Apostles, or by the Fathers, but the Body itself, and the Blood itself.' They adopted the teaching of John Damascene, (who appears to have died between the time of the two Councils), that when the word 'antitype' † was used of the elements by the Fathers, it referred to the *unconsecrated* elements. The falsity of this

* For fuller details see Dimock, *Ritual*, 1910 Edn., pp. 81 ff.

† The word 'antitype' has changed its meaning. In Heb. ix. 24, 1 Pet. iii. 21, tr. A.V. 'figure,' the old meaning remains, viz. the earthly counterpart of a heavenly reality. Such is the meaning here.

idea is now universally admitted; the Fathers did frequently call the *consecrated* elements antitypes. The Council further declared, by the way, that 'if it is an image of the body, it cannot be the Divine body itself,'—a declaration the truth of which condemns all the rest of their Eucharistic pronouncements.

The doctrines enunciated by these two Councils exemplify two separate stages of advance in sacerdotal ideas since Augustine's time. According to the former, the elements themselves, apart from their use, though called an image or 'icon,' represent the Incarnation in some sort, and some kind of divine wonder-working produces the representation,—it is no mere choice of a figure: 'the Master Christ, as He deified the flesh, which He took, by His own natural sanctification and by the union itself, so He was well-pleased that the bread of the Eucharist, as a true image of the natural flesh sanctified through the visitation of the Holy Spirit, should become divine body.' The second Council did not find fault with these words, but exchanged their comparative indefiniteness, and susceptibility of interpretation in a figurative manner, for an argument which left no room for misapprehension; the 'unbloody sacrifice' is no image but 'the body and blood of Christ': figurative explanation is expressly excluded.

But this did not mean any theory of transubstantiation; the language is explained by the teaching of John Damascene in his *De Fide Orthodoxa*, IV. xiii. Again the caution must be added that this is but a formal enunciation of ideas suggested by very early language, and anticipated by John's predecessors in doctrinal theology.* Anastasius of Mt. Sinai, a century earlier, was, according to Waterland, 'the first, or among the first, that threw off the old distinction between the symbolical and true body, thereby destroying in a great measure the very idea of a sacrament.' Anastasius said: 'So we believe, and so we confess, according to the voice of Christ Himself—this is my body—He did not say, this is the figure (*ἀντίτυπον*) of my body and blood': anticipating the very language of John, and of the Second Council of Nicæa. John's words are also those of the Council: 'God forbid' (that any one should think bread and wine to be types) they are 'the very deified body of the Lord.'

The history of Eucharistic doctrine from this period onwards is really a history of the modes of interpretation of the supposed miracle wrought by consecration. The Second Council had established the doctrine as an article of the faith, subsequent

* For a *catena* of passages see Dimock's *Doctrine of the Lord's Supper*: Appendix on the Augmentation Theory.

theological speculation could only supply theories to obscure the contradiction between what the bread and wine obviously are, and what this dogma asserts them to be. In this enterprise, which might seem to be an impossible one, they were greatly aided by the apparently pious conception that the greater the impossibility to be believed, the more meritorious the credulity which accepted it,—*credo quia impossibile*—an idea not without meaning, indeed, as affirming the reasonableness of what transcends human experience, *if there is reasonable ground for trusting the Revealer*, but an idea fatal to purity of faith, if applied to any revelation less than infallible, that is, Divine.

Waterland reduces the theories roughly to five:—

1. The elements literally become the same personal body.
2. The elements contain the same body.
3. The elements become another personal body.
4. The elements contain another personal body.
5. The elements are or contain a true and proper body of Christ, distinct and different from a personal body.

The enumeration of these shades of distinction clearly demonstrates the difficulty immediately felt when the typical interpretation of Holy Scripture is abandoned; for these theories antedated the enunciation of transubstantiation.

In John Damascene's teaching, often called the Augmentation Theory, the following points are noteworthy (the translations are strictly literal):—

1. 'The bread and wine are changed into body and blood of God.'
2. 'The Holy Spirit visits, and does these things which are above reason and thought.'
3. 'But the mode is unsearchable,' yet as a parallel is cited the process by which food becomes man's body and blood, not another different body from that before possessed; so 'by the invocation and visitation of the Holy Spirit' the bread and wine 'are marvellously changed' into Christ's body and blood—'and are not two, but one and the same.'

The difference between this and the later extravagances of Eucharistic theory is plain; there is here no teaching of the same body being on ten thousand altars at once; the bread becomes body, indeed, but by being incorporated into Christ's body through the operation of the Holy Ghost. In the Augmentation Theory the word 'body' in Christ's words is adjectival: 'This is my body, but not all of it': it was left for later teaching to make the words an outrage upon common reverence and common sense by asserting that whole Christ, and the same

Christ who is in Heaven, is in every particle of the bread, and every drop of the wine. Nevertheless the *language* of the Augmentation Theory is often scarcely distinguishable from that of Transubstantiation; in the West, where not the invocation of the Holy Ghost, but the priest's recital of the words of institution, was the miracle-working agency, and there was therefore even greater room for superstitious development, that theory soon paved the way for further grievous error.

In Waterland's words * : ' Before the end of the ninth century the Eastern innovations, introduced by Anastasius and Damascene, and established by the Nicene Council, spread far and wide, both among Greeks and Latins. . . . The old notion of a sacrament, as importing a sign and a thing signified, wore off apace, and now all the care was how to make out that very body and blood, by some subtle evasions, or newly devised theories.' Such a departure was bound to end in ' blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits,' both in East and West, † and the first fatal step was taken in attaching to the elements what Holy Scripture only promises to the faithful recipient. It is not necessary, it is not any use, that the bread should become the Lord's body in order that the partakers may partake of the Lord's body; the incorporation of a fragment of miraculously changed bread into the physical system can only be deemed of any worth whatever, by those who are sadly ignorant of the meaning of partaking of Christ's slain body and shed blood. Such literature is indeed ' a crime and an outrage ' in Augustine's words already quoted.

(2) Paschasius.

That advances in the direction of further corruption were generally slow, and not by leaps and bounds, is excellently shown by the very tardy growth of anything like direct worship of the consecrated elements. Adoration of the Host, for example, was still unknown in the early part of the ninth century, ‡ though it seems one of the first natural deductions from the Augmentation Theory. However, with the appearance of Paschasius' work, *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, written 831, but published

* Works, Vol. v. p. 204.

† In the regular Syriac Liturgy, whether older or more recent than the official promulgation of the Augmentation Theory, occur these words amongst the private prayers of the priest before reception: ' Grant me, O Lord, to eat thee holly,' ' I hold Thee, who containest the ends of the world; I have Thee in my hands, who rulest the deep; Thee, God, I place in my mouth.' (From Freeman's *Principles of Divine Service*, Vol. ii. part I., p. 182, where something similar, though not so terrible as the last, is stated to exist in the ancient English Use.)

‡ See Dimock on Agobard, in *Eucharistic Worship*. pp. 219-224.

some years later, a change began which marks a new epoch. The teaching of Paschasius, though not without its antecedent causes and subsequent modifications, is substantially the teaching of the Church of Rome to-day. It has been often noted that the development of the Roman doctrine of the Real Presence runs more than parallel with the development of the Papal system, and that in both the three stages of development coincide. The notorious False Decretals, a product of this period, embodied Paschasian doctrine, and the two works have been described as twin births of the same conception of the Ecclesiastical mind.* The next stage was that of Gregory VII (Hildebrand), 1073-1085, who also appealed to a forged document to establish his power, and in whose pontificate the condemnation of Berengarius established the Paschasian doctrine. The third stage saw Transubstantiation promulgated at the Fourth Council of Lateran, (1215), by Innocent III, whose aims at aggrandizement were furthered by the shamelessly interpolated *Decretum* of Gratian. † This very noteworthy concomitance is not produced to foreclose inquiry, but to suggest an explanation of the way in which Paschasian and ultra-Paschasian dogmas triumphed over the opposition of the most learned theologians of the time, and over the common sense of the very Popes themselves.

Paschasius' doctrine differs from that of John Damascene in substituting for the latter's augmentation theory unmistakable teaching of the change of the bread and wine into the very flesh and blood which were born of Mary and hanged upon the Cross. Comparing the miracles of feeding, he says: ' for from the very blessing of Christ such great abundance remains, and what was eaten and what laid aside was not anything else than the five or seven loaves themselves. How much more therefore (for the Word was made flesh) the flesh of the Word produces, and the abundance of Christ and His blood flow in the Sacrament. And there is no other than flesh of Christ, and yet Christ remains whole.' ‡ Such passages are frequent. Paschasius bolsters up his theory by the citation of miracles, such as the appearance of the consecrated bread in the form of a lamb. One pious priest prayed that he might see what was the appearance (*species*) hid under the form of bread and wine, and was rewarded with the vision of the Child Christ on the altar, afterwards partaking

* Greenwood, *Cathedra Petri*.

† For details see Dimock, *Romish Mass and English Church*, pp. 63 ff.

‡ Tr. in Harrison, *Dr. Pusey's Challenge*, ii. p. 314; here and in Vol. i. Chaps. viii., ix., will be found full details of Paschasius' teaching, with its curious anticipation of some modern equivocations in the use of the words 'spiritual,' 'sacramental,' 'mystical,' etc.

of the Sacrament, but 'not before it returned into the outward appearance of its prior form.'

More wonderful than the compiling of such a farrago is its triumphant spread against all the learning of the day. Rabanni Maurus and Bertram were amongst the more famous opponents, the latter writing specifically to oppose Paschasius' teaching. Odo, Archbishop of Canterbury, is said to be the only tenth century author who publicly declared himself on the Paschasian side. It is now the fashion to maintain that Bertram did not really differ from Paschasius; this opinion was not held when Bertram's work was prohibited by Clement VIII, placed in the first class of heretical writings in 1559, denounced as a forgery of (Ecolampadius by Poussevin the Jesuit, and stated by Bellarmine to be the work of the chief opponent of Paschasius. Referring to the ominous inactivity of Popes Nicholas I and Adrian II in regard to the controversy, L'Aroque says they saw 'that the belief of the enemies of Paschas was a belief publicly received by all the world—in France, in Germany, in England, and elsewhere; and, moreover, approved by the most learned men of the age, publicly vindicated by writings, supported by the authority of the most eminent princes and prelates . . . it cannot be said' but these Popes had credit and power enough to have opposed themselves.' Is this tacit papal support a partial solution of the mystery of this triumph of error over truth?

(3) Hildebrand, Gregory VII.

Two centuries later than Paschasius, the dogmas associated with his name were almost, but not quite, triumphant. Berengarius of Tours, the friend of Hildebrand (afterwards Pope Gregory VII), wrote a famous letter to Lanfranc in 1049, reproaching him for maintaining Paschasian doctrine, and appealing to Scotus and the Doctors of the Church. This letter was read in a Synod at Rome in 1050, and Berengarius was excommunicated and summoned to appear at a Synod. Being at the time in prison he could not appear, but was condemned in his absence. Two more condemnations followed in 1051; in 1054 a Council was arranged to be held at Tours under Hildebrand as Papal Legate, but the illness of the Pope, Leo IX, and Hildebrand's consequent departure for Rome, saved Berengarius for the time. In 1059, under Pope Nicholas II, he appeared and had to give way, signing the famous *Ego Berengarius* declaration. How far Western Christendom had travelled in the direction of Paschasian materialistic doctrine regarding the Lord's Supper, could hardly be better illustrated than by this repeated condemnation of the

'apostle' of the patristic teaching, culminating in his being forced to sign the following declaration:—

'I, Berengarius . . . with mouth and heart profess myself to hold . . . that the bread and wine which are placed on the altar are after consecration not only a Sacrament but also true body and blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ: and sensibly (*sensualiter*), not only sacramentally but really, are handled and broken by the hands of the priest, and ground by the teeth of the faithful. . . .'*

Berengarius had yielded to force, but had not altered his mind. Returning to Tours, he answered a treatise by Lanfranc with another still extant. Pope Alexander II was content to give him a friendly warning, but at the Council of Poitiers, 1075, he hardly escaped with his life. At last, at Rome in 1078, Hildebrand, now Pope Gregory VII, and personally averse from the Berengarian controversy, in which his personal beliefs must have been on the 'heretic's' side, as certainly his policy of personal aggrandizement was on the other, instead of reinforcing his predecessor's condemnation of Berengarius, addressed the following words to him: 'I certainly do not doubt thou dost think well concerning the Sacrifice of Christ according to the Scriptures; however, because it is my custom to have recourse to the Blessed Mary concerning those things which move me, I directed a certain "religious" friend to pay attention to fastings and prayers some days beforehand, and so to obtain from Blessed Mary, that through him she would not be silent to me, as to whither I should betake myself concerning the business which I had on my hands concerning the Sacrifice of Christ, (for a position) in which I might remain unmoved. The "religious man" heard from B. Mary, that nothing was to be thought concerning the Sacrifice of Christ, nothing was to be held save what the authentic Scriptures contained, against which Berengarius was holding nothing.' It may well be imagined that this extraordinary action on the part of the Pope gave no satisfaction, except to Berengarius, whom he sent back to Tours with great honour. Cardinal Benno's comment is: 'He commanded a fast to the Cardinals, that God might show who was right in his opinion concerning the body of the Lord, the Roman Church or Berengarius;—(he who is) dubious in faith is unfaithful.' Egilbert's is: 'Behold a true pontiff and a true priest who doubts if that which is taken on the Lord's Table be true

* To obviate any ambiguity, the statement is repeated twice in the declaration, once as opposed to Berengarius' teaching, once as above translated. For the whole story see Harrison, *ibid.* i. 219 ff. Dimock, *Ritual*, pp. 98 ff.

body and blood of Christ': that of the Council of 30 Bishops at Brixen is (1070): 'putting in question the Catholic and Apostolic faith concerning the body and blood of the Lord, an old disciple of the heretic Berengarius.' This last comment was directed against Gregory's contentment with the very hazy declaration now signed by Berengarius, of which it has been said that 'The doctrinal exposition of Pope Gregory and the Roman Council would have satisfied any of the reformed denominations.'* This was in 1078; in 1079 Berengarius had to sign another confession, acknowledging that the elements are *substantially* changed into the Real Body and Blood of Christ, a confession which he speedily rejected.

The opinions of Berengarius lived on, though in influential quarters they were either abandoned or concealed. The Council of Plaisance, 1095, had to condemn them; Abelard, in the twelfth century, still regarded the question as under discussion; St. Bernard's views are doubtful, but even after the Fourth Lateran Council the University of Paris had to defend itself from a charge of similar heresy. In fact it is impossible to believe that learned students of Holy Scripture and the early Fathers could fail to hold such opinions, however reluctant they might be to take the stand of a Wycliffe. Nevertheless there is no question as to what was the 'orthodox' opinion of the time; the teaching of Paschasius had ripened to that extent that the formation of some doctrine of Transubstantiation could not be long withheld.

(4) Innocent III.

The Fourth Lateran Council, 1215, which decreed the death of heretics, the suspension of allegiance to princes who would not punish heretics, and compulsory confession to a priest, also declared Transubstantiation to be an Article of the Faith. Transubstantiation is the climax of the attempts to explain the obvious contradiction involved in any theory of a change in the consecrated elements; they are not changed—the bread remains bread, and the wine remains wine. Physical explanation being, therefore, impossible, recourse was had to metaphysics, and the Realistic philosophy of the Schoolmen supplied what was wanted. By that philosophy material things were supposed to consist of 'substance' and 'accidents,' the 'substance' being the thing itself, the 'accidents' the qualities of the thing, supposed to inhere in the substance. Bread, for example, would consist of a substratum which may be called 'breadness'; its colour, size, weight, and everything knowable about bread being 'accidents' inherent in the substance. In consecration

* Edgar, *Variations of Popery*, p. 7.

the substance of 'breadness' disappeared, being exchanged for 'fleshness,'* the 'substance' of Christ's body; while the accidents remained unchanged. The philosophy is now obsolete, but it served its turn, and just as the papal system survives the discovery that its historic bases were forged and false, so the Roman Eucharistic doctrine survives the exposure of its false philosophy.

It should be at once stated that there is a considerable doubt as to whether Transubstantiation was the work of the Council at all. Innocent III, in whom the papacy attained to its greatest height of absolute power, was not much concerned about the views of those whom he called to his Councils. Bishop Cosin says the Canons of the Fourth Lateran Council are simply the Pope's Decrees, 'written by him, and read in the Council, and disliked by many, and afterwards set down in the Book of Decretals, under certain titles, by his nephew Gregory IX.' Dimock says: 'Transubstantiation was hardly regarded as an Article of the Faith before the Council of Trent. How else is it to be accounted for, that Peter d'Alliaco speaks of it as the general *opinion* of the Doctors (which he therefore embraces), but as no necessary inference either from Scripture, or, as it seems to him, from the determination of the Church?' †

An instructive indication that Transubstantiation was known at the time to be an advance upon previous teaching, and dangerously out of keeping with much of it, is afforded by the *Decretum* in Gratian, in its record of the '*Ego Berengarius*,' already quoted above. There the following gloss appears, from the hand of John Semeca, of Halberstadt, written about 1215: 'Unless thou wisely understandest the words of Berengarius, thou wilt fall into a greater heresy than he himself was (in). And therefore thou shouldst refer all things to the species themselves.' In other words, the doctrine of Transubstantiation, with its separation of substance and accidents, was formulated largely to disprove literal grinding with the teeth of the very flesh of Christ, which Berengarius was forced to approve! The Schoolmen could admit the teaching that Christ's human body was at the same time on earth in many places and in heaven—with the adverb 'sacramentally' thrown in as a salve to their outraged intellects, ‡—but they could not allow the idea that that human

* This word is used as a *pis aller*; in fact the Roman teaching is that not only 'body,' but also 'soul' and 'divinity' are in the transubstantiated bread. It is impossible really to reconcile this even with the exploded philosophy on which it is based.

† Cosin, *Works*, Vol. iv. p. 222; Dimock, *Romish Mass*, p. 71.

‡ So Aquinas: but Bellarmine confutes it. Jeremy Taylor, *Real Pre-*

body of Christ is continually being wounded and torn by the teeth of the faithful. How could the invisible, intangible, imperceptible 'substance' be seen or touched? In fact they agree so far with Berengarius' real belief, and not with what the Council compelled him to say.

It is not possible here to enter into the many contradictions involved in the new doctrine of Transubstantiation, nor is it necessary, for the story of their confutation is the story of the English Reformation. Yet it is worth while to conclude this section with a brief notice of some of the more fundamental absurdities of the doctrine.

(1) The manifest absurdity of the separation of 'substance' and 'accidents' led to the practical test-question: are the 'accidents' of bread and wine able to nourish the body, though no 'bread-ness' and no 'wine-ness' remain after consecration? Some early Schoolmen, logically enough if transubstantiation were true, denied the nourishing power of the 'accidents,' but logic had to yield to facts, and the later teaching admits the nourishing. Various have been the attempts to define what does the nourishing, for certainly shape, colour, etc., are not articles of food. The futility of all such attempts is clear; unless the 'accidents' are stretched to include all that makes bread 'bread,' unless in fact the distinction between 'substance' and 'accidents' is abandoned, the nourishment is an insoluble problem.

(2) What really happens to the accidents? The Catechism of Trent teaches that: 'Since those "accidents" cannot inhere in the body and blood of Christ, it remains that they sustain themselves resting on no other thing, above all the order of nature . . . this was the perpetual and constant teaching of the Catholic Church.' Yet the Fathers not only asserted that accidents could not exist without their substance, but confuted heretics on the strength of that argument.* The statement of the doctrine is its best refutation, cf. Cranmer: 'although all the accidents, both of the bread and wine, remain still, yet, say they, the same accidents be in no manner of thing, but hang alone in the air, without anything to stay them upon . . . in the bread and wine, say they, these accidents cannot be, for

sence, xi. § 21, is worth quoting on this point: 'I might make advantage of this contestation between two so great patrons of transubstantiation if I did need it, for Aquinas says that a body cannot be in two places at once locally, Bellarmine says neither can it be sacramentally; it were easy then, to infer that therefore it is in two places no way in the world.'

* Stillingfleet, *Doctrine of the Trinity and Transubstantiation compared*, pp. 23-27.

the substance of bread and wine, as they affirm, be clean gone. And so there remains whiteness, but nothing is white; there remaineth colours, but nothing is coloured therewith; there remaineth roundness, but nothing is round; and there is bigness, and yet nothing is big; there is sweetness without any sweet thing; softness without any soft thing; breaking without anything broken; division without anything divided.*

(3) Where is now the literal interpretation of the words 'This is my body'? To Transubstantiation it means: 'What you take and eat is my body in 'substance,' but all that you touch, see, handle, taste, etc., is 'accidents' of bread. You take and swallow substance of body, but you press accidents of bread with your teeth.' Surely, this congeries of absurdities reduces the so-called literal acceptance of Christ's words to a literal rejection of them, and to trace even briefly the steps by which such caricatures of the Lord's ordinance came into being, is to understand that the moving spirit of the Reformation was something quite other than a desire for political or intellectual freedom, namely a protest against the degradation of God and Man.†

This section will fittingly conclude with some reference to the question of Sacrifice. The term had been applied to the Lord's Supper figuratively for many centuries; with the development of the Real Corporal Presence, a sister-dogma appeared, which changed its significance altogether. The sacrificial idea in some sort preceded any idea of transformation of the elements in consecration, as witness the remembrance of the dead, as benefitted by the sacrament in some undefined way; but the conception of a propitiatory offering for sin was not attached thereto. Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and Minucius Felix defended themselves against the charge of being atheists as having no sacrifices, by saying they had no need of any but spiritual sacrifices; Julian the Apostate (d. 363) found fault with the Christians because they had no sacrifices and no altars. Long after the importation of the idea of 'oblation' of the elements, there was still no real sacrifice pretended, though a perilous step had been taken. Eusebius, Jerome, and Augustine, are quoted by Jewel to repudiate the idea of any real sacrifice in the Early Church, save the 'spiritual sacrifices' offered by the whole body of the redeemed.‡ Indeed, there could be no thought of the real

* Cranmer, *Lord's Supper*.

† As an illustration of the protest of the English people as a whole against the doctrine of Transubstantiation, may be cited the phrase 'Hocus-pocus,' used to describe juggling quackery of any kind, yet—sad to contemplate—drawn from the Latin of our Lord's words of institution! So low did Transubstantiation bring His Name.

‡ See Harrison, Vol. i. c. xii. §§ 133 ff. for abundance of proofs from later authors.

propitiatory sacrifice in the Holy Communion, until the dogma of a Real Corporal Presence had taken shape. The Conception of a sort of dramatic representation of Calvary, due to a misunderstanding of Holy Scripture, (a misunderstanding which still finds place in the hymnology of the Reformed Churches) is quite confessedly remote from a real sacrifice, which could only follow the acceptance of Paschalian teaching concerning the effect of consecration. When that teaching became prevalent, all was changed. Such additions as those to the Ordinal: 'Receive the power to offer sacrifice,' with the formal handing to the ordinand of paten and chalice: indicate the greatness of the change. Compelled to deliberate upon the matter at the Council of Trent, the Church of Rome set its seal to the dogma of Mass-Sacrifice, which for several centuries had dominated the popular mind to the virtual exclusion of 'Communion' in the Lord's Supper, by decreeing that there is a true and proper and propitiatory sacrifice in the Mass; that they are anathema who say that the sacrifice is a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, a commemoration only of the Sacrifice of the Cross; that in His Last Supper, Christ, showing Himself a Priest for ever after the Order of Melchizedek, offered His Body and Blood to God the Father under the species of Bread and Wine. Cranmer had been dead some years when this decree was issued, in 1562, but this authoritative statement sums up the sacrificial doctrine with which he and the Reformers had to contend, and against which the B.C.P., both in 1549 and 1552, was directed.

The decree demands a brief examination:—

(1) It enshrines a curious reminiscence of a serious division in the Council. The question arose: Did Christ offer Himself as a propitiatory Sacrifice to God in the Supper? If so, then why the Death upon the Cross? * If not, then how could any repetition of the Lord's Supper be a propitiatory sacrifice? The Council was very evenly divided, and every argument that could be brought to bear against the novelty of declaring that Christ offered Himself was brought by the one side, especially by the Bishop of Veglia, who almost won his case, according to Sarpi. However, the party which saw that to maintain the Mass-Sacrifice was essential to the preservation of the papacy, prevailed, and it was decreed that the Lord did offer Himself. Note, however, a most significant omission in the decree; the Lord's offering of His Body and Blood is not stated to be 'propitiatory,' and the omission was designed.† Could there be a

* See Dimock, *Romish Mass, passim*, esp. pp. 5 ff. for fuller detail.

† See Dimock, *ibid.*, p. 7, note

clearer admission of the impossibility of reconciling the Mass-Sacrifice with the Lord's Institution?

(2) The relation of the Mass-Sacrifice to the one Sacrifice once offered upon the Cross is another dilemma. The theory that the latter propitiates for original sin, the former for later sins, was repudiated by Rome itself with indignation.* It is impossible to attribute propitiatory efficacy to the Mass without detracting from the sufficiency of the Death upon the Cross, which Rome dare not do as yet, at least in so many words. 'Commemorative sacrifice,' 'Applicatory sacrifice,' and other such phrases, apart from their doctrinal inaccuracy, will not consist with the categorical wording of the Tridentine decree: 'true and proper and propitiatory.'

(3) The tangle in which the mind is involved becomes confusion worse confounded when such questions are asked as: What is sacrificed, and how is it sacrificed? According to Bellarmine these questions can only be answered by assuming that Christ sacrificed Himself by first transubstantiating the bread into His very Body, and then by eating and so destroying His own Body.

(4) One last dilemma shall be noted. The Mass-Sacrifice is stated to be the one means by which the Sacrifice of the Cross is made available for the living and the dead. If so, what need of repeated masses, for the dead, at any rate? The soul is presumably made partaker of that perfect Redemption, yet it needs further applications! Well might the Reformers use the famous words of the Homily: 'We must take heed lest of the memory the Holy Supper be made a sacrifice.'

5. Liturgical Products of the English Reformation.

Though the appeal to Holy Scripture, and the recovery of the great doctrine of Justification by Faith, were as much the lever of the Reformation in England as elsewhere, the specific point chosen by Cranmer's unerring instinct for bringing Reformation principles to bear upon religious thought and life was the doctrine of Holy Communion. In his oft-quoted words denouncing the dogmas of the Real Presence and Mass-Sacrifice as the roots of all Roman heresy, is enshrined the specific characteristic of the English Reformation. The displacement of the Sacrifice by the Communion, of the Corporal Presence on the Altar by the Spiritual Presence in the heart of the believer, governed the compilation of the B.C.P., and procured the death

* The attempt to interpret Art. XXXI as framed only against this theory of Mass-Sacrifice is well-known; see Dimock, *Blasphemous Fables and Dangerous Deceits*.

of the martyrs in Mary's reign. The martyrdom of John Frith in 1533, on account of his denial of the Corporal Presence, was the first indication of this becoming the crucial test of reforming tendencies. The enactment in 1539 of the Six Articles, upholding with terrible penalties Transubstantiation, Communion in one kind, and Private Masses, (in half the Articles,* therefore, opposing the Reformation in this specific doctrine), served both to prove the existence of opposition to Mass dogmas, and to identify reform with that opposition. Not only did Bishops Latimer and Shaxton resign their sees, but so many were those who refused to obey, that the penalties had to be modified. Henry's idea of reformation, *i.e.*, merely independence of the Pope, was plain in the English Litany of 1544, where one of the petitions was for deliverance from the Bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities, but the opposition to the Six Articles Act manifested the impossibility of stopping there.

With Edward's accession, on January 28, 1547, things rapidly altered. On July 31 the first Book of Homilies appeared, and also Edward's first Royal Injunctions were issued, on December 20 the first Act of Edward's first Parliament ordered the priest to communicate with the laity, not by himself, and to administer to the laity in both kinds, while on December 24 a repealing Act got rid of the Six Articles Act. Yet the doctrine of the Holy Communion was not clear; a Royal Proclamation enjoined men to 'devoutly and reverently affirm that holy bread to be Christ's body, and that cup to be the cup of His holy blood, according to the purport and effect of the Holy Scripture'—words which might mean anything, according to the beliefs of those who interpreted them. The purpose of the Proclamation was to check irreverence due to rejection of the Mass-doctrines with no clear teaching to replace them, and for that purpose it would suffice. Images had largely disappeared by May, 1548. The order for communion in both kinds had been accompanied by the appointment of a committee to deal with the liturgical alterations needful, and the history of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper becomes one with the history of the liturgy, in which three dates are marked by liturgical productions:—1548, the Order of Communion; 1549, Edward's First Prayer Book; 1552, Edward's Second Prayer Book.

(I) THE ORDER OF COMMUNION, 1548.

This was an interim production, to be used at first with the

* Of the other three, Vows of Celibacy, Celibacy of Priests, and Auricular Confession, the last was closely connected with the Mass, and the other two did not touch the life of the layman.

Latin Missal, but afterwards incorporated in the 1549 B.C.P.* The contents were as follows:—

1. *Exhortation*—the first in 1662 B.C.P.

2. *Rubric*: 'The time of the Communion shall be immediately after that the Priest himself hath received the Sacrament, without the varying of any other rite or ceremony in the Mass (until other order shall be provided), but as heretofore usually the Priest hath done with the sacrament of the body, to prepare, bless, and consecrate so much as will serve the people; so it shall continue still after the same manner and form, save that he shall bless and consecrate the biggest chalice, or some fair and convenient cup or cups full of wine with some water put unto it; and that day, not drink it up all himself, but taking one only sup or draught, leave the rest upon the altar covered, and turn to them that are disposed to be partakers of the communion, and shall thus exhort them as followeth':

3. *Second Exhortation*—the third in 1662.

4. *Warning to Communicants*—made one clause of the first in 1662, ('If any man here be an open blasphemer,' etc.).

5. *Rubric*: 'Here the Priest shall pause a while, to see if any man will withdraw himself: and if he perceive any to do so, then let him commune with him privily at convenient leisure, and see whether he can with good exhortation bring him to grace: and after a little pause, the Priest shall say':—

6. '*You that do truly,*' etc.

7. *Rubric*: 'Then shall a general confession be made in the name of all those that are minded to receive the Holy Communion, either by one of them, or else by one of the ministers, or by the Priest himself, all kneeling humbly upon their knees':

8. *The Confession*—as in 1662.

9. *The Absolution*—as in 1662, save that it commenced: 'Our blessed Lord, who hath left power to His Church, to absolve penitent sinners from their sins, and to restore to the grace of the heavenly Father such as truly believe in Christ, have mercy upon you,' etc.

10. *The Comfortable Words*.

11. *Prayer of Humble Access*—as in 1662, with the addition of 'in these holy mysteries,' after 'drink his blood.'

12. *Administration*, first to Ministers, then to people, with the first part of the present words, save that instead of 'body and soul,' 'body' was used alone in administering the bread, 'soul' alone in administering the wine.

* The important doctrinal and other differences from the present B.C.P. are noted later under the 1549 B.C.P., in which the *Order* was inserted almost bodily.

13. *Rubric*: 'If there be a Deacon or other Priest, then shall he follow with the chalice, and as the Priest ministereth the bread, so shall he for more expedition minister the wine.' The bread is to be 'such as heretofore hath been accustomed; and every of the said consecrated breads shall be broken in two pieces at the least. . . . 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 Jesus Christ.' If the wine 'hallowed' is not enough, more is to be consecrated, the words of institution (in Latin) being used, 'and without any levation or lifting up.'

This first instalment of reform,* avowedly temporary, exhibits the transitional nature of the doctrine held at the time. On the one hand, Gardiner expressed approbation of it, which he well might do, being able to interpret it by the Missal, still retained and used with it: on the other hand, the use of the English tongue, administration to the laity, and that in both kinds, with the order to break the bread for distribution, and the calling the consecrated elements 'bread' and 'wine' in the closing Rubric, marked a distinct advance, and promised still greater alterations. Cranmer's own position on the Lord's Supper was that of one groping towards fuller light. So far back as 1532 he had been lodging at Nuremberg with Osiander, whose niece he married, and whose *Church Order* was then being completed. The indebtedness of the B.C.P. to this work, in several particulars supposed to prove dependence upon Mozarabic and other Ancient Liturgies, suggests at least some influence on Cranmer. However, it was through Ridley that Cranmer's final doctrine of the Lord's Supper took shape, and, therefore, through the publication in 1532 of Bertram's Treatise against Paschasius. That work, unable to overthrow heresy at the time, bore fruit in later days, in a way of which Bertram could not have dreamed.

In May of 1548, the whole service was used in English, and, in the words of Dr. Gasquet: 'It is clear that before September, 1548, services were already drawn up and in use, the main parts of which corresponded with those subsequently enforced in the Book of Common Prayer.' † This proof of the industry of the Committee appointed to provide the 'other order' of the Rubric quoted above from the Order of Communion, is supplemented

* Ordered to be used on Easter Day, April 1, 1548.

† Gasquet, 147; from Tomlinson's *Great Parliamentary Debate*, p. 7, a document of the utmost importance for the story of 1548.

by the report of the Great Parliamentary Debate on the Lord's Supper on December 15, 17, 18, 1548. From that report the following, amongst many, important conclusions must be drawn:—

(1) Cranmer and his fellow reformers distinguished between Transubstantiation and the Real (Corporal) Presence, and rejected both.

(2) The other side recognized that omission was prohibition, and deplored the abandonment of Adoration, Elevation, and the Oblation of the Host, Tonstal also protesting against the discredit thrown upon the word 'Mass.'

(3) The unreliability of the 'Ancient Liturgies' as standards of historical or doctrinal accuracy was clearly felt and expressed.

(I) THE COMMUNION OFFICE OF 1549.

Within a month of the Great Debate, Parliament passed the new book, and by March it was published, coming into general use on Whit-Sunday, June 9. The relation of its Communion Office to the Sarum Missal is exhibited in the following description of their respective contents* in parallel columns, in which parts largely identical in both Offices are in Clarendon type; parts used by the Reformers, but with alterations of doctrinal significance, are in Italics; the many important changes of order will be seen directly from the Table; rubrics are indented, only the more important of those in the Missal being noted, their length being greater than the remainder of the service. † The comparison must compel agreement with the following estimate: 'The Eucharistic Service of the Church of England is substantially a new service. If we take even the Communion Service of 1549 and compare it with the Canon according to the Use of Sarum, we find that by far the greater part of it is new. . . . The Office of 1549 occupies twenty-three closely-printed pages at the end of Mr. Maskell's *Ancient Liturgies of the Church of England*, and of these not above two pages are to be found in the Sarum Missal' (Prebendary Sadler, *The Church and the Age*, p. 305).

* The full text of the Office of 1549, side by side with that of the Sarum Use in English, may be seen in Canon Estcourt's *Dogmatic Teaching of the Book of Common Prayer on the Eucharist*. The 'Canon' is similarly displayed in Tomlinson, *Tracts on Ritual*, Vol. i, No. 113.

† The divisions of the Mass are borrowed from Frere, pp. 282 ff.

1549 B.C.P.

The Supper of the Lord and Holy Communion commonly called The Mass.

Notice to be given by intending Communicants. Evil-livers and those at variance to be kept away.
Vesture (vestment or Cope).

Psalm in English (Introit).

Priest to stand afore the midst of the Altar.

Lord's Prayer.
Collect for Purity.
Psalm.
Lesser Litany.

The Gloria in Excelsis.

The Lord be with you, etc.
The Collect.

Alternative Collects for the King.
The Epistle.

The Gospel.
Announced by the reader, with response, 'Glory be to thee, O Lord.'

SARUM USE.

Ordinarium Missæ.

1. Preparation.
Vesting hymn.
Versicle and Response.
Collect for Purity.

2. Psalm, etc.
Psalm.
Lesser Litany.

Lord's Prayer.
Hail Mary.

3. Approach to Altar, etc.
Versicles and Responses.
Confession of Priest.
Absolution of Priest by the Minister.
Confession of Ministers.
Absolution of Ministers.
Kiss of Peace.

Lights, kissing altar, etc.
Priest to begin at South corner of Altar.

Silent Prayers.

4. Censing.
Lesser Litany.

Many regulations for censing; for procession to altar; for dress of deacon, sub-deacon, light-bearers, etc., for colours.

5. Gloria.

The Gloria in Excelsis (ten variations): regulations as to priest's sitting or standing.

6. Collects and Memorials.

The Lord be with you, etc.

The Collects (seven the maximum).
Many regulations as to posture, signing the cross, bringing bread, wine and water, bringing basin and water for washing, etc.

7. Epistle.

8. Gradual.
Rubric concerning gradual, etc.

9. Alleluia, Sequence, and Tract.

10. Censing.

11. Gospel.

Many regulations as to procession, posture, blessing, censing, etc.

1549 B.C.P.

The Creed.

Sermon and Homily.
Exhortation to worthy receiving the Sacrament.

Exhortation to the negligent.
Offertory, by the people 'to the poor men's box.'

Sentences inciting to generous giving.

Singing the Sentences.

Nature of the offertory.

Non-communicants to leave the Quire.

Bread and wine (with water) to be set upon the Altar, after the offertory.

The Lord be with you.
Sursum Corda.

It is very meet, right, etc. (somewhat altered).

Proper Prefaces, reduced to five, and two entirely new.

Holy, Holy, Holy.

Prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church.

To be said 'plainly and distinctly.'

Intercession (wording entirely new).

For acceptance of 'these our prayers.'

For the truth and unity of Church.

For the King and Council, etc.

For Bishops and Clergy.

For all God's people.

Praising God for Saints, Mary alone mentioned by name.

For God's servants departed (before the Consecration, to avoid the idea of offering for the dead).

(ii) *Consecration.*

Reference to the one oblation once offered.

Prayer for sanctification of the bread and wine by the holy Spirit and word (two crossings).

Recital of institution with two single directions for manual acts.

Elevation and shewing sacrament forbidden.

SARUM USE.

12. **The Creed.**
13. Versicles, etc.
The Lord be with you.

14. Offertory, i.e. by the Priest of bread and wine.
Crossings, kissings, censings, washings, etc.

15. Its Prayers.
Prayer for acceptance of Sacrifice for sins and Offences, on behalf of living and dead.

16. **The Secret.**
Secret Prayers, etc.
17. **The Salutation.**

The Lord be with you.
Sursum Corda.

18. **The Preface.**
It is very meet, right, etc.

Proper Prefaces.

19. **The Sanctus.**

Holy, Holy, Holy.

20. **The Canon.**

Rubrical regulations for hands, eyes, signing cross, etc.

(i) *Intercession.*

For acceptance of these 'holy sacrifices.'

For the Church.

For the Pope and King.

For special individuals.

Commemorating Saints (25 by name), and seeking their merits and prayers.

Here to regard the host with great veneration—

For acceptance of this oblation

Again to look at host—
For its becoming the Body and Blood of Christ.

(ii) *Consecration.*

Wash fingers and elevate host.

Recital of institution, not in the words of the Bible, and multitudinous accompanying regulations.

1549 B.C.P.

(iii) *Oblation.*

Celebrating before God 'the memorial which (His) Son hath willed us to make.'

Sacrifice of Praise and thanksgiving. Our Souls and bodies offered as a reasonable Sacrifice.

Prayer that these prayers may be taken to God's holy Tabernacle in Heaven by the Ministry of His holy Angels.

(iv) *Lord's Prayer* (without regulations).**The Peace of the Lord, etc.**

Substituted for Agnus Dei:—

Christ our Paschal Lamb is offered up for us, once for all, when he bare our sins on his body upon the cross; for he is the very lamb of God, that taketh away the sins of the world; wherefore let us keep a joyful and holy feast with the Lord.

N.B.—Agnus Dei transferred to 'the Communion time.'

Invitation to Confession.

Confession by all, Priest and people.

General Confession.

Absolution. [*cf.* Absolution of Priest by the Minister (p. 256), Division 3.]

Comfortable Words.

Prayer of Humble Access.

Rubric for Reception.

Words of Administration.

Sentences.

Twenty-two from Holy Scripture,

SARUM USE.

(iii) *Oblation.*

Offering Victim to God, *cf.* Abel, Abraham, and Melchizedek.

Prayer for Angels to take the host to God's Altar in heaven.

Prayer for the dead.

Prayer for the living to have their part with the Saints (15 named).

Ascription, with five signings of the Cross.

(iv) *Paternoster*, with minute regulations as to Elevation of Paten and hands.

Prayer with more regulations, for peace, etc., by intercession of Saints.

Breaking the Host in the Chalice.

Peace, with signing the Cross.

21. Agnus Dei.

22. Commixture and Pax.

Prayer, placing third part of the Host in 'the Sacrament of the blood.'

Prayer for the priest's worthy reception.

Kissing corporal and the deacon.

Minute regulations for the Pax.

23. Prayers at reception.

Prayer to God 'Who willed thy only begotten to take flesh . . . which I, unworthy, here hold in my hands.'

Adoration of the Host.

Address to the Body, and reception.

Address to the Blood, and reception.

Thanksgiving prayer.

(No Communion of the People in the Missal.)

24. Prayers at Ablutions.

Three prayers with elaborate rubrics.

25. Anthem 'Communio.'

1549 B.C.P.

not including the ambiguous 'Taste and see.'
The Lord be with you, etc.
Collect, 'We most heartily thank thee.'

The Blessing.

SARUM USE.

'Taste and see,' etc.

26. Post-Communion.

Dominus vobiscum, with ritual regulations.

Collects, replete with invocations and memorials of Saints.

Dominus vobiscum.

Let us give thanks unto the Lord.

27. Dismissal.

Ite, Missa est.

28. Closing Prayer.

Private Prayer for acceptability of the Sacrifice.

In the name of the Father, etc.

Regulations for procession.

Post-Communion Gospel (John i. 1-14).

It is scarcely credible that any one would find the outstanding point of this comparison to be 'the close similarity' between the 1549 B.C.P. and the Sarum Use*; their fundamental difference is even more apparent, if possible, in the following list of the chief omissions, alterations, additions, and transpositions:—

a. Omissions.

The 'Hail Mary.'

The ritual approach to the Altar.

Mutual Confession and Absolution of Clergy.

Kiss of peace.

Censing (*passim*).

Collects called 'Memorials.'

Gradual, etc., with ritual accessories.

Ritual production of the Book of the Gospels, with Kissing the Book, etc.

Ritual placing of the elements, with kissing, censing, and hand-washing. Prayer of oblation of elements, offered in honour of 'saints,' and for salvation of living and dead.

Kissing Altar, crossings, etc.

Secret prayers, involving intercession of Saints.

Offering of the elements, as 'their holy undefiled sacrifices,' in the 'Canon.'

Reference to merits and prayers of the Saints.

Elevation of the consecrated Elements, and accompanying posturings.

Reference to the 'pure victim,' 'holy victim,' etc., with crossings.

Reference to Abel's, Abraham's, and Melchizedek's sacrifices.

Prayer that Angels should carry the elements to the 'Altar on high.'

Prayer to 'sanctify and to give life to' the Elements.

Using the Host to make 5 signs of the Cross.

Prayer for intercession of Mary, etc., and all the Saints.

Ritual kissings, touching eyes with the paten, etc.

Threefold breaking of the Host, etc.

'Commixture' of the Bread and Wine.

The Pax, kissing of 'corporal,' and of the deacon.

* Frere, p. 458.

Private prayer before priest's communicating, referring to the Lord's taking 'flesh, the which I, unworthy, here hold in my hands.'
 Address 'to the Body' before reception: 'Hail for evermore, Most Holy Flesh of Christ,' etc.
 Address 'to the blood.'
 Rinsing of hands and chalice, with prayers, including 'we adore the sign of the Cross.'
 'Taste and see that the Lord is sweet,' etc.
 Post-Communion, Procession, and Gospel.

b. Alterations.

The Title 'Mass' relegated to position of no repute.
 Use of the English tongue.
 Chasuble made of no account by alternative use of Cope.
 Collect for purity said publicly.
 'God's board' used sometimes instead of 'altar.'
 Sentences exhorting to charitable giving during the Offertory, instead of a devotional anthem from the Psalms.
 Prayer to 'receive these our prayers, which we offer,' etc., instead of 'accept and bless these gifts, these presents, these holy undefiled sacrifices,' etc.
 Praising God for virtue of Saints, instead of 'Communicating with and venerating the memory,' and pleading the merits and prayers of the Saints.
 Christ's 'one oblation, once offered,' etc., for 'this oblation—we beseech thee to accept.'
 'Bless and sanctify these thy gifts of bread and wine that they may be unto us the body and blood' instead of 'which oblation make blessed, admitted, ratified, reasonable, and acceptable, that it may be made to us the Body and Blood.'
 Words of Scripture used in the Consecration.
 'Celebrate the memorial which thy Son hath willed us to make' instead of 'offer a pure victim,' etc.
 'Our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving' for 'a holy sacrifice, an immaculate victim.'
 Partakers of this Holy Communion,' for 'this participation of the altar.'
 General confession to God alone, for the *Confiteor* addressed to Saints, etc.
 Unambiguous sentences of scripture, for 'Taste and see,' etc.
 'Almighty and ever-loving God, we most heartily thank thee,' etc., for the five Post-Communion Collects including reference to sacrifice, intercession of Saints, etc.
 'The Peace of God,' etc., instead of the priest's private prayer for the acceptance of the sacrifice he has offered.

c. Additions.

Collect for the King.
 Sermon, and exhortation 'to the worthy receiving.'
 Exhortation to communicate more diligently.
 Gathering the communicants together, and excluding others from the quire.
 Offering oneself to be a 'reasonable holy and lively sacrifice.'
 'Christ our Paschal lamb is offered up for us, once for all, when he bare our sins, on his body upon the cross; wherefore let us keep a joyful and holy feast with the Lord.'
 'Ye that do truly and earnestly,' etc.
 Comfortable words.

Prayer of humble access.

Words of administration 'The body which was given: . . . The Blood which was shed.'

d. Transpositions.*

Commemoration of the dead placed before the consecration to avoid suggestion of offering Christ for the quick and the dead.
 'Agnus Dei' transferred to 'the communion time, beginning so soon as the priest doth receive,' etc.
 Confession and absolution, (the latter prefaced by reference to God's promises of forgiveness to the repentant), made 'general' instead of for celebrant only, and transferred to a suitable position.

The Act which established the 1549 B.C.P. is the 'Authority of Parliament, in the Second Year of the Reign of King Edward the Sixth,' words of importance for the understanding of the 'Ornaments Rubric,' in which they are still to be found. That even these great changes were only of the nature of a compromise is sufficiently attested by the extant correspondence of the day; not, however, a compromise between Rome and the Reformers, but between Lutheran views of the Sacramental Presence and those of Cranmer and the English Reformers generally.† The genuine opposition of the great body of those who rebelled in various parts of the country is evidence of the departure from the Sarum Mass, not to be weakened by Gardiner's claim that he could find the Mass in the book. Such emphasis upon ambiguous words and phrases, scattered here and there, to the exclusion of the general and obvious trend of the whole book, is an unworthy policy unhappily not unknown in England at a later date, and in a less ambiguous B.C.P. The new Ordinal, published March, 1550, was far more free from ambiguity (see p. 498), and, with the abolition of altars at the same period, and the calling in of old Service-Books, paved the way for the inevitable revision of 1552.

(III) THE COMMUNION OFFICE OF 1552.

It is remarkable that this Prayer Book, which had scarcely time to come into use before Edward's death caused the suspension of all reform for five years, is nevertheless essentially the B.C.P. of 1912. It was passed on April 14, printed in August, and prescribed for use from November 1, 1552; the 42 Articles, substantially our 39 Articles, received the King's Mandate on

* The Injunctions of 1548, No. 19, mention 'transposed' as a contemplated process in reforming the Mass; such transposition was made more effective still as a reforming instrument in 1552.

† For the true relation of the 1549 B.C.P. to Lutheranism see Dimock, *History of B.C.P.*, 1910 Edn., pp. 7 ff.; for evidence that it was regarded as transitional see Tomlinson, *Great Parliamentary Debate*, pp. 19, 20; and *First Prayer Book of Edward VI*, pp. 4 ff.

June 9, 1553, the King's death occurring on July 6. The nature of the Book is clear from the statement of the Act which enjoined its use; it is the former book 'explained and made fully perfect . . . more earnest and fit to stir Christian people to the true honouring of Almighty God.' This estimate of their work by those who compiled both books might suffice to silence for ever the Cosin-Heylin theory, popularized by Wheatley, that the second book was virtually the work of foreigners, even if that theory were not otherwise untenable. It is now disclaimed, but it has done its evil work in casting a slur upon the revision of 1552.

The importance of the changes will be seen from the following lists of omissions, alterations, etc. :—

a. Omissions.

'Commonly called the Mass,' in the Title.

All special Vesture: the surplice being ordered for all services.

Introit sung by clerks.

Introit said by priest.

Lesser Litany.

Dominus Vobiscum.

'Glory be to thee, O Lord' before Gospe.

Direction to add to the wine 'a little pure and clean water.'

Prayer for dead.

'Doth vouchsafe, in a Sacrament and Mystery, to give us his said body and blood to feed upon spiritually.'

'Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord' in the *Ter Sanctus*.

'In these holy mysteries,' after 'so to drink his blood.'

Indented Rubrics and sign of the cross in prayer of consecration.

'We . . . do celebrate and make here before thy divine Majesty, with these thy holy gifts, the memorial which thy Son hath willed us to make.'

Agnus Dei during communion.

Post-communion sentences.

Petition for prayers to be carried by the Angels to heaven.

The declaration that in each part is received the whole body of Christ.

b. Alterations.

'North side of the Table,' for 'afore the midst of the Altar,' this last word being everywhere changed.

'He hath instituted and ordained holy mysteries, as pledges of his love,' etc., for: 'he hath left in these holy mysteries, as a pledge of his love, and a continual remembrance of the same, his own blessed body, and precious blood,' etc.

'Discreet and learned Minister of God's word, and open his grief, that by the ministry of God's holy word,' etc., for 'discreet and learned priest, taught in the law of God, and confess and open his sin and grief secretly . . . requiring such as shall be satisfied with a general confession, not to be offended with them that do use, to their satisfying, the auricular and secret confession to the Priest,' etc.

The exhortations of 1549 completely rearranged.

'That we receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine . . . may be partakers of,' for 'with thy Holy Spirit and word vouchsafe

to bless and sanctify these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood,' etc.

'Delivereth the bread . . . the cup' for 'delivereth the sacrament of the body of Christ . . . of the blood of Christ.'

'Into their hands' for 'in their mouths at the Priest's hand.'

Second part of present words of administration instead of the first.

'Vouchsafe to feed us, who have duly received these holy mysteries,' for 'vouchsafed to feed us in these holy mysteries.'

'A good number,' instead of 'some' necessary to communicate with the priest, the 'good number' being given as 'four or three at the least,' even in a parish with not more than twenty communicants.

Bread 'usual to be eaten,' instead of 'unleavened and round'; 'three times in the year,' instead of 'once.'

c. Additions.

Ten Commandments.

'Militant here in earth' added.

Rubric concerning notices.

Delivery 'into the hands' of the people 'kneeling.'

Rubric regulating disposal of surplus bread and wine.

The Black Rubric.

d. Transpositions.

Gloria from beginning to end of Service.

Prayer for Christ's Church, entirely broken up and rearranged.

Confession, etc., before consecration.

Lord's Prayer after communicating.

First Thanksgiving taken out of Prayer at Consecration, and made an alternative after communicating.

The following alterations outside the Communion Office also bear upon it :—

Provision for Double Communion for Christmas and Easter omitted.

Communion Table allowed to stand in the middle of the Church.

Reservation for the Sick omitted.

Celebration at burial omitted.

The relation between the two Edwardian books is plain enough from these lists of changes; the second is the first with the removal of whatever had been proved by experience to be ambiguous. It is significant that every detail fastened upon by Gardiner as a loop-hole for the Mass, was altered. Nor was any room left for any Lutheran idea of a Corporal Presence, a matter of grave importance in view of current controversy, seeing that the work of 1552 is the B.C.P. of to-day. The proof of this last statement will now appear.*

On the accession of Queen Elizabeth the 1552 B.C.P. was expressly restored, with three alterations, 'and none other or otherwise.' The three specified alterations were (1) the omission of the petition against the Bishop of Rome in the Litany, (2) new Tables of Lessons, and (3) the addition of the words of administration in 1549 to those prescribed in 1552, making our

* The holes and corners in which the Real Corporal Presence and Mass-Sacrifice are still pretended to be found, will be noted in the last section of this Introduction, pp. 269 ff.

present compound sentences. The too common phrase 'Prayer-Book of Queen Elizabeth' is, therefore, a misnomer, and actually misleading as liable to convey the impression that revision of any kind took place. The one alteration in the Communion Service, above-described, simply restored words of administration with some claim to scriptural accuracy and doctrinal safety; the words 'which was given,' 'which was shed,' especially with the words of 1552 retained: 'Take and eat this,' 'Drink this in remembrance:' effectually safeguarded the change from misinterpretation. However, two other changes appeared in the *printed* B.C.P. which have been cited as evidence of a retrogression in doctrine:—(1) the unauthorized Rubrics prefacing Morning Prayer, (2) the omission of the 'Black Rubric.' The former of these matters is dealt with elsewhere (pp. 76 ff.). The Black Rubric will also receive attention elsewhere, but the simple fact that it was not part of the 1552 B.C.P., but a Royal Proclamation appended thereto, divests its omission of any significance whatever.*

The final form taken by the XXXIX Articles, and the addition of that portion of the Catechism which deals with the Sacraments, are the two important additions to the B.C.P. between 1552 and 1662. This last addition was made in 1604, and sundry occasional prayers and thanksgivings were added, the B.C.P. thus enlarged being often called the Prayer Book of James I.

6. Liturgical Changes at the Restoration.

In estimating the intention and effect of the last revision of the B.C.P., preponderating attention should be paid to the Revisers' own Preface. They state, by the pen of Bishop Sander-son, that in spite of various alterations 'the main body and essentials of it (as well in the chiefest materials, as in the frame and order thereof) have still continued the same unto this day, and do yet stand firm and unshaken'; they are 'fully persuaded in (their) judgments, and here profess it to the world that the book as it stood before, is free from error'; and that with no desire 'to gratify this or that party in any way' they set about revising the book with practical aims, the general account of their alterations being that they were made to:—

1. Guide the clergyman in Divine Service.
2. Alter archaic and ambiguous language.
3. Embody the improved English Version of Holy Scripture.
4. Add special services for special occasions.

Despite this straightforward declaration of policy, concluding

* For further information see pp. 273 ff; 365 ff.

with an appeal for comparison of the old and new, when they 'doubt not but the reason of the change may easily appear,' there is a tendency to attribute to the revision an effect which credits the Revisers with a deep dark plot to undermine the doctrine, (especially the doctrine of the Lord's Supper), of the Church of England. This charge has been often and openly brought: 'The Revisers seized the opportunity (contrary to what the public was reckoning upon) to make our formularies not more Puritanic, but more Catholic. They effected this, without doubt, stealthily, and, to appearance, by the minutest alteration; but to compare the Communion Service as it now stands, especially in its rubrics, with the form in which we find it previously to that transaction, will be to discover that, without any change of features which could cause alarm, a new spirit was then breathed into our Communion Service.*' On the same page is added 'It has actually escaped general observation. Wheatley on the Liturgy notices the changes; but though himself a High Churchman, overlooks their import. Nicholls, if I remember right, scarcely adverts to the fact; and Shepherd, who meant to take pains, seems not to have known anything of the matter.'

What then are these changes, designed to effect so much, yet recognized not even by their authors nor by any one else for two centuries? The Laudian movement, with all its tendencies to exclusive episcopalianism, Arminianism, and the revival of discarded outward forms, did not seriously touch the doctrine of Holy Communion. In the temper of the Protestant world over the Thirty Years' War, and active papal propagandism by the Jesuits, that high-handed disregard of the rubrics which ordered the altar-wise position of the Lord's Table and the railing it in, loomed large enough to help to embitter the nation against Laud, but it would hardly bear to be construed as a doctrinal innovation, save by implication. Treatises on the Lord's Supper might defend the Church of England from imputations of Zwinglianism, by asserting that the Presence to the hearts of the faithful was a 'Real' Presence, and even (less wisely) by using the word 'oblation' in a sense which the B.C.P. had carefully avoided, but the doctrine of the Church of England was untouched.

The failure of the Savoy Conference in 1661 was perhaps to be expected, with both parties in the land indisposed to concession; but when the revision was handed over to Convocation, there was at any rate some sign of a willingness to meet the desires of the Puritans, and, as will shortly be seen, some of the

* Alexander Knox, *Remains*, Vol. i. p. 60: from Dimock, *History of the Prayer Book*, p. 68.

changes recently attributed to an imaginary longing for the B.C.P. of 1549, were actually changes granted at the request of the Puritans. There certainly was a party anxious to introduce such changes as are to be seen in the ill-fated Scottish Liturgy of 1637, but that party met with no success; the famous note in Sancroft's handwriting runs: 'My Lords the Bishops at Ely House ordered all in the old method': the changes proposed were not adopted. Mention of some of these rejected proposals will indicate the true nature of the revision:—

1. To substitute 'Catholic Church' for 'Church Militant here in earth,' so as to include the dead in the prayer by the words 'we, and all they which are of the mystical body of Thy Son, may be set at His right hand.'
2. To prefix 'priest the' to 'minister of God's Word.'
3. To provide 'another method of the Consecration, Oblation, Address, and Distribution,' including:—
 - a. Invocation of the Holy Spirit and the Word on the bread and wine.
 - b. After Consecration a rubric: 'Immediately after shall follow this Memorial or Prayer of Oblation.'
 - c. 'We Thy humble servants do celebrate and make here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, the Memorial which Thy Son hath willed and commanded us to make . . . death of Thy Son Jesus Christ, now represented unto Thee.'
 - d. 'That whosoever shall be partakers of this Holy Communion, may worthily receive the most precious body and blood of Thy Son Jesus.'
 - e. *Agnus Dei* to be sung during administration.
4. The Table always to stand in the East.
5. The Priest to 'offer up and place' the elements on the Table.
6. Wafer bread to be allowed.

The rejection of these proposals, to be seen inserted in the 'Durham' or 'Bodleian' Books or Laud's B.C.P. of 1637, used by the Revisers, is most significant, and corroborates the evidence of the Preface. The mistake, often made, is due to the failure to distinguish between the temper of the Commission, which made no alterations, and the Convocation which did make concessions to the Puritans. The spirit of the latter, and not of the former, is to be regarded as the motive of the revision of 1662.

The changes actually made may be seen in the following list:—

Notice required some time the day before.

Ordinary to be informed of any refusal to admit to the Lord's Table.

Direction to people to kneel at commencement of the office.

Enlargement of rubric explaining the Kyrie.

'The Priest standing as before,' for 'standing up,' before Collect for the King.

Creed 'sung or said' for 'said.'

Notices put before the Sermon; enlarged list of notices, with restriction of notice-giving to the Minister, who must announce only what is prescribed in the B.C.P., or by the King or the Ordinary.

'Then shall the Priest return to the Lord's Table and begin the Offertory' added; 'earnestly exhort them to remember the poor' omitted.

Alms 'and other devotions' to be gathered into 'a decent basin' which must be reverently brought to the Priest 'who shall humbly present and place it upon the Holy Table.'

'Deacons' added to Churchwardens, etc., as Collectors.

Rubric to 'place upon the Table' the bread and wine, added.

'And oblations' added to Prayer for Church Militant; 'or oblations' to indented rubric.

Clause beginning 'And we also bless thy holy name' added.

Exhortation of 1552, to be 'sometime' said at the discretion of the Curate, adapted for use as a regular exhortation for announcing Holy Communion.

In exhortation to the negligent 'in the remembrance of the sacrifice of his death' for 'in the remembrance of his death.'

In same exhortation paragraph omitted expressly condemning 'gazers and lookers on them that do communicate.'

Reference to confession 'before this congregation' omitted.

Leading in the confession restricted to 'one of the Ministers.'

'Pronounce this Absolution' instead of 'says thus.'

'Holy Father' to be omitted from 'It is very meet, right,' etc., on Trinity Sunday.

'As at this time' for 'as this day' in Christmas Preface, and for 'this day' in Whit-Sunday Preface.

'Be sung or said' for 'follow' in Rubric before 'Therefore with Angels,' etc.

'The Lord's Table' for 'God's board' in Rubric before Prayer of humble access.

'When the Priest, standing before the Table, hath so ordered the Bread and Wine, that he may with the more readiness and decency break the Bread before the people, and take the cup into his hands' added to Rubric before the 'Prayer of Consecration,' this name being then first given.

Five indented Rubrics in Prayer of Consecration, and 'Amen' at close of Prayer, added.

Rubric for consecrating additional bread and wine added.

Rubric for replacing and covering surplus consecrated bread and wine added.

'The mystical body of thy Son' for 'thy mystical body' in 2nd Post-Communion Prayer.

'One or more' for 'one' in rubric directing use of collects when there is no Communion.

'Sundays and other Holy-days' for 'Holy-days' in rubric directing method of closing service when no communion on such days.

'Closing with the Blessing,' added to that rubric.

'Convenient number' for 'good number,' in rubric forbidding celebration without sufficient communicants.

Omission of 'at the table with other meats' after 'Bread be such as is usual to be eaten.'

Curate to have bread and wine remaining, only if unconsecrated, the consecrated not to be carried out of the Church, but reverently eaten and drunk immediately after the Blessing, by the Priest and such other of the communicants as he shall then call unto him.

Omission, in the Rubric relating to provision of bread and wine, of the words: 'and the Parish shall be discharged of such sums of money, or other duties, which hitherto they have paid for the same, by order of their houses every Sunday.'

Rubric added, concerning disposal of offertory.

'Black Rubric' re-introduced, being the Royal Proclamation of 1552, altered by the re-arrangement of one clause, the addition of the word 'therein' before 'given to all worthy receivers,' and the substitution of 'corporal' for 'real and essential' before 'presence,' beside verbal changes of no significance whatever.

N.B.—The alteration of compulsory to suggested Communion in Marriage Service.

Of these changes the following, amongst others, were directly due to the Puritan objections at the Savoy Conference:—

1. Notice required some time the day before.
2. Leading in the confession restricted to 'one of the ministers.'
3. 'As at this time' for 'as this day.'
4. Indented Rubrics in Prayer of Consecration, which name is practically that used in the Puritan request: 'Prayer at the Consecration.'

5. The Black Rubric was restored at their request, covering all alterations with regard to kneeling.

The following are the alterations most generally supposed to mark a retrograde movement:—

1. Addition of remembrance of the faithful dead in the Prayer for Church Militant.
2. Alteration of rubrics regarding presentation of alms, and placing of bread and wine on the Table.
3. 'Remembrance of the Sacrifice of his death' for 'remembrance of his death.'
4. 'Pronounce this absolution' instead of 'say this.'
5. Rubric before Prayer of Consecration, directing the ordering of bread and wine.
6. 'Prayer of Consecration.'
7. 'Paten' and 'Chalice.'
8. 'Amen' at end of Consecration.
9. Rubric commanding surplus bread and wine to be covered.
10. Alteration in wording of Black Rubric.

The separate doctrinal effect (if any) of these alterations will be noted either in the following section, or in their place in the Exposition. Their general effect, as indicative of the tendency of the last revision, can be summed up in a very few words:—

1. The Preface disclaims 'to the world' any doctrinal tendency at all.
2. The known proposals containing a doctrinal tendency towards higher sacramental doctrine were ignored.
3. The alterations supposed to embody higher sacramental doctrine were largely due to Puritan suggestion.
4. Such alterations as the relaxation of the rule requiring the Communion after matrimony, and others outside the Communion Service, pointed the other way.*

If, therefore, it is still held that the 1662† B.C.P. represents a retrograde step doctrinally, it is held at the cost of the honesty of the Revisers, the facts of historical research, and the plain meaning of the alterations themselves, which are, on this theory, to be interpreted by the use of the words 'Paten' and 'Chalice,' 'Amen' at the end of a Prayer, 'Absolution' in the rubric preceding a prayer (inserted in Morning and Evening Prayer in 1552), thankful remembrance of the faithful dead, as desired by Bucer, and as safeguarded from Prayer for the Dead by the retention of the Title 'Church Militant here in earth,' and the injunction to cover the unconsumed bread and wine after administration.‡

7. Interpretative Principles of the Tractarian Movement.

No changes have taken place in the Communion Office since 1662, save the necessary alterations of royal names. Such doctrinal variations, however, as the use of the word 'altar' in Coronation Services, and the introduction of prayer for the dead into occasional special offices, illustrate the new method of affecting the doctrinal standards of the Church of England, viz. by the imposition of a new meaning upon her unaltered formularies. This new method is due to a school of thought originating in the 'Tracts for the Times,' and well known as 'The Oxford Movement.' In spite of the Prefaces to the B.C.P., and to the Articles, claiming that 'any man' can understand all changes; that all ceremonies 'are set forth that every man may understand what they do mean, and to what use they do serve, so that it is not like that they in time to come should be abused'; and that 'no man hereafter shall either print,

* The regulation for consecrating more bread or wine separately is definitely opposed to Roman directions: Canon Estcourt, (R.C.), terms it the revival of 'the sacrilegious rubric of 1548,' because it allows a second consecration in one kind, destructive of any sacrificial idea in consecration.

† Convocation completed its work on December 20, 1661, but the revised book only became law on May 19, 1662.

‡ The inclusion of the words 'the sacrifice of' (No. 3 in list) suggests no alteration of doctrine.

or preach, to draw the Article aside any way, but shall submit to it in the plain and full meaning thereof, and . . . shall take it in the literal and grammatical sense,' yet a microscopical search has been made by the new school for words and phrases, rubrical and devotional, which may serve to establish an interpretation of the B.C.P. unknown to its authors, and to three centuries of Christian life and thought.

Though no part of the B.C.P. has been neglected in this search, those parts which deal with the doctrine of the Lord's Supper have naturally been most in the minds of those whose position depends upon the mediæval ideas of a Corporal Presence and priestly Sacrifice.

To assist the student by gathering into one place the items chiefly relied upon by the new school, they are here submitted to brief discussion. Two of these may be dealt with summarily.

(1) The 'Ornaments Rubric' has been dealt with in its place on pp. 76 ff.; here it needs only to repeat that according to some modern interpretations, it teaches doctrine as well as ritual, the assumption being that the 'ornaments' prescribed therein carry with them the doctrines connoted by their use. (2) The retention of such words as 'Mass,' 'Canon,' and 'Altar,' in 1549, are often used as a justification for their re-introduction; it would seem, however, that the use of such words in 1549, with their subsequent rejection, tells in precisely the opposite direction.

In regard to the other items, consisting of minute details of phraseology in the present B.C.P., it is necessary to remark that they must be interpreted not by their possible meaning in another connexion, or in no connexion at all, but by their relation to their context, to any alterations in that context which have taken place, and to the professed interpretation of them by those who introduced them. It is justifiable to scrutinize with care a method of interpretation which depends upon minute and scattered phrases: which demands their consideration in isolation from their surroundings and history: which claims an equivocal passage as necessarily supporting only one of two possible views: which, finally, supersedes the general witness of the whole B.C.P. and its history.

(1) **In the First Exhortation in the Communion Office** :—'God hath given His Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ . . . to be our spiritual food and sustenance *in that holy Sacrament*. Which, being so divine and comfortable a thing to them who receive *it* worthily, and so dangerous to them that presume to receive *it* unworthily,' etc.

It is contended that, 'holy sacrament' being the antecedent

to 'which,' and Jesus Christ being 'in that holy sacrament,' and 'it' being capable of unworthy reception, Jesus Christ is present independently of the worthiness of the recipient. If it should be replied that 'sacrament' means only the externals, the bread and wine, then, it is argued, Christ must be in the bread and wine. It is claimed that whichever meaning of Sacrament be chosen, a Real Objective Presence is taught by these words.

The answer is :—

(a) Apart from any flaw in the argument, the explicit statement of the title of Article XXIX : 'Of the wicked which eat not the Body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper' : must govern the interpretation of this hortative language, and not *vice versa*.

(b) The Exhortation states that God has given His Son, not to be in that holy Sacrament, but to be our spiritual food therein. It is for us by worthy reception of the Sacrament, to accept or reject God's gift of His Son.

(c) The two-fold use of the word 'Sacrament,' first as both outward and inward, then as outward only, is too common to justify any deduction from such double use here.

(2) **1st and 3rd Exhortations, etc.** : 'Mystery, mysteries.'

The suggestion is that such a term could not be applied to the bread and wine, without there being some change in them deserving such a title, and though the whole rite may be intended elsewhere, the plain meaning of the words in the second Post-Communion Collect : 'duly received these holy mysteries' : forbids its application to aught but the consecrated elements.

The point of this argument turns on the meaning of the word 'mystery,' the signification of which had originally nothing to do with 'mystification,' the literal translation of the Greek word being 'secret,' either from Greek *μύω*, 'shut,' or Heb. *mistar*, 'secret place.' It is, therefore, only properly applicable to bread and wine as such, and not at all to bread and wine which have ceased to be figurative; as Bertram says : 'If there be no figure in that mystery, it is not properly called a mystery.' St. Paul uses the word many times, of the Gospel, of faith, etc., where the application of the modern meaning of the word makes either a wrong sense or no sense at all. The literal application of the four words 'This is my body' to bread destroys its 'mystery,' as a secret : cf. Art. XXVIII, 'overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament,' i.e. confounds the figure with that which is figured, so that there is no 'mystery'—no 'secret'—left.

(3) **Prayer of Humble Access** : 'Grant us . . . so to eat the flesh . . . and to drink his blood, that our sinful bodies may

be made clean by his body,' etc. The inference is that it is possible so to partake of Christ's flesh and blood as not to be made clean, etc., i.e. that the wicked can partake of that flesh and blood, which are therefore not dependent upon the faith of the recipient.

Here is to be observed a curious ignorance of the English idiom of the B.C.P. The word 'so' may be used before 'that' to signify 'in such a manner' or 'with such a result.' To-day the separation of 'so' from 'that' implies the meaning 'in such a manner,' three centuries ago it did not: cf. 'so assist us with thy grace, that we may continue in that holy fellowship.' This does not leave any room for God's *so* assisting us with His grace that we may *not* continue in that holy fellowship.*

(4) **The Words of Administration.** The argument is that the former part of the words declare the bread and wine then given to be the Lord's Body and Blood, and that the 'this' of the second clauses refers to the 'Body' and 'Blood' of the preceding clauses. The history of the words is sufficient answer to all argument; the first sentence of 1549 is an old form with the significant addition of '*which was given (was shed) for thee*'; the second, in 1552, took the place of the first to silence misinterpretation; the two were combined in 1559, in order to preserve the ancient form and yet safeguard it from misuse. The 'this,' of the 1552 clauses, could only mean the elements then given to the recipient; this is all it means now.

(5) **The First Post-Communion Collect:** 'this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.' 'This,' it is said, refers to the Communion just administered, which is called a sacrifice. To most readers of the Bible, however, the form of the words is enough to solve all doubts, 'sacrifice of praise' being the very language of Heb. xiii. 15, and 'thanksgiving' being the summary of the latter part of that verse, which cautiously explains the ambiguous word 'sacrifice'—'that is the fruit of our lips giving thanks to His Name.' Thus is precluded any meaning in the phrase save 'sacrifice which consists of praise and thanksgiving.' † But historically the words 'sacrifice of praise' had been used in a sense which took 'sacrifice' literally and not figuratively, the words 'of praise' being descriptive, and not a *definition of the thing offered* in sacrifice. It is therefore to be granted that the phrase alone is ambiguous, but the following facts will remove

* Several other examples from B.C.P. may be found in Dimock, *Eucharistic Presence*, p. 438.

† It has been suggested that the word 'this' may refer here, not to the praise and thanksgiving of the rite as a whole, but to the sacrifice mentioned in the remainder of the prayer.

the ambiguity. In 1549 the same words formed part of the long Consecration Prayer, where, immediately after Consecration, came: 'Wherefore . . . we . . . do celebrate and make here before thy divine Majesty, with these thy holy gifts, the memorial which thy Son hath willed us to make . . . entirely desiring thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.' The following words of Cranmer show what he meant by the phrase: 'His (Christ's) Sacrifice . . . was the taking away the Sins of the world; ours is a praising and thanking for the same . . . this is the priest's and people's sacrifice.' However, 'mis-taking' compelled the re-arrangement of the whole service in 1552; these words were taken from before administration, and placed after it, where their application to the completed rite is unmistakable; the words about making a memorial before God were omitted as unscriptural; and the newly-made Post-Communion Collect became an alternative to the already existing one, so that the phrase was deprived of any important doctrinal teaching by its use being not obligatory.*

The expressed desire to make this prayer obligatory in any new revision is evidence that those who would press the literal sacrificial meaning, recognize the hopelessness of so doing with the B.C.P. as it stands. †

(6) **The 'Black Rubric.'** Nothing is more confidently affirmed than that the alteration of the original wording of this note in 1552 on its reintroduction in 1662, has restored the doctrine of the Real Presence to the Church of England, for the original had 'Real and Essential' where the revisers put 'Corporal,' thereby implicitly allowing the Real Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood.

The answer is plain:—

(a) The 'Rubric' was reintroduced at the request of the Puritans, to explain that kneeling at reception should not be misconstrued into adoration ‡ of *any* Presence in the Elements.

(b) It expressly states this to be the purpose of its reintroduction.

* That the 'this' was not meant to refer to any of the bread and wine left after distribution, is proved by the words of Bishop Cosin, pointing out that if, as the Scottish Book of 1637 directs, proper care is used in consecrating, it is easy to avoid having any consecrated bread left.

† For the attempts to use the Greek of the words 'Do this' and 'Remembrance' to establish the idea of literal sacrifice see pp. 216, 7 above. The direction to the Celebrant to use the Roman Missal in his private prayers immediately after the B.C.P. form of Consecration, so as to intrude the sacrificial idea, is, apart from its questionableness on moral grounds, a confession of the non-sacrificial form of our Liturgy.

‡ For the practice of Adoration, see p. 366.

duction: 'lest the same kneeling should . . . out of ignorance and infirmity, or out of malice and obstinacy, be misconstrued and depraved.'

(c) It declares kneeling to be for the spiritual reason of humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ therein given to all worthy Receivers, and for the practical reason of avoiding possible profanation and disorder.

(d) It forbids adoration of either 'the sacramental Bread or Wine there bodily received,' or 'any Corporal Presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood,' exchanging the ambiguous words, 'real and essential,' for the unequivocal word 'corporal.' 'Real,' etymologically derived from *res*, 'the thing,' and 'essential,' etymologically derived from *esse*, 'being,' had come to mean, since Cranmer's time, what they now mean. Every Christian believes in the 'reality' of Christ's Presence to all worthy receivers at Holy Communion in that later sense; what Cranmer meant by 'Real Presence' is just what advocates of a Real Presence in the elements mean by it to-day, and is excluded by the word 'Corporal.'

(e) It gives as the reason for forbidding adoration, that 'the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances,' so that to adore them is to be abhorred as idolatry; that the natural Body and Blood of Christ are in Heaven and not here; and that it destroys the truth of His Natural Body to imagine it to be in more places than one. In any sense, therefore, in which Christ's Body can be the Body which was given for us, it is never on earth, according to this Rubric, so that any kind of Real Presence (in the old sense of the word 'real') is expressly denied.

(f) To fancy some Presence of a 'Spiritual Body' as taught or even justified by the omission of the words 'Real Presence' (nowhere to be found in B.C.P.) is to attribute to the Revisers something of which they are known to have been innocent; the Bishops' reply at the Savoy Conference was: 'The posture of kneeling best suits at the Communion, as the most convenient, and so most decent for us, when we are to receive, as it were from God's hand, the greatest of seals of the Kingdom of heaven.' Convocation, more desirous of placating the Puritans, certainly did not mean more than the Bishops at the Conference, unless their honesty is to be impugned.

(g) What Presence is possible, which leaves the Sacramental bread and wine still in their very natural substance, and leaves Christ's Body, given for us, in Heaven? Attempts have been made to avoid this dilemma by boldly claiming that the 'rubric' is not binding—a suggestive cutting of the Gordian knot—and

by claiming that the 'rubric' excludes a carnal, physical, Presence, but not a 'Spiritual Presence,' this last trading on an ambiguity in the use of the word 'Spiritual.' St. Paul uses the word (1 Cor. xv.) as meaning 'belonging to the spirit,' contrasting the 'spiritual body' with that 'belonging to the soul' (A.V. 'natural body'). In that sense the Lord's body is now a 'spiritual body,' and is 'in heaven, and not here.' Upholders of a Real Presence in, with, or under the forms of bread and wine, intend to convey by 'Spiritual Presence,' the Presence of some imaginary 'body' made of 'spirit,' a meaningless self-contradictory suggestion, which cannot bear for one moment the investigation of the word 'spiritual.' The true spiritual Presence of Christ is His Presence by His Spirit, to our spirits, and no other Presence is thinkable without violence to the truth of His Incarnation and perfect manhood.

(7) *The First Book of Homilies*,* notice at its close: 'Hereafter shall follow sermons . . . of the due receiving of His blessed Body and Blood, under the form of bread and wine.' The first 160 pages of Pusey's work, *The Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church*, are devoted to this.†

The following considerations will show the futility of any arguments based upon the words of this notice:—

(a) This argument for building a doctrine upon a notice proceeds from those who reject the binding authority of the titles of the Articles; see below, p. 277.

(b) The notice was issued in July, 1547, when, as Pusey admitted, Cranmer's belief as to the Real Presence was not what it was afterwards; when not even the Order of Communion had been issued; and when it was penal to doubt Transubstantiation, the Six Articles Act being still unrepealed until December 24. One of the Homilies was from the pen of Bonner.

(c) When the Second Book of Homilies appeared, in Elizabeth's reign, the title of this Homily was changed, though most of the others retained the titles given in the notice appended to the First Book.

(d) The Article authorizing the Homilies mentions the titles of the Second Book, sanctioning thereby not the 1547 title of the promised Homily, but 'Of the worthy receiving of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ.'

(e) Cranmer replied to Gardiner's claim that in the 1549 B.C.P. 'it is there said, the body and blood of Christ to be under the

* This and the three following passages are not in the Communion Office itself, but so immediately bear upon it, as to demand treatment in this place.

† See Goode, *On the Eucharist, Supplement*, pp. 20–22.

form of bread and wine':—'When you shall show the place where this form of words is expressed, then shall you purge yourself of that, which in the meantime I take to be a plain untruth.'*

(f) The teaching of the Homily, as is well known, directly opposes the doctrinal accompaniments of the Real Presence.

(8) The Catechism: 'Q. What is the inward part, or thing signified? A. The Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.'

The argument for the teaching of a Real Objective Presence in this passage is largely dependent upon an exploded idea of the opinions of Overall, the Author of this part of the Catechism,† whose opinions, moreover, orthodox or unorthodox, could in no case bind the Catechism, which was, as Wheatley says, 'allowed by the bishops' at the Hampton Court Conference, including Whitgift. It was made to meet the view of the Puritans of 1604, and definitely approved by the Puritans of 1661 at the Savoy Conference.

To put the matter briefly, the language is scriptural, both in what it includes, and in what it excludes. Christ is received 'by the faithful' in the Lord's Supper; such oneness with Christ, in His own ordinance, on the part of those who are His own, is not denied; in fact, it is greatly due to a belittling of the sacramental belief of the reformed churches, by those who seek to establish a doctrine of a Corporal Presence of some kind, that any idea has arisen that there is anything in these words needing explanation by those who reject that Corporal Presence. Christ is not received by the faithless, nor by the faithful in virtue of the physical reception of bread and wine—except, of course, that that reception is part of the obedience of faith.‡

The attempt has been made to interpret 'faithful' as here used in a loose theological sense, somewhat resembling 'Christian,' as applied to a country. This interpretation, however, is expressly excluded elsewhere. Cf. Art. XXVIII, XXIX.

(9) Article XXIX. 'Of the wicked which eat not,' etc. Here has to be met an attempt to explain away a serious indictment against any 'Presence' (independent of the faith of the recipient),

* Dimock, *Eucharistic Presence*, pp. 230 ff., shows by quotations that the Real Objective Presence is not necessarily taught by the words in question, even were they authoritative.

† Dimock, *Euch. Pr.*, pp. 295 ff.

‡ The Irish B.C.P. has added a Q. and A. to the Catechism here, explaining the reception to be after a heavenly and spiritual manner, by faith, using the actual language of the second paragraph of Art. XXVIII.

rather than to enlist language on behalf of that position. The argument is that in correct theological language 'partakers of Christ' does not mean what it appears to mean, but 'partakers of the benefits of Christ's Presence,' which benefits of course the wicked do not enjoy.

It is, perhaps, useless to urge that the Royal Declaration prefixed to the Articles speaks of 'the plain and full meaning,' and 'the literal and grammatical sense,' but the complete absence of any such 'theological' sense of 'partakers of Christ,' in any writings of the Reformers in the period when the Articles were drawn up, demands an answer. The 'theological' sense appears in the pleadings of those who, both in Cranmer's time and now, are called upon to reconcile their belief that the wicked can partake of Christ with the plain statements of Holy Scripture attaching everlasting life to any feeding on Christ. Bradford and Jewel both had to meet this imaginary distinction between real receiving and effectual receiving of Christ.

The refusal to regard the title as authoritative has been already alluded to above (p. 275), in connexion with the argument drawn from the notice closing the First Book of Homilies, of 1547. But, whether authoritative or not, this title was set in its place by those who passed the Article, and is therefore authoritatively interpretative of the meaning of the Article in the eyes of those who thus passed it.

Again, this Article was kept out of the printed copies, though it passed Convocation in 1562, because it too plainly shut out all believers in a Real Corporal Presence, including Lutherans. Why should this have been, if in the theological language of the time it did no such thing? Bradford was put to death for 'the denial of wicked men to receive the Lord's Body'; other Reformers used the same language. Rogers' *Exposition of the Articles*, 1585, 'perused and by the lawful authority of the Church of England, allowed to be public,' speaks of the 'ubiquitaries, both Lutheran and Popish . . . saying the very body of Christ, at the Lord's Supper, is eaten as well of the wicked as of the godly,' as 'adversaries of this doctrine,' i.e. that of the Article. To the indefensible argument, that the Article cannot mean what it says because certain bishops responsible for it were opposed, viz., Parker, Cheney and Geste, see the full answer in Dimock, *Euchar. Pres.*, pp. 629 ff. Archbishop Parker visited Cheney with ecclesiastical penalties for his Lutheran tendencies; Geste's and Cheney's opposition proves the Article to mean what it says. In the same place will be found full reply to the further allegation that as Augustine is mentioned in the Article, and he believed the wicked to take Christ's body (?), therefore the

Article cannot mean what it says;—as though the teaching of the English Church depended upon either the doctrine of St. Augustine, or the authenticity of certain words quoted from him, instead of upon the obvious purpose and meaning of their quotation by the framers of the Article.

(10) Article XXXI, 'the sacrifices of Masses.' Again the difficulty created is an argument not so much to establish any dogma, as to get rid of the plain force of language subversive of a dogma.

It is asserted:—

(a) That the phrase 'the sacrifices of Masses' is not 'the sacrifice of the Mass.'

To this contention, not generally held now, it is enough to reply that the plural term is used as equivalent to the singular in many authoritative documents.*

(b) That the words 'commonly said' could not be used of an authoritative doctrine, so the Article must be directed against some popular misconception, and not against the Roman doctrine of Mass-Sacrifice.

But there was no authoritative doctrine of the Mass-Sacrifice in 1553 when the Article was written, so that the framers of the Article could only say 'commonly said.' The Missal itself contains no verbal oblation of Christ, as the Reformers often pointed out in appealing to the Missal against the Roman Mass.

(c) That the rejected doctrine is one inconsistent with the one offering of Christ once made, with which the Roman Mass claims not to be inconsistent.

But the Reformers thought and taught that the Roman Mass is inconsistent with, and derogates from, the completeness of the finished work of Christ, disputing the Roman claims.

(d) That the strong language used, 'blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits,' must point to something more grossly corrupt than Mass-Sacrifice.

But the Reformers believed that nothing could be more gross than to put a limitation to the redemption wrought once for all on the Cross, and believed that limitation essentially to attach to the received Roman teaching of Mass-Sacrifice.

(e) That the special error denounced in the Article is that Christ's Death took away *original* sin, the Mass being used for *actual* sins of baptized Christians—a dogma taught by some eminent Romans, and credited to Roman Catholicism generally by the Lutherans, but repudiated authoritatively.

But the language in which Rome repudiates this special error emphatically teaches for truth the very thing condemned in the Article, namely that the Mass does benefit the quick and

* See Dimock, *Dangerous Deceits*, p. 10, and *Appendix*, Note A.

the dead, by the offering of Christ therein.* Rome has never repudiated the language attributed to the doctrine of the Mass in that Article; nor were the Martyrs put to death for disbelieving what Rome herself repudiated. The Homily clearly teaches what the Reformers believed and what they disbelieved: 'Christ commanded to His Church a Sacrament of His Body, and Blood: they have changed it into a sacrifice for the quick and the dead.'

It is worth noting, in conclusion, that when, in 1562, the Council of Trent anathematised those who said that the Mass-Sacrifice was 'blasphemous' as detracting from the sacrifice of Christ on the Cross, in the revision of the Articles which took place immediately afterwards, the Reformers added 'blasphemous' to the word 'fables' in the Latin copy, the English version being similarly altered in 1571, 'forged fables' (*figmenta*) becoming 'blasphemous fables' (*blasphema figmenta*).

Omission and Prohibition.

Against such unsuccessful efforts to read into the B.C.P. a doctrine already acquired outside it, must be set the designed excision therein of both the idea of a Presence of Christ in the elements, and also that of a sacrifice of any kind save the scriptural ones of thanksgiving, self-sacrifice, and self-surrender. The effect of the contrast is felt even by those who persevere in grafting upon the Church of England the doctrines rejected by her, and justification is now sought in the new-fangled principle that omission is not prohibition, i.e. that unless a doctrine is expressly repudiated, no amount of evidence of its removal from the B.C.P. will avail to prove it to be inconsistent with loyalty to the Church of England. A telling illustration of the effects of such a principle is to be seen in the following commentary upon the Prayer of Consecration, successively altered in 1549 and 1552 to get rid of the Corporal Presence and Mass-Sacrifice.

'The Prayer (of Consecration) avoids at *this point any express mention* of the consecration of the creatures of bread and wine, and of the work of the Holy Spirit in consecration: it is carefully worded so as not to express *any special theory* of consecration while consecrating *the sacrament*: the prayer has already been offered that we may duly eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood, and it is enough now to pray that we, receiving *those creatures of God*, may partake of that Body and Blood, *truly and really*, in a *sacramental* manner, according to the full meaning of Christ's Ordinance, *whatsoever that may be*, without specifying the *hidden way* in which the earthly elements are *made* conductors of the heavenly grace.' †

* Dimock, *ibid.* pp. 27–30.

† Frere, in *Procter & Frere*, last Edition, p. 492.

Note :—

(1) 'At this point.' There is no mention, save in the 1662 Title, of any consecration at *any* point, and 'the work of the Holy Spirit in consecration,' is not only wanting at any 'point,' but has been expunged from this point since 1552, the work of the Holy Spirit being to consecrate *us*, not the bread and wine—we consecrate the elements in the secondary sense of setting them apart for sacred use.

(2) 'Express mention.' The phrase suggests that somewhere there is *unexpressed* mention 'at this point'; but where? 'Avoided' is hardly a fair equivalent for 'excised' (see p. 336).

(3) 'Any special theory'—implies that any theory may be held, including Transubstantiation; the omission of the words 'that they may be to us the Body,' etc., in 1549, is, then, to be reckoned as of no doctrinal importance. Hence the prayer excludes, and does not merely fail to include 'any special theory of consecration.'

(4) 'Consecrating the Sacrament.' The word 'sacrament' is used for the bread and wine alone, i.e. not including the whole of the outward part (e.g. the breaking and the reception), and excluding all the inward part of the Sacrament. This use of the word allows the suggestion that both the outward and inward are in the bread and wine, antecedently to and apart from faithful reception.*

(5) 'Those creatures of God.' This variation of the B.C.P. words, 'these thy creatures of bread and wine,' is capable of a meaning foreign to the Prayer-Book words, which expressly exclude any idea of any change through consecration.

(6) 'Truly and really, in a sacramental manner.' Why qualify 'truly and really' with 'in a sacramental manner'? 'Sacrament' above meant bread and wine: does 'sacramental' here mean the same?

(7) 'Whatsoever that may be.' These words ignore the omission in B.C.P. of all ways of receiving Christ involving a Presence in the elements.

(8) 'Hidden way.' What is hidden, and from whom? Neither the B.C.P., nor Holy Scripture, has any idea of any 'hidden way,' save as all revelations, 'mysteries,' are hidden from *unbelief*.

(9) 'Made conductors.' The elements do not 'conduct' grace, which is only conferred upon faithful recipients of the elements. The word 'made' is, therefore, meaningless, or worse, as suggesting some miraculous change in the elements.

* The word 'Sacrament' is used in B.C.P. of the elements alone, e.g. Art. XXIX; but the phrase 'consecrating the Sacrament' is not to be found there.

COMPARATIVE TABLE OF COMMUNION OFFICES.

SARUM USE.	1549.	1552.	1662.
Private prepn. with	Introit	1.	1. Lord's Prayer
2. Collect	1. Lord's Prayer	2.	2. Collect
Antiphons, etc.	2. Collect	3.	3. Commandments
1. Lord's Prayer	Kyrie	4.	4. Collects for King
Hail Mary, etc.	30. Gloria	5.	5. Collect for day
Introit	4. Collects for King	6.	6. Epistle
Clergy Confessn.	5. Collect for day	7.	7. Gospel
Censing, Kyrie, etc.	6. Epistle	8.	8. Creed
30. Gloria	7. Gospel	10.	9. Notices
5. Collect, etc.	8. Creed	9.	10. Sermon
6. Epistle, etc.	10. Sermon	11.	11. Offertory Sentences
Gradual, censing	16. Exh. to communicants	—	12. Placing elements
7. Gospel, etc.	14. Exh. to negligent	13.	13. Prayer for Church
8. Creed	11. Offertory Sentences	15.	14. 1st Exhortation
Oblation of elements	12. Providing elements	14.	15. 2nd to negligent
Censing ditto	21. Lift up your hearts	17.	16. 3rd to Communicants
Handwashing	22. Prefaces	18.	17. Invitation
Secret prayers	23. Holy, Holy, Holy	19.	18. Confession
21. Lift up your hearts	13. Prayer for Church	20.	19. Absolution
22. Preface	25. Consecration	21.	20. Comfortable Words
23. Holy, Holy, Holy	28. Thanksgiving	22.	21. Lift up your hearts
23. Prayer for Church	27. Lord's Prayer	23.	22. Prefaces
25. Consecration	Versicles	24.	23. Holy, Holy, Holy
27. Lord's Prayer, etc.	Agnus Dei	25.	24. Humble Access
Agnus Dei	17. <i>Invitation</i>	26.	25. Consecration
Commixture	18. <i>Confession</i>		26. Administration words
The Pax	19. <i>Absolution</i>	27.	27. Lord's Prayer
Priest's reception	20. <i>Comfortable Words</i>	28.	28. Thanksgiving
Ablutions	24. <i>Humble Access</i>	29.	29. Alternative ditto
Collects	26. <i>Administration words</i>	30.	30. Gloria
Dismissal	Agnus Dei	31.	31. Blessing
Private Prayer	Sentences	—	32. Surplus consumed
Last Gospel	Versicles		
	29. Thanksgiving		
	31. Blessing		

Sarum Use is much shortened to bring it within limits for comparison (for closer comparison see pp. 256 ff.); portions of 1549 in Italics were in 1548 Order of Communion, used with the Missal: Words of Administration of 1549 and 1552 were combined in 1559 as in 1662; Exhortations were much changed in arrangement (see p. 319).

ANALYSIS AND HISTORICAL NOTES

	PAGE
Title, 1552 (1549).*	286

I. ANTE-COMMUNION.

† <i>Giving notice of intention to communicate</i> , 1549; <i>altered</i> 1662	290
<i>Warning notorious evil-livers</i> , 1549	291
<i>Warning those at variance</i> , 1549; <i>order to report to</i> <i>Ordinary</i> added 1662	291
<i>Defining place of Table, and position of Priest</i> , 1552; (1549)	291
Lord's Prayer, 1549; printed 1662.	297
Collect for purity, 1549	297
(Here in 1549 followed:—	
Introit.	
Lesser Litany.	
Gloria in excelsis.	
The Lord be with you, etc.)	
<i>Concerning the Commandments</i> , 1552; <i>enlarged</i> 1662.	298
Commandments, 1552	299
<i>Concerning Collects for the King</i> , 1549	299
Collects for the King, 1549	300
<i>Concerning Collect, Epistle and Gospel</i> , 1549; <i>altered</i> 1552 and 1662	300
Creed, 1549	304
<i>Respecting Notices</i> , 1552; <i>enlarged and placed before</i> <i>Sermon</i> , 1662	306
<i>Prescribing Sermon or Homily</i> , 1549; <i>altered</i> 1552 and 1662	307
(Here in 1549 followed:—	
†Exhortation to communicants.	
Exhortation to negligent.)	

* Dates are put into brackets when subsequent changes of position, wording, or both, are important.

† Rubrics are in italics and indented.

‡ For the intricate changes of arrangement of Exhortations see Table on p. 319.

	PAGE
<i>Regarding the Offertory Sentences</i> , 1549; <i>altered</i> 1552, <i>made separate Rubric</i> 1662	310
Offertory Sentences, 1549	310
<i>Regarding the collection of the offerings</i> , 1549; <i>altered</i> 1552 and 1662	311
<i>Ordering the placing of the bread and the wine</i> , 1662 (1549); <i>no directions</i> , 1552	312
(Here in 1549 followed:—	
The Lord be with you, etc., second time.	
Lift up your hearts, etc.	
Proper Prefaces.	
Ter Sanctus.	
Prayer for Church, including Consecration.)	
Prayer for Church Militant, 1552, (1549); last sentence added 1662	313
<i>Indented Rubric</i> , 1552; ' <i>oblations</i> ' added 1662	318
<i>Ordering Announcement of Holy Communion</i> , 1548, (1549); 1662	318
First Exhortation, 1548; enlarged for the negligent, 1549; some time said also, 1552; adapted for an- nouncing, and clause added from another Exhorta- tion, 1662	318
<i>Providing for the negligent</i> , 1549; <i>placed before Second</i> <i>Exhortation</i> . 1552	322
Second Exhortation, 1552; one clause omitted 1662..	323

II. COMMUNION.

<i>Directing that communicants be conveniently placed</i> , 1662; (1549)	323
Third Exhortation, 1548; placed here 1549; one clause transferred to First Exhortation, 1662	324
<i>Preceding the Invitation</i> , 1549, (1548); <i>placed here</i> 1552.	325
Fourth Exhortation (Invitation), 1548; placed here 1552.	326
<i>Regulating the Confession</i> , 1548	326
Confession, 1548	326
<i>Regarding the Absolution</i> , 1548; called ' <i>Absolution</i> ' 1662.	327
Absolution, 1548; altered 1549	327
Comfortable Words, 1548	327
Lift up your hearts, etc., 1549; placed here 1552	328
<i>Directing turning to the Lord's Table</i> , 1662	328
It is very meet, right, etc., 1549; placed here 1552	328
<i>Indented Rubric</i> , 1662	328
<i>Respecting Proper Prefaces</i> , 1549	328

Ter Sanctus, 1559 ; printed 1662	329
Proper Prefaces, 1549 :—	
(1) Christmas, 1549 ; seven days after, 1552	329
(2) Easter, 1549 ; seven days after, 1552	329
(3) Ascension, 1549 ; seven days after, 1552	329
(4) Whitsunday, 1549 ; six days after, 1552	330
(5) Trinity, 1549 ; in 1549, 1552, 'It is very meet,' etc., repeated with this Preface, 'holy Father' excepted	330
*Ter Sanctus, 1549 ; altered 1552	331
(Here in 1549 followed :—	
Long Prayer (the Canon),† including :—	
Petitions for living and dead.	
Consecration.	
Oblation.	
Thanksgiving.	
Lord's Prayer.	
Agnus Dei.	
Fourth Exhortation.	
Confession.	
Absolution.	
Comfortable Words.)	
<i>Preceding Prayer of Humble Access</i> , 1548	331
Prayer of Humble Access, 1548 ; placed here 1552	332
<i>Providing for arranging the bread and the wine</i> , 1662.	333
Prayer of Consecration, 1552 ; (1549)	334
<i>Indented Rubrics</i> , 1662 ; (1549)	339
<i>Prescribing the order of reception</i> , 1549, (1548) ; <i>altered</i> 1552 and 1662	340
<i>Regarding the administration of the bread</i> , 1548 ; <i>altered</i> 1552 and 1662	342
Words of administration of the bread, 1559 ; first part 1548, 1549 ; second 1552	342
<i>Regarding the administration of the wine</i> , 1548 ; <i>altered</i> 1552 and 1662	343
Words of administration of the wine, 1559 ; first part 1548, 1549 ; second 1552	345
<i>Directing Consecration of more bread or wine</i> , 1548 ; <i>wanting in</i> 1549, 1552 ; <i>altered and placed here</i> 1662	345
<i>Directing to cover with a fair linen cloth</i> , 1662	346
(In 1549 Agnus Dei sung during administration.)	

* The Ter Sanctus was originally printed here only.

† The term 'Canon' is used in 1549 Communion of the Sick: it disappeared in 1552.

III. POST-COMMUNION.

(In 1549 Post-Communion Sentences and Versicle.	
<i>Respecting the saying of the Lord's Prayer</i> , 1552	348
Lord's Prayer, 1549 ; placed here 1552 ; printed 1662	348
First alternative Thanksgiving, 1552 ; (1549)	349
Second alternative Thanksgiving, 1549 ; altered 1552	352
Gloria in excelsis, 1549 ; placed here with one sentence repeated 1552	353
<i>Regarding the method of dismissal</i> , 1548	354
Blessing, 1549 ; (1548)	354

APPENDIX.

<i>Concerning the use of Collects when no Communion</i> , 1549 ; <i>enlarged</i> 1552, <i>altered</i> 1662	354
Collects, 1549 ; two for Rain and Fair Weather placed elsewhere 1552	355
<i>Concerning Sundays, etc., when no Communion</i> , 1552 ; (1549)	356
<i>Prescribing a convenient number of communicants</i> , 1662 ; <i>some</i> , 1549 ; <i>good number</i> , 1552	356
<i>Fixing the minimum</i> , 3 out of 20, 1552 ; (1549)	356
<i>Ordering Clergy to communicate weekly in Cathedrals</i> , <i>etc.</i> , 1552	357
<i>Prescribing the use of purest Wheat Bread</i> , 1552 ; (1549)	357
<i>Directing the disposal of the bread and wine remaining</i> , 1662 ; (1552)	360
<i>Directing the provision of the bread and wine</i> , 1549 ; <i>altered</i> 1552 and 1662	362
<i>Ordering a minimum attendance of three times a year</i> , 1552 ; (1549)	362
<i>Regarding Easter Dues</i> , 1552 ; (1549)	364
<i>Regulating the disposal of the offerings</i> , 1662	365
'Black Rubric,' 1552 ; <i>omitted</i> 1559 ; <i>restored with verbal</i> <i>alterations</i> , 1662	365