

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



**PATREON**

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

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

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

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

## PART I.

THE history of the Book of Common Prayer is a subject which, in the present day, is urgently calling for a less superficial study than is commonly accorded to it.

It would be out of place here to attempt anything like a minute examination of the various corrections and emendations through which the book has passed in its various revisions.

But I believe the readers of the *CHURCHMAN* will welcome an attempt to set before them a fair and impartial view of the doctrinal character which has been impressed upon it, as seen in the light of its own history, and of the controversies through which it has had to make its way.

I must not be understood as pretending to have anything very new to say on the subject. Indeed, attention has already been directed to some of the matters which I desire now to bring into prominence. But there has been, as I am persuaded, so much of misunderstanding on the subject, that, as it seems to me, an effort may well be made to emphasize certain important lessons which certainly ought to be learnt by all who desire to know the mind of the Church of England on some of the burning questions of our own day.

It is of the first importance to take a true view of the two editions of the Prayer-Book, which are commonly known as the first and second Liturgies of King Edward VI. And present circumstances demand that our attention should be fastened on the service for the Holy Communion.

The comparative study of this service as contained in the two books of 1549 and 1552 is full of instruction. And in order to apprehend this instruction aright, there are four questions to be asked. And to these questions it will be my endeavour, very briefly, to give a clear and sufficient answer.

These questions are as follow :

1. In what relation did the first book of Edward stand to earlier service-books ?
2. What was the doctrinal position of Edward's first book, in relation to then existing controversies ?
3. In what relation did the second book of Edward stand to the first book ?
4. What was the doctrinal position of Edward's second book ?

In the present article it will be necessary to confine ourselves to the first two of these questions. To answer these aright is

the necessary preliminary to the profitable study of the two last questions.

For the present, then, we have to do only with the first Liturgy of King Edward VI., which, having been drawn up by a Commission which met at Windsor in May, 1548, and then, having been approved by Convocation, was ratified by Act of Parliament in the January following, and enjoined to be used from the feast of Whitsunday, 1549.

I. As regards the first question, it is important for us to observe that the Sarum Missal (like the present Roman Mass-Book) contained much which may be said to bear witness against the doctrine of transubstantiation, while it also enjoined practices involving the idolatry of the Mass-worship, and prayers which might be understood as suggesting the blasphemy of the Mass-sacrifice.

Its witness against error had been received by tradition from earlier and purer days. Its idolatries had been added in comparatively recent times. They resulted naturally from modern additions to the faith, which they naturally also tended to support and establish.

In the first year of Edward's reign an Act of Parliament had passed (with the unanimous approval of Convocation) requiring that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper should be delivered to the people, and under both kinds.

Following this, on March 8, 1548, was put forth, by proclamation, an "Order of the Communion," which not only restored the cup to the laity, but also made certain interpolations in the service which were to be spoken in the vulgar tongue. These were afterwards incorporated in the service-book of 1549. They included "the comfortable words," the idea of which had doubtless been suggested by the Liturgy of Archbishop Hermann of Cologne, with whom Cranmer had had correspondence, and of whose "Simple and Religious Consultation" an English translation had been published in 1547, and a second edition in 1548.

But these additions were to be made "without the varying of any other rite or ceremony in the Mass (until other order shall be provided)."<sup>1</sup>

This first step towards reformation was by no means an

---

<sup>1</sup> Yet the last rubric for *second* consecration directs "without any levation or lifting up."

It should be observed that the proclamation accompanying gives to this service the character of a first instalment only of further reformation to be expected. See Cardwell's "Liturgies," p. 426, and Gasquet, pp. 95, 96. A somewhat similar note of promise appears to have been inserted (perhaps as an afterthought) in the book of 1549. See P.S. edit., p. 97, and Preface, iv., v.; see also Gasquet's "Edward VI.," p. 234.

unimportant one. Yet it was but one step, and a step which was professedly to be followed by other steps. And the next step made a very much farther and bolder move in advance.

The changes effected in the first book of Edward VI. were very considerable indeed. It is right for us to view them not only from the point of view of our own further progress, but especially from the standpoint of those who were familiar only with the mediæval service of superstition.

It will then be seen clearly that the authorization of this book marks a most important epoch in the history of our Reformation.

The name of "the Mass," indeed, survived (though only as the term by which the Communion<sup>1</sup> was "commonly called"), but the idolatry of the Mass and the blasphemy of the Mass-sacrifice were not to be found. And how was their absence to be accounted for? Their absence was the absence of what had been conspicuously present. It was unmistakably the absence which came of determined and deliberate rejection. The design and purpose of the rejection was too obvious to be questioned. The object clearly and evidently was to lop off

<sup>1</sup> It would be a mistake to suppose that the first Prayer-Book necessarily meant to express an approval of the term *Mass*, or desired to perpetuate its use, any more than Article XXV. meant to set a seal of approval to the use of the language whereby those five rites are "*commonly called sacraments*," which "are not to be counted for sacraments of the Gospel." Compare Article XXXI., " *vulgo dicebatur*," "it was commonly said." It has been said: "The word 'communion' would hardly have been understood in mediæval England, and it does not occur before the sixteenth century. The phrase 'Lord's Supper' was equally strange. Latimer tells us that, when talking to a Bishop he 'chanced to name the Lord's Supper.' 'Tush!' said the Bishop; 'what do ye call the Lord's Supper? What *new term* is that?' ('Sermons,' p. 121). . . . The Lord's Supper had to be explained to the Romanized English folk of that day as being that which [had been travestied in, and] was 'commonly called' the Mass" (*English Churchman*, review of "Some Replies to Mr. Tomlinson's Pamphlet"; see also Gasquet, p. 199).

In Cranmer's "Book on the Lord's Supper," published in 1550, he declares the purpose to take away the Mass clearly out of Christian Churches as being manifest wickedness and idolatry (see ch. ix., P.S., p. 349; also ch. xii., pp. 350, 351). Yet of the fifth and last book it has been said that it "is really a defence of the Prayer-Book just set forth, with the praise of which he concludes" (Gasquet's "Edward VI.," p. 199).

It should be noted also that the word "Mass" is used only in the heading of the service: "The Supper of the Lord and the Holy Communion, *commonly called the Mass*." Elsewhere the word is avoided, as in the heading of the Collects, etc.: "The Introits, Collects, Epistles, and Gospels, to be used at the Celebration of the Lord's Supper and Holy Communion through the Year."

This seems to be good evidence that the first book had no intention of setting the seal of approval to the term by which the service had previously been "commonly called."

without sparing the "dangerous deceits" which had grown out of the doctrine of transubstantiation.

In the view of this obvious and conspicuous rejection of what had hitherto been so prominent a feature in the Mass, we are bound to pronounce the service in the first book of Edward to have been a very innovating service indeed. And its innovating character is only rendered more marked by the conservative principle which (as compared with the work of Continental Churches of the Reformation) marked the peculiar character of the English Reformation.

The effect of these striking innovations in the book of 1549 has hardly, perhaps, been estimated to the full. The Sarum service had become an eminently sacrificial rite, and elevation was ordered for the purpose of adoration. But in the new book the sacrificial character is made to give place to the prominent feature of communion, and all elevation and ostentation is distinctly forbidden. Even among Continental Protestants there were not wanting some who would have hesitated to counsel so sudden and sweeping a measure of reform.<sup>1</sup>

Yet—all this notwithstanding—it must be added that the first book took no distinct and decided stand as against more than the Romish doctrine of the mode of the Presence *sub speciebus*.

Therefore there remained yet somewhat that had a doubtful sound in the ears of those who were as the vanguard in the Reformation movement. Of this I shall have occasion to speak presently. For the present it must suffice to emphasize the point which I desire specially to have insisted on in answer to the first question, viz., that in the first Prayer-Book of Edward VI., as compared with earlier service books, this is the prominent feature to be noticed—that there is a root-and-branch rejection of the idolatry of transubstantiation, and of all the most salient points of the sacrifice of the Mass.

II. We proceed, then, to our second question, and we ask: What, then, was the doctrinal position of this book in relation to the then existing controversies? It is needless to insist on the fact that it was decidedly anti-Papal. Not, of course, that it was intended to be intolerant of the adherents of the old learning. It was a Liturgy designed for the use of a great national Church—the Church of a nation which, having been

<sup>1</sup> See "Eucharistic Presence," pp. 501, 502; see also Bucer's "Scripta Anglicana," p. 375, and Gasquet's "Edward VI.," p. 224. Luther did not regard elevation as a dangerous practice. It was prescribed in the Wittenberg order of 1533. And though Luther had given it up in 1539, it is said to have remained in use in Northern Germany (see Gasquet's "Edward VI.," p. 222).

recently held in the bonds of superstition, had to be educated in the new learning of a purer faith. But while it was thus intended to be, as far as possible, comprehensive and tolerant, it was unavoidable that its omissions should tell the tale of a decidedly Protestant influence, and so give it a character (as far as omissions and prohibitions could do) which was decidedly anti-Romish.

But it is not sufficient for our purpose to say that its character was anti-Papal. It is essential that our inquiry should go further than this. Protestants at this date were separating into two distinct camps, both decidedly anti-Papal. These were the Lutheran and the Reformed parties. And this separation, which had its accentuation on the Continent, made the echoes of its voices to be pretty clearly heard here in England. It is scarcely necessary to say that the main point of difference was on the question of the Real Presence in the Eucharist. The Lutherans stubbornly insisted on maintaining the doctrine which is commonly called consubstantiation, and which (so far as regards the Presence in the reception of the Sacrament) can scarcely be said to differ from the Romish doctrine; while the Reformed acknowledged only a Real Presence to the faith of the recipient—a Presence which (though in their view, and in the view even of eminent Romish divines, all that is needful or profitable for the purpose of communion) was consistently and persistently denounced by their opponents as only a Real Absence.

Now, we have to ask: In which of these camps did the new Prayer-Book take its place? To which of these separate parties did it belong?

It has, perhaps, been too commonly assumed to have been Lutheran. It would, as I am persuaded, be far more correct to say that it adhered to neither of these parties. But it would be a still better answer to say that it was the property of both, and did not speak distinctly the language of either.<sup>1</sup>

And here we have a position to maintain, which, because it will probably be assailed, we must be content to bestow some labour upon. It will doubtless by many be thought weak, and therefore we must endeavour to defend and fortify it.

It will be my aim, accordingly, to show that those portions of the book which might be most naturally regarded as evidencing a distinctively Lutheran (or decidedly anti-Reformed) character are capable all of being understood in a sense which might be accepted by the Reformed, and, indeed,

---

<sup>1</sup> See Hilles's letter to Bullinger (June, 1549) in "Original Letters," P.S. edit., p. 266, and Bucer's "Scripta Anglicana," p. 456; Basil, 1557.

were held to be defensible by those who rejected most strongly the (so-called) doctrine of consubstantiation.

(1) What some will probably regard as the most difficult statement to reconcile with Reformed doctrine, will be found in a rubric at the end of the Communion Service. This rubric declares: "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."

This teaching, however, should be classed with other similar declarations in the same book which use the preposition "in" to denote the relation of the *res sacramenti* to the *sacramentum* in the reception of the Lord's Supper. Thus, in the exhortation to the communicants we have the words, "He hath left *in* those holy mysteries, as a pledge of His love, and a continual remembrance of the same, His own blessed body and precious blood, for us to feed upon spiritually, to our endless comfort and consolation."

Again, in the prayer after the administration we have the words: "We most heartily thank Thee, for that Thou hast vouchsafed to feed us *in* these holy mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, and hast assured us (duly receiving the same) of Thy favour and goodness towards us."

But for those who know the place which was taken by Archbishop Cranmer in these liturgical revisions, the following extract will suffice to show that this language was not intended to convey of necessity anything like the distinctive doctrine of the Lutheran Churches: "I say (according to God's Word and the doctrine of the old writers), that Christ is present *in* His sacraments, as they teach also that He is present in His Word, when He worketh mightily by the same in the hearts of the hearers; by which manner of speech it is not meant that Christ is corporally present in the voice or sound of the speaker (which sound perisheth as soon as the words be spoken), but this speech meaneth that He worketh with His Word, using the voice of the speaker as His instrument to work by, as He useth also His sacraments, whereby He worketh, and therefore is said to be present in them"<sup>1</sup> ("On Lord's Supper," p. 11, P.S. edit.).

---

<sup>1</sup> See also Cranmer's explanation of the rubric in reply to Gardiner ("On Lord's Supper," p. 64, P.S. edit.), and his apology for the Catechism (of Lutheran origin), authorized by him (in English translation, with important changes; see Burton's Preface, pp. xiii, xv, xviii) in 1548 ("On Lord's Supper," pp. 227, 374, P.S. edit.).

It will be seen that Gardiner, who had, with the other Bishops generally, subscribed the book of 1549, or some book of "agreement on points" (see *Church Intelligencer*, October, 1891, p. 160), though strongly con-

Indeed, language of a far more decidedly Lutheran sound was on occasion defended and maintained by our Reformers as capable of being fairly understood in the sense of the Reformed. And divines of distinctly anti-Lutheran views did not hesitate to speak of the Body and Blood of Christ, as not only *received in*, but *being*, in a certain sense, *in* the outward and visible signs of them; not, of course, as being contained in them, nor, of course, as being in them viewed simply in themselves, but in them regarded as the ordinance of Christ for the purposes of the Sacrament.

(2) In the prayer of consecration is found language which to some may seem, perhaps, still less in accordance with the doctrine of the Reformed. Here we have the following petition: "Hear us (O merciful Father), we beseech Thee; and 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 of Thy most dearly beloved Son, Jesus Christ," etc.

But the language which speaks of sanctifying the sacramental elements for their sacramental purposes was by no means regarded as inconsistent with the views of those who were called sacramentaries.<sup>1</sup> And there is good reason, as well as high authority, for regarding the addition of the words "to us" as making a very important modification in the meaning of expressions which speak of the elements as being the Body and Blood of Christ.<sup>2</sup> Thus modified, the words do

denying the prohibition of elevation and adoration, claimed four points in the book as having a Catholic sound, and inconsistent with the views of the Reformed.

These points were: (1) The consecration prayer, "wherein we require of God the creatures of bread and wine to be sanctified and to be to us the body and blood of Christ" (Cranmer, "On Lord's Supper," P.S. edit., p. 79). To which Cranmer answers, "We do not pray absolutely that the bread and wine may be made the body and blood of Christ, but that unto us in that holy mystery they may be so" (*ibid.*; see also pp. 83. 88). And (2) "that the Church of England teacheth at this day, in the distribution of the Holy Communion, in that it is there said the body and blood of Christ to be under the form of bread and wine" (*ibid.*, p. 51, referring, apparently, to the words of administration). To which Cranmer replies: "When you shall show the place where the form of words is expressed, then shall you purge yourself of that which in the meantime I take to be a plain untruth" (p. 53).

The other two points, (1) "To remember with prayer all estates of the Church, and to recommend them to God" (*ibid.*, p. 84); and (2) the "prayer of humble access" (after consecration), Cranmer passes by as needing no answer (*ibid.*, p. 229).

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g., Westminster Confession, ch. xxix. 3.

<sup>2</sup> So Cranmer explains the meaning of these words as in the first Prayer-Book of Edward, in language which becomes almost the very language substituted for them in the second Prayer-Book ("On Lord's



not at all necessarily imply any change in the elements in themselves. They may quite fairly be understood as signifying no more than their being exhibitivè or effectual signs for the conveyance of the *res sacramenti* to the souls of the faithful—in other words, their being to the faithful the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ.

(3) But another difficulty may be found in the words, "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 us to make." This is language, indeed, not unnaturally suggestive of a doctrine for which there is, we believe, no foundation in the inspired Word of God. Nevertheless, the words "these Thy holy gifts" do not, any more than "these Thy creatures of bread and wine," imply of necessity any presence on the Holy Table of the Body and Blood of Christ. It is not questioned that the sacrament was ordained for the continual remembrance of the Sacrifice of the death of Christ. And the memorial of that sacrifice may as well be made by the *ordained signs* of Christ's crucified Body and outpoured Blood, as by the very Body and Blood of the glorified Redeemer.<sup>1</sup> Such a memorial of a sacrifice in the

---

Supper," p. 79, P.S. edit.). Similarly, Herbert Thorndike ("Rel. Assembl.," p. 369; quoted by Waterland, "Works," vol. iv., p. 689, note), and Archbishop Laud (see Bulley's "Variations," p. 184), and Waterland ("Works," vol. iv., p. 695), and Bishop Field ("Parasceve Paschæ," p. 114, 1624), and Hooker ("Works," vol. ii., p. 362, edit. Keble), and Archbishop Wake (Gibson's "Preservative," vol. x., p. 56), and Bishop Patrick ("Christian Sacrifice," pp. 56-59, 1690).

The Bishop of Chichester (Day), who refused to sign the book, or to agree to the "book of their agreement," gave three reasons for his refusal: (1) The omission of *christm* in confirmation; (2) instead of "that it may be unto us," etc., he would have "be made unto us," etc.; and (3) after the consecration he would have added, "that these sacrifices and oblations," etc. (see Gasquet's "Edward VI.," p. 164).

<sup>1</sup> In the visitation of the Universities following on the Commission of May, 1549, Ridley arranged for a great public disputation, in which the second conclusion to be maintained was this, "that in the Lord's Supper there is no other oblation than a giving of thanks and a commemoration of our Lord's death" (Gasquet's "Edward VI.," p. 247). And this in support of the Book of 1549. As early, probably, as January, 1548 (see Gasquet, "Edward VI.," p. 85), Cranmer had come to the conclusion that the "oblation and sacrifice" of Christ in the Mass are terms improperly used, and that it is only a "memory and representation" of the sacrifice of the Cross (see Gasquet, p. 86).

Moreover, it appears from the "Administration Book" in the probate registry of Norwich (1549-55) that during the vacancy of the See of Norwich most part of all altars in the diocese had been taken down by the commandment of Cranmer, and this must have been some time in the first twelve months during which the first Prayer-Book was in use (see *Church Intelligencer*, September, 1891, p. 137, and Cranmer's "Works," P.S. "Remains," p. 154, note).

Lord's Supper may readily be conceded by those who are most faithfully opposed to the blasphemous doctrine of a real sacrificial offering in the Eucharist, and of the Real Objective Presence which underlies it. And the language of this prayer—objectionable as it may be thought to be—ought in fairness to be interpreted by the fact that the language which spoke of the *hostia* in this sacrament had—evidently of set purpose—been eliminated from this service-book.<sup>1</sup> Thus interpreted, it may certainly be said that this prayer does not convey—does not even naturally suggest—the Lutheran doctrine of the Eucharist. It would be easy to fortify our position, if need be, with additional evidence. But, perhaps, what has been alleged may suffice to make good our contention. We are fully satisfied that our second question can only fairly be answered by saying that as regards the doctrinal position of Edward's first book, while it admitted somewhat of a Lutheran sound, a sound which would be agreeable to Lutheran ears, it did not teach distinctly any<sup>2</sup> strictly Lutheran doctrine. Its tendency was very distinctly anti-Papal. It was not at all distinctly anti-Lutheran, but it was also not distinctly anti-Reformed.<sup>3</sup> It was comprehensive (as far as possible) of the

<sup>1</sup> And by the words, "Christ our Paschal Lamb is offered up for us once for all when He bare our sins in His Body upon the Cross."

M. Gasquet supposes that the word "oblation" was in the first draft of the book, but had disappeared before it came up to the Lords ("Edward VI.," p. 196). Accordingly he considers the book had been *tampered with* after the Bishops had signed it (p. 179). And this view is endorsed by the review in the *Guardian* of December 17, 1890. This charge rests entirely on the report of the speech of Thirlby, Bishop of Westminster, whose words are set down: "Also there was in the book 'oblation,' which is left out now" (p. 405). Gasquet understands this to signify "that when the book was agreed to by the Bishops the word 'oblation' was in it, which is now left out." But that the word was ever in the revised book is extremely unlikely. Not only would it have been altogether out of accord with "Cranmer's known opinions" as represented by M. Gasquet himself (p. 196), but if such a *tampering* had taken place we should almost certainly have heard more about it; whereas the words of Thirlby are only paralleled with other expressions, which point to a change, not from an earlier draft of the revised book, but from the book of the old use. This mistake has been clearly and ably pointed out by the reviewer in the *Church Intelligencer* of January, 1891, p. 12. See also especially p. 159, October, 1891.

<sup>2</sup> Thirlby consistently said in the debate of 1548: "It is a duty to set forth God's truth in plain terms. The want of this plainness in the present case caused him in his conscience not to agree to the doctrine" of the book (see Gasquet, pp. 165, 406). On the other hand, Gardiner, who, desiring to show Cranmer inconsistent, made the most of its ambiguities, could speak of the book as "not distant from the Catholic faith in my judgment" (Cranmer, "On Lord's Supper," pp. 62 and 92, P.S.; see Gasquet, p. 284).

<sup>3</sup> Cranmer himself had at this date embraced the doctrine of the Reformed (see "Original Letters," P.S., p. 323).

views of both Lutherans and sacramentaries. There were passages not a few which might doubtless be pleasing to Lutheran hearers, and displeasing, in the sense which they *might* naturally convey, to the ears of those who were strongly opposed to anything like the doctrine of a Corporal Presence.<sup>1</sup>

And Bishop Tunstall, in the House of Lords (December 14, 1548), pointed out that "the adoration was left out of the book" because those who had compiled it believed that "there is nothing in the Sacrament but bread and wine" (see Gasquet's "Edward VI.," p. 161).

There can be little doubt that the book of 1549 was really an *interim* provision with a view to a further reformation (see "Original Letters," P.S., vol. ii., pp. 535, 536, and "Papers on Eucharistic Presence," No. 7, pp. 514, 515, and Gasquet's "Edward VI.," pp. 95, 234, 235, 259). So the Irish Prayer-Book of 1551 was a reprint of the English book of 1549, which Mr. Walton regards as a "remarkable illustration" of the "doctrinal insincerity" of those in authority ("Rubrical Determination," p. 52). This, however, is assuming a doctrinal position for the book of 1549 which we are persuaded is a mistaken one.

There was much need for caution, and great dread (with great cause) of the consequences of "sudden mutation." See Latimer's "Sermon of the Plough" ("Sermons," P.S., p. 76) and Gasquet's "Edward VI.," pp. 251 *et seq.* Bucer, in 1551, wrote to the King: "Your sacred Majesty has already found by experience how grave are the evils which ensued on taking away by force false worship from your people without sufficient preliminary instruction" ("De Regno Christi," lib. ii., cap. v.). See Gasquet, p. 300.

<sup>1</sup> It is true that the Lutheran doctrine of the Presence can consistently claim, if true, to be regarded as an article of the faith. And therefore the first Prayer-Book, in admitting Lutheranism, was admitting that which might make a claim, if admitted at all, to be admitted alone. But it does not follow that the first book, in admitting a sound of Lutheran doctrine, was admitting this claim, however consistent. It might say—and we believe that in effect it did say—to the doctrine of a Corporal Presence, "Room is not altogether denied to you here; only you must be content to take the place of a tolerated opinion beside another tolerated (and more favoured) opinion which is your contradictory." No doubt this was like offering to it a place as to live in, in which its life must be enfeebled as unto death. But the Reformers would doubtless have preferred that, without doing violence to it too violently, it might die a natural death. There was policy, therefore, in the *mixed* character of the first book, regarded as an *interim* measure. But it must be obvious that such a book had not the elements of endurance, regarded as a permanent provision for the worship of the English Church. It must have been evident that it could never give satisfaction to any party. And, as a matter of fact, we know what dissatisfaction it gave both to the Reformed and to the anti-Reformed.

Thus Hooper speaks of the book as "very defective and of *doubtful* construction, and in some respects, indeed, manifestly impious" ("Original Letters," P.S., p. 79). And Dryander writes of it: "You will find something to blame in the matter of the Lord's Supper, for the book speaks very obscurely, and however you may try to explain it with candour, you cannot avoid great absurdity. The reason is, the Bishops could not for a long time agree among themselves respecting this article" (*ibid.* pp. 350, 351. See Gasquet, "Edward VI.," pp. 232, 333).

Early in 1548 John at Ulmis wrote to Bullinger: "Peter Martyr has

But there was in it absolutely nothing that need either have shocked the views of the Lutheran or (as regards any doctrine distinctly taught) have been a necessary cause of offence to the Reformed.

And the importance of this will be seen, I believe, when we proceed to examine the second book of Edward VI.

N. DIMOCK.

---

maintained the cause of the Eucharist and Holy Supper of the Lord; namely, that it is a remembrance of Christ and a solemn setting forth of His death, and not a sacrifice. Meanwhile, however, he speaks with caution and prudence—if, indeed, it can be called such—with respect to the real presence, so as not to seem to incline either to your opinion or to that of Luther" ("Original Letters," P.S., pp. 377, 378. See Gasquet, p. 103). These words may be said, we believe, exactly to express the doctrinal position which the first book was intended to occupy.

That the first Prayer-Book was not intended to teach any distinctly Lutheran doctrine is certain from Cranmer's vindication of the language which made the nearest approach to Lutheran sound in his work on the Lord's Supper, which was written from a distinctly Reformed standpoint. And that Cranmer was already standing on the same doctrinal standpoint before the authorization of the first Prayer-Book is now abundantly evident from the "Notes touching the Disputation of the Bishops," which has been published by M. Gasquet. See especially Gasquet's "Edward VI.," pp. 434, 440, 441.

And though he had been "in the error of the Real Presence" not long before (see "On Lord's Supper," P.S., p. 374), it may be inferred that his views had changed before the publication of his translated German Catechism, from the evident design of his changes to de-Lutheranize its teaching (see Gasquet, "Edward VI.," pp. 130, 131).

Richard Hills, a man very well informed in such matters, wrote from London on June 1, 1549: "We have an uniform celebration of the Eucharist throughout the whole kingdom, but after the manner of the Nuremberg Churches and some of those in Saxony" ("Original Letters," P.S., p. 266). Evidence of the influence of the Lutheran pattern on the book of 1549 will be found in Gasquet's "Edward VI.," ch. xiii.; see especially pp. 228, 229. But abundant evidence that the book was not intended to teach distinctly Lutheran doctrine will be found also in pp. 229-235. It is clear that at this date Cranmer had adopted the views of the Reformed. And Gasquet quite rightly speaks (p. 233) of "the care taken to employ turns of expression which should not clash with his new views."

Latimer found "no great diversity" in the Communion offices of the first and second Books of Common Prayer ("Remains," P.S., p. 262), which is explained by the fact that he regarded their transubstantiation, and oblation, and adoration as "the very sinews and marrow-bones of the Mass" (Ridley's Works, P.S., p. 112), and these were not found in the first book (see Gasquet, "Edward VI.," p. 276). But it should be noted that Latimer added "I do not well remember wherein they [the two books] differ" ("Remains," p. 262).

