

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

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

PART V.

I MUST proceed now—and I do so under a very deep and painful sense of responsibility—to submit for careful and deliberate consideration some observations on the subject which has been occupying our attention in this series of articles.

If the view which has been presented of the history of our Prayer-Book, and its relation to the controversies of former days, be substantially the true view, it must be obvious that the conclusions arrived at have a most important bearing on an approaching crisis—for a crisis of some sort is surely (humanly speaking) inevitable in the Church of England.

We have even yet fresh in our remembrance the claim made by a leading and influential religious journal—not professing to represent extreme opinions—a claim made on behalf of a lately deceased Cardinal, whose position since 1845 had been confessedly one of hostility (though we may gladly add of *kindly* hostility) to the Reformed Church of England, that he is rightly to be regarded as the “founder” (“we may almost say”) of that Church as we now know it.

“De mortuo nil nisi bonum.” We should be sorry to be severe (or to seem to wish to be severe) on the very remarkable echoes of eulogium which were heard resounding on every side in the week which followed the announcement of Cardinal Newman’s death.

Moreover, we think it well that the minds of English Churchmen should be led to recognise—as they hardly yet have recognised—the new departure which dates from the influence of Newman and his associates in the University of Oxford. The language used by the *Guardian* we believe to be quite true in a sense reaching perhaps far beyond what the *Guardian* itself might be ready to allow.

It *was* a new departure, a new founding—in some sense a building on a new foundation—a founding of something quite new, and quite different from the Church of the old historical Anglican party, which (in the persons of its best representatives) had so ably and consistently maintained the primitive Catholicity of the Church of England against Papal innovations and Puritan scrupulosities. It *was* a founding—or an attempt to found—a Church of England strangely unlike the Church which had been upheld by such men as Jewel and Hooker and Andrewes, altogether different from that which

had been in the view of Laud and Bramhall, and Cosin and Bull.

But let us desire to acknowledge quite to the full what there was of good in the Oxford Movement.

We should very few of us probably desire to have restored to us exactly the state of things which existed before the Oriel Common-Room engaged in the task of changing the character of our English religion—a state of things not easy to be realized by those who do not belong to the generation of the past.

Probably a few—possibly not a few—of those who read these pages may have found little help to true devotion in what they regard as the painful artificialities and apparent unrealities too often characterizing the ornate ceremonial and musical intonations so pleasing to the present generation. But in their desire for a simpler and more natural service, they need not imagine that there was everything to encourage the worshipping of God in spirit and in truth when all external decencies were neglected or avoided.

It will perhaps be generally allowed that there is some measure of truth in the opinion that currents of religious thought which had swept over our land (though some of them most healthful in their tendencies) had left the Church of England not only with too low an estimate of the accessories of worship, and a disposition to denounce as Popish every effort to support the dignity of “decency,” and promote the due observance of order and the outward forms of reverence in the services of the sanctuary, but also with something like an ignorance of, if not with a certain prejudice against, the true Church principles of our Reformed Theology, and (speaking generally) with a somewhat inadequate view of the position of the Sacraments of the New Testament in relation to the Gospel of Christ.

If this was so, it was time that there should be something like a loyal rebellion against the reign of slovenliness, a practical crusade against the practice of irreverence, and a legal revolt against the law of disorder.

If this was so, it was surely well that there should be a return to the study of the true Scriptural theology of our Reforming divines, and a fearless defending (in its integrity) of the faith once for all delivered unto the saints.

And if this was so, it is well, it is right, that the need which existed for some correcting movement should now be fully and freely acknowledged.

And then it may also be willingly confessed that herein was that which, in some measure, must be held to account for and excuse the strange intermingling in the reactionary movement

of those who desired to be true disciples of the English Reformation with those who were (perhaps unconsciously at first) engaged in the work of Romanizing the Church of England, while still condemning the corruptions of Rome. For some of them use an extreme bitterness of opprobrium and a vehemence of strong language such as in writings of Anglican theologians¹ will hardly (or rarely) be matched.

Let it not be thought that we are unwilling to recognise and acknowledge to the full all the good that is due to the very remarkable influence of the new movement among us.

But when we turn to the matter of Eucharistic doctrine, we can have no hesitation in preferring the Church of England as reformed by our Reformers, to the Church of England as founded by Cardinal Newman. And it is a matter of importance, surely, that we should see clearly the choice that is set before us. We can hardly be mistaken in declaring that a conflict is impending—a conflict in which everyone will be called to take a part—a conflict between the old and the new, between the Church of England as it was—the truest and the purest and most truly Catholic representative of the Reformation movement, and the Church of England as the admirers of Newman would fain make it. It would emerge an unhealthy branch of the unreformed Christian Church, almost as it emerged from the dark ages of ignorance, when the parasites of mediæval superstition and idolatry had struck their roots into her bark, and had *developed* into a religious system of faith and of practice assimilated indeed to the worship of the heathens, but having (in the superstructure which overlaid foundation truths) little in common with the doctrine which had been delivered by the Apostles—such as

¹ Witness the terrible denunciation of the Romish Church written by Newman in 1837: "If we are induced to believe the professions of Rome and make advances towards her, as if a sister or a Mother Church, which in theory she is, we shall find too late that we are in the arms of a pitiless and unnatural relative, who will but triumph in the arts which have inveigled us within her reach. Let us be sure she is our enemy, and will do us a mischief where she can. . . . Crafty, obstinate, wilful, malicious, cruel, unnatural as madmen are—or, rather, she may be said to resemble a demoniac. Thus, she is her real self only in name; and till God vouchsafe to restore her, we must treat her as if she were that Evil One which governs her" (see *Record* of September 12, 1890).

How strange that the writer of such a warning should so soon have been lured into the embrace of the unnatural relative, who did, indeed, triumph in the arts which inveigled him within her reach! How much stranger still if we are to understand that the use of any such language as this was afterwards (in part) excused or apologized for, or its guilt extenuated as being the echo of the opinions of others, or as a manifesto required by the necessities of the writer's position! (See "Apol. pro Vitâ Suâ," pp. 201-203.)

was assuredly another Gospel than that which had been preached by St. Paul, and was a forged addition to the faith once for all delivered to the saints.

Our Reformers would have laughed to scorn the idea that they were contending merely or mainly about such matters as the infallibility or supremacy of the Pope or the immaculate conception of the Virgin.

They laid down their lives, and, till the Church of England was refounded by Newman and others, they were honoured as martyrs¹—honoured alike by High Churchmen and Low Churchmen, honoured by the true sons of the old Church of England—honoured for laying down their lives as witnesses against the teachings—the blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits—which are inseparable from the Romish doctrine of the Mass² as now formulated and fixed and stereotyped in the

¹ See "Papers on Eucharistic Presence," No. vii., p. 512.

² See "Papers on Eucharistic Presence," pp. 541, 542. That Bishop Tunstall (see Collier's "Eccles. Hist.," vol. iv., p. 422, edit. 1840; and letter of G. H. R. H. in *Guardian* of September 10, 1890) recognised "Heterodoxies" (the expression "impious doctrine" is rather the reflection of the opinions of those he is opposing) in certain scholastic teachings concerning the Mass, and that other upholders of the Romish doctrine have sometimes used strong language against popular conceptions or abuses of Romish teaching, cannot alter the fact that the language of our Article XXXI. is directed against that which now is the accredited doctrine of Rome.

Tunstall (long on more than friendly terms with Cranmer, and probably his assistant in his scheme for reforming the Breviary—see Gasquet's "Edward VI.," pp. 28, 29) was one of those men who, while they could never accept what they regarded as the dangerous innovations of the Reformation, were not blind to the light in which the Reformers were walking. And we need not doubt that if he, and such as he (their acceptance of transubstantiation notwithstanding), could have influenced the proceedings of the Council of Trent, some of the mediæval superstitions of the Mass doctrine would have been condemned, instead of being made into component parts of the Romish faith. But in that assembly the overpowering influence of the Italian and Spanish prelates (many of them creatures of the Pope and tools of the Jesuits) forged new fetters for the adherents of the Papacy, and made decrees which virtually condemned, not only the doctrines of the Reformed and the Articles of the Church of England, but with these the teachings of such men as Sadoletto, and Contarini, and Ægidius of Viterbo, and Seripandi, and Cajetan (and we may add the names of Tunstall and Pole)—men who had in measure been making their light to shine in Romish darkness. Witness the following from Cajetan (teaching a doctrine which is only more fully expanded in our Article XXXI.): "*Ex eo quod in lege nova facta est remissio peccatorum per oblationem Christi jam nulla superest oblatio pro peccato. Fiet enim injuria oblationi Christi, tanquam minus sufficienti*" ("Epistolæ Pauli . . . juxta sensum literalem enarratæ," fol. 201, a. Parisiis, 1540). Compare with this the words of Chrysostom: "*Ἐν τοῖνυν ἀφῆκε τὰς ἀμαρτίας διὰ τῆς μιᾶς θυσίας, οὐκ ἐστὶν χρεία δευτέρας*" ("In Ep. ad Heb.," cap. x., hom. xviii.; Op., tom. xii., p. 175, Ed. Montfaucon, Paris, 1735; see also p. 134). And contrast with this the

decrees of the Council of Trent, and summarized in the Creed of Pope Pius IV.

It is idle, we fear, to doubt (let it be said with no bitterness of spirit, but in sadness of sorrow) that we have now to do with an aggressive party in the Church which would desire to undo the work of the Reformation as our Reformers effected it, and would desire to frame a National Church much more according to the plans of Cardinal Newman than after the counsels of Archbishop Cranmer.

Hence the desire to rid the Church of England of the thirty-nine Articles altogether, or, failing that, to rid the Articles themselves of the doctrine of the "Reformed," and so to muffle their voice that they may give forth only a so-called "Catholic" sound.

Hence also the desire to have restored to us the use of the mediæval missal of Sarum, or, failing that, the permissive use (in whole or in part) of the first Prayer-Book of Edward VI.

And there are not wanting indications that the advanced Anti-Reformed Party may choose for their first battle-field the

teaching of Bellarmine: "Remissio perfecta nondum facta est, sed quotidie fit, et fiet usque ad mundi consummationem; ergo manet adhuc, et manebit usque ad mundi consummationem hostia pro peccato" ("De Missa," lib. ii., cap. ii., c. 1047). See "Romish Mass and English Church," pp. 41, 42. (Bellarmine's words refer to "application.")

Canon Jenkins has well said: "It can never be too confidently affirmed that the doctrines laid down at Trent did not represent the faith of the Western Church, as it was explained by its most authoritative expositors but a few years before its assembly" ("Pre-Tridentine Doctrine," p. 6; see also pp. 99-101, 112-114).

The reader may be asked to weigh well the following words, quoted from the *Church Quarterly Review* of April, 1896: "It can hardly be denied, especially in the light of what has become 'l'enseignement traditionnel' since Trent, that the Protestants have so far made out their case as to show that the priest's offering of Christ in the Mass, as it is destructive, so it is necessarily reiterative; and therefore the doctrine that the Mass is a 'verum ac propitiatorium sacrificium' is one that must come into collision with the Epistle to the Hebrews in the end" (p. 47).

This is a very important testimony, as coming from a writer who seems desirous of taking the most favourable view of Romish doctrine, but is too fair to limit the application of our Article XXXI. to the system of private Masses, and such abuses of the Mass doctrine as were sometimes attributed (in error) to Thomas Aquinas and Catharinus. He says: "Judged by its history, that the aim of Article XXXI. was primarily directed against the system of private Masses we cannot doubt; but, on the other hand, that its denunciation is even more comprehensive, and touched the doctrine of the Mass itself, we are ready to believe. There was a close connection between the doctrine of the Mass and the system of private Masses. It was felt at the time. To Lutheran protests against private Masses, it was replied: 'Hoc de omni Missâ asserunt, non de privata duntaxat.' And at Trent the doctrine of the Mass was so drawn up as to cover with its ægis the ideas on which that system rested" (p. 45). See "Dangerous Deceits," pp. 16-20.

question of returning to the use of the service of "the Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass," of 1549.

If so—can we, any of us, doubt that on this battle-field they must be met? And can we question that they should be met, not by men alone of one party or school of thought, but by all who would be true and faithful to the "Reformed" and genuine Catholic doctrine of the Church of our fathers?

And let us not fail to mark that the battle-field chosen by the extreme party of advance is well chosen. It is well chosen, for in support of their claim to be allowed the use of the first book of Edward, they can put forth pleas which at first sight seem very plausible, and which to those who take no account of the dangerous tendencies in the air may even well appear to be very reasonable.

1. They can fairly plead that the very Act of Uniformity which established the use of the second book defended (and more than defended) the use of the first.

2. They can plead that there have been saintly and learned divines of the Reformed Church of England who have not hesitated on liturgical grounds to express a preference, in some respects, for the first, and a regret that so many changes had been made in the second.

3. They can urge that daughter Churches, in communion with the Reformed Church of England, have used their liberty in the way of alterations in the office of the Holy Communion tending rather towards approximation to the service of the first book.

4. They can urge also that increasing study of, and improved acquaintance with, the ancient liturgies of the Christian Church have tended rather to make men look more

¹ Nothing said here or in previous chapters must be understood as implying that the Church of England would exclude any from lay-communion on account of their holding doctrines of the Eucharistic Presence or Sacrifice which she does not hold. And as regards the Lutheran doctrine, it should always be remembered that its Lutheran setting makes it comparatively innocuous. On this point see "Eucharistic Presence," pp. 173, 174. What we are now called upon to deal with is something very different. But the obvious purpose of giving a distinctly "Reformed" character to our English Service does not, of course, imply a design of making it repellent to those of different views (see "The Answer of the Bishops at the Savoy," Prop. I. § 5, in Cardwell's "Conferences," p. 138). The Church's faith has to do with that which "alone is material," *i.e.*, "the Real Presence," to the faith of our souls. All else has to do with that which (in the "Reformed" view alone) is only the *mode*; and the negation of a *mode*, as a *mode* (even though seriously erroneous, and in its results pernicious) is no article of the Christian faith. On this subject see "The Theology of Bishop Andrewes," p. 12, note, and pp. 14-17; and also Grindal's Remains, pp. 250, 251, P.S. edit.

favourably than before on the form and order of the first book.¹

And, now, what answer, it will be asked, have we to these pleas? How are we to meet our opponents, if we have to meet them, on this battle-field of controversy?

It will be found that to give a true and satisfactory answer to the first plea will involve a sufficient reply to all the other pleas. And, accordingly, the chief aim and object of this series of papers has been to lead up to the one true and conclusive answer to the first of these very plausible arguments.

It is impossible, indeed, for us not to foresee that it will seem to many to be a very strange way of strengthening our position as against those who are earnestly desiring a restoration of the first book, to argue as we have argued, and to maintain, as we are convinced that in the cause of truth we are bound to maintain, that that first book was not nearly so objectionable as some have represented it, and as very many have been in the habit of regarding it, that it had rejected what was decidedly Romish, and contained nothing that could strictly be accounted even distinctly Lutheran in the doctrine of the Eucharist.

Nevertheless, we are persuaded that to bring out clearly the very truth of this matter is all that is needed to make our position impregnable, and to show unprejudiced minds the validity and force of our objections to restoring or permitting the use of the first book.

We can now adopt as our own the language of the Act which gives authority to Edward's second book. Cranmer could have used that language,² though he had thrown himself thoroughly and heartily into the work of revision which so carefully pruned the ambiguities of the first book.

¹ It must, however, by no means be assumed as certain that, of the mass of liturgical apparatus on which learned scholars have lately been expending their labours, all that is most important and valuable is new light, which was inaccessible to the study of our Reformers. See Mr. Burbidge's "Liturgies and Offices," chaps. v., vi.

² See "Papers on Eucharistic Presence," No. vii., pp. 506, 507. When Gardener claimed the Book of Common Prayer as (like Cranmer's "Catechism") teaching *oral manducation* ("in that it is there so Catholicly spoken of"), Cranmer answered: "The Book of Common Prayer neither useth any such speech, nor giveth any such doctrine, nor I in no point improve on that godly book, nor vary from it. But yet glad am I that the said book liketh you so well, as no man can mislike it that hath any godliness in him joined with knowledge" ("On Lord's Supper," pp. 55, 56, P.S. edit.).

There was, of course, no denying here that there was another sense which "*mistakers*" could read into "the said book." But there is good evidence here that that was not Cranmer's sense.

But, while admitting the truth of all that is thus quoted against us by the advocates of the first book, we must be allowed also, as against their contention, to have admitted on their side the truth which is also declared in the same Act, that the revision, whose results we have in the second book, made "fully perfect" what in the first was (in some sense) imperfect.¹

Imperfection is often tolerable, and for a time may be wisely tolerated; while to return from what is fully perfect to that which is imperfect may be intolerable, a change which no right-minded man could think of tolerating for a moment.

It may be a sin to fall back on a position which once it was good to occupy. It will assuredly be a sin if it involve the abandoning of an advanced post of doctrinal truth for the sake of joining forces with dangerous doctrinal error.

It must surely be a sin if it be for the purpose of re-admitting and welcoming a doctrine which necessarily regards as heresy the doctrinal standpoint of the Reformed, which we are pledged to defend, and bound to uphold as the truth.

To occupy a certain position in a forward reforming movement may be a just cause of thankfulness and joy, but to be in the same position in a doctrinal retrogression—in a turning back from truth towards error—may be truest cause for shame and confusion of face.

But if the Act which is quoted against us speak true, it would be a serious retrogression to return to the use of the first book. It would be to desert a position of doctrinal perfection for the very purpose of re-admitting doctrinal errors or doctrinal dangers, the exclusion of which had made perfect the second book.²

¹ Mr. Pocock, indeed, does not hesitate to regard the profession that "the new book was only a new form of the first book more fully explained and interpreted" as "a downright lie invented for political purposes" (*English Historical Review*, October, 1886, p. 681). And indeed, it may well be granted that any such assertion would have been misleading if the first book had been intended to *teach* and *enforce* the doctrine of the Real Presence in the Romish or Lutheran sense. But we are now well assured that it had no such intention. And when Mr. Pocock adds that "it was a pure invention made for the purpose of quietly getting the second Prayer-Book through the Houses of Parliament" (p. 682), he seems to me to be forgetting that the assertion is made in the very Act of Parliament itself. And I can hardly think that it will be readily believed that at such a time, and in such a cause, Parliament was persuaded to put its hand blindly to what it knew nothing about, and did not concern itself to inquire into.

² It is important to observe that whereas the Communion Service of 1548 came forth professedly as a *first step* in a movement of Reform, with promise of further advances to follow, the second book of Edward VI. was accompanied with the claim *then made for the first time* of "full perfection." This stamp of completeness and *finality* distinguishes it from all previous efforts (see "Eucharistic Presence," pp. 514, 515).

This is the point which needs to be most strongly insisted upon, and we must ask leave to return to it for a while in a concluding article.

N. DIMOCK.

(To be continued.)



ART. VI.—ENGLISH CHURCH HISTORY:

A REVIEW OF MR. WAKEMAN'S RECENT BOOK.

NEVER was it more necessary that English Church-people should understand the true history and doctrine of their Church. Perhaps never was there a time when men were more anxious for information upon these two important subjects. How important, then, that seekers after truth should be able with confidence to gratify this most laudable desire! Lately there has been published a new "History of the Church of England." The book covers the whole period of English Church history—from the planting of the Gospel in Britain to the present time. It is clearly and attractively written; it is well printed, and sold at a moderate price. It has already met with a large sale, for within a very short time it has run into a second edition. It is advertised as recommended by bishops, divinity professors, and heads of theological colleges; and within a short time we venture to prophesy it will become a recognised "text-book" of English Church history in High Church theological colleges. It will be required to be "got up" by many candidates for ordination, and it will probably be largely used in the upper forms of some of our public schools.

As far as the giving of mere historical facts are concerned, we have little fault to find with the book. But very few so-called "histories" are content to deal simply with facts. History is rarely written *merely* to give a list of events in purely chronological sequence. Where history is so written it is little read, except by the professed historical student. Such books are not popular, and they do not run into second editions within a few weeks of their publication.

In most histories the facts are presented, and naturally so, from the writer's particular point of view, whether political or religious. The present volume is no exception to this rule. In it, as in many other instances, not only are the facts so given, but the deductions made from those facts, and the reasons given for the sequence of events are biassed by the writer's theological standpoint and predilection to a most