

spurned by Rome and anathema" to the overwhelming majority of the thinking virile men of England, to whom sacerdotalism is an abomination. As the *British Weekly* has recently said: "If Evangelicals in the English Church had a fraction of the courage and consistency of Anglo-Catholics, they would be brave enough to carry their convictions on this matter into practice. They would refuse to go on any longer treating Free Churchmen like strangers and foreigners outside the household of God. They would dare, if need be, to create precedents, and to show their faith in Christian unity by their works."

We conclude by quoting two sentences from the writings of the late Professor Gwatkin: "Evangelicals and Nonconformists are still the backbone of serious religion in England, and its future chiefly depends on their willingness to receive new truth from the world around them; and of such willingness there are many hopeful signs. If they will only thank God and take courage, they have it in them to represent religion more worthily than any who have gone before them."

Gentlemen, shall we thank God and take courage?

THE DOCTRINAL BASIS OF THE HOLY COMMUNION SERVICE OF OUR PRESENT PRAYER BOOK.

BY THE REV. T. W. GILBERT, B.D., Rector of Bradfield,
Berks.

MOST of the great movements which have influenced the history of the world have been complex both in their origin and in their results. The world movement, known as the Reformation, was no exception to this rule, but whatever combination of circumstances contributed to bring about the Reformation, and however manifold the results of the Reformation have been on the subsequent history of the world, it can be said with truth that the Reformation is crystallized in our present Holy Communion service. Pre-Reformation England is the England of the Roman Mass; post-Reformation England is the England of the Holy Communion service.

At the outset of the consideration of the subject we are faced with an apparent paradox, for Dean Field, of Gloucester, declares that "the canon of the Mass, rightly understood, is found to contain nothing in it contrary to the rule of faith, and the profession of the Protestant Churches. . . ." ¹

The statement is important in emphasizing the difficulty of interpreting theological phrases at their face value—a fact of peculiar significance to the English Church of the sixteenth century as of the

¹ Field, *Of the Church*, vol. ii. p. 96.

twentieth—but the assertion is largely true. The actual words of the Roman Missal which, for example, prays that the bread and wine “ may to us be made ” the Body and Blood of Christ, are capable of a most Evangelical interpretation ; the prayer in the canon for the faithful departed has no purgatorial reference or implication ; the prayer for the intercession of the saints is not without a certain amount of Biblical support ; the offering of the bread and wine to God can be explained with reference to primitive custom, and is consonant with Evangelical idea. *Prima facie*, therefore, the Canon of the Mass offers little for criticism, and shows the difficulty of interpretation without having due regard to the actual facts of history which govern the interpretation.

Let us therefore look at the matter from the historical standpoint. Green, in his *Short History of the English People* (p. 241), says that “ it was by his exclusive right to the performance of the miracle which was wrought in the Mass that the lowliest priest was raised high above princes.” When we seek for information as to “ the miracle wrought in the Mass,” which raised the priest above the prince, we get an answer from the Lateran Council of 1099, which declared that it was “ a thing too execrable that the hands which had been so highly honoured as to be allowed to do that which no angel could do, namely, to create God the Creator and offer Him for the redemption of the world, should be degraded to become the servants of those hands which were polluted by obscenity or stained by rapines and the unjust shedding of blood.”¹

This quotation, while it indicates the attitude of the clergy in the matter of lay investitures, which was then a burning question, will also serve the purpose of showing what was the real teaching of the Mediæval doctrine of the Mass. The phrase “ to create God the Creator ” is striking enough, and utterly repellent to our ears, but it is the vigorous if crude expression of the dominant feature of the Mass. Transubstantiation, or “ to create God the Creator,” is the prop of the mediæval conception of the priesthood and of the Church, whether we regard it from the standpoint of the noble intentions of Hildebrand or from the more commercialized standpoint of Alexander VI.

The other phrase used at the Lateran Council to “ offer Him for the redemption of the world ” sums up the sacrificial conception of the Mass, and completes the unique position occupied by the Mediæval priest.

Both of these important points are summed up in the official teaching of the Council of Trent in the following words :

“ After the consecration of the bread and wine, our Lord Jesus Christ, true God as well as true Man, is contained truly, really, and substantially under the appearances of these things which are perceived by the senses.

“ Whereas in this Divine sacrifice which is performed in the Mass that very Christ Himself is contained and immolated without the shedding of blood, Who on the altar of the Cross once offered Himself

¹ Perry, *Student's English Church History*, i 187.

with the shedding of blood, the holy Synod teaches that the aforesaid sacrifice is truly propitiatory. . . . Wherefore not only is it offered for the sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities of the faithful living, but also rightly, according to the tradition of the Apostles, for the dead in Christ not yet purified to the full."

The canon of the Mass, therefore, both by the official teaching of the mediæval Church and also by the rubrical injunctions incorporated in the canon, has as its doctrinal basis: (i) Transubstantiation; (ii) "the Divine sacrifice of Christ without the shedding of blood," and (iii) the offering of that Divine sacrifice of Christ without the shedding of blood both for the living and the dead.

It is upon this threefold basis that the doctrine of the Roman Missal was based, and it was by the same three dogmas that the Canon of the Mass was interpreted.

In the evolution from the teaching of the Roman Missal to the doctrine of our present Prayer Book, the Prayer Book of 1549 occupies a very important place. Broadly speaking the 1549 Prayer Book was both a compromise and a stepping stone. The break away from Rome and the fierce theological controversies of the first half of the sixteenth century had brought a certain amount of fluidity into the realm of dogmatics, and the 1549 Prayer Book was therefore to a large extent tentative. The main characteristics of the Communion Office are the following:

The Canon followed the line of the mediæval Missal, and comprised the Prayer for the Church Militant, our present Consecration Prayer, our present first Prayer of Thanksgiving after Communion, and the Lord's Prayer. In this Canon we notice a prayer for the faithful departed, a prayer that the Holy Spirit may sanctify the elements, and the statement that "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. . . ." The *Agnus Dei* is said immediately after the Consecration, and the first part only of the present words of administration is used.

Now with the background of the doctrinal teaching both of the Roman Missal and of the Reformers in our mind, we can see that some of the important statements of this Prayer Book are capable of more than one interpretation. For example, the prayer that the sanctified elements "may be unto us the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ" is capable of an interpretation agreeable to modern Evangelicals, but it is equally capable of a Lutheran interpretation. In the same way the statement that "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 . . ." lends itself both to the teaching of the Roman Missal as well as to Zwinglianism.

The inevitable result was that rigid Romanists, like Bishop Bonner, complained of the heresies involved in the omission of the Adoration of the Host, in the omission of the "oblation" of the "Host," and in the omission of the prayer that the bread might be "made" the body of our Lord. On the other hand, Bishop Gardiner

declared that the teaching of the 1549 Prayer Book on "the true faith of the holy mystery . . . is well termed not distant from the Catholic faith, in my judgment." He could see the doctrine of Transubstantiation in the words of administration, in the invocation of the Holy Spirit on the elements, and also in the Prayer of Humble Access being placed after the Prayer of Consecration ; whilst one of the rubrics at the conclusion of the service lent itself to the same interpretation when it declared of the broken pieces of wafer that "men must not think less to be received in part than in whole, but in each of them the whole body of our Saviour Jesus Christ."

Therefore, what we see in the 1549 Prayer Book with reference to the three cardinal features of the Roman Missal is the following, i.é. :

1. With regard to Transubstantiation, Bishop Gardiner and his fellow Roman Catholics see this dogma in the words of the Canon wherein (to use Gardiner's own words) "we require of God the creatures of bread and wine to be sanctified and to be to us the Body and Blood of Christ, which they cannot be, unless God worketh it and make them so to be." . . . He also insists that the words of administration teach a Real Presence localized in the consecrated elements. In opposition to this we have Cranmer's own interpretation that "in the Book of the Holy Communion we do not pray that the creatures of bread and wine may *be* the Body and Blood of Christ ; but that they may *be to us* the Body and Blood of Christ, that is to say, that we may so eat them and drink that we may be partakers of His Body crucified and of His Blood shed for our redemption" (*Gasquet*, p. 205, note).

2. With regard to "the Divine sacrifice of Christ without the shedding of blood," evidence in support of this was seen in the use of the vestment or chasuble, which was one of the vestments allowed by the fourth rubric, and in the use of the term "altar." These are counterbalanced by the permission to use the "cope," which was not regarded as a sacrificial garment, and also by the use of the term "God's board" for the Holy Table.

3. Bishop Gardiner could see the teaching of the Roman Missal of "the Divine sacrifice of Christ without the shedding of blood, both for the living and the dead," in the retention in the canon of the commendation of, and prayer for, the faithful departed. Cranmer, on the other hand, had ceased to hold the view "that Christ is therein offered by the priest and people" (*Gasquet*, p. 129).

The main difference between the two points of view can be narrowed down into the difference between those who connected the presence of Christ with the act of consecration, and those who connected the presence of Christ with the act of communion on the part of the faithful recipient.

It has been necessary to lay emphasis upon the character of the 1549 Prayer Book, because in this way alone can be understood the changes which were effected in 1552, changes which made our present Prayer Book what it is.

That the 1549 Prayer Book was looked upon as a compromise, and a temporary compromise only, may be gathered from the

evidence of contemporaries like Bucer, who declared, on April 26, 1549, that the "concessions made to the infirmity of the present age . . . are only to be retained for a time, lest the people, not having yet learned Christ, should be deterred by too extensive innovations from embracing His religion, and that rather they may be won over" (*Original Letters*, p. 536).

It is also clear that even before the issue of the 1549 Prayer Book, Cranmer and his fellow-reformers had already given up any belief in Transubstantiation, or in a "Real Presence" in or under the form of bread and wine, and also had discarded the accompanying dogmas of the offering of the Divine sacrifice of Christ without shedding of blood both for the living and the dead. This is evidenced by the Great Parliamentary Debate of 1548, and is emphasised by Cranmer's treatise on the Holy Communion, which was published in 1550.

With these facts before us it is obvious that as soon as circumstances permitted a doctrinal position of a more Reformation character would be adopted. The opportunity came in 1552. In the interval from 1548, at least eight new Bishops favourable to the Reformation had been appointed, which in itself presaged changes of a Reformation character, and so we are not surprised to find that the alterations effected in 1552 concern the very points which made the 1549 Prayer Book a compromise.

The first important change had reference to the words of administration. Bishop Gardiner had declared of the words of administration of 1549 that he and his fellow Romanists "agree in the form of teaching with 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."

Cranmer had controverted the statement, declaring: "they say that Christ is corporally in or under the forms of bread and wine; we say that Christ is not there, neither corporally nor spiritually, but in them that worthily eat and drink the bread and wine He is spiritually, and corporally in Heaven."

The 1552 Prayer Book cut the difficulty by changing the words of administration into the second half of our present form, and this was a clear assertion of Cranmer's teaching that Christ's presence is to be found not in the bread and wine but in the worthy receiver.

The second great change was the breaking up of the Canon, and this also was done with a deliberate intention. Bishop Gardiner had declared that the Invocation of the Holy Spirit in the Consecration involved the Real Presence in the elements; the Invocation, therefore, was omitted. He asserted that "Masses for the dead" were supported by the prayer for the departed in the first part of the Canon: this prayer was also omitted. Gardiner had found the Real Presence in the fact that the Prayer of Humble Access followed the Consecration; the Prayer of Humble Access was therefore placed before the Prayer of Consecration.

Instead of the offering of the consecrated elements, as in 1549, which could be interpreted as the offering of the Body and Blood of

Christ, the Prayer of Consecration declares that Christ Himself had made "a full, perfect, and sufficient . . . oblation . . . for the sins of the whole world," and the part of the Canon which speaks of "our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving" is transferred to the post-Communion service and made into our first Thanksgiving Prayer.

The re-arrangement of the Canon, therefore, was not the work of a blundering iconoclast, but was dictated on the one hand by a desire to remove ambiguities, and on the other to frame the service in such a form that its doctrinal intention should be clear. The Canon of 1549, as the evidence of Bishop Gardiner shows, was quite capable of being used as the Mass of the Roman Missal; the alterations effected in 1552 did away with such a possibility, and it is the 1552 Prayer Book, therefore, which witnesses to the truth that Cranmer changed the Mass into the Communion service. The re-arrangement and omissions nullified any idea of Transubstantiation or of the Real Presence in or under the form of bread and wine, and emphasized the Presence of Christ in the worthy receiver; the changes repudiated the sacrifice of the Mass, and taught instead the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, and the offering of ourselves as a living sacrifice to God in return for the full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice made for us by Christ on Calvary.

The Prayer Book of 1552 is important, because the changes which have taken place since then have been few in number. The combination in 1559 of the 1549 and 1552 words of administration in no way altered the doctrinal teaching, because the interpretation of the 1549 words was governed by those of 1552. The omission of the Black Rubric in 1559 was covered by the condemnation of Transubstantiation in the Thirty-nine Articles of 1571. I am not unmindful of the assertions of those who import a doctrinal significance to the changes of 1662, but the statement of Gasquet holds true (though it has a very different significance for him than for us), that "as regards the English Book, what it was in 1552 it practically remains to the present day. The position which was deliberately abandoned in 1549 and still further departed from in 1552 has never been recovered."

To sum up, our present Holy Communion Service, by its re-arrangements, omissions, and additions which mark it off both from the Roman Missal and from the 1549 Prayer Book, occupies the following position with reference to the main subjects upon which the Reformation turned, i.e.:

i. In reference to the question of Christ's Presence in the Sacrament, the Anglican position is stated by Hooker in the following terms: "The Real Presence of Christ's most blessed Body and Blood is not to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament. . . . I see not which way it should be gathered by the words of Christ *when* and *where* the bread is His Body or the cup His Blood, but *only* in the very heart and soul of him that receiveth them" (Book V, c. lxvii, 6).

ii. In reference to the question of sacrifice in the Sacrament, the

Anglican point of view is summed up by Archbishop Laud in these words: " At and in the Eucharist we offer up to God three sacrifices : one by the priest only—that's the commemorative sacrifice of Christ's death represented in bread broken and wine poured out ; another by the priest and people jointly, and that is the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving for all the benefits and graces we received by the precious death of Christ ; the third, by every particular man for himself only, and that is the sacrifice of every man's body and soul, to serve Him in both, all the rest of his life, for this blessing then bestowed on him " (Conference with Fisher, quoted by Meyrick, *Doctrine of the Holy Communion*, p. 40).

THE DOCTRINAL BASIS OF N.A. 84.

BY W. GUY JOHNSON (Member of the National Assembly).

IN view of the statements by members of the Prayer Book Revision Committee, e.g. by Lord Hugh Cecil at the last session of the House of Laity, that no change in the doctrine of the Prayer Book is made in their Report, it may seem unnecessary and even ungracious to seek for any special doctrinal characteristics in that document. But if you first read your own doctrine into the Prayer Book and then make proposals which would bring out that doctrine more clearly, people who are unable to find it in the Prayer Book may be excused for thinking the proposals do involve a change. Moreover, it is clear that a large number of Churchpeople, belonging to more than one school of thought, are of opinion that the alterations made in the Prayer Book in 1552 greatly changed its doctrinal complexion as compared with the Book of 1549. Proposals, therefore, which have for their effect a reversion in many important features to the 1549 Book must be supposed to carry with them the doctrinal implications of such reversion.

It is important to bear in mind that N.A. 84 is only an instalment of revision, and it is a reasonable inference that the further revision contemplated by it will be in the same direction as that we are now asked to follow. It is further important to remember that many of the proposed changes are of the nature of concessions to those among us who are already teaching a system of doctrine quite alien to that which is contained in the Prayer Book, and we cannot overlook this when interpreting the meaning of these concessions. In the time allotted to me it is only possible to indicate a few of the chief points in the Measure which appear to distinguish it doctrinally from our present book.

To begin with the Calendar, it is very remarkable that while as many as twenty-nine additions are made to it, no name later than 1380 has been deemed worthy of commemoration. If Anskar