

THE REFORMATION, THE MASS
AND THE PRIESTHOOD

Ernest C. Messenger
Ph.D. (Louvain)

**THE REFORMATION
THE MASS AND
THE PRIESTHOOD**

*A DOCUMENTED HISTORY WITH SPECIAL
REFERENCE TO THE QUESTION OF
ANGLICAN ORDERS*

VOLUME I

THE REVOLT FROM THE MEDIEVAL CHURCH

LONGMANS, GREEN AND GO.
LONDON NEW YORK TORONTO

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO., Ltd.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.4.
6 OLD COURT HOUSE STREET, CALCUTTA
53 NICOL ROAD, BOMBAY
36A MOUNT ROAD, MADRAS

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.
114 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK
221 EAST 20TH STREET, CHICAGO
88 TREMONT STREET, BOSTON

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.
215 VICTORIA STREET, TORONTO

NIHIL OBSTAT I
EDUARDUS CAN. MAHONEY, S.TH.D.
CENSOR DEPUTATUS

IMPRIMATUR :
JOSEPH BUTT, VIC. GEN.
WESTMONASTERH, XXTVa JANUARIi MCMXXXVI

First published - - March, 1936

Printed in Great Britain

INTRODUCTION

The present work arose out of a desire entertained by the author to set forth a reasoned account of why the Catholic and Roman Church refuses to allow that Anglican clergy have the powers of the Catholic priesthood. The author soon realised that the essential point is the difference in the conception of the priesthood entertained in the two Communions, and this in turn was seen to be linked up with the respective doctrines on the Eucharist. That there *is* a serious difference in these doctrines in the two Communions it is the object of the historical part of this work to show. But it would not be satisfactory if one were merely to indicate this difference of view; it seemed also desirable to study the doctrine of the Early Church, in order to determine whether the later Catholic conception is a development of the early teaching, or a corruption of it—in other words, whether the Catholic or the Protestant conception of the Eucharist and the Priesthood is the true one.

Accordingly, the first part of the work sets forth the Scriptural and Patristic doctrine of the Eucharist and the Priesthood. We endeavour to show that the teaching of Scripture and early Tradition is that the Body and Blood of Christ are really and objectively present under the appearances of bread and wine, and that this sacred Body and Blood are in the Mass solemnly offered up to God the Father, in memory of the Passion and Death of His Son. In the course of this examination, we show how these doctrines are enshrined in the Eucharistic rites used in the early Church. A similar treatment is given to the doctrine concerning the Christian Priesthood, and the ordination rites by which men were set apart for this sacred office in the early Church. The rest of this first portion of the work deals with the development of Eucharistic and Hierarchical theology in the Middle Ages.

We are thus in possession of the specific ideas and doctrines which were rejected at the Reformation. With this rejection we next proceed to deal. We begin with the Continental Reformation, and show how the Reformers rejected the Catholic

conception of the Eucharist and the Priesthood, and proceeded by a natural sequence to discard the Catholic rites, and to substitute new ones, more in harmony with the new Protestant views. Then we proceed to show how the Catholic Church dealt with these innovations in doctrine and ritual, and how she reaffirmed the traditional positions once for all in the Council of Trent. A supplementary chapter discusses the attitude of the Catholic Church towards Lutheran orders.

Having thus dealt with the Continental Reformation, we turn to consider the Reformation in England. We give an extended treatment to its preparation under Henry VIII, for in recent times there has been a strong attempt by scholars, Catholic as well as non-Catholic, to "whitewash" Henry, and to maintain that the English Reformation during his reign was orthodox save for the denial of the Pope's Supremacy, and that in particular, the doctrinal formulae of Henry's reign are orthodox. Views such as these have been expressed recently by the Abbé Constant, and by Mr. Hilaire Belloc. We shall show from unimpeachable documentary evidence that these views cannot be maintained.

Next we shall study the development of the English Reformation in the reign of Edward VI, and we shall endeavour to show that the changes which then took place had all been prepared in the previous reign. We shall also show how, at every stage, the English Reformation was carried out with the advice and assistance of the Continental Reformers, and that it proceeded on a plan parallel to that of the Continental movement, both as regards doctrine and ritual. Thus, the Continental ideas on the Eucharist and the Priesthood were substituted for the traditional Catholic conception, and the new ideas were, as on the Continent, expressed in new Eucharistic and Ordination rites. The conclusion is obvious : the Anglican Ordination rite was intended to introduce a Christian ministry of the Protestant or "Evangelical" type.

Thus, at the end of the reign of Edward VI, we find the English Church not only separated from the See of Rome and from those Churches which had remained faithful to it, but committed to Protestant formularies of faith, with a Protestant liturgy and ordination service, and with a number of Protestant ministers, ordained by the new rite.

At this point our first volume comes to an end. In our second volume, we shall deal with the reconciliation of England with

Rome under Queen Mary, and we shall examine carefully the attitude taken by the ecclesiastical authorities, both here and in Rome, to the new Ordinal. We shall show that from the first, ordinations carried out by the new rite were regarded as invalid, and that it was taken for granted that those ordained by it were merely Protestant ministers, with no sacrificial powers.

From Mary we shall pass on to consider the Elizabethan religious settlement, and we shall stress the significance of the fact that she reintroduced an ordination rite which had been categorically condemned both by the English Catholic bishops, and by the Holy See itself.

We shall then deal with subsequent discussions and pronouncements on Anglican Orders, culminating in the Commission of 1896, and the Bull *Apostólica Cura*.

Having thus dealt with the historical side, we shall proceed, also in Volume Two, to discuss the theological aspect of the question. We shall endeavour to show that the validity of Anglican Orders must depend ultimately upon the view taken as to the correctness of the Anglican, or of the Catholic theological standard. The historical facts are what they are, and cannot be gainsaid. If these facts be interpreted in the light of Catholic theological teaching, accepted as the standard of reference, then Anglican Orders must be regarded as invalid. If, on the contrary, the Protestant conception of the Eucharist and the Priesthood is accepted as the true one, then there is no reason why Anglican Orders should not be regarded as true orders.

We hope also in the second volume to discuss the significance of recent recognition of Anglican Orders by Old Catholics and certain Eastern Patriarchs.

Throughout the work we shall make our appeal so far as possible to the original documents, and we shall let these speak for themselves. We shall of course comment on their significance, but at any rate the reader will be in a position to judge whether or not our comment is justified by the evidence produced.

In the compilation of the work, we have not hesitated to profit by the excellent works which have from time to time been published by learned scholars of both the Anglican and Roman Communions. We have been particularly indebted to works such as Dr. Darwell Stone's *History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, Canon Dixon's voluminous *History of the Church of England*, Canon Kidd's *Documents Illustrating the Continental Reformation*, the admirable collection entitled *Liturgy and Worship*,

published by the S.P.C.K., Gairdner's *Lollardry and the Reformation*^ Canon Kidd's *Medieval Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice*, Goossens, *Les origines de VEucharistic*; Coppens, *Uimposition des mains* ; Gasquet and Bishop, *Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer* ; Van Rossum, *De Essentia Sacramenti Ordinis* ; Michel, *Ordre* (in *Dictionnaire de Theologie Catholique*) ; Constant, *The Reformation in England*; the learned articles on the English Reformation which appeared in the *Tablet* during 1895-1897 and were from the pen of the Very Rev. Mgr. Canon Moyes ; and many other books which are duly referred to in the course of the work. These we have supplemented by our own researches, and from time to time we have been led to differ from the distinguished authorities we have just mentioned. But at any rate we give our reasons for so doing. We have endeavoured to write *history*, and to be as impartial as circumstances will permit, and to get at the real facts.

In conclusion, the author takes this opportunity of tending his warm thanks to the many individuals who have helped him in the preparation of this work with their help and advice. He would especially thank the Fathers of the London Oratory for permission to use their admirable library, the Rev. R. H. Moberly, Principal of Bishop's College, Cheshunt, for permission to use the library there ; the Rev. Dr. Firminger, Chaplain to His Majesty the King ; the Rev. Dr. Kidd, Warden of Keble College, Oxford, and the Rev. Dr. Darwell Stone, sometime Warden of Pusey House, Oxford, who have all assisted in elucidating various matters ; the Rev. Fr. Leeming, and Rev. Fr. Silva-Tarouca, both of the Gregorian University, Rome, who have helped in the matter of documents in the Vatican Archives ; the Very Rev. Dr. Barton, Consultor of the Pontifical Biblical Commission, and Professor of Scripture at St. Edmund's College, Ware; the Rev. Dr. Simcox, Professor of Canon Law at the same College; the Right Rev. Mgr. Barnes; Mr. H. O. Evennett, of Trinity College, Cambridge ; and last but not least, the Right Rev. Mgr. Canon Bickford, President of St. Edmund's College, who not only allowed the author to consult the valuable and rare works in the College Library, but also, by setting him free from his work as Professor of Philosophy, providing him with the leisure necessary for the preparation and writing of this work.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
	— — — — —	
Introduction	— — — — —	ix

PART ONE

THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD IN SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION

I.	The Real Objective Presence	3
	A. Preliminary note on Doctrinal Development — — — — —	3
	B. The Real Presence in Scripture	3
	C. The Real Presence in Patristic Tradition	3
II.	The Sacrifice of the Mass	14
	A. In Scripture — — — — —	14
	B. In Patristic Tradition - - - - -	14
III.	The Early Liturgy of the Eucharist	26
IV.	The Ministry and Ordinations in the New Testament - — — — —	32
V.	The Ordination Rites in the Early Church	37
VI.	The Developed Ordination Rites - - -	47
VII.	The Development of the Western Ordination Rite in the Middle Ages - - -	61
VIII.	The General Theology of the Sacraments in the Middle Ages — — — — —	69
IX.	The Theology of Holy Order in the Middle Ages - — — — —	73
	A. The Priesthood and the Episcopate -	73
	B. The conditions of Validity, and the question of schismatical and heretical Ordinations — — — — —	73
	C. The question of the matter and form of Order - — — — —	73
X.	The Development of Eucharistic Theology in the Middle Ages, and the Formulation of the Doctrine of Transubstantiation	95

PART TWO

THE CONTINENTAL REFORMATION

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. The Forerunners of the Reformation : Wyclif and the Lollards, Jerome, and Huss.....	105
II. Martin Luther and the Mass - - -	115
III. The Confession of Augsburg and the Mass	12i
IV. The Lutherans and the Eucharist after the Confession of Augsburg - - -	136
V. The Lutheran Conception of the Christian Ministry - - - - -	141
VI. Lutheran Ordination Rites - - -	152
VII. Martin Bucer	162
VIII. Zwingli	170
IX. Calvin	173
X. Catholic Replies to the Reformers - -	179
A. On the Mass	179
B. On the Priesthood - - - -	179
XI. The Reformation at Cologne - - -	185
A. The Provincial Council of 1537 .	185
B. The <i>Encheiridion</i> - - - -	185
C. The <i>Simplex et Pia Consultatio</i> - - -	185
D. The <i>Antididagma</i>	185
E. Bucer's <i>Constans Defensio</i> - - - -	185
XII. The Council of Trent	202
A. General View of Protestant Conceptions of the Mass and the Priesthood - -	202
B. Formulation of the Catholic Doctrine on the Real Objective Presence -	202
C. Formulation of the Catholic Doctrine on the Sacrifice of the Mass -	202
D. Formulation of the Catholic Doctrine on Holy Order	202
XIII. The Catholic Church and Lutheran Orders	221

PART THREE

THE ENGLISH REFORMATION UNDER HENRY VIII

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. Henry VIII, until the Convocation of 1536	233
II. The Ten Articles of 1536 -	245
III. The <i>Bishops' Book</i> - - - - -	253
IV. The Negotiations with the Lutherans in 1538	263
V. The Six Articles	271
VI. The Revision of the <i>Bishops' Book</i> , and the Enquiry on the Sacraments - - -	276
VII. The <i>King's Book</i> — — — — —	292
VIII. The <i>Rationale</i> and Other Liturgical Projects	301
IX. Addendum One : Bishop Barlow's Consecra- tion, ETC. — — — — —	308
X. Addendum Two : Cranmer's Views - -	316

PART FOUR

THE ENGLISH REFORMATION UNDER EDWARD VI

I. The Two Chief Reformers : Cranmer and Ridley	325
II. The Three Parties in the Episcopate - -	330
III. The Plan for a Protestant General Council	340
IV. The First Steps	345
A. The Royal Visitation — — — — —	345
B. The Marriage of the Clergy - - -	345
C. The Questionnaire on the Mass - -	345
V. The <i>Communion Book</i> — — — — —	358
VI. The Imprisonment of Gardiner, and the Publication of Cranmer's Catechism -	345
VII. The First Prayer Book — — — — —	373
A. The "Windsor Commission" - -	373
B. The Sources used — — — — —	373
C. General Analysis - - - - -	373
D. The new Communion Service - -	373
E. The Doctrine of the new Service - -	373

CHAPTER	PAGE
VIII. The Debate on the Eucharist in the House of Lords, and the Voting on the Act of Uniformity -	402
IX. The Reception of the First Prayer Book -	412
A. Imprisonment of Bps. Bonner and Gardiner -	412
B. Opinions of the Foreign Reformers in England -	412
G. Opinion of Galvin -	412
D. Opinion of Cardinal Pole -	412
X. The Visitation and Debates at Oxford and Cambridge -	421
XI. Cranmer's Book on the Eucharist	424
XII. Gardiner's Reply, and Cranmer's Rejoinder	437
XIII. The Introduction of the New Ordinal	448
XIV. The Ordination of Deacons -	460
XV. The Ordination of Priests -	468
XVI. The Consecration of Bishops -	481
XVII. The Reception of the New Ordinal -	493
A. By Protestants — — — — —	493
B. By Anglo-Catholics -	493
C. The Use of the Ordinal and the number of Ordinand -	493
XVIII. The Destruction of Altars, and the Preparations for the Revision of the Prayer Book	507
XIX. The Second Prayer Book -	517
A. Its Compilers -	517
B. The Voting in the House of Lords -	517
C. Analysis of the New Book - - -	517
D. The Changes in the Ordinal -	517
E. The "Black Rubric" - - - -	517
F. The Reception of the New Book -	517
XX. The Forty-two Articles -	533
XXI. The Catechism, and the <i>Reformatio Legum</i> -	558
XXII. Conclusion of Volume One -	564
Index	567

PART ONE

THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD IN SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION

CHAPTER I

THE REAL OBJECTIVE PRESENCE

- A. PRELIMINARY NOTE ON DOCTRINAL DEVELOPMENT.
- B. THE REAL PRESENCE IN SCRIPTURE.
- C. THE REAL PRESENCE IN PATRISTIC TRADITION.

A. PRELIMINARY NOTE ON DOCTRINAL DEVELOPMENT.

The method we are adopting in this work seems to call for a brief explanatory note. It should be hardly necessary to remark that Catholics believe in two founts or sources of revealed doctrine, Scripture and Tradition. We do not regard ourselves as in any way bound to find proof of all our doctrines in Scripture alone ; we are quite prepared to allow that some may rest solely or mainly on Tradition. A more important point is that some doctrines may be only implicit in Scripture, and explicit only in Tradition. And the employment of these terms “ implicit ” and “ explicit ” naturally leads to a discussion of the possibility of doctrinal development, for a doctrine may remain implicit for some time before becoming explicit, and its explication may be a comparatively lengthy process.

In point of fact, however, Catholics maintain that the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence, ultimately formulated as “ Transubstantiation,” is contained explicitly, so far as its essentials are concerned, in the data of Scripture and Tradition. That is to say, the doctrine ultimately formulated by the Council of Trent is contained in the Scriptural and Patristic statements that the eucharistic bread and wine *become* and *are* the Body and Blood of Christ. Subsequent reflection upon these doctrinal statements, together with consideration of the obvious fact that, in appearance, the bread and wine remain, was bound to lead to further discussion as to the nature of the change by which the bread and wine become the Body and Blood. Various explanations might be suggested, and were in fact suggested in the course of time, some by orthodox theologians, and others by heretics. It thus became necessary to decide which of these various explanations was a faithful exposition and development

4 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

of the doctrine entrusted to the Church's guardianship. The Church had, from time to time, to exercise her authority in this way, and to express her mind. Thus we get ever more explicit formulations of the Eucharistic doctrine, culminating in the definitions of Trent.

As to the Eucharistic Sacrifice, we shall endeavour to show that Scripture and Tradition are explicit on the point that there is a Sacrifice in the Eucharist. The precise nature of the sacrifice does not seem to be taught explicitly in Scripture, but Tradition is clear, at any rate from the fourth century.

In the case of the Christian priesthood, and the rite of ordination, there will be found to have been much development of a minor kind, while the essentials have existed from the beginning.

But in the case of the Eucharist and in that of the Priesthood, there has been a gradual development of some kind or other, and a slow "explication" of doctrine. This fact of development, which we here acknowledge, necessarily admits of being regarded in two ways. There will always be some who maintain that the developments the Church has authorised and approved are, in reality, corruptions of the original doctrine, and that the statement and formulations which she has condemned as heretical are, in point of fact, the true and original doctrine, or at any rate a legitimate development of this. Such will be the view held by those who initiate the particular heretical interpretation, or who subscribe to it. Catholics, on the other hand, will of course maintain that the doctrine subsequently approved is a legitimate development of the original deposit. How are we to know which of these two attitudes is correct? There are two methods which may be adopted to determine this question.

The first method would be to examine the earlier and later texts, and show critically that, in point of fact, the Catholic doctrine as formulated eventually is substantially and in germ contained in the earlier statements. That is the method adopted by those who write histories of dogma, and studies in positive theology. It is largely the method which inspires the present work. Most of the works produced on the Catholic side in the Reformation period and since, have been of this kind. The Protestants appealed to Scripture and early Tradition, against the Catholic teaching of the Middle Ages. Naturally, therefore, the Catholic apologists and controversialists accepted this ground for the debate, and endeavoured to show that the later teaching was a legitimate expression of the earlier. (They were,

in point of fact, hampered by a somewhat inadequate conception of the nature and scope of doctrinal development.) In any case, it is of great interest to note that modern non-Catholic historians of dogma decide here in favour of the Catholic attitude, rather than in favour of the Protestant view. That is to say, they tend to admit that the Eucharist is presented in Scripture, and especially in Tradition, in a way which involves a Real Objective Presence and a Sacrifice, and that while there are undoubtedly different tendencies of thought in certain of the early Fathers, the great central school of Patristic tradition held conceptions which were bound to culminate in the Tridentine definitions. Thus the appeal to early Christian Tradition, first made by the Protestant Reformers, has been decided against them, not only by Catholic apologists, but also by many non-Catholic writers.

There is a second method of deciding the legitimacy of later theological developments, namely, the criterion of acceptance by the official authority of the Church. Catholics have always held that the Church has a perpetual and infallible teaching office, and accordingly, a later Council can officially and infallibly declare the real meaning and sense of an earlier statement of doctrine. Moreover, for this purpose, the Church may, if she thinks fit, employ new terminology in order to set forth her mind more clearly. The terminology may indeed be new, but in its essentials the doctrine itself will be very old indeed—in fact, as old as the Church itself. Thus, the First Council of Nicaea, in a.d. 325, employs the word *homoousion*—a term not found in Scripture or early writers—to define the sense in which the Church believes Our Lord to be really and truly the Son of God. Other examples would be the terms “Transubstantiation,” “Immaculate Conception,” and “Infallibility.” It is obvious that if the Church has this abiding gift of infallibility in teaching, there can never be any appeal from a later council to an earlier one, or from a Papal or Conciliar definition to Scripture, or Patristic tradition. In this sense the “appeal to history” would be “treason” to a Catholic. He can never admit that the Church has been mistaken in its definitions. Once she speaks, the cause is ended.

This second method, of course, can hardly appeal to non-Catholics. But while they may not be disposed to accept the infallible authority of the Council of Trent, for instance, at any rate they ought to allow that, on matters on which Christians

6 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

were divided in the sixteenth century, the great conservative body of the Western Church was not necessarily in the wrong, and that its judgments and decisions are, to say the very least, not lightly to be set aside, even by those who do not admit its canonical authority. If the Tridentine definitions faithfully represent the doctrine of the Mediaeval Church—and this is admitted by all—it must not be assumed without proof that the teaching of the Mediaeval Church is other than that of the Early Church. In point of fact, as we have already said, the appeal to the Early Church has been decided by many scholars against the Protestant conception, and in favour of the Catholic doctrine. This in itself gives to the Tridentine definitions a very great *a priori* value, which is seen to be entirely justified when we examine the facts themselves.

B. THE REAL OBJECTIVE PRESENCE IN SCRIPTURE.¹

Catholics consider that the Real Objective Presence of Christ's Body and Blood under the appearances of bread and wine—which finds its ultimate formulation in the definition of Transubstantiation, i.e., the conversion of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood—is clearly taught in the New Testament.

1. It is taught in the great Eucharistic discourse recorded in the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel, written towards the end of the first century, when, as it is generally agreed, the Eucharist was regarded as the Body and Blood of Christ (see later). Our Lord, according to this chapter of the Gospel, after performing the miracle of the multiplication of the loaves to feed five thousand people in the desert, profits by this occasion to set forth some teaching concerning some future "Bread" which He is to give. He compares this "bread" with the Manna, which the children of Israel ate in the wilderness :

"Your fathers did eat manna, in the wilderness, and are dead. But this is the bread that cometh down from heaven, so that if any man eat of it, he may not die. I am the living bread, which came down from heaven : if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever. And the bread that I will give, is my flesh, for the life of the world."²

¹ In this and the following sections, we adopt the conservative position on the matter of the authenticity of the incidents and discourses recorded in the New Testament. The reader who seeks for a reasoned justification for this conservative position will find it in works such as *L'origine de l'Eucharistic*, by Dr. Goossens ; *L'imposition des mains et les rites connexes dans le nouveau testament et dans l'Eglise ancienne*, by Dr. Coppens and others of a similar kind.

² John vi. 49-52.

The Jews then “ strove amongst themselves,” saying, “ How can this man give us his flesh to eat ? ”¹ They understood Our Lord to mean literally that He would give them His flesh to eat. Instead of disabusing them, and explaining that they had misunderstood Him, and given a “ carnal ” interpretation to what He meant “ figuratively ” or “ spiritually,” Our Lord repeats His statement, with startling emphasis :

“ Indeed, indeed, I say to you, Except you eat the flesh of the son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you. He that eateth my flesh and drmketh my blood, hath everlasting life, and I will raise him up in the last day. For my flesh is truly meat, and my blood is truly drink. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, abideth in me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth me, the same also shall live by me. This is the bread that came down from heaven. Not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead : he that eateth this bread shall live for ever.”²

The Jews were naturally scandalized, and even Our Lord’s disciples said : “ This saying is hard, and who can hear it ? ”³ To whom Our Lord said : “ Doth *this* scandalise you ? What if you should see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before ? ”⁴ after which words we may understand something like the following : “ would you not then believe my words ? ” Then Our Lord adds, “ It is the spirit that quickeneth (or ‘ gives life ’), the flesh profiteth nothing.” The words that I have spoken to you (which we may well understand, in accordance with Hebrew custom, as ‘ the things of which I have spoken to you ’) are spirit and life.”⁶ We may paraphrase this thus : “ I have said that * he that eateth me shall live by me,’ and that ‘ except you eat my flesh and drink my blood you shall not have life in you.’ But you must not think that I will give you my dead flesh to eat. I will indeed give you my flesh to eat, for my flesh will be indeed and truly meat, and my blood will be indeed and truly drink, but they will be vivified by my spirit, and that is why they will be life-giving realities.” Even after this explanation, “ many of his disciples went back and walked no more with him.”⁶

“ Then Jesus said to the twelve : Will you also go away ? ” And Simon Peter answered Him : “ Lord, to whom shall we go ? Thou hast the words of eternal life, and we have believed and have known that thou art the Christ, the Son of God.” Which we may paraphrase thus: “ We will not go away. What

1-4 53.
4 VI. 63.

1 *John* vi. 54-59.
* vi. 64.

* vi. 61.
• vi. 67.

other teacher could we have ? For we believe and know that thou art the Christ, the Son of God, and canst really and truly tell us how to attain to eternal life, and therefore, as you say that ‘ He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life,’ we believe it, though we understand it not.”

2. Next, we have the *of Institution*, at the Last Supper, when Our Lord took bread and broke it, and gave it to His disciples, saying, " Take, eat, for this is my body, the one which is being given for you.”

And likewise the cup, “ This is my blood, the blood of the new covenant, the blood which is being poured out for the sake of many, for the remission of sins. Do this for a commemoration of me.”

Is it possible not to see in this the fulfilment of the promise made in the Synagogue of Capharnaum, recorded in John vi ? Surely we have here the giving of the flesh and blood of Christ, “ for the life of the world ” ? Compare “ The bread which I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world ”^x and “ This is my body, the body which is being given for you.”

Catholics have consistently appealed to these texts as proving the Real Objective Presence of Christ’s body and blood under the appearances of bread and wine, and indeed, the very doctrine of Transubstantiation. For it is to be noted that, while Our Lord speaks of “ bread ” in the promise : “ The *bread* which I will give,” He adds that it is to be His Flesh ; and when He comes to the actual institution, He does not say “ with this bread,” or “ in,” or “ under this bread is my body,” but “ *This is my body.*” Similarly, He does not say “ in,” “ with ” or “ under this wine is my blood,” but “ *This is my blood.*” Yet manifestly the outward appearances of bread and wine remain, and in a sense we can still speak of the consecrated elements as “ bread” and “ wine,” in virtue of these outward appearances. Our Lord’s definite statement that the consecrated elements *are* His Body and Blood, taken in conjunction with the evident fact that the appearances of bread and wine remain, involve the doctrine of Transubstantiation. The consecrated elements are now Christ’s Body and Blood. But the appearances of bread and wine remain. Accordingly, the substance of the bread and wine must have been changed into the Body and Blood, for otherwise it would not really be true that “ This is His Body.” His

Body is really present, beneath the outward appearance of bread, and similarly His Blood under the appearance of wine.

3. We next come to the witness of *St. Paul*, who reminds the Corinthians that in the Eucharist they actually participate in and of the Lord's Body and Blood :

“ The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the participation of the blood of Christ ? And the bread which we break, is it not the participation of the body of Christ ? ”^x

The Greek word used here for “ participation ” is *koinonia*, and J. Y. Campbell has pointed out² that five times out of six, when used with a genitive it signifies a material participation in an object. Accordingly, St. Paul teaches here that the reception of the sacramental elements is the actual reception of Our Lord's Body and Blood.

This doctrine is clearly expressed in 1 Corinthians xi, 27-29 :

“ Whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord. But let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of the chalice, for he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, not discerning the body of the Lord. For this reason are many among you infirm, and weak, and many sleep. But if we would judge ourselves, we should not thus be judged. But whilst we are judged, we are chastised by the Lord.”

Here St. Paul plainly teaches that the reception of the sacramental elements in an unworthy state or condition is a terrible thing, which involves guilt in respect to the Body and Blood of the Lord Himself, and in consequence, brings down upon the receiver judgment and punishment. And this is because he receives, “ not discerning ” or “ distinguishing ” the Body of the Lord from ordinary food.

There would seem to be a reference to the Eucharist in Hebrews vi, 4, which speaks of “ those who have tasted the heavenly gift.” It is worthy of note that the context shows that this is one of the fundamental points of the Christian Religion.³

But enough has been said to show how plainly Holy Scripture teaches the Real Objective Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ under the appearances of bread and wine, and implies the conversion of these elements into the Body and Blood.

¹ 1 Cor. x. 16.

³ See Hebrews v. 12, vi. 4.

* *Journal of Biblical Literature*. 1932. pp. 352-80.

10 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

C. THE REAL OBJECTIVE PRESENCE IN PATRISTIC TRADITION.

1. Turning now to the early Christian writers, we can begin with *St. Justin Martyr* (c. a.d. 150), who speaks of the Eucharistic Food as follows, in his *Apology* :

“This food is called by us Eucharist. . . . We do not take these things as ordinary bread, or ordinary drink, but just as Jesus Christ our Saviour, being made flesh by the Word of God, had flesh and blood for our salvation, so also we have been taught that the food eucharisticised by the prayer of the word which has come from Him—food by which our blood and flesh are nourished with a view to their transformation—is *the flesh and blood of this same incarnate Jesus*”¹

It is to be noted here that St. Justin does not say that the bread and wine *are united with* the Body and Blood, as we might expect from the half-hinted analogy with the Incarnation, but that they *are* the Body and Blood. Jesus Christ *had* flesh and blood, but the bread and wine *are* the Body and Blood.

2. Next, we may mention *St. Ignatius of Antioch* (c. a.d. 110), who calls the Eucharist “the bread of God,” “the medicine of immortality,” “the antidote that we should not die but live for ever in Jesus Christ.”² And he condemns the Docetic heretics “who abstain from the eucharist because they confess not that the eucharist *is the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ*, who suffered for us.”³

3. Next, *St. Irenaeus* (c. 190) speaks thus of the Gnostic heretics of his time :

“How can they allow that the bread which has been eucharisticised *is the Body* of their Lord, and that the cup *is of His Blood*, if they say that He is not the Son of the Creator of the world ? And how can they say that the flesh which is nourished with the Body and Blood of the Lord is doomed to corruption ? Our belief is in harmony with the Eucharist, and the Eucharist, in turn, establishes our belief. For we offer to Him the things that are His own, proclaiming harmoniously the communion and unity of flesh and spirit. For as the earthly bread, receiving the invocation of God, is no longer ordinary bread but Eucharist, consisting of two realities, an earthly and a heavenly, so also our bodies, partaking of the Eucharist, are no longer corruptible, having the hope of the resurrection to eternity.”⁴

We have here two statements, one that the bread *is* the Lord's body, and that this is even acknowledged by the Gnostic heretics,

¹ *Apol.*, I, 65. N.B.—Throughout this work italics are *ours*, unless otherwise noted.

^{*} *ad Ephes.*, v. 20.

['] *ad Smyrn.* vii. 1.

⁴ *Adv. Hares.* IV, viii. 5.

and another to the effect that the consecrated bread is no longer ordinary bread, but eucharist, comprising an earthly and a heavenly reality. It has been suggested that the "earthly and heavenly realities" referred to are Our Lord's flesh and His spirit, but it seems more likely that they are the outward appearances of bread and wine, and Our Lord's Body and Blood. And while it is said that these are two "realities," they must, in view of the former statement, be combined in such a way as to justify the statement that the consecrated bread is no longer ordinary bread, but *is* Our Lord's Body.

4. In *Tertullian* (c. a.d. 197) we get similar statements, and at the same time the use of a new term, that of '*figura*' which might create a difficulty, if the context were not considered. Tertullian is arguing against Marcion that the God of the Old Testament is the same as the God of the New, and further, that Our Lord possessed a real, and not a phantom body. Accordingly, he points out that bread is spoken of in the Old Testament as a figure of Our Lord's body, which figure is fulfilled in the Institution of the Eucharist. Further, he argues that a figure must be a figure of a reality, *ergo* Our Lord's body is a real one :

"(Our Lord says :) * With desire have I desired to eat the pasch with you.' The destroyer of the law desired even to keep the passover! . . . Having received the bread and distributed it to the disciples, He made it His own body, by saying, 'This is my body,' i.e., [this] figure of my body. But there would not have been [note past tense] a figure, if there were not [present tense] a body of true reality. . . . A phantom would not be capable of having a figure. . . . But why does He call bread His own body? . . . Marcion understands not that this had been an ancient figure of the body of Christ, who says by Jeremias : * Against me they have devised a device, saying, Come, let us cast wood upon his bread,' to wit, the cross upon His body. Therefore did the illuminator of ancient things sufficiently make known what He then meant bread to have signified, calling [now] bread His own body. So also in the mention of the chalice. . . . That thou mayest also recognise in wine an ancient figure of blood, Isaias will be at hand. . . . So also He now consecrated His own blood in wine, who then figured wine in blood."¹

This shows that when Tertullian says that bread is a *figure* of Our Lord's body, he is speaking of "bread" in Old Testament texts. In this very passage he says Our Lord "*made* bread His Own body," "*called* bread His Own body," "*consecrated* His

¹ *Adu. Mardon*, v. 40*1.

12 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

Own blood in wine.” And any lingering doubt about Tertullian’s meaning ought surely to be dispelled by the following passage in which he condemns idolaters ; whom he describes as

“passing from the idols to the church . . . approaching those hands to the body of the Lord which bestow bodies on demons. . . . Makers of idols are chosen into the ministry of the Church. Horrible sin ! The Jews laid violent hands but once upon Christ; these every day assault His body. O hands worthy of being cut off! Let them now consider whether it was said only in a figure, ‘ If thine hand scandalize thee, cut it off ’ ? What hands ought more to be cut off than those by which the body of the Lord is offended ? ”^x

5. With the passage of time, we get many unequivocal testimonies to the conversion of the bread and wine into Christ’s Body and Blood, and no one can mistake their meaning. Thus *St. Cyril of Jerusalem* (c. a.d. 386), in his Catechetical Instructions, explains that “ before the invocation of the adorable Trinity, the bread and wine are mere bread and wine, but after the invocation the bread becomes the Body of Christ, and the wine the Blood of Christ.”²

Or again :

“ He Himself having declared and said concerning the bread, ‘ This is my body,’ who shall dare to doubt henceforward ? And He Himself having settled and said, ‘ This is my blood,’ who shall ever doubt, saying, ‘ This is not His blood ’ ? He once, at Cana in Galilee, turned water into wine, which is akin to blood, and is He undeserving of belief when He turned wine into blood ? . . . Wherefore, with the fullest assurance let us partake as of Christ’s body and blood, for in the type of bread is given to thee the body, and in the type of wine is given to thee the blood in order that having partaken of Christ’s body and blood thou mightest become one in body and one in blood with Him. . . . Wherefore, do not contemplate the bread and wine as bare [elements], for they are, according to the Lord’s declaration, Christ’s body and blood, for even though sense suggests this to thee, yet let faith establish thee. Judge not the thing from the taste, but from faith be fully assured without misgiving that thou hast been vouchsafed Christ’s body and blood. . . .

“ These things having learned, and being fully persuaded that what seems bread is not bread, even though sensible to the taste, but Christ’s body, and what seems wine is not wine, even though the taste will have it so, but Christ’s blood . . . strengthen thy heart.”³

The Tridentine Decree on Transubstantiation is practically identical with this fourth century statement of St. Cyril of Jerusalem.

¹ *De Idololatria*, pp. 8-9.

^{*} *Catech. xix. 7.*

^{*} *Catech. iv. 319-22.*

6. We need not trouble to give extracts from *St. John Chrysostom* (c. a.d. 380), of whom Loofs says that he

“ speaks of the presence of the real body and blood of Christ in such a grossly carnal way, and sometimes even so materially, and tactlessly (!), he speaks so distinctly of a conversion brought about by the words of consecration, that it is not surprising that almost all agree in saying that Chrysostom held a real eating of the real body and blood of Christ.”¹

7. We are quite ready to admit that there are ambiguous phrases here and there in some of the Fathers, and that, in particular, there was one group of writers in the fifth century who, in arguing against the Monophysites, used language and arguments which seem to imply the permanence of the substance or nature of the bread and wine after consecration, though it is important to note that even these writers were careful to assert that the bread and wine were “ transformed ” into the Body and Blood of Christ ; for that was an element of tradition which they evidently felt bound to accept. In any case, it is particularly interesting and significant that the ideas of this school originated with *Nestorius*, who was opposed in this matter by *St. Cyril of Alexandria*. Dr. Bethune Baker comments thus on the Eucharistic ideas of these two writers :

“ The view of the Eucharist which is represented as that of Cyril's school, it is evident, approximates closely to the doctrine of * transubstantiation, the *ousia* of the bread and wine becoming the *ousia* of the Word of God and ceasing to remain real bread and wine, whereas Nestorius champions the view that they remain in their own *ousia*, though inasmuch as that *ousia* is the same as the *ousia* of his human nature, they are His body and blood.”²

As is well known, the Monophysite heresy arose out of a misunderstanding of certain terms used by St. Cyril of Alexandria, and so it is not altogether surprising, though of course regrettable, that orthodox writers should have made use of arguments first put forward by Cyril's opponent, in order to refute the Monophysites. In any case, the fact that these ideas and arguments originated with Nestorius should surely be sufficient to make them suspect in orthodox minds.³

Fluctuations of thought, and imprecisions of terminology, of course, must be expected to occur in the history of the development of a doctrine.

¹ *Abendmahl*, 55, in Batiffol, *UEucharistie*, p. 408.

² *Nestorius and his Teaching*, p. 146.

³ See the treatment of this subject by Père Lebreton in the *Report of the Eucharistic Congress in London, 1908*, and also in Batiffol, *L'Eucharistie*, p. 454 et seq.

CHAPTER II

THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS

A. IN SCRIPTURE.

B. IN PATRISTIC TRADITION.

A. IN SCRIPTURE.

1. We will turn back now, first to Scripture and then to early Tradition, to consider the Eucharist as a Sacrifice. And here we may begin with an Old Testament type, and an Old Testament prophecy.

It is well known that many of the Psalms are of Messianic import, and were regarded as such, not only by the Jews, but also by Our Lord Himself. An instance is *Psalms cix (ex)*, to which Our Lord expressly appealed in Matthew xxii. 44. Now, in this psalm occurs the words :

“Thou art a priest for ever, after the manner of Melchisedeck.”

And the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews specifically applies this verse to Our Lord, who accordingly is “The High Priest after the order of Melchisedeck.”¹

2. Now apart from the Psalms, the only reference to Melchisedeck is in *Genesis xiv. 18-20*, where we are told that when Abram was returning from the slaughter of the kings, laden with booty, he was met by Melchisedeck, King of Salem :

“And Melchisedeck, the King of Salem, brought forth bread and wine, and he was priest of the Most High God, and he blessed him, and said, ‘Blessed be Abram by the most high God. . . . And he (Abram) gave him tithes of all.”

The Latin Vulgate here takes the clause concerning Melchisedeck’s priesthood to be explanatory of the preceding one, and translates *sacerdos enim erat Altissimi*, “for he was priest of the Most High God,” which implies that the “bringing forth” of the bread and wine was a specifically priestly act, i.e., an offering. This of course would not mean that Abram and his

¹ Hebrews v. 6, 10.

followers were not afterwards refreshed with the sacrificial bread and wine, for sacrificial banquets of this kind were fairly universal. The Hebrew *vau* may of course be taken in this explanatory sense. But the Protestant versions have translated the Hebrew literally by "and," and Protestant commentators have argued that the mention of Melchisedeck's priesthood has reference, not to the bringing forth of the bread and wine, which precedes its mention, but to Melchisedeck's act of blessing Abram, which follows it. Catholic commentators reply by pointing out that blessing was not a specifically priestly act, but was common to fathers of families, etc., and therefore the mention of Melchisedeck's priesthood would have no *raison d'être* on this hypothesis. It is also to be noted that even if we suppose the clause to refer to what follows, i.e., the blessing, this does not prove that it does not also refer to what precedes, i.e., the "bringing forth" of bread and wine.

Protestants appeal to the fact that *Josephus* regards the "bringing forth of bread and wine" as merely for the refreshment of Abraham, and not as a sacrifice. Here is what *Josephus* actually says 1:

"This Melchisedeck gave presents to Abraham's army, and a great abundance of provisions, and during the *feast* (παρὰ τὴν ἰσχυρίαν) he began to praise Abraham, and to bless God who had subjected his enemies to him. And when Abraham gave him the tenth part of the booty in turn, he accepted the gift."

Now it is to be noted here that, while the sacred text says that Melchisedeck blessed *Abraham*, *Josephus* says Melchisedeck blessed *God*, which implies some kind of religious rite. Further, the word we have translated as "feast" is often used for a sacrificial meal, and is so used by *Josephus* himself when he speaks of the consuming of sacrifices. So that *Josephus's* silence is not so absolute as has been represented, and he certainly does not *deny* that Melchisedeck offered a sacrifice.

To this we may add that *Josephus's* contemporary, *Philo*, says explicitly that Melchisedeck did in point of fact offer a sacrifice upon this occasion :

"When that great High Priest of God most Mighty saw Abram returning in safety . . . holding up his hands to heaven, he blessed him, and offered up the sacrifice for the victory (τὰ ἐμὲν Λκία and splendidly feasted all who had shared in the expedition." 2

1 *Antiquities*, I, x. 2.

2 *De Abrahamo* xl.

16 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

Furthermore, it is very interesting to note that the *Rabbinical tradition* of the Jewish writers is quite explicit on the point. Thus St. John Fisher, in his *Defence of the Catholic Priesthood*, quotes the following testimonies :

(a) *Rabbi Samuel ben Nahman*, who lived in the third century a.d., quoted by Rabbi Moses Hararsan in his eleventh century Midrash Bereshit Rabba major, on Gen. xiv. 18, as follows :

“ This gives the mysteries of the priesthood, for he (Melchisedeck) sacrificed bread and wine to the Holy and Blessed God, as is said there, ‘ And he was the priest of the most high God.’ ”

(b) *Rabbi Phinehas*, who lived in the second century a.d., writes as follows :

“ In the time of the Messiah, all sacrifices shall cease, but the sacrifice of bread and wine shall never cease. As it is said, Genesis xiv. 18, ‘ And Melchisedeck, King of Salem, took out (except) bread and wine.’ Melchisedeck it says, that is, the King Messiah. It says *Melchi*, that is king, because he is king of the whole earth, and also *sedeck* means justice. And he shall send his justice and peace over the whole world. . . . The King of Salem, that is the upper Jerusalem, took out bread and wine, that is, shall separate the sacrifice of bread and wine from the cessation of (other) sacrifices, as is said in Psalm cix. 4 : ‘ Thou art a priest for ever, according to the order of Melchisedeck.’ ”

(c) Next we get a certain *Rabbi Johai*, who, according to Fisher, lived some time before Christ. He prophesies that the sacrifice of bread and wine shall never cease, partly from the words of Judges ix. 13 : “ Can I desert my wine, which maketh glad both God and men ? ” ; upon which he comments as follows :

“ Granted that wine maketh men glad, how shall it make God glad ? By the sacrifice which is made of it.”

Again, he argues from Psalm Ixxii. 16 (Ixxi. 16), upon which he comments :

“ The sacrifice of bread shall never fail, as appears from the words of this psalm, ‘ And there shall be a handful of corn in the earth upon the top of the mountains.’ ”

(d) Next we have *Rabbi Kimhi*, who lived in the twelfth century a.d., and wrote a commentary on the psalms (printed in the Rabbinical Bible, Venedig, Bamberg, 1516-17), and also *Rabbi Solomon Rashi* (eleventh century a.d.), who similarly wrote a commentary on the psalms, also printed in the same

Rabbinical Bible. They interpret the whole of Psalm Ixxii (Ixxi) of the Messias, and say that his future sacrifice shall consist in a handful of com, with which the Chaldaic Targum agrees, for it says, “And there shall be *corban*, that is, a sacrifice of com in the earth in the top of the mountains of the church.”

(e) To the above we may add that Suarez, in his commentary on the Third Part of St. Thomas's *Summa* (q. 22, art. 6, sect. iv), utilising Galatinus, lib. 10, *De arcanis cath. writ.*, c. 4, 5, 7, and Genebrar in *Chronograph*, in 3. set. p. 13, in tom. 5 *Biblioth. sancta*, says that a *Rabbi Samuel*, in his book *De adventu Messia*, c. 19, writes :

“Melchisedeck instituted a sacrifice to God in bread and wine, with which he communicated Abraham, the friend of God.”

And a certain *Rabbi Moses* :

“Melchisedeck received Abraham returning from the war, with a banquet, having first solemnly offered bread and wine with the gentile rite (*pane et vino de ritu gentis sollemniter prius oblato*).”

We thus see that the view that Melchisedeck offered a sacrifice in bread and wine, and was in this respect a type of the future Messias, is by no means peculiar to Catholic writers.

3. We next come to the famous prophecy of *Malachy*, the last prophet of the Old Testament. This is translated as follows in the Westminster Version :

“I take no pleasure in you,
 Saith Jehovah of hosts,
 Neither will I accept an offering
 At your hand.
 For from the rising of the sun
 Even unto the setting thereof
 My name shall be great among the gentiles
 And in every place
 There shall be sacrifice, there shall be offering
 Unto my name, even a pure oblation;
 For my name shall be great among the gentiles,
 Saith Jehovah of hosts.”

There are only three possible interpretations of this prophecy. *One* would be that the prophet is referring to the pagan sacrifices offered in his time. This is really an untenable suggestion, for these sacrifices were certainly not offered to Jehovah, and it would run counter to the warning found throughout the prophets that the Jews are to keep themselves free from pagan

18 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

contaminations. To this we may add the idea, certainly favoured in i Corinthians x. 20, that the pagan sacrifices are offered to devils, and not to the true God.

The *second* suggestion would be that the sacred author had in mind the Jewish colony at Elephantine. This must also be ruled out, as the Palestinian Jews would hardly wish for a multiplication of such shrines. And in any case, such shrines most certainly did not then exist "in every place, from the rising of the sun unto the setting thereof," so that even in this hypothesis we should have to do with a prophecy.

The *third* suggestion is that it is a prophecy of what is to take place in Messianic times. And in this respect, as Father Lattey says, the prophecy must be looked upon as the complement of that found in Psalm ex (eix) 4, concerning the Priest of the Messianic era, according to the order of Melchisedeck. Adopting this third view, we must say that the prophecy has received its literal fulfilment in the Sacrifice of the Mass in the Catholic Church.

Taking this Old Testament evidence now together, we may say that it looks forward to a priest according to the order of Melchisedeck, who will in some way offer a sacrifice throughout the whole world, among the gentiles, and whose sacrifice will probably be associated with bread and wine, the ritual emblems of Melchisedeck.

4. Turning now to the New Testament evidence, we may note how, in *John vi. 52*, Our Lord says that the bread which he will give is His Flesh, "for the life of the world," language which suggests a sacrificial offering, for a definite purpose.

5. Next, we have the *words of institution*. The very phrase *touto poiete*, "this do," has a sacrificial sound, for *poiein* is used in the Bible for the offering of sacrifice, e.g., Exodus xxix. 39, cf. also Levit. ix. 7 ; Ps. Ixvi. 15 ; Luke ii. 27, and Justin Martyr uses it in this sense :

"The oblation of wheaten flour, prescribed to be offered for those who were purified from leprosy, was a type of the bread of the eucharist which Our Lord commanded us to offer [*poieit*^A for a commemoration of His Passion."¹

Again, in the same words of institution we have the use of the present participles, which imply that the bread becomes the Body which is here and now being "given" for the faithful, i.e., for the sake of the faithful, not merely to the faithful;

¹ *Dialogue with Trypho*, n. 41.

while the wine becomes the Blood which is here and now
 “poured out⁹⁹ for many for the remission of sins.¹

Likewise we have the use of the word *anamnesis*, memorial, which is used in a sacrificial sense in Leviticus xxiv. 7 ; in Numbers x. 10, and probably also in Psalm xxxvii. 1, Ixix. 1.

6. We must also note the parallel which St. Paul draws out in his *First Epistle to the Corinthians* between the Eucharist, the Pagan sacrifices, and the sacrifices of the Jews :

“Behold Israel according to the flesh : are not they, that eat of the sacrifices, partakers of the -altar ? . . .

“The things which the heathen sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God. And I would not that you should be made partakers with devils.

“You cannot drink the chalice of the Lord and the chalice of devils ; you cannot be partakers of the table of the Lord and of the table of devils.”²

It is to be noted that the Jewish altar is called “the table of Jehovah⁹⁹ in the prophecy of Malachi, in the verse which immediately follows after the prophecy of the sacrifice of the Gentiles, i.e., in Malachy i. 12, so that no one can urge that the “table⁹⁹ does not mean “altar.”

7. Further, we have the definite statement in *Hebrews* xiii. 10, that Christians have an altar, of which Jews may not eat, while Christians in turn should not eat or participate any longer in Jewish sacrifices :

“It is best that the heart be established with grace, not with meats, which have not profited those that walk in them. We have an altar, whereof they have no power to eat, who serve the tabernacle.”³

8. We may here deal briefly with some objections brought against the Catholic doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass, from this same Epistle to the Hebrews.

First, it is said that, while the author draws out a very detailed parallel between Melchisedeck and Our Lord, he says nothing

^x Bishop Hooper, of Gloucester, made this sacrificial terminology a reason for denying the Real Presence :

“If He were here in the sacrament bodily and corporally, He should every day suffer and shed His precious blood. For the scripture saith, ^{*} This is my body that is broken for you and my blood that is shed for you? ” (*Sermons on Jonas*, P.S., Early Writings, p. 516.) In other words, if Scripture teaches the Real Objective Presence, it also teaches the Sacrifice.

^a 2 Cor. x. 18-21.

• *Hebrews* xiii. 9-10

20 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

of the offering of bread and wine. This is, of course, quite true, but mere silence does not prove anything. For the sake of argument, let us suppose that the Protestant interpretation of Genesis xiv. 18-20 is correct, and that Melchisedeck did *not* offer bread and wine, but merely refreshed Abram with this food. And let us also suppose that the Protestant interpretation of the Eucharistic texts in the New Testament is correct, and that Our Lord gives us bread and wine, and *not* His body and blood. Even so, it would be true that Our Lord, like Melchisedeck, refreshes His faithful people with bread and wine ; and yet it would still be true that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, who could hardly be ignorant of the fact, nevertheless passes it over in silence ! So that in any case the author cannot be supposed to *deny* a thing because he does not *refer* to it.

Next, a more insistent argument from the Epistle is based upon the definite statements it contains to the effect that Our Lord offered Himself *once for all*:

“ He needeth not daily (as the other priests) to offer sacrifices, first for his own sins and then for the people's, for this he did once for all, in offering himself.”¹

“ Nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holies every year with the blood of others ; for then he ought to have suffered often from the beginning of the world. . . . Christ was offered once for all, to exhaust the sins of many.”²

To this we reply that the statement that Our Lord offered Himself “ once and once only ” must obviously be read in the light of the context. The inspired author is comparing Our Lord with the Jewish high priest, and the ritual of the Temple :

“ Into the second (the holy of holies) the high priest entereth alone, once a year, not without blood, which he offereth for his own and the people's ignorance. . . . Christ hath entered *once* into the holies.”³

Here obviously the “offering” implies the whole sacrifice, the slaying of the victim, the entering of the priest behind the veil, and the presentation or sprinkling of the blood inside the holy of holies. That symbolises Christ's death, and entrance into Heaven, and this took place once and once only. Christ, having died, has entered once for all into the heavenly holy of holies. That this is the meaning of “ offering ” here is obvious from the statement that if Our Lord were to offer Himself often,

¹ Hebrews vii. 27.

² Hebrews ix. 25-28.

³ Hebrews ix. 7, 12.

He "ought to have suffered often," i.e., died often. There can, then, be no repetition of Christ's death.

On the other hand, there can and must be a sacrificial commemoration or memorial of Christ's death. (See texts previously mentioned, and also the definite statement of St. Paul in i Corinthians that the Eucharist "shows forth" the death of the Lord.)

Further, the Epistle to the Hebrews gives us definitely to understand that Our Lord continues His priestly intercession for us "behind the veil," i.e., in Heaven.¹

If now we turn to the last chapter of the Epistle we shall see that a Christian sacrifice, so far from being excluded, is really supposed. St. Paul says that we Christians have an *altar*, of which it is our right to eat.² Then, a few verses later, we have:

"By him (Christ), therefore, let us offer the sacrifice of praise always to God, that is to say, the fruit of lips confessing to his name. And do not forget to do good and to impart, for by such sacrifices God's favour is obtained."³

We may allow—though this is by no means certain—that "the sacrifice of praise" means praise, and not the Eucharistic offering itself. And obviously almsgiving, etc., is not the Eucharistic offering. But they are mentioned precisely in connection with the "altar," of which Christians have the right to eat, and, moreover, these sacrifices are to be offered by or through Jesus Christ, who is our Eternal Sacrifice; for this may well be the implication of the statement in xiii. 8, "Jesus Christ, yesterday and to-day and *the same* for ever," which precedes the reference to the Christian altar. Hence these subsidiary sacrifices presuppose the Christian altar, with its sacrifice, Christ Himself, and are to be offered to God only through and by Him, i.e., in union with the Divine Victim.

We may freely allow that all this is left in a certain obscurity, but at any rate it is not true to say that the language of St. Paul excludes the Eucharistic Sacrifice. It may only be urged that the Christian Sacrifice must respect the uniqueness of Our Lord's Sacrifice upon the Cross, and this necessity has ever been before the mind of the Church's theologians, who have insisted that our redemption was merited for us by the Sacrifice of Calvary, and that the sacrifice of the Mass does but apply the merits of that One Sacrifice. Further, the language which is preferred

¹ *Hebrews* viii. 1; x. 19-22; etc.

² *Hebrews* xiii. 10.

³ xiii. 15-26.

22 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

by her theologians is that Our Lord did indeed offer Himself but once, and that on the Cross, and yet *we* can offer Him daily. The Mass is the *Church's* sacrifice, rather than Our Lord's, although of course it is still true to say that the Catholic priesthood acts in a ministerial and instrumental capacity, and derives its powers and authority from the great High Priest, Christ Himself.

B. IN PATRISTIC TRADITION.

1. Coming now to the evidence from early Christian tradition, we note that the *Didactic*, a first-century document, speaks of the Christian "sacrifice," and invokes the famous prophecy of Malachy :

"On the Lord's Day gather together and break bread, and offer the Eucharist, having first confessed your transgressions, that our sacrifice may be pure. Let everyone that hath a dispute with his friend not come together with you until they be reconciled, that your sacrifice be not profaned. For this is the word that was spoken by the Lord : * In every place and time to offer to me a pure sacrifice, for I am a great King, saith the Lord, and my name is wonderful among the Gentiles.' "x

We note the obvious reference here to Our Lord's injunction that one who is not at peace with his brother should go first to be reconciled with him "and then let him come and offer his gift at the altar."?

2. Next, the *Epistle of Clement of Rome* to the Corinthians, written also towards the end of the first century, compares the oblations of Christian priests to the sacrifices offered by the Jews, and says that the offerings are to be made at fixed times :

"It behoves us . . . to perform both the oblations and the liturgical duties, and not at random and disorderly hath He commanded this to be done, but at determinate times and hours. . . . They, therefore, that make their oblations at the appointed times, are at once accepted. . . . For there are proper offices assigned to the chief priest, and there are proper ministrations incumbent on Levites. . . ."8

3. Again, *Iustin Martyr* (c. a.d. 150), in his *Dialogue with Trypho*, says the Old Testament offering of flour was a type of the Eucharistic sacrifice which Our Lord commanded us to offer for a commemoration of His Passion. In the same passage, St. Justin goes on to quote the prophecy of Malachy, and then says:

* *Circa finem.*

1 *Matthew* v. 24.

· *Ep. ad Cor.*, 40, 41, 44.

“Even then does He prophesy concerning the sacrifices offered unto Him in every place by us gentiles, that is, of the bread of the eucharist and of the cup in like manner of the eucharist, saying that His name is by us glorified, and by you profaned.”¹

4. The *Epistle of Barnabas*, while repudiating carnal sacrifices, speaks of “the oblation not made by human hands,” which pertains to “the new law of Our Lord Jesus Christ.”²

5. The *Epistles of St. Ignatius* employ the word altar (*thusiasterion*) five times in relation to Christian worship.³ He also speaks of the Eucharist as “the new oblation of the new covenant,” “the oblation of the Church,” “the pure sacrifice.”⁴

6. *Origen*, again, describes the Eucharist as “the only memorial which makes God propitious to men,” and calls Our Lord “the shewbread which God set forth as a propitiation through faith in his blood.”⁵

7. We also get some significant passages in *St. Irenaus*, as follows :

“Giving instruction to His disciples to offer up to God the first-fruits of His creatures—not as though He needed, but that they themselves might be neither unfruitful nor ungrateful—He took that creature bread and gave thanks, saying, This is my body. And in like manner He confessed the cup—which is, according to us, from that creation [wine ?]—to be His own blood, and taught the new oblation of the New Testament, which [oblation] the Church receiving from the Apostles, throughout the whole world offers to God, to Him who grants us sustenance, the first-fruits of His own gifts in the New Testament, respecting which Malachias, one of the twelve prophets, thus predicted. . . .

“We offer unto God His own, harmoniously proclaiming communion and union. For, as bread which is from earth, receiving the invocation of God, is no longer common bread, but the eucharist, consisting of two things, both of an earthly and of a heavenly thing, so also our bodies, partaking of the eucharist, are no longer corruptible, having the hope of resurrection unto (everlasting) ages. . . .

“The Word (of God) gave to His people a command to offer oblations, though He needed them not, that they might learn to serve God, and so on this account does He wish us also to offer the gift at the altar frequently, without intermission. There is, therefore, an altar in the heavens (for thither are our prayers and oblations directed), and a temple, as John saith in the Apocalypse.”⁶

¹ *Dialogue with Trypho*, n. 41.

² cf. Darwell Stone, *History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, i, p. 46.

³ IV, xvii, 5, xviii, i, in D. Stone, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

⁴ In *Leo*, *bom.* xiii. 3.

⁵ *Adv. Hares.*, lib. iv, c. xvii. 5-6, xviii. 1-6.

⁶ ii. 6.

24 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

8. But by the time of *St. Cyprian* (c. a.d. 258) the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice had become quite explicit. Here are some citations from this African Father :

“ We see the sacrament of the dominical sacrifice prefigured in the priest Melchisedeck. . . . For who is more a priest of the most high God than our Lord Jesus Christ, who offered sacrifice to God the Father, and offered that same which Melchisedeck had offered, that is bread and wine, namely, His own Body and Blood ? . . . In Genesis therefore, that the blessing given by the priest Melchisedeck to Abraham might be duly celebrated, a figure of the sacrifice of Christ goes before, appointed namely in bread and wine, which thing the Lord perfecting and fulfilling, offered bread and the chalice mingled with wine. . . . For taking the chalice on the eve of His passion, He blessed and gave to His disciples saying, Drink ye all of this, for this is the blood of the new testament, etc., wherein we find that the chalice had been mixed which the Lord offered, and what he declared His blood had been wine. Whence it is apparent that the blood of Christ is not offered if there be not wine in the chalice, nor is the sacrifice of the Lord celebrated by a legitimate consecration, unless the oblation and our sacrifice correspond with His passion. If Jesus Christ our Lord and God be Himself the great high-priest of God the Father, and first offered Himself a sacrifice to the Father, and commanded this to be done in commemoration of Himself, assuredly that priest who imitates what Christ did, truly acts in Christ's stead, and he then offers in the Church, to God the Father, a true and complete sacrifice, if he so begin to offer according as he sees Christ Himself did offer. . . . Because in all the sacrifices we make mention of His Passion (for the sacrifice which we offer is the Passion of the Lord), nothing else but what He did ought we to do.”¹

Elsewhere *St. Cyprian* speaks of the custom of offering the sacrifice for the living and the dead.²

9. Equally definite quotations could be given from *Origen*, *St. Cyril of Jerusalem*, *St. Augustine*, *St. Ambrose*, and many other Fathers. But the belief in the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, at any rate from the time of *St. Cyprian* onwards, is nowadays contested by no serious theologian or historian.

Here are one or two quotations :

St. Ephrem (c. a.d. 373) : “ An eternal redemption having been obtained, Thou dost daily renew Thy sacrifice upon the altar.”³

St. Basil (a.d. 379) : “ Can he who is not clean of heart exercise the priestly office without danger ? . . . The Lord teaches us that he who dares to sacrifice the body of the Lord

¹ Ep. 63, *ad Caelicum*.

² Ep. 70, *Ad Clerum et PUbem Fumis.*, Ep. 77, *ad Nemesianum*.

³ *Patanes.*, Ixxiv, p. 555.

• . . is so much more impious as is the body of the only begotten Son of God of greater excellence than goats and oxen.”¹

St. Ambrose (a.d. 397) : “ Let us priests follow Christ as best we may, that we may offer sacrifice for the people; though lowly in merit, yet honourable by sacrifice, because, though Christ is not now seen to offer, yet is He Himself offered on earth when the body of Christ is offered, yea, He is Himself manifested as offering in us, whose word sanctifies the sacrifice which is offered.”²

St. John Chrysostom (a.d. 407) : “ That great High Priest, when He has taken His station at this holy table, presenting that rational worship, offering up that unbloody sacrifice . . . calls on all to send up this most awful sentence, Holy, Holy, Holy.”³

And again : “ Do we not offer up daily ? We offer indeed, but making a commemoration of His death, and this oblation is one, not many . . . because it was offered once. . . . For we always offer up the same, not truly one sheep to-day and another to-morrow, but always the same thing, so that the sacrifice is one. According to this reasoning, as He is offered up in many places, are there also many Christs? Not at all, but one Christ is everywhere ; both here entire, and there entire—one body. Wherefore, as He that is offered up in many places, is one body, not many bodies, so also is the sacrifice one. Our High Priest is he that offered up that sacrifice which cleanses us ; that same sacrifice we offer up also now, which was then offered—that sacrifice which cannot be consumed. This takes place for a memorial of that which then took place.”⁴

St. Cyril of Alexandria (a.d. 444) : “ We celebrate in the churches the holy and vivifying and unbloody sacrifice, not believing the body which lies before us to be that of one of the men amongst us or of a common man, and in like manner the precious blood, but rather receiving it as having become the proper body and blood of the all-vivifying Word.”⁵

The force of the Patristic testimony to the Sacrifice of the Mass, as to the Real Presence, was recognised by so stout a Protestant as Tyndale, who in his *Fruitful and Godly Treatise* answered the Lutherans thus :

“ Unto them that say that the bread is his very body, I answer, Ye must remember that the old doctors as earnestly call it a sacrifice, as they do Christ's body. But that ye deny. . . . Wherefore ye ought of no right to be angry with them (the Zwinglians), though they deny the doctors, where they seem to say that the sacrament is the very body of Christ, as they be not angry with you when ye deny them where they as earnestly affirm that it is a sacrifice.”⁶

¹ *De Baptismo* lib. ii, q. 2-3.

² *Hom. vi in * Vidi Dominum*, * n. 3.

³ *Expl. xii anath. xi.*

⁴ *In Ps. xxxviii.*

⁵ *Hom. xvii in ep. ad Hebr.*, n. 3.

⁶ Parker Society edn., p. 370-1.

CHAPTER III

THE EARLY LITURGY OF THE EUCHARIST

Having thus dealt with the doctrinal aspect of the Eucharist in Scripture and Tradition, we now proceed to deal briefly with the early forms and gradual development of the rite according to which the Eucharist was celebrated. We shall find, as we might expect, that the principle *lex orandi*¹ *lex credendi* applies here, and that the evidence of the liturgies confirms the conclusion we have already derived from an examination of Scripture and Tradition.

1. The Eucharist was undoubtedly the central rite in Christian worship from the beginning. This is shown by Acts ii. 42 : “ They were persevering in the doctrine of the Apostles, and in the communication of the breaking of bread, and in the prayers.” Moreover, the rite was performed very frequently, and at first even daily : “ Continuing daily with one accord in the Temple, and breaking bread from house to house.”¹ It is also worth pointing out especially how St. Paul, in his journeys, contrives to spend the first day of the week with some church, and to “ break bread ” there.

As to the rite used, we must note that the ritual of the Pasch, at which the Last Supper was instituted, comprised an instruction given by the father of the family, consisting of a recital of God's benefits to his people, especially their deliverance from Egypt, the blessing of the cup of wine, and the singing of the Hallel, or psalms of praise, consisting of psalms cxii to cxvii, with psalm cxxxv. In the second place, the service in use in the synagogues at this time consisted of readings of portions of the Old Testament, exposition of the passages read (i.e., preaching), and prayers, perhaps in a litany form.

There can be little doubt that the primitive rite of the Eucharist would in its composition include elements derived from these two sources. Thus, we should expect to find the

¹ Acts ii. 46-7.

reading of Scripture, with a homily. Afterwards the "gifts" of bread and wine will be prepared, and the celebrant will begin the "prayer of thanksgiving" (for the word "Eucharist" means "thanksgiving"), which will enumerate God's benefits to His people, and lead up to the Passion and Death of God's Son, together with His glorious Resurrection and Ascension, and the descent of the Holy Ghost. In connection with the Passion would naturally come the solemn commemoration of the institution of the Eucharist, as the Christian sacrifice and sacrament, with the recital of the words of institution. There would then be the distribution of the consecrated elements to the communicants, ending doubtless with further thanksgiving. Probably some psalms would be sung at some parts of the rite, or perhaps some liturgical hymns of Christian origin. (There seems to be an allusion to some such liturgical hymn in Ephesians v. 14.)

2. The only account we have in the New Testament of the Eucharistic rite is in Acts xx. 7-11. There is indeed no mention here of any readings from Scripture or of psalms, but St. Paul preached a lengthy homily, and after this he "broke bread" and communicated, accompanying these acts by a prayer (*satis locutus est*). This vague description must of course be taken in conjunction with the Scriptural passages which tell us how the Eucharist was regarded (see pp. 6 *et seq*¹ 14. *et seq*.).

3. Omitting some "thanksgiving prayers" which occur in the *Didache*, the exact significance of which is disputed, the next reference to the Eucharistic rite is in the *Epistle of Pope Clement the First to the Corinthians*. From this we gather that "The Master commanded that the offerings and services (*prosphoras kai leitourgias*) should be performed, not at random, but at fixed times and hours."¹

But a much more detailed account is found in *St. Justin Martyr*:

"On the day called Sunday, all that live either in town or country meet together at the same place, where the writings of the apostles and prophets are read. . . . When the reader has done, the bishop preaches a sermon. . . . At the conclusion of this discourse we all rise up together and pray, and prayers being over, there is bread and wine and water offered, and the president sends up prayers and thanksgivings . . . and the people conclude with the joyful acclamation of Amen."²

28 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

Previously, St. Justin has said that after the prayers and the ritual kiss of peace,

“bread and a cup of wine and water are brought to the president, which he takes, and offers up praise and glory to the Father of all things, through the name of His Son and the Holy Spirit, and his thanksgiving to God for deeming us worthy of these His creatures, is a prayer of more than ordinary length. When the bishop has finished the prayers and the thanksgiving, all the people present conclude with an audible voice, saying, Amen. . . . The Eucharistic office being thus performed by the president, and concluded with the acclamation of all the people, those we call deacons distribute to everyone present to partake of this Eucharistic bread and wine and water, and then they carry it to the absent.”¹

Thus, in the time of Justin Martyr, the Eucharistic rite consisted of:

- (1) lessons from the Old and New Testament;
- (2) a homily;
- (3) the prayer of the faithful;
- (4) the kiss of peace ;
- (5) the presentation of the bread and wine to the celebrant;
- (6) the eucharistic prayer of praise and thanksgiving, of more than ordinary length, concluding with “Amen” ;
- (7) the distribution of communion to those present;
- (8) the taking of communion to the absent.

Gradually the rite became definitely divided into two portions, the “Liturgy of the Catechumens,” comprising the reading of Scripture, homily, prayers, and possibly psalms, etc., and the “Liturgy of the Faithful,” beginning with the presentation of the bread and wine for the Sacrifice, or « Offertory,” then going on to the Consecration Prayer, and the Communion. The Consecration Prayer was known as the *Anaphora*, or Canon.

4. The two oldest *Anaphora* known to us are, first, the *Anaphora* ascribed by scholars to *St. Hippolytus*, Bishop of Rome in the third century, and a fourth century one found in the *Sacramentary of Serapion*. The former is easily the most important, as, in the opinion of scholars, the Hippolytan rite is

“the model of all Liturgies known to us from its day until now. The Antiochene Liturgy of the fourth century is based upon it. . . . From the Antiochene form evolved the Byzantine Liturgy. . . . From the same Antiochene root grew the normative Liturgy

of St. James (Jerusalem) . . . which in turn furnished the standard for most of the Syrian Liturgies. . . . Even the so-called Nestorian Liturgy has undoubted affiliations with the Antiochene type. . . . A careful investigation and testing of the primitive text of the Roman Canon shows that the old Hippolytan text was its foundation also.”¹

Here is this Eucharistic Canon or Anaphora from the rite of Hippolytus :

Bishop : The Lord be with you.

Congregation : And with thy spirit.

Bishop : Lift up your hearts.

Congregation : We have, to the Lord.

Bishop : Let us give thanks to the Lord.

Congregation : It is meet and right.

Bishop : We give thanks unto thee, O God, through thy beloved Servant Jesus Christ, whom in the last times Thou hast sent to be the Saviour, Redeemer, and Announcer of thy Will, who is thine inseparable Word through whom Thou hast made all things, and who was well pleasing unto Thee. Him thou didst send from heaven into the womb of the Virgin, and, being carried in her womb, was incarnate, and was manifested as thy Son, born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin. He, in fulfilment of Thy will, and preparing for thee a holy people, stretched out His hands when He was suffering, that He might deliver those who believed in Thee.

When He was being given up to His willing passion, that he might destroy death, break the bonds of the devil, trample hell underfoot, illumine the just, set a boundary to death, and show forth the Resurrection, taking bread, He gave thanks unto Thee, and said, “ Take, eat, this is my body which is broken for you.” Likewise also the cup, saying, “ This is my blood which is poured out for you. When ye do this ye make a memorial of me.”

Remembering then His death and Resurrection, we offer to Thee the bread and the cup, giving thanks to thee that Thou hast considered us worthy to stand before Thee and act as Priest unto thee.

And we beseech Thee to send Thy Holy Spirit upon the sacrifice of Thy Church. Which do Thou, in uniting it, give to all the saints who partake for fulfilment of the Holy Spirit unto the strengthening of faith in truth, that we may praise and glorify Thee.

Through Thy Servant Jesus Christ, through whom, unto Thee, be glory and honour to the Father and the Son with the Holy Spirit in Thy Holy Church, now and evermore. Amen.

The above is the Anaphora or Canon used at the Ordination Mass. For the *Apostolic Tradition* says that at every ordination the Eucharist is to be offered, and it is interesting to note that

¹ Lietzmann, quoted in *Liturgy and Worship*, p. 108.

30 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

the rubrics specify a concélébration by the new priests with the bishops on this occasion.¹

There is another account of the Eucharist in the *Apostolic Tradition*, and that is the Baptismal Eucharist. After the rite,

“The offering is immediately brought by the deacons to the bishop, and by thanksgiving (by eucharisticising) he shall make the bread into the image (Greek: *antitupon*) of the body of Christ, and the cup of wine mixed with water, according to the likeness of the blood, which is shed for all who believe in Him.”²

We note here the use of the words “antitype” and “likeness.” Easton, the latest editor, adds the following important note on these:

“The former word (antitype) is used by Cyril of Jerusalem,³ and the latter by Serapion.⁴ None of this language is ‘symbolic’ in the modern sense. Whatever unlikeness theologians might feel existed between the symbols and the things signified was overshadowed by the realistic connection that existed between them.”⁵

5. The anaphora of *Serapion* is also of venerable antiquity. A translation of it will be found in *Bishop Serapion's Prayer Book* (S.P.C.K., London, 1899), and also in Duchesne's *Christian Worship* (fifth edition, p. 76). We quote the following extract:

“Holy, holy, holy, Lord of Sabaoth, full is the heaven and the earth of Thy glory. . . . Lord of hosts, fill also this sacrifice with Thy power and Thy participation, for to Thee have we offered this living sacrifice, this bloodless oblation. To thee have we offered this bread, the likeness⁶ of the Body of the only begotten. This bread is the likeness of the Holy Body, because the Lord Jesus Christ in the night in which He was betrayed took bread and broke and gave to His Disciples, saying, ‘Take ye and eat, This is My Body, which is being broken for you for remission of sins.’ Wherefore we also making the likeness of the death, have offered the bread, and beseech Thee through this sacrifice, be reconciled to all of us and be merciful, O God of Truth: and as this bread had been scattered on the top of the mountains and gathered together came to be one, so also gather Thy holy Church out of every nation and every country and every city and village and house, and make one living Catholic Church. We have offered also the cup, the likeness of the Blood, because the Lord Jesus Christ, taking a cup after supper, said to His own disciples: ‘Take ye, drink, this is the new covenant, which is My Blood,

¹ See *Apostolic Tradition*, translated by Easton, p. 72.

² p. 48 in Translation by Burton Scott Easton (Cambridge, 1934).

³ See the passage quoted from St. Cyril of Jerusalem on p. 12.

⁴ See the quotation from Serapion, below.

⁵ *Apostolic Tradition*, p. 94.

⁶ *ἡμοιωμά*, see above.

which is being shed for you for remission of sins.' Wherefore we have also offered the cup, presenting a likeness of the Blood. O God of Truth, let Thy Holy Word come upon this bread, that bread may become Body of the Word, and upon this cup, that the cup may become Blood of the Truth. . . . We intercede also on behalf of all who have been laid to rest, whose memorial we are making. . . . Receive also the thanksgiving of the people, and bless those who have offered the offerings and the thanksgivings."

It is worthy of note that these two primitive forms of the Eucharistic Canon both represent the rite as a sacrificial one.

From these two rites have been derived all the great liturgical families. It is not necessary to study these in detail: they all teach the Real Presence and the Sacrifice. We shall be concerned mainly with the particular form known as the Roman rite, in general use on the Continent and in this country at the time of the Reformation. It was the Roman rite which was discarded by the Reformers, and replaced by the various Protestant Communion Services with which we shall deal in due course.

CHAPTER IV

THE MINISTRY AND ORDINATIONS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

We now turn back to consider the Christian Ministry and the Ordination rites in the early Church. One important point at once follows from the preceding chapters : *The key to the interpretation of the ordination rites of the early Church is to be found in the Eucharistic theology and rites of the Church of that time.* If a particular ordination rite simply says that the candidate is raised to the “presbyterate,” and if it is clear *aliunde* that the “presbyterate” was an office to which the function of offering the Eucharistic sacrifice was attached, then emphatically the ordination rite in question must have intended to convey what we call the sacerdotium, or “sacrificing priesthood.” And the use of the word *presbyteratus* instead of *sacerdotium*, or *presbyter* instead of *sacerdos*, makes no difference, provided it is clear that the office and function conferred upon the candidate really include that of offering the Eucharistic gifts, i.e., the body and blood of the Lord, under the forms of bread and wine.

1. We will first discuss very briefly the *number and character of the grades of the ministry.* It is of faith that Our Lord instituted a hierarchical ministry, and it is also clear that, *historically*, the ministry has, at least from the second century, consisted of bishops, priests, and deacons. It is, moreover, *offaith* that all these three grades belong to the Sacrament of Holy Order, and it is also *offaith* that this, like all other Sacraments, was instituted by Christ our Lord, at least in this sense that if, as in the case of the Sacrament of Extreme Unction, a sacramental rite is “promulgated” by an Apostle, he must have done so by Divine authority. It is thus *offaith* that it is in accordance with Our Lord’s positive will that there is in the Church a distinction between the episcopate, or high priesthood, and the simple priesthood or ordinary priests. That, however, does not mean that the three grades were in explicit and definite existence

from the time of Pentecost. The Apostles themselves possessed the episcopate, i.e., the fulness of the priesthood, for they had the power of ordaining, and the power of ordinary jurisdiction, which are characteristic of bishops. In the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistles, we find churches endowed with officials who are sometimes called "bishops" and sometimes "presbyters." It is not certain whether these were really bishops or simple priests. It is not at all impossible that at first the churches were governed—subject of course to the supreme authority of the Apostles—by a college of what we should now call "bishops."¹ But by the time of St. Ignatius, i.e., in the second century, it is clear that there were in existence simple priests as well as bishops. And while the New Testament evidence is not clear or convincing, Catholics are nevertheless sure that the simple priesthood, as distinct from the episcopate, must be of Divine, or Divine-Apostolic, as distinct from merely ecclesiastical institution, and that therefore the simple priesthood must have been instituted at least by an Apostle, if not directly by Christ our Lord, and, moreover, by an Apostle acting upon Divine instructions, or expressing the Divine Will.

The existence of deacons, of course, is quite clear in the New Testament.

We said above that the Apostles possessed the plenitude of the priesthood. While various powers were given to them at different times, the essential power of the priesthood as such, i.e., the power to consecrate and offer Our Lord's body and blood, was communicated by Our Lord to the Apostles at the Last Supper. This has been solemnly defined by the Council of Trent (Session 22, cap. i).²

It would seem clear also from the above definition that the priesthood conferred upon the Apostles at the Last Supper was the *plenitude* of the priesthood, i.e., that the Apostles were

¹ It is conceivable that some of the Apostolic Churches were thus governed by real "presbyter-bishops," who possessed the plenitude of the priesthood, i.e., the episcopal dignity, but that these churches were at the same time governed immediately by the Apostles, or by Apostolic delegates like Timothy. In this hypothesis it would be the Apostles or their delegates who really possessed episcopal jurisdiction over these churches. Possibly the "presbyters" who ordained Timothy, as mentioned in 1 Tim. iv. 14, would be "presbyter-bishops," and it is also conceivable that such a college of presbyter-bishops continued to exist at Alexandria, where some early authorities say that the presbyters used to appoint the patriarch. Dom Puniet says that the laying on of hands by presbyters in the present rite for ordaining priests may be a relic of the days when presbyters really possessed episcopal power. On the other hand, as we shall see, the *Apostolic Tradition* expressly states that presbyters do not ordain.

* cf. Tixeront, *Holy Order*, pp. 32-3.

made not only "priests" but "bishops." That is to say, they were at the same time empowered to create other priests.

There are various other powers inherent in the Christian ministry, besides the power to consecrate and offer which is characteristic of the priesthood as such. It is unnecessary to mention all of these, but we may single out the power of forgiving and retaining sins, formally and explicitly conferred upon the Apostles by Our Lord after His Resurrection, as recorded in John xx. 21-23. It is very important to observe from the outset that by the words: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whose sins ye shall forgive, they are forgiven, etc.," Our Lord did not confer the *priesthood* upon the Apostles, but only a *secondary and subordinate power* attached to the priesthood. The Apostles had already been constituted priests, i.e., endowed with the essential power of consecrating and offering the Eucharistic sacrifice, at the Lord's Supper. The Apostles were at another time given the supreme power of teaching and governing all nations. But with this we are not immediately concerned here.

As to the *rite* by which the Apostles were ordained priests, we have no information. It is of course possible that Our Lord may have laid His hands upon them, but there is no record of this fact in the Scriptures.

We can now pass on to the Scripture account of the rite of ordination as applied, first to deacons, secondly to presbyters, who, as we have seen, may have been bishops, and thirdly, the ordination of St. Timothy, who certainly was a bishop, for instructions are given him concerning the ordination of others.

2. *Ordination of Deacons.*¹

Acts vi. 1-6 records the ordination of the first deacons. The Christians of Jerusalem selected seven of their number, "presented them to the Apostles, who prayed, and laid their hands on them." We note here a clear distinction between the *election* or choice, which was made by the community in general, and the *ordination*, which was reserved to the Apostles. As to the functions of the newly chosen deacons, while the narrative in the Acts gives us to suppose that the occasion for their appointment was a dispute concerning the ministration of material goods, there can be little doubt that they were practically from the first associated both with a certain amount of preaching (St. Stephen

¹ See Coppens, *Imposition des Mains*, p. 220 et seq.

was also a teacher, and Philip was an Evangelist, Acts xxi. 8), and especially with the ministration of the spiritual table of the Eucharist. It is this variety and solemnity of function which account for the virtues sought in the candidates for the office, for they are to be "men of good repute . . . full of the Holy Ghost and of wisdom,"¹ "modest, not double tongued, not given to much wine, not following after filthy lucre, but having the ministry of the faith in a pure conscience."² We have only to read the Epistles of St. Paul to realise how widespread the institution of the diaconate very soon became.

3. *Ordination of Presbyters.*

The *Acts* speaks in many places of certain superiors of local churches, called "presbyters," and once called "bishops."³ They are first found in the Church of Jerusalem,⁴ then in the churches of Pisidia,⁶ then in those of Asia.⁶

There is no mention of the rite of ordination so far as the presbyters of Jerusalem are concerned. But there is a reference to the rite in connection with the presbyters of Pisidia and Asia. As to the former: "when they had constituted presbyters in every church, and had prayed and fasted, they commended the Christians to the Lord."⁷ It is important to note that the word used for "constituted" here is *cheirotein*, which at least suggests an imposition of hands. This ordination, again, is the work of the Apostles only. At the same time, Acts xx. 28, i.e., the address to the presbyters of Ephesus, makes it clear that their office is due to the Holy Ghost: "Take heed to yourselves, and to the flock, over which the Holy Ghost has placed you bishops to feed the Church of God."

To these references we may add that of 1 Timothy v. 22, in which the disciple of St. Paul is instructed as follows: "Lay hands suddenly on no man"; unless, as some think, this refers to the reconciliation of penitents.

There is also an apparent reference to an ordination rite in Acts xiii. 1, in which "prophets and doctors," in response to a special instruction from the Holy Ghost, "separated" Paul and Barnabas for their special work, "laid hands on them," and sent them away. It is to be remarked that the verb here translated as "separate," *aphorizein*, occurs in the description

¹ Acts vi. 3. ¹ 1 Timothy iii. 8-9.

⁴ Acts xi. 30; xv. 22-23 / xvi. 4 > xx*. z8.

⁴ Acts xx. 18, 28.

• Acts xx. 28.

⁴ Acts xiv. 23.

⁷ Acts xiv. 23.

of the Old Testament rite of ordination of the Levites.¹ We are bound to say, however, that some, basing themselves upon the express declarations of St. Paul,² think that the ceremony described in Acts xiii. i was not a real ordination. There are two further questions which would be involved. Were the "prophets and doctors" themselves in orders, and if so, in presbyteral or episcopal orders? They would, of course, have to be in episcopal orders if they were really ordaining. Secondly, if an ordination is here referred to, was it to the episcopate or to the simple priesthood?

4. Lastly, we have the ordination of St. Timothy by St. Paul. There are references to this both in the First and the Second Epistle to Timothy:

"Neglect not the gift which is in thee, which was given thee by prophecies, with the imposition of hands of the presbyters."³
 "Stir up the gift which is in thee by the imposition of hands."⁴

We gather from this that Timothy's ordination involved a discourse by prophets, and the imposition of St. Paul's hands and those of the presbyters of some local Church. The result of the ordination is the possession of a certain gift or charisma. The characteristics of this gift are given us in 2 Timothy i. 7-12, and consists of graces of the Spirit especially suitable for his pastoral ministry, and his guardianship of the faith.

As to the particular office conveyed by this ordination, it seems clear that it is the fulness of the priesthood, i.e., the episcopate, that is in question, for the functions of Timothy are plainly episcopal ones.

Summing up, we may say that the New Testament gives us to understand that Christian ministers were ordained by *prayer*, accompanied by the *laying on of hands* of the Apostles, together with the laying on of hands of the "presbyters," in certain cases at any rate.

¹ Numbers viii. 5-26, i.e., in Numbers viii, 11.

• In Galatians i. 12, 17; ii. 8.

• 1 Timothy iv. 14.

* 2 Timothy i. 6.

CHAPTER V

THE ORDINATION RITES IN THE EARLY CHURCH

The scanty literature of the first and second centuries does not give us much information about ordinations. The *Didache* says : “ Appoint, therefore, bishops and deacons,¹ and St. Clement in his *First Letter to the Corinthians* simply says that “ the Apostles established their first converts as bishops and deacons.”²

But with the third century our information becomes more extensive. The laying on of hands is mentioned in many instances.³ But there are practically no references here to the form of words employed. For this we must go to the early *Church Orders* and *Constitutions*. These seem to have been drawn up because of certain irregular practices which had begun to creep in. For instance, confessors for the faith had apparently begun to claim the right to exercise the priesthood without ordination. Accordingly, we get the decrees of various councils in East and West regulating the subject of ordination.⁴ But most valuable information as to the rite of ordination is given us by the *Church Orders*. The earliest of these is apparently the “ *Constitutions of the Church of Egypt*,” which seems, however, to have originated in Rome, and to have been written by St. Hippolytus,⁵ and to have been set forth by him under the title *Apostolic Tradition* (St. Hippolytus died 235). This *Apostolic Tradition* contains a most interesting and early ordination rite, which appears again in various works derived from the *Apostolic Tradition* and dating from the third to the fifth century, and which, in view of their wide geographic spread, in Latin, Coptic, Arabic, and Ethiopic versions, show how universal this early ritual must have been.

¹ xv. 1.

• xlii. 4, 16.

* cf. Coppens, *op. cit.*, p. 141-2 ; Tixeront, *op. cit.*, p. 146.

⁴ cf. Coppens, *op. cit.*, p. 143.

• Its Hippolytan origin, however has been denied by R. Lorentz (*De Egyptische Kerkordening*, Haarlem, 1929).

38 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

We shall deal only with the three higher orders, i.e., the episcopate, priesthood and diaconate.

1. *The Consecration of Bishops.*

The people, presbyters, and visiting bishops are all assembled. A first imposition of hands is made by all the bishops. All pray in silence because of the descent of the Holy Ghost. Then one of the bishops, at a summons from the others, imposes his hand upon the ordinand, and recites the following prayer :

O God and Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ, Father of mercies and of all consolation, who dwellest on high and yet beholdest lowly things, who knowest all things before they come to be, Thou who hast set boundaries in Thy Church (? instituted ordinances) by the word of Thy grace, foreordaining from the beginning the race of the righteous (from) Abraham, appointing rulers and priests, and not leaving Thy sanctuary without a ministry, Thou from the beginning of the world hast been well pleased to be praised in those whom Thou hast chosen : pour forth now that power that is from Thee of Thy principal spirit, which Thou didst give to Thy beloved Son Jesus Christ, which He bestowed on His holy Apostles, who established the Church in every place, Thy sanctification, to the glory and unfailing praise of Thy name.

Grant, O Father, reader of the heart, to this Thy servant, whom Thou hast elected to the episcopate, to feed Thy holy flock, and to show forth to Thee the primacy of the priesthood (*primatus sacerdotii*), serving without blame day and night unceasingly to propitiate Thy countenance, and to offer the gifts of Thy Holy Church, to have, in the spirit of the primacy of the priesthood (*primatus sacerdotii*) power to remit sins according to Thy commandment, to give the lots (? bestow ecclesiastical offices) according to Thy precept, to loose every bond according to the power which Thou didst give to the Apostles, to please Thee, moreover, in meekness and purity of heart, offering Thee a sweet-smelling savour, through Thy child Jesus Christ, through whom be to Thee glory, with Him and the Holy Spirit. Amen.¹

2. *Priests.*

The *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus directs that the Bishop is to lay his hand on the head of the ordinand, the Presbyters also touching it with him, while the Bishop is to say, “*secundum ea qua prae dicta sunt, sicut prae diximus super episcopum*”² But the rubric also orders the recitation of a special prayer for a priest.

¹ Cf. *Apostolic Tradition*, by Easton, p. 34; *Liturgy and Worship*, by Finninger, p. 630 ; Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, p. \$27.

² Easton makes the interesting suggestion that this direction refers back to a stage of ecclesiastical organisation prior to the monarchical episcopate, “which came later in Egypt than elsewhere” (*Apostolic Tradition*, p. 79). But this is difficult to reconcile with the statement that priests do not really ordain.

We are probably to understand that the first part of the prayer for a bishop is to be said for a priest, and the latter part replaced by this special prayer.¹ This is as follows :

“ God and Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ, look down on this Thy servant, and impart to him the Spirit of grace and counsel of the presbyterate, that with a pure heart he may help and govern Thy people, as Thou didst look down on Thy chosen people and command Moses to choose presbyters, whom Thou didst fill with Thy spirit which Thou gavest to Thy servant. And now, O Lord, grant that there may be unfailingly preserved amongst us the spirit of Thy grace, and make us worthy that believing we may minister to Thee in simplicity of heart, praising Thee through Thy Servant Jesus Christ. . . ,²

The *Apostolic Tradition* is careful to say that priests do not really ordain : “ Clerum non ordinant (presbyter) super praesbyteri vero ordinatione consignat episcopo ordinante.”³

3. *Deacons.*

The *Apostolic Tradition* lays it down that the bishop alone imposes hands upon a candidate for the diaconate, for the latter is ordained, not “ *in sacerdotio, sed in ministerio episcopi . . . non accipiens communem præsbyteri spiritum*” The prayer for this is as follows :

“ O God, who hast created all things, and ordered them by Thy Word, O Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, whom Thou didst send to minister Thy will and manifest Thy desire to us, give to this Thy servant the Holy Spirit of grace and solicitude and industry, whom Thou hast chosen to minister to Thy Church, and to offer in Thy holy of holies that which is offered to Thee by Thy ordained chiefpriests to the glory of Thy name, that having without blame served the degrees of ordination in purity of life, he may obtain the highest rank (? priesthood), and Thy honour, and glorify Thee, through Thy Son Jesus Ghnst our Lord.”⁴

We must now point out some features in this Ordination rite, the earliest we possess. We note, to begin with, that in the “ consecration prayer ” the office is definitely *named* in the case of the *episcopate* and the *priesthood*. In the case of the *diaconate*, the office is sufficiently specified by the statement that the candidate is “ to minister⁵ to the Church,” and to “ offer in the holy of holies that which is offered to God by ordained

¹ So Firminger, in *Liturgy and Worship*, p. 630.

² Easton, p. 37 ; Firminger, in *Liturgy and Worship* p. 630' ; Duchesne, *op. cit.*, p. 530.

³ Easton, p. 38.

⁴ *Liturgy and Worship*, p. 631 ; Easton, *Apostolic Tradition*, p. 38 ; Tixeront, *op. cit.*, pp. 159-160 ; Latin text in Duchesne, *op. cit.*, pp. 530-1.

⁵ The Greek for this would of course be *diakonein*.

chief priests," i.e., to act as deacon at Mass. This is remarkably explicit, as denoting also the essential relations of the deacon to the *sacrificing priesthood*.

In the case of the *episcopate*, we note that prayer is made that God would pour forth His princely Spirit in power upon the candidate, that He may "feed thy holy flock, and show forth to thee the primacy of the priesthood," or "high priesthood," "offering the gifts of thy Holy Church" [again note the sacrificial conception explicitly set forth], and, "in the spirit of the primacy of the priesthood, to have power to remit sins, and to bestow offices": a very full enumeration of the episcopal functions, with special emphasis on the *sacrificial* function.

We note that there are *two* laying-on of hands in the case of the consecration of a bishop. As we shall see, the *first* laying-on of hands disappears generally in the derived rites, while other ceremonies are added. In place of the omitted first imposition of hands, the subsequent rites have directions concerning the choice of the candidate, so that it would seem the first imposition of hands was simply a solemn approbation of the candidate by the bishops present.¹

Turning now to the ordination of *priests*, we note that while part of the prayer for bishops is probably to be said, there is in addition a special prayer, naming the priesthood, and mentioning the analogy of the presbyters chosen by Moses. The character of the "presbyterate," i.e., the sacerdotal character, hardly needed explicit mention, in view of the definite reference in the episcopal prayer, and in point of fact it is not impossible that the sacrificial reference would be included in the part of the episcopal prayer ordered to be said for priests. Moreover, the *Apostolic Tradition* itself enacts that all the presbytery is to join with the bishop in offering the gifts.²

II

The *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus, which, as we have seen, dates from the third century, provided the basis for many other church orders from that time onwards. It is called the "first church order." The "second" is the work known as the *Canons of Hippolytus*. These were made much of by Bishop John Wordsworth, who regarded them as the third-century service book

¹ See Coppens, *Imposition des Mains*, p. 145, against Frere, *Essays on the Early Church*, pp. 275, 308.

² Easton, p. 72.

of the Roman Church. But, as Professor Turner says, they are "a very secondary authority, a version of a version, not only late in their present Arabic dress, but not earlier than the fourth century in their substance."¹ These canons exist at present in two versions, one Arabic and the other Ethiopic, and it seems that the former is a translation from the latter, while the latter in turn must have been a translation from the Greek. (There is also a Latin version made from the Arabic, and this was published in 1870 by Haneberg.) Achelis, their editor, for the edition in the *Texte und Untersuchungen* of Gebhardt and Harnack, remarks, *d propos* of the number of translations through which the work has passed, "Under these circumstances, it becomes our first duty to ascribe the least possible weight to all those proofs which are based upon particular words or expressions, especially when these are not contained in the Egyptian Church ritual."² It would surely follow that arguments based upon omissions in the present form of the Canons would be equally precarious. However, let us now examine the ordination prayers in these Canons.

The prayer for the ordination of a bishop corresponds to that in the *Apostolic Tradition*. The consecrator mentions "the great Abraham" (the type of a spiritual Father), and then prays that God may bestow upon the elect the power which Christ gave to His Apostles :

"Look upon this Thy servant, giving him Thy grace and the spirit of power, which Thou didst give through our Lord Jesus Christ, Thy only Son, to the holy Apostles, who founded the Church in every place to the honour and glory of Thy name."

Then we get an enumeration of the special functions comprised in this office :

"Grant him to watch over Thy people without sin, and to be worthy to feed Thy great and holy flock. Receive his prayers and his oblations which he shall offer to Thee day and night, and let them be to Thee as an odour of sweetness. Grant him also, O Lord, the episcopate, and the spirit of clemency, and the power to remit sin, and grant him ability to dissolve all bonds of iniquity of devils, and to heal all diseases, and to bruise Satan under his feet."

The episcopate is thus obviously represented as a *sacrificial* high priesthood, empowered to offer the oblations to God. In this respect the parallel with the Apostolic Tradition is obvious.

In the case of the ordination of a *priest*, however, the *Canons*

¹ *Apud* Firminger, in *Liturgy and Worship*.

² pp. 215-7.

42 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

of Hippolytus state that “all things are done as with a bishop, except that he is not enthroned. Also the same prayer is said over him in its entirety (*pratur tota*), as for a bishop, with the sole exception of the word ‘episcopate’. Let the bishop be in all things like unto the priest, except the throne and ordination, for the power of ordaining is not given to him.” This would seem to imply that the special prayer for priests given in the *Apostolic Tradition* is *not* to be said, but this cannot be regarded as quite certain. In any case, the prayer is to be so adapted as to miss out the phrase “Grant him the episcopate.” Presumably the reference to the offerings of oblations, and the power to remit sin, will remain in the adapted prayer, and it will thus be perfectly clear that what is being conferred is a *sacrificial* priesthood, even if the word “priest” be not included.

The prayer for a *deacon* expressly mentions St. Stephen, who is of course the type of a deacon :

“Pour forth Thy holy spirit on this Thy servant, and prepare him with those who serve Thee according to Thy will, even as Stephen. . . . Accept his service through our Lord Jesus Christ.”

It is highly probable that the original Greek form of these canons would have *diakonia* for “service.”

Thus, in the *Canons of Hippolytus*, the ministry is still clearly set forth as a *sacrificial* ministry, one office is expressly *named* (the episcopate), the priesthood is described in terms of *sacrifice*, and the diaconate in terms of the first Deacon, and the ministry of service.

in

The *Third Church Order* is that found in Book VIII of the so-called *Apostolic Constitutions*, and in a summarised form in the *Constitutiones per Hippolytum*. This Order belongs to the latter part of the fourth century, and gives us the ordination rite as carried out in most of the Eastern churches at this time.

The consecration of a bishop is thus described :

One of the principal bishops, with two others, stands near the altar, the rest of the bishops and presbyters praying silently, and the deacons holding the Gospels open upon the head of the elect. The principal bishop then says the consecratory prayer, which corresponds to the prayer in the *Apostolic Tradition*, but is somewhat developed :

“O Lord God Almighty . . . Thou hast given laws to Thy Church by the coining of Thy Christ in the flesh. . . . Do Thou by the intercession of Thy Christ pour down upon us the power of Thy eternal Spirit . . . even as, according to Thy Will, O eternal God, He gave Him to Thy holy Apostles. Grant, O Lord who knowest hearts, to this Thy servant, whom Thou hast chosen to the episcopate, to feed in Thy name Thy holy flock, and to perform the functions of the pontificate in holiness and without blame, ministering day and night before Thee. May he propitiate Thy countenance, and gather together the number of those who shall be saved, and offer to Thee the gifts of holy Church. Grant him, Almighty Lord, through Thy Christ, to share in the Holy Spirit, that he may have power to remit sins according to Thy commandment, and to provide clergy as Thou hast bidden, and to loosen all bonds according to the power Thou gavest to the Apostles, and to please Thee in gentleness and purity of heart, offering to Thee continually without blame or sin in the odour of sweetness, the pure and unbloody Sacrifice which Thou hast constituted through Christ as the mystery of the new Covenant, through the same Thy holy Son Jesus Christ. . . . Amen.”

This beautiful and expressive prayer makes it perfectly clear that the episcopate is the plenitude of the sacrificial priesthood. Note the very explicit reference to the unbloody Sacrifice of the Mass.

Strangely enough, there is no rubric directing the consecrating bishop to impose hands when reciting this prayer, but, as Coppens says, the addition of new ceremonies, such as the holding of the Gospels on the head, has necessarily led to a rearrangement of the text, and the omission of a ceremony universally known and observed.¹

For the ordination of a *priest*, the bishop is directed to lay his hand upon his head, in the presence of the presbyters and deacons, and to say a prayer in which the following occurs :

“Look down upon this Thy servant, who is put into the presbytery by the vote and determination of the whole clergy, and do Thou replenish him with the Spirit of grace and counsel, to assist and govern Thy people with a pure heart, in the same manner as Thou didst look down upon Thy chosen people, and didst command Moses to choose elders, whom Thou didst fill with thy Spirit, so do Thou also, O Lord, to this man. . . .”

Here we get the explicit mention of the presbyterate which is being conferred, and the typical allusion to the presbyters chosen by Moses, as in the *Apostolic Tradition*.

44 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

For a *deacon*, the *Apostolic Constitutions* direct that the bishop is to lay hands on the candidate, and say a prayer containing the following :

“Receive our supplication, and cause the light of Thy countenance to shine upon this Thy servant, who is ordained for Thee to the office of a deacon, and fill him with Thy holy Spirit and with power, as Thou didst fill Stephen, Thy martyr, and follower of the sufferings of Thy Christ. Render him worthy to discharge acceptably the ministration of a deacon . . . that he may attain a higher degree.”

This mentions the office, and its type, Stephen.

The ordination rites of the Coptic and Maronite Churches seem to have been derived from this rite in the *Apostolic Constitutions*. In addition, it would seem to have formed the basis of the Greek rite.

IV

Next we must mention a group of fourth-century ordination prayers, namely those found in the Prayer Book or “Sacramentary” of Bishop Serapion (a.d. 350), the friend and correspondent of St. Athanasius, and Bishop of Thmuis in Egypt. It is to be noted that this prayer book of Serapion does not contain a *complete ordination rite*, i.e., it is *not a complete Church Order*, but only contains *prayers used on various occasions*.

1. Here is the prayer for a bishop, from this Sacramentary of Serapion :

“Laying-on of hands of the making of a bishop : Thou who didst send the Lord Jesus for the gain of all the world, Thou who didst through Him choose the Apostles, Thou who generation by generation dost ordain holy bishops, O God of truth, make this bishop also a living bishop, holy (? worthy) of the succession of the holy Apostles, and give to him grace and divine spirit, that Thou didst freely give to all Thy own servants and prophets and patriarchs : make him to be worthy to shepherd Thy flock, and let him still continue unblameably and inoffensively in the bishopric, through Thy only begotten Jesus Christ. . . . Amen.”

This prayer duly mentions by name the office which is being conferred. It presents certain analogies with the prayer in the *Apostolic Tradition*, but is very much shorter.

2. Here now is the prayer which Serapion gives for the ordination of a *presbyter* :

“We stretch forth the hand, O Lord God of the heavens, Father of the Only Begotten, upon this man, and pray that the

Spirit of Truth may dwell upon him. Give him the grace of prudence and knowledge, and a good heart. Let the Divine Spirit come to be in him, that he may be able to be a steward of Thy people, and an ambassador of Thy divine oracles, and to reconcile Thy people to Thee, the uncreated God, who didst give of the Spirit of Moses upon the chosen ones, even the Holy Spirit. Give a portion of the Holy Spirit to this man also, from the Spirit of Thy Only Begotten, for the grace of wisdom and knowledge and right faith, that he may be able to serve Thee in a clean conscience, through Thy only begotten Jesus Christ."

This prayer presents certain analogies with the prayer for priests in the *Apostolic Tradition*, and its related rites. Like them, it contains the typical reference to the elders chosen by Moses, and prays that the spirit given to them may be imparted to the ordinand. Accordingly, we may say that it specifies the order given by this recognised typical allusion.

In any case it is by no means certain that the above is the only prayer to be said for a priest. (We have already remarked that the Sacramentary of Serapion does not give a complete ordination rite.) It begins with the phrase, "We stretch forth the hand," and this occurs at the beginning of only one other prayer in Serapion's collection, and this is No. 28, which is the first of "Benedictions *to be said in connection with previous prayers.*" (The words also come in the *middle* of Serapion's Eucharistic anaphora.) So that there may have been other prayers in this Ordination rite.

3. Here is the prayer at the laying-on of hands of the making (katastaseos) of deacons :

"Father of the Only Begotten, who didst send Thy Son, and dost ordain the things (*pragmatd*) on the earth, and hast given rules to the Church and orders (*faxeis*) for the profit and salvation of the flocks, and dost choose bishops, presbyters and deacons for the ministry of Thy Catholic Church, and didst choose through Thine Only Begotten the seven deacons, and didst freely give to them Holy Spirit, make also this man a deacon of Thy Catholic Church, and give in him a spirit of knowledge and discernment that he may be able cleanly and unblameably to do service in this ministry in the midst of the holy people, through Thy only begotten Son Jesus Christ. . . Amen."

This prayer mentions the office conferred by name.

V

At the end of the fifth or beginning of the sixth century, we get a brief description of the ordination rite in *pseudo-Dionysius*

46 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

the Areopagite, which evidently corresponds to that of the *Apostolic Constitutions*. The prayers are not quoted, but the ceremonies are described.¹

° The bishop-elect kneels before the altar, and the Scriptures are placed on his head. The consecrating bishop lays his hand on him, and recites prayers.

“The candidate for the priesthood kneels also before the altar, and the bishop lays his right hand on his head, reciting a consecratory prayer.

“A candidate for the diaconate kneels, but only on one knee, his head is ‘overshadowed’ by the bishop’s right hand, and a consecratory prayer.

“For the rest, the consecrating bishop makes a sign of the cross on each candidate for orders, and there is a proclamation of their names and the orders they are receiving, and the ceremony ends with the holy kiss.”

Here we obviously have the intermediate stage between the simple rite in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, and the developed form in the Oriental liturgies, which we shall now proceed to describe.

¹ *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, ch. v.

CHAPTER VI

THE DEVELOPED ORDINATION RITES

I. GREEK RITE.

The ordination rite of the Greek Church as practised in the ninth century was published by Morinus in 1655.

1. In the case of a *deacon*, after the oblation, the ordinand comes forward and the Bishop recites what is known as the "Proclamation" :

"The Divine grace . . . advances N. to the diaconate."

The ordinand kneels, and the Bishop marks his head with a triple sign of the Cross, and lays his hand upon him, reciting the following prayer :

"O Lord our God, who in Thy foreknowledge dost pour the abundance of Thy holy Spirit upon those who are destined by Thy inscrutable power to become ministers and serve in Thy mysteries, do Thou, O Lord, preserve this man, whom it hath pleased Thee to promote to the diaconate, holding the sacrament in all honesty of faith and purity of conscience ; grant him the grace given to Stephen Thy first martyr, who was first called by Thee to the work of this ministry, that he may minister according to Thy good pleasure in the degree bestowed upon him. . . ."

Then there come some invocations, followed by a second imposition of hands, with the following prayer :

"O God our Saviour, who with incorrupt voice didst sanctify the law of ministry for Thine Apostles and didst declare the same of Thy first martyr Stephen, and didst Thyself preach in fulfilling the office of a deacon. . . . Do Thou, O Lord, fill this Thy servant, whom Thou hast willed should take up the ministry of a deacon, with the coming of Thy lifegiving Spirit. . . . For not by the imposition of my hands, but by the visitation of Thy abundant mercies he is shown worthy of Thy grace. . . ."

After this, the new deacon is invested with the *orarium*, and, after the kiss of peace, with the *fiabellum*.

The prayers accompanying the impositions of hands mention the office conferred, and one refers to the deacon's past in the sacred mysteries.

48 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

2. The ordination of a *priest* begins similarly with the “Proclamation,” and the signing with the cross. Then the bishop imposes his hands, saying the following prayer :

“ O God, who art without beginning or end . . . and who hast honoured with the name of priest those who belonging to this degree have been judged worthy to preach the word of Thy truth, O Lord of all things, Thyself grant to this person also, whom Thou hast been pleased to allow me to promote, to receive this great grace from Thy Holy Spirit. Make him Thy accomplished servant, who may please Thee in all things, and lead a life worthy of this sublime dignity which Thy foreseeing omniscience confers upon him. . . .”

Then come some invocations, followed by a second laying-on of hands, with this prayer :

“ O God, great in power . . . do Thou, O Lord, fill this man, whom Thou hast been pleased should take up the degree of priesthood, with the gift of Thy Holy Spirit, that he may be worthy to assist blamelessly at Thy Altar, to preach the Gospel of Thy kingdom, sanctify the word of Thy truth, to offer to Thee gifts and spiritual sacrifices, and to renew Thy people with the washing of regeneration. . . .”

After this, the new priest is invested with the stole (*orarium*), and chasuble (*phelonium*) ; then the bishop gives him the kiss of peace, and lastly, before communion, the bishop puts into his hands a consecrated host. We note that these ordination prayers mention the order conferred, and the second prayer mentions the priestly office at the altar.

3. At the Consecration of a *Bishop* the bishop elect is led up to the altar by three bishops. The consecrating bishop lays his hands on the head of the bishop elect, reciting the “ Proclamation ” :

“ The Divine grace . . . advances N., the most pious priest, to a bishop. Let us all therefore pray for him that the grace of the All Holy Spirit may come upon him.”

Then, opening the book of the Gospel, the consecrator lays it upon the head and neck of the bishop elect. The threefold sign of the cross is made, and then the bishop lays on hands again, saying the following prayer:

“ O Lord our God and Ruler, who through Thine illustrious Apostle Paul hast enjoined upon us degrees and ranks for the service and ministry of Thy sacred and stainless mysteries at Thy holy Altar, namely, first Apostles, secondly Prophets, and then Doctors : do Thou, O Lord of all, strengthen this man also, who has been elected and deemed worthy to undertake the evangelical

yoke and the Pontifical dignity, through the hands of me a sinner and my fellow bishops, and with the coming and virtue and grace of Thy Holy Spirit, as Thou didst strengthen the holy Apostles and Prophets, as Thou didst anoint Elings and hallow Bishops, so also shew his bishopric blameless, and adorning him with all honour pronounce him to be holy. . . .”

Then come some invocations, followed by another imposition of hands, with this prayer :

“ O Lord our God, who, when human nature could in no wise bear the presence of Thy Godhead, didst by Thy dispensation constitute mortal teachers like to ourselves in reason, to occupy Thy throne and offer sacrifice and oblation for all Thy people, do Thou make this man also, who is now declared to be a dispenser of pontifical grace, to shine in the world as an imitator of Thee, the true Shepherd. . . .”

Then the pallium is given to the new bishop, and the ceremonial kiss of peace follows.

Both these ordination prayers for a bishop mention the office, and also its sacrificial character.

We notice a certain “luxury” about this Greek ordination rite. There are several laying-on of hands, each accompanied by a sufficient ordination prayer. It is to be presumed that in the early stages, when the liturgy was not yet crystallised, and *extempore* prayers were allowed, there were different forms, employed, and that eventually these were both combined, instead of one replacing the other. We shall see a similar development and combination taking place in the Roman rite. Of course, this multiplicity makes it a little uncertain which is the central “essence” of the rite, or its “matter and form,” to adopt Western terminology. We shall discuss this question elsewhere.

A still greater elaboration and complication took place in the ordination rite in the Armenian Church, which we shall deal with later. Here considerable infiltrations took place from the Roman rite, and accordingly, though the Armenian rite is an Eastern rite, it will be best dealt with after the Roman rite.

We pass on now to the East Syrian, Chaldean or Nestorian Rite.

H. NESTORIAN RITE.

1. In the ordination of a deacon, the bishop lays his right hand on the head of the ordinand, reciting a prayer beginning “ O Lord, our good God.”

50 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

Then, after making the sign of the cross upon the candidate, the bishop again lays on his hand, saying the following prayer :

“ O Lord God, strong and mighty, holy and glorious . . . Who hast chosen Thy holy Church, and hast raised it up in its prophets and apostles and priests and doctors . . . and hast placed in it also deacons for the ministry of Thy glorious and holy mysteries : Do Thou, as Thou didst choose Stephen and his companions, so also now according to Thy mercy, give to these Thy servants the grace of Thy Holy Spirit, that they may be chosen deacons in Thy holy Church, and may minister at Thy holy Altar with pure hearts and clear consciences, and may shine in robes of justice for the ministry of Thy life-giving and divine mysteries, and may receive from Thee in the day of retribution an eternal reward for this pure and holy ministry in which they serve before Thee. . . .”

This prayer mentions the office by name, its type, and its function in connection with the Sacrifice.

After more signs of the cross, the bishop imposes upon the new deacon the *orarium*, after which he gives him the book of epistles, saying, “ He is separated, he is sanctified,” and signs him with the cross.

2. The ordination of a *priest*, after a certain number of preparatory ceremonies and prayers, begins with a prayer, “ May the grace of Our Lord Jesus Christ . . . be with us,” said *submissa voce*. Then the bishop lays his right hand on the head of the ordinand, reciting the prayer, “ O our good God.” Then follows the sign of the cross, and another laying-on of the hand, with the following prayer :

“ O Lord God Almighty . . . do Thou, O great God of Power, King of all ages, look now upon these Thy servants, and choose them with a holy choosing for the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, that they may open their mouths in words of truth, and choose them also to the priesthood, O Lord, Mighty God, that they may lay hands on the sick and heal them, and may, in purity of heart and with good conscience, serve Thy holy Altar, offering to Thee the oblation of prayer and the sacrifice of confession in Thy holy Church, and may minister in the power of Thy gift, and may hallow the hearts of the well-disposed. . . .”

This mentions the priesthood by name, and its sacrificial office.

Then comes another signing with the cross, and the giving of the *pallium* and the *orarium*, followed by the giving of the book of the gospels. The bishop here signs the new priest with the cross, saying “ he is separated, he is sanctified.”

3. In the consecration of a *bishop*, the book of the gospels is placed on the head of the elect, while all the bishops lay their hands on him. The consecrating bishop recites the prayer, "May the grace of Our Lord Jesus Christ . . . be with us." Then he places his right hand on the head of the elect, and extends his left hand over him, saying the prayer, "O good and beneficent God." This prayer contains the following :

"Do Thou, O Lord, show the light of Thy countenance upon this Thy servant, and choose him with a holy choosing through the anointing of Thy Holy Spirit, that he may be to Thee a perfect priest, and an imitation of our true High Priest. . . . Strengthen him with Thy Holy Spirit for this holy ministry to which he is ascending. . . . Grant him to visit Thy flock in uprightness of heart, and to preach with his tongue the word of truth. . . . Endue him, O Lord, with power from on high, that he may bind and loose in heaven and on earth, and that by his hands the sick may be healed, and that mighty deeds may be done by him in Thy Holy Name . . . and that he may make, by the power of Thy gift, priests and deacons, and deaconesses and subdeacons and readers, for the ministry of Thy holy Church according to Thy Divine Will, and may gather together, feed and increase Thy people, the sheep of Thy flock. . .

This clearly specifies the episcopal office.

Then the bishop is invested with the cope, mitre, and pastoral staff.

We note that in this Nestorian rite, which is on the whole simpler than the Greek rite, there is no "Proclamation"—a point which will have to be borne in mind when we discuss what is the essential part of the Eastern rites.

m. SYRO-JACOBITE OR WEST SYRIAN RITE.

1. The ordination of a *deacon* begins by the bishop tonsuring the candidate in the form of a cross. The Archdeacon recites the "Proclamation," and the bishop then, holding the Body and Blood of the Lord, places his hands on the head of the candidate, saying the prayer beginning "*Deus qui ecclesiam*" :x

"O God, who buildest Thy Church . . . by those who in all generations are ordained to rule it, cast Thine eyes upon Thy servant, and send on him the grace of Thy Holy Spirit; fill him with faith, charity, virtue, holiness, and as Thou didst give grace to Stephen, whom Thou didst first call to the work of this ministry, so grant that to this Thy servant may come help from heaven. . .

This mentions Stephen, the type of a deacon.

52 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

After this, there is another laying-on of hands, a sign of the cross, imposition of the *orarium*, and giving of the *flabellum*.

2. The ordination of a *priest* similarly begins with the giving of the tonsure, and the proclamation by the Archdeacon. The bishop, holding the Body and Blood of the Lord, places his hands on the ordinand's head, saying the prayer "O great and wonderful God." This contains the following :

"Look down upon Thy servant N. who is promoted to the priesthood . . . fill him with the Holy Ghost and with grace...."

Here the office is expressly mentioned.

Then there comes another imposition of hands, and sign of the cross, with investiture in *orarium*, chasuble, girdle, and thurible.

3. For the consecration of a *bishop*, after some preliminaries, including a profession of faith, and a "Proclamation" said by one of the Bishops, the book of the gospels is placed upon the head of the elect, the patriarch laying his hands upon him, and saying two prayers.

These contain the following :

"O God, who hast given Thy beloved Son, the Word Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory, to be a shepherd and healer of our souls, and who by His precious Blood hast constituted Thy Church and instituted in it the whole sacerdotal order which Thou hast given to us to direct us how to please Thee . . . do Thou now send down upon this Thy servant Thy holy and uncreated Spirit, to the end that he may feed and administer Thy Church which is entrusted to his care, may ordain priests and anoint deacons, may consecrate altars and churches . . . loose and bind, cast off and sever. Grant him all the power of Thy saints, the same which Thou didst give to the Apostles of Thy only begotten Son, that he may be a glorious Bishop, with the honour of Moses, with the rank of Aaron, with the power of Thy disciples, with the works of Thy holy Jacob, on the throne of the patriarchs, that Thy people, the sheep of Thine inheritance, may be established and confirmed. . .

Here the office conferred is mentioned and its functions described.

There follows the investiture and the enthronisation.

IV. MARONITE RITE.

The Syrian Maronites have rites similar to those of the Jacobites, but longer. There are five impositions of hands in the case of a deacon ; three for a priest, and the same number for a bishop. There are unctions, but no tradition of instruments.

v. COPTIC OR ALEXANDRINE RITE.

This is used in all churches in Egypt, separated or Catholic.

1. *Deacons.*

After various preliminaries, including the reciting of the Proclamation by the Archdeacon, the bishop lays his right hand on the head of the ordinand, reciting the prayer "O Lord God and Master," which contains the following:

"Cause Thy face to shine on Thy servant . . . who is promoted to the diaconate by the vote and judgment of all who have brought him here. Fill him with the Holy Spirit and wisdom and power, as Thou didst fill Stephen the first deacon and first Martyr. . . . Make him minister of Thy holy Altar, that he may minister according to Thy good pleasure in the office of deacon."

This names the office, and its functions with regard to the Sacrifice.

Afterwards the bishop makes three signs of the cross on the new deacon's face, and invests him in the stole. There follows the kiss of peace.

2. *Priests.*

The Archdeacon recites the Proclamation, as in the case of deacons. The bishop lays his right hand upon the head of the ordinand, saying a prayer which contains the following:

"Look upon Thy servant, who is promoted to the priesthood. . . . Fill him with the Holy Spirit and with grace as he stands in fear before Thy face, that he may preside over and rule Thy people in purity of heart, according as Thou didst watch over Thy people whom Thou hadst chosen, and didst command Thy servant Moses to choose to himself as elders those whom Thou didst fill with the Holy Ghost. . . . Grant to this man the Spirit of Thy wisdom, that he may be filled with saving virtues, and with the sword of teaching, and may instruct Thy people in gentleness . . . that he may perform the offices of a priest over Thy people. . . ."

Here we have the office itself named, and the type mentioned (elders appointed by Moses).

The bishop then signs the ordinand on the forehead, declares him a priest, and invests him with the stole, etc.

3. *Bishops.*

After various ceremonies and prayers, the patriarch lays his right hand on the head of the elect, while the assisting bishops touch his shoulders. The patriarch recites the ordination prayer, which contains the following :

“ O Lord our God and Ruler . . . who hast from the beginning constituted priests to defend Thy people, and hast not left Thy sanctuary without a ministry. . . . Pour forth the power of Thy guiding Spirit, whom Thou didst give in Thy name to Thy holy Apostles ; grant this same grace to this Thy servant N. whom Thou hast chosen to the episcopate, that he may feed Thy holy flock, and be to Thee a blameless minister . . . offering to Thee gifts in holy churches. . . . Give to him the unity of Thy Holy Spirit that he may have the power of forgiving sins . . . and also the power of constituting clergy for the sanctuary, according to Hrs command . . . of making new houses of prayer, and sanctifying altars, and may please Thee in gentleness and humility of heart, offering to Thee in innocence and blamelessness the holy unbloody sacrifice, the mystery of this New Covenant, in the odour of sweetness. . . .”

Here the office of the episcopate is mentioned, and its functions enumerated, including an explicit reference to the sacrificial power.

Afterwards the new bishop is invested, and finally the book of the gospels is laid, not on his head, but on his breast.

It is interesting to note that the prayer said by the Bishop in the Coptic rite when laying hand on the deacon is practically identical with the prayer in the *Apostolic Constitutions*. The prayer for the priesthood is more or less the same as that found in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, and an expansion of the one in the *Apostolic Tradition*. The first of the prayers for a Bishop corresponds to that in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, and is based upon that in the *Apostolic Tradition*.

VI. ABYSSINIAN RITE.

We will now proceed to describe the rite of Ordination as officially described in the books of the Monophysites of Abyssinia. In later times, as we shall see, the administering of ordinations by these Monophysites became very careless, and some ceremonies were employed which are not contained in the official books, while others enjoined in the books were omitted; Hence certain “*dubia*” sent to Rome, with which we shall deal later.

The following is based upon the Latin account of the Abyssinian rite, sent by Mgr. Bel to Canon Estcourt, and printed by him in *Validity of Anglican Ordinations*, Appendix xxxv :

1. Consecration of Bishops.

The assisting bishops place their hands upon the elect. . . . The senior of the bishops asks the priests and deacons saying,

“Is this he whom you have chosen? . . . And to them he says thrice, “Do you know him to be worthy?” If they thrice give an affirmative reply, the senior of the bishops shall lead up the elect; the priests standing in the sanctuary shall pray in silence. . . . Each one of the bishops shall place his hand upon him, saying :

“We place our hands upon the elect servant of God, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, that he may be strong in good works, and may remain without stain in the Church of the living and invisible God, that he may make and pronounce a good judgment, and may live and teach in the grace of sanctity ; this is the faithful servant, who is consecrated in the name of the Most Holy Trinity, and the mystery of the Cross.”

When the bishops say this prayer, the deacons place the book of the gospels on his head. Then the senior of the bishops places his hands upon him . . . saying the prayer of consecration :

“O God the Father of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, Father of mercies, Lord of our goods, who dwellest on high and beholdest lowly things, who knowest all things before they are, who hast perfected the sacraments in the word of grace and hast called holy those whom, since the days of Abraham, Thou hast constituted judges and priests in Thy holiness; who leavest not Thy Church without ministers, who before the beginning of the world hast demanded eternal adoration ; pour forth now that power and spirit of judgment which by Thy beloved Son Jesus Christ Thou hast given to the holy Apostles of Thy Church through the wood of the Cross ; may praise and glory be ever given to Thy name ; give the spirit of understanding; pour forth the Holy Spirit upon this Thy servant, whom Thou hast assumed to the episcopate, that he may keep and govern Thy flock without blame, that in his works he may day and night walk before Thee, that he may offer a pleasing victim to Thee in the Holy Church, that he may confer upon priests the Holy Spirit, with the power of remitting sins, and administering sacraments, as Thou hast commanded ; that he may absolve from all sins, as Thou didst give this power to Thine Apostles ; that he may serve Thee in simplicity and purity of heart and in the odour of sweetness, through Thy Son Jesus Christ. . . .”

This is obviously another form of the same prayer which is found in the third century *Apostolic Tradition*. The rite continues :

“Then the consecrator kisses the elect . . . and the consecrator and the new bishop finish the holy sacrifice together. . . .”

2. For the ordination of *priests*;

The bishop places his hand on the head of the ordinand. . . .

56 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

The priests all touch him, and standing near him, pray. . . .
The bishop prays over him, saying :

“ O my God and Father of our Lord and Saviour, look down upon this Thy servant, let him receive the spiritual grace and counsel of holiness, that with a pure heart he may govern Thy people, as Thou didst order Moses to choose leaders for Thy chosen people, and fill him with the Holy Spirit, which Thou didst give to Moses. And now, O Lord, give to Thy servant the fulness of the spirit of grace, keep him for us, give to him, etc.”

This, again, is obviously based on the form for priests contained in the *Apostolic Tradition*, and again closely resembles the prayer contained in the Sacramentary of Sarapion. We must say the same of this Abyssinian prayer as we said of that of Sarapion : it must be considered to signify the office conferred by the recognised typical allusion to the elders chosen by Moses. We note there is no reference to any other ceremony, such as the one later introduced in the rite, accompanied by the words “ Receive the Holy Ghost.”

3. For a *deacon*, the bishop places his hand upon his head and prays. The priests and deacons all stand around. The bishop alone imposes his hand, and prays as follows :

“ O God, who hast created all things, and reformed all things in Thy word, O Father of our Lord and Saviour, whom Thou hast sent to do Thy will and manifest Thy counsel, send forth the spirit of goodness and vigilance upon this Thy servant whom Thou hast chosen to be a deacon in Thy Church, to approach Thy temple, and offer Thy holy things to Thee, together with him who is consecrated as Thy high priest. May he glorify Thy name, keep a pure heart without blame, that he may attain with honour the highest dignity of the priesthood, and glorify Thee through Thy Son Jesus Christ. . . .”

Here again we note the analogy with the corresponding prayer in the *Apostolic Tradition*, but not, in this case, with the Sacramentary of Sarapion. The order is named, and its sacrificial function mentioned. There is no trace of the ceremony introduced subsequently (kissing the patriarchal cross).

From the East we pass to the West.

vn. ROMAN ORDINATION RITES.

There are two principal Western Liturgies, the Roman and the Gallican. The former flourished in Rome itself, Southern

Italy and Africa ; the latter prevailed in Northern Italy, Gaul, Spain, Brittany, and, later, in Ireland. We deal first with the Roman rite.

1. Ordination of a *deacon*.

After the Epistle of the Mass, the Bishop calls the candidates by name, and the archdeacon leads them before the altar. Then the Pontiff places his hands on the head of each ordinand, saying two prayers, the second being the consecratory prayer, "*Adesto, quesumus, omnipotens Deus, honorum dator*" still found in the present Roman rite. In this prayer, the bishop recalls the example of the Levites, and begs God to send the Holy Spirit upon the newly ordained, and that by the practice of all virtues they may deserve promotion to a higher order. Here are some extracts from this prayer, as found in the Leonine Sacramentary (sixth century) :

"Look down favourably, we beseech Thee, O Lord, on this Thy servant, whom we humbly dedicate to the office of the diaconate, that he may serve at Thy holy Altars. . . . Send down upon him, we beseech Thee, the Holy Spirit, that he may be strengthened by the sevenfold gift of Thy grace for the faithful discharge of the work of his ministry."

The rite concludes with the kiss of peace.

2. Ordination of *priests*.

The candidates present themselves before the Pontiff, vested with stole and planeta. The bishop invites the assembly to pray, and the Litanies follow. Then the bishop lays hands upon the head of each candidate, and recites two prayers, the second being the consecratory prayer found in the form of a preface in the present Roman rite, "*Deus honorum omnium*." This recalls the example of the seventy elders, helpers of Moses, and of the Evangelists who assisted the Apostles, and invokes upon the ordinands the spirit of holiness, asking for them, together with the dignity of the sacerdotal office, the grace to be model Christians. Here are some extracts, as found in the Leonine Sacramentary (sixth century) :

"Grant, we beseech Thee, Almighty Father, to these Thy servants, the dignity of the Priesthood (*presbyterii*). . . . May they so obtain from Thee, O Lord, the office of second dignity, that it may be accepted by Thee."

The rite concludes with the kiss of peace.

3. *Bishops.*

The form for the consecration of a bishop is given in the eighth and ninth Roman "Ordines" (ninth-century MSS.). As described here, the consecration is performed by the Pope. After the introit, there is a lesson from 1 Tim. iii. While the Gradual is being sung the bishop-elect is vested by the archdeacon in dalmatic, planeta, and campagi. The officiating bishop then invites the faithful to prayer, and the litanies are sung. After that, the Pope alone, laying his hand upon the head of the elect, says two prayers, the second being the consecratory prayer in the present Roman rite in the form of a preface, "*Deus honorum omnium*" which recalls the example of Aaron, and asks for the new bishop the virtues represented by the vestments of the high priest. Particular mention is made of the power to bind and loose, and God is entreated to bestow upon him all the qualities of a good and faithful shepherd. The ceremony ends with the kiss of peace. Here are some extracts from the consecratory prayer, as given in the Leonine Sacramentary :

"Grant to these Thy servants whom Thou hast called to the ministry of the High Priesthood (*summi sacerdotii*) this grace, that whatever was signified in those garments by the brightness of gold . . . may shine in the life and conduct of these men ; fulfil in Thy priests (*sacerdotibus*) the perfection (*summam*) of Thy mystery. . . . Grant to them the throne of the episcopate, to rule Thy Church."

Vin. GALLIGAN.

The Gallican ordination rite is described in the "*Statuta Ecclesia Antiqua*" drawn up in the Province of Arles about the beginning of the sixth century, but supposed in the Middle Ages to be the Canons of the Fourth Council of Carthage. It is found in various sources, such as the Gelasian Sacramentary, the *Missale Francorum* (seventh or eighth century), the *De Officiis* of St. Isidore, and the Mozarabic *Liber Ordinum*.

1. *Deacons.*

The rite begins with a presentation of the candidate to the assembled people. Then we have the invitation by the bishop to those present to pray, *Oremus*, and this is followed by the laying-on of hands and the consecratory prayer, identical with that found in the present Roman rite.

2. *Priests.*

The candidate is presented to the faithful and approved by

them. Then comes the invitation to prayer, and the consecratory prayer, during which the bishop and priests hold their hands extended over the head of the ordinand. This prayer was the *Deus sanctificationum omnium*, as found in the present Roman rite, with one or two verbal differences. Here is the form as found in the Vatican Manuscript (Regina 316) of the Sacramentary, and printed by H. A. Wilson, p. 24 :

“Deus sanctificationum omnium, auctor cujus vera consecratio, cujus plena benedictio est, Tu domine super hos famulos tuos, quos presbyterii honore dedicamus manum tue benedictionis his infunde, ut gravitate actuum et censura vivendi probeat se esse seniores . . . ut purum atque immaculatum ministerii tui donum custodiant, et *per obsequium plebis tua corpus et sanguinem Filii tui immaculata benedictione transformet*. . . .”

That is the form given in the seventh or eighth century Vatican Manuscript. It so happens that some later Pontificals, such as the Egbert Pontifical (ninth or tenth century), and the Pontifical of Robert of Jumieges (eleventh century), have some corrupt forms of the phrase underlined (the former has “*corpus et sanguinem filii tui immaculati transformet*, and the latter has “*corpore et sanguine filii tui immaculata benedictione transformatur*” from which some Anglican scholars have quite unjustifiably argued that the *later* forms prove that the *original* text did not imply any transformation of the Eucharistic elements into Christ's Body and Blood).¹

But surely the variants in the later texts are quite obviously corruptions—the authors of *Priesthood in the English Church* admit they are “ungrammatical”—and the earliest text, in the Vatican Manuscript, is perfectly clear.

¹ See for instance the remarkable suggestions made by Dr. Firminger in his *Essay on The 'Vindication' of the Bull*, p. 20, also *Priesthood in the English Church*, p. 47, with reference to Gore, *Church and the Ministry*, p. 367 f., second edition. It is interesting to note the variation in the terminology. *Priesthood in the English Church* says, “*It is clear that the original reading was that preserved in several MSS., thus: 'Corpore et sanguine Filii tui immaculata benedictione transformatur ad inviolabilem caritatem.'*” Dr. Firminger (*The 'Vindication'*) says: “*The authors of the valuable tract entitled 'The Priesthood in the English Church,' following up a suggestive note in Canon Gore's work on the Christian Ministry, have clearly shown that in many venerable if not (as seems probable) the most primitive readings, the prayer was not for the transformation of the bread and wine but for the transformation of the priest by the Body and Blood.*” But in *Liturgy and Worship*, Dr. Firminger says: “*It would seem that the petition was originally a prayer that the new priest might be enabled to transform the body of Christ (i.e., the Church) 'unto a perfect man.'*” (p. 635). (Italics ours.)

But why assume that the earliest version we have is a corrupt one? It makes sense, at any rate, and the “intermediate” versions which Dr. Firminger mentions are, as he allows, “ungrammatical.” There seems to be no reason why the *present* form “*ut panem et vinum in corpus et sanguinem Filii tui immaculata benedictione transformet*” should not really give the *sense* of the original, as known to us by the Vatican Manuscript.

3. *Bishops.*

The rite began with the presentation of the candidate to the assembled people, by the metropolitan and bishops of the province, in the form of an exhortation. The faithful approved of the choice by saying "*Dignus est*" Then the consecrating bishop invited those present to pray, and this was followed by the consecratory prayer. While this was being said, two other bishops held over the head of the bishop-elect the book of the Gospels, and all the priests present touched his head with their hands. As to the consecratory prayer, this seems to have been practically identical with the Roman prayer "*Deus honorum omnium.*"

After the consecratory prayer, the hands were anointed.

CONCLUSION.

Concluding this our brief survey of the ancient ordination rites of the Church, we note that in practically every case the fundamental ceremony is the laying-on of hands by the bishop, accompanied by a consecratory prayer. (The laying-on of hands is not specified in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, but it was doubtless observed nevertheless.) The consecratory prayer, as we should expect, gives us the meaning of the ceremony, that is to say, it expresses the *office* which is conferred, and/or the *grace* which is being impetrated. With one or two exceptions, the office is mentioned *by name*. Sometimes it is referred to *by a typical allusion*, recognised by usage, such as the elders appointed by Moses, as a type of Christian priests appointed by the bishop; Stephen as the first Deacon. In very many cases, not only is the office mentioned, or alluded to typically, but also its *functions* are specified, and very many of the rites expressly mention the *sacrificial* function. Even when this sacrificial function is not mentioned, it is fair to say that it is *implied*, inasmuch as at that time the office conferred was understood to include the sacrificial function in question. These ordination rites were carried out during the celebration of the Christian Sacrifice, and it was understood that a "bishop" was a "high priest," a "presbyter" was one empowered to consecrate and offer the Body and Blood of Christ, and that a "deacon" was a person with authority to assist the priest at Mass, and to help in distributing Holy Communion.

CHAPTER VII

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE WESTERN ORDINATION RITE IN THE MIDDLE AGES

Both the ancient Roman and the Gallican rites seem to have been in use from the fifth to the eighth centuries. (The ancient British and Anglo-Saxon rite was apparently a variant of the Gallican form.) But in the course of time, the Gallican and Roman rites were combined, and the essential features of the former were adopted by the latter. In addition, new ceremonies were introduced from time to time in local churches, and gradually spread to others. This naturally led to a certain amount of variety in Western ordination rites. But it must nevertheless not be forgotten that the fundamental plan, and general identity of the main prayers, remained unchanged throughout this development, and thus, as Morinus says :

“ The modern Roman Pontifical contains all that was found in earlier Pontificals, but the early Pontificals did not contain all that is found in the modern Roman Pontifical. For various motives of piety and religion led to the introduction into recent Pontificals of certain recent additions which were absent in all the earlier editions, and the later the date of these Pontificals, the more numerous the additions. But it is a remarkable and striking fact that in all these books, whether ancient, more modern, or contemporary, *there is only one single form of ordination* both as concerns words and ceremonies* and the later books omit nothing of what was in the early ones. Thus the modern form of ordination differs not at all* whether in word or in rite* from that used by the ancient Fathers.*”¹

The development of the rite for the priesthood and episcopate in the West will best be seen from the following table :

I. ORDINATION OF A PRIEST.

Ancient Roman rite :

Litanies,

Laying-on of hands by bishops, followed by

Roman consecratory prayer, *Deus honorum omnium.*

Kiss of peace.

¹ *De Sacris Ordinationibus*, III. p. io. Italics ours.

62 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

Ancient Gallican rite :

Approbation of the candidate by the faithful,
Invitation to prayer, and
Consecration prayer, *Deus sanctificationum omnium*, during
which the bishop and priests hold hands over the
ordinand.
Lastly, the anointing of hands, with a suitable formula.

Tenth-century English Pontifical (Archbishop Robert's
Benedictional) :

Litanies,
Rearrangement of stole,
Consecratory prayer, *Deus honorum omnium* (Roman),
Blessing of priest's hands, and anointing of hands and
head (*Gallican*),
Vesting with chasuble, and blessing, followed by Gallican
consecration prayer, *Deus sanctificationum omnium*, de-
scribed as "*ad consummandum presbyterum*."

Twelfth-century Pontificals (Magdalene College Pontifical,
Trinity College, Cambridge, Pontifical, and Trinity College,
Dublin, Pontifical) :

Litanies,
Laying-on of hands and Roman consecratory prayer,
Arrangement of stole, and giving of chasuble,
Gallican consecratory prayer ("*ad consummandum pres-
byterum*"),
Anointing of hands,
Giving of chalice and paten,
Final blessing (= blessing previously accompanying
giving of chasuble).

In the three twelfth-century Pontificals just mentioned, there are later marginal notes, directing further additions. Thus the Magdalene Pontifical has a marginal note at the laying-on of hands, as follows, "Accipe Spiritum Sanctum, etc. Veni Creator Spiritus, etc." It has a further note after the Communion in the Mass, directing the bishop to lay on hands again, loosen the chasubles, and to say "Accipe Spiritum Sanctum, quorum peccata remisistis, remittuntur, etc." Both these notes are in a fourteenth-century hand.

The Cambridge Pontifical has a note directing the *Veni Creator* to be said just before the anointing of hands. Another

note prescribes the new laying-on of hands, with the words "Accipe Spiritum Sanctum, quorum, etc.," after the Communion.

The Dublin Pontifical has a marginal note specifying the *Veni Creator* at the first laying-on of hands of the bishop and presbyters, as in the Magdalene College Pontifical. But in other notes the use of the *Veni Creator*^*tioro*. the anointing of hands is recognised "*secundum quosdam*" and a form of blessing the hands before the anointing is inserted. After the episcopal benediction, the final laying-on of hands and "Accipe Spiritum Sanctum, quorum, etc.," is inserted. All these notes are in sixteenth-century handwriting.

D. EPISCOPATE.

Here is the developing rite for the episcopate :

Ancient Roman :

Invitation to prayer,

Litanies,

Laying-on of hands, followed by two prayers, the second being the consecratory prayer in the form of a preface, *Deus honorum omnium*.

Kiss of peace.

Ancient Gallican :

Presentation of elect to people, in the form of an exhortation.

Invitation to prayer.

Holding of book of gospels over the head ; laying-on of hands, and consecratory prayer.

Anointing of hands.

Tenth-century Pontifical (Archbishop Robert) :

Litanies,

Placing of book on shoulders, laying-on of hands, and Roman consecratory prayer (with an anointing of the head inserted in the middle).

A second prayer "*super episcopum*."

Blessing of the sevenfold spirit.

Anointing of hands,

Anointing of head,

Blessing and giving of pastoral staff,

Giving of the ring.

The twelfth-century Magdalene Pontifical omits the first anointing of the head in the middle of the consecration prayer,

64 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

and gives the ring before the staff. But before the litanies it inserts a long examination in the form of question and answer.

Other twelfth-century pontificals introduce the blessing and giving of a mitre, while in the fourteenth century the words « *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum* » are in some cases said during the laying-on of hands, which previously took place in silence.

We must now comment upon these additions to the rites.

I. PRIESTHOOD.

1. The *earliest* addition is the *anointing of hands*. This was, / as we have seen, practised in the ancient Gallican rite. It seems also to be hinted at by the British monk Gildas : “ The hands of priests are blessed that they may be reminded not to depart from the precepts which the words express in their consecration.”¹

In the eighth or ninth century, the custom was introduced for a time of anointing also a priest's head, but this was discontinued.

2. The next important addition is the *tradition of instruments*. It seems to have begun first in Italy, in the tenth century, and was not widespread until the twelfth century. By the thirteenth and fourteenth century it was practically universal. It was accompanied by a formula expressing the power to offer sacrifice.²

3. The last addition which took place was the *final laying-on of hands*, after the Communion in the Ordination Mass, accompanied by the words, “ Receive the Holy Ghost, whose sins you shall forgive, etc.” This addition cannot be traced before the thirteenth century,³ and, as we have seen, it is written in the margin of the twelfth-century Magdalene College Pontifical, in a fourteenth-century handwriting.

4. But before this custom became general, there was another custom which we must mention, and that is the introduction of some kind of invocation of the Holy Ghost at the *first* laying-on of hands. The invocation took various forms,

¹ Gildas, *Increpatio in clerum* ; Migne, *P. L.*, vol. 69, col. 388.

² At first the explicit power to offer sacrifice seems to have been expressed in connection with the vesting in the chasuble. So in the tenth cent. Corbey Pontifical of St. Eloi, the Egbert Pontifical (tenth or eleventh cent.), the Benedictionale of Abp. Robert (tenth cent.), the Cahors Pontifical, etc.

³ In a Bec Pontifical (thirteenth cent. (?), Martini Ordo XI) the reference to sacrifice appears in connection with the anointing of hands.—(Firminger, in *Liturgy and Worship*, p. 651.)

¹ It is mentioned by Scotus (see p. 84.).

and one of the forms, as we shall see, was this precise text, "Receive the Holy Ghost, whose sins, etc." It is quite possible that another form was the "*Veni Creator*" which may have been written in the ninth century, and which, as we know, was introduced into the ordination rite of bishops and priests, and though now sung during the anointings, seems in some places, at any rate, to have been sung during this first laying-on of hands. At least one other form of prayer to the Holy Ghost was used at Mainz (see below). Here are the citations which indicate some kind of invocation of the Holy Ghost at this stage of the ordination :

(a) Rudolph's *Life of St. Lietbert*, written some time after 1031, says of the saint that "When at the imposition of the pontifical hand it was said to the new priest, 'Receive the Holy Ghost, whose sins, etc.,' he trembled."¹

(b) Ivo of Chartres (1116), speaking of the imposition of hands at the *commencement* of the rite of ordination, says, "All lay hands . . . and invoke the Holy Spirit."

(c) Honorius of Autun (1106-35),¹¹¹ *anima*, I, 181, says that "the Bishop lays on hands, and bestows the power of binding and loosing . . . and anoints their hands with chrism so that they may consecrate the Body of Christ."

(d) The *Speculum Ecclesie*, wrongly assigned to Hugh of St. Victor, repeats the statement of Ivo of Chartres.

(e) Hugh himself, in the genuine work *De Sacramentis*, II, pars, iii, c. 12, says : "After the invocation of the Holy Spirit, they receive the stole."

(f) Bishop Sicard of Cremona, writing about the year 1200, says that the priests, when laying on hands with the bishop, do not give the Holy Ghost, ° *sed orant ut super eos veniat* " {*Mitræ*, P.L., Vol. 213, col. 64), which would seem to imply some vocal prayer.

{g} Durandus, in his *Rationale*, written in 1286, similarly says, " *imponentes enim manus, non dant sanctum spiritum, sed orant ut super eos veniat* " (II, cap. 9).

Also we have the very interesting note in the thirteenth-century Pontifical of Foix, near Toulouse, which states that just before the Consecratory Prayer, "The Bishop, standing, saying nothing, lays on hands on the heads of each, according to the custom of the Roman Church, and likewise all the assisting

^x Morinus, quoted by Dr. Firminger, *Liturgy and Worship*, p. 653.

presbyters. But according to the custom of some churches they say : * Receive the Holy Ghost, whose sins, etc.' ”

(h) Next we have the fourteenth-century marginal note in the Magdalene College Pontifical, “*Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*” etc. “*Veni Creator*” etc. against the first laying-on of hands.

(i) And finally, the fourteenth-century Mainz Pontifical says that when the Bishop advances towards the candidates to lay hands on them, he intones “*Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*” and the choir sing the rest; then the bishop and presbyters go in a circuit and lay hands on each candidate, the bishop saying, “May the Holy Ghost come upon thee, and the power of the Most High guard thee from sin.” And accordingly, the *Institutio* put forth by the Council of Mainz of 1549 says that “the bishop, when about to confer the sacerdotal order, says, * Receive the Holy Ghost, whose sins, etc.’”¹

All these facts must be taken into due account in discussing mediaeval theories of the matter and form of the order of priesthood.

H. EPISCOPATE.

1. Turning now to the additions to the episcopal rite, the first addition is the interrogatory on doctrine. An examination of this kind was ordered in the *Statuta ecclesiae antiquae*, once thought to be the decrees of the Fourth Council of Carthage, but really a compilation of the Galilean Church. It is therefore quite likely that the interrogatory originated in this Church. We have seen that it does not occur in English tenth-century pontificals, but it is in twelfth-century ones.

2. After the Litany, a marginal note in the Magdalene College Pontifical indicates the singing of the *Veni Creator*.

3. The formula “*Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*” now found at the laying-on of hands by the three bishops is nowhere found before the fourteenth century. It was not in general use even in the sixteenth century. But it is found in the Exeter Pontifical (fourteenth century), which specifies that the words are to be said by all the officiating bishops.²

¹ *Institutio Christiana*, 1549 edn., p. 222b.

In the sixteenth-century Pontifical of Cardinal Bainbridge, the Gelasian invitory is said while the bishop and priests lay on hands. They impose hands again at the *Deus honorum omnium*, and there is a final laying-on of hands by the bishop, with the words “Receive the Holy Ghost, whose sins/” etc.

• “*Idem faciant et dicant omnes episcopi astantes.*”

4. The custom of anointing a bishop's hands and head originated from Gaul.

5. The giving of a mitre originated in the eleventh century.

6. The giving of a crozier, on the other hand, was practised in Spain in the seventh century.

7. The giving of the ring is a non-Roman ceremony, which can likewise be traced back to Spain in the seventh century, and was adopted by the Gallican rite.

The Armenian Rite.

Having dealt with the elaboration of the Roman rite, we can now consider the Armenian rite. Although this is an Eastern rite, it has received so many infiltrations from Roman sources that it was advisable to postpone its treatment until now.

1. Bishops.

The ordination is preceded, as in the Latin rite, by pan examination. The Patriarch then places the open book of the Gospels upon the shoulders of the bishop elect, places his right hand on his head, and after the "Proclamation," recites an *epiklesis* invoking the Holy Spirit. The laying-on of hands is several times repeated, with new invocations of the Holy Spirit. Later on, the Patriarch anoints the head and thumbs of the elect with chrism, gives him the pastoral staff, puts the ring on his finger, gives him the book of the Gospels, and finally places the mitre upon his head.

It would seem that these infiltrations from the Roman rite date back to the middle of the twelfth century. They were certainly absent in the ninth century.

2. Priests.

The rite begins, as in the Roman rite, with an interrogatory. After various psalms, the deacon asks for prayers for the ordinand, and after three invocations of these present, the bishop places his right hand upon the head of the ordinand, saying the prayer, "O Lord God Almighty," etc. After various ceremonies, the bishop again places his hand and a cross on the ordinand's head, saying, "May the divine and celestial grace," etc. There follows another imposition of the right hand and cross, and recitation of a formula, "Lord God Almighty," etc. The bishop then gives the stole to him, saying, "Receive the yoke of Our Lord Jesus Christ," etc. After various psalms and lessons and

other ceremonies, the bishop again imposes his right hand, and recites the prayer "Lord God of virtues, etc." Then the sacerdotal vestments are given with prayers. Later on, the bishop anoints with chrism the forehead and hands of the ordinand. Then the bishop takes the chalice and paten, with wine and the host, and puts them in the hand of the ordinand, saying :

"Take and receive the power and faculty by the Holy Spirit to offer and celebrate holy Masses, in the name of Our Lord Jesus Christ, for the living and the dead."

That is definite enough. Also, in one of the prayers, the bishop prays :

"Grant him the Apostolic grace . . . to consecrate the awful and holy sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."

The tradition of instruments was added to the Armenian rite about the middle of the twelfth century.

3. *Deacons.*

This begins with an interrogatory, as in the Roman rite. The Bishop places his right hand on the ordinand's head, saying a prayer, "Lord God almighty," etc. Then a psalm, followed by a new imposition of hand and cross, with prayer, "Lord God almighty, author of all things," etc. Another imposition of hands, with the "Proclamation" : "May the divine and heavenly grace," etc., then a prayer, "Lord, mighty God." Then lessons from Scripture. After many ceremonies, another imposition of the right hand and cross, and a prayer. Then a hymn, further ceremonies, and investiture, blessing, and giving of the book of the gospels, with the form :

"Receive the power to read the holy gospel in the churches of God for the instruction of the living and the memory of the dead."

Then the thurible is given, with the words, "Receive the power to incense," etc.

Here are extracts from one of the prayers :

"O Lord God . . . who hast appointed deacons for the ministry of Thy Holy Church . . . look down on this Thy servant who is ordained now to the ministry of Thy Church. . . . Give him the power and grace of blessed Stephen, Thy first martyr and first deacon, that filled with the Holy Ghost, he may remain spotless in the ministry of Thy Holy Table."

¹ An alternative version reads : "Take --- for thou hast received the power, etc."

CHAPTER VIII

GENERAL THEOLOGY OF THE SACRAMENTS IN THE MIDDLE AGES

Parallel to the development of the sacramental *rites* there was a similar development in the Sacramental Theology of the Church.

1. In the early and Patristic period, it is evident that the sacred rites were regarded as means of grace, and it is quite easy to find Patristic references to the seven great rites ultimately called the “seven sacraments.” But the word “sacrament” was rather loosely employed, and often applied to rites other than the seven. Moreover, the exact nature of a sacrament received little consideration in the early ages. Even so, it is evident that the Fathers regarded the sacramental rite as consisting essentially in some external action or words, constituting a “sign,” by which some internal reality or grace was not merely expressed or symbolised, but also conferred.

2. A great step forward was taken by St. Augustine, who clearly distinguished between the element, matter, or action, and the words employed. The former is indeterminate in itself, and becomes of sacramental efficacy in virtue of the words used, or “form” as we now call it. Thus, speaking of baptism, he says, “In aqua verbum mandat; detra' verbum, et quid est aqua nisi aqua? Accedit verbum ad elementum, et fit sacramentum.”¹ This of course does not in any way destroy or lessen the character of the sacraments as instrumental channels of grace: the effect of the sacraments comes always from God. But still, it comes *through* the sacraments, as through a sign which symbolises what it effects, and effects what it symbolises. And as a sacrament is a sign or symbol, and the element or action is in itself indeterminate, the completion of the symbolism, and indeed its most important part, is to be found in the *form*. Thus, the act of washing with water may indeed symbolise the washing

¹ In Joann^a tract 80, n. 3; Migne, P.L., xxxv, 1840.

of the soul, but it does not essentially and necessarily mean that. But when it takes place in the rite of baptism it does mean that, and this is made clear by the words used which accompany the action.

3. All this was subsequently developed by the great scholastic theologians into what is called the theory of the *matter* and *form* of the sacraments. The *terminology* is new, but there is nothing that was not already implicit in patristic theology.

4. In addition to the use of the proper rite, i.e., the proper matter and form of the sacraments, the scholastic theologians say that there must be a *right intention* in the person *administering* the sacrament, and also in the person *receiving* it (in the case of an *adult*). That again is an elementary truth which hardly needs establishing. The administration and reception of a sacrament is a conscious human act, and must therefore take place with due deliberation and an intention to perform a sacred rite. Opinions may and do differ as to what kind of intention is necessary, but at least some intention is obviously required. A sacrament is not a magical formula, or a talisman, and it ought to be evident that a rite performed, say, unconsciously, or in joke, could hardly be regarded as the valid administration of a Divine sacrament.

The question of intention, however, was not much developed in the Patristic period. But it was equivalently involved in the discussion as to the validity of baptism conferred by heretics. The early Church was so conscious of the unity of the Catholic Church, and its indwelling by the Holy Ghost, that some of the Fathers were led to say that a heretic who had fallen away from the unity of the Church Catholic could no longer administer a sacrament validly. The question first arose in connection with the baptism conferred by heretics. St. Cyprian and St. Firmilian both maintained that persons baptised by heretics should be rebaptised. They were opposed by Pope St. Cornelius, with his famous dictum, "*Nihil innovetur, nisi quod traditum est.*" The matter was discussed again in connection with the Donatist controversy, when St. Augustine vindicated the orthodox view, as set forth by Pope Cornelius, pointing out that the grace of the sacrament comes from God, and is thus not hindered by the unworthiness of the minister.

Nevertheless, the tendency to regard heretical sacraments as invalid was by no means scotched, and in the early Middle

Ages there were even Popes who regarded heretical or simoniacal ordinations as invalid.

5. Passing now to the scholastic period, we may note in the first place the truly sacramental rites were clearly distinguished from the non-sacramental ones, and the *number* of the former was definitely determined as *seven*. But this was not an innovation. It was rather a consequence of the more exact definition of a sacrament which was evolved about the same time, that is, about the twelfth century. Perhaps the most convincing proof that the sevenfold number of the sacraments was not then invented, is the fact that in the various negotiations for unity between the Roman and the Greek Churches, the latter at once accepted the Roman formula on the subject. Instances would be the confession of faith presented to the Second Council of Lyons in 1274 by Michael Palaeologus, the similar statement contained in the Decree *Ad Armenos* of the Council of Florence in the fifteenth century, and also the explicit declarations of councils of the separated Greek Church in the sixteenth century condemning Protestant errors on the subject.

6. Inasmuch as a Sacrament confers grace, it seems evident that a sacramental rite could be instituted only by *Divine authority*. This was recognised in general by the scholastics, but it was not so generally admitted that the seven sacraments were instituted as such immediately by Christ our Lord. The scholastics were aware of the fact that some of the details of sacramental administration were obviously of ecclesiastical institution, and that in some cases even the matter and form had varied in the course of ages. Indeed, some of the variations in the matter and form occurred precisely in these same Middle Ages.¹ This was the case with the Sacrament of Holy Order, as we have already mentioned. Accordingly, many of the Scholastics were inclined to say that Christ directly instituted only some of the seven sacraments, and that the Holy Ghost instituted the others, either during the time of the Apostles, or subsequently. The Council of Trent subsequently defined that Christ instituted all the seven sacraments. But it did not explicitly define that He instituted them all *immediately*, or that He instituted them *specifically*, with

¹ Thus the more explicit realization that the sacraments confer grace by effecting what they signify led to the general introduction of *imperative* forms by way of addition to the *deprecatory* forms hitherto in use. This explains the addition of the "*Ego te absolvo*" to the form of absolution, and the "*Accipe potestatem*, etc.," in the ordination rites.

their matter and form. It would seem that the Church wishes us to hold that Christ directly instituted all the seven sacraments, at any rate *generically*, that in some cases He determined also the matter and form, as in the case of baptism—though even here it must be noticed that there is room for a certain variety in the form of baptism—and that in some other cases He left the *specific* determination of the matter and form to the Church. This would account for the fact that the matter and form of some sacraments seem to have changed very much in the course of ages. Thus, Confirmation was apparently administered at first only by the laying-on of hands, while now, in both East and West, it is by unction with chrism. There has been a correspondingly wide variation in the form used.

CHAPTER IX

THE THEOLOGY OF HOLY ORDER IN THE MIDDLE AGES

- A. THE PRIESTHOOD AND THE EPISCOPATE.
- B. THE VALIDITY OF SCHISMATICAL AND HERETICAL ORDINATIONS.
- C. THE MATTER AND FORM OF ORDER.

We come now to the specific sacrament of Holy Order, and we must examine the mediaeval theology of this in more detail.

A. THE PRIESTHOOD AND THE EPISCOPATE.

1. First we must mention the treatment of the various *grades* of order, or offices held in the Church. East and West agreed in holding that there were three major degrees, of Divine, or Divino-Apostolic, as distinct from mere ecclesiastical institution, namely, the episcopate, priesthood, and diaconate. (The special question of the relation between the two former will be dealt with later.) In addition, East and West also possessed a degree called the Subdiaconate—a “minor order.” In all, the West possessed four minor orders, while the East only possessed two. Leaving aside these minor orders, as of comparatively little importance for our subject, we must concentrate our attention on the three major orders, the Diaconate, the Priesthood, and the Episcopate.

2. If we begin with the *diaconate*, this was, at the least, instituted by the Apostles. Its sacramental character was doubted by some scholastics, as for instance by Hugh of St. Victor in the twelfth century, and by Durandus in the fourteenth, but the majority held that it forms part of the sacrament of holy order.

3. But the sacrament of holy order *par excellence* is the *priesthood*, with its twofold power over the natural body of Christ (the power of consecrating and offering the Body and Blood of Christ in the Mass), and over the mystical body, i.e., by

absolving from sins. All agreed that the priesthood is really and truly a sacrament. There was, as we shall see, a difference of opinion as to its matter and form.

4. As to the *episcopate*, we must emphasize, against certain Anglican misunderstandings on the subject, that the scholastics regarded the episcopate as a divinely, or at least an apostolically instituted rank, and most held that *only a bishop can administer the sacrament of holy order*. But there was a further question : does the episcopate as such constitute an *order* distinct from the priesthood, and therefore is it as such a *separate sacrament* ? In other words, is it, not merely a divinely (or apostolically) instituted *rank* or *office*, but is it a rank or office conferred by a *sacramental rite* ? Is it not merely a distinct *rank*, but a distinct *order* ?

5. It is customary for Anglican writers to say that the mediaeval scholastics were all "presbyterians."¹ This is because the majority of them denied that the episcopate constituted a distinct *order*, or that the rite by which the episcopate is conferred is a *sacramental rite*. Many, if not most of the great scholastics, hold that the priesthood, and the sacrament of holy order, is complete and entire in the simple priest, and that what the episcopate confers is not precisely a sacramental *grace* or *order*, but merely an *extension* or *complement* of the powers given in sacramental ordination to the priesthood. But even so, it is to be noted that the rank possessing this complement or extension of the powers of the priesthood exists *by divine, or at least by apostolic, right*.

6. *St. Thomas*, for instance, deals with this question in the Supplement to the Third Part of the *Summa*, q. 40, arts. 4-5. In article 4 he says that the power over the natural body of Christ requires no superior, but on the other hand, the power over the mystical body, i.e., the power to absolve, requires jurisdiction from a superior. In article 5, he elaborates this notion, that a bishop is superior to a priest in this matter of jurisdiction over the mystical body. And as he confines the sacrament of holy order to that which directly gives power over the natural body of Christ, he says in the answer to the second difficulty, that, though the episcopate has a spiritual power peculiar to it, as this is not connected with the natural body of Christ the episcopate as such is not a *sacrament*.

¹ "Presbyterianism had come into full being within the pale of the Isatin Church."—Dr. Firminger, in *Liturgy and Worship*, p. 660.

Even so, in q. 38, art. 1, St. Thomas explains that *only a bishop can confer the sacrament of order*.

7. The views of *St. Bonaventure* are similar to those of St. Thomas. He also denies that the episcopate is a separate order, or a sacrament. Thus, he writes in *IVDist.* 24, q. 3 :

“Ultra sacerdotium non est gradus ordinis. Sed tamen intra hunc gradum et ordinem contingit esse *distinctionem dignitatum et officiorum*,¹ quae tamen *novum gradum vel ordinem non constituunt*, ut archipresbyter, *episcopus*, archiepiscopus, patriarcha, Pontifex Summus, quae ultra sacerdotium *non addunt ordinem*, nec gradum novum sed *solum dignitatem et officium*. Et ita episcopatus, prout concernit ordinem sacerdotii, bene potest dici ordo, sed prout distinguitur contra sacerdotium, dicit dignitatem quamdem, vel officium episcopi annexum, et non est proprie nomen ordinis, nec novus character imprimitur, nec nova potestas data, sed potestas data ampliatur. . . . Hoc etiam tenet communis opinio, quod in episcopatu character novus non imprimatur, sed illi aliqua eminentia confertur, quae semper manet cum ipso caractere ordinis, ablata omni jurisdictione. . . . Non datur ibi nova potestas, sed solum potestas ligandi et solvendi ampliatur.”

On the other hand, in *Dist.* 25, art. 1, q. 1, he insists that *only a bishop can ordain* :

“Posse autem gradus distribuere et conferre, non est cujuslibet potestatis, sed ejus qui in potentia supereminet. . . . Ideo patet quod duo requiruntur ad hoc quod episcopus possit ordinem conferre, scilicet, quod ille habeat illum ordinem, et quod habet episcopalem dignitatem.”²

8. It must be obvious that this *a priori* reasoning for the fact that only a bishop can ordain is rather weak. On the other hand, ecclesiastical tradition was absolutely unanimous that a bishop is the proper minister of holy order, at any rate in the case of the priesthood. Accordingly, it is not surprising that *Scotus*, seeing the inconsistency of the Thomist and Bonaventurian view, should have declared in the *Reportata* iv. 9 that the episcopate is really a distinct hierarchical order, precisely because of the special powers it possesses. Similarly *Durandus* maintains that the episcopate is an order and a sacrament. The majority of the scholastics, however, taught a view similar to that of St. Thomas and St. Bonaventure.

9. While the scholastics seem to invoke mainly *a priori* and analytic considerations for their denial that the episcopate constitutes a distinct order, it is not at all unlikely that they were

¹ Italics ours.

² Scotus also teaches that only a bishop can ordain (*Summa Theol.*, q. 38, art. x).

aware of the fact that in the New Testament at any rate, the terms "bishop" and "presbyter" are used indiscriminately, and that what is called the monarchical episcopate seems to have been introduced towards the end of the apostolic age, and that as St. Jerome says, "one was chosen to preside over the rest . . . as a remedy for schism."¹ But if they knew of this statement of St. Jerome, they would also know of the statement in the same letter of the same Doctor that *only a bishop can ordain*. It is reflection upon this last-mentioned fact which will later result in the conviction that the episcopate, constituting as it does the plenitude of the priesthood—for the priesthood in its fulness is possessed only by one who can perpetuate the office—must have been instituted by Christ, and must be a distinct order, and a sacrament.

The scholastic treatment of the episcopate was thus inadequate and unsatisfactory, but it was hardly unorthodox. It was bound to change in one of two directions, that is to say, the episcopate would either come to be regarded as a *separate order and sacrament*² or else, as a mere *dignitas* it would cease to be regarded as absolutely necessary for the Church, and it would come to be held that a presbyterian polity is a possible one, and that presbyters can if necessary ordain—in other words, that there is no essential difference between priest and bishop. The Catholic tradition developed in the former direction,³ while the Protestant reformers developed in the latter.⁴ This is very important, and must be borne in mind when we are interpreting Reformed documents. Thus, as we shall see, when Reformed works and formularies imply that bishops are only useful functionaries, and stress the fact that bishop and priest in the early church were the same office—as is the case with the Continental Protestant and some of the English formularies of the Reformation period—the implication is already one which is tending in a heretical direction. Such a heretical direction is still more

¹ Ep. xlv. i.

² The modern representatives of the Thomist School such as Hugon, and also Cardinal Billot, allow that the episcopate is an order and a sacrament, but merely deny that it is *adequately distinct* from the priesthood. Accordingly, they say that the episcopate can only be received by one already ordained priest. Others, on the contrary, holding that the episcopate is an *adequately distinct* order and sacrament, say that a deacon could validly be consecrated bishop, without passing by the priesthood.

³ To some extent the Protestant Reformers were anticipated by a few mediaeval canonists and theologians who held that the Pope could authorise a simple priest to ordain another priest. But the *communis sententia* denied this, and rightly urged that there was no historical instance of any such power being conferred. Vasquez allows that both views are "probable/*" but the opinion in question is practically given up now.

manifest when simple priests take upon themselves to ordain, as happened in Germany and elsewhere at the Reformation.

10. In this connection we must say something of alleged cases in which the Holy See has conferred upon simple priests, such as abbots, power to confer the diaconate and/or the priesthood. The first is a Bull of Innocent VIII, 19th April, 1489, conferring upon a Cistercian general and his successors power to ordain *deacons*. (There are said to be other instances, but on insufficient evidence.) If the Bull referred to be authentic, we shall have to admit that a priest can with Papal authority confer the diaconate. It is admitted that he can confer the subdiaconate, and so there would not be great difficulty in admitting a similar power with respect to the diaconate. The second, and far more important case, is a Bull of Boniface IX of 1400, discovered in the Vatican Archives in 1924, giving to the Abbot of St. Osyth and his successors the power to ordain his subjects to the subdiaconate, diaconate, and *priesthood*. The Bishop of London claimed that this infringed his jurisdiction, and three years later, in 1403, the privilege was withdrawn. The discoverer of the document, Abbot Fofi, thinks that the concession supports the theory that a priest possesses the radical power to ordain other priests, and that he can do so if delegated by the Pope. But such a view is completely opposed to Catholic tradition. It seems far more likely that the Bull is to be understood mainly as a permission for ordinations to take place in the monastery itself, and that, at any rate in the case of the priesthood, it is taken for granted that a bishop will be employed for the purpose. In favour of this view it is urged that the Bishop of London merely complained that the Bull infringed his *jurisdiction*, whereas if it had really conferred upon the abbot the power to ordain priests—a grant of which no other example exists in history—the Bishop would surely have commented upon the singularity and doubtful validity of the privilege.

11. As to the consecration of a *bishop*, it is the universal Catholic tradition that this can only be done by another bishop, and in view of this fact, the supposed ordination of the Patriarch of Alexandria in pre-Nicene days by the presbyters of the city must be understood either as an election, or else it must be supposed that the presbyters of Alexandria were at that time endowed with the episcopal dignity. We have already seen that possibly some of the Apostolic churches were governed in New Testament times by colleges of presbyter-bishops.

Certainly any attempt at ordination of a bishop, by simple priests, such as took place in certain countries during the Reformation period, would be completely contrary to Catholic tradition.

B. VALIDITY OF SCHISMATICAL AND HERETICAL ORDINATIONS.

1. We must now consider in more detail the question of the *validity of heretical ordination*, in order to bring to light the theological principles which were dominant in the West at the time of the Reformation, and which would therefore be invoked when the question of the validity of Anglican and Protestant orders arose. The question of heretical ordinations had been much discussed, especially in the ninth and tenth centuries. It was agreed on all hands that the sacrament of holy order *could not be reiterated*, but on the other hand there were many, in both East and West, who steadfastly maintained that *heretics could not properly ordain*. This was especially the case in the East (and still is to this day), and it is interesting to note that St. Theodore, the seventh Archbishop of Canterbury, a Greek from Tarsus, insisted on reordaining St. Chad *ab initio*, because he had been consecrated by Quartodecimans,¹ and inserted in his Penitential the following article: “*Si quis ab hereticis ordinatus sit, iterum debet ordinari.*” Similarly, a Roman Council in 769 declared that the ordinations of an anti-Pope were null. Again, John VIII said that excommunication prevented a bishop from ordaining validly. All this resulted in what Saltet calls “a theological regression of long duration and of great importance.”² But even so, the Augustinian doctrine was not without its defenders, throughout this period, and little by little it triumphed over the other view, and became the definitive teaching of the theological schools in the thirteenth century.

2. *Peter Lombard* himself sets forth at length the various opinions previously held. They are four in number.

- (a) These ordinations are invalid.
- (b) They are valid.
- (c) Heretics can baptise, but not ordain.
- (d) Sacraments conferred by heretics are valid if conferred in the *forma ecclesiae*, but not otherwise.

3. It is this *fourth* view which ends by being adopted universally. Thus, *St. Thomas*, in Supplement to the Third

¹ Eddi, *Life of St. Wilfrid*.

^{*} *Reordinations*, p. 162.

Part of the *Summa*, q. 38, art. 2, says that "haeretici et ab ecclesia praecisi" can confer orders and other sacraments, "dummodo formam debitam et intentionem servant" so far as the actual conferring of the sacrament is concerned, though it does not convey grace; "cum eis gratiam non dant, non propter inefficaciam sacramentorum, sed propter peccata recipientium ab eis sacramenta contra prohibitionem Ecclesiae."

4. Similarly, *St. Bonaventure* says, *IV Sent. Dist. 25*, q. 2, that an "episcopus haereticus servans formam Ecclesiae et intentionem habens Ecclesiae, vere ordinat, licet non ad utilitatem ordinet."

Again *Scotus* says that heretical bishops, in virtue of their power of order, can consecrate validly, although not licitly.¹

Again, in the *Summa Theologica*, III, q. 38, art. 2, *Scotus* says heretics and schismatics ordain validly, though illicitly "dummodo adsit intentio ex parte ministri et suscipientis, debitaque materia et forma." A similar statement will be found in *Durandus of S. Pourcain*?

5. We see then that by the end of the thirteenth century all the theological schools were agreed that *a heretical bishop can ordain validly, provided the form and intention of the Church are conserved.*

But what if the form and/or intention of the Church is not conserved? What if there be an alteration in the form? Here is *St. Thomas's* discussion of this subject:

"Concerning the changes which may take place in the forms of the sacraments, two things must be taken into account. First, on the part of the one who utters the words it is required that he should have the due intention. Hence, *if by adding or diminishing, he intends to introduce a new rite which is not received by the Church, he seems not to confer the sacrament, for he seems not to intend to do what the Church does.*² There is another point to be considered, and that is the *significance of the words*. For the words operate in the sacraments according to the sense they bear, as has been said, and hence in the case of alteration we must consider whether, by such a change the due and proper sense of the words is taken away, for if this be the case, it is manifest that the reality of the sacrament is destroyed. Now it is evident that *if some of those things which belong to the substance of the sacramental form be diminished, the proper sense of the words is taken away, and therefore the sacrament is not administered.* . . . If, however, something is taken away which is not of the substance of the form, such a diminution does not take away the proper sense of the words, and consequently does not destroy the performance of the sacrament."⁴

¹ *Repórtate* IV, dist. 25, q. 1, n. 16.

• Italics ours throughout.

² *Dist. 26*, q. 1, ad. 2.

⁴ III, q. 60, art. 8.

St. Thomas proceeds to give a similar treatment to the question of an addition to the form. The principles laid down by the Angelic Doctor were accepted generally, and so there is no need to give other quotations from scholastic writers on this matter.

C. THE MATTER AND FORM OF ORDER.

We now come to the important question of the *matter and form of the sacrament of Holy Order*. The question is an important one, for Anglicans often say that during the Middle Ages an erroneous theory was dominant, to the effect that the matter of the priesthood was, not the imposition of hands, but the tradition of the instruments, and that it was this erroneous view which led to the rejection of Anglican Orders in the reign of Queen Mary. We will postpone for the present a discussion as to whether the theory that the tradition of the instruments is the real matter of the priesthood is true or false, but will confine ourselves here to establishing that at any rate it was by no means the only view held during the Middle Ages.

1. We have already shown that it was precisely in the early Middle Ages that the various additions were made to the ordination rite. This is very important. It is quite likely that the exact dates of the introduction of these various additions, and their place of origin, may not have been known to the scholastic writers. But it is quite impossible, and demonstrably false, that they were unaware of the fact that earlier ordination rites were without these later ceremonies. In this connection we must mention the *Statuta Ecclesia Antiqua*, quoted by ancient writers as canons of the Fourth Council of Carthage, a.d. 398, but really a number of disciplinary and liturgical canons drawn up in the province of Arles about the beginning of the sixth century, perhaps by St. Caesarius of Arles. The rite described in these canons is an early form of the Gallican rite of ordination. Thus, Canon 2 is as follows :

“Episcopus cum ordinatur, duo episcopi ponant et teneant evangeliorum codicem super caput et cervicem ejus, et uno super eum fundente benedictione, reliqui omnes episcopi qui adsunt, manibus suis caput ejus tangunt.”

Canon 3 gives the corresponding direction for the ordination of a priest:

“Presbyter cum ordinatur, episcopo eum benedicente et manum super caput ejus tenente, etiam omnes presbyteri qui praesentes sunt, manus suas juxta manum episcopi super caput illius teneant.”

Now these canons were certainly known throughout the Middle Ages, for they occur in liturgical books like the Gelasian Sacramentary and the *Missale Francorum*, and are incorporated in the later Pontificals. In addition, Ivo Gamotensis, a.d. 1117, expressly quotes them¹ as the decrees of the Council of Carthage, and in the thirteenth century Durandus similarly quotes this "African Council."²

There is the further point that, though East and West had separated from one another, yet there was certainly intercourse between the two Churches, and various attempts were made at reunion. In these discussions it must have come to the knowledge of at least some of the Western theologians that the Eastern ordination rites possessed no ceremony such as the tradition of the instruments.

We may also mention in this connection the wide vogue in the West of the pseudo-Dionysian writings, which were translated several times into Latin, and commented on by many scholastic writers. Now these writings, as we have seen, contain a description of the supposed Apostolic ordination rite, consisting essentially of the laying-on of hands, without any tradition of instruments.

Lastly, there were of course the plain testimonies in the New Testament specifying the central place occupied in the Ordination rite by the ceremony of the laying-on of hands, and the express statement in 1 Timothy that it was by this laying-on of hands that the gift of the Holy Ghost was given.

AU this formed part of the common knowledge of the scholastics of the Middle Ages, and we must bear it in mind when discussing their theories of the essence of the ordination rite.

2. Cardinal Van Rossum has shown in his *De Essentia Sacramenti Ordinis*, pp. 155 *et seq.*, that a great number of mediaeval writers speak in a way which implies that the laying-on of hands is at least one essential feature in the ordination rite, if not the only one. Thus :

(a) *Hugh of St. Victor* says³ that by the imposition of hands is given the power of offering sacrifice, and in this connection he appeals to the ancient statutes of the Church. He then mentions the investiture, and the tradition of instruments, and says that these are given in order that the ordinati may know

¹ *P.L.*, Vol. 161, cols. 448 and 1137.

³ *De Sacramentis*, II, pars iii, cap. 12.

¹ *Rationale*, II, cap. ii.

82 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

that they *have* [already] *received* (se *accepisse* agnoscant) the power of offering pleasing victims to God.

(b) *Peter Lombard*, the Master of the Sentences, says that the imposition of hands gives the priesthood to the ordinand.¹ And like *Hugh of St. Victor*, he also says that priests' hands are anointed "in order that they may know they *have* [already] *received* the grace of consecrating. . . . They also are given the chalice with wine, and the paten with the host, that by this they may know that they *have* [already] *received* (sciant se *accepisse*) the power of offering pleasing victims to God."²

(c) Similarly, *Durandus*, in his *Rationale*, says the priest is given the instruments that he may know he *has received* (*accepisse*) the power of the priesthood.³

(d) *Albert the Great* expressly recognises that the primitive rite of ordination consisted in the laying-on of hands⁴ : "Hic erat ritus consecrationis in primitiva ecclesia," and says that the sacerdotal character is given "quando episcopus imponit manum capiti cum verbis ad hoc statutis."⁶ Yet elsewhere he says that the tradition of the instruments and the accompanying formula constitute the matter and form of the sacrament.[®]

(e) *St. Thomas Aquinas*, in his *Commentary on the Sentences*, distinguishes between the "*preparatio*" for the order of the priesthood and the actual "*collatio potestatis*." The former is the laying-on of hands, the blessing, and the unction. The latter consists in the "ipsa datione calicis sub forma verborum determinata," in which "character sacerdotalis imprimitur."⁷ His reason for saying that the character is given by the tradition of the instruments, is that "quilibet ordo traditur per collationem illius rei quæ præcipue pertinet ad ministerium illius ordinis,"⁸ and that the "principalis actus sacerdotis est consecrare corpus et sanguinem Christi."⁹

On the other hand, he expressly states that "per manus impositionem datur plenitudo gratiæ, per quam ad magna officia sint idonei [sacerdotes],"⁹ and in the *Summa questionum*, III, he says that "Impositio manuum in sacramentis ecclesiæ fit ad designandum aliquem copiosum gratiæ effectum," and that in particular, "manus impositio fit . . . in sacramento ordinis, in quo confertur quædam excellentia potestatis in divinis mysteriis."

¹ In i *Tim.* iv. 14 ; *P.L.*, Vol. 192, col. 350.

⁹ In IV *Sent.*, dist. 24.

⁹ II, cap. 10.

⁴ *Comment, in lib. de eccles. hierarch.*, c. v.

• *Comp. Theol. Verit.*, 6, c. 36.

• In IV *Sent.*, dist. 24, art. 38.

⁷ *Dist.* 24, in *Supplementum in III Summa*, q. 37, art. 5.

⁹ *Opusculum, Tract, de articulis fidei et sacramentis ecclesia.*

⁹ *Dist.* 24.

To harmonise these apparently divergent statements, Cardinal Gotti suggests that, in St. Thomas's view, "sola manuum impositio non determinat ad quem actum det ei gratiam . . . ideo hoc per traditionem instrumentorum explicari et determinari debet."¹ In other words, the tradition of the instruments is an explication or determination of the purpose of the laying on of hands. This would agree with the view of St. Bonaventure, which we will now proceed to explain.

(f) The treatment given by St. Bonaventure, the contemporary and friend of St. Thomas, in his own *Commentary on the Sentences* is perhaps the most illuminating of all. He writes as follows :

"Hoc pro generali regula habendum est, quod in illo signo exteriori imprimitur character in quolibet ordine, in quo principalis potestas quam respicit ordo, signatur tradi ordinato. Ad hanc autem signandam duo concurrunt exterius, scilicet, traditio alicujus instrumenti, et expressio verbi. . . . Et haec duo sunt essentialia et intrinseca sacramenti, et perficientia sacramentum. Quoniam enim manus est organum organorum in operando, et lingua in exprimendo, recte significatur conferri potestas in officio utriusque, et haec in quolibet ordine reperiuntur. . . . Sed quoniam characteres sunt diversi, habentes majorem dignitatem et minorem, secundum gradus potestatum, ideo tam per signa quam verba diversificantur, maxime in ordinibus sacris et in minoribus. In ordinibus sacris, quoniam datur ibi nobilis potestas et excellens, *fit manus impositio*, non tantum instrumenti traditio ; quoniam manus est organum organorum, in quo scilicet residet potestas operandi; unde *sic ordinabant in Ecclesia primitiva*, ubi non nisi isti duo ordines (diaconatus et presbyteratus) expliciti erant. Sed in ordinibus minoribus fit traditio alicujus instrumenti. . . ."

The significance of this reference to the rite of the primitive Church becomes clearer in his answer to the third objection. This objection was to the effect that "esto quod tales libri vel vasa deessent, sicut forte deerant in Ecclesia primitiva, nihilo minus tales ordines dari possent." On this he comments :
 ° Sicut omne instrumentum sive armatura in virtute manus est; sic etiam *per impositionem manuum*, ubi deessent talia, *possent significari* ; unde sicut post videbitur, *in impositione manuum in Ecclesia primitiva ceteri ordinis implicabantur qui postmodum processu temporis explicati sunt, et quantum ad verbum, et quantum ad signum, et quantum ad personas.*"

St. Bonaventure's view, then, is that the laying on of hands contains *implicitly* the *virtus operandi*, and the tradition of the

instruments has been introduced subsequently in order to *determine or make explicit* the powers given.

In the answer to the first difficulty, he even suggests that *the tradition of the instruments may be looked upon as an impositio manuum*, for in the “*collatio alicujus instrumenti*” is a “*protensio manus*.”

In the answer to the fifth objection, St. Bonaventure allows for a historical development, not only of the matter of orders, but also of the form (“*quantum ad verbum*”). This naturally allows for a certain variety in verbal expression, which St. Bonaventure expressly allows in the answer to the fifth difficulty¹:

“*Semper intelligendum est fuisse verbum aliquod, in quo exprimeretur potestas tali dari; sed non fuerunt verba prafixa, nisi in solis duabus sacramentis. . . . In aliis, etsi verba sunt necessaria, non tamen sunt determinata vocabula, vel vocaliter, sed verba quacunque sensum exprimentia quantum est de ratione sacramenti, sufficiebant, si quis haresim introducere non intendebat. Sed nunc necessarium est servare formam ab ecclesia statutam et approbatam.*”

(g) Scotus sets forth his opinion in three works, the *Summa Theologica*, the *Commentary on the Sentences*, and the other Commentary known as the *Reportata*. He allows for two opinions²: (i) one would be that the tradition of the instruments confers the whole of the priesthood; the other, which in the *Commentary on the Sentences* he describes as “probabile,” is that in ordination to the priesthood there is a twofold matter, and a twofold form. These would be the tradition of instruments, with the formula “*Accipe potestatem, etc.*,” and the laying-on of hands by the bishop, with the formula “*Accipe Spiritum Sanctum, quorum remisistis, etc.*” In any case, he adds, in his *Summa*, that the “*posterior a prima dependeat, i.e., traditur sacerdoti auctoritas in corpus Christi mysticum, per quam fideles praeparari queant ad digne sumendum Eucharistiae Sacramentum.*” If the former view be adopted, then “*per unum characterem habet ordinatus potestatem conficiendi corpus Christi, per quem . . . simul disponitur de congruo ad habendam potestatem super corpus Christi mysticum ligandi atque solvendi. Et subinde in uno eodemque signo sensibili et verbis confert ambas potestates, unam explicite, et aliam quasi implicite.*”

Scotus's language evidently implies that the laying-on of hands with the power to forgive *sins*, follows the tradition of the

¹ Cf. his requirement for the validity of heretical ordination, quoted on p. 79.

² It is, accordingly, hardly correct to ascribe only one view to Scotus, and that the view of the double matter and form, as is done by Van Rossum (*De Essentia Sacramenti Ordinis*), Michel (*Diet, de théol. cath. s.v. Ordre*) and d'Alès (*Dictionnaire apologétique*).

instruments.¹ He does not say that this last laying-on of hands was of very recent introduction into the rite, though he can hardly have been unaware of this, seeing that it was apparently introduced in the very century in which he was writing. But this may explain why he allows for an alternative view. It is strange that, in this alternative view (i.e., that the tradition of the instruments is the matter), there is no reference to the laying-on of hands. But it must be remembered that *Scotus is writing after St. Thomas and St. Bonaventure*, and may well be taking it for granted that their presentation of this theory is known, i.e., that the laying-on of hands is an essential preparation (St. Thomas), or perhaps included in the "protensio manus" in the tradition of the instruments (St. Bonaventure).

(h) There continued to be theologians who seemed to regard the laying-on of hands as the most important part of the rite. Thus there is an interesting treatment of the subject in *Peter of Tarentaise, O.P.*, afterwards Pope Innocent V (died 1276). In his *Commentary on the Sentences*² he shows that he is perfectly aware of the fact that there was no tradition of the instruments in the early Church, for this is pointed out in the third difficulty :

"Videtur quod character non imprimatur in instrumenti corporalis traditione . . . quia in primitiva Ecclesia non erant hujusmodi instrumental

And similarly, that there was no investiture in the primitive Church, or among the Greeks :

"Nec in induitione vestium . . . in primitiva Ecclesia et apud Grecos non fuit hujus vestium distinctio."

In his "Respondeo," he first of all follows St. Thomas :

"In sacramentorum collatione, per aliqua quae ibi fiunt suscipiens praeparatur et disponitur, ut per benedictionem, unctionem, manuum impositionem et vestium concessionem ; per unicum vero actum character imprimitur, scilicet per instrumenti traditionem."

Here the "impositio manuum" is a "preparation," as in St. Thomas. But almost immediately afterwards Peter makes an exception for the diaconate and priesthood, adopting the view and phraseology of St. Bonaventure :

"In duobus supremis ordinibus, fit in impositione manuum, quia manus est organum organorum."

This is presumably to be interpreted in the Bonaventurian

¹ Cf. *Summa, loc. cit.*: "tunc complete in sacerdotem est ordinatus cum episcopus manus imponendo, etc."

² *IV Sent. dist. 24, quest. 3, art. 3.*

sense, i.e., the *impositio manuum* includes implicitly the *traditio instrumentorum*.

In the fifteenth century, *John Gerson* (died 1429) says in his *Compendium Theological* that "in sacerdotio, fit pro sacramento impositio manuum cum forma verborum,"² but this must be taken in conjunction with his acceptance of the double matter and form theory in his *Regula morales de sacris ordinibus*, n. 159.

In the sixteenth century, *Cardinal Cajetan* (died 1534) holds the double matter and form theory for the priesthood,³ but elsewhere⁴ remarks that the only matter for the diaconate must be the imposition of hands, and not the giving of the Book of the Gospels, because, as he points out, *deacons were made before the Gospels were written* !

3. There is another idea which makes its appearance in the Middle Ages, and that is, that the *unctions* form part of the matter of the sacrament of holy order. This point has not received the attention it deserves, *Cardinal Van Rossum*, for instance, does not include this in his list of theories, though he mentions *en passant* that various people held it. It is similarly only hinted at by d'Alès in his article in the *Dictionnaire Apologétique*⁵ and passed over by Michel in his article in the *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*.

We have already mentioned that *Peter Lombard* says the unctions are performed that the priest may know he has already received the grace of consecration. But other writers give to them a much more efficient rôle. Thus *Saltet* says the theory that the unctions constitute the essence of holy order is implied in a decree of Pope Urban II (1088-90). In addition, we may mention the following :

Honorius of Autun (1106-35)†¹ his *Gemma anima* says the power of consecrating the Body of Christ is given in the unction.

Stephanas de Balgiaco, 1136, says that "in unctione visibili, quae est sacramentum spiritualis unctionis, datur potestas ligandi atque solvendi."

Hildebert, in 1134, says: "Ex unctione sortitur persona potestatem consecrandi substantias consecrandas."

Bandinus, 1165, says: "Istis, cum ordinantur, episcopus manus inungit, quo gratiam consecrationis accipiunt."

And towards the end of the same century, *Bishop Sicard*

* *Cardinal Van Rossum* strangely says there is "nihil" on the subject in the *Compendium Theologia* !

† *De septem sacramentis*.

* *Tract. 11*.

• *Opuscula*[^] tom. i, tract 26.

includes unction as one of the essential elements of order.¹ (See below.) The same is true of *Durandus*. (See later.) Saltet also mentions a *Compendium theologies veritatis* wrongly attributed to St. Bonaventure.²

In any case it is quite clear that this theory of the essential character of unction lasted right up to the sixteenth century, for the Cologne *Encheiridion*, published in 1537, speaking of the sacrament of Order, says first that the “elementum hujus sacramenti, quod ad ordines majores attinet . . . impositio manuum est,” and then adds, “praeterea, unctio quae adhibetur sacerdotio initiandis, elementum est ordinis.”

We shall come across other instances of the persistence of this idea in Reformation times.

4. We have seen that St. Thomas regards the laying-on of hands as a preparation for ordination, though by it the fulness of grace is given, and that St. Bonaventure hints that the tradition of instruments may be an explication of the former ceremony, and in a sense take its place, inasmuch as it comprises itself a “protensio manus.” This may account for the fact that other thirteenth-century writers, while they enumerate various essential elements in the rite of ordination, seem to *exclude* the imposition of hands from these. One example is Sicard, Bishop of Cremona, who says in his *Mitræ* that, in his opinion (*ut puto*), the essence of ordination for the priesthood consists in the vesting in stole and chasuble, the unctions, and the tradition of the instruments, with their accompanying words, and adds, “caetera praecedentia et subsequencia sunt solemnitatis.” But the “praecedentia” included the imposition of hands!³ He seems to go further still, and to deny that the laying-on of hands gives the Holy Spirit, but is merely an occasion of prayer that the Holy Ghost may come upon the *ordinandi*!⁴

Similarly *Durandus*, in his *Rationale*, writes: “Ei qui in presbyterum ordinatur, traduntur sub certis verbis stola et casula, calix cum patena, et etiam inunguntur, quae res et verba, sunt de hujusmodi sacramenti substantia. Caetera praecedentia et sequentia de solemnitate sunt.”⁵

¹ *Mitræ*, P.L., Vol. 213.

* *R_eordinationis* p. 233. The theory is not favoured by St. Bonaventure: “Concedendum est quod in unctione non imprimitur character.”—(*In IV Sent.*, d. 24, Part II, art. 3, q. 4.)

• *Mitræ*, P.L., Vol. 213.

* Col. 64.

• Lib. ii. Elsewhere, as we have seen (p. 82), *Durandus* says the tradition of instruments shows that the power to sacrifice had already been given. He does not specify what ceremony it is which confers the power.

88 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

At first sight these statements certainly seem to imply that the laying-on of hands is a non-essential element of the ordination rite. But it is at least possible, in view of what St. Bonaventure holds, that these writers would say that the imposition of hands is really *included in the ceremonies of anointing, tradition of instruments, and investing, in the form of a "protensio manus."* For we repeat that all these mediaeval writers must have been aware of the phraseology used in Scripture, and of the *Statuta Antiqua Ecclesia*, and the "Ecclesiastical Hierarchy" of pseudo-Dionysius, and also with the early mediaeval writers who, as we have seen, regard the laying-on of hands as at least one essential feature of the ordination rite.

5. So much for the *theory* at this time. As to *practice*, it must be evident that, in the presence of so many conflicting views, the bishops would be most careful to carry out *the whole ordination rite as it then existed*. One might, however, ask what would happen if some one of the ceremonies of the ordination rite were omitted. This would obviously raise the question as to whether the particular ceremony were essential or not. In this matter, canon law provided a guide, in the form of a decretal of Gregory IX (1145-1241), as follows :

« Presbyter et diaconis cum ordinantur manus impositionem tactu corporali (ritu ab Apostolis introducto) recipiunt; quod si omisum fuerit non est aliquatenus iterandum, sed statuta tempore ad hujusmodi ordines conferendos caute supplendum quod per errorem exstitit praetermissum. Suspendio autem manuum debet fieri cum oratio supercaput effunditur ordinandi.”¹

The next Pope but one after Gregory, i.e., Innocent IV, who was in every way likely to know Gregory's meaning, says that the decree was intended merely to *ensure the performance of the omitted ceremony*, and was *not in any way intended to suggest that it constitutes only an accidental rite of ordination*.² And certainly this would seem to be the only reasonable view, for the Roman authorities are not accustomed to issue decrees which suppose one theological theory rather than another on a subject debated in the schools, unless they expressly state that it is their intention to inculcate this one particular view.

It is of interest to note that the same Pope Innocent IV, in his commentary on the chapter "Presbyter," recognises the historical changes which have taken place in the form of

¹ Lib. 1, tit. 11, cap. presby. de saerm. non iter.

² Van Rossum, p. 22.

ordination ; and at the same time gives us to understand what is required in a sufficient form :

“ De ritu apostolico invenitur in Epistola at Timotheum, quod manus imponebant ordinandis, et quod orationes fundebant super eos. Aliam autem formam non invenimus ab eis servatam. Unde credimus quod nisi essent formae postea inventae, sufficeret ordinatori dicere : * Sis sacerdos ' vel alia aequipollentia verba. Sed subsequentibus temporibus, formas quae servantur Ecclesia ordinavit.”

This makes it sufficiently clear that in the opinion of the authorities, any form might suffice which made it quite clear that the order of priesthood, etc., was being conferred, but that as the Church has appointed certain specific forms, these of course must be carried out in practice.

There was no special decree at this time as to what should be done in the case of the omission of the ceremony of the tradition of the instruments, but it would seem that the ceremony would certainly have to be supplied. Some centuries later, when the question was definitely raised, Rome decided that the whole rite should be repeated *sub conditione*.

6. In 1439, however, in connection with the Council of Florence, an important Papal decree was issued, the bearing of which we must carefully consider. As is well known, at the Council of Florence a union had been negotiated between the Eastern and the Western Churches. Pope Eugenius IV had already invited the Armenian Patriarch to participate in the Council, in 1414, but it was not till 1438 that four deputies from the Armenians arrived. The Greeks were just on the point of departing at that moment. On November 22nd, 1439, the special Decree of Union for the Armenians was read and solemnly adopted. It is a long document comprising :

(a) formulas of faith, such as the creeds of Nicaea and St. Athanasius, the definitions of Chalcedon on the two natures, and of Constantinople on the two wills in Christ;

(b) decisions on discipline; and

(c) an exposition of sacramental theology, following the lines of St. Thomas's opusculum *De fidei articulis et septem sacramentis*. Here is the part of the decree on Order, with the corresponding words of St. Thomas :

Decree.

Sextum sacramentum est ordinis, cujus materia est illud,

St. Thomas.

Sextum est sacramentum ordinis. . . . Materia autem hujus

per cujus traditionem confertur ordo ; sicut presbyteratus traditur per calicis cum vino et patenae cum pane porrectionem. Diaconatus vero per libri Evangeliorum dationem. Subdiaconatus vero per calicis vacui cum patena vacua superposita traditionem ; et similiter de aliis per rerum ad ministeria sua pertinentium assignationem.

Forma sacerdotii talis est: "Accipe potestatem offerendi sacrificium in Ecclesia pro vivis est mortuis, in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti." Et sic de aliorum ordinum formis, prout in Pontificali romano late continetur.

sacramenti est illud materiale, per cujus traditionem confertur ordo ; sicut praesbyteratus traditur per collationem calicis, et quilibet ordo per collationem hujus rei quae praecipue pertinet ad ministerium illius ordinis.

Forma autem hujus sacramenti est talis : "Accipe potestatem offerendi sacrificium in Ecclesia pro vivis et mortuis," et idem est dicendum in consimilibus ordinibus.

Now, the key to the interpretation of this Decree is to be found in the fact that *the Armenians had already added to their rite a tradition of instruments*, namely, in the middle of the twelfth century.¹ At the same time, it must be borne in mind that this addition was made in response to a request of the Roman authorities. Even so, *Rome did not say that those ordained and consecrated without such ceremonies must be reordained and reconsecrated*, as would certainly have been done if Rome had held that orders conferred without the tradition of instruments were invalid. *There is no mention even of conditional reordination, but only of the inclusion of the rite in future.*

Furthermore, it is to be remembered that the Council of Florence had united not only the Armenians, but also the other Greek Churches to the Holy See, and Rome could hardly be unaware of the fact that there was no tradition of instruments in these other Eastern rites. She might have desired to see it introduced, but she did not insist on it in any other case. As a writer said long ago in the *Tablet* :

"Eugenius IV was in actual and constant communication with the Greeks, and undoubtedly recognised their orders. Are we to believe that the Roman authorities of that time, who fully admitted without question the orders of the Greeks, and received without mention of reordination a bishop like Bessarion, possessed no knowledge whatever of their ordination forms, or of the fact that the tradition of instruments was lacking in their ordinals ?" ^a

¹ See article by d'Alès in *Dictionnaire d'Apologétique*. III, p. 1148.

• *Tablet*, Nov. 21st, 1896.

The utmost one could say is that the Pope favours and perhaps teaches the view that, in the Western (and Armenian) rite, the Church has constituted the tradition of instruments as *an* essential part of ordination, or perhaps even the most essential part. It would not necessarily follow that Rome thereby intended to teach definitely that the tradition of instruments was *the only essential part*, *q1* that the laying-on of hands was *unnecessary*. The best proof of this is that, as we shall see, *Catholic theologians continued to discuss the question of what essentially constituted the rite of ordination*, and that the view that part at least of the essence of the rite consists in the imposition of hands and the accompanying prayer continued to be held by theologians of unimpeachable orthodoxy.

Moreover, there continued to be some who regarded the *unctions* as forming part of the matter of holy order. We have mentioned the Cologne *Encheiridion* in this connection on a previous page, and in this respect we may add that *the Cologne theologians say nothing about any traditio instrumentorum in the case of the major orders*, though they do mention it as the matter for the minor orders: "In collatione minorum ordinum . . . certa quaedam instrumenta traduntur."

It is not surprising, in view of this diversity which continued to exist after and in spite of the Decree *ad Armenos*, that the Council of Trent should deliberately have left the question open, as we shall see. Finally, we might add that *on several occasions subsequent to the Decree ad Armenos, Rome expressly recognised the validity of Greek ordinations carried out without the tradition of instruments*, as, e.g., in 1595, when Clement VIII issued an instruction and arranged for a Greek bishop to confer Greek orders on Greek students in Rome itself—an arrangement confirmed by Pope Urban VIII in *Universalis Ecclesiae*, 1624. Again, in 1742, a bull *Etsi pastoralis* was issued for the Italo-Greeks. Pope Benedict XIV said the Greeks were to follow their ordinal, and in 1743 forbade them to make any changes in it. He explained the Decree of Eugenius as follows:

"Necesse est igitur fateri Eugenium locutum de *materia et forma integrante et accessoria*, quam optavit ab Armenis superaddi manuum impositioni jam diu ab illis adhibitae, ut Ecclesiae latinae moribus se accommodarent ac rituum uniformitate firmitus eidem adhaerent."¹

To this we may add the description of the Decree *Ad Armenos*

¹ *De syn.*, viii, c. x, n. 8, Denz., n. 701 n.

given by Denny and Lacey in their *De Hierarchia Anglicana*, p. 114:

“Armenorum instruendorum causa, proprios Ecclesiae Romanae ritus tantum historice describit. . . . Ritus non nisi historice describuntur ; quocirca decreto nec diffinitio inest, neque auctoritas legis ferendae. Ita sane sentiebat Benedictus XIV.”

To sum up : it was an accepted datum of Catholic theology in pre-Reformation times that the sacrament of holy order, as a sacred sign signifying and conferring the power of the priesthood, must, by its matter and form, signify what it effects. It was recognised fairly widely that there had been a certain evolution in this matter, and a certain variety in rite. The central rite of the imposition of hands, and the accompanying prayer, had remained throughout, and was regarded by many if not most as still *an* essential part of ordination.¹ Some were inclined to regard the unctions and the tradition of instruments in the same light, others again said the same of the final imposition of hands with the power to forgive sins, even going so far as to disregard the first laying-on of hands, or to assign it only a preparatory role. In the case of Eastern Churches, the Church recognised the validity of ordination conferred without a tradition of instruments. In the case of Western rites, she would, in the existing state of opinion, certainly not tolerate the omission of the tradition of the instruments, and she certainly did not tolerate the omission of the first laying-on of hands. All the existing ceremonies would have to be carried out, for they now together formed part of the Church's form, which she had evolved for the conferring of sacred orders.

7. Lastly, we must point out that *no medieval theologian, liturgist, or canonist ever held that the sole and sufficient form for the priesthood was the formula “Receive the Holy Ghost, whose sins, etc”* In this connection Anglicans sometimes quote the *Institutio Christiana* put forward by the Council of Mainz in 1549. But this work, after quoting the various commands of Our Lord in the New Testament, such as “As the Father hath sent me, so I send you,” “This do for a remembrance of me,” “Going therefore teach all nations,” “Whose sins you shall forgive,” etc., goes on to say : “In conferring orders, the bishop, looking attentively at the foregoing commands and promises, uses a form

* The Council of Mainz, in its decrees (cap. 35), speaks only of the imposition of hands as the sensible sign : “In collatione ordinum, quae cum impositione manuum velut visibile signo traditur, doceant. . .

of words which comes very closely indeed to the promises and commands of this kind, and expresses them openly and plainly. For when he is *about to confer* the sacerdotal order (*traditurus ordinem sacerdotalem*), he says, *Receive the Holy Ghost, whose sins you shall forgive, etc.' ” This passage calls attention to the use of this text in the ordination rite—the only one out of those quoted which is so used. It does *not* say that *this is the form of Holy Order*; if anything, it implies the contrary, inasmuch as the bishop says them (*inquit*) when he is only *about to confer* the order (*traditurus*). Or in any case the passage would imply no more than that the words in question are *part* of the form for conferring orders. In this connection it is worthy of note that the next chapter in the *Institutio* says that the “external sign and visible element in the major orders is the imposition of hands. . . . In the initiation to the priesthood, besides the imposition of hands, *unction is also accustomed to be employed*, the use of which, both on account of its antiquity, and its aptness for signifying the mystery, is *altogether to be retained* in the Church. . . . The Catholic Church initiates its priests with a special unction, as a sign of consecration, and of the excellent power which Christ has given them of binding and loosing the sins of men . . . and that they may be admonished that *they have received* (*accepisse*) *the grace of consecration*”

Now even though we grant that the words *Receive the Holy Ghost whose sins, etc.,*” give the power of binding and loosing, it can hardly be maintained that they give “the grace of consecration.” This must therefore be conferred by some other form.

8. We must now discuss the question of the mediaeval conception of the *matter and form of the episcopate*. It has already been pointed out that many, if not most, of the mediaeval theologians denied that the episcopate was a separate sacrament or order, but regarded it only as a divinely instituted *dignitas*, comprising an extension of the powers of the priesthood. But even so, it must be remembered that the rite for the making of a bishop would be considered to possess its matter and form, just as the minor orders do, which were equally regarded as non-sacramental. And, by analogy, it would be said that the episcopate must be conferred by appropriate words and actions. The scholastics can hardly have been unaware of the express mention of the laying-on of hands in Scripture, pseudo-Dionysius, and the *Statuta antiqua Ecclesia*. But strangely enough, the only writers who deal with the question seek elsewhere for the

94 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

essential matter and form of the episcopate. Probably they were influenced by the analogous tendency to find the essential matter and form of the priesthood in the tradition of instruments, investiture, unctions, etc.

Thus, *Sicard*, Bishop of Cremona, in his *Mitræ*, says that "Capitis et manuum unctio, pollicis confirmatio, baculi et annuli traditio, et eorum singularia verba sunt, *ut puto*, hujus sacramenti substantia, caetera solemnitas."

St. Bonaventure seems to think the giving of the crozier is the essential feature :

"In episcopatu non datur nova potestas, sed solum potestas ligandi et solvendi ampliatur, et ideo, in hujus signum, baculus pastoralis porrigitur."¹

In addition, he allows a certain significance to the unctions :

"Illa sanctitatis eminentia per superabundantem inunctionem debet signari."²

"Pontifici fit unctio in capite, in quo significatur abundantia gratiae."³

Durandus, in his *Rationale*, copies the statement of *Sicard*, but adds to the essential features the "*Evangelii traditio*."^{*}

Naturally no mediaeval theologian either says or implies that the essential form for the episcopate is the "*Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*," introduced, as we have seen, in the fourteenth century at the laying-on of hands. This was reserved for post-Reformation scholastic theologians.

CONCLUSION.

Thus opinions were divided in the Middle Ages as to the matter and form of Holy Order. The Decree of *Eugenius IV* certainly seemed to favour one particular view, but it seems impossible that it was intended to settle the question once and for all.

¹ In *IV Sent.*, dist. 24, q. 3, ad. 5.
• In *corpore*.

^{*a} *Ibid.*, ad. 6.
4 II, cap. 11.

CHAPTER X

THE DEVELOPMENT OF EUCHARISTIC THEOLOGY IN THE MIDDLE AGES, AND THE FORMULATION OF THE DOCTRINE OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION

We must now proceed to study the parallel development of the *Eucharistic* theology between the Patristic period and the Reformation.

1. The former period handed on to the Middle Ages the twofold conception of the Eucharist, namely, the conversion of the bread and wine into Our Lord's Body and Blood, and the offering of that Body and Blood in memory of the Passion. The latter point was not much discussed, because it does not seem to have been directly called in question. But the nature of the Real Presence was the subject of very keen discussion. While tradition was clear that the eucharistic bread and wine become the Body and Blood, it remained true that in appearance the bread and wine remain. Some of the Fathers had, as we have seen, given the solution of the difficulty, in the explicit statement that it is merely the sense qualities of the elements that persist. But the doctrine was elaborated in the Middle Ages, mainly because of certain heretical solutions of the difficulty that were advanced.

2. The first heterodox solution to be suggested was the *symbolical* solution : the Body and Blood are not *really* present under the forms of bread and wine, but are present only *figuratively*. This was obviously unorthodox, for it denied one of the data of the problem, i.e., the revealed doctrine that the consecrated elements are really the Body and Blood. It was refuted by Paschasius Radbertus (a .d. 830-850) in his *De corpore et sanguine Christi*.

3. Another heterodox solution was to the effect that the body of Christ present under the form of bread was not His natural, but His *mystical* body. This also was refuted by

Paschasius Radbertus.¹ He establishes that the Eucharist is the *natural* body of Christ which is present, and, secondly, that it is *really* present. There is, indeed, also a “figure” in the sacrament, as well as the “reality” of the Body and Blood. The sacrament is reality, for the Body and Blood, by the power of the Holy Ghost and the words of consecration, are produced from the substance of bread and wine. The “figure” consists in “*quod exterius sentitur*” the “reality” in “*quod interius intelligitur aut creditur*”

4. In the same ninth century, however, *Ratramnus* wrote a work, *De corpore et sanguine Domini*, in which he discusses these various ideas, and also another, which apparently was held in some quarters, an “ultra-realist” theory, which denied that the Eucharistic bread was in any sense a “figure” of the Body of Christ, but was this Body really and absolutely, in such a way that the Body could be said to be present to our senses. Ratramnus refutes this idea, and holds a theory similar to that of Paschasius: the Eucharist is at once *figure* and *reality*, figure according to the visible appearances, but the Body and Blood according to the invisible substance. But on the other hand, Ratramnus errs inasmuch as he holds that what is thus present is not the historic Body of Christ, but His “spiritual” body.² A similar idea was advanced by Rhaban Maur, the Archbishop of Mainz (died 856). The doctrine of Paschasius, on the other hand, was defended by Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, Gerbert, who became Pope Sylvester II, and by others. There was, however, at this time, no official decision by the Church authorities.

5. Next we come to *Berengarius*, who was a “rationalist” in theology. He maintained that the *substances* of bread and wine must remain, for reason tells us that they do so. Accordingly, the doctrine of the Church must be accommodated or interpreted in such a way as to be harmonised with this fact. And in particular, Berengarius says it is not true that the invisible substance, of which Paschasius had written, is the Body and Blood of Christ. The invisible substance beneath the species is that of bread and wine. Yet Berengarius does not wish altogether to

¹ It is interesting to note that later on Paschasius was invoked by St. John Fisher as holding the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist (cf. *De veritate corporis et sanguinis Christi*, Præfatium), while on the other hand, his work was said by Ridley to affirm only a Virtual, and not a Real Presence. There can be little doubt that Fisher was right, but naturally at the time Paschasius wrote, the terminology employed was somewhat imprecise, and thus might be misunderstood by people like Ridley.

² *Op. tit., c. 89.*

deny the doctrine of the Real Presence, and so he interprets this to mean that by consecration the bread and wine become, without any change in their nature or substance, the "sacrament," "figure," or "sign" of the Body and Blood.

In saying that the Sacrament is a "figure," Berengarius remains in the line of scholastic tradition, and is merely re-echoing Paschasius. But whereas Paschasius went on to say that the Sacrament also contains the "reality" of the Body and Blood, Berengarius expressly denies this. He says that the bread and wine are *called* the flesh and blood of the Saviour because the Eucharist is *celebrated in memory of* the crucifixion of this flesh, and the shedding of this blood.¹ It is obvious that this is a denial of the Real Objective Presence. Again, he says that if the bread were changed into the true flesh of Christ, this would mean either that the bread is transported to heaven, where the body of Christ is, or else that the Body of Christ descends from heaven into the bread. But both these ideas must be rejected, Ergo.²

6. The Church authorities could not possibly remain inactive in view of this clear denial of one of her most cherished doctrines. Accordingly, formula after formula was presented to Berengarius for his signature. Some of these were expressed in language which would now be misunderstood, as for instance the formula imposed by the *Council of Rome* in 1059, where Berengarius had to confess that the bread and wine after consecration are not merely the "sacrament" of the Body and Blood, but the "real body and blood," and that this Body and Blood are "sensibly and not merely sacramentally, but in very truth, touched by the hands of the priest, broken and ground by the teeth of the faithful."

This particular formula must be correlated to the person to whom it was submitted, and the particular errors it was intended to exclude, for otherwise it would itself inculcate an erroneous doctrine, if taken too literally, and apart from its historical context. This was indeed generally recognised in the Middle Ages, for there was a Gloss on the Canon Law,³ saying that:

"Nisi sane intelligas verba Berengarii, in majorem incidet haeresim quam ipse habuit; et ideo omnia referas ad species ipsas, nam de Christi corpore partes non facimus."

¹ *Apud Lanfranc, De corpore et sanguine Domini, cap. xxii.*

² *Decretum Gratiani, col. 2022, gloss on Dentibus.*

³ *Ibid., cap. xxi.*

98 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

In any case, the last great formula, imposed on Berengarius at the *Council of the Lateran* in 1079, was drawn up in irreproachable terms:

“I, Berengarius, believe with my heart and confess, with my mouth, that the bread and wine placed on the altar are, by the mystery of sacred prayer and by the words of our Redeemer, changed substantially into the true, proper, and vivifying flesh and blood of Jesus Christ our Lord, and that after the consecration, it is the true body of Christ, namely, that which was born of the Virgin, was offered for the salvation of the world, hung upon the Cross, and sits at the right hand of the Father, and that it is the true blood of Christ, which flowed from His side, and that they are present not only in a sign and by virtue of the sacrament, but in their proper nature, and in verity of substance.”¹

7. This statement of ecclesiastical authority receives an illuminating commentary in the following exposition of the Catholic doctrine written expressly against Berengarius by *Lanfranc*, Archbishop of Canterbury :

“We believe that the earthly substances which are consecrated by the priestly ministry on the Lord’s table are converted ineffably, incomprehensibly, marvellously, by the operation of divine power, into the essence of the Lord’s Body, the appearance, however, and some other qualities of the bread and wine remaining, lest the communicants should feel horror at receiving Flesh and Blood, and also for the greater merit of believers. Nevertheless, the Body of the Lord remains in heaven at the right hand of the Father, immortal, inviolate, integral, incontaminate, unhurt. So that it may be truly said that we receive the very Body which was born of the Virgin, yet not that very Body. It is that very Body, if you consider its essence and the propriety and efficacy of its true nature. It is not the same, if you consider the appearance and the other qualities of bread and wine. *This faith has been held from the beginning, and is still held by that Church which is called Catholic because it is spread throughout the world.*”²

Similarly, *Lanfranc*’s successor at Canterbury, the great *St. Anselm*, writes:

“Without any doubt, the Eucharist is the True Body which was born of the Virgin Mary and rose from the tomb, and the very Blood which flowed from the side of that crucified Body. Those who pretend that after consecration it is bread materially, and the Body of the Lord figuratively only, are carnal and think carnally, and *err foolishly against the Faith*, trusting rather their bodily eyes rather than the words of Truth. Of course it is a figure in the sense that we do not see or taste what we believe to be present. . . . According to the definitions of the holy

¹ *Lanfranc, De corpore et sanguine Domini*; Migne, P.L., CL, col. 411.

² *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, Migne, P.L., Vol. CL, col. 430.

fathers it is to be understood that the bread laid upon the altar is changed by the solemn words (of Our Lord) into His Body, and that the substances of bread and wine do not remain, but the species remain, that is, the form, colour, and taste. . . . Though the wicked do not receive the virtue of the sacrament, yet it must not be denied that they receive not only the species but also the true substance of the Body of Christ.”¹

8. Some disciples of Berengarius taught that the real presence was brought about by the union of the bread and wine with the body and blood of Christ, i.e., a substantial union, after the manner of the Incarnation. This theory which may be called “impanation” was rejected by the great scholastic theologians of the time, who went on to give a more explicit formulation of transubstantiation. Thus Aicher of Liege says that “the bread and wine remain what they were, not as to their substance, but as to their figure and their other qualities, which continue to exist. Their substance has been changed into something else.”² And the same theologians go on to explain that the Presence is not one which is subject to the laws of space.

9. The word “transubstantiation” first appears in the middle of the twelfth century. “Substance” is used as the contrast to “*forma*” “*figura*” “*species*” and, last but not least, “*accidentia*,” But in the explanation of the doctrine, two interpretations are advanced. Some say that the substances of the bread and wine are *annihilated*, and replaced by the Body and Blood—a theory which will be adopted by the Scotists and Nominalists of the thirteenth and later centuries. But the majority think it is a *conversion* of the substance of the bread and wine. This will be the interpretation adopted by the Thomist school.³

10. In the meantime, the Real Presence having been denied by the Waldenses and Cathari, the General Council of the Lateran in 1215 solemnly defined the doctrine of Transubstantiation, in the following terms :

“The body and blood of Jesus Christ are truly contained in the sacrament of the altar, under the species of bread and wine, *these having been transubstantiated by the divine power, the bread into the body, and the wine into the blood.*”⁴

¹ *Opera*, ii. 163-5, ed. Gerberon.

² *De sacramentis corporis et sanguinis Domini*, lib. 1, cap. vii.

³ The Council of Trent, in defining Transubstantiation, leaves this theological question still open.

⁴ Denzinger, 430. ** *Corpus et sanguis J. C. in Sacramento altaris sub speciebus panis et vini veraciter continentur, transubstantiatis pane in corpus, et vino in sanguinem, potestate divina.*”

And it is significant that a *precisely similar definition* was signed by Michael Palaologus, the Greek, at the Second Council of Lyons in 1274.¹

11 . These definitions leave open the theological question debated in the schools as to whether the substances of bread and wine are *annihilated* or converted. Accordingly, we find the two views mentioned championed by the Thomists and Scotists in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

(a) *St. Thomas* proves the doctrine of transubstantiation from the words of Institution.¹ He goes on (art. 3) to argue that transubstantiation implies the "conversion" of the substance of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood, and rejects the idea that the former substances are "annihilated."

(b) *Scotus*, however, while accepting the *fact* of Transubstantiation, as a faithful son of the Church, does not, in contrast with St. Thomas, think that it is proved conclusively by the words of Institution, apart from the teaching of Tradition and the authority of the Church.⁸ Also, he rejects the "conversion" theory, and instead teaches that Transubstantiation consists in two acts: the "annihilation" of the substances of bread and wine, and the "adduction" of the Body and Blood of Christ.

(c) The critical attitude of Scotus is developed still further by the Nominalists. Their founder, *William of Occam*, of course accepts the doctrine of Transubstantiation. "Whatever the Church of Rome believes, this alone and nothing different I believe, either explicitly or implicitly." But on the other hand, William agrees with Scotus that the doctrine cannot be proved definitely from Scripture. And apart from the definition of the Church to the contrary, it would not be unreasonable to suppose that the substance of bread and wine remain, in the same place and under the same species as the Body of Christ. But the Church has decided otherwise.

(d) A similar attitude is taken up by *Peter d'Ailly*, who even goes so far as to suggest that one could say the substances of bread and wine remain in some sense, and still believe in Transubstantiation! But he himself rightly rejects this hazardous interpretation.

His ideas will be found in his *Commentary on the Sentences*, written some thirty years before the Council of Constance which

¹ Denzinger, 461.

* *Summa Theol.*, II, q. 75, art. 2.

* "Hoc principaliter teneo propter auctoritatem Ecclesiae, quae non errat in his quae sunt fidei."—*Reportata*, IV, dist. 11, q. 3, n. 13.

condemned Wyclif. He of course starts out with the fact that the Church has defined Transubstantiation, which must therefore be accepted by all. But the Church has not defined in what Transubstantiation consists. Accordingly, he begins by discussing various definitions which have been suggested, and finally accepts the following :

“Transubstantiatio est successio immediata duarum rerum non habentium communem materiam vel subjectum, quarum posterior est substantia quae incipit de se et principaliter esse, ubi alia res totaliter desinit esse.”¹

Then he comes to the actual question, ° *Utrum panis transubstantiatur in corpus Christi.*” He remarks that:

“Licet catholici concordaverunt in hoc quod corpus Christi vere et principaliter est in sacro sub speciebus panis et vini, circa modum fuerunt diversae opiniones.”

The first view is that the “substantia panis fit corpus Christi,” i.e., the bread *as such* becomes the Body of Christ. This he rejects, for philosophical reasons.

The second view is that the

“substantia panis non remanet panis, nec tamen desinit, esse simpliciter, sed reductur in materiam per se stantem vel aliam formam recipientem, et hoc sive in eodem loco sive in alio, et corpus Christi coexistet accidentibus panis.”

He remarks that this opinion “non posset reprobari nec per evidentem rationem, nec per auctoritatem scripturae cogentem.”

The third interpretation is that the “substantia panis remanet.” This admits of two ways :

“Uno modo, sicut recitat magister, scilicet quod remaneat ibidem ubi corpus Christi incipit esse. Alio modo : substantia panis recederet ad alium locum.”

He then discusses the former :

“Quoad primum, est possibilis, quia valde possibile est substantia panis coexistere substantiae corporis, nec est magis impossibile duas substantias coexistere quam duas qualitates, quare, etc.

“Sed utrum corpus Christi posset coexistere subst. panis et vini nec dubium est. Et posset dici quod si sit possibile quod una creatura sustentet alias, ut dicunt aliqui . . . time possibile est corpus Christi assumere substantiam panis per unionem. Quicquid tamen sit de hoc, patet quod ille modus est possibilis, nec repugnat rationi nec auctoritati bibliae. Imo est facilius . . . quia ponit quod substantia panis deferat accidentia. . . . Et nullum inconueniens videret sequi . . . si tamen concordaret cum determinatione ecclesia.²⁹

Peter d'Ailly here allows the theoretical possibility of "impanation," or the union of the Body and Blood with the bread and wine, the substances of the latter being "assumed" by Christ. He says it is not contrary to Scripture, but he evidently doubts whether it can be reconciled with the teaching of the Church.

As to the second interpretation, that is not "reasonable."

Finally, we come to the fourth view :

"Quarta et communior: substantia panis non remanet, sed simpliciter desinit esse."

Peter first shows that this is not impossible to God, and concludes:

« Licet ita esse non sequatur evidenter ex scriptura, nec etiam videre meo ex detenninatione ecclesiae, quia tamen magis favet ei ut communi opinioni sanctorum et doctorum, ideo teneo eam."

He then discusses some minor matters, and finally "an de facto panis simpliciter annihilatur," and gives the Scotist view.

After this, Peter discusses the question of the accidents of bread and wine, and how they continue to exist. He sets forth three views, and rejects them. Then he gives the fourth :

"Quarta et communio opinio, cui favet magis doctrina ecclesiae, est quod accidentia quae fuerunt panis remaneant sine subiecto, et hanc teneo."

To sum up, Peter d'Ailly accepts the Church's definition of the *fact* of transubstantiation, as taught by the Lateran Council, and while allowing the theoretical possibility that the substances of bread and wine might be "assumed" by Christ, rightly doubts whether it can be reconciled with the decision of the Church, and therefore accepts the "common doctrine of saints and doctors" that the substances of bread and wine cease to be. And similarly, he accepts the doctrine that the accidents of bread and wine exist without a subject, because the doctrine of the Church favours this. Peter d'Ailly therefore is quite orthodox, and it is unfair to suggest that he is anything else.

At the same time his bold speculations and rash concessions were bound to lead to difficulties. As we shall see, they ended by stimulating certain definitely heretical lines of thought, which forced the Church authorities to make still more explicit the traditional doctrine, in the Council of Trent.

PART TWO

THE CONTINENTAL REFORMATION

CHAPTER I

THE FORERUNNERS OF THE REFORMATION: WYCLIF AND THE LOLLARDS, JEROME, AND HUSS

We have now to begin our examination of a great religious movement in which the traditional conceptions of the Eucharist and the priesthood were very seriously modified ; in other words, we now have to study the Protestant Reformation. We shall first deal with the Reformation on the Continent of Europe, giving a short account of its English precursor, John Wyclif, and his Bohemian followers, Huss and Jerome. Then, having dealt with the Eucharistic doctrines of the great Protestant Reformers, and glanced at the effect these new doctrines had upon the Eucharistic rite as used by them, we shall turn our attention to the accompanying change in their conception of the Christian ministry, and the manifestation of this in their new Ordination rites. After that we shall deal with the Catholic opposition to these new doctrines, culminating in the decrees of the Council of Trent, which reaffirmed the traditional doctrines against the innovations of the Reformers. Having thus dealt with the Continental Reformation, we shall be in a position to study the English Reformation. We adopt this method because on the one hand *it is really impossible to understand the English movement unless we are thoroughly acquainted with the Continental movement by which it was so greatly influenced*, and also because opinions are practically unanimous as to the character of the Protestant innovations on the Continent. They are not, indeed, unanimous on the subject of the English Reformation. There are some who maintain that the English Reformation was quite a different kind of movement from the Continental one, and that while the latter undoubtedly affected the Catholicity or orthodoxy of the religious bodies in question, the one in this country left the essential Catholicity of the Church of England intact. We propose to show that *this theory cannot be maintained*, and for this purpose it is essential for us to show *the fundamental identity of the aims of the Reformers abroad and of the Reformers in this country*—an identity

of aim which manifests itself in a striking *identity of language*. Hence it is obviously necessary for us to explain the Continental movement, and to give the interpretation of that movement which is, as we have said, almost universally accepted.

We begin, then, with an Englishman, John Wyclif, who has been called "The Morning Star of the Reformation," and who undoubtedly influenced Luther's predecessors, Huss and Jerome, and thus, indirectly, Luther himself.

I. WYCLIF.

Wyclif's doctrine is not always clearly set forth, and is at times very difficult to follow. The trouble is that he is hampered by what have rightly been called the "realistic" expressions found in Scriptures and the early Fathers. He professes to return to the true doctrine, as taught in Scripture and the early Fathers, and especially by Ambrose and Augustine, and revived by Berengarius. But Scripture, and the Fathers, use realistic expressions, and so Wyclif has to do the same, but he evidently uses them in a *figurative* or *symbolical* sense, in accordance with the doctrine he sets forth elsewhere.

One thing is clear, and that is that *he expressly denies Transubstantiation, in any form*. The sacrament contains "naturally" only bread and wine, but "sacramentally" it contains also the body and blood of Christ. Consecration consists merely in the sanctification of the bread and wine, and after the consecration the bread remains bread *localiter et substantialiter*, but is *concomitanter* the body of Christ, which is then present *sacramentaliter*, and which believers receive *spiritualiter*. To interpret this, we must bear in mind that *Wyclif expressly claims to follow Berengarius*. True, what Wyclif calls the "new Church" had condemned Berengarius, and defined Transubstantiation at the Fourth Council of the Lateran. But, asks Wyclif, were the Bishops of this Council predestined? If not, they could not define Catholic doctrine, and he implies that they were not in fact predestined. And so he revives the heresy of Berengarius, and asserts that the body of Christ is not present in the consecrated sacrament "*essentialiter, vel substantialiter, vel corporaliter, vel identice*," and that the "consecrated host is neither Christ nor any part of Him, but an effectual sign of the body and blood of Christ."¹

Accordingly, when he comes to the question of the truth

¹ Cf. Dr. Darwell Stone, *History*, i. 368.

of the Words of Institution, "This is my Body," etc., Wyclif says¹: They can be true only in a figurative sense, i.e., they (the bread and wine) *represent sacramentaliter* the body of Christ." That gives us the meaning of the word *sacramentaliter*" as used by Wyclif. Again:

"non restat nisi *sensus tropicus*, scilicet, quod hoc figurat sacramentaliter corpus Christi."

Wyclif accordingly says that the consecrated host is to be honoured as an *image* of God, but not adored.²

Here is another implication of his teaching, as set forth by Wyclif himself:

"The layman who remembers the body of Christ in heaven brings about better, and more effectually, than the priest who consecrates, and equally really, though in a different manner, that the body of Christ is with him. But the common people most faithlessly and blasphemously believe that this sacramental sign of the Body of Christ is actually Christ Himself. And in this heresy clergy and prelates are involved."³

It ought hardly to be necessary to point out that *there is a vast difference between this theory and that held by Peter d'Ailly*. Wyclif's theory goes very far beyond the theory of "impanation," i.e., the assumption by Christ of the substances of bread and wine, which Peter d'Ailly allows as theoretically possible, but which he nevertheless rejects. Hence it is not surprising that Wyclif was condemned by Peter d'Ailly himself at the Council of Constance.

As to the *Sacrifice of the Mass*, Wyclif seems to have denied that this was instituted by Christ (see later). And if, as we have shown, Wyclif denied the Real Objective Presence or change of the bread and wine into Our Lord's Body and Blood, *he would naturally deny the Sacrifice of the Body and Blood*, for a priest cannot offer what is not really and substantially present upon the altar.

2. Wyclif also held a peculiar view of the *priesthood*, but this seems to have been linked up not so much with his theory of the Eucharist as with his peculiar theory of predestination and "dominion," according to which God communicates power and rights only to those in a state of grace. Hence only those in a state of grace could have a right to possess either property or power, or authority, and mortal sin involved the forfeiting of all such rights.

Thus we get a proposition of Wyclif condemned at the Council of Constance :

* *De Eucharistia*, xxxviii-ix.

- *Ibid.*

' *De Eucharistia*, cap. 4.

108 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

“Si episcopus vel sacerdos exsistat in peccato mortali, non ordinat, non consecrat, non conficit, non baptizat.”

“Nullus est episcopus dum est in peccato mortali.”

Moreover, he seems quite definitely to have held that others besides bishops could ordain, for the 28th proposition condemned at Constance is as follows :

“Confirmatio juvenum, clericorum ordinatio, locorum consecratio reservantur Papae et episcopi propter cupiditatem lucri temporalis et honoris.”

The explanation of this is to be found in his *Trialogus*, iv. 15, where he says that in the primitive Church there were only two ecclesiastical degrees, priests and deacons. All other degrees were introduced by *superbia*.

3. So much for the doctrines of Wyclif on the Eucharist and the Priesthood. These doctrines were of course accepted, and even emphasized, by some of his Lollard followers and supporters. Thus, John Purvey, one of his closest friends, denied transubstantiation, objected to the confessional, and maintained that a layman, if holy and predestined to eternal life, was a true priest, competent to administer the sacraments without episcopal ordination, and that every holy priest was a bishop and prelate.¹

And in 1395, a Bill was actually presented to Parliament incorporating twelve Conclusions representing the opinions of the Lollards, which were also affixed to the doors of Westminster Abbey and St. Paul's Cathedral. The fourth of these conclusions is as follows :

“The feigned miracle of the Sacrament of bread leads all men but a few into idolatry, for they think that the body of Christ, which is never out of heaven, is, by the power of the words of the priest, in its essential being enclosed in a small piece of bread which they show to the people. But God would that they would believe what the evangelical doctor (Wyclif) says in his * *Trialogus*, that the bread of the altar is by way of relation (habitualiter) the body of Christ; for we suppose that in this way any man or woman who is a believer in God's law can make the sacrament of this bread without any such miracle.”²

And again, in 1402, Sir Louis de Clifford laid before the Archbishop of Canterbury a statement of Lollard opinions which he favoured, including the following :

“That the seven sacraments are only dead signs, and are of no value in the way in which the Church uses them.

¹ Gairdner, *Lollardy and the Reformation*, I, 52.

² *Fasciculi *izaniurum*, Rolls series, v, pp. 361-2.

"That the Church is nothing but the synagogue of Satan; and therefore they will not go to it to worship the Lord, or to receive any Sacrament, least of all the Sacrament of the altar, because they maintain that it is nothing but a morsel of dead bread and a tower or pinnacle of Anti-Christ."¹

Yet, as we have seen, both Berengarius, and Wyclif after him, were willing to allow that in *some* sense, i.e., "sacramentally" or "figuratively," the bread and wine could be called the Body and Blood of Christ, which were in this way "spiritually" present. And some of the more moderate Lollards were willing to make this concession to Catholic terminology.

Thus, in the Confession of the Lollard Sir John Oldcastle, Lord Cobham, made in 1413, and its subsequent explanation, we find it said **that**:

"The most worshipful Sacrament of the altar is Christ's body in form of bread. . . . As Christ, when dwelling here on earth, had in Himself Godhead and Manhood, yet the Godhead veiled and invisible under the manhood which was open and visible, so in the Sacrament of the altar there is real body and real bread, that is, the bread which we see, and the body of Christ veiled under it, which we do not see."²

That gives us the other side of the Lollard doctrine, i.e., the attempt to combine the denial of Transubstantiation with the assertion of some kind of a spiritual Presence, which would enable them to retain a great deal of Catholic terminology, but in a non-orthodox sense—a feature which we shall find prominent later on both in the Continental and English Reformers.

4. Having set forth the Wycliffite doctrines, we can now study the reaction of the Catholic authorities to them. That attitude was, as might be expected, one of uncompromising hostility, which manifested itself in condemnation after condemnation.

In 1381 the Chancellor and Doctors of the *University of Oxford* pronounced as follows on Wyclif's doctrines :

"Certain persons . . . renew alas ! in these days certain heresies formerly solemnly condemned by the Church (N.B.) . . . saying . . . first that in the Sacrament of the altar the substance of material bread and wine, which were before consecration, really remain after consecration (realiter remaneri post consecrationem) ; secondly, which is dreadful to hear, that in this venerable sacrament, the body and blood of Christ are not essen-

¹ Walsingham, *Historia Anglicana*, Rolls series, xxviii (b), ii, 252-3.
² *Fasc.* PP. 43[^] 444.

IIO THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

tially or substantially or corporally (essentialiter, substantialiter, corporaliter), but figuratively or symbolically (figurative seu tropice), so that Christ is not really there in His own bodily presence (veraciter, in sua propria praesentia corporali) . . . from which assertions the Catholic faith is endangered. . . . We therefore . . . have summoned many doctors of sacred theology and professors of canon law . . . and it was at length finally decided and declared by their judgment that the assertions are erroneous, and opposed to the decisions of the Church, and contrary to truths which are Catholic and plainly result from the words of the saints and the decisions of the Church, namely, that *by the sacramental words duly pronounced by a priest, the bread and wine on the altar are transubstantiated or substantially converted into the real body and blood of Christ, so that after the consecration there do not remain in the venerable Sacrament the material bread and wine which were there before in the two substances or natures, but only in the species of the same, under which species the real body and blood of Christ are actually contained, not only figuratively or symbolically (tropice), but essentially, substantially, and corporally, in such a way that Christ is really there in his own proper bodily presence.*"¹

We call attention here to the fact that the theologians of Oxford use the word "corporeal" presence, together with the words "essential," "substantial," to represent the true Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence. The use of the term does not, of course, imply a "materialistic" view of the Presence, as though Our Lord were present after the manner of bodies, or subject to the conditions of space. Obviously He is *not*, for when the Host is divided, Our Lord's Body is not divided.² The word is used to emphasize the reality of the presence of Our Lord's natural Body.³ We shall see that the same term is used by Luther himself to express his own doctrine of the Presence.

Next, we call attention to the definite terms of the condemnation, and in this connection it must be remembered that the University of Oxford was not at all predominantly Thomist in those days, but that the Scotists and even Nominalists

¹ Lyndwood, *Provinciale*, p. 59, iii, Oxford, 1679.

² Cf. St. Thomas's hymn, *Lauda Sion*.

³ Thus, St. Thomas says that Christ, out of friendship for us, has not deprived us of His "corporeal presence": "*Nec sua praesentia corporali nos in hac peregrinatione destituit*," but joins Himself to us really and truly in the Sacrament of the Eucharist—"sed per veritatem corporis et sanguinis sui nos sibi conjungit in hoc sacramento" (*Summa Theologica*, III, q. 75, art. 1). It is in this sense that pre-Reformation Catholic theologians, and Luther himself, say Christ is "corporally" present. But the other Protestant reformers, wilfully perhaps, misunderstood the term, as though it implied that Christ is present after the manner of ordinary bodies, having size, dimension, and extension of parts. In this sense, of course, Christ is not "corporally" present, as Reformation and post Reformation Catholic theologians rightly point out. We shall later quote a passage from Bishop Gardiner which will serve as an example of Reformation Catholic theology, and for post-Reformation teaching, we may quote St. Robert Bellarmine, *De Eucharistia*, Ub. 1, c. 2, regula 3.

were represented there. Yet *all parties combine to condemn the new doctrine of Wyclif*

5. The next step was a condemnation of Wyclif by a *Provincial Council* held in *London* in 1382. At this there were present ten bishops, seventeen doctors in theology, sixteen doctors in civil and canon law, and others. Twenty-four propositions extracted from Wyclif's works were condemned, ten as heretical and opposed to the determination of the Church, and fourteen as erroneous. Amongst them were the following, on the Eucharist; condemned as "conclusiones hæreticæ, et determinatione ecclesiæ repugnantes":

i. The substance of the material bread and wine remain after consecration.

2. The accidents do not remain without a subject in the same sacrament after consecration.

3. Christ is not in the sacrament of the altar identically (identice), truly, and really (vere et realiter), in proper bodily presence (in propria præsentia corporale).

4. A priest or bishop in mortal sin does not ordain, consecrate, or baptise.¹

6. In 1397, another *Provincial Council*, presided over by *Archbishop Arundel of Canterbury*, condemned eighteen propositions, including three on the Eucharist, as follows:

1. The substance of the bread remains on the altar after its consecration, and does not cease to be bread. *Hæresis, loquendo de pane naturali.*

2. The bread is figuratively the body of Christ. . . .

This also is condemned as heresy.

The third was a particular interpretation of Berengarius's confession. This was condemned as erroneous.²

Again, in 1412, the University of Oxford, in a letter addressed to *Archbishop Arundel of Canterbury* and the Bishops of the Province, expressly condemned the propositions that "the consecrated host is at the same time the body of Christ and real bread, because it is the body of Christ at least in figure, and is real bread in nature," and that "the consecrated host is real bread by nature, and the body of Christ *figuraliter*." This was in 1412.

The same year, 1412, an obligatory statement of doctrine was delivered by the *Archbishop of Canterbury* to Sir John Oldcastle, as follows:

¹ Mansi, *Concilia*, xxvi, col. 695-6; Hefele, X, 210-11.

² Mansi, *Concilia*, ix.xvi, 817.

112 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

“The faith and the determination of Holy Church touching the blissful Sacrament of the Altar is this, that after the sacramental words be said by a priest in his Mass, the material bread that was before is turned into Christ's very body, and the material wine that was there before is turned into Christ's very blood, and so there leaveth on the altar no material bread nor material wine, the which were there before the saying of the sacramental words.”¹

7. And to crown this ecclesiastical condemnation, Wyclif's doctrine, as stated in the four propositions condemned at the Council of London in 1312 and by that council condemned as heretical, was in turn condemned by the General Council of Constance in 1415 and 1416, and duly confirmed by Martin V in 1418?

At this Council forty-five articles of the English reformer are condemned, and amongst them the following :

1. Substantia panis materialis et similiter substantia vini materialis remanent in Sacramento altaris.

2. Accidentia panis non manent sine subjecto in eodem Sacramento.

3. Christus non est in eodem Sacramento identice et realiter propria praesentia corporali.

4. Si episcopus vel sacerdos existat in peccato mortali, non ordinat, non consecrat, non conficit, non baptizat.

5. Non est fundatum in Evangelio, quod Christus Missam ordinaverit.

All the articles are condemned *en bloc* : “Quidam ipsorum erant et sunt haeretici, quidam seditiosi, quidam erronei, alii temerarii, nonnullis scandalosi, etc.”

It is to be regretted that the Council did not attach a proper note to each statement. But in any case the Decree of the Lateran Council was still in force, and it was evident that Wyclif's teaching on the Eucharist was opposed to it.

n. HUSS AND JEROME.

1. The doctrines of Wyclif are historically of great importance, for they spread, not only throughout England, but also abroad, and, by influencing John Huss and Jerome of Prague, helped to prepare for the Protestant Reformation eventually begun by Martin Luther. In 1401, a Bohemian noble who had come to Oxford to study, took back with him to Prague some of Wyclif's works. In 1403, the University of Prague condemned 45 propositions from Wyclif's works. The doctrine of the

¹ *Fasc. J'izaniorum*, pp. 441, 442 ; Wilkins, *Concilia*, iii. 355.
• Hardouin, *Concilia*, viii, 299, 302, 909.

English heresiarch was, however, defended vigorously by *John Huss*. He seems to have adopted Wyclif's teaching, though at the Council of Constance he endeavoured to maintain that his teaching was orthodox. At any rate it is clear that he held propositions such as “*Panis est corpus Christi, hoc est, signum sacramentale ejus,*”¹ and that the bread is a symbol of the body of Christ present “*sacramentaliter, non realiter et identice,*” and he also seems to have taught definitely that the bread remains after consecration. These doctrines were again and again condemned by bishops and theologians and, as we have seen, were eventually condemned in the Council of Constance.

2. As to *Jerome of Prague*, he also was charged at the Council of Constance in 1415 with holding Wyclif's doctrines. He repudiated these, but before his death retracted his abjuration.

Huss and Jerome also seem to have adopted Wyclif's peculiar views that the Church is composed only of the predestined, and that if an ecclesiastic falls into mortal sin, he ceases to have any spiritual power, and especially, the power of consecrating the sacrament.² They denied at the Council of Constance that they held this, but at any rate their followers would seem to have held it, for one of the questions which were to be put to them was the following: “*Utrum credat quod malus sacerdos, cum debita materia et forma et cum intentione faciendi quod facit Ecclesia, vere conficiat, vere absolvat, vere baptizat, vere conferat alia sacramenta?*”³

3. Various other heretics held Wycliffian views on the Eucharist at this time. One worthy of special mention is *John Wessel*, of Groningen, born about 1429, and educated by the Brethren of the Common Life. He taught at Paris and Heidelberg, and died in 1489. He wrote a work “*On the Sacrament*” and seems to have taught that there is no essential difference between the presence of Christ in the Eucharist and His presence elsewhere.

4. These Eucharistic errors were, as we have said, condemned at the Council of Constance. Another official and solemn exposition of the Church's doctrine was made at the *Council of Florence*, which temporarily united East and West once more in 1439. The Easterns held no special Eucharistic heresy,

^x Loserth, ii.

¹ Cf. Hefele Leclerc, *Histoire des Conciles* vii, 265 sqq. and Denzinger, 627, 656.

³ Denzinger, 672.

114 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

but were more concerned in the kind of bread used, and accordingly, the Decree of Union, *Latentur Cali*, confines itself to saying that “the body of Christ is really consecrated” either in fermented or unfermented bread. It also declared that “the holy *sacrifices of Masses*” benefit the departed. This phrase is of great importance, for it adopts precisely that plural form, *M sacrifices of Masses*” which is used in the Anglican article 31 for its condemnation of the Mass?

¹ See pp. 548-551.

CHAPTER II

MARTIN LUTHER AND THE MASS

LUTHER.

It is not our intention in this work to give a complete account of the doctrine of the Protestant Reformers on the Continent, nor even a connected account of the history of their Eucharistic ideas. A general outline will suffice, as there is not much controversy about the matter.

1. It was on October 31st, 1517, that Luther nailed his famous 95 theses to the door of the Castle Church at Wittenberg. These were in the main directed against what Luther regarded as disciplinary abuses in the Catholic system, and in particular, the supposed selling of indulgences. But he went on to attack, as other abuses, the "buying and selling of Masses," and the multiplication of Masses for the living and the dead. The implication was that the doctrines underlying these practices was unsound, and this Luther very soon explicitly asserted.

In 1520, he issued his three great Reformation treatises, the "Manifesto to the German Nation," the "Babylonian Captivity," and the "Address to the German Nobility." Here we find three important doctrines set forth : (1) *Consubstantiation*, in place of the Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation : the substances of the bread and wine remain, though the Body and Blood of Christ become really present with them. At first Luther confines himself to objecting to Transubstantiation being made a matter of faith. It may be held as an opinion, but Luther thinks his own more probable.¹ But shortly after, in a *Reply* to Henry VIII's criticism of his work, Luther becomes more definite : "Now I transubstantiate my opinion, and I say that it is an impiety and a blasphemy to say that the bread is transubstantiated." From this time onwards he remained faithful to his doctrine of Consubstantiation, and held it in spite of the criticisms of friends, and the bitter attacks of foes.

¹ *Babylonian Captivity. Opera latina*, Frankfort edn., V, 29-35.

118 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

to those intending to approach the Sacrament,¹ then comes the Consecration. The Secret was omitted with the Offertory. The Preface was shortened. Of the whole of the hated 'Canon' the 'priest' was merely to pronounce aloud over the bread and wine the words of consecration as given in i Cor. xi. 23-25, saying then the Sanctus and Benedictus. The Elevation came during the Benedictus. The Our Father and the Pax follow, then the communion of the officiating clergyman and the faithful, under both kinds. To conclude there was another collect, and then the blessing."²

There is one feature, however, which Luther retained, for a time, and that was the *elevation of the consecrated elements*. In the *Babylonian Captivity* of 1520, he describes the elevation as "a remnant of the Hebrew rite, in which it was customary to elevate the gifts which, after being received with thanks, were brought back to God."⁸ Accordingly, in his Latin Mass of 1523, he writes:

"The bread and the cup are to be elevated, this ceremony being still maintained for the sake of the weak."⁴

The "elevation" is still prescribed in the Wittenberg order of 1533. Luther seems to have given it up himself in 1539, and told a correspondent in 1542 that he could please himself about it.⁶ In 1543 he says he had dispensed with it to assert his Christian freedom, but he would resume it if he thought it useful. It seems, however, to have been retained, especially in Northern Germany, for some time after.

As to the *adoration* of Our Lord present in the Sacrament, Luther discouraged it, as he said the sacrament was instituted to be received in communion, not to be adored. In his *Von Anbeten des Sacraments* of 1523 he says that each individual should be left free to adore or not, and that those who do not adore the sacrament are not to be termed heretics, for it was not commanded, and Christ is not present for this purpose. Those do best who forget "their duty towards the sacrament," and therefore do not adore because there is danger in adoration.⁶ Yet in 1544 he says: "Since Christ is truly in the bread, why should He not be treated there with the greatest reverence, and even adored?"⁷

5. Luther's views spread far and wide, and were adopted in the main by his friend *Philip Melancthon*, who had been

x *Werke*, Weimar ed. 19, p. 95. 1 *Luther*, Vol. V, pp. 145-6. *Italics ours.*

• *Opera latina*, Frankfort Edn., V, 51-2.

4 *Ibid.*, vii, 9.

• *Werke*, Weimar ed., xi, pp. 448 f.

• *Briefe*, v, 507 (De Wette edn.).

7 *Apud* Grisar, V, 464.

associated with the great reformer since 1518, when he had been given the chair of Greek at Wittenberg. But Melanchthon hesitated at first as to Luther's doctrines, especially on the Real Presence. The Anabaptists and other Protestants—such as Carlstadt—agreed with the Swiss Reformer Zwingli in denying the Real Presence. However, Luther seems to have converted Melanchthon for a time, at any rate, and in 1529, before the Conference between Luther and Zwingli at Marburg, he said to Baumgarten that the Zwinglian opinion was an "*impia sentential*

This Conference was called in order to see whether the two great Protestant Reformers could not come to an agreement, but of course it failed, and they parted bitter enemies. They drew up certain articles, expressing their agreement on certain points, and their disagreement on the Eucharistic Presence.¹

"At present we have not been able to agree whether the real body and blood of Christ are *corporaliter*² present in the bread and wine."

The two views were indeed incompatible, and after all, if Luther had the right to start a new theory in opposition to that taught by the Church, in virtue of the exercise of his own private judgment, why should not Zwingli do the same? And if they differed, who was to decide between them? The controversy was a violent one, and indeed never really ended, though many attempts were made by "moderate men" such as Melanchthon and Bucer, with whom we shall shortly deal, to patch up a peace between the contending parties.

6. One result of Zwingli's criticism of Luther's theory was that the latter was supplemented by another new doctrine, that of the *ubiquity of Our Lord's humanity*, Zwingli had objected that even Consubstantiation implied a miraculous interference with the laws of nature, and should be rejected just as much as Transubstantiation. Luther countered this by inventing the doctrine of Ubiquity, precisely in order to assert the non-miraculous nature of his Consubstantiation. As Our Lord is everywhere as Man, He is *already* in and with the bread and wine,

¹ *Corpus Reformatorum*, xxvi, 127.

² Note the word "*corporaliter*," which Luther uses, together with Catholic theologians to signify the *Real Presence* of Our Lord's Body in the Eucharist. But of course Luther did not, any more than did Catholic theologians, think that this term implied a presence subject to the conditions of space and quantity, and leading to divisions when the host is broken, etc. Cf. what we said on the condemnation of Wyclif by the University of Oxford, p. 60, and also later, in Gardiner's controversy with Cranmer, p. 437.

116 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

2. Luther's second innovation was his *denial of the doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass*, as taught by the Catholic Church. He attacks the idea that the Mass is a sacrifice offered to God, because it would then be a "good work," and as such, fatal to his doctrine of justification by faith only. And accordingly, in the *Babylonian Captivity*, he explains that "The Mass is nothing else but the divine promise or testament of Christ, commended by the Sacrament of His Body and Blood. . . . It cannot be a work." And again: "The greatest and most specious scandal of all is to be taken away, namely, the belief that the Mass is a sacrifice which is offered to God, an opinion favoured by the words of the Canon of the Mass, etc." . . . "Christ, at his Last Supper, when He instituted this sacrament, and bequeathed the Testament, did not offer it to God the Father, or perform it as a good work for others, but . . . exhibited a sign to every one of them."¹ Hence "The Mass, which ought to agree with the example of Christ, by whom it was instituted, cannot be a sacrifice of offering."² The elements are a gift from God, and not a sacrifice offered to God. "And in this matter, let the priest remember that the Gospel is to be preferred to all the Canons and Collects composed by men, and the Gospel, as we have seen, does not allow the Mass to be a sacrifice."³

The Mass, then, is *not a Sacrifice*, but a *Sacrament*. And as a Sacrament it should, at least, be allowable for the faithful to receive under both kinds, even though such reception is not indispensable.⁴

3. The denial of Transubstantiation, and the Sacrifice of the Mass, is accompanied by a *denial of the Catholic doctrine of the priesthood*. In the *Babylonian Captivity* he asserts that all Christians are equally priests, in virtue of their baptism, and all have equal power to administer the Sacraments, including the Eucharist. But as it would lead to confusion for all to exercise their "priesthood," the Christian community delegates its functions to some one individual, by means of an "ordination rite." But this ordination rite is merely a ceremony of delegation or appointment, not a sacrament, and it confers no priestly "character" which was not possessed before.

"The Sacrament (of Order) is not known to the Church of Christ, it has been invented by the Pope's Church. Not only is there no promise of grace attached to it, but in the whole of the

¹ *Ibid.*

• *Opera Latina*, Frankfort edn., V, 52-3.

² *Ibid.*

• *Babylonian Captivity*.

New Testament there is no mention of it. It is ridiculous to affirm the existence of a sacrament when the divine institution of it cannot in any way be proved.”¹

We must also mention that in this same work on the *Babylonian Captivity* Luther denies that there are *seven* sacraments, and asserts *three only* : baptism, penance, and the Supper. (Principio negandamihisunt septem sacramenta, et tantum tria pro tempore ponenda.)

Yet—and this is also worth noting—Luther was not averse to describing the Mass as the “Eucharistic Sacrifice,”² meaning of course that it was a *sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving*.

4. Obviously Luther’s denial of the true Sacrifice of the Mass was inconsistent with the continued use of the Catholic Mass. Accordingly, in 1523—six years after his “theses”—he brought out a new “Latin Mass,” or *Formula Missa et Communionis*.

Luther’s principles are set forth at the beginning of this Latin Mass. His aim is not to compose an entirely new service, but to *purge and purify the old*. We shall give a careful analysis of his Latin Mass when we deal with the Communion Service in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI, which so closely resembles it. But here we may point out that the distinguishing feature in Luther’s service is that *all that savours of sacrifice is rigidly excluded, and for this reason the Offertory and the Canon disappear altogether*.

Luther carried these innovations still further when he brought out his “German Mass” three years later, i.e., in 1526.

Grisar thus describes Luther’s liturgical innovations :

“To build up a new liturgy from the very foundation was far from Luther’s thoughts. . . . He preferred to make the best of the Roman Mass, for one reason, as he so often insists, because of the weak, i.e., so as not needlessly to alienate the people from the new Church by the introduction of novelties. *From the ancient rite he merely eliminated all that had reference to the sacrificial character of the Mass, the Canon for instance, and the preceding Offertory*. He also thought it best to retain the word ‘Mass.’ . . .

“In Luther’s ‘German Mass,’ as in his even more traditional Latin one, we find at the beginning the Introit, Kyrie Eleison, Gloria and a Collect; then follows the Epistle for the Sunday together with a Gradual or Alleluia or both; then the Gospel and the Credo, followed by the sermon. ‘After the sermon the Our Father is to be publicly explained, and an exhortation given

1 Weimar edn. vi, 572.

* Apud Grisar, *Luther*, V, 464.

120 THE REFORMATION. THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

and no miracle is involved in their “consecration.” Moreover, He is already in the soul of the believer, even before Communion is received. Thus the whole function of the Eucharist is not to bring about or to add to the presence of Christ in the soul of the believer, but, by stimulating his faith, to increase his consciousness of that presence.¹ To this it might be obviously objected that in that case the Real Objective Presence is surely unnecessary. Others, and amongst them Luther’s own followers, drew this inference, but Luther himself remained obstinate, and continued to teach Consubstantiation to the end.

¹ This Receptionist doctrine will be found in a letter written by Luther in 1543, *Briefe*, v, 577-8 (de Wette).

CHAPTER III

THE CONFESSION OF AUGSBURG AND THE MASS

In 1530, ten years after the publication of Luther's three great Reformation treatises, the Emperor Charles V ordered the Lutheran princes to present a statement of their beliefs at a Diet to be held at Augsburg. Accordingly, the famous "Confession of Augsburg" was drawn up, for the Lutheran party. The German text was probably composed by Luther, and the Latin version by Melancthon.

This Confession was duly presented at the Diet, and in turn a group of thirty Catholic theologians presented a criticism of it. We proceed to quote here the articles dealing with the sacraments in general and with the Eucharist. The articles concerning Holy Order will be dealt with in the chapter on the Lutheran conception of the ministry.

1. The Augsburg Confession defines the sacraments merely as "signa et testimonia voluntatis Dei erga nos, ad excitandam et confirmandam fidem in his qui utuntur proposita," and proceeds to condemn those who teach "quod sacramenta ex opere operato justificent."

On the other hand, it allows that the "sacramenta et verbum, propter ordinationem et mandatum Christi, sunt efficacia, etiam si per malos exhibeantur." But this is so vague that a Zwinglian could subscribe to it. There is no statement as to the *number* of the sacraments. The Catholic theologians accordingly point out this defect: "Petendum erit ut quod hic in genere de sacramentis perhibent, speciatim de septem sacramentis ecclesiae fateantur."

It will be interesting to see how this request was dealt with by Melancthon, in a *Defence of the Confession* (*Apologia Confessionis*) which he published the following year, i.e., in 1531 :

« Hic jubent adversarii nos etiam septem sacramenta numerare.
... Si sacramenta vocamus 'ritus qui habet mandatum Dei
et quibus addita est promissio gratiae' . . . vere sunt sacramenta
baptismus, caena Domini, absolutio."

122 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

These are the only sacramental rites mentioned in the *Confession* itself. Of the other sacraments of the Church, Melanchthon writes as follows :

“ Confirmatio et extrema unctio sunt ritus accepti a Patribus, quos ne ecclesia quidem tanquam necesarios ad salutem requirit, quia non habent mandatum Dei. . . . Matrimonium non est primum institutum in Novo Testamento, sed statim initio, creato genere humano. Habet autem mandatum Dei, habet et promissiones. . . . Quare si quis volet sacramentum vocare, discernere tamen a prioribus illis debet, quae proprie sunt signa Novi Testamenti, et sunt testimoniae gratiae et remissionis peccatorum. . . . Si omnes res annumerari sacramentis debent quae habent mandatum Dei et quibus sunt additae promissiones, cur non addimus orationem . . . eleemosynam . . . item afflictiones . . . ? ”

He gives a similar treatment to Holy Order, as we shall see, but sufficient has been quoted to show that *though Melanchthon is willing to allow these rites to be called sacraments in a certain sense, he does not allow that they are sacraments in the strict sense, as hitherto taught by Catholic theologians. We shall find the same attitude taken up by Anglican reformers.*

In 1540, a revised form of the Augsburg Confession was put forth by Melanchthon, on his own authority. The statement about the sacraments being “ efficacious ” remains unchanged, as also the article on the use of the sacraments. The number remains unspecified.

2. The Tenth Article of the Confession of 1530 is on the Eucharist, and is as follows, in the German form for which Luther himself was probably responsible :

“ The real body and blood of Christ are really present under the forms of bread and wine in the Lord’s Supper, and are distributed and received.”¹

In the Latin version of Melanchthon, however, this is very much modified :

“ The body and blood of Christ are really present, and are distributed to those who eat in the Lord’s Supper.”

This modified form says nothing of any presence “ under the forms of bread and wine,” and could therefore have been accepted by a Zwinglian. The German form of Luther is certainly more definite, but again it naturally does not affirm Transubstantiation, and would be consistent with its denial. It does, however, associate the “ real presence ” with the “ forms of bread and wine.”

¹ *Corpus Reform.*, xxv\, 559.

In any case, the ambiguity and inadequacy of this statement of the Real Presence was remarked upon by the Catholic theologians, in the Reply they drew up to this Augsburg Confession, and presented to the Emperor :

“ In verbis nihil offendit quando fatentur corpus et sanguinem Christi substantialiter et vere adesse, si modo credunt sub qualibet specie integrum Christum adesse. . . . Adjicitur unum valde necessarium, ut credant omnipotenti verbo Dei substantiam panis et corpus Christi mutari, ita enim in concilio generali definitum est.”¹

In 1540, the vague assertion of a Real Presence becomes vaguer still, and the significant word “ exhibited ” is incorporated :

“ Together with the bread and wine, the body and blood of Christ are really *exhibited* to those who eat in the Lord's Supper.”

Thus, whereas in 1530 the formula had said that the body and blood are *really present*, now they are said merely to be *really exhibited, together with* the bread and wine (“ cum pane et vino ”). This studiously vague statement could have been accepted by almost every kind of Protestant.

3. We must now turn to the article of the Confession of 1530 which deals with the Mass.

Its authors protest that they have not abolished the Mass, and they *go on* to attribute a very strange doctrine on the Sacrifice to the Catholics :

“ Our churches are falsely accused of abolishing the Mass. For the Mass is retained among us, and is celebrated with the greatest reverence. . . . But Masses are basely profaned (i.e., by the Catholics) by being used for gain. . . . Therefore private Masses were discontinued among us. . . . There was added an opinion which infinitely increased the number of private Masses, namely, that *Christ by His Passion made satisfaction for original sin, and instituted the Mass, in which oblation should be made for daily sins, mortal and venial*; hence arose a public opinion that the Mass was a work washing away the sins of the living and the dead ex opere operato ; here it began to be disputed whether one Mass said for many availed as much as if each Mass were said for each : this dispute brought forth an infinite number of Masses.”²

¹ *Le Plat*, II, 338 *et seq.*

* Accessit opinio quae auxit privatas missas in infinitum, videlicet, quod Christus sua passione satisfecerit pro peccato originis, et instituerit Missam in qua fieret oblatio pro quotidianis delictis mortalibus et venialibus : hinc manavit publica opinio quod missa sit opus delens peccata vivorum et mortuorum ex opere operato, hic coemptum disputari utrum ima missa dicta pro pluribus tantumdem valeret quantum singulae pro singulis : haec disputatio peperit istam infinitam multitudinem missarum.” (Confessio Augustana, ex prototypo desumpta, in *Le Plat*, *Monumenta*, II, p. 391.)

The Confession continues :

“ Concerning these opinions we have taught that they differ from Holy Scripture and injure the glory of the passion of Christ. For the passion of Christ was an offering and satisfaction not only for original sin, but also for all other sins. . . . But Christ commands us to ‘do in remembrance of’ Himself; wherefore the Mass was instituted that faith in those who use the Sacrament may recollect the benefits received through Christ. . . . For this is to remember Christ, to remember His benefits and to perceive that they are really presented to us. . . J’l

The Lutherans, then, deny that they have abolished the Mass, but say they have abolished private Masses, because of an erroneous doctrine taught by the Catholics to the effect that the Cross was the sacrifice for original sin, and the Mass the sacrifice for daily sins.

Here we have the first formulation of a grave accusation that has been made against Catholic theology ever since, and has become a commonplace with Anglican and other Protestant apologists. Anglicans are never tired of saying that what their Articles repudiate is, not the official doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass, but this corrupt doctrine, as taught by Catholic theologians before the Reformation, or at least set forth to the people in sermons. We must examine this matter very carefully, and see if there is any real evidence that such a doctrine was in fact taught. We will also see if it be true that what the Reformers repudiated was merely this false doctrine, and not the Sacrifice of the Mass itself, as previously taught by Catholic theologians, and subsequently defined at Trent.

4. We note to begin with, that the Augsburg article mentions no authority for its remarkable statement. A supposed authority was subsequently forthcoming, as we shall see. In the meantime, it is of the greatest importance to note that *the supposed doctrine was at once repudiated by the theologians on the Catholic side.* The first repudiation was by two eminent theologians, Arnold Wesaliensis and Joannes Cochlaeus, described as “*primi nominis inter Pontificios tunc temporis theologi,*” in their *Brevis Responsio*. They write :

“ As for what they say, that Masses were multiplied to infinity from the opinion, etc. --- *we do not think that that opinion is held by any Catholic doctor, so far is it from being the case that that opinion is common amongst us.*”²

¹ Francke, Lib. Symb. Ecc. Luth., i, 29-31.

² Nobis profecto verisimile non est earn opinionem ullius esse doctoris Catholici, tantum abest ut apud nos vulgata sit ea opinio. (Coelestinus, *Hist. Comitiorum*, ii, 237, apud Dimock, *Dangerous Deceits*, p. 28.)

THE CONFESSION OF AUGSBURG AND THE MASS

Moreover, a *Reply* to the Augsburg Confession was drawn up in the same year, 1530, on behalf of the Catholic party, by John Maier von Eck, Professor of Theology, in the University of Ingolstadt, and other theologians.

In the first draft of this *Reply*, the Catholic theologians answer as follows :

“ Imponunt Catholicis asserere passionem Christi factam pro originali peccato, missam fieri pro actualibus. At hic concionatores principes suos decipiunt, dum Catholicis errorem et hæresim imponunt inauditam. Ostendant nobis eum qui sentiat Christum solum pro peccato originis in passione satisfecisse, et nos adversabimur ei quam Lutherò. *Nunquam ita docuere Catholicì, sed dicimus Christum satisfecisse pro omnibus peccatis.* At sicut concionatores dicunt illam satisfactionem nulli prodesse sine fide, ita Catholici et tota ecclesia docuit nos illius satisfactionis participes fieri per sacramenta et sacrificium missæ, per bona opera, et similia.”¹

However, it would seem that this earlier Draft was not altogether acceptable to the Emperor, who was anxious for peace, and in any case it was revised, and this later form was duly read in the Diet on 3rd August, 1530. Even so, the Catholic theologians still declare that *they have never heard of the doctrine in question* ;

“ By this abolition of Masses the worship of God is diminished, honour is taken away from the Saints, the last will of the dead is made void and annulled, the dead are robbed of intercessions that are their due, and the devotion of the living passes away and becomes cold. Wherefore the abolition of private Masses cannot be admitted or tolerated ; *nor can we well understand what is assumed, that Christ by His Passion made satisfaction for original sin, and instituted the Mass for actual sin. For this was never heard of by Catholics. And now, when many of them have been interrogated, they most constantly deny that this has been taught by them* ; for the Mass does not wash away sins—which are healed by Penance as by their own proper remedy—but it washes away the penalty due for sin, supplies satisfactions, and confers increase of grace and salutary protection to the living.”²

¹ J. Ficker, *Die Confutation der Augsbürgischen Bekenntniss*, p. 100.

² At hac abrogatione Missarum cultus Dei minuitur, sanctis subtrahitur honor, ultima voluntas defunctorum corrumpitur et irrita fit, debitis defuncti spoliantur suffragiis et vivorum devotio aufertur et frigescit. Quare missarum privatarum abrogatio admitti ac tolerari non potest, neque satis intelligi potest quod assumitur, Christum satisfecisse sua passione pro peccato originali et instituerit missam pro actuali peccato. Nam hoc nunquam auditum est a Catholicis. Jamque rogati plerique constantissime negant ab iis sic doceri ; non enim missa delet peccata, quæ per poenitentiam videtur peculiarem medicinam sanantur, sed delet poenam pro peccato debitam, satisfactions supplet, et gratiæ confert augmentum ac salutarem vivorum protectionem. (Caroli Casari et Catholicorum principum responsio ad Articulum de Missa, Le Plat, *Monumenta*, ii, p. 397.)

Yet another repudiation was made a little later by the eminent theologian, Albertus Pighius, the Provost of the Church of St. John at Utrecht, in his treatise on the Sacrifice of the Mass. Referring to the Confession of Augsburg, he writes :

“ They are to be told that they have not acted candidly, and do not so act, in ascribing to us in their *Confession* the ‘ opinion which increased private Masses infinitely, namely, etc? *In truth I, who for very many years have had experience of the schools, which are open to all kinds of discussions and examination of the truth, and assertions, have yet never heard or read of any one advancing an opinion of this kind before I read their ‘ Confession* Nor do I think that they will be able to produce anyone, whether a schoolman or anyone else, who puts forth an opinion of this kind, and even if they had found any such person, they still would not have acted candidly in ascribing the stupidity of one man to us all, who never heard or read of any such thing among ourselves ; and by monstrosities of this kind they asperse our doctrine, and defile it, and misrepresent it among a populace ignorant of these matters, and ready to believe them***]

And again, in 1533, the Dominican Peter Anspach, preacher to the Elector of Brandenburg, at Frankfort-on-Oder, described this accusation as a “ lie.”²

And fifty years later, Cardinal Bellarmine repudiated it with equal indignation :

“ *Impudenti mendacio* tribuitur Catholicis doctoribus ilia divisio quod Christus passione sua satisfecerit solum pro peccato originis, pro actualibus autem instituerit missam. *Nemo enim Catholicum unquam sic docuit.*”³

5. In view of this categorical repudiation of the doctrine in question, the Reformers could hardly fail to produce any evidence in their possession that the doctrine had in fact been taught. It would seem that the *one and only piece of evidence they produced at this time** was a statement in a work then ascribed to Thomas Aquinas, and afterwards ascribed to Albert the Great, though it was probably written by neither.

The statement was ascribed to Thomas Aquinas by McLancthon himself, in his *Apology for the Confession of Augsburg*, written the year after the *Confession*, i.e., in 1531.

“ Repudiandus est error Thoma, qui scripsit corpus Domini

¹ Pighi, *Controv. Ratisbon.*, fol. 92 b, edition 1545.

² *Antithesis der Lutherischen Bekenntniss*, Frankfort-on-Oder, 1533, p. 45.

³ *Judicium de libro . . .* p. 88, quoted in *Revue Anglo-Romaine*, ii, 254.

⁴ Catharinus had not then written the work in which he was supposed to set forth this doctrine. We deal with Catharinus in Vol. II.

semel oblatum in cruce pro debito originali, jugiter offerri pro quotidianis delictis in altari. . . .”^x

In view of this we must ask whether the doctrine in question is found in the work in question. The work *De venerabili Sacramento altaris* ascribed to St. Thomas is a series of sermons elsewhere ascribed to Albertus Magnus.* Here is the statement as found in the works of Albert² :

“The second cause of the institution of this Sacrament is the Sacrifice of the Altar, against a certain daily injury of our sins. That as the body of the Lord was once offered on the Cross for original sin, so it may be offered constantly on the altar for our daily sins, and that the Church may have in this a gift for pleasing God, precious and acceptable above all the Sacraments and Sacrifices of the Law.”³

Now it might help us to get at the real meaning of this passage if we knew who wrote it. As has been said, Melancthon attributes the work to St. Thomas Aquinas, and in point of fact it will be found bound up with his works. But scholars are agreed now that it was not written by St. Thomas. If, of course, it had been written by the Angelic Doctor, we could have appealed to the undisputed fact that in other works, undoubtedly written by him, St. Thomas makes it perfectly plain that *the Sacrifice of the Cross atoned for all sins, actual as well as original** But as it was not written by him, we cannot adopt this method.

The work from which the passage is taken has, however, been ascribed to St. Albert the Great, and at least one scholar

, 1 *Apol. Conf.*, c. xii. Seven years later, Lutheran envoys sent to Henry VIII, in 1538, similarly ascribe the opinion to St. Thomas, and attribute to it the prevalence of private Masses :

“An potest etiam magis impium quidquam dici, quam illi de missis istis docuerunt ? Nempe quod Christus sua passione satisfecerit pro peccatis originis, et instituerit missam in qua fieret oblatio pro quotidianis delictis. . . . Sic enim Thomas inquit in opusculo de Sacramento Altaris. . . . (Pocock's *Burnet*, iv, PP. 360-362.)

¹ *Opera Alberti Magni*, Tom. xxx, xii, p. 250, Lyons edition.

* Secunda causa institutionis hujus Sacramenti est sacrificium altaris, contra quamdam quotidianum delictorum nostrorum rapinam : ut, sicut Corpus Domini nostri semel oblatum est pro delicto originali, sic offeratur jugiter pro nostris quotidianis delictis in altari, et habeat in hoc Ecclesia unus ad placandum sibi Deum, super omnia legis sacramenta vel sacrificia, pretiosum et acceptum.” (*Sermo I de Sacr. Euch. Obera.*)

² Dr. Kiad himself says : “It is impossible that either St. Thomas or his master (Albert) could have committed themselves to the theological error contained in the passage quoted. . . . Both, as trained theologians, uniformly teach that Our Lord's sacrifice upon the Cross was the one propitiation for all sins, original as well as actual, and that the Eucharist, though a distinct, was no independent sacrifice, but drew all its efficacy from its relation to the Sacrifice of the Cross.” And he concludes that “the Reformers did the Schoolmen an injustice,” though he thinks “they were not mistaken in regarding the abuses as the practical outcome of errors taught under their name.” (*Later Medieval Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice*, p. 82.)

in our own time has defended this attribution, namely, Dr. Jacob, Canon of Ratisbon, who published a critical edition of the work towards the end of the last century. If the work was really written by Albert, then we can apply the method mentioned above, and appeal to other passages in Albert's works where he makes his opinion perfectly clear.

6. However, the ascription of the work to Albert the Great is questioned by others, amongst them Dr. Vacant.¹ Accordingly, we will not rely upon it, but we will take the work upon its own merits, and examine it carefully to see what it really teaches. For at any rate, no one has questioned that the work in question, which consists of a connected series of thirty-two sermons, is by one particular author.

Now the *first* chapter or sermon, in which the incriminating passage occurs, is headed "The Three Reasons for the Institution of the Sacrament of the Body of Christ." It sets forth these reasons, as follows : (i) A memorial of Christ, (2) the sacrifice of the altar, (3) the food of man. The sermon goes on to say that Divine Wisdom instituted the Sacrament for these three purposes, against three ancient evils (*vetera mala*), namely, the forgetting of God, the debt of robbery from another, and the corruptions of the deadly fruit. Thus, at once, the author goes back to the Garden of Eden and the Fall, to explain the origin of *present* evils. And this is made still more evident by what *immediately* follows :

"For our first parents, being deceived by the serpent's deceit, fell into these three evils, and *through them their successors have been corrupted* (primi enim parentes in haec tria mala inciderunt . . . et per eos successores sunt depravati)."

And then follow Scripture texts concerning these three original evils, with applications showing how *they exist still at the present time*;

"Concerning the first evil, we read in Eccl. x. 14, 'The beginning of the pride of man is to fall away from God, because his heart has departed from him that made him,' that is, through forgetfulness of God, when he was busy in the harmful discussion with the serpent—and *this still is apt to happen often to certain foolish people*."

Concerning the second evil, we read in Genesis iii. 6. . . . And so they both committed this theft (rapinam commiserunt). *They commit a similar robbery who exceed the measure of justice in the use of creatures and things.*

¹ Revue Anglo-Romaine, iii, 723 et seq.

Concerning the third. Genesis ii. 17, and Psalm xiii. 2. *So also those who take the poison of sin to their use, kill and corrupt their souls.*

Accordingly, against these three evils, the Sacrament has been instituted. . . .

* This do in memory of me ' : see the first reason, the memorial of the Saviour against forgetfulness.

* Which is given for you ' : see the second reason, namely, the sacrifice of the altar against robbery (*sacrificium altaris contra rapinam*).

' Take, eat ' : see the third reason, that is, the medicinal food against corruption."

There follows a development of the first reason, i.e., the sacrament as a memorial, in the course of which the author quotes Eusebius as follows :

" Because the body assumed by the Lord was to be hidden from our eyes and taken up to the heavens, it was necessary that on the day of the supper he should consecrate for us the sacrament of his body and blood, so that it might be offered continually in a mystery as it had been *offered once as a ransom* (*ut offeretur jugiter per mysterium, quod offerebatur semel in pretium*), and that the eternal victim should live in our memory, and be always present in grace."

The use of this quotation, with its express statement that Christ's body was offered *once as a ransom*, must be carefully noted.

Next, the author gives a similar expansion to the second reason for the institution of the Eucharist. It begins with the precise passage which is incriminated.

The author goes on :

" In order to understand this sacrifice, we may reflect upon three reasons why the old sacrifice was changed. First . . . Christ ought to change the old sacrifice into a better one. . . .

" The second reason is *the exigency of our debts*, for so great was *the debt of our first parents*, because of the magnitude of the robbery, the ingratitude of the robber, and the majesty of the one robbed, namely, the Creator, that not only the sacrifices of the law, but even the whole world would not suffice as a satisfaction."

Notice again here that " our debts " are reduced or summed up in the " debt of our first parents (*secunda est debitorum nostrorum exigentia : tarn magnum enim erat debitum primorum parentum, etc.*). Then the author gives various Scripture texts, amongst them Hebrews x and Psalm Ixviii:

" * A body hast thou fashioned me.' . . . ' A body,' which is above all other sacrifices, because without sin, ' thou hast fashioned me,' that is, Thou hast given me fit and proper for living in, *which can be offered for the redemption of all.* Ps. Ixviii. 5 :

130 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

‘Then did I pay that which I took not away/ namely, *when I offered on the Cross a sufficient sacrifice for the debts of all men* (quando scilicet pro debitis omnium sufficiens sacrificium in cruce offerebam).”

Here we have, in the very passage explaining the one incriminated, an explicit statement that Christ on the Cross offered a sacrifice sufficient for the sins of all men !

The third reason for the change of the old sacrifices is their insufficiency. An exposition of this concludes the first sermon.

The second sermon again considers the Sacrament as a memorial or reminding of the Saviour.

The third sermon returns once more to our own special subject: De secunda causa institutionis Sacramenti Eucharistiae, scilicet Sacrificio Altaris, and deals with the “forma offerendi” of the sacrifice, and in this connection he discusses three things :

“First, its prefiguring in the ancient sacrifices, secondly in its reality in human form, thirdly under the appearance of bread and wine. The first was that of the synagogue under the law, the second that of Divine Charity offered on the Cross, the third that of the faithful soul, i.e., the faithful consecrated on the table of the Church. The first was given as a sign, *the second for a ransom or price* (secunda in pretium), the third as a solace (tertia in solatium). Then he gives Scripture texts for the first. For the second, he quotes Hebrews x : * We are sanctified by the oblation of the body of Jesus Christ once,’ that is, on the Cross.”

For the third he quotes other texts.

The rest of this sermon explains that the sacrifices of the old law availed only because they prefigured Christ, the Redeemer of the World.

The next sermon explains the “excellency of our sacrifice.” Amongst other things, it excels others by the effect of its goodness.

“For it has a triple good effect upon the three states of the faithful, in the world, in purgatory, and in heaven. In the first state it relaxes sins (‘peccata relaxat’), in the second it alleviates the heavy penalty, in the third it generates great joy.”

Passing over several other sermons, we come to sermon 21. This deals with the first four of twelve fruits or effects of the Body of Christ against our twelve “*languores*.” In the course of this he quotes Leviticus ii: “If the sacrifice be from the gridiron, the flour shall be tempered with oil, and when thou offerest it to the Lord thou shalt deliver it to the hands of the priest, and when he hath offered it, he shall take a memorial out of the sacrifice, and burn it upon the altar for a sweet savour to the

Lord," and says that "the bread cooked on the gridiron and offered, and tempered with oil, is Christ who suffered for us on the Cross, and who was wholly anointed with the Holy Spirit. The memorial of this sacrifice is the host, which is offered in memory of the Lord's Passion."

In sermon 22 and 23 he discusses other fruits, and in No. 24 explains the "three principal fruits," the first of which is the destruction of sins." In No. 25, he again discusses the effects of the Body of Christ, as shown by its names, and in particular, by its name of "sacrament of the altar." In this connection he says :

° Because of the fact that we fall daily, at least venially, therefore Christ is daily immolated for us, so that *He who conquered death once by dying* daily relaxes the remains of sins through this Sacrament. Ambrose says : 'Just as what is offered everywhere is one body, so also it is one sacrifice. *Christ offered on the cross a victim for all, once* ; we also offer the victim now, but what we perform is a memorial of that sacrifice, *nor is it repeated by reason of its infirmity, but because of our own*, because we daily sin.' "

z Passing over sermon 26, we come to sermon 27, which considers the Blood of Christ, as shed on the Cross. It contains the following passage :

" Concerning the preciousness (*pretiositatem*) of the Blood of Christ, we must especially note the reason why such a price is given for man, and this is threefold. First, the necessary solution of a great debt. . . . For the first man was bound by a very great debt indeed, because he was bound to make satisfaction to God for himself and *for the whole human race*, which he had robbed and killed by eating the forbidden fruit, for which reason he was ordered, with all his progeny, to be put into the prison of hell until he should render all the debt by a sufficient victim. For it is just that satisfaction should be made according to the amount of the sin, and according to the dignity of the majesty injured. . . .

From this it follows that for so many murders by our first parent, *who killed all men*, for through him all men die, and also for the injured majesty of the Great Creator, such a precious victim ought to be offered to God and slain, and his blood shed, as would at least be worth as much as all the men who had been killed. But because such a victim could not be found in the whole creation, it was necessary that the Son of God should become man, better than any creature, and that He should be *stain for the debt of man*, and His blood shed."

This again makes it perfectly plain that *the sins of the human race are being viewed in their origin, in the "original sin" of Adam*,

The next sermon, 28, considers other points concerning the precious blood, *as shed upon the cross* (in cruce fusus), namely,

the greatness of its power or virtue, which consists in *the destruction of the devil, the redemption of the world* (in mundi redemptione), and in reconciliation with God. And in explaining the third, he says that the blood of Christ has reconciled us to God *inter alia* because it is “*a sufficient price which is paid for our sins* (ratione pretii sufficientis, quod in eo pro nostris debitis solvit).” And this is said of the Precious Blood, *as shed upon the Cross*.

In view of all this, we think it must be obvious to all that *the writer of these sermons held, as all Catholics have always done, that our Redemption and Atonement was consummated by Our Lord's Sacrifice on the Cross*. It is renewed, or commemorated daily in the Mass, not because of the insufficiency of the Sacrifice of the Cross, but because of our needs. And when the author says that Our Lord was offered on the Cross *for the original debt*, the way the author treats this original debt in these sermons shows that he is viewing it as *containing in itself all the sins of the human race to which it led*.

His meaning must thus be that of other Catholic theologians, such as St. Thomas, who himself says :

“Because we need the fruit of the Lord's Passion daily, on account of our daily failings, therefore this sacrament is ordinarily offered daily in the Church.” (“Quia fructu dominicae passioni quotidie indigemus propter quotidianos defectus, quotidie in Ecclesia regulariter hoc sacramentum offertur.”¹)

Or, as the Council of Trent says, the continual sacrifice of the Mass was instituted so that the “salutary virtue of the Sacrifice of the Cross might be applied to the remission of those sins which we daily commit.”²

The most that might be said would be that the statement, *taken out of its context*, might be understood in an unorthodox sense, but after all, this might be applied to many other statements !

7. Is there any evidence that in point of fact it did lead to “real and widespread perversions of the truth,” as is categorically asserted by Dr. Kidd, in his *Later Medieval Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice* ?³ Dr. Darwell Stone has the following cautious statement:

“Whatever may be the truth of the belief of the authorities at Nuremberg in 1524 that a friar had taught that ‘Christ suffered only for original sin and for the actual sins committed before He

¹ *Summa Theologica*, III, q. 83, a. 2.
¹ Page 82 *et seq.*

³ Sess., xxii, c. 1.

came,' or in the popular accusation against Johann Rode, the Rector of the Church of Our Lady at Lübeck, in 1529, that he had maintained that the death of Christ was effectual only for men of former times, they may afford evidence, if not of misconceptions of this kind in popular teaching, at least of what some uninstructed persons supposed to be taught."¹

Here we have, then, two apparent instances, of the doctrine in question. But a close inspection will show that the persons in question were *not accused of teaching this doctrine*, but another. For an account of the Friar of Nuremberg, we must refer to Spalatin, who records as follows :

"Minoratus Concianator Nurmbergae, Senatus auctoritate jussus est tacere post hac, ut ausus in Quadragesima praedicare Christum pro originali *et actualibus* tantum ante se patris passum. Nam peccata post passionem Christi *factis bonis operibus nostris* redimenda esse ; item confessionem auricularem ab Apostolic, institutum esse."²

It would seem from this that the friar's teaching was hardly so very unorthodox. And Nuremberg at that time was under Lutheran control. It is merely a case of a Lutheran senate objecting to the preaching of good works, and the inculcation of the necessity of auricular confession ! In any case, it is evident that *the doctrine of the friar is not the same as that attributed by Melancthon to Thomas Aquinas*.

The *second* case is that of the Rector of Lübeck. For this we have to refer to Regemann, *Lubeckische Chronik*, col. 131-33.3 From this we gather that the accusation was made "popularly, in satirical songs, that the death of Christ was effectual only for men of former times, " and that their posterity must seek salvation from him." The last part is given by Ranke, but strangely omitted by Darwell Stone. It would seem that there again we have to deal with *a travesty of the doctrine of the necessity of good works* and confession, etc., as more or less wilfully misunderstood by Lutheran heretics.

The only other piece of evidence produced by anyone as to the existence of this "misconception" on the Continent, is given by Maclear and Williams in their book on the Thirty-nine Articles.⁴ Here we are told that Luther, in 1528, said as follows :

"Cur jam aperte concinentur, pro peccatis post baptismum

¹ *History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, ii, 75.

² *Annales*, sub anno 1524, see Menckenius, *Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum*, ii, 634.

³ Cf. Ranke, *History of the Reformation*, iii, 427.

⁴ 1909 edn., p. 367 note.

134 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

commissis Christum non satisfacisse, sed tantum pro culpa originali ? ”

The only reference given is “Conciones ad 16 Joann.” Concerning this we need only say that there is no such work of Luther's, and that application to Anglican scholars at Oxford and elsewhere has failed to produce any trace of the supposed statement, or any further reference for it. In view of this, we may surely dismiss it.

8. Thus, we have shown that, prior to the Confession of Augsburg, when the accusation was first made, *there is not a little of evidence forthcoming which will show that the supposed doctrine was ever taught, or even popularly believed.* Later on, we shall deal with subsequent occasions upon which the doctrine was referred to in England, and show that there also no evidence whatever is forthcoming, and that the only *later* writer accused of teaching the doctrine (Catharinus) is *absolved from the charge by Anglicans themselves,*

The situation may well be summed up by the following statement in a letter written by Bucer to the Landgrave of Hesse in 1544 :

“On our side, we have gone so far, in the ardour of the combat, as to impute daily to our adversaries, in sermons and in writings, things to which they do not plead guilty, and of which we shall never be able to convince them.”¹

As we shall see, the accusation is dropped in subsequent revisions of the Confession of Augsburg, but on the other hand it is repeated by Lutheran ambassadors when they go to England in 1538. By that time it had obviously become a lie fit only for propagation outside Germany !

But let us suppose that the error had really been taught, either by theologians, or at any rate by popular preachers ; just as it is possible that in sermons the preachers of indulgences may have exaggerated the value of these. In that case the proper course of action should surely have been to have repudiated the error, and to have countered it by formulating the true Catholic doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass. This was precisely what was done by the Catholic theologians at Augsburg. *And yet the Lutherans continued to deny the sacrifice of the Mass.*

9. Before we leave this subject, we must mention that the Catholic theologians in their reply to the Confession of Augsburg

¹ M. Lenz, *Briefwechsel Landgraf Philipps von Hessen mit Bucer*, ii, Leipzig, 1887, p. 240.

quite realised the heretical implication in the Lutheran article, and pointed this out, at the same time vindicating the Catholic conception from supposed Scriptural objections :

“ Quod autem insinuavit, in missa Christum non offerri, vdtut ab antiquo damnatur, et a fidelibus exclusum, omnino rejiciendum est. Haec enim antiqua haeresis fuit. . . .

“ Neque obstat S. Paulus ad Hebraeos oblatione missae, quod una oblatione et semel justificati sumus per Christum. Loquitur enim divus Paulus de oblatione victimae, hoc est, cruenti sacrificii, agni occisi in ara sanctae crucis, quae quidem oblatio semel facta est, a qua omnia sacramenta et etiam sacrificium missae suam habent efficaciam.....

“ Neque missam tantum esse memoriam passionis Christi... ”¹

Similarly, Dr. Eck submitted the following :

“ Lest there should arise a verbal contention about the words oblation, victim, and sacrifice, the Catholics have added a distinction between three oblations, namely, that Christ was offered in the paschal lamb of the Old Testament figuratively or typically ; on the cross passibly, where He offered Himself to God the Father for our sins, and again, He is offered daily in the Mass *mysteri aliter et representative*, in memory of His passion and oblation once made on the Cross. Thus the Mass is not a bloody victim, but a mysterious and representative one.”²

¹ Lc Plat, II, 338 *et seq.*

• *Apud Kidd, Documents*, p. 295-6.

CHAPTER IV

THE LUTHERANS AND THE EUCHARIST AFTER THE CONFESSION OF AUGSBURG

1. The fact that the Lutherans were really denying the Catholic doctrine of the Mass was, as we have seen, already plain to the Catholic doctors at Augsburg in 1530. The fact became plainer still when Melanchthon wrote his *Apologia Confessionis* in 1531, to which we have already referred in connection with the supposed doctrine of Thomas Aquinas. He writes as follows :

“ There was only one propitiatory sacrifice, namely, the death of Christ. . . . There now remain eucharistic sacrifices, which are called *sacrifices of praise*—the preaching of the word, faith, invocations. . . . These sacrifices are not satisfactions for those making them, nor applicable to others. . . . #

“ We willingly allow the Mass to be regarded as the perpetual sacrifice, provided it is the whole Mass which is regarded in this way, that is, the ceremony together with the preaching of the word, faith, invocation, and thanksgiving. . . . ”

The resemblance between this and the subsequent exposition by Cranmer is very striking. The Mass is a sacrifice, in the sense that it is *a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving only*,

2. In the Revised Confession of 1540, the sacrifice of the Mass is still more explicitly rejected, though curiously enough the accusation made against Thomas Aquinas is silently dropped:

“ There was an opinion prevalent in the Church, that the Lord's Supper is a work which, when celebrated by the priest, merits the remission of sins, both as to guilt and punishment, to him who does it and to others, and this *ex opere operato*. . . . And again, that when applied to the dead it is satisfactory. . . . And that is the way in which they understand ‘ sacrifice,’ when they say that the Mass is a sacrifice, namely, a work which when applied for others merits for them the remission of guilt and punishment, and that *ex opere operato*, , , . And thus they understand that an oblation is made by the priest in the Mass for the living and the dead. . . . But the Passion of Christ was the oblation and satisfaction, not only for original guilt, but also for

all other sins. . . . In the institution of the Lord's Supper, Christ does not command priests to offer for other living and dead persons. . . . It is much more absurd that the Mass is applied to freeing the souls of the dead, for the Mass was instituted to be a recollection, that is, that those who use the Lord's Supper may, by the remembrance of the benefit of Christ, establish and strengthen their faith, and comfort their terrified consciences. . . . Nothing is ordered about an offering for the sins of the living and the dead, but it is ordered that the body and blood of the Lord be received, and that this be done for the remembrance of the benefit of Christ. Now the remembrance signifies . . . the remembrance by faith of the promise and benefit, the comforting of the conscience, and the giving of thanks for so great a benefit."¹

Dr. Darwell Stone well remarks that "Like the writings of Luther himself, this statement in the revised form of the Confession of Augsburg *appears to deny the Eucharistic sacrifice in any ordinary sense, as well as to clear away perverted ideas about it.*"*

3. The formulations of Lutheran Eucharistic doctrine subsequent to the Confession of Augsburg consist, in the main, of modifications, and attempts to find an ambiguous formula which would be acceptable to the Zwinglians as well as to the Lutherans. They were due in great measure to the efforts of Bucer—to whom we give a separate treatment—and Melancthon, whom we have already mentioned. It would seem that, as a result of an interview between these two at Cassel on January 10th, 1535, Melancthon abandoned the doctrine of Consubstantiation, and approximated to the Zwinglian view, or at least to the Bucerian modification of it. This is important, in view of subsequent developments.

In May, 1536, a "Concord of Wittenberg" was signed by Lutheran and Bucerian theologians. The first articles are as follows :

"We confess that in the words of Irenaeus, the Eucharist consists of two things. . . . And so we think and teach that the body and blood of Christ are really and substantially present, *exhibited*, and received (*adesse, exhiberi, et sumi*) with the bread and wine (*cum pane et vino*).

And although we deny that transubstantiation takes place . . . nevertheless we grant that by a sacramental union the bread is the body of Christ, that is to say, when the bread is given, there is at once present and truly *exhibited* the Body of Christ (*simul adesse et vere exhiberi*)."

Now here we note the introduction of the term "exhibited,"

¹ Francke, *op. cit.*, iv, 20-22.

^{*} *Op. cit.*, p. 30. Italics ours.

which was absent from Luther's own formula. The term comes, as we shall see, from Bucer, who regarded it as a conveniently vague term which might be accepted both by Lutherans and Zwinglians, and which may be taken properly to signify Bucer's own intermediate view, which we shall explain in due course. We shall also see that it is adopted by the Zwinglians and the Calvinists, as a suitable term to express their particular doctrine—and also into the English 10 Ten Articles"—a significant fact.

4. In December, 1536, we get the Schmalkaldic Articles, a purely Lutheran formula. The sixth article is as follows :

“The bread and wine in the Supper are the real body and blood of Christ, and they are given and taken not only by pious, but also by impious Christians. . . . We care nothing for the subtle sophistry concerning Transubstantiation, whereby they (the Catholics) pretend that the bread and wine leave and lose their natural substance, and that only the species and colour of bread remain, and not real bread. For it is most in agreement with Scripture that the bread is present, and remains.”¹

But even so, as this formula was signed not only by Luther but also by Melancthon, who had modified Luther's expressions when translating his German text into Latin for the Augsburg Confession, we are hardly surprised to find a certain vagueness in its terms, and that, for instance, the Body and Blood are *not* said to be present “under the forms of bread and wine.” However, the typically Bucerian word “exhibited” is notably absent.

5. In 1551, an adaptation of the Augsburg Confession was made, for presentation to the Council of Trent. It is called the “Saxon Confession.” Substantially it is the same as the Confession of 1530, but it has three noticeable features, one an ambiguous presentation of the Real Presence, introducing the word “exhiberi”, another statement which emphasizes that the Real Presence, whatever it may be, is *confined to the sacramental use in the service itself*, and a third statement as to the way in which the Eucharist is a sacrifice—but *only of praise and thanksgiving* :

“The Sacraments are actions ordained by God, and *the things themselves have not the nature of a Sacrament outside the ordained use*, but in the ordained use Christ is really and substantially present in this Communion, and the body and blood of Christ are really exhibited (exhiberi) to those who receive. . . .

“Many before this time have written that there is an offering of the Mass for the living and the dead, and that it merits for him

1 Francke, *Lib. Symb. Ecc. Luth.*, ii, 32*3.

who offers it and for others remission of sins *ex opere operato*. . . . The word of God condemns those errors. . . . There is only one propitiatory sacrifice or sacrifice whereby the wrath of the eternal Father towards the human race was appeased, that is the complete obedience of the Son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, crucified and risen. . . . And this sacrifice is applied to individuals by their own faith, when they hear the Gospel and use the Sacraments. . . . The ancient Church uses the words sacrifice and offering, but thereby understands the whole action, prayer, reception, recollection, faith, confession, and thanksgiving. This whole inner and outer action, in one converted to God and in the whole Church, is in very truth a sacrifice of praise, or Eucharistic, and a reasonable service. . . . Certain persons are now craftily learning to lessen the absurdity. They say that the offering is not merit but application. . . . But each one applies to himself the sacrifice of Christ by his faith. . . . What then do the sacrificing priests now understand who say that they offer Christ? Antiquity did not so speak. . . . They say that we destroy the continual sacrifice. . . . It is a continual sacrifice to proclaim the uncorrupted doctrine of the Gospel and to call on God rightly; lastly, as the Lord says, to 'worship the Father in spirit and in truth.' Here also we hold fast the right use of the Sacraments. Since we preserve all these things most faithfully, we preserve with the greatest reverence the continual sacrifice."¹

6. About the same time, the Württemberg Confession was drawn up by John Brenz, also for the purpose of presentation to the Council of Trent. Emphasis is laid on the continued existence of real bread and wine in the consecrated Sacrament, and on the presence of the real body and blood of Christ. The Eucharist is allowed to be a sacrifice *in a general sense*, as a memorial of Christ's death, and as a means of applying the merits of His passion to communicants :

"Concerning the substance of the Eucharist, we believe and teach that the real body of Christ and His real blood are given, and we reject the teaching of those who say that the bread and wine are only the signs of the absent body and blood of Christ. . . . God is able in the Eucharist to annihilate the substance of bread and wine, or to change it into the body and blood of Christ, but that God uses this power does not seem to be declared in the certain words of God, and it appears to have been unknown to the ancient Church. . . . The very necessity of the sacrament seems to require that real bread remains together with the real presence of the body of Christ.

"Since the word sacrifice is capable of very wide meaning, and signifies a holy worship in general, we willingly grant that the right and lawful use of the Eucharist may in this sense be called a sacrifice. . . . Another error is that the Eucharist is a sacrifice of such a kind that it ought to be continually offered in the Church

to expiate the sins of the living and the dead, and to obtain for them other benefits, bodily and spiritual. . . . Another error is that some think the oblation, as they call it, not indeed to be in itself a propitiation for sins, but to apply the propitiation and merit of Christ to the living and dead. But it has been shown that the Eucharist is *not properly an oblation* but is so called because it is *a memorial of the oblation once offered on the cross*. Again, the application of the merit of Christ is not made by any other external instrument than the preaching of the Gospel of Christ and the administration of the Sacraments which Christ instituted for this purpose. . . .

"Another error is the carrying about and reserving of one part of the Eucharist for special worship of God. The Holy Ghost forbids the institution of any worship of God without the certain command of God. . . .ni

7. We have already pointed out that Melancthon had for many years abandoned the Lutheran doctrine of Consubstantiation. On November 15th, 1557, he wrote secretly to Mordheisen that he did not believe in the Real Presence at all, but could not declare himself openly. But he added that if he could take up his residence elsewhere, he would speak. However, he died in 1560.

8. It is hardly necessary for us to speak of later Lutheran formulae, but perhaps we may conclude with the Formula of Concord drawn up in 1577 by Martin Chemnitz, a pupil of Melancthon. This contains the following statements :

"We reject and condemn . . . the papistical Transubstantiation . . . the papistical sacrifice of the Mass, which is offered of the sins of the living and the dead."

On the other hand, it still affirms a "real presence" :

"The body and blood of Christ are really and substantially present, and are really distributed and taken together with the bread and wine. The bread does not signify the absent body of Christ. . . . The body and blood of Christ are taken together with the bread and wine, not only spiritually through faith, but also by the mouth . . . after a supernatural and heavenly manner, by reason of the sacramental union."

It also teaches ubiquity and the adoration of Christ present, but not of the elements of bread and wine.²

¹ Heppé, *Die Bekenntnisschriften der Altirer, Kirche Deutschlands*, pp. 514-20.

² Francke, *Lib. Symb. Eccles. Luth.* III.

CHAPTER V

THE LUTHERAN CONCEPTION OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY

Having outlined the development of the Lutheran ideas on the Eucharist, we will turn back and consider the corresponding development of Lutheran ideas on the Christian ministry.

1. We have already mentioned that Luther had in 1520 set forth his theory of the universal priesthood of all Christians, in virtue of their baptism.

In *An den Bock zu Leipzig* (1521) Luther attacks not only the priesthood, but the episcopate. The priesthood of which Scripture speaks is a *servitus, dispensatio, episcopatus, presbyterium*, but never *sacerdotium*. If we turn to history, we find that at first ecclesiastical authority was entrusted to the oldest. A bishop is only a superintendent, and so every ecclesiastical superior ought to be called a superintendent. Luther also appeals to a statement by St. Jerome, to prove that there was no real difference between a bishop and a simple priest. As for those who are now called bishops, God does not recognise them. Ecclesiastical authority ought to be instituted as in primitive times. As all the faithful are equally priests, the congregation ought to choose the wisest and most pious amongst them and make him its servant or minister for *the preaching of the gospel and the administration of the sacraments*.¹ The ecclesiastical *sacerdotium* derived from the bishops may indeed be an ecclesiastical institution, but it is certainly not a divine institution.

2. Thus, Luther would allow some kind of Christian ministry, in which certain individuals, appointed by the community, exercise their functions in the general interest. Luther develops these ideas in a practical form in his treatise *De instituendis ministris ecclesia*, addressed to the Protestants of Prague in 1523.²

¹ Note this "evangelical" conception of the Christian ministry, which, as we shall see, is common to all the new Protestant Churches, including the Church of England.

² *Works*, Weimar edition, xii, p. 194 ff.

In this work he insists upon the Evangelical conception of the ministry, i.e., the ministration of the Word as contrasted with the Catholic conception, i.e., the power to sacrifice and absolve :

“Ordinatio, auctoritate Scripturarum . . . exemplo et decretis Apostolorum, in hoc sit instituta, ut ministros verbi in populo institueret. Ministerium publicum, inquam, verbi, quo dispensantur mysteria Dei, per sacram ordinationem institui debet . . . Papistae autem de hoc ministerio ne somniant quidem in suis ordinibus. Quid autem faciunt? Primum, caecitate percussi, omnes simul ne norunt quidem, quid sit verbum aut ministerium verbi, praesertim Episcopi ipsi ordinatorum. . . . Deinde, loco ministrorum verbi, ordinant sacrificulos, qui missas sacrificent, et confessiones audiant. Hoc enim vult Episcopus, dum calicem dat in manum, et confert potestatem illam consecrandi et sacrificandi pro vivis et mortuis. . . . Item cum illis sacrosancto mysterio Spiritum in aures inflat, et confessores facit, dicens ‘Accipe Spiritum Sanctum.’ Haec est illa potestas consecrandi et absolvendi gloriosissima. . . . Si igitur ulli negandi sunt esse sacerdotes, maxime negandi sunt illi quos papistici ordines unxerunt. Nam ex praedictis satis constat eos hoc plane nullo modo agere, ut ministros verbi ordinent, sed tantum sacrifices missarum et auditores confitentium. . . . At cum certissimum est, Missam non esse sacrificium, deinde, confessionem eam quam praeceptam volunt, nullam esse, utrumque autem sit humanum et sacrilegum inventum et mendacium, plane sequitur, per ordines illos sacros neminem fieri coram Deo aut sacerdotem aut ministrum.”

He goes on to say that all the powers possessed by the official priesthood are possessed in common also by the faithful laity, in virtue of their baptism, which has made them all priests. And from this he somewhat illogically concludes that the official ministers ought not to be called priests :

“Ex his omnibus credo confirmatum esse, eos qui sacramentis et verbo inter populos praesunt, non posse nec debere sacerdotes vocari . . . Ministri sunt. . . .”^a

Accordingly, he urges the newly-formed congregations to meet together and choose for themselves “a bishop, that is, a minister or pastor.” They were first to remind themselves in prayer that the Lord had promised to be in the midst of those gathered together in His name, and then to select capable persons for the ministry of the Word, who would officiate in the name of all :

“Eligite quem et quos volueritis, qui digni et idonei visi fuerint, tum impositis super eos manibus illorum qui potiores

¹ Weimar edn., xii, pp. 173-4.

^a *Ibid.*, p. 190.

inter vos fuerint, confirmetis et commendetis eos populo et Ecclesiae seu universitati, sintque hoc ipso vestri Episcopi, ministri, seu pastores.”¹

But if they are too old-fashioned to innovate in this way, Luther will condescend to their weakness and allow them to choose someone already ordained as a Catholic priest:

“Si omnino infirmiores estis quam ut hunc liberum et Apostolicum ritum instituendi sacerdoti audeatis tentare, age, feremus infirmitatem vestram, et permittamus utjam ordinatos ab Episcopis papisticis accipiatis.”²

When a large number of congregations have thus chosen their ministers, these might meet and elect a Superintendent, who would make the visitation of the churches, “until Bohemia finally returns to the legitimate and evangelical archiepiscopate.”

3. In a work written for the congregation at Leisnig about the same time, Luther similarly says that those who preach do so “as the deputy and minister of the others.” No one may be a preacher except by the choice of the congregation. Where there is no bishop to provide for them who holds Christian and evangelical views, the people are themselves to give the call to the right preacher. And “whoever is chosen for the office of preacher is thereby raised to the most exalted office in Christendom: he is then authorised to baptise, to say Mass, and to hold the cure of souls.”³

The opinions of Melancthon were, as we shall see, similar to those of Luther.

4. These Protestant views on the nature of the Christian ministry received their first formal expression in the Confession of Augsburg of 1530, where they were naturally accompanied by language setting forth the Lutheran conception of the Church.

Article 5 is headed “The Ecclesiastical Ministry,” and says that in order that we may attain to justifying faith (“by which we believe that we are received in grace, and our sins are forgiven by Christ’s sake”—art. 4), there has been instituted a “ministry of teaching the gospel and of giving the sacraments” (*ministerium docendi evangelii et porrigendi sacramenta*).

Article 7 says that “the Church is the congregation of saints, in which the Gospel is rightly taught and the sacraments rightly

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 193.

² *Ibid.*, p. 194.

³ The Scriptural Ground and Reason why a Christian Congregation or Assembly has the right and power to ... call, appoint or remove pastors,” *Werke*, Weunax edn., xi., p. 475.

144 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

administered,” and adds that “For the true unity of the Church it suffices to agree on the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments, nor is it necessary that there should be everywhere similar human traditions or rites or ceremonies instituted by men.”

Article 14 deals with “Ecclesiastical Order,” and says that no one ought publicly to teach in the church or administer sacraments unless he be rightly called (*rite vocatus*).

5. The Catholic theologians dealt comparatively gently with these statements, which were obviously ambiguous, and could be given a Catholic sense. In addition, they had already pointed out that the Mass is a sacrifice, and from this it would necessarily follow that the “ministry of the word and the sacraments” is also a sacrificial priesthood. Possibly at this early stage the Catholic theologians did not realise the heretical implications behind the phrase in question.

In their first Reply, they remark as follows on Article 5 :

“Recte hic principes asserunt ministerium docendi evangelii et administrationis sacramentorum, sed concionatores eorum multum zizaniorum inseruerunt, quæ a vera fide adducunt. . . . Secundo, nullibi explicant quid de sacramentis et numero sacramentorum sentiant. Quod tamen erat necessarium.”¹

And on article 14, they comment :

“Cum multa hic omittantur, tacite videntur negare, potissimum accedentibus erroneis condonatorum scripturis. Nam ab initio non meminerunt ordinem esse sacramentum. . . . Cum proprium sit *externum sacerdotium* in ecclesia, Luther cum complicitibus hierarchicos confundens ordines, asserunt omnes quotquot baptizati sumus, tam viros quam mulieres, equaliter esse sacerdotes. . . . Tertio, negat episcopatum differre a presbyterio. Hæc fuit hæresis Arianorum. . . . *Nec aperiunt quid ad consecrationem missa attineat, neque modum vocandi explicant.*”²

In the final form of the reply, however, the Catholic theologians confine themselves to saying that Article 14 may be accepted if the “right calling” is understood “*secundum formam juris*,” etc., which of course includes ordination by a bishop.

Article 7 of Part Two of the same Augsburg Confession deals at greater length with the episcopal power. It insists that bishops should confine themselves to their ecclesiastical office, and not meddle with civil affairs. But the only ecclesiastical office assigned here to bishops is “the power of the keys, which,

¹ J. Ficker, *Die Confutation des Augsburgerischen Bekenntnisses*, p. 21.

² J. Ficker, *op. cit.*, p. 49.

according to the precept of the Saviour, consists in forgiving and retaining sins, and in administering the sacraments," for, the Confession adds, the power of the keys is exercised only "docendo seu predicando verbum et porrigendo sacramenta." As to this, we may again remark that the terms used are ambiguous. Of course a Catholic Bishop is consecrated "to preach the Word and administer the Sacraments," including those of the Eucharist and Holy Order. If the phrase were used by one holding the Catholic doctrine of the Mass and the Sacraments, including that of Holy Order, it could pass as orthodox. But even so it would be incomplete, for as the Catholic theologians remark in their answer, "satis aperte dignoscitur, episcopus non solum habere potestatem ministerii verbi Dei, sed etiam potestatem regiminis et coercitivas correctionis."¹ It would seem that the Catholic theologians did not at this time realise that the ambiguity in the terms used was deliberate, and betrayed a definite heretical conception of the Christian ministry. This ought to have been clear from the insinuated denial of the Sacrifice of the Mass, and in any case became perfectly clear in the light of subsequent developments.

It is interesting to note that the Confession uses the same terms of the episcopate as of the simple ministry : both are ministers of the Word and the Sacraments, and there is no clear distinction expressed between them. It is also worthy of note that *this ministry of preaching and administering sacraments constitutes the exercise of the power of the keys*, i.e., the power to forgive and retain sins. In all this we undoubtedly find the origin of the phraseology used in the Anglican ordination form, and the subsequent explanations given of it.²

6. In the year following the Augsburg Confession, i.e., in 1531, Melancthon explained his ideas on the ministry in greater detail in his *Apology for the Confession*. Thus, on article 13 he remarks :

"Our opponents (i.e., the Catholics) understand the priesthood to be, not the ministry of the word and the sacraments to others, but the power to offer sacrifice,³ as if it were necessary in the New Testament to re-establish the Levitical priesthood charged with sacrificing to obtain the forgiveness of sins. We, on the contrary, teach that the sacrifice of Christ dying on the Cross was sufficient for the sins of the whole world, and that there is no need of any other

¹ Le Plat, II.

* See p. 476 and Vol. II.

• Note that this makes perfectly clear the unorthodox sense in which the Lutherans were using the phrase "ministry of the word and the sacraments."

sacrifice for the remission of sins. Men are justified simply by the sacrifice of Christ, provided they believe they are redeemed. *Priests are therefore called, not to sacrifice, as had to be done for the people in the Law*, that thereby they might merit for the people the remission of sins, but *they are called to preach the Gospel and to administer sacraments to the people*. We have not another sacerdotium similar to the Levitical. . . . But *if order is understood of the ministry of the word, we would not object to it being called a sacrament*, for this ministry of the word proceeds from a Divine command, Rom. i. 16, and has great promises, and in this sense one can also call the laying-on of hands a sacrament."

Again, on article 14 he explains that the different degrees of order, i.e., the ministry, are "venerable customs, which ought to be retained for the public good and ecclesiastical discipline":

"Our opponents allow our article 14, in which we say that no one ought to have the administration of the word and the sacraments in the Church unless he be rightly called, on condition that we make use of canonical ordination. On this point we several times pointed out in the Diet that we most earnestly desired to retain the ecclesiastical polity and the grades in the Church, even those made by human authority. . . . But the bishops compel our priests to reject and condemn the kind of doctrine which we have set forth. . . ."

7. In the edition of his *Loci Communes*, published this same year, 1531, Melanchthon repeats his statement that he is willing to include Holy Order among the sacraments, *provided it is clearly understood to be simply a ministry of the word and the sacraments.*¹

8. A Declaration, written by Melanchthon, and subscribed by all the Lutheran divines present, was annexed to the Schmal-kald Confession of 1537, on the Power and Jurisdiction of the Bishops. It begins as follows:

"In the *Confession* and the *Apology*, we set forth those things which it was profitable to say in general about the ecclesiastical power. For the Gospel gives to those who preside in the Churches the command to preach the Gospel, remit sins, and administer sacraments, and also jurisdiction, i.e., the command to excommunicate those whose crimes are known, and also to absolve once more those who repent. Now, by the confession of all, even our adversaries, it is clear that this power is by divine right common to all who preside over the Churches, whether they are called pastors or presbyters, or bishops. . . . St. Jerome teaches that the grades of bishop and presbyter or pastor are distinct by *human* authority. And the thing speaks for itself, because the power is the same, as I have said above.

"But there was one thing which subsequently made a difference between bishops and pastors, namely, ordination, because it was

¹ *Corpus Reformatorum*, vol. xxi, p. 470.

decided that one bishop should ordain ministers in many churches. But since by divine right there are not diverse grades of bishop and pastor, it is manifest that ordination by a pastor, performed in his church, is ratified by divine right. And so, inasmuch as the ordinary bishops have become the enemies of the Church, or will not give ordination, the churches retain their right. For wherever the Church is, there is the right of ministering the Gospel, wherefore it is necessary that the Church should retain its right of calling, choosing, and ordaining ministers. And this right is properly the gift given to the Church, which no human authority can take away. . . . Hence where there is a true Church, there of necessity is the right of choosing and ordaining ministers, just as in case of necessity even a layman can absolve, and become the minister and pastor of another. . . . This is also confirmed by the statement of Peter, 'You are a royal priesthood,' which words pertain to the true Church, and as this alone has the priesthood, so certainly it has the right of choosing and ordaining ministers. And this is also witnessed to by the most common custom of the Church. For in times past the people chose pastors and bishops. Then there came a bishop, either of that Church or of a neighbouring Church, and he confirmed the elect by the imposition of hands, nor was there any other ordination besides this approbation. Later on new ceremonies were added. . . . And finally more recent persons added, 'I give thee power to sacrifice for the living and the dead.' - - -

"From all this it is clear that the Church retains its right to choose and ordain ministers. Hence, since the bishops either have become heretics, or will not impart ordination, the Churches are compelled by divine right to ordain pastors and ministers, with the aid of their own pastors (*adhibitis suis pastoribus*)."

This sets forth the Lutheran view very clearly. They have no objection to bishops as such, or to bishops ordaining, but if bishops cannot be had, then the presbyters can ordain, for in any case, presbyters or bishops merely exercise the rights inherent in the community as a whole.

9. Similar views are expressed elsewhere, e.g., in the *Judicium de Impositione Manuum*, written by Melanchthon in 1540 : Here he says it is obvious that a layman may teach. Neither is it true that the power of changing the bread is given only to a certain grade of the ministry. The Pontifical party do indeed say that the Church is a polity in which no one has the power of teaching publicly, or administering the supper of the Lord, unless he be consecrated by a bishop holding a see and accepted by the Roman Pontiff. But this of course is wrong. Then Melanchthon continues :

"I will now set forth in proper order what things are necessary in constituting ministers.

1. Vocation or election is necessary. It was the universal custom of the primitive Church for the bishops to be chosen by the people. . . . But now ministers are called in our churches either by the princes or by the senate, and this is a pious and just calling. . . .

2. After vocation or election, there used to be added the 'approbation' (*comprobatio*), which was done by the neighbouring bishops, two or three, as many histories relate. These imposed hands on the elect. We also keep this custom, as you know

"It would be an excellent thing for the elect minister to be set forth in the presence of the Church, commended to God by public prayer, and confirmed by the testimony of his colleagues. These things were once carried out with gravity, and I would desire them to be done now also. But you see how discipline is loosened. . . . But it would certainly be useful to restore this custom. . . . Nevertheless I say that one called or elected by the voice of those who have the right to call a person to the ministry of the Gospel, is a true minister of the Gospel, and can teach and administer the sacraments, even without this other rite of the imposition of hands. For the imposition of hands adds nothing of right or power, but it is a declaration and an approbation of the vocation, which has to be established. And the sacraments are valid, on account of the divine ordinance. . . . Indeed, it is not lawful to ask the rite of ordination from the bishops who now occupy the sees and say that they condemn the doctrine of our churches, for they ordain no one without wicked bonds. . . . But the universal Church is not extinguished on this account, but remains amongst us : where the voice of the Gospel sounds, there is the ministry, there also is the right of election, and of approbation. . . .

"I know that the Church must be perpetual, and that it does not depend upon the sees of bishops, but that it truly is the Church which sounds forth the Gospel. Therefore the ministry is also in this Church.

"I do indeed regret that we are divided from those who hold the ordinary power, but they have cast us off without fault of ours."¹

10. Here, again, is a scheme of Church government drawn up by the Lutheran divines at Wittenberg, and subscribed by Luther, Bugenhausen, Melanchthon, and others, in 1545 :

"It is a great thing and necessary to the Church, to exercise proper care about ordination. . . . The whole Church, and especially the chief members of the Church, should make this then-care, that many should be prepared for the office of teaching, and that after they have been examined by learned examiners, they should be either admitted to the ministry or be rejected. This work was once entrusted to the bishops. But most of them have for a long time now been very fierce against those who teach rightly. . . . Even if the authority of ordination is to be granted to bishops, they must declare their mind about doctrine. For if

they will remain enemies of the gospel, and will not admit any to ordination without binding them to impious doctrine and to the destruction of the truth, ordination may not be sought from them. But if they should be willing to embrace and defend true doctrine . . . they might deserve very well indeed of the Church. For it will be very profitable rightly to restore ordination. . . .

"But there are manifest abuses by which ordination has been polluted now for many ages. *There is a strong persuasion that priests (sacerdotes) are ordained for sacrificing (propter sacrificium), not for the sake of teaching the Gospel.* And this opinion has increased the number of sacrificing priests (sacrificulorum), because men think that to heap up these sacrifices is the principal worship of God. . . . So, if there is to be an agreement, and if the authority of ordaining is to be commended to the bishops, it will be necessary that there should first be an agreement on doctrine, as has been said. And then, that *the mandate given in ordination should be to teach the Gospel and administer the Sacraments, and not other works, such as sacrificing for the living and the dead.* Nor are consciences to be weighed down by the wicked law of celibacy. . . ."x

We especially call attention to Melanchthon's stipulation about the ordination mandate, and its date, 1544. *It is precisely the mandate chosen for the new Anglican ordination rite*, as we shall see.

11. Another interesting document is a *Sententia* of Melanchthon, *De Ordinatione Ecclesie Ministrorum*, subscribed by Bugenhagen, whose own church ordinance was taken as a model by Cranmer when composing his new Prayer Book (see p. 159). It is given in Melanchthon's Works, vol. vii, col. 740 :

"The Son of God, sitting at the right hand of the Father, gives gifts to men, some prophets, others apostles, others evangelists, others pastors, others doctors, etc. . . . He brought forth the Gospel from the bosom of the eternal Father, instituted the Evangelical Ministry, and sent and still sends forth doctors. . . . 'How shall they preach unless they be sent?' He sends either those who are called immediately by His voice, or those who are called by the Church, or by certain persons in the name of the Church. We do not dispute that immediate mission or vocation by which He immediately sends doctors, such as the prophets and apostles. . . . This immediate mission or vocation is at once an ordination of such persons. . . . But the right of mediate vocation, by which God regularly wishes men to be called by the voice of the Church to the evangelical ministry, is also a great blessing from God. . . . And this blessing must be recognised and understood in the Church. The sayings of Paul and histories teach us how this vocation used to be carried out. . . . The apostles and pastors called other ministers, and, by the accustomed sign,

declared the vocation by the imposition of hands, in order that the vocation should be more known to them, and should be known to the Church.

"It behoves that a vocation should be indicated to the Church and manifested either by words or by some sign. It will be very profitable to those called to know their calling and to have clear testimony of their vocation. . . . In histories we read that vocations or elections were made by the suffrages of the whole multitude. To this there succeeded election or vocation[^] which is now done by the principal members of the Church, or princes, or the senate, with the assistance of some ministers of the Gospel as inspectors of doctrine. Where there is no prophetic or apostolical mission, as we said above, we rightly say that no one ought to function in the ministry without this mediate vocation. . . . This vocation, comprising the nomination of the person, or his election, the examination of doctrine, and witness in the Church and prayer, is in real fact an ordination. . . . God Himself anoints His salutary ministers with His Holy Spirit. He imposes hands, and blesses. . . . Now, the signs of testimony in the Church may be words or rites, such as the imposition of hands, which rite we also observe still, because it is manifest that this most ancient rite, which was used in the Church of the fathers, was handed on by the apostles to the pastors, who functioned after them in the ministry. . . . The Pope and the bishops have for many ages contaminated in many ways this testimony, which they call ordination. *They have added many wicked opinions concerning sacrificing for others*, false worship, and again the unjust bonds of the canons, and again unctions with oil consecrated with magical blasphemies, etc.

"It is accordingly necessary to spurn and avoid this rite of the Pope and the Bishops. And Luther has done piously, in transferring to the true Church not only vocation, but also this public testimony, which takes place in a public rite, because certainly the examination of doctrine is to be done by ministers of the Gospel. And it is a good thing for a ministry to begin with some public rite and with prayer. And there are many religious and grave causes for retaining this public rite; it is profitable to the churches to see who have a testimony of doctrine from whom, and it is profitable to the called themselves. . . . It is profitable also to distinguish by public testimony those ordained in our churches from others who are anointed by the bishops. But although Luther has thus observed these things, and although I consider them religiously observed, and desire them to be observed, still, I say that the signs of the testimony are changeable, and that it is possible for someone to be truly called and ordained who did not use this right, namely, the imposition of hands, and that his ministry is efficacious. . . . I do not say this in order that the rite should be abolished, or to condemn the pastors who add this rite to religious calling and the examination of doctrine . . . but that a distinction should be made between things necessary and things not necessary. . . . We ought to give thanks to God because we know now that ordination has been transferred from

the enemies of the Gospel to our churches, and we ought to defend this with greater care, and not to abolish it."

This very clearly sets forth the Lutheran view. Ordination by the laying-on of hands is merely an external approbation of the calling of the minister, and, though useful, is not necessary. Again, ordination by a bishop may be dispensed with in case of necessity, though if the bishops will only become "Gospel" bishops, they may be given the right to ordain, provided always they will ordain merely to the ministry of the Word and the Sacraments, and will not try to make sacrificing priests.

There is another point which is important. Luther asserts several times—and Melancthon does not contradict him—that the "powers" possessed by the Christian minister, such as they are, are also possessed *radicaliter* by all the faithful. All are equally priests. It must be obvious that in this case, ordination cannot possibly confer any fresh power; it can only confer authority to exercise powers already possessed. In this connection it is interesting to note that in the sixteenth century there was much loose talk about the "power" of bishops, when reference was really being made to their jurisdictional authority, and not to any spiritual power inherent in their orders. There was thus a certain amount of confusion in the terms which were used. Even so, it seems clear enough that, whereas in the Catholic conception, *real powers* were conferred in ordination which were not possessed before,¹ in the Lutheran idea, what was conferred was, not *powers*, but the *right or authority to exercise* them. We shall later on call attention to the significant fact that the Anglican Ordination rite uses the term "authority" precisely where one would expect the term "power," and that this substitution occurs particularly in phrases in which the Pontifical rite uses "power." This in itself is an indication that the ideas underlying the Anglican rite are Lutheran rather than Catholic.

¹ Jurisdiction, or authority to exercise power, on the other hand, is not given precisely by ordination.

CHAPTER VI

LUTHERAN ORDINATION RITES

Having explained the ideas of the Lutherans on the Christian ministry, we shall now proceed to show how they expressed these in new Ordination rites, from which *all reference to the power to sacrifice was expunged*, and which were, owing to the needs of the time, administered for the most part by “presbyters.”

1. We have already mentioned the general direction as to ordinations drawn up by Luther in 1523 (see p. 142). He very soon put these ideas into practice himself.

He seems to have done so for the first time in 1525 in the case of a George Rorcr, called to the archdiaconate of Wittenberg. The ordination took place “with imposition of hands and prayer.”¹

In 1527, superintendents were appointed in the Lutheran churches, by the Saxon Visitation.

Nevertheless, at Augsburg in 1530, Luther made it plain that he would not object to coming to terms with the Catholic bishops, provided they would undertake to help to administer his Evangel. In this case they “would be free to appoint clerics to the parishes and pulpits.” But as they clung to the Old Faith, he called them “foes of God,” and spoke of their “anti-Christian bishopry,” etc.²

Accordingly, the new Protestant ordinations continued. And in 1535 we read of the solemn ordination of a certain Johann, “examined by us and publicly ordained in the presence of our Church, with prayers and hymns.”³ In this year, 1535, the preachers and pastors sent out or officially recommended by Wittenberg were submitted to a searching examination on doctrine, and only after passing this and taking an oath as to the future could they receive their commission. The examination is referred to in the certificate of ordination.

The existence of this Lutheran ministry became known to

* Grisar, *Luther*, v, p. 190.

• Grisar, vi, 329, referring to Weimar edition, xxx, 2, p. 339 *et seq.*

• Grisar, vi, p. 265.

the Catholic authorities, for in 1535 Pope Paul III dispatched a nuncio, Vergerio, to Germany, to prepare for the proposed General Council. He' went to Wittenberg and interviewed Luther, who admitted that at Wittenberg they ordained priests, and that Pastor Bugenhagen "was the bishop appointed for that work ; he ordained as St. Paul had taught" ; all in vain had the "most holy bishops of the Papists" refused to ordain the Lutheran preachers II

2. Some sort of ordination rite was thus already in existence. But the earliest printed Lutheran ordination service is dated 1539, and is in two forms, as follows :a

I.

Formula ordinandorum ministrorum verbi,

i. Examinatione facta ordinandi sunt. Commendetur et petatur pro eo et universo ministerio ab ecclesia publica oratione, ut Deus in messem suam multos et Christi fideles operarios mittere dignetur, pro sanctificatione nominis sui, pro augmento regni coelorum, et pro salute omnium populorum, et ut eos puros et constantes servet in sana doctrina, contra portas inferorum, contra vim mundi etc. quia res maxima est, et necessaria cunctis ecclesiis, ministerium verbi et a solo Deo miserante datum et conservandum.

Post flexis coram altari genibus cum ordinatore et ministris seu presbyteris ecclesiae, cantet chorus :

Veni sancte spiritus.

V. Cor mundum crea in me Deus,

R. Et spiritum rectum innova in visceribus meis.

Vel V. Emitte spiritum tuum, etc.

cum collecta De Spiritu Sancto.

Ordinator ascendat gradum, et verso ad ordinandos vultu, dicat:

S. Paulus dicit, omnis creatura Dei bona est et sanctificatur per verbum et orationem. Vos autem cum sitis non solum creatura Dei sed etiam jamdudum sanctificati per verbum et sacramento baptismi, vocatione Dei sancta et prima, nunc etiam vocatione altera ad sanctum et divinum ministerium, quo per vos multi alii vocentur, sanctificentur ut lucrificent verbo et opere vestro, intelligentes ex hoc ipso, quod sancte et digne sanctis istis vocationibus vestris agere vos oportet, in primis, ut ipsi sitis sani in fide, puri in verbo, irreprehensibiles in conversatione, ut et doctrina et via (sitis) boni dispensatores mysteriorum Dei, et utiles Christo ministri inveniamini in illo die Domini.

Verum, ut et nos officium nostrum quod nobis impositum est, impertiamus, quo magis vos nobiscum et nos vobiscum

¹ Grisar, iii, p. 425-8.

² Sehling, *Die Evangelischen kirchenordnungm des xviijahrh*, I, i, p. 26.

sanctificemur, addimus et nostrum verbum et orationem, sicut scriptum est: Qui sanctus est sanctificetur adhuc.

Paulus ad Timoth : "Fidelis servus qui episcopum . . ." usque in finem paragraphi, "et laqueum diaboli," vel si placet, ultra.

Et illud Act. xx : "Attendite ergo " usque " sanguine suo acquisivit," vel plura si libet.

Hic auditis non commendari vos pecore, boves vel porcos, sed ecclesiam Dei viventis suo sanguine proprio partam, quod etiam de manibus vestris et nostris requirat in die novissimo.

Tunc, impositis manibus in caput ipsorum ab ordinatore et presbyteris, dicat ordinator,

Pater noster.

Et addatur haec oratio. . . J

Tunc abeant unusquisque in locum suum, ordinati autem primi cum ecclesia nostra communicent.

Si placet, cantetur, "*Nu bitten wir den heilig geist.*"

Tunc procedat mox officium missae.

II.

Forma ordinationis latina, qua usurpatur quando peregrini accedente ordinationis petenda causa, germanicam linguam non intelligunt.

Paulus apostolus describens quales esse episcopi debeant, sic ait in cap. 3, 1 Tim. :

"Indubitus sermo . . . inculpati."

Alio in loco,² idem Paulus communefacit seniores in ecclesia Ephesi his verbis :

"Attendite igitur . . . vestrum."

Audistis gravissimam commonefactionem apostoli, ex qua intelligimus, nobis qui vocati sumus, ut episcopi, hoc est confectionatores et pastores simus, non commendari pascendum gregem anserum aut porcorum, sed ecclesiam quam Deus sanguine suo redemit, ut eam pascamus verbo Dei incorrupto, vigilemus quoque et attendamus studiose caventes ne lupi et sectarii irruant in miseris oves. Ideo Paulus nominat episcopatum bonum opus.

Quod ad nos privatim attinet, jubemur caste et honeste vivere, et nostrum domum, conjugem, liberos et familiam modeste et pie tractare et regere.

Haec vos factururus esse pro virile, clara voce hic in publico promitte :

Dicatis, Promitto.

Imponite manus.

Oremus conjunctis precibus.

Pater noster.

Clementissime Deus, aeternae pater domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui per os dilecti filii tui domini nostri Jesu Christi ad nos dixisti, "Messis quidem copiosa, operarii vero pauci . . . suam." Huic

¹ This prayer is in German, but the Latin form is given in the next ordination rite.

^a Acts xx, 28 ff.

tuo mandato divino obsequentes, toto pectore oramus, ut hisce petentibus ab hac ecclesia confirmationem suae vocationis, et nobis et universis vocatis ad ministerium verbi tui, spiritum sanctum tuum benigne digneris largiri, quo possimus esse magno numero consociati fideles et constantes ministri evangelii tui, muniti et roborati ope tua et praesidio adversus diabolum, mundum et carnem, ut per nos quamvis indignos et imbecilles tamen sanctificetur nomen tuum, augeatur regnum tuum, et fiant aliqua tibi grata et multis salutaria.

Velis etiam potenter reprimere et cito prorsus abolere tetram abominationem papisticam et Mahometicam et aliarum sectarum furores, quae sanctum nomen tuum blasphemant, regnum tuum destruere conantur, et voluntati tuae contumaciter se opponunt.

Has nostras preces, quas a Te edocti et jussi et spe impetrandi rogata confirmati, ad Te cum ardentibus gemitibus effundimus, velis mitissime Pater, clementer exaudiri, sicut freti tua veraci promissione. Te facturum credimus, et certe confidimus, propter dilectum filium tuum dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, qui una cum Spiritu Sancto tecum vivit et regnat per saecula saeculorum. Amen.

Nunc igitur, abeuntes juxta praeceptum Petri apostoli, pascite gregem Christi eum qui vobis commissus est, curam illius diligentem agentes, non coacte sed sponte et volentes, neque turpis lucri gratia . . . gloriae coronam.

Benedicat vobis dominus, ut faciatus fructum multum. Amen.

3. Luther's general ordination rite was used very widely, with certain local modifications.

An interesting variant is found in the ordination rite of the Hessian Reformed Church, as given by Richter² :

"The Church shall be assembled, and all shall pray in common for the elect. . . . Then the elect shall be set in the midst, and three at least shall lay hands on each of them . . . of whom one shall say, with a loud voice : 'Receive the Holy Ghost, whose sins thou shalt remit,' etc., or else, 'Receive the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, Whatsoever thou shalt bind, etc.'"

These injunctions come from the Landgrave Philip of Hesse, who, as we know, was in close relations with Martin Bucer and the other reformers.

4. In some other places, it seems that at first the Pontifical continued to be used, but even so, some important modifications were made. Thus, at Brandenburg, where the Bishop had gone over to the Lutheran party, the Ecclesiastical Constitution of 1539 specified that « abuses are to be suppressed, *especially the saying 'Accipe potestatem legendi Evangelium pro vivis et defunctis' . . . and also the saying * Accipe potestatem offerendi sacrificium pro*

vivis et defunctis? which is contrary to the main article of our Christian faith.”¹

5. Melancthon gives us the ordination rite at Wittenberg in letter n. 4409 (19th Nov., 1548). It consists of eight parts :

(1) Examination of candidates, to see if they are capable of defending the true doctrine against the gates of hell ;

(2) kneeling before the altar, the ordainer and his assistants sing the *Veni Creator*, while the ordinands are in the choir ;

(3) the officiant goes to the altar, and, turning towards the ordinands, recites over them 1 Timothy iii and Ephes, i. 15 *et seq.* ;

(4) allocution asking if they are willing to consecrate themselves to the divine service ;

(5) laying-on of hands, with recitation of the *Pater Noster* and another prayer ;

(6) allocution on 1 Peter v. ;

(7) blessing with sign of the cross on their head, with a formula;

(8) singing of the *Pater Noster* and communion.

6. We have said sufficient to show that the Lutheran churches had no rooted objection to episcopacy, or even to Catholic bishops, provided they would become Lutherans. But if they remained faithful to the Catholic Church, then if necessary, the Lutheran communities were prepared to create bishops or superintendents of their own. The ordination rites we have so far given are those for ordaining Lutheran “presbyters.” Here is a Lutheran rite for the “consecration” of a Lutheran bishop. It was drawn up by one of Luther’s assistants, Bugenhagen, for use in Denmark and Norway, and was officially adopted in those countries in 1537. Bugenhagen himself consecrated the first bishops for Denmark by this rite :

Lecta epistola in Missa, aliquis praedicator vel praepositus . . . dicit populo, N. esse electum in Superattendentem, pium virum, industrium, modestum, doctum, etc. Ideo se admonere ut orent pro eo et verbi ministerio, *Pater noster*, etc.

Mox canitur *Veni, Sancte*, etc. . . .

Ordinator . . . jubet primum orari, *Pater noster*, ut adsit Deus huic negotio. Mox surgens et stans, commendat brevibus. Ministerium verbi sanctissimum, utilissimum, necessarium, etc.

Inde canitur Psalmus, Domine Dominus noster, etc. Ex quo mox unum et alterum versum Ordinator interpretatur brevissime. . . .

¹ Daniel, *Cod Lilurg, Eccl. Lulh.t* 524.

Mox legit Superintendenti officia ipsius . . . et postea mandat ei ut sincere doceat Evangelium, id est, remissionem peccatorum et vitam aeternam in Christo Jesu filio Dei solum ; item, de caritate, cruce, poenitentia, magistratu, obedientia ex verbo Dei, item, de sacramentis ex Christi institutione, non aliud aut aliter. Promittis ? Respondet, Promitto. Ordinator addit: Da dexteram; et ille dat.

Sequitur statim Psalmus qui canitur, Ecce nunc benedicite Domino, etc.

Post psalmum, dicit Ordinator : “ Vobis pastoribus canitur hic Psalmus. . . . ”

Et perget, sic dicens : “ Hactenus cecinimus sacra cantica et Psalmos, commendantes officium verbi; nunc de eodem audiamus, et sacras lectiones.”

Hic aliquis ex presbyteris recitet lectionem : Sic dicit Paulus Episcopo : Tit. i. 5-16.

Secundus presbyter statim recitet lectionem alteram : Actorum xx. 25-37.

Tertius presbyter mox subjungit tertiam lectionem, II Tim. iv. 1-5.

Post has lectiones, Ordinator dicit: Haec omnia admonent officii sui praedicatores et simul declarant quam placeat Deo hoc officium, et necessarium sit Ecclesiae. Nam per praedicatorem suum Christus ipse praedicat, baptizat, dat sacramentum, arguit, exhortatur, consolatur. . . . Pergit vero sic dicens : Post haec omnia scire debetis omnes quod haec ordinatio sanctificatur per haec duo, nempe, per verbum et orationem. . . . Verbum apostolicum audistis. . . . Nunc ergo, ut perficiatur haec sanctificatio, addamus et alterum, nempe orationem. . . . Orationi etiam addebant Apostoli et Seniores Ecclesiae manuum impositionem, cum ordinarent vel mitterent praedicatores, ut vides in Actis. Quem morem susceperunt postea Ecclesiae Christi ab Apostolis, quemadmodum Paulus hortatur Episcopum, dicens, “ Manus ne cito alicui imponas.” De praedicatoribus et doctoribus ecclesiarum haec dicuntur, *non de Missariis*. . . . Hoc ergo et nos, ab Apostolis docti, hic faciemus, in nomine Domini nostri Jesu Christi.

Hic Ordinator, cum presbyteris et senioribus, imponit capiti ejus manus, et dicit aperte :

Oremus, Pater noster, etc. Et addit:

Omnipotens aeternae Pater, qui ita nos docuisti per unigenitum Filium tuum, unicum Magistrum nostrum, “ Messis est multa, operarii vero pauci, etc.” . . . quae verba nos admonent bonos operarios, id est, praedicatores et ecclesiarum doctores a tua gratia seria et fideli prece petendos : nos tuam immensam bonitatem precamur ut clementer respicias hunc famulum tuum quem ad episcopale ecclesiae officium eligimus, ut sit diligens in verbo tuo, ad praedicandum unicam nostram salutem Jesum Christum, ad docendas conscientias, ad consolandum, ad monendum, et arguendum cum omni patientia et doctrina, ita ut sacrosanctum Evangelium perpetuo apud nos duret, sincerum et sine fermento humanae doctrinae, et fructum ferat nobis omnibus aeternae salutis. Per eundem. . . . Amen.

158 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

Et statim canitur Danice, Nunc rogamus Spiritum Sanctum, propter fidem rectam maxime, etc.

Interim procumbit Ordinator coram altari, cum ordinato et aliis presbyteris, et orant, dum cantatur primus cantici versus. Deinde surgunt, et vadit quisque in locum suum, ut postea, cum aliis fidelibus, accipiant sacram Christi communionem in hac Domini Coena.¹

Here is the corresponding rite for the ordination of a presbyter :

Est autem ordinatio nihil aliud quam ritus ecclesiasticus, vocandi aliquem in ministerium verbi et sacramentorum. Nemo enim per se, non vocatus rite, subire ministerium in Ecclesia debet. . . .

Suscipiat electum presbyterum Superattendens in templum . . . et coram altari publice sic eum ordinet, hac ceremonia :

Primum, post lectam Epistolam in Missa, unus ex presbyteris ascendat suggestum, et dicat, illum virum N. . . . probatum ab Episcopo in doctrina sincera, nunc ordinandum ad hoc illius ecclesiae officium coram altari, sacra lectione, exhortatione, manuum impositione, et oratione. Idcirco exhortari se ut populus interim oret et commendet ministerium cum ministerio Deo. . . .

Deinde cantante schola Veni Sancte Spiritus . . . coram altari geniculatur ordinandus . . . et Superattendens stans ad altare, dicat Collectam "Deus qui corda fidelium Sancti Spiritus," etc. Deinde, versus ad populum, legat sacram lectionem de episcopis, ex Epistola ad Titum. . . . Post lectionem, pronat ordinando mandata *de Evangelio sincere predicando et de Sacramentis recte administrandis*; deinde ut recte doceat de poenitentia, de cruce, de magistratu et obedientia, de bonis operibus, et resistat Ser sanam doctrinam erroribus, et ut diligenter studeat sacris litteris, sit quoque assiduus in oratione. Ad quae omnia, aperta voce, coram omnibus respondeat se haec diligenter curaturum secundum gratiam Dei.

Deinde Episcopus sive Superattendens cum presbyteris imponat ordinando manus, et oret aperta voce, Pater noster, et addat Collectam ad hoc factam, et in fine jubeat totam ecclesiam respondere Amen.

Mox canitur "Nunc precamur Sanctum Spiritum." . . . Interim Superattendens geniculatur coram altari, et orat secreto. Finito vero primo versu cantici, surgit et stat altare versus, et simul surgunt alii presbyteri cum ordinato, et ordinatus accipit sibi locum non procul ab altari, ut accipiat communionem sacram."²

Thus, the Anglican rite is not at all peculiar in having a special rite for the "consecration" of a "bishop." And it is significant that this Ordination rite of Bugenhagen was set forth in a *Pia Ordinatio* presented apparently by Bugenhagen himself to King Henry VIII in the year 1537, and that according to

¹ Kidd, *Documents*, pp. 332-4.

² Kidd, *Documents*, pp. 330-332.

Wickham Legg, it was from this same volume that Cranmer derived the basis for his new service of Matins and Evensong.¹

7. It is interesting to note that in the ordination certificates given to the new ministers, Luther claimed that his community was *the Catholic Church*, and his doctrine *the Catholic Faith*! Thus, in the certificate of Heinrich Bock, sent to Reval in Livonia, dated May 17th, 1540, and signed by Luther, Bugenhagen, Justus Jonas, and Melanchthon, it is stated that he "adheres to the consensus of the Catholic Church of Christ,"² and a similar certificate for the schoolmaster Johann Fischer declares that his doctrine had been found to be in accordance with the Catholic doctrine of the Evangel as professed by the Wittenbergers.³ The same certificates say that Luther, Bugenhagen, Jonas, and Melanchthon "have entrusted the persons named with the ministry of the Church, that he may preach the Gospel and dispense the sacraments instituted by Christ." The certificate of Fischer states that he had been called by the people, who had asked that "his call might be confirmed by public ordination, and this had been done when it was clear that he held the pure Catholic doctrine, and rejected all the fanatical opinions which the Catholic Church of Christ rejects."⁴ It is also noteworthy that the pastor of Wittenberg and others say they undertook the ordination because "we may not refuse to do our duty to the neighbouring churches, for the Nicene Council made the godly rule that ordination should be requested of the neighbouring churches."⁵

Thus the claiming to the word "Catholic," and the appeal to early Councils, was not confined to Anglican Reformers, but was common to the Continental Protestants.

8. Soon after 1540, a further step was taken by the Lutherans in the appointment of "bishops." An opportunity occurred when the Catholic see of Naumburg-Zeitz fell vacant. Johann Frederick, the Elector, determined to appoint a Lutheran preacher as bishop, and quoted the fact that the Kings of England, Denmark and Sweden had set their bishops in order. The two latter countries had done so by means of Bugenhagen's rite already referred to.⁶ After some discussion, Nicholas

¹ *Cranmer's Liturgical Projects*, p. xxxiv.

² *Ibid.*, p. 35, dated April 18th, 1540.

³ Grisar, vi, 313-4.

⁴ Grisar, v, 190 *et seq.*, referring to Janssens, *History of the German People*, English edn., vi, x8x *et seq.*

⁵ *Briefwechsel*, 13, p. 57.

⁶ *Briefwechsel*, 13, p. 35.

Arnsdorf, a Lutheran preacher of Magdeburg, was chosen, and the ceremony of "consecration" was performed by Luther himself in the Cathedral of Naumburg on Jan. 20th, 1542 :

"ostensibly according to the usage of the earliest ages, when the Church had not as yet fallen away from the Gospel. The blessing and imposition of hands were to signify that the Church of Naumburg, i.e., the whole flock, was wedded to its bishop ; he, too, in like manner, would ceremonially proclaim his readiness to take charge of this same flock. The bishops of the adjoining sees, who, in accordance with the custom of antiquity, should have assembled to perform the consecration, were represented by three superintendents and one apostate Abbot. . . . At the outset of the ceremony, Nicholas Medler (superintendent at Naumburg) announced the deed which was about to be undertaken * through God's grace,' to which the people assented by saying * Amen.' After this, Luther preached a sermon on the text . . . 'Take heed to yourselves, and to the whole flock, in which the Holy Ghost hath placed you bishops * (Acts xx. 28). After the sermon, Arnsdorf knelt before the altar, surrounded by the four assistants, and the 'Veni Creator' was sung. Luther admonished the future bishop concerning his episcopal duties, and on the latter giving a satisfactory answer, in common with the four others, laid his hands on his head ; after this Luther himself offered a prayer for him. The 'Te Deum' was then sung in German."¹

Luther shortly afterwards wrote a work in justification of his act, under the title "Exempel einen rechten Christlichen Bischoff zu weihen."² It begins as follows :

"Martin Luther, Doctor. We poor heretics have once more committed a great sin against the hellish unchristian church of our most fiendish father the Pope, by ordaining and consecrating a bishop for the see of Naumburg without any chrism, without even any butter, lard, fat, grease, incense, charcoal, or any such-like holy things."

Four years later, i.e., in 1544, Luther appointed a bishop also at Merseburg, namely, George of Anhalt. In the ceremony of consecrating this new bishop, Luther was assisted by Justus Jonas and others, and the rite of Naumburg was repeated. In 1546 two more Lutheran priests were ordained by the Reformer "in the apostolic way."³

9. However, before we leave this subject, we would stress the fact that in spite of the irregularity of these proceedings—an irregularity which it was claimed was necessitated by circumstances—the Lutherans claimed, in a sense, an Apostolic

¹ *Grisar*, v, p. 191 *et seq.*
• *Werke* Walch's ed., xxi, p. 282.

• *Werke*, Erl. ed., xxvi, ii, pp. 93ff.

succession for their “evangelical” ministry inaugurated in this way. This is made clear in the Latin Catechism of Justus Jonas, Luther’s fellow reformer, written in 1539 and apparently based upon the German Smaller Catechism of Luther himself. This Catechism is of special interest because it was translated into English by Cranmer. We give extracts from it later on.¹

¹ See pp. 369-370.

CHAPTER VII

MARTIN BUCER

1. The next Continental Reformer we must mention is *Marlin Bucer*. He became a Dominican in 1506, and was in due course ordained priest, but in 1521 became a secular. The next year he married a nun, and in 1523 went to Strassburg. He had a few years previously become a disciple of Luther, together with his friend Mclanchthon. But when the dispute broke out between Luther and Zwingli, Bucer seems to have sided with the latter. At the same time, he endeavoured to make peace between the two opponents, by suggesting various ambiguous formulæ to which he hoped they would both agree. His own ideas on the Eucharist were set forth from time to time in the form of "propositions." Thus, he published nine propositions in 1530 :

1. We deny transubstantiation.
2. We deny that the body of Christ is locally in the bread. . . .
3. We affirm that the body of Christ is really in the Supper, and that Christ actually present feeds us with His real body and His real blood, using for this purpose His own words which the ministers recite, and the holy signs of bread and wine.
4. As by baptism there is the power of regeneration so the very body and blood of Christ are "exhibited" (*exhiberi*) by the symbols of the Eucharist.
6. He is really and actually present in the Supper . . . through symbols that are received by faith.¹

The combination of realistic language with symbolical interpretation here is very manifest.

Dr. Darwell Stone explains his doctrine as follows :

"Like Luther, he asserted that the communicant received the body and blood of Christ. Like Zwingli, he denied that the body and blood are united to the sacramental signs. His own view appears to have been that *the communicants receive in the Sacrament only bread and wine*, but that *their faith*, when they receive the elements, *uplifts* them to a real spiritual participation of the body and blood of Christ *in heaven*."²

¹ *Scripta Anglicana*, 611.

² *History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, ii, 44. Italics ours.

Also, we note the use in the above formula of Bucer's favourite term "exhibited." Indeed, three years later, he writes :

"In all my writings I bear witness that there is specially in the Holy Supper an 'exhibition' (*exhibitionem*) of the body and blood of Christ, which is most real because it is heavenly and spiritual. . . . The bread is shown and given to the senses, and at the same time the Body of the Lord, that is, the communion of the Lord, is 'exhibited' and given (*exhibetur et traditur*) to faith."¹

2. Bucer's doctrine remained the same throughout his life, as the following extract from a statement put forth by him just before his death will show. Here again we shall find the term "exhibited"² :

"18. Scripture must agree with itself, and therefore the texts which say that Christ dwells in us and that we eat Him must agree with those which say that He is in heaven, and hath a body and is therefore limited and bound in one place.

"19. And may not be placed in all or many places at one time.

"20. Hence Christ's presence whether in the word or in the sacraments is no presence of place, neither of senses nor of reason, nor yet no earthly presence, but a spiritual presence, a presence of faith, and a heavenly presence, forasmuch as we are conveyed into heaven by faith.

"21. The antichrists make the simple people to believe by these words that we receive and have Christ here present alter some worldly fashion, that is to say, either enclosed with the bread and wine, or else that He is present under their accidents, so that there He ought to be honoured and worshipped.

"22. Let them be taught that there is no presence of Christ in the supper, but *only in the lawful use thereof*³ and such as is obtained and gotten by faith only.

"25. He offereth Himself, *being in heaven*, to be received by us.

"33. I define or determine Christ's presence, howsoever we perceive it, either by the sacraments or by the word of the Gospel, to be only the attaining and perceiving of the commodities we have by Christ . . . dwelling and living in us. Which presence we . . . have by faith.

"39. Christ is present *realiter* and *substantialiter* if one would understand by the presence of the Lord really and substantially, that He is received verily indeed by faith, and his substance is given in the sacrament, but if he would interlace any worldly presence with these words I will deny it, because the Lord is departed this world.

"45. The bread and wine be *signs exhibitwe*, that is to say, such signs as do give the things signified . . . after the same manner

¹ *Scripta Anglicana*, p. 612.

• Sententious sayings of Master Bucer : Strype's *Cranmer*, app. xlv.

• Italics ours.

as He gave His disciples the Holy Ghost by the sign of breathing of His mouth.

"50. 'This is my body' means 'The thing which by this sign I give unto you is my body.'

"52. Three things are given and received in the Lord's supper of them that rightly communicate. . . . First bread and wine, *nothing in themselves changed*, but that they are, by the words and ordinance of the Lord, made all only the signs. Secondly, the self body and blood of the Lord. . . . Thirdly, the establishing of the New Testament of the forgiveness of sins.

Subscribed. Martin Bucerus, D. Prof. Theol., Cambridge."

3. Bucer, of course, denied the Catholic doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass, and wrote several treatises against it. The following passages will define his attitude :

"They do a horrible injury to the Divine Majesty, who turn the sacrament of the Eucharist into a sacrifice for the living and the dead, and do not dispense it to those present, and even when they do so, only distribute one-half of it."¹

Later on, in connection with the Reformation at Cologne, we shall quote other passages showing that he rejected entirely the Catholic doctrine of the Mass.

4. He gave practical expression to his views, by advocating and assisting in the abolition of the Mass, first at Berne in 1528, when after a discussion in which he took an active part, the Council decreed that :

"All Masses, altars, statues, and whatever was a source of superstition contrary to the word of God, must be abolished at once."

The next year, 1529, the Mass was, at Bucer's instigation, abolished also at Strassburg by the civil authority.

5. Naturally enough, like all the Reformers, Continental and English, Bucer felt the urge to compose a new Communion service, to take the place of the hated Mass. He outlines the form a Communion service should take, in his *Epitome of Christian Doctrine*² :

"The minister is to prepare the communicants by a doctrinal instruction, taken from Scripture. Then the faithful are to offer gifts for the poor.³ Next, the minister is to utter a prayer of thanksgiving, in language which can be understood by all present, for all God's benefits, and especially for the gift of His Son. To this

¹ *De ordinatione legitima*, in *Scripta Anglicana*, p. 248.

² *Scripta Anglicana*, p. 179.

³ Bucer elsewhere explains that it was from this custom of offering gifts for the poor that the Mass came to be called a "sacrifice" in the works of the Fathers ! (See *Centura on English Prayer Book*, p. 463.)

thanksgiving are to be joined public prayers and petitions. Then the minister is to consecrate and celebrate the memorial of the Lord, in the Lord's own words, and exhort the faithful to a pious reception of the sacrament, and then distribute it to them. Finally, the function should conclude with praise and thanksgiving."

Here, again, is the form which Bucer drew up for administering the Supper to the sick :

"A passage from the gospel is read, and then follows a long homily. Then a prayer, then the Our Father, then an exhortation to the sick person. Then the 'institution,' in these words :

Audite et attendite, corde fideli, quomodo Dominus sanctum suum Sacramentum instituerit, nobisque ejus usum mandaverit. In ea nocte que Dominus traditus est, etc. His verbis praelectis, accipiat panem et gustet ante, tum det aegrotis ac reliquis, et inter distribuendum dicat, 'Accipe, igitur, vera fide corpus Domini, verum sacrificium pro peccatis tuis, ad vitam aeternam.' Similiter distribuatur et calicem, dicatque 'Accipe quoque vera fide sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu Christi, satisfactionem pro peccatis tuis et confirmationem novi aeternique testamenti, gratiae et adoptionis Dei, ad vitam aeternam, et gratias ei sempiternas age.' "x

In these forms we note that a "prayer of thanksgiving, with petitions for all men," takes the place of the old Canon of the Mass. It is also to be noted that the words of institution are recited to the faithful present, to remind them of what happened in the past, rather than to consecrate the bread and wine present. In the form for giving communion, the person is told to receive the Body and Blood "with true faith." But this of course does not imply any objective Real Presence. For Bucer teaches that the bread and wine remain unchanged, but those who receive them with faith partake also of the Body and Blood, though these are not naturally in the bread and wine :

"Nec cum pane et vino naturaliter miscetur, nec localiter eis includitur, verum se hic nobis modo coelesti dat in cibum."²

6. The general outline of a Communion Service given by Bucer took various forms in practice. The following particulars of the Strassburg service in 1524 are given in *Liturgy and Worship*, p. 141, from Hubert, *Die Strassburger liturgischen Ordnungen* (Göttingen, 1900) :

☩ Confession with 1 Tim. i. 15 ; Mark ix. 24 as an absolution ; Introit, Kyrie, Gloria, Epistle, Alleluia, Gospel, Sermon, and Nicene Creed ; the setting forth of the elements without prayer but with an admonition to self-oblation (Rom. xii. 1)—Orate fratres, Dominus vobiscum. Sursum corda, Preface, Sanctus, Benedictus ; a Canon consisting of intercession followed by

¹ *Scripta Anglicana*, p. 368.

² *Scripta Anglicana*, p. 180.

commemoration of redemption and prayer for its fruits. *Qui pridie* and elevation of the chalice and thanksgiving for forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Eucharist; the Lord's Prayer with a *Libera nos, Agnus Dei*; Communion preceded by *Domine Jesu Christe Fili Dei* and followed by a hymn, *Quod ore sumpsimus* and the Blessing.

So far the traditional structure and much of the contents of the Mass in a German version are followed with considerable closeness ; but almost immediately alteration began, and before the end of the year Bucer and his fellow divines described the service as consisting of Confession and Absolution, Psalm or Hymn, a short Prayer, Epistle with Exposition, Decalogue or other song, Gospel, Sermon, Creed, Intercession with prayer for grace, and commemoration of the Passion (no doubt, as in the subsequent service books, concluding with the Lord's Prayer), exhortation, the Institution (no longer in the form of *Qui pridie* addressed to God, but in that of a *lesson from the Gospels* or *I Cor. xi addressed to the people*). Communion, Hymn or Psalm, short prayer, and Blessing. Further, within a few years the Epistle has vanished, and a Psalm or Hymn may take the place of the Creed."²

7. Next we come to Bucer's ideas on the *Ministry* and *Ordination*. The latest exposition of his ideas on the ministry in general will be found in Courvoisier, *La notion d'Eglise chez Bucer dans son developpement historique* (Paris, 1933), a thesis presented to the University at Strassburg. In this work the author traces the development of Bucer's thought and shows how from the first he rejected the Catholic conception of the priest as a mediator between God and man. A layman can work for the Lord, and the Lord Himself was a layman. All believers are equally priests. But, like Luther, Bucer soon found it necessary to institute some kind of hierarchical ministry. The priestly power of the keys still belongs fundamentally to the Community as such, but it is the ministers who exercise this power. Such were Bucer's views in 1536. Two years later, in 1538, we get a further development, in the form of a division of the presbyteral office, into the bishop and the other presbyters. A bishop is the chief presbyter, "*primus inter pares*" who presides and commands "in the place of and in the name of the whole Council of Presbyters."³

Thus, while Bucer was still at Strassburg, he had gradually evolved a threefold hierarchy, of bishop, presbyters, and deacons. But a bishop was not essentially distinct from the other presbyters, but merely their president. A second point must be emphasized. The function of the Christian ministry, as conceived by Bucer,

¹ Hubert, p. Ixix.

• Hubert, *op. cit.*, p. 97.

• *Ibid.*, p. 102.

is not a sacrificial function* but the administration of the Word and the sacraments together with Christian discipline. Deacons as such were charged especially with looking after the poor.

Some details of Bucer's hierarchical ideas may be of interest, in view of his influence upon English reformers.

On page 280 of the *De vera animarum cura** written in 1538, he criticises St. Jerome's idea that at the beginning all presbyters governed the Church in common, and that only later was one presbyter set over the rest as a bishop. Bucer justly remarks that in all the principal churches, from the time of the Apostles, there was one presbyter chosen as the leader and president,

“dux et antistites, qui caeteris omnibus praeivit, et curam animarum ministeriumque episcopale praecipue et summo in gradu gessit atque administravit.”

Here is another defence of episcopacy, from the same work of 1538 :

“ [The institution of one supreme presbyter as bishop strictly so called] has always been observed in all churches, so far as we have been able to gather from all ecclesiastical histories, and the most ancient fathers. . . . Moreover, this is also called for by the necessity of human things, for in all matters which have to be administered by several persons, it is necessary to appoint one or a few, who may preside over the others, and speak and do all things in the name of the rest (*omnia agant reliquorum nomine*), . . . And that all things might be done in order and fruitfully, the presbyters, together with the Church, as I have said, always chose and ordained, either from among themselves or from outside, some superior, who, like the consuls in the cities, should have the supreme care of the Church, and should have the supreme inspection over all the ministries and affairs of the Church, in order that these should be well administered, and these also in particular had special charge of teaching, exhortation, and discipline, acting in the name of the whole Church and with the counsel of the presbyters. On account of this duty of supreme inspection they called this person ‘Bishop,* that is, ‘Overseer.’ And so we now see what grades of minister the Lord has always used in most of His Churches. . . . And therefore in all well-ordered Churches, ministers of these kinds will be instituted.”

We note here that bishops are in every way desirable, and have been found in most Churches, and in all well-ordered ones. The implication is, of course, that there may be Churches without bishops, but they will not be “well-ordered.”

Other passages on the subject might be quoted from works which Bucer wrote after he came to England, but they simply repeat more or less what he says in the above.

8. Just as Bucer's notions of the Eucharist expressed themselves in a new Communion service, so also his new notions of the Christian ministry expressed themselves in a *new Ordination rite*.

We have seen that it was in 1538 that Bucer set forth his scheme of the Christian ministry, with its three degrees. The same work gives a statement of how an ordination rite should be carried out, in accordance with the model of the primitive Church :

"The ancient Churches ever had the custom of setting forth the elect ministers before the whole multitude of the faithful. . . . If after that exhibition the elect were approved, then there was preached to them and to the whole Church a diligent sermon concerning the ecclesiastical ministry, that is to say, how the ordained are to act towards the Church, and in turn, how the Church is to behave towards them. Afterwards there were made ardent prayers, oblations were made for the needy, the Lord's Supper was celebrated, and so the elected ones were consecrated as it were in the presence of the Lord and by Him, and were confirmed in the good administration of this ministry by the help of the Holy Ghost. This rite of the Church derived its origin from the custom of the Apostles, and was faithfully observed so long as the Churches were ruled by true bishops."

Then he continues :

"Now, alas ! the ' Pontificii ' have turned all this into an empty and idolatrous ceremony. But amongst ourselves, who have taken upon ourselves to reform matters, care and zeal in choosing and constituting ministers of the Church is still, unfortunately, far removed from the care and zeal of the Apostles and of the ancient Churches. The Lord grant us that whatsoever is still to be desired may be truly known by us, and that we may carefully correct the same."

However, we know that ordinations took place at Strassburg, for Bucer describes the "ordination" of members of his reformed Collegiate Church of St. Thomas, as consisting in a "*solennitas apostolica, cum impositione manuum presbyterii*."³ And the "*Lex municipalis senatus argentinensis de conferendis sacerdotiis*," in the drafting of which Bucer had a hand, similarly says that "*presbyteri ecclesiae*" are those to whom the Church has given the "*supremum munus sacra dispensandi et curam animarum procurandi*," and these are to be ordained as Paul and Barnabas ordained presbyters, "*electione scilicet et compro-*

* *Scripta Anglicana*, p. 293.

• *Ibid.*

Scripta Anglicana, p. 206.

batione totius ecclesiae, et adhibita gravi precatione cum jejuniis.”¹

And again, we have the statement in the *De Regno Christi*, written by Bucer for Edward VI in 1550, that ministers are to be ordained by the laying-on of hands, as was done in the early ages of the Church, and has at this present time been reintroduced in “restitutis ecclesiis.” Also, since ministers are to be ordained in the presence of the whole Church, “it is fitting that the relevant passages of Scripture should be read and explained at the ordination ceremony, so that the people may pray more fervently.”²

All this explains the fact that when Bucer came to England, he brought with him and submitted to Cranmer his own Ordination rite,³ which Cranmer took as his basis when composing his own new Ordination service for the Reformed Church of England.

We shall have more to say about Bucer, in connection with the Reformation at Cologne, and in our chapters on Edward VI.

¹ *Scripta Anglicana*, p. 231.

² *Ibid*, p. 40.

³ Bucer's Ordination rite is printed in extenso in Latin, with Cranmer's English rite in parallel columns, in my *Lutheran Origin of the Anglican Ordinal*, London, 1934.

CHAPTER VIII

ZWINGLI

1. We have already had occasion to mention who started a rival Reformation in Switzerland, and who quarrelled so bitterly with Luther. His Reformation may be said to have begun in 1523, with the issue of his 67 Articles, and a Defence of them. The eighteenth article was as follows :

“Christ, who offered Himself once for all (*einmal*) on the Cross, is the perpetual and effectual sacrifice and victim for the sins of all believers. Wherefore the Mass is not a sacrifice, but a commemoration of the sacrifice offered on the Cross once for all, and a token of the redemption set forth (*bewiesen, exhibita*) by Christ.”¹

Zwingli, in his explanation of this article, says that the offering of Christ on the Cross was impaired by the saying of Catholics that as we daily sin, we must offer the sacrifice of the altar daily.² In the Lord's Supper, Christ gives us His flesh as food, and His blood as drink. But the bread is only the “figure of the body” and the wine the “figure of the blood.” Note the combination here of realistic with symbolical language. But “Christ's body and blood are the food of the soul when it firmly believes that the body and blood of Christ are its salvation.” “The body and blood of Christ are nothing else than the word

1 Christus, qui sese semel in cruce obtulit, hostia est et victima satisfaciens in æternum pro peccatis omnium fidelium. Ex quo colligitur missam non esse sacrificium, sed sacrificii in cruce semel oblati commemorationem et quasi sigillum redemptionis per Christum exhibitæ.

Here we have undoubtedly the original source of the famous English Article 31 (see p. 549).

For purposes of comparison, here is the thesis on the Mass defended by the Zwinglians in a disputation at Berne in 1528 :

“Missa, ut hodie in usu est, in qua Christus Deo Patri offertur pro peccatis vivorum et mortuorum, Scripturæ est contraria, in sanctissimum sacrificium passionem et mortem Christi blasphema, et propter abusus coram Deo abominabilis.” (Thesis 5.)

Cf. also Thesis 4 on the Real Presence :

“Quod corpus et sanguis Christi essentialiter et corporaliter in pane Eucharistiæ percipiatur, ex Scriptura Sacra non potest demonstrari.” (Kidd, *Documents*, p. 460.)

* He does not, however, attribute to Catholics the doctrine that Christ on the Cross atoned only for original sin.

of faith, namely, that His body which died for us and His blood which was shed for us on the Cross, redeemed us.”¹

2. In subsequent works, Zwingli made his denial of the Real Presence more explicit still. Thus, in his *Nature of the Faith* addressed to Charles V in 1531 :

“ In the Holy Eucharist, the real body of Christ is present by the contemplation of faith, that is, those who give thanks to the Lord for the benefit conferred on us in His Son recognise that He took real flesh, that in it He really suffered, that He really washed away our sins by His blood, so that everything done by Christ becomes as it were present to them by the contemplation of faith. But that the body of Christ, that is the natural body itself, essentially and actually is either present in the Supper, or committed to our mouth and teeth as the papists and certain others maintain, this we deny.”²

Or again :

“ The opinion which asserts that the body of Christ is eaten in the Supper corporally, naturally, essentially, is irreligious. . . . To eat the body of Christ spiritually is nothing else than to lean in spirit and mind on the mercy and goodness of God. . . . To eat the body of Christ sacramentally is to eat the body of Christ in mind and spirit, with the addition of the sacrament. . . . When you come to the Lord's Supper . . . and partake of the bread and wine which are now the symbolical body of Christ, you eat sacramentally.”³

3. In the above passages, and in many others that could be quoted, we notice a tendency to use realistic language, i.e., to allow that the faithful receive the Body and Blood of Christ *spiritually* in the Supper, that the Body and Blood are present in the Eucharist *spiritually*, and *to the contemplation of faith*, etc.—and at the same time we notice that the subsequent explanations *empty these phrases of their real significance*. The fact is that, like all others, Zwingli felt compelled upon occasion to use realistic language, for this is found in the Scriptures themselves. But he is careful to explain that the language is only used *symbolically*. We call attention to this to show how unsafe it is to build upon isolated passages or phrases in the Reformation works or liturgies which seem at first sight to imply a “ Real Presence.” The context, or the explanations of their composers, will give the true meaning.

¹ *Opus Articulorum*, Art. xviii, *Opera*, ed. 1581, i. 37 : Corpus et sanguinem suum turn cibum animo fore quum animus certe credit corpus et sanguinem Christi suam esse salutem. . . . Hoc fieri per spiritum Dei, qui fidem hunc animu persuadet, per quam fidem homo vivit. --- Vides hic corpus et sanguinem Christi aliud nihil esse quam verbum fidei. --- Dum hoc firmiter credimus, animus noster aliter et reficitur corpore et sanguine Christi.

• *Opera*, ii, 541 ; Niemeyer, *Collectio Confessorij/m*, 72 sqq.

• *Opera*, ii, 555.

4. Like Luther, Zwingli expressed his new Eucharistic teaching in a new Communion service. This is appended to the Epistle to the Princes of Germany, written for presentation to the Conference at Augsburg in 1530.¹

5. Naturally, as Zwingli rejected the sacrifice of the Mass, he also rejected the sacrificing priesthood, and the sacrament of Order. In his thesis 27 of 1523 he states that all Christians are brethren in Christ and in No. 62, that Scripture knows no other presbyters or priests than those who announce the word of God. In his work on True and False Religion of 1525 he says that Holy Order is a human figment :

“Holy Order, which they say impresses a certain character on the soul, is a human figment. And what they adduce concerning the imposition of hands from Acts and 1 Tim. iv is frivolous. This was an external ‘*consignation*’ by which were made known those upon whom the gift of tongues was to come, or who were to be sent forth for the ministry of the word. What has this to do with that figment of character? It is a function, not a dignity; the episcopate is the ministry of the word. Therefore he who administers the word is a bishop, and he who does not is no bishop, any more than a consul or magistrate who does not function is really such.”²

6 Zwingli was killed in battle in 1531, and was succeeded by Henry Bullinger, as chief pastor of the sect. The Zwinglian teaching was set forth and adopted in the Confession of Basel of 1534, and the First Helvetic Confession of 1536. The former was drafted by Ecolampadius, the latter by Bullinger, Myconius, and Grynaeus. This, the First Helvetic Confession, was drawn up partly as an approach to unity with the Lutherans, and Bucer’s mind is evident in the production. Accordingly, we shall find his favourite term “exhibited” accepted now by the Zwinglians. It comes in the article on the Eucharist, art. 23 :

“The body and blood of the Lord are not naturally united to the bread and wine, but the bread and wine are ordained by the Lord to be symbols by which the real communication of His body and blood may be *exhibited* (exhibeatur) by the Lord Himself. . . . The holy symbols . . . are holy and venerable things, as being instituted and used by the High Priest Christ, exhibiting in their own way, as we have said, the things signified. . . .”³

In 1549, the Zwinglians found themselves able to sign a joint formula of faith with the Calvinists on the subject of the Eucharist.

¹ Kidd, *Documents* pp. 444-8.

² *De Vera et falsa Religione*, Zurich, 1525, p. 302.

³ Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom* iii, p. 225.

CHAPTER IX

CALVIN .

1. From Zwingli we pass naturally to the great French-Swiss Reformer, *Calvin*. He went to Geneva in 1536 as the collaborator of the French reformer, William Farel, a pupil of (Ecolampadius). From Geneva he went two years later to Strassburg, where he became intimate with Bucer and his friend Capito, and signed the Augsburg Confession "in the sense of its author," i.e., of Melancthon. In 1541 he returned to Geneva, and died there twenty-three years later. He never received Holy Orders. His ideas are set forth in his *Institutes*, first published in 1536, enlarged in 1539, and published in its final form in 1559.

2. Calvin will allow only *two Sacraments properly so called*. Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

"Præter hæc duo, ut nullum aliud a Deo institutum est, ita nec ullum agnoscere debet fidelium ecclesia."¹

Accordingly the other five are not strictly sacraments :

"Sacramenta non esse, quinque reliqua quæ pro sacramentis hactenus vulgo habita sunt."²

3. Passing over Baptism we come to Calvin's doctrine on the Eucharist. His view on the Presence was, like that of Bucer, an attempt to find a middle view between that of Luther and Zwingli. He emphatically rejects the *real and substantial* presence of Our Lord's Body and Blood under the appearances of bread and wine, and teaches instead that there is a *spiritual* presence which acts upon the faithful by the Holy Spirit. This spiritual presence must not be conceived of as attached to the bread and wine, but rather we are to think of the faithful soul as being lifted up on the wings of faith *to Heaven*, where it *spiritually* communes with its Saviour. Or again, we may say that Christ in Heaven communicates to us, through the Sacrament, the power and grace which He wishes to impart to us. This may be called the "virtualist" or "dynamic" view of the presence.

¹ 1536 edn., *Opera** Corpus Reformatorum, Vol. 29, col. 138.

² *Ibid.** col. 141.

Accordingly, Calvin is Avilling to adopt the phraseology both of Zwingli and of Melancthon, giving to both a sense of his own. But he is specially partial to the term "exhibited" :

"The breaking of the bread is a symbol, not the thing itself. But in the *exhibition* (exhibitione) of the symbol, the thing itself is *exhibited*. . . . The mystery of the Holy Supper consists of two things, the bodily signs which are set before our eyes and represent to us invisible things in such way as our weakness can grasp, and the spiritual reality which is both denoted and exhibited (exhibetur) by the symbols. . . J'l

"In them is *exhibited* to us the spiritual food of the soul (exhibetur). . . . The nature of a Sacrament is overthrown unless the earthly sign corresponds in the method of signifying to the heavenly thing. And hence the reality of this mystery is overthrown unless real bread represents the real body of Christ."

"I gladly accept whatever can mark the real and substantial communication of the body and blood of the Lord, which is *exhibited* to the faithful under the holy symbols of the Supper."

"They are greatly deceived who suppose that there is no presence of Christ in the Supper unless it is placed in the bread. For by such an idea they leave nothing to the secret operation of the Spirit which unites Christ Himself to us. Christ does not seem to them to be present unless He descends to us, as if we did not equally possess His presence if He draws us up to Himself. . . . They locate Christ in the bread, we do not think it right for us to bring Him down from heaven. . . .

"This thought will take us away from the carnal adoration which some with perverse rashness have introduced in the Sacrament. . . . That pious minds may rightly lay hold of Christ, they must be raised to heaven. . . . Rather is Christ to be adored spiritually in the glory of heaven than this so dangerous way of adoration devised, full of a carnal and gross idea of God. . . . What is idolatry, if it be not to worship the gifts instead of the Giver? In which there is doubly a sin, for the honour is taken away from God and bestowed on a creature, and God Himself is dishonoured in his polluted and profaned gift, when from His Holy Sacrament a dreadful idol is made."

1 *Institutes*, 1559 edn., IV, xvii, 10, 11. *Opera*, Vol. 30, cols. 1009, 1010.

• IV, xvii, 14, col. 1013.

• IV, xvii, 19, col. 1017.

4 IV, xvii, 35-36, col. 1038-1040.

The passages quoted above are from the 1559 edition. But the same doctrine and phraseology are found in the first edition of the *Institutes*, published in 1536, as the following will show :

"Cum panem videmus nobis in *signum* corporis Christi *exhibitum*, haec statim concipienda est similitudo : ut corporis nostri vitam panis alit, sustinet, tuetur, ita corpus Christi vitae nostrae spiritualis cibum ac protectionem esse. Cum vinum in *symbolum* sanguinis, cogitandum, etc." (*Opera*, Corpus Reform., Vol. 29, col. 119).

"Christum in eo quaeramus, non nostro corpori, nec ut sensibus carnis nostrae comprehendi potest, sed sic, ut animo velut praesentem sibi datum et *exhibitum* agnoscat" (col. 121).

"Dicimus vere et efficaciter *exhiberi*, non autem naturaliter. Quo scilicet

4. Calvin's doctrine thus involves the denial of the Real Objective Presence under the appearances of Bread and Wine, and the Adoration of Christ as present under those forms. He naturally rejects also the Catholic doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass. This is a "most pestilent error" and an "abomination." There is no oblation in the Eucharist other than that of prayer and thanksgiving :

"He has given us a table at which to feast, not an altar on which to offer a sacrifice. He has not consecrated priests to sacrifice, but ministers to distribute the sacred banquet."¹

"A sacrifice of expiation has as its object to appease the wrath of God. . . . The real sacrifice of this kind was offered by Christ alone, by Him alone because it could not be offered by any other. And it was offered once for all, because the efficacy and power of that one sacrifice which was offered by Christ is eternal. . . . And therefore there is nothing lacking so as afterwards to leave room for another sacrifice to-day. . . . In the other kind of sacrifice, which we have called Eucharistic, are contained all the offices of love . . . then all our prayers, praises, thanksgiving, and whatever is done by us for the worship of God. And all these depend on the greater sacrifice by which we are consecrated in soul and body to be a holy temple unto the Lord. . . . This kind of sacrifice has nothing to do with appeasing the wrath of God, or obtaining remission of sins. . . . This kind of sacrifice the Lord's Supper cannot be without, in which, while we announce His death and return thanks, we offer nothing else than a sacrifice of praise. From this duty of sacrifice we Christians are all called a royal priesthood."²

We call attention to this conception of the Eucharistic Sacrifice found in Calvin's *Institutes*. They obviously resemble very closely the conception of the sacrifice found in the Anglican Prayer Book of Edward VI and explained in detail in Cranmer's works.

5. As Calvin rejects the Catholic doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass, so also he rejects the Catholic conception of the

significamus, non substantiam ipsam corporis, seu verum et naturale Christi corpus illic dari, sed omnia quae in suo corpore nobis beneficia Christus praestitit (col. 123).

^{**} Hzc cognitio nos facile a carnali etiam adoratione abstrahet, quam perversa temeritate quidam in Sacramento erexerunt" (col. 124).

* IV, xviii, 12, col. 1059.

• IV, xviii, 12-18.

Similarly in the 1536 edition, Calvin says that by the Mass "intolerabilem illic blasphemiam ac contumeliam Christo irrogari" (c. 132), because it is injurious to the Redemption accomplished on the Cross. Calvin is of course quite aware of the Catholic defence, as the following shows :

"Quis cogitet se morte Christi redemptum esse, ubi novam in missa redemptionem viderit ? . . . Neque evadet qui dixerit: non alia causa nos peccatorum remissionem in missa obtinere, nisi quia morte Christi jam acquisita est" (*ibid.*, col. 134).

sacrificial priesthood, and the Catholic view of the sacrament of holy order, by which the priestly character is conferred :

"All those do an injury to Christ who say they are priests who offer a sacrifice of reconciliation. It is He who was ordained by the Father, and consecrated with an oath as priest according to the order of Melchisedek. . . . We are indeed all priests in Him, but merely for the offering of praise and thanksgiving to God, and chiefly to offer ourselves and all that is ours."¹

"The priesthood of the Catholics is therefore a 'damnable sacrilege,* and it is impudent to call it a sacrament.'"²

"True priests are ordained by the mouth of Jesus Christ to be *dispensers of the Gospel and of the sacraments.*"³

And again :

"Jesus gave commandment to His apostles to preach the Gospel and to baptise. Previously He had told them to distribute the holy sacrament of His body and blood. Here we have a holy, inviolable and perpetual ordinance, given to all those who succeed to the place of the Apostles, by which they receive commandment to *preach the Gospel and to administer the sacraments.* Hence those who do not busy themselves with the preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments boast falsely of having a common ministry with the Apostles."⁴

"It is by vocation that ministers are destined for this *preaching of the Gospel and administration of the sacraments.* But by whom comes this vocation to those whom God destinies to His ministry ? One cannot here derive any certain teaching from the institution of the Apostles. . . . Must one say that only the bishops have the right to ordain ? But the ordination which they claim to confer is *to sacrifice* and immolate Jesus Christ, which is not to consecrate to God but to destine to the devil. . . . The true and only ordination is to call to the government of the Church he whose life and doctrine has been well proved."⁵

"In the matter of the ceremonies of ordination, we must reject all that does not correspond to the reality, as for instance the words *Receive the Holy Ghost,* which Christ could say, but no one after Him, and again unction.*"⁶

¹ Lib. IV, cap. xix, 28, col. 1086.

• *Ibid.*

• *Ibid.* 31, col. 1088.

⁴ IV, cap. iii, 6, col. 780.

* 539 edn., cap. xix, col. 1089-90.

• IV, cap. xix, 29-31, col. 1094.

The above quotations are from the second edition, 1539, but the first edition (1536) contains the same doctrine :

"Promptum est definire quae sit presbyterorum functio, qui in presbyterorum ordine habendi sint, vel potius, quid omnino sit ordo ipse. Functio est evangelium annunciare, et sacramenta administrare" (c. 186).

Bishops and priests have the same office :

"Episcopus est qui ad ministerium verbi et sacramentorum vocatus, officium suum bona fide exequitur. Episcopus et presbyteros promiscue voco ecclesiae ministros."

6. It is not necessary for us to discuss the subsequent history of Calvinism. But it is important to record some of the main Confessions of Faith in which the doctrines of its founder were set forth and expressly accepted.

The first of these was the *Catechism of Geneva*, 1537 and 1545. Next comes the *Consensus Tigurinus*, or "Consent of Zurich," which dates from 1549, which is important as marking the agreement of the Zwinglians and the Calvinists on sacramental doctrine, and is also important because of its influence in England in the reign of Edward VI.

Later Confessions of Faith, of the now united Zwinglians and Calvinists, are : the *Gallican Confession* of 1559, the *Belgian Confession* of 1561, the *Heidelberg Catechism* of 1563, and the *Second Helvetic Confession*, composed by Bullinger and adopted

Ordination is vocation :

"Ordo est ipsa vocatio" (*ibid.*).

"Falluntur dum existimant aliud quidpiam esse consecrare et ordinare, quam ecclesia; episcopum et pastorem constituere" (c. 186).

"Neminem ordinant (Catholici) nisi ad sacrificandum, quod non est Deo, sed dxmonis consecrare" (c. 187).

As to the minister of ordination :

"Nunc --- a quibus ordinandi, hoc est vocandi sint ministri ecclesiae. . . . Utrum totius ecclesiz comitiis, aut paucorum suffragiis --- an vero magistratus sententia episcopum creari satius est, nulla certa lex constitui potest, sed pro temporum ratione, populorumque moribus capiendum est consilium. . . . Satiis mihi videtur eo eligendi munere, vel magistratum, vel senatum, vel seniores aliquot defungi, advocatis semper, ut dixi, nonnullis episcopis, quorum fidem et probitatem spectatam habeant" (c. 187).

On the ceremonies of ordination :

"Nunc exequamur, quo ceremoniae genere initiandi sint. Dominus noster, cum apostolos amandaret, ad evangelii praedicationem insufflavit in eos. . . . Haec insufflationem retinuerunt boni isti viri, et quasi Spiritum sanctum e gutture suo egerant, super eos quos formant sacrificulos demurmurant 'accipite spiritum sanctum? . . . Multa egit Dominus quae nobis exempla esse noluit" (c. 189).

"Foetet eorum unctio" (c. 190).

"Superest impositio manuum, quam fuisse ab apostolis observatam constat. . . . Hunc ritum dictum existimo ab Hebraeorum more. . . . Id erat symbolum, quo Domino commendabant cui Spiritus sancti gratiam precari volebant. . . . Sed quidquid fuerit, an protinus sacramentum habendum est? Apostoli orarunt genibus flexis, genua igitur non flectentur sine sacramento? --- Si in eum finem usurpemus (impositionem manuum) ut gratias spiritus, quemadmodum apostoli, conferamus, ridicule agemus. Nam neque id ministerium nobis a Domino commissum est, neque id symbolum constitutum" (cgl. 190-1).

"Quod si is qui assumitur in episcopum, constituatur in medio coetu ecclesiae, admoveatur sui officii, ac super sum oratur, seniorum manibus super eum impositis, nulla religione nisi ut et ipse Deo se in ministerium offerri sentiat, et ecclesia incitatur ad ipsum communibus precibus Deo commendandum : talem manuum impositionem nemo sanus improbet (c. 191).

In the second edition (1539) Calvin insists a little more on the laying-on of hands :

"Licet nullum exstet certum praeceptum de manuum impositione, quia tamen fuisse in perpetuo usu Apostolis videmus, illa tam accurata eorum observatio praecepti vice nobis esse debet" (IV, cap. iii, 16).

And in the wide sense of the word he will even allow this laying-on of hands to be called a "sacrament," i.e., in the sense that it is "a ceremony taken from Scripture" (IV, cap. xix, 31, c. x088).

in Germany and Switzerland in 1566. The last two documents are the most authoritative expositions of Calvinistic doctrine.

It is unnecessary for us to deal with these in detail ; but we must call attention to the fact that art. 24 of the *Consensus Tigurinus* describes Transubstantiation, etc., as “ crassa figmenta atque fuites argutiæ.”¹

¹ Kidd, *Documents*, p. 656.

CHAPTER X

CATHOLIC REPLIES TO THE REFORMERS

A. ON THE MASS.

B. ON THE PRIESTHOOD.

A. ON THE MASS.

1. These new Protestant conceptions of the Eucharist and the priesthood met, of course, with vigorous opposition from the Catholic theologians. We have already mentioned in connection with the Diet of Augsburg, how Protestant misrepresentations of the Sacrifice of the Mass were repudiated by the Catholic theologians present. From time to time also the Catholic doctrines were once more explained, and vindicated in the light of Scripture and Tradition. An example will be found in the *Assertio Septem Sacramentorum* of *Henry VIII*, written in 1521, the year after the publication of Luther's three great Reformation treatises. The title of this work indicates that it was a defence of all the seven Sacraments, and it contains, *inter alia*, a defence of the Sacrifice of the Mass from Luther's attacks.¹

2. Another and particularly able defence of the Sacrifice is contained in the *Sacri Sacerdotii Defensio contra Lutherum* by *St. John Fisher*, Bishop of Rochester, written in 1525, and is especially noteworthy because of its information as to the Rabbinical interpretation of the sacrifice of Melchisedeck—information which we have incorporated in the present work, and which shows the breadth of the learning of the Cardinal of Rochester.

^x The University of Paris in 1521 condemned 98 propositions taken from Luther, including the following :

6. Confirmatio et extrema unctio non sunt sacramenta a Christo instituta. . . .—Haeretica.

7. Missa passim creditor esse sacrificium quod offertur Deo, inde Christos hostia altaris aicitur, sed evangelium non sinit missam esse sacrificium.—Impia, blasphema ac haeretica.

8. Manifestos est error, missam applicare seu offerri pro peccatis, pro satisfactionibus, pro defunctis. . . .—Contumeliosa et haeretica (*Le Plat, Monumenta*, II, 102-3).

3. Again, at Augsburg, the Catholic theologians not only repudiated the erroneous presentation of Catholic doctrine on the Mass, but also expounded the proper view. Thus *Dr. Eck* explained the different kinds of "oblation" :

"Lest there should arise a verbal contention about the words 'oblation,' 'victim' and 'sacrifice,' we have explained that there are three oblations, i.e., Christ was offered in the paschal lamb of the Old Testament figuratively or typically ; upon the Cross, by way of suffering, He offered Himself to God the Father for our sins ; and in the Mass there is daily offered mysteriously and representatively, a memorial of His passion and oblation once made upon the Cross. The Mass is therefore not a bloody sacrifice, but a mysterious and representative one."¹

Again, the Catholic theologians at the same Diet carefully explain the meaning of Hebrews x. 14, which the Protestant party quoted in support of their own view :

u St. Paul is speaking of the offering of the victim, that is, of the bloody sacrifice, of the slain lamb, to wit, on the altar of the Cross. This offering certainly was made once for all, and *from it all the Sacraments and also the Sacrifice of the Mass have their efficacy*. Therefore He was offered once only on the Cross with shed blood ; to-day He is offered in the Mass as a peaceful and sacramental victim."⁸

4. Similar Catholic statements were made in connection with the Zwinglian attack upon the Mass. Thus, at the Second Disputation at Zurich in 1523, *Martin Steinly* gave four reasons why the Mass is a sacrifice :

"First, the universality of sin prevents the sacrifice of themselves offered by individual Christians, or the sacrifice of itself offered by the Church, from being a pure and holy and spotless sacrifice ; and the words of the prophet Malachi show that there is to be a 'pure offering' not only in Jerusalem, like the sacrifice on the cross, but also 'in every place.' . . . Secondly, the institution of the Eucharist was the fulfilment of the type of Melchisedek. . . . Thirdly, in view of the promise of our Lord that the Holy Ghost . . . shall be with the Church, the unvarying Christian tradition proves that the Mass is a sacrifice. . . . Fourthly, the Mass was instituted by Our Lord to be in remembrance of Him, and it is a commemoration of His passion, in which there is both the sign and the reality of sacrifice. Since that same blood of Christ, and that same body which hung on the Cross, and that same Christ who suffered on the cross, are actually a sacrifice in the Mass itself the Mass is assuredly a sacrifice actually as well as in name, and it is both a sacrifice and a commemoration of a sacrifice."³

¹ Kidd, *Documents illustrating the Continental Reformation*, pp. 295-6.

⁸ Francke, *op. cit.*, iv, 61.

³ *Apud* Darwell Stone, *History of the Doctrine of the Eucharist*, ii, 75.

B. ON THE PRIESTHOOD.

1. Just as the new Protestant conception of the Eucharist was at once replied to by the Catholic party by restating the true Catholic doctrine, so also, to the new Protestant conception of Orders and Ordination, as put forward by Luther and others, the Catholics replied by setting forth once more the Catholic conception.

Already in 1521—the year following the publication by Luther of his three great Reformation treatises—the Faculty of Theology of the *University of Paris* censured a hundred and five propositions taken from his works. Amongst them were the following statements on the Sacrament of Holy Order, followed by the comments of the theologians of Paris :

Prop. 2. The Church of Jesus Christ does not know the Sacrament of Order.—Comment: Heretical: this is the error of the Poor Men of Lyons, the Albigenses, and the Wycliffites.

Prop. 3. All Christians have the same power in the Word and in the administration of all the sacraments (*quocunque sacramento*).

Prop. 4. The keys of the Church are common to all.

Prop. 5. All Christians are priests.

Comment : Props. 3-5 are destructive of the hierarchical order, and heretical.

2. In the same year, 1521, Luther's errors on Order were answered in England by the monarch himself, *Henry VIII*, in his *Asserlio Septem Sacramentorum*. He quotes various statements from Luther, and then remarks that "his denying Orders to be a Sacrament is, as it were, the Fountain to all the rest." He goes on to deal with the evidence from Scripture for the existence of the Sacrament of Order, mentioning *inter alia* that

All men do unanimously confess, Luther only excepted, that the Apostles were by our Saviour ordained priests at the Last Supper, where it plainly appears that power was given them to consecrate (*conficiendi*) the Body of Christ, which power the priest alone hath."

And later on :

"As it is sufficient for us to read in the Gospel that the Power of consecrating the Sacrament was given them to whom the priests succeed, so is it likewise enough that we read the counsel of the Apostle to Timothy, 'That he impose not hands rashly upon any one.' Which passage plainly demonstrates that the ordination of priests is not performed by the consent of the laity (by which alone Luther affirms that a priest may be ordained), but by the Ordination by a Bishop only, and that by a certain imposition of

182 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

hands, in which God, through the exterior sign, should infuse an interior grace. . . . I wonder that anyone should be so distracted as to doubt whether grace is given by the Sacrament of Orders to the Priest of the Gospel. . . . How dares Luther affirm that this Sacrament was unknown to the Church of Christ, which was used by the Apostles ? . . .

"Notwithstanding this, he opposes himself against all the reasons, authority, and faith of all, by this one argument: 'We are all priests,' says he. . . . He extols the laity to the priesthood for this only reason that he may reduce priests to the rank of the laity, denying priesthood to be a sacrament but only a custom of electing a preacher. . . .

"Furthermore, that Luther is really not able to hold what he says, viz., 'That the priest's office is nothing but to preach to the people, for to say Mass, says he, is nothing but to receive the Communion for himself—Let us again hear the Apostle's words, 'Every priest that is taken out from amongst men is constituted for men, in the things that belong to God, that he may offer gifts and sacrifices for sins.' Does not this plainly show us that a priest's duty requires from him, to offer sacrifices to God for men ?

"In the right of electing, as he calls it, he attributes the chief power to the people, for though in one place he seems to give this rite promiscuously to the bishop and people when he says, 'That although it is certain all Christians are equally priests, and that they have a like power in all the sacraments, yet that none can lawfully use this power without the consent of the congregation or the calling by the superior,' yet in another place he gives the greatest right to the people. . . .

"It cannot be denied,' says he, 'that the true Churches were formerly governed by elders, without these ordinations and consecrations, because of their age and long experience in these matters.' Let him show us where he finds these things. . . . For if each layman has an equal power with the priests in every sacrament, and the order of priesthood is nothing, why does the Apostle write to Timothy : 'Neglect not the grace which is in thee, etc. . . .

"What Luther says is done by the people's consent, St. Paul shews to be done by the Bishop. . . . You see, by this, that priests are made by imposition of hands. And that it may not be doubted that grace is also given at the same time, 'Stir up,' says he, 'the grace of God, which has been given to thee by the imposition of my hands,' etc. . . . I wonder that Luther is not ashamed to deny the Sacrament of Holy Orders, seeing that the words of St. Paul are in every man's hands, which teach that a priest is made only by another priest (*non nisi a sacerdote fieri sacerdotem*), and that not without consecration, in which a corporeal sign is used, and so much grace is given that the one who is consecrated not only receives himself the Holy Ghost, but also the power to conferring it upon others."

3. A most comprehensive and detailed defence of the

Catholic hierarchical system was set forth in answer to Luther by *John Fisher*, in the work we have already referred to.¹ The work is in three parts. The first establishes the argument from prescription : the constant tradition of all the Churches, as witnessed by the works of the Fathers, is that there is a visible and external priesthood in the Church. Chapter II gives a constructive defence of the Catholic thesis, in the form of ten propositions :

(1) It is reasonable that matters concerning the salvation of souls should be confided to certain individuals.

(2) Christ when on earth established pastors to tend His sheep.

(3) It is fitting that the shepherds who are to exercise this function should receive the gift of a more abundant grace.

(4) *Defacto*, Christ gave them such grace and power.

(5) Not only was the institution of such pastors necessary at the beginning of things, but it must last for ever.

(6) No one can exercise pastoral functions legitimately unless called by the heads of the Church, regularly ordained, and given mission.

(7) All thus legitimately instituted must be regarded as called by the Holy Spirit.

(8) The said pastors receive from the same Holy Spirit the gift of grace, in their ordination.

(9) The Holy Spirit has willed that this grace should be linked up with a sensible sign.

(10) All thus legitimately ordained pastors and priests are justly regarded as invested with the sacred priesthood.

Then in Chapter III the author refutes the Scriptural arguments advanced by Luther.

It is interesting to note that Fisher seems throughout to take it for granted that the sensible sign in the rite of ordination is the laying-on of hands. He does once mention the unctions as well, but he never once refers to the tradition of instruments, or to the investiture. This again is noteworthy as showing that in circles uncompromisingly Catholic, the theory of St. Thomas and the Decree *ad Armenos* was by no means universally accepted.

4. Luther was also refuted by *John Eck*, in his *Encheiridion*, published in 1533, i.e., three years after the Confession of Augsburg. Under the heading “*De ordinis Sacramento*” he says

¹ *Sacri Sacerdotii defensio contra Lutherum*, 1525.

184 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

that he will give the Scriptural proofs that order is a sacrament “because they (the Lutherans) deny that Order is a sacrament.” He also says that the Lutheran ordinations are merely a revival of the kind of ordination which “took place centuries ago, and which is mentioned by Tertullian, who says of certain heretics that ‘they turn priests into laymen, and impose sacerdotal duties upon the laity.’” Luther endeavours to make priests not otherwise than Pharaoh and the gentiles have done, and as Scripture narrates concerning Jeroboam, who made priests out of the least of the people.”

CHAPTER XI

THE REFORMATION AT COLOGNE

- A. THE PROVINCIAL COUNCIL OF 1537.
- B. THE " ENCHEIRIDION."
- C. THE " SIMPLEX ET PIACONSULTATIO."
- D. THE " ANTIDIDAGMA."
- E. BUCER'S " CONSTANS DEFENSIO."

A. THE PROVINCIAL COUNCIL OF 1537.

The new Protestant theories, and the Catholic reaction against them, are very well illustrated in the temporary Reformation which took place at Cologne under the Archbishop, Hermann von Wied. This is also of particular interest to us, as the works produced in connection with it had a marked influence upon the English Reformation.

In 1536, i.e., six years after the Confession of Augsburg, a Provincial Council was held at Cologne under the authority of the Archbishop, with a view to counteracting the activities of the Reformers. The Council issued various Decrees, which are considered to be the work of John Groepper, whom Rivière describes as " the glory of the Church of Cologne," and who was present at the Council of Trent. The Decrees teach the Real Objective Presence, as we should expect from a Catholic Council. Occasion is also taken to set forth the true Catholic doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass :

"The people are to be taught the nature of the sacrifice of the Mass, namely, that it is representative. Christ died once . . . true God and true Man, He hung once only on the Cross, offering Himself to the Father as a Sacrifice. . . . And yet He is immolated daily in the sacrament. Not that Christ is thus often slain, but that one sacrifice is daily renewed by mystic rites, and by the daily remembrance of the death of the Lord, by which we have been set free, in eating and drinking the flesh and blood which have been offered for us, this very act (the death of Christ) may be represented ; and this sacramental oblation admonishes us to gaze, as it were, on the Lord on the Cross, and to draw thence for ourselves from that inexhaustible source the grace of salvation ; and we offer sacrifice for the living and the

dead when we implore the Father for these through the death of His Son.”¹

B. THE “ENCEIRIDION.”

The Council of Cologne promised a fuller book of instruction in the Catholic religion, and this appeared probably in 1537, under the title *Encheiridion*. It seems to have been written by Groepper, though put forward in the name of the Archbishop.

1. It insists, as we should expect, that there are seven sacraments, all instituted by Christ. The doctrine of the Objective Real Presence, i.e., Transubstantiation, is clearly taught :

“By the power of the word of God, the sacrament of bread and wine is so changed that it is substantially different from what it was before, and that which before the consecration was bread and wine, is after consecration substantially the flesh and blood of Christ.”²

2. The Catholic doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass is once more carefully set forth and vindicated :

“Our opponents . . . pretend that the orthodox impair the work of Christ, and that they crucify the Son of God afresh, by withdrawing the sanctification for our sins from the offering once made on the Cross and assigning it to the Mass, or rather to the outward work of the priest. But these calumnies of our opponents ought not to upset anyone in the Church, for the mind and judgment of the orthodox have always been and are quite different from what is pretended. All the pious, from the beginning of the world to this day, have known by the help and teaching of the Holy Spirit, that there is only one propitiatory and satisfactory sacrifice for our sins and for those of the whole world, and that is Christ our Lord, the lamb without spot, who was offered for us on the Cross, and who is described as having been slain from the beginning of the world.”³

“Sacrifice is of two kinds. There is a propitiatory sacrifice, which is offered for the remission of sins, to appease the wrath of God, and to reconcile us to God. There is also a sacrifice of praise, thanksgiving and obedience, which we pay to God as the honour and service rightly due to Him. . . . These sacrifices are so connected together that the latter could not exist without the former, and the former is the cause and foundation of the latter. . . . In every sacrifice there are two things, the thing offered, and the act of offering. . . . And so in the Mass there is the thing offered, and the act of offering. Again, the thing offered is twofold, namely, the real body of Christ, and the mystical body. If we consider the real body of Christ . . . who can deny that this can rightly be called a propitiatory sacrifice, not by reason of the act of offering which the priest makes, but by reason of that

¹ Hardouin, *Conc.t* ix, 2007-8.

² 1558 edn., fol. 49-50.

³ Fol. 58.

act of offering which took place once, having been made on the Cross, the force of which, being ever of the same power and efficacy, lasts for ever? . . . Though even in this way the body of the Lord on the altar is not *omnino proprie* called a sacrifice, but is rather a sacrament, or the *res sacramenti*, for a sacrament and a sacrifice seem to differ in that a sacrament is a holy sign by means of which God presents something to us, and a sacrifice is that which we offer to God. . . . Thus in the sacrament there is nothing which is the priest's own, but Christ does all. . . . In so far as the Church offers to God the real body and blood of Christ, the sacrifice is merely representative of that which was once accomplished on the Cross. In so far as the Church offers herself (and she is the mystical body of Christ) and dedicates herself and all that is hers to God through Christ, the sacrifice is real but spiritual, that is, the eucharistic sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, and the obedience which is properly due to God. . . . Christ offered Himself once unto death in His mortal flesh, that He might destroy death, and restore us to life by rising again. But nevertheless the Church daily offers Him, not in death, for Christ once risen from the dead dieth no more, but in remembrance of His death, that she may be filled with the fruit of His passion and death."¹

"The whole Church clearly professes that remission of sins or justification is ascribed only to the offering made on the Cross. For this alone is the ransom for our sins and for those of the whole world."²

This well-balanced and carefully phrased statement of Catholic doctrine is admirable in every way.

3. The same work also contains a brief statement of the Catholic doctrine on the sacrament of Holy Order :

"Order is a certain grace and power, which is infused in baptised persons by handing on, through a certain visible sign, when by the imposition of hands such persons are rightly ordained for the public performance of some office in the Church. . . . Order is a sacrament, for it has its visible sign, and it has also its word, and therefore the promise of the assistance of the grace of God in the ministry.

"The 'word' of this sacrament, which the bishop uses in ordaining presbyters, is very plainly set forth in the Scriptures, for first we read in John xx that Jesus breathed on the Apostles and said, 'Receive the Holy Ghost, whose sins you shall forgive, etc. . . . And again Matt, xxviii, 'Going therefore teach all nations. . . . Again Mark xvi . . . Luke xxii and 1 Cor. xi, 'Do this in memory of me.' Which places show that the Apostles and their successors have received divine authority in ordination. . . . The priest receives the power³ of preaching the gospel, he receives the power of baptising, of forgiving sins, of consecrating and making the Lord's body, and of administering the other sacraments. . . .

¹ Fol. 65-66. ² Fol. 70. ³ Note the insistence that Order confers a power.

"The element of this sacrament: In the case of major orders, concerning which there is no doubt that the Church has received them from the institution of Christ, it is the imposition of hands. . . . Moreover, the unction which is used in one initiated into the priesthood, is an element of order. . . . As to the minor orders . . . certain instruments are given."

Here we note that the function of the priesthood is explained as including the power of consecrating and making (*consecrandi conficiendique*) the Body of Christ.

C. THE "SIMPLEX ET PIA CONSULTATIO."

In 1539, however, three years after the Provincial Council, Hermann von Wied, the Archbishop, came under the influence of Melancthon and Bucer, went over to the Lutheran party, and with their assistance drew up a Lutheran service book and manual, called the *Simplex et Pia Consultatio*. This work is of particular interest for it was twice published in an English translation, i.e., in 1547 and 1548, and its liturgical services were utilised in the compilation of the Anglican rite, as we shall see.

1. The first thing to note is that the book carefully abstains from saying that there are seven *sacraments*, and indeed speaks only of two, Baptism and the Supper.

2. As to the *Eucharist*, Dr. Darwell Stone says that "the opinions appear to be Lutheran."¹ The following extract is sufficiently indicative :

"The Supper of the Lord is the communication of the body and blood of Christ, which are truly *exhibited* to us when the supper is celebrated according to the Lord's institution."²

This vague statement is noteworthy because it incorporates the Bucerian term "exhibited," and limits the presence to the right use of the Supper.

3. On the *Sacrifice of the Mass*, the Archbishop rejects the Catholic doctrine and sides with the Lutherans. He says that Christ on the Cross is that only acceptable and propitiatory sacrifice, through which we obtain of God grace, salvation and all benefits—a statement which might be quite orthodox, but here undoubtedly insinuates that the Mass is not an offering of Christ. He goes on to speak of "our bodies and our souls" as "an acceptable sacrifice through faith," and of repentance as "a sacrifice unto God," also of the "sacrifices of praying, magnifying God, and giving of thanks, the sacrifice of liberality

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 81.

■ Fol. 81.

towards our neighbours,"¹ in fact of any and every sacrifice *except* the offering of Christ's Body and Blood. This last is expressly excluded in the following passage:

"Before all things the pastors must labour to take out of men's minds that false and wicked opinion whereby men think commonly that the priest in the Mass offereth up Christ our Lord to God the Father, after that sort that with his intention and prayer he causeth Christ to become a new and acceptable sacrifice to the Father for the salvation of men, complieth and communicateth the merit of the Passion of Christ and of the saving sacrifice whereby the Lord Himself offered Himself to the Father a sacrifice on the Cross, to them that receive not the same with their own faith . . . (*propria fide non apprehendunt et suscipiunt*).

"And whereas the Holy Fathers call the ministration of this sacrament a sacrifice and oblation, and that the priest in administering the supper offereth Christ, let the preachers know and teach other when need shall be, that the Holy Fathers by the name of a sacrifice understood not application, which was devised a good while after the Fathers and prevailed with other abuses, but a solemn remembrance of the Sacrifice of Christ. . . . For while the Supper of the Lord is ministered as the Lord instituted it, the Sacrifice of Christ is celebrated and exhibited therein through the preaching of His death and distribution of the sacraments."²

This passage is noteworthy because it shows that its author knew quite well that in the Catholic doctrine the Mass *applies the merits of the Passion*.

4. Passing over the subject of Matrimony, we may remark that the *Pia Consultatio* regards Confirmation merely as a pious rite, arising out of the imitation of Christ and the Apostles :

"The ancients, *imitating the example* of Christ and the Apostles, made use of the *symbol* of the laying-on of hands. Hence this ceremony, performed in the faith of Christ, inasmuch as it is undoubtedly an office of faith and Christian charity, is in every way *agreeable to* the words and institutions of the Lord. . . . We wish to restore its pious and salutary use in the Church, *removing all abuses*."³

1 Chapter on Oblations.

* Ante omnia vero tollere Pastores ex animis hominum studebunt falsam illam et imiam opinionem, qua vulgo existimatur, Sacerdotem in Missis Christum Dominum nostrum Deo Patri offerre, ea quidem ratione ut sua intentione et oratione efficiat, ut Christus Patri fiat novum et acceptum Sacrificium, pro hominum salute, aut meritum passionis Christi et salutiferi sacrificii quo Dominus ipse se Patri in cruce hostiam obtulit, applicet et communicet iis qui id propria fide non apprehendunt et suscipiunt. . . .

Quum autem sancti Patres hujus sacramenti tractationem Sacrificium vocant et oblationem, scribuntque aliquando sacerdotem administrando coenam Christum offerre, sciant Pastores et concionatores, et aliis cum opus erit exponant, sanctos patres nomine sacrificii nequaquam intellexisse applicationem, quae diu post tempora patrum excogitata est, et cum aliis abusibus obtinuit, sed memoriam solemnem sacrificii Christi.

• Fol. 78.

190 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

This fails to say that Confirmation is *a sacrament instituted by Christ, conferring grace*, and by implication these points of Catholic doctrine are denied.

5. We come now to the treatment of Holy Order. The chapter "On the Institution of Pastors" has the following passage (we quote from the 1547 English translation) :

"The office of priesthood, that is to say, the ministry of *preaching the Gospel and dispensing the sacraments* and discipline of Christ, is and was from the beginning of the world, and shall be to the end of the same, right necessary and wholesome. . . . Neither is it to be doubted but that bishops were made presidents over all priests. . . . No man is to be admitted to the cure of any congregation which is not diligently tried and allowed by those examiners whom we shall appoint to this office. . . . The person must be examined whether he understand the doctrine of Christ, a sum whereof we have comprehended in this book, and whether he acknowledge that the same doctrine in sum is truly described in this book as surely it is the only and undoubted doctrine of Christ which the true Catholic Church of Christ ever holdeth and followeth. . . . When he is thus examined and proved, the examiners must give him a testimony of their comprobation unto those whose office it is to invest him, and of the suffragan. Which suffragan shall use nothing in the ceremonies of ordination, *nor enjoin anything in ordaining, that agreeth not with this same doctrine of Christ set forth in this book*, for it is evident that this doctrine is the very Christian doctrine, and the certain sentence and faith of the Catholic Church."

We call attention to some features of this exposition. As we have already pointed out, the same *Liber Reformationis* of Cologne contains an explicit repudiation of the doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass. In view of this, the description of the "priesthood" as the "ministry of preaching the Gospel and dispensing the sacraments and discipline of Christ," without any elaboration or specification, is surely significant, especially in its *omission of the function of offering sacrifice*. On the other hand, bishops are allowed for as well as priests, and the ministry in general is described as "right necessary and wholesome." Modifications of the ordination rite are definitely enjoined, and obviously comprise *the omission of the power to offer sacrifice*, for the repudiation of this is part of the doctrine set forth in this book with which the ordination rite is to agree. But nothing further is specified as to details, except that it is evidently implied that the anointing of hands is to be omitted in the ordination rite (see below p. 195). Another interesting point is the emphasis on the claim that the new Protestant doctrine set forth

in the book is the doctrine of "the *true Catholic Church* . . . the certain sentence and faith of *the Catholic Church*." Note well how the German Reformers claim to be "Catholics."

6. The *Simplex et Pia Consultatio* did not confine itself to doctrinal exposition, but it also set forth a series of new liturgical rites. We quote the following account of these from *Liturgy and Worship*.

"Its ritual, which was the work of Bucer, is for the most part a combination of formulae derived partly from various Lutheran Orders and partly from Strassburg, either directly, or through the Order of Cassel (1539), which was either Bucer's work, or largely influenced by him. It is marked throughout by the copiousness of its didactic and hortatory features.

"The Mass begins with the Strassburg Confession, one or other of the five 'comfortable words' from the later edition of the Strassburg Mass, and a new Absolution; after which the traditional order is followed from the Introit to the Sermon, Alleluia and the Sequence being alternatives, and followed by a German hymn; after the Sermon follows the Strassburg Intercession; during the Creed alms are collected; *Dominus vobiscum, Sursum corda*, etc., introduce a fixed Preface, reminiscent of Eastern forms, and *Sandus* and *Benedictus* are sung in Latin and German, followed by the Institution in the Lutheran form, the Lord's Prayer, and *Pax Domini, Agnus Dei*, and hymns accompany the Communion, which is followed by a thanksgiving, either that of Brandenburg-Nürnberg or that of Luther's German Mass, and the Aaronic Blessing."¹

Thus there is no Canon in this rite.

Once more we remind the reader that this work appeared in two English translations, just before the composition of the first English Prayer Book, which utilised the new liturgy of the Lutherans of Cologne.

D. THE "ANTIDIDAGMA."

The *Simplex et Pia Consultatio* was published in 1539. In 1544 an answer was published on behalf of the Chapter of Cologne entitled *Antididagma, or a Defence of the Christian and Catholic Religion*. Like the two former Catholic works, this also is thought to be the composition of John Groepper.

1. The Catholic theologian who is its author criticises the Reformed work on the ground that it allows *only two sacraments*;

"Haec liber concedit nobis duo tantum sacramenta. . . . Quasi Christus duo tantum instituerit sacramenta: reliqua vero omnia non per Christum aut ex mandato ipsius fuerint instituta."

¹ *Liturgy and Worship*, p. 144.

¹ p. 35, 1549 edn.

2. Similarly it criticises the treatment of the *Real Presence* :

"The book requires from the candidate for confirmation that he shall confess that with the bread and wine there is a communication of the body and blood of Christ. . . . It does not say 'under the species of bread and wine.' . . . And so the book will have it that there are two things diverse in kind given us in the sacrament, namely, bread and wine, and with them the body and blood of Christ."¹

Against this, the *Antididagma* asserts the Catholic doctrine :

"The Catholic Church has taught that this most holy sacrament is made and consecrated by the Almighty Word of Christ, by which the invisible priest, in his holy ministry, converts and changes the visible creatures into the substance of His Body and Blood."²

3. The author goes on to give yet another careful explanation of the doctrine of the *Sacrifice of the Mass* :

"Christ offered a twofold sacrifice when He went from this world to the Father. One was the bloody sacrifice of the Cross, where by offering of His body and the shedding of His precious blood He obtained for us remission of sins and eternal redemption. . . . This sacrifice of the new law, offered once only on the Cross, is offered no more in like manner. That is the one sacrifice which has merited for us remission of sins and eternal life. But, when the heavenly Father determined to establish with us by the death of His only begotten Son a new covenant and league of grace, He took care also to provide that a sacrifice harmonious to such a covenant, whereby we might be continually kept in mind of the covenant and league, should be instituted and manifested to us. Wherefore Christ the Lord, "when He had willed to offer Himself once for us a bloody sacrifice, on the very night in which He was betrayed, before His passion, after He had already determined to undergo it, He instituted and left to us a kind of image of His sacrifice, as a sacrifice whereby we might henceforth again and again offer sacrifice in the Church. And this is that other sacrifice, not the bloody, but the bloodless offering of remembrance and thanksgiving and praise. . . . *He commanded that we should offer spiritually, and by way of commemoration, this most holy sacrifice to the heavenly Father again and again and ever until He should come* (A),³ not to merit remission of sins as if remission had not been

¹ Page 64.

² Page 64.

³ The passages in italics, marked A, B, C and D are the passages which are said by Canon Brightman to be the "source" of the phraseology used in the Anglican Consecration Prayer. Cranmer had certainly read the *Antididagma*, and copied out some extracts from it (see p. 196). And he twice makes a note of the *whole section* (38 pages) which deals with the Sacrifice of the Mass. If Dr. Brightman's suggestion is correct, it is surely significant that Cranmer should have chosen to adopt merely those phrases which explain the *Sacrifice of the Cross*, and that of the passages which describe the Sacrifice of the Mass as a "memorial or representative sacrifice" which is *offered*, he should copy out only the word "memorial" and, omitting the word "sacrifice," should talk about *celebrating* a memorial instead of *offering* it! But in point of fact, as I showed in an article in the *Clergy Review* for November, 1934, Cranmer may have derived his phraseology from other sources, namely, a sermon by

fully and sufficiently obtained through Christ once on the Cross (B) for all believers, but for a memorial of that redemption of His, that is, that in these most holy mysteries we may ever mystically and in figure represent and set forth His passion and death to God the Father and give Him thanks, that of His free grace He has given to us and to all the world His beloved only Son, and through Him remission of sins and all His gifts, so that thus by spiritual representation and commemoration and thanksgiving of this kind, and particularly by the reception of His most holy sacrament, we may apply and appropriate to ourselves those divine gifts which have been procured.”¹

“On the method of this sacrifice, the Catholic Church has to this time taught that in every Mass four sacrifices are spiritually offered to God.

“First, by the command and institution of His Son our Lord Jesus Christ, by an eternal work but with a mystical signification, bread and wine mingled with water are offered. Secondly, there is offered the common sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving on behalf of the whole Catholic Church, on behalf of all the world, for all the good deeds of God, whether known or unknown to us, which from the beginning until now He has unceasingly shown and daily shows to all the world.

“Thirdly, when the consecration has taken place, Christ is offered, His body and His blood, and His most sacred passion, by means of the commemoration and representation of it.

“And fourthly, the Church herself and whole community of Christ is offered, which in this most sacred action dedicates and sacrifices herself wholly to God the Father through Christ our Lord, whose Body she is.

“And moreover the holy Fathers have taught that besides these four chief sacrifices very many others are offered. Such are the profession of belief, manifold prayers, entreaty and intercession for all men, and many other and devout desires and wishes. All these assuredly are kinds of real and spiritual sacrifices, and are set out in the Mass.”²

Here is a fuller explanation of the third sacrifice :

“When the consecration has taken place, Christ the Lord (*who then offered Himself in His mortal body to God the heavenly Father as a bloody sacrifice for the sins of the world*) (C), noy, in the name of the whole Church, in an unbloody manner, is offered by or in a spiritual representation and commemoration of His most holy passion. This takes place when the Church sets forth (*proponit*) or represents Christ and His true body and blood to God the Father, with thanksgiving, and earnest prayer for its sins and for those of the whole world.

“For although this sacrifice in that form in which it was offered

Gardiner, a statement by Tunstall, and a *Rationale* produced in the reign of Henry VIII, all of which contain very inadequate and unsatisfactory statements of the doctrine of the Sacrifice.

¹ Page 80, 1549 edn.

• Page 82-3.

194 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

on the Cross was offered once only, and the blood shed only once, so that it may not be repeated or offered again in that way (*ita*) nevertheless such a sacrifice remains and continues in the presence of God perpetually accepted in its virtue and efficacy, so that that sacrifice *once offered on the Cross* (D) is no less efficacious to-day in the sight of the Father, and powerful, than in that day when blood and water flowed from the Wounded Side.”¹

4. After this long explanation, the *Antididagma* points out the errors in the *Pia Consultatio* :

“Against all those things which have just been said about the sacrifice of the Eucharist and about the Mass as a whole . . . this book raves in many ways. First it says that Christ instituted His supper only for the sake of communion, as if Christ in His supper did not institute any new sacrifice. . . . Again, that book takes away the sacrifice of the Church, and in its made-up formula for the observance of the Lord’s Supper, it has no mention of any sacrifice. Nor again is there any mention under the title ‘Concerning the Christian Sacrifice,’ where the term ‘sacrifice of the Church’ is applied only to what is offered for the poor.”²

“It does an injury to the Church when it says that hitherto it has been preached in the Church, and still is taught, that the priest offers Christ to the Father that by his intention and prayer he may make Him a new and acceptable sacrifice for the salvation of men, and, as it were, apply the merit of the passion of Christ and distribute it to those who do not themselves apprehend it by faith. . . . All which is a fiction.”

The *Antididagma* especially criticises the new Communion rite:

“But the most dreadful thing of all is that in this book there is set forth a certain new Mass, in which there is no consecration with invocation of the divine name, so that necessarily the whole people which shall be persuaded to receive this doctrine, will be most cruelly and wickedly deprived of the Body and Blood of Christ. See folio no, where the priest is instructed that, after the hymn Sanctus has been sung, without any invocation or canonical prayer he is immediately to recite with singular gravity the words of the apostle Paul in which he narrates the institution of this sacrament. Then immediately the people say ‘Amen,’ and similarly he shall declaim the *Pater noster*, and then communicate the people.”³

5. As to the other sacraments, the *Antididagma* points out the defective treatment in the *Pia Consultatio* :

“This book denies that confirmation is a divine sacrament. . . . It says that confirmation is not a function which belongs peculiarly to a bishop. It gives the power to certain unknown visitors, and in general to other pastors, the power to confirm, but

1 Fol. 88-9 “ 1549 edn. · Pp. 105-6, in 1549 edn. · Page 107, in 1549 edn.

at the same time, not according to the ancient form and custom handed down by the Catholic Church (fol. 90).nl

"The book does not number the sacrament of Penance or of Absolution among the sacraments of the Church. It desires that henceforth no one should be bound to enumerate his sins, but only make a general and humble confession of them."²

"As to the Holy Unction, the book completely eliminates this sacrament, together with the prayers which hitherto have been piously used in its administration."³

6. The *Antididagma* then gives, first an exposition of the Sacrament of Holy Order, and points out the errors in the *Pia Consultatiti* :

"Concerning the sacrament of holy ordination, which the Book calls the Institution of Pastors. Holy Ordination is a sacrament of the Holy Church of God, in which grace is given by an external sign to those ordained to the public and common ministry of the Church. . . . It can be proved that presbyters were not usually ordained without external unction, especially in the Western Church. . . .

"Let us see now what this Book dares to put forth against this doctrine. . . .

"In the first place, ordination is not numbered among the sacraments of the Church. . . . There is mention only of the institution of pastors, as if there were no other orders in the Church. . . . And since this Book had previously repudiated the holy unction with chrism, here it commands the Suffragan that he should not attempt to do anything contrary to the teaching of this book, nor impose any burdens or vows contrary to this book upon the ordained. . . . But it is not in the power of our Prince to abrogate and abolish the form of Ordination in use in the whole Catholic Church for more than a thousand years."⁴

"To these it adds that ordination belongs *principally* to bishops, as if others beside the bishop could ordain in the Church, contrary to Scripture and the rule of the apostolic Church. And the pretended Reformation apparently allows others to ordain."⁵

In this connection the *Antididagma* refers to the appointment of certain Superintendents.

7. This *Antididagma* is of peculiar interest to us, for a copy of the 1544 edition was in Cranmer's library, and his *Common Place Book* contains several citations from it. And in particular, he twice refers to the whole of the long section explaining the Catholic doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass.⁷

¹ Page 63 in 1549 edn.

¹ Page 112.

[•] Page 123.

[•] Page 119.

[•] Page 36.

[•] Page 118.

⁷ *Commonplace Book*, Royal MS., 7 B, xi and xii, Vol. One, p. 112 : "De missae sacrificio. Lege Capitulum Colonien., fol. 84 et deinceps fol. 38, folia integra." Vol. Two, p. 117, "De sacrificio Missae. Lege Capit. Colon., fol. 84 et fol. 38 sequentia."

And the two following express quotations made by Cranmer are very important:

° Vol. II, p. 206, Colon, capit fol. 109. Turpe et fcede errant qui nullum discrimen inter meritum remissionis peccatorum et applicationem talis meriti, etc. Nunquam aliter docuit Ecclesia catholica quam Christum Jesum esse unicum sacrificium, unicum pretium et redemptionem unicam, qua meruit nobis in cruce et pretio sanguinis emit peccatorum remissionem.!

“Et mox : ‘Est quidem verum Christi passionem plus quam abunde sufficere peccatis omnium hominum oportet.’”

The sequence of this passage, not expressly quoted by Cranmer, but of which he can hardly have been unaware, is worth giving :

“Tamen, ut fide propria et devotione nos faciamus ejus participes, preccmurque Deum. . . . Et ut suinmatim dicamus, *Christi sacrificium est promerita remissionis applicatorium, quod eo applicet sibi quisque perfidem remissionem illam, quod et in defunctis obtinet.* . . . Neque vero unquam docuit Ecclesia catholica, sicut adversarii calumniantur, Missam esse opus tantum externum solius sacerdotis, quo secundum suam deputationem vivis aut defunctis quibus voluerit promeretur remissionem peccatorum, licet etiam illud sine fide peraget. . . . Contra, docet Ecclesia missam non privatum sed commune esse sacrificium sacerdotis publici Ecclesia: seu populi ministri. Nam quod sacerdos agit ministerio, populus agit voto. . . .”

All this shows that *if* Cranmer rejected the Catholic doctrine it was certainly not because he was unaware of a temperate and moderate exposition of it.

E. THE “CONSTANS DEFENSIO.”

An answer to the *Antididagma* was written in German by Martin Bucer, and published at Bonn in 1545, with a preface by Hermann, the Lutheranising Archbishop. It is of especial interest to note that this work was translated into Latin in 1550 by Dr. Matthew Parker, at that time Master of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. The manuscript of this translation is in the Corpus Library. It seems to have been printed first at Geneva in 1613. This is the edition we will quote.

1. On p. 121, Bucer refuses to allow that there are seven sacraments taught in Scripture ;

* This is followed, in the *Antididagma*, by “Hanc fidem suam in communibus orationibus plerumque testatur, et præcipue in sacro officio Missæ?” Cranmer does not copy out this sentence, but he must have read it.

“Holy Scripture nowhere teaches that there are seven sacraments. . . . It is quite clear that Scripture testifies only of two visible signs of grace and communion with Christ.”

In particular, he denies that Confirmation was instituted as a public sacrament:

“It is quite likely that the Apostles did not use this sign without a divine commandment, imparted either orally or by some secret suggestion of the Holy Ghost. But inasmuch as the gift of God was a special power . . . which did not belong to all churches or to all Christians . . . so they *did not ordain the use of this sign as a public sacrament.*”¹

But still *in a sense* it may be called a sacrament:

“Since the Church uses this sign, in order that she may strengthen those who publicly confess their faith in the Church, it may not unfittingly be called a sign of grace and a sacrament.”²

2. But the most important part of the work is Bucer's treatment of the *Eucharist*.

He maintains that in point of fact there is a consecration of the bread and wine in the Cologne Communion rite (but naturally this must be understood in terms of the Bucerian doctrine of the Presence) :

“The Apostle . . . handed down that the consecration of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ ought to be performed by the recitation of those words of the Lord (i.e., the words of consecration).”³

And he endeavours to maintain that while there is a real consecration in the Lutheran rite, there is none in the Catholic Mass :

“The Lord has commanded us to do in the supper what He Himself did . . . that is to pronounce His words. . . . If anyone sets out merely to recite these historically, and not to have others present as well, to whom he addresses them . . . as our opponents do, he would not consecrate the sacrament.”⁴

To the objection that the Cologne Communion Service has abolished the Canon, he answers that the Roman Canon is a “new composition, not an antique tradition,” and contrasts it with the description of the Eucharist given in pseudo-Dionysius. He maintains that the Canon has been ordered by no Council, and therefore each Church is free to substitute other prayers for it.⁵

3. He deals with the doctrine of the *Sacrifice of the Mass* at great length. Thus, ch. 84 is entitled “Whether the celebration of the holy Supper is and may suitably be called a sacrifice.”

¹ Page 21.
• Page 325.

³ *Ibid.*

³ Page 320.
³ Page 337.

198 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

In this chapter, he says that sacrifices spoken of in the New Testament are :

“ Christ the Lord Himself, who alone offered Himself, and no other, also the faithful who are converted to God and offered to Him as a sacrifice ; the body and soul of each individual Christian, almsgiving, and finally praise and thanksgiving, and the confession of Christ's name.”¹

In the next chapter he maintains that “ the holy Supper, according to the Scriptures, ought not to be called a Sacrifice ” :

“ Although in the holy Supper all the five sacrifices enumerated above are found, and are even there especially, yet they ought all to be found in holy assemblies, even though the holy Supper be not celebrated in them. . . . But that the holy Supper might be called a sacrifice if this term be rightly understood, seeing that all the sacrifices of the New Testament ought to be present therein and offered, the Cologne Book does not dispute.”²

He endeavours thus to explain the origin of the term “ sacrifice ” as applied to the Mass :

“ The name of ‘ sacrifice ’ was by the ancients attributed to the administration of the holy Supper chiefly because the gifts of the faithful, i.e., bread and wine, on behalf of the poor and needy, together with prayer and thanksgiving, were offered to the Lord, and again because the especial memory and communion of Christ the victim offered on the altar of the Cross was solemnly carried out, and thanksgiving for such great benefits given through that victim to us by the Lord was made, together with the religious surrender of the will and obedience of the whole Church and of each individual Christian. But Christ ought not therein to be presented and offered to the Father as a new victim.”³

And again :

“ There is no dispute between the true churches [i.e., the Lutheran churches] and their adversaries that the priests (*sacerdotes*) in the name of the whole congregation, and the whole congregation through the priests, and each individual of himself, should offer in the holy supper thanksgiving, prayer, and gifts for the poor, and that therein prayers and thanksgivings should be made for all men . . . and that finally the priests in their preaching of the gospel and the distribution of the sacraments, together with thanksgiving and prayer, should apply the sacrifice of Christ offered on the altar of the Cross to all those present, that is to say, set it forth, and in so far as they are able, communicate and exhibit it.”⁴

Then, in chapter 88, he discusses the fourfold sacrificial character of the Mass, as set forth in the *Antididagma* :

“Whether in the Mass four sacrifices are offered, namely, bread and wine, thanksgiving and prayer, Christ the Lord Himself, and the Church of ChrSt.”

As to the first, the offering of bread and wine, he says :

“It would indeed be decorous if the faithful were to bring bread and drink with them for the poor, and offer these to the Lord, from which a certain portion might be consecrated and distributed. Nevertheless, inasmuch as the Lord neither instituted nor Himself practised the collecting and offering of food and drink at the table and at His holy Supper, no Church can be compelled to do so.”¹

“The sum of this article is, first, that it would be a good and Christian thing if bread and wine were offered at the holy Supper for the poor, but that for the rest this is not commanded by the Lord. . . . Secondly, that the oblation of bread and wine should in any way be a significative sacrifice, as our adversaries pretend, has no Scripture or ancient observation in this favour. . . . Thirdly, if to offer bread and wine means to offer thanks to God for them, then this kind of offering is not passed over in silence in the Cologne Book.”²

The second kind of “sacrifice,” namely, that of thanksgiving and prayer, Bucer of course accepts.

Next we come to the crucial part, the third sacrifice. He allows that the Fathers used the phrase “offering Christ,” but maintains that by it they meant something altogether different:

“The celebrating and consecrating of the sacrament, and die distributing it to be taken and enjoyed, as also the thanksgiving to the Father for all the benefits given to all through Christ our Saviour—that is what the holy Fathers called ‘offering Christ.’ . . . In this oblation of Christ there is no setting forth or representation of our Lord Jesus Christ, through which he is set forth and represented to God the Father, other than the fact that therein we ought to give Him our highest thanks. . . . This is not a setting forth or a representing of the Son of God by which we present or represent Him to the Father, but rather the reception of our Lord Himself. . . . *It is to us that He is there offered, not to the Father.*”³

He next sets forth what he calls “notable admissions of the truth” which the Catholic theologians make in their *Anti-didagma* :

“1. They confess that this sacrifice in the holy Supper is a work and ministry of the whole Church, and that the priest ought to speak and do all things there in the name of the whole Church. . . .

“2. They confess that it ought to be far from all Christians to think that Christ the Lord and His most holy sacrifice offered

in the Cross is set forth (*proponatur*) to the Father with the sacrifice of the Mass, or is made acceptable to Him, or that to this sacrifice should be ascribed merit or remission of sins. For Christ the Lord is for ever at the right hand of the Father, and He sets forth His sacrifice to the Father Himself, which also is of itself acceptable to the Father, and is alone pleasing to Him, and has merited beforehand and won for us abundantly the remission of sins for all the elect of God. . . .”

It is evident here that Bucer is twisting the Catholic statements according to his own views. He continues :

“All these things our adversaries confess so far as words go, but so far as the thing is concerned, the Masses they celebrate, preach up, and extol, are altogether repugnant to this their confession. . . . For outside this confession, it is publicly said and preached by them that the priest in the holy Supper oilers to God the Father His beloved Son Christ our Lord for sins, and for the salvation of the living and the dead, and they persuade men that this is the case.”¹

The fourth sacrifice, that of ourselves, Bucer accepts.

At the end of the book there is “*Judicium Mclanchthonii de controversiali* in which he mentions these four sacrifices :

“As to the Mass, they contend that it is a sacrifice, and make out that four things are offered. . . . There is no dispute except about the third. For the Son of God alone offered Himself. This is the question, whether the little sacrificers offer the Son of God, and again, whether by this their sacrifice they merit for themselves and for others.”³

4. Lastly, here is Bucer’s treatment of Holy Order :

“The first accusation made against the Cologne Book is that it does not number order among the sacraments. But the Cologne Book says nothing against the idea that there is a consecrating in the ordaining of pastors . . . and that the imposition of hands . . . if rightly administered, is a holy sign of grace, and that therefore it may not unsuitably be called a sacrament.”³

But Bucer carefully abstains from saying that it is a *real* sacrament, *instituted by Christ!* He next deals with the objection that the Cologne Book speaks only of pastors, as if there were no other orders in the Church. He replies :

“It was not the intention to deal in detail and to examine most accurately all the ministries and offices in the Church.”

He then mentions the ancient ecclesiastical grades, of major and minor orders, and continues :

“The distinction of these ministries in the Church is not an apostolic or necessary tradition, but *a free matter, which each Church can arrange as it shall find to be most useful.*”¹

His words imply that this applies just as much to bishops as to any other ecclesiastical grade.

To the objection that particular churches cannot abolish rites and ceremonies he asserts that “any one bishop has as much authority as any other in all ecclesiastical ordinances and rites.”

5. This at any rate makes the Reformed position perfectly clear. *There is no sacrifice in the Mass* in the Catholic sense, and therefore *no real sacrificial priesthood*. There is, of course, a Christian ministry but the various grades in it are *a matter of convenience*, and each church may do as it pleases in the matter. Similarly, each church may change rites and ceremonies. It is of the utmost significance that these are the ideas set forth in a work which Dr. Matthew Parker considered worthy of a Latin translation in 1550?

It only remains for us to chronicle that in 1546 Archbishop Hermann was excommunicated, and in 1547 deprived of his offices. From that time he lived in retirement, and died in 1552.

¹ Page 384.

• The work was in all probability known to Cranmer, for Bucer spent three months with the Archbishop before going to Cambridge (see p. 456).

CHAPTER XII

THE COUNCIL OF TRENT

- A. GENERAL VIEW OF PROTESTANT CONCEPTIONS OF THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD.
- B. FORMULATION OF THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE ON THE REAL OBJECTIVE PRESENCE.
- C. FORMULATION OF THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE ON THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.
- D. FORMULATION OF THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE ON HOLY ORDER.

A. GENERAL VIEW OF PROTESTANT CONCEPTIONS OF THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD.

This will be a convenient point to summarise the great religious upheaval of the sixteenth century on the Continent, so far as the Mass and the Priesthood are concerned.

1. The first point to note is that *the various groups of reformers all agreed in rejecting the hitherto received doctrine of Transubstantiation, and insist that the elements of bread and wine remain substantially what they were before consecration.* But the influence of Scripture and early Tradition was too strong to allow all the reformers to deny any and every kind of Real Presence. They differed, however, among themselves as to the kind of presence they were prepared to allow. The highest form—and yet far removed from the Catholic doctrine—was the theory of *Consubstantiation*, as put forward by Luther. The lowest form would be the *symbolistic* view put forward by Zwingli, according to which the bread and wine merely “represent” Christ’s Body and Blood. Between these two extremes are all kinds of intermediate views, such as those of Bucer, Melancthon, and Calvin, which may be described as *virtualistic* views of the Presence. There is no corporeal presence of the Body and Blood in or under the form of bread and wine, but these elements are said to “exhibit” the Body and Blood, in the sense that he who receives these elements with proper dispositions is fed spiritually with the Body and Blood, which may thus be said to be really present *in the Supper*, but *not in the bread and wine*,

2. *All the Reformers agree in repudiating the hitherto accepted Catholic doctrine that there is an offering of the Body and Blood of Christ by the priest in the Mass, in memory of the Passion, and that the Mass is in this sense a sacrifice.* Some of them attribute to the Catholics an absurd theory that the Cross was a sacrifice only for original sin, and that the Mass is a sacrifice for actual sin. The Catholics explained that this was not held by them, and set forth the true doctrine, and the relation between the Sacrifice on the Cross and the Sacrifice of the Mass. Nevertheless, *the Reformers continued to deny that there is any offering of Christ's Body and Blood in the Mass.*

They allow, however, that there is a “*sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving,*” and also the sacrifices of *almsgiving, and self-surrender,* and that inasmuch as these take place in the Communion service, this may be called a sacrifice in this *figurative* sense.

3. These new views were obviously incompatible with the continuance of the Roman Mass, with its insistence on Transubstantiation and the Sacrifice of Christ's Body and Blood. Accordingly, *all the various schools of Reformers drew up new Communion rites.* These we may describe in terms of Dr. Brightman, writing in *Liturgy and Worship* :

“There are four types of ritual produced by the Continental Reformation, proceeding respectively from Wittenberg, Strassburg and Geneva, Zurich and Cologne. In all of these, it may be said at the outset, and once for all, ‘everything,* in Luther's words, ‘that signifies oblation † is ‘repudiated,’ as well as all prayers for the dead.”¹

4. Corresponding to this new conception of the Eucharist, we get *a new conception of the Christian ministry.* Since there is no real change brought about in the Eucharistic elements, there is obviously no need for any *special spiritual powers* to “consecrate” the bread and wine. And any Christian is capable of “offering” the “sacrifice” of praise, thanksgiving, almsgiving, and self-surrender. But on the other hand, some kind of external ministry is evidently desirable, if not absolutely necessary. A Christian minister is, however, *not a sacrificing priest, but a minister of the word and the sacraments.* He represents the congregation, and is in a sense their delegate. They exercise their powers in and through him, and what he does he does as their representative and in their name.

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 139.

5. The "ordination" of a minister is the solemn "appointment" of a minister by the Church as a whole, represented by its principal ministers. The type of such "ordination" is found in Scripture, namely, prayer and fasting, and the laying-on of hands, and it is admitted that this ceremony may well be retained. But there is to be no commission given in ordination to offer sacrifice.

6. Concurrently with this we get a general agreement among the Reformers that *ordination is not, properly speaking, a Sacrament*. There are only two real sacraments—or at the most, three. In addition, there are other rites, of ecclesiastical institution, such as confirmation, etc. Order would seem to be one of these. It is an ecclesiastical rite, by which Christian ministers appoint others, with the consent and approval of the Church as a whole. *It does not confer a character or any special spiritual power.*

7. Further, while the *laying-on of hands* may well be retained as an Apostolic custom, it is not to be regarded as absolutely indispensable. This is well set forth by the Lutheran theologian, Chemnitz (1522-86) :

"The rite of ordination is nothing else but a public testimony whereby that calling is in the sight of God and in His name declared to be lawful and divine.

"In that public recognition of vocation, the Apostles used the external rite of imposition of hands, which was a customary one at that time. . . . But the promises are not tied down to that rite of imposition of hands, concerning which Christ has given no command and no such promise as He has concerning the two Sacraments."¹

8. As to the *grades* of this public ministry of the word and the sacraments, the Reformers profess that they are *not opposed in principle to the three grades of bishops, priests, and deacons*. If the bishops will become Reformers, then they may retain their position, and be granted the right of ordaining.² But bishops, or "superintendents" as the Lutherans prefer to call them, are not absolutely necessary, even for ordination, and are not superior to presbyters *jure divino*. In this connection the Reformers insist that in the early Church bishop and presbyter were convertible terms.

9. All these ideas were naturally opposed by the *Catholics*, who defended the sacramental character of the rite of holy order, the

¹ Apud R. Travers Smith, *We ought not to alter the Ordinal*, Dublin, 1782, p. 21.

² Cf. Melancthon, pp. 148, 149.

sacrificial nature of the office conferred, and the sole right of bishops to confer the priesthood.

10. The Reformers, however, continued to organise their ecclesiastical polities in accordance with their views.

B. FORMULATION OF THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE ON THE REAL OBJECTIVE PRESENCE.

We now come to the inevitable result of all these heretical innovations on the subject of the sacraments, and especially of the Eucharist and Holy Order—their solemn condemnation in the General Council of the Church known as the Council of Trent. After many difficulties and delays, the Council was opened on December 13th, 1545, and continued, with various intervals and prorogations until 1563.

The method adopted by the Council was an eminently wise and fair one. Statements from the Protestant reformers were extracted from their works and reported on by many theologians. Then drafts of canons and chapters on the disputed points were considered by the bishops, and after any necessary modifications, were finally passed.

At the *seventh* session of the Council, held in 1547, various Reformed statements concerning the Sacraments were considered by the theologians, amongst them being the following :

1. The sacraments of the Church are more or less than seven.—Luther.
9. There is not a sacrament which imprints a character.—Luther.
11. All Christians of both sexes have equal power to administer the word and the sacraments.—Luther.
12. Each pastor may enlarge, abridge and change, as he pleases, the forms of the sacraments.—*Liber Reformationis* of Cologne.
14. The sacraments were instituted only in order to nourish faith.¹

At this same seventh session of the Council, i.e., in 1547, thirteen canons were passed on the sacraments in general. Here are the principal ones :

1. If anyone saith that the sacraments of the New Law were not all instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, or that they are more or less than seven . . . or even that any one of these seven is not truly and properly a sacrament, let him be anathema.
5. If anyone saith that these sacraments were instituted for the sake of nourishing faith only, let him be anathema.

¹ Theiner, *Acta*, i, 383-4.

6. If anyone saith that the sacraments of the New Law do not contain the grace which they signify . . . as though they were merely outward signs of grace or justice received through faith, and certain marks of the Christian profession whereby believers are distinguished amongst men from unbelievers, let him be anathema.

9. If anyone saith that in the three sacraments Baptism, Confirmation, and Order there is not imprinted in the soul a character, that is, a certain spiritual and indelible sign, on account of which they cannot be repeated, let him be anathema.

10. If anyone saith that all Christians have power to administer the word and all the sacraments, let him be anathema.

11. If anyone saith that in ministers, when they perform and confer the sacraments there is not required the intention at least of doing what the Church does, let him be anathema.

12. If anyone saith that a minister in mortal sin, who observes all the essentials belonging to the effecting or conferring of the sacraments, neither effects nor confers the sacrament, let him be anathema.

13. If anyone saith that the received and approved rites of the Catholic Church, wont to be used in the solemn administration of the sacraments, may be condemned, or without sin be omitted at pleasure by the ministers, or be changed by every pastor of the churches into other new ones, let him be anathema.

Thus, already by 1547 the Catholic Church had solemnly defined the existence of the seven sacraments, and affirmed that the sacrament of order confers a character, in consequence of which the sacrament cannot be repeated.

In 1547 some statements on the Eucharist by the Protestant Reformers were also considered by the theologians of the Council. Here are the most important ones, in substance :

1. In the Eucharist there is not really the body and blood of the Godhead of Our Lord Jesus Christ, but only as in a sign . . . This is the error of Zwingli and (Ecolampadius and the Sacramentarians.

2. In the Eucharist Christ is *exhibited* to the communicant (*exhiberi*), but to be eaten only spiritually, by faith, not sacramentally.—This is an article of the above-mentioned heretics.

3. In the Eucharist there is indeed the body "and blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ; but together with the substance of bread and wine, so that there is no transubstantiation, but a hypostatic union of the sacred humanity with the substance of bread and wine.—Luther.

4. Christ is not to be adored in the Eucharist, nor venerated with feasts, nor to be carried about in processions, nor to be taken to the sick, and its adorers are really idolaters.—Luther.

5. The Eucharist is not to be reserved in the sacarium, but to be consumed immediately. . . .—*Liber Reformationis* of Cologne.

6. In consecrated hosts or particles remaining after communion, the body of the Lord does not remain, but is only there when it is being received. . . . Luther.

7. It is of divine right that the faithful should be communicated under both kinds.—*Augsburg Confession* . . . Luther.¹

A similar list of Eucharistic statements was again distributed to the theologians for their consideration on September 2nd, 1551. The propositions are practically the same, but there are slight modifications here and there. Thus, Proposition 2 runs :

“In the Eucharist, Christ is *exhibited* to the communicant (*exhiberi*), but to be eaten only spiritually by faith, not sacramentally.—Zwingli and the Sacramentarians. While these do not deny that Christ is really in the Eucharist, they assert that Christ cannot be eaten except by faith, and that only the morsel of bread is taken sacramentally.”

Proposition 3 adds to the statement about the hypostatic union of the Body with the Bread the explanatory statement :

“so that it is true to say, * This bread is my body.’ ”

A new proposition is added for No. 4 :

“The Eucharist was instituted only for the remission of sins.”
—Luther.

Also, No. 7, which asserts that the body of Christ is there only while it is being received, adds “not before or after reception.”

The ninth proposition runs :

“A communicant under one kind does not receive as much as under both kinds.”—Luther.

The tenth is :

“Faith by itself is sufficient preparation for the reception of the sacrament, neither is Confession before it necessary, but optional. . . .”—Luther.²

Dr. Darwell Stone remarks on this list of propositions :

“It is of considerable importance as giving a brief abstract, apparently mostly made with great fairness, of the crucial points in the teaching of the Reformers, and as showing that the differences between the Lutherans and others were clearly understood by those who drew it up.”³

The reports of the theologians were definitely hostile to the propositions, as might be expected. And after lengthy discussions, a number of doctrinal chapters and canons were drawn up and formally approved in the thirteenth session of

¹ Theiner, I, 406.

² *History of the Doctrine of the Eucharist*, II, 88.

³ Theiner, I, 488-9.

the Council, 1551.¹ These are most important, for they constitute a solemn declaration and exposition of the official doctrine of the Church, and a vindication of the traditional teaching. Here is a summary of the most important points. The first chapter deals with the “ Real Presence ” :

“ In the august sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, after the consecration of the bread and wine, Our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and man, is truly, really, and substantially contained under the species of these sensible things. For neither are these things mutually repugnant : that our Saviour Himself always sitteth at the right hand of the Father in heaven, according to the natural mode of existing, and that, nevertheless, He is in many other places, sacramentally present to us in His own substance, by a manner of existing which, though we can scarcely express it in words, yet can we, by the understanding illuminated by faith, conceive, and ought most firmly to believe, to be possible unto God. . .

The third chapter contains this statement :

“ This faith has ever been in the Church of God, that, immediately after the consecration, the veritable Body of Our Lord, and His veritable Blood, together with His soul and divinity, are under the species of bread and wine, but the Body indeed under the species of Bread, and the Blood under the species of wine, by force of the words; but the Body itself under the species of wine, and the Blood under the species of bread, and the soul under both, by the force of that natural connexion and concomitance whereby the parts of Christ our Lord, who hath now risen from the dead, to die no more, are united together ; and the divinity, furthermore, on account of the admirable hypostatical union thereof with His body and soul. Wherefore it is most true that as much is contained under either species as under both.”

Chapter IV defines Transubstantiation :

“ Because Christ our Redeemer declared that which He offered under the species of bread to be truly His own body, therefore has it ever been a firm belief in the Church of God, and this holy Council doth now declare it anew, that by the consecration of the bread and of the wine, a conversion takes place of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of His blood, which conversion is, by the holy Catholic Church, suitably and properly called Transubstantiation.”

Chapter V deals with “ the cult and veneration to be shown to this most holy Sacrament ” :

“All the faithful may, according to the custom ever received in the Catholic Church, render in veneration the worship of latria, due to the true God, to this most holy Sacrament. For not therefore is it the less to be adored on this account, that it was instituted by Christ the Lord in order to be received, for we believe that same God to be present therein, of whom the eternal Father, when introducing him into the world, says, ‘Let all the angels of God adore him.’ . . .

“Very piously and religiously was this custom introduced into the Church, that this sublime and venerable sacrament be, with special veneration and solemnity, celebrated every year on a certain day and that a festival, and that it be borne reverently and with honour in processions.”

Chapter VI defends the taking of the Sacrament to the sick, and the reserving of it for this purpose.

Chapter VII enjoins that no one conscious of mortal sin ought to approach the sacred Eucharist without previous sacramental confession.

Chapter VIII mentions the three kinds of communion, sacramentally only; spiritually only; and spiritually and sacramentally, and inculcates frequent communion.

There follow eleven canons, which condemn the various Protestant heresies advanced by the Reformers :

1. If anyone denieth that, in the sacrament of the most holy Eucharist are contained truly, really and substantially, the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of Our Lord Jesus Christ, and consequently the whole Christ, but saith that He is only therein as in a sign, or in figure, or in virtue, let him be anathema.

2. If anyone saith that, in the sacred and holy sacrament of the Eucharist, the substance of the bread and wine remains together with the body and blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ, and denieth that wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the Body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the Blood, the species only of the bread and wine remaining, which conversion indeed the Catholic Church most aptly calls Transubstantiation, let him be anathema.

3. If anyone denieth that in the venerable sacrament of the Eucharist, the whole Christ is contained under each species, and under every part of each species, when separated, let him be anathema.

4. If anyone saith that, after the consecration is completed, the body and blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ are not in the admirable sacrament of the Eucharist, but only during the use, while it is being received, and not either before or after, and that in the hosts or consecrated particles which are reserved or which remain after communion, the true Body of the Lord remaineth not, let him be anathema.

SIO THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

5. If anyone saith either that the principal fruit of the most holy Eucharist is the remission of sins, or that other effects do not result therefrom, let him be anathema.

6. If anyone saith that, in the holy sacrament of the Eucharist, Christ, the only begotten Son of God, is not to be adored with the worship, even external, of latria, and is consequently neither to be venerated with a special feast nor to be solemnly carried about in processions, according to the laudable and universal rite and custom of Holy Church, or is not to be exposed publicly to the people to be adored, and that the adorers thereof are idolaters, let him be anathema.

7. If anyone saith that it is not lawful for the sacred Eucharist to be reserved in the sacarium but that immediately after consecration it must necessarily be distributed among those present, or that it is not lawful that it be carried with honour to the sick, let him be anathema.

8. If anyone saith that Christ *exhibited* in the Eucharist is eaten spiritually only and not also sacramentally and really, let him be anathema.

The ninth canon concerns the precept of annual communion. The tenth says that a priest may communicate himself.

The eleventh denies that faith alone is a sufficient preparation for receiving the sacrament.

There is one point to which we here call attention, and that is, that in the above very careful formulation of her official doctrine, the Catholic Church has abstained from using terms which imply the Aristotelian Thomist or Scholastic views of substance and accidents. She does not define officially that the “accidents” of bread and wine remain, but deliberately chooses the more general term “appearances” or species.

Note also that *the Church never makes use of the term “exhibited” in her own exposition of the doctrine of the Real Presence, and that the term only occurs in the eighth canon, which is condemning a statement made by the Reformers.*

C. FORMULATION OF THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE OF THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.

A similar treatment was given to the subject of the Sacrifice of the Mass. To begin with, statements by the Reformers on the subject were extracted from their works, and submitted to theologians in December, 1551, as follows :

1. The Mass is not a sacrifice, nor an offering for sins, but only a commemoration of the sacrifice accomplished on the Cross. It is indeed metaphorically called a sacrifice by the Fathers,

yet it is not really and properly a sacrifice, but only a covenant and promise of remission of sins.—Luther and the *Apology for the Augsburg Confession* (Melanchthon).

2. The Mass is not of the Gospel, and it was not instituted by Christ, but it was invented by men. . . . In it is committed manifest and multiple idolatry.—*Defence of Augsburg Confession*, and Calvin, and Melanchthon (*Locis communibus*).

3. Blasphemous despite is done to the most holy sacrifice of Christ accomplished on the Cross if anyone believes that the Son of God is offered anew to God the Father by priests in the Mass. That Christ is mystically sacrificed and offered for us is nothing else than that He is given to us to be eaten. And in the words "Do this for My Memorial" Christ did not ordain that the Apostles should offer His body and blood in the Sacrifice of the Mass.—Rieger . . . Luther . . . Bucer. . . .

4. The canon of the Mass is full of errors and delusions, ought to be abolished, and is to be avoided no less than the worst abomination.—*Defence of Augsburg Confession* . . . Zwingli, Bullinger, Melanchthon. . . .

5. The Mass is not profitable as a sacrifice either to the living or to the dead, and it is impious to apply it for sins, satisfactions, and other needs.—Melanchthon . . . Calvin . . . *Defence of Augsburg Confession* . . . Luther. . . .

6. As no one communicates for another, or is absolved for another, so neither in the Mass can a priest offer sacrifice for another.—*Defence of Augsburg Confession*.

7. Private Masses . . . are unlawful, and to be abolished, and are opposed to the institution of Christ.—*Defence of Augsburg Confession* and Calvin. . . .

8. Wine is not the matter of this sacrifice. Neither is water to be mixed with the wine in the cup. So to mix it is contrary to the institution of Christ.—*Bucer*. . . .

9. The rite of the Church of Rome by which the words of consecration are said secretly and in a low voice is to be condemned, and the Mass ought to be celebrated only in a vernacular language which all understand; and it is an imposture to assign certain Masses to certain saints.—Calvin. . . .

10. In the celebration of Masses all ceremonies, vestments, and outward signs are incitements to impiety rather than offices of piety. . . . Luther. . . . x

These statements were duly considered and reported on by the theologians. The latter carefully distinguished the senses in which some of the statements might be understood. Eventually canons and a doctrinal statement were drawn up for consideration by the bishops. But in April, 1552, the work of the Council was suspended. In July, 1562, the consideration of the Sacrifice of the Mass was resumed. Thirteen questions based on the propositions examined in 1551 were submitted

to the theologians. Reports were duly made, and lengthy discussions by the bishops followed. Finally, a series of chapters and canons was formally passed by the Council at the twenty-second session in September, 1562.

The first chapter points out that Our Lord was a priest according to the order of Melchisedeck, and continues :

“ He therefore, our God and Lord, though He was about to offer Himself once on the altar of the Cross to God the Father, there to operate an eternal redemption by means of His death, nevertheless, because His priesthood was not to be extinguished by His death, in the Last Supper, on the night in which He was betrayed, in order that He might leave to His own beloved Spouse the Church a visible sacrifice, such as the nature of man requires, whereby that bloody sacrifice, once to be accomplished on the cross, might be represented, and the memory thereof remain even unto the end of the world, and its salutary virtue be applied to the remission of those sins which we daily commit—declaring Himself constituted a priest for ever, according to the order of Melchisedeck, He offered up to God the Father His own body and blood under the species of bread and wine, and under the symbols of those same things He delivered [His own body and blood] to be received by His apostles, whom He then constituted priests of the New Testament; and by those words * Do this in commemoration of me ' He commanded them and their successors in the priesthood to offer [them] ; even as the Catholic Church has ever understood and taught. For having celebrated the ancient Passover . . . He instituted the new Passover, Himself, to be immolated, under visible signs, by the Church through priests, in memory of His own passage from this world unto the Father, when by the shedding of His own blood He redeemed us, and delivered us from the power of darkness, and translated us into His kingdom. And this is indeed that clean oblation . . . which the Lord foretold by Malachias was to be offered in every place a clean offering to His name, which was to be great amongst the Gentiles, and which the apostle Paul, writing to the Corinthians, has not obscurely indicated when he says that they who are defiled by the participation of the table of devils, cannot be partakers of the table of the Lord, by the table meaning in both places the altar. . . . ”

Chapter II declares that the sacrifice of the Mass is propitiatory, both for the living and the dead :

“ For as much as, in this divine sacrifice which is celebrated in the Mass, that same Christ is contained and immolated in an unbloody manner who once offered Himself in a bloody manner on the altar of the Cross, the Holy Council teaches that this sacrifice is truly propitiatory. . . . For the Lord, appeased by the oblation thereof, and granting the grace and gift of penitence, forgives even heinous crimes and sins. For the victim is one and the same, the same now offering by the ministry of priests who then offered

Himself on the Cross, the manner only of offering being different. The fruits indeed of which oblation, namely of that bloody one, are received most plentifully through this unbloody one, so far is this latter from derogating in any way from that former oblation. Wherefore, it is rightly offered not only for the sins, pains, satisfactions and other necessities of the faithful who are alive, but also for those who are departed in Christ and are not yet fully purified, according to a tradition of the Apostles."

Chapter III explains that Masses in honour of the Saints are offered to God who crowned the saints.

Chapter IV affirms that the Canon of the Mass is pure from all error, "for it is composed out of the very words of the Lord, the traditions of the apostles, and the pious institutions also of holy pontiffs."

Chapter V defends the accustomed ceremonies of the Mass.

Chapter VI says that though it is desirable that "at each Mass the faithful who are present should communicate," yet it refuses to condemn "masses in which the priest alone communicates sacramentally, since those masses also ought to be considered as truly common, partly because the people communicate spiritually thereat, partly also because they are celebrated by a public minister of the Church, not for himself only, but for all the faithful."

Chapter VII defends the mingling of water with wine in the chalice.

Chapter VIII says it is not expedient that Mass should everywhere be celebrated in the vulgar tongue, but pastors are frequently, during the celebration of Mass, to expound some portions of those things read at Mass.

A ninth chapter introduces nine canons :

1. If anyone saith that in the Mass a true and proper sacrifice is not offered to God, or that to be offered is nothing else but that Christ is given to us to eat, let him be anathema.

2. If anyone saith that by those words "Do this for the commemoration of me" Christ did not institute the apostles priests, or did not ordain that they and other priests should offer His own body and blood, let him be anathema.

3. If anyone saith that the sacrifice of the Mass is only a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, or that it is a bare commemoration of the sacrifice consummated on the cross, but not a propitiatory sacrifice ; or that it profits only him who receives ; and that it ought not to be offered for the living and the dead for sins, pains, satisfactions and other necessities, let him be anathema.

4. If anyone saith that by the sacrifice of the Mass a blasphemy is cast upon the most holy sacrifice of Christ consummated on the

214 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

cross, or that the former is derogatory to the latter, let him be anathema.

8. If anyone saith that masses wherein the priest alone communicates sacramentally are unlawful and are therefore to be abrogated, let him be anathema.

The other canons concern minor points. There follows a Decree concerning things to be observed and to be avoided in the celebration of Mass.

The result of the Council is thus described by Dr. Darwcll Stone :

“ The proceedings of the Council of Trent, and of the Catechism drawn up in consequence of the action of Trent, show *the rejection by the Church of Rome in the sixteenth century of the characteristic ideas about the Eucharist of the Continental Reformers*,¹ The denial of Zwingli that the body and blood of Christ are received ; the contention of Bucer and Calvin that though there is a spiritual reception of the body and blood of Christ by the faithful communicant, the consecrated elements are not that body and blood ; the assertion of Luther that, while the consecrated elements are the body and blood of Christ, they are also as fully bread and wine as before consecration ; the refusal of all of these to allow any other kind of sacrifice in the Eucharist than a mere commemoration or such as may be in any kind of prayer, were all put aside and condemned.”²

Dr. Darwcll Stone, as we see, limits the condemnation of the Council to the ideas of the *Continental* Reformers. But in any case, the condemnation applies also to the English Reformers inasmuch as *they merely copied some of the ideas of the Continental Reformers*, as we shall see in due course.

D. FORMULATION OF THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE ON HOLY ORDER.

The Council of Trent similarly condemned the Protestant errors and heresies on the subject of Holy Order. We have already seen that the Council defined that the Apostles were constituted priests at the Last Supper,³ and also that Holy Order was declared to be a sacrament conferring a character,⁴ and therefore incapable of being repeated. But a more detailed treatment was given to this particular subject. As in the case with other matters, first of all a theological commission examined heretical statements extracted from the works of the Reformers. This was done in 1551. Here are the most important propositions examined :

¹ *Italics ours.*

• *Op. cit.*, ii, 105.

• Cf. p. 212.

4 Cf. p. 206.

1. Order is not a sacrament, but a certain rite of choosing and a constituting ministers of the word and the sacraments.—Luther, Calvin, Melancthon.

2. Order is not one sacrament. . . . Calvin.

3. There is no ecclesiastical hierarchy, but all Christians are equally priests, and for the use or execution [of orders] there is needed vocation by the ruler (*magistratus*) and the consent of the people, and he who once becomes a priest can again become a layman.—Luther, Bucer, Calvin.

4. There is not in the New Testament a visible and external priesthood (*sacerdotium*)^t nor any spiritual power, whether for the consecrating of the body and blood of the Lord, or for offering, or for absolving from sins in the presence of God, but only an office and ministry of preaching the gospel, and those who do not preach are not priests.—Bucer, Luther, Calvin.

5. Unction is not only not required in the giving of orders, but is pernicious and to be despised, and the same applies to all other ceremonies; and through ordination the Holy Ghost is not conferred, and hence vainly do bishops say, "Receive the Holy Ghost," when they ordain.—Calvin.

6. Bishops have not been instituted by divine right, neither are they superior to presbyters, nor have they the right of ordaining, or if they have it, they have it in common with presbyters.—Luther, Calvin, Bucer.^l

Similar statements were examined in 1562, but this time they were seven in number, as a new one was introduced:

2. Order is not only not a sacrament, but rather a human figment, invented by men unacquainted with ecclesiastical things.

The consideration of these propositions eventually resulted in the formal passing of several chapters and canons on the Sacrament of Order in the 23rd session, in 1563. At first it was proposed to promulgate a statement to the following effect:

In every law the priesthood and sacrifice had been found united.

There is in the New Law a priesthood ordained for the Eucharistic Sacrifice, comprising various degrees, which are themselves ordered to the supreme degree, the priesthood, which contains them all. The diaconate is affirmed in Scripture; the inferior orders are named with their functions in the earliest documents of the Church. Order is a sacrament, for it confers power and grace by means of a sensible rite having its origin in the actions of Our Lord Himself, i.e., in the giving of the chalice, etc., to the Apostles at the last supper, when He constituted them priests, in the breathing when He gave them the power to forgive sins, and in the laying-on of hands used in ordaining Paul and Barnabas. As to the grace communicated, this is clearly affirmed by St. Paul in 2 Tim. i. 6, 7. The Church has always held that order implies a sort of consecration, fixed and irremovable, and which cannot

be destroyed, so that it is impossible for a properly ordained priest to be again a layman. Just as order is a sacrament, it is also one sacrament and not many, for the various degrees converge to the sacrifice and sacrament of the Eucharist in such a way that, like the heavenly hierarchy, the hierarchy of orders is constituted under one supreme head, the Roman Pontiff, Vicar of Jesus Christ. If anyone says that all Christians are equally priests, or equally enjoy an equal spiritual power, he overturns the constitution of the Church.

Also the Council declares that bishops form part of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, and that they are not only different from priests but are superior to them, for they are the successors of the apostles. They administer the sacrament of confirmation, ordain ministers of the Church, and perform other functions which inferior ministers cannot. Hence those ordained by a bishop are validly and legitimately ordained, and the consent or call by the multitude or of any secular power whatsoever are not in any way required for the validity of ordination. On the contrary, those who enter the sacred ministry otherwise than by the true door, that is, by the authority of the ecclesiastical power, must be regarded as robbers and thieves.

In addition, the following canons were proposed :

1. If anyone says that there is no visible and external priesthood in the New Testament, or that there does not exist the power of consecrating and offering the body and blood of the Lord and of forgiving or retaining sins before God, but only a charge and simple ministry of preaching the Gospel, and that those who preach not are in no wise priests, let him be anathema.

2. If anyone say that besides the priesthood there are not in the Catholic Church other inferior and middle orders, which tend as degrees to the order of priesthood, or that order is a human figment, invented by men ignorant of ecclesiastical things, let him be anathema.

3. If anyone say that order or sacred ordination is not properly and truly a sacrament instituted by Jesus Christ, or denies the unity of this sacrament, or professes that it is a *simple rite used for the choosing of ministers of the word and of the sacraments*^ let him be anathema.

4. If anyone affirm that ordination does not confer any *spiritual and indelible power*, and that one who becomes a priest can again become a layman, or that the Holy Ghost is not given by it, and that it is in vain that bishops say to the ordinands, "Receive the Holy Ghost," let him be anathema.

5. If anyone say that sacred unction used by the Church is not only not necessary for the conferring of orders but also that it is harmful and contemptible, as well as the other ceremonies of Order, let him be anathema.

6. If anyone say that there does not exist in the Catholic and Apostolic Church any hierarchy or any holy principality, but that all Christians are equally priests, and equal in spiritual power, let him be anathema.

7. If anyone say that bishops are not superior to priests, or that they have not the right to ordain, or if they have this right they possess it in common with priests, or that orders conferred without the consent or call of the people or of the secular power are invalid, and that those who, without being regularly ordained and sent by the ecclesiastical and canonical authority, come from elsewhere, are nevertheless legitimate ministers of the word and the sacraments, let him be anathema.¹

These statements met, however, with certain criticisms on minor points. Thus, the Cardinal of Lorraine criticised a statement contained in the first chapter to the effect that in every law the priesthood and sacrifice were united, as he thought this was not true of the *natural* law, in which, though there was indeed sacrifice, there was no separate order of priests.² Also, he thought that the statement about the matter and form of the sacrament, as referred to in the third chapter, should be omitted, as the matter cannot easily be determined, because of the difference of views held. But he desired that the imposition of hands should be mentioned. Others wanted canon 7 to say that bishops are superior to priests by divine right.

As a result of these criticisms and suggestions, the whole project was carefully revised, and passed in a new form. Here is its substance :

Chapter I. On the Institution of the Priesthood of the New Law.

“Sacrifice and priesthood are, by the ordinance of God, in suchwise conjoined, as that both have existed in every law. Whereas therefore, in the New Testament, the Catholic Church has received, from the Institution of Christ, the holy visible sacrifice of the Eucharist, it must needs also be confessed that there is in that Church a new, visible and external priesthood, into which the old has been translated. The Sacred Scriptures show, and the tradition of the Catholic Church has always taught, that this priesthood was instituted by the same Lord our Saviour, and that to the Apostles and their successors in the priesthood the power was delivered of consecrating, offering, and administering His body and blood, as also of forgiving and retaining sins.”

Chapter II deals with the Seven Orders. It is declared to be fitting that there should be several and diverse orders of ministers, to minister to the priesthood. The Scriptures mention not only priests but also deacons, and from the beginning the other orders have been in use.

¹ *Concilium Tridentinum*, Gorresgesellschaft, tome ix, 1924, pp. 38-41.

² Cf. St. Thomas, *Summa Theologica*, Ia, Hae, q. 103, art. 1 ad 3 : “Sacerdotium erat ante legem [mosaicam] apud colentes Deum secundum humanam determinationem, qui banc dignitatem primogenitis attribuebant.”

Chapter III declares that Order is truly and properly a Sacrament, but it abstains from defining its matter and form 1:

u Whereas by the testimony of Scripture, Apostolic tradition, and the unanimous consent of the Fathers, it is clear that grace is conferred by sacred ordination, which is perfected *by words and outward signs*, no one ought to doubt that Order is truly and properly one of the seven sacraments of Holy Church. For the Apostle says : * I admonish thee that thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee by the imposition of my hands. . . .”

Chapter IV deals with the ecclesiastical hierarchy and ordination : Priests rightly ordained cannot again become laymen :

“ And if anyone affirm that all Christians are indiscriminately priests of the New Testament, or that they are all mutually endowed with an equal spiritual power, he clearly does nothing but confound the ecclesiastical hierarchy. . . . Wherefore the holy Synod declares that, besides the other ecclesiastical degrees, bishops, who have succeeded to the place of the Apostles, principally belong to this hierarchical order; that they are placed, as the same apostle says, by the Holy Ghost, to rule the Church of God; that they are superior to priests, administer the sacrament of Confirmation, ordain the ministers of the Church, etc. . . . Furthermore, the sacred synod teaches that in the ordination of bishops, priests, and other orders, neither the consent nor vocation nor authority, whether of the people or of any civil power or magistrate whatsoever, is required in such wise that without it the ordination is invalid, yea rather doth it decree that all those who, being only called and instituted by the people, or by the civil power and magistrate, ascend to the exercise of these ministrations, and those who of their own rashness assume them to themselves, are not ministers of the Church but are to be looked upon as thieves and robbers, who have not entered by the door.”

There follow eight canons :

The first canon remains unchanged, as originally proposed. It affirms the visible and external priesthood, with its power of consecrating and offering the body and blood of Christ, as well as of forgiving sins. The priesthood is not an office and bare ministry of preaching the Gospel.

Canon 2 affirms the existence of other orders besides the priesthood, both greater and minor.

Canon 3 is as follows :

“ If anyone saith that order, or sacred ordination, is not truly and properly a sacrament instituted by Christ, or that it is a kind of human figment devised by men unskilled in ecclesiastical

1 In view of the previous discussion (see p. 217) this abstention must be regarded as *deliberate*.

matters, or that it is only a certain *rite for choosing ministers of the word of God and the sacraments*, let him be anathema.”

Canon 4 declares that:

“If anyone saith that by sacred ordination the Holy Ghost is not given, and that vainly therefore do bishops say, ‘Receive the Holy Ghost,’ or that a character is not imprinted in ordination, or that he who has once been a priest can again become a layman, let him be anathema.”

Canon 5 :

“If anyone saith that the sacred unction which the Church uses in ordination is not only not required, but is to be despised and is pernicious, as likewise are the other ceremonies of Order, let him be anathema.”

Canon 6:

“If anyone saith that in the Catholic Church there is not a hierarchy by divine ordination instituted, consisting of bishops, priests, and ministers, let him be anathema.”

Canon 7:

“If anyone saith that bishops are not superior to priests,¹ or that they have not the power of confirming and ordaining, or that the power which they possess is common to them and to priests, or that orders conferred by them without the consent or vocation of the people or the secular power are invalid, or that those who have neither been rightly ordained nor sent by ecclesiastical and canonical power but come from elsewhere, are lawful ministers of the word and the sacraments, let him be anathema.”

Canon 8:

“If anyone saith that the bishops who are assumed by the authority of the Roman Pontiff are not legitimate and true bishops but are a human figment, let him be anathema.”

Thus the Council of Trent defines that the Christian ministry is essentially a *sacrificial priesthood*, and that *bishops possess a power of ordaining which is not shared by simple priests*. There is by divine ordinance a hierarchy in the Church, and this consists of bishops, priests, and ministers. Bishops are superior to priests. Thus the Council rejects the Presbyterian conception of Church polity, and also, by insisting that the priesthood is a *sacrificial* one, it rejects by implication any conception of the ministry as a mere *authority to preach the word and administer the sacraments*, if this phrase be

¹ The Council abstains from *dining* that bishops are superior to priests *by divine right*, but confines itself to three statements : (1) There is a divinely instituted hierarchy, which consists of bishops, priests, and ministers ; (2) bishops are superior to priests ; (3) the power of ordaining and confirming is not common to bishops and priests. This leaves open the question as to how and when the simple priesthood (as distinct from the fulness of the priesthood possessed by bishops) was instituted.

intended to exclude the *power to consecrate and offer the Body and Blood of Christ*.

It is to be noted that the Council does not employ this ambiguous phrase, "the ministry of the Word and of the Sacraments," when formulating the Catholic doctrine in its own chapters, but uses it only when quoting and condemning statements of the Protestant Reformers. This is of the utmost importance. It was evidently clear enough by that time that, while the phrase *could* have an orthodox signification, in point of fact, it was being used in a heterodox way by the Reformers, and therefore was not a suitable one to choose for the designation of the Catholic Priesthood.

Before leaving this great Council, we would remind the reader that the propositions condemned were advanced by different schools of Protestant Reformers. It may be that no one Reformer held all the Protestant errors condemned, but if he held *any* of them, he was to that extent a Protestant, and condemned. We shall shortly proceed to the English Reformation. Our aim will be to discover whether the reformed Anglican Church was on the Catholic side, or the Protestant side, and this will be determined by finding out *whether it taught the traditional doctrines, as defined ultimately at Trent, or the doctrines of the Continental Reformers there condemned*. The question as to whether the historical succession of ordinations by bishops, real or nominal, was conserved, is a minor one. We have seen that the German Reformers had no rooted objection to bishops, provided they were "evangelical" in character, and, in point of fact, a historical succession was carried on in Sweden. But that did not prevent the Swedish Church from being Lutheran, i.e., Protestant.

CHAPTER XIII

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND LUTHERAN ORDERS

In connection with the Council of Trent there are some references to Lutheran and Calvinistic orders which ought not to be omitted.

1. At the *Colloquy of Poissy* (a sort of Conference between French Protestants and Catholics), which took place in 1561, Beza and other French Protestants had claimed to possess an extraordinary vocation, which justified their assumption of the ministry, and dispensed with the ordinary means of ordination by a bishop. The Catholic theologians, of course, would not allow this, and remarked that an extraordinary vocation would naturally be accompanied by a power of working miracles, etc., which was conspicuously absent in the case of the French Protestant ministers.

2. In 1562, at the *Council* itself, a project for Catholic Reform was put forward in the German Emperor's name. This contained a suggestion to the effect that, where Catholic priests were few in number, some of the Protestant pastors who were otherwise suitable might be chosen and sent to some kind of college, where they could be trained for the Catholic ministry.¹ Ordination is not mentioned, but it is obviously implied that the course of training would end in Catholic ordination, especially in view of the fact that on May 4th, 1562, the Cardinal Secretary of State "submitted to the Papal legates (at the Council) another request of the Emperor, asking for the Archbishop of Prague an authorisation to ordain as priests certain Calixtin pastors, even though married. . . . The reply was subject to certain conditions of orthodoxy which were first to be verified. . . ."²

* Le Plat, V, 265, ii.

• Hefele-Lederg-Richard, *Concile de Trent*, ix, 2, 692.

From this it is sufficiently obvious that the new Protestant orders were from the first regarded as invalid by the Catholic Church.

It is, indeed, stated in Dr. Kidd's *Counter Reformation* (1933, p. 90) that a proposal was made at Trent that, in the absence of a Catholic priest, Catholics could seek the sacraments at the hands of a Protestant minister, and this statement was repeated in a letter to the *Church Times* (March 2nd, 1934) by the Rev. E. Forse. But Dr. Kidd subsequently acknowledged that he derived his information from Philippon

3. As to the subsequent fortunes of the Lutheran Churches from the Hierarchical point of view, an episcopal constitution in one form or another was conserved in the *Lutheran Churches* of Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Iceland, and Finland. In Sweden and Finland, there was also an actual historical succession, i.e., Lutheran bishops were consecrated by Catholic bishops, and the line continued. In Finland, however, the succession was broken a few decades ago. In Sweden it remains to this day. In Denmark and Norway, the first reformed bishops were consecrated by a simple priest.¹ In Germany, from the first, as we have seen, there were certain "superintendents," as well as at least two Lutheran "bishops" intruded into Catholic Sees. The latter died out, but government by "superintendents" continued, and latterly these have taken the title of "bishop."

4. Thus, the only country in which an unbroken episcopal succession has been retained is *Sweden*. It is interesting to note that the Church Order of Abp. Laurentius Petri of 1571, which was confirmed by the Assembly of Upsala in 1593, says that "the ordinance of bishops was *very useful*, and without doubt proceeded from the Holy Ghost, and so it was generally approved and accepted in the whole of Christendom, and has since so remained, and must remain in the future, so long as the world lasts"—phraseology which resembles that of the Catechism of Justus Jonas, and also to some extent the famous Preface to the Anglican Ordinal.

The ordination service follows the Lutheran model. Deacons have now ceased to exist, having disappeared during the seventeenth century. Priests are given a chasuble, and bishops a pectoral cross and cope, pastoral staff, and mitre. But the form accompanying the laying-on of hands seems to be merely the "Our Father" and a colourless prayer. Further, it must be borne in mind that Swedish Lutherans are in full communion with the non-episcopal Lutheran Churches in other countries, so that it seems evident that they regard the episcopal form of government as a *matter of convenience* at the most. But a far more serious defect is that *ofform and intention*, for it seems quite clear

(*La Contre Reformation*, 1884), whose statement is erroneous, for no such suggestion was made at Trent, as a reference to the original documents in Le Plat and Hefele will show. Dr. Kidd in the *Church Times* for April 20th, 1934, undertook to withdraw the statement in any future editions of his book. See also the *Universe* for April 13th, 1934, p. 12; April 27th, p. 12; and May 4th, p. 12.

¹ i.e., by Bugenhagen. See p. 156.

that in Sweden as elsewhere, the conception of the Eucharist and of the Christian Ministry is the Lutheran or Protestant one, and the "form" of Holy Orders must be interpreted in this sense, and not otherwise. It is interesting to note that the Lambeth Conference of 1920 accepted the validity of Swedish Lutheran orders. An independent investigation was undertaken by the English Church Union, which agreed that the actual succession has been preserved, "but expressed some doubt as to the intention."¹ The Anglican writer just quoted remarks that "the denial of 'intention' is an objection which Anglican scholars must not use without caution, for Rome employs it against themselves."² He concludes that "the validity of Swedish ordinations must be accepted, not only because it has been recognised by the Anglican bishops, but because all the objections to it can be shown to be insufficient, which means that a Swedish priest who wished to serve in the Anglican Communion would not have to be ordained. There have been several cases in America of Swedish priests received in their orders."³ The same writer records that Anglican Bishops have recently (1920) taken part in the consecration of Swedish Bishops.⁴

5. As to the Catholic attitude to Lutheran orders in general, and to Swedish orders in particular, the question has not been much discussed, but it is plain that the Catholic Church regards them all as invalid.

6. But before we leave the subject of Lutheran Orders, we must mention one reference to the subject in post-Reformation history. Towards the latter part of the seventeenth century there were certain discussions in Germany concerning the possibility of the reunion of Protestants and Catholics. One such attempt at negotiation had taken place under the auspices of the Archbishop Elector of Mainz, John Philip von Schonbom, in 1661, and in connection with this attempt—which failed—a document was in circulation purporting to be the proposed concessions which the Archbishop was willing to make, with, it was said, the approval of the Holy See.⁵

The plan certainly contained some startling proposals. The Mass was to be said in German, Auricular Confession was to be abolished in Germany, the doctrine of Purgatory left

¹ C. B. Moss, in *Episcopacy, Ancient and Modern*, p. 325.

² *Op. cit.*, pp. 324-5.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 333.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 324.

⁵ Thus Febronius (Bishop Von Hontheim) : "Extant et quadam pacis conditiones ab Electore Moguntino jussu et auctoritate Summi Pontificis in aulis Germania Proposita."—*De Statu Ecclesia*, Pref., p. xxi.

an open question, celibacy to be abolished for bishops and priests, and the Pope to be regarded, not as a judge of controversy, but simply as the head of the hierarchy, and he should be required to choose his advisers from both branches of the united communions, etc. The document contains no express reference to Lutheran orders, but the clauses stated that the united Lutherans or Evangelicals, henceforth to be called "Reformed Catholics," should recognise the Pope as the first Christian priest, while he on his part would acknowledge them to be true members of the Church and hold them entitled to receive a share in the offices and dignities of the Roman Church. As to this extraordinary document, which, as Dr. Russell of Maynooth rightly says :

"not only contains a formal and explicit abandonment of almost all that is distinctive in Catholic discipline and practice, but also compromises some of the most important principles of Catholic belief."¹

—it is only necessary to say that it is *now recognised as a forgery*, and this on the authority of a letter written by Leibniz in 1700, in which he describes the document as a mere fabrication.²

7. However, another attempt at Reunion was conducted under the auspices of Bishop *Spinola* at various times from 1661 onwards, and these culminated in a Conference at Hanover between the Bishop and certain Lutheran theologians, under the leadership of *Molanus* in 1683. The Bishop there put forward certain terms of Reunion, which were said to have Papal approval. It is quite certain that the Pope knew of his efforts for reunion, for the Pope wrote authorising him to proceed, both in 1677 and 1678. But on the other hand, there is nothing explicit to show that the Pope approved of the specific proposals made by *Spinola* at Hanover in 1683. And further, we have no definite information as to what these proposals really were. There are certain proposals found in Lutheran historians of the period, and these are indeed ascribed to Bishop *Molanus*. They are attributed to him also by the Rev. Dr. Jordan, writing on the subject in the *Review of the Churches* for Jan., 1930. On the other hand, in his own book, *Reunion of the Churches*, Dr. Jordan admits that *Spinola* left no written document on the question, and that "we are entirely dependent on Protestants for our information."³ But he himself considers the Lutheran account

of them reliable.¹ The proposals, as set forth by the Lutherans, "comprised concessions in doctrine, in discipline, and in Church government, of the largest and most unexampled liberality,"² and resemble the articles attributed to the Archbishop of Mainz on the previous occasion, so much that Dr. Russell says he "probably took as his model these fabricated articles."³ However this may be, the proposals as found in Lutheran historians included the following concessions :

The chalice was to be given to the laity, saint worship and good works were to be "explained" in a sense satisfactory to the Protestants ; Protestants were to retain their practices which tend to edification ; their ministers were to be at liberty to marry, the clergy of each party were to preach and catechise in turn under the names of "Old Catholics" and "New Catholics," the Eucharist was to be received occasionally at each other's hands in token of intercommunion ; the Council of Trent and its anathemas were to be in abeyance until the meeting of a new General Council ; the Protestants were to appear there and to vote by their superintendents ; the Pope would release all Protestants from the name of "heretic" by a formal Bull, and they in return would declare that they did not regard him as Antichrist, but as the First Patriarch of Christendom.⁴

This extraordinary proposal for "reunion" or rather "intercommunion" does not mention any reordination of Protestant pastors, and Dr. Jordan has concluded that such reordination was not contemplated. But this inference can easily be shown to be wrong, by the following facts. In consequence, presumably, of Bishop Spinola's proposals, the Lutheran Molanus presented on March 30th, 1683, a project of reunion under the title "*Methodus reducendae unionis ecclesiasticae inter Romanenses et Protestantas*," which was subsequently revised because of Protestant criticism, and published in 1691 under the title "*Regulae circa Christianorum omnium ecclesiasticum unionem*." These "rules" are to govern the interim period, until the future General Council of Protestants and Catholics is to meet.⁵ Under Rule 8, we are told that the two parties

¹ See pp. 48, 53.

² Russell, *op. cit.*, p. lxxvii.

³ p. lxxvii.

⁴ In Jordan, *Reunion of the Churches*, p. 53.

⁵ Some have endeavoured to ascribe these Rules to Spinola, but that is quite out of the question, for one of the rules lays it down that "Errant Romanenses, quod doceant transubstantiationem, manereque accidentia sine substantia, sed si icto modo idololatram repellant, erit error tolerabilis" (rule 5, No. 3). No Catholic Bishop could write that!

must come to some agreement concerning those customs or rites which cannot be abolished or introduced without disturbance. So far as Protestants are concerned, examples would be the withholding of the chalice, and celibacy in Catholic priests, while on the "Roman" side there would be the difficulty of the reception of sacraments without an assurance of the ordination of the one administering them. Here, then, we have the recognition of an explicit difficulty which prevents Catholics from receiving the sacraments from the hands of a minister whose orders they do not recognise. Obviously, then, Spinola, in his original proposals, which these *Regula* follow up, could not have offered to recognise Lutheran orders.

This is confirmed by the fact that Leibniz in his treatises "On Methods of Reunion," says explicitly that the marriage of bishops and the acknowledgement of Protestant orders present the greatest difficulties to reunion. He suggests that the Protestants might be content to wait for the decision of a future Council on the Orders question, provided they were not meanwhile required to affirm the invalidity of their orders. Then, "while they wait, and in the future, after the Union, they should be looked upon as rightly ordained, by giving them orders in some special way, which, in Catholic opinion, would have all that is necessary to a true Ordination, and in Protestant opinion might be regarded as a confirmation of what they already claim, until the intervention of the judgment of the Catholic Church assembled in Council."¹

Ultimately, the *Regula* were sent to Bishop Bossuet, and they were accompanied by a second work entitled *Cogitationes Privatae*, also by Molanus, in further explanation of the Protestant plan for Reunion. From this second work we quote the following extract :

"The Pope is to confirm and ratify the ordinations hitherto made by the Protestants *in some way acceptable to both parties*, and which will render the peoples quiet concerning the use of the sacraments, as far as this is possible. For as to the future ordinations which will take place after the preliminary union, these will be by Bishops after the Roman manner, and so there will be no question about them. And here it is to be especially noted that we seek this confirmation of our ordinations, not for our own sake, for no one of us doubts them, but for the sake of the Roman Catholics, who *without the said confirmation would have doubts about the value of the sacraments* which they would receive from our hands after the

¹ Foucher, II, 29, *apud* Jordan, p. 70.

preliminary union, from which it is clear that the determination of this matter cannot be postponed to the future Council.”¹

Once again, this passage, with its expression of the willingness of Protestants to receive some kind of conditional reordination makes it clear that Bishop Spinola could not have offered to recognise Protestant orders as valid.

Bossuet wrote a Commentary on this work of Molanus, entitled *De Scripto Intitulo * Cogitationes Privata!* He comments as follows on the proposal of Molanus concerning orders :

° The fifth request is that the Supreme Pontiff should ratify the Ordinations of Protestants in a manner acceptable to both parties.—The first thing to do is to agree concerning this manner or mode, and there is nothing about this in the writing in question. It is clear, so far as we are concerned, that it is not in the power of the Pontiff to ratify ordinations carried out by laymen, and all Catholics together with the Supreme Pontiff himself regards the ordinations which have taken place throughout Germany as undoubtedly of this kind, since it is evident that in the beginning they were not carried out by bishops, but at the most by priests, who had received no power to ordain. . . . And although they might be persuaded to be ordained by our bishops, while disagreeing from them in faith, this would be unseemly, and all that ordination would be a mockery to both parties. . . . Hence even that preliminary union under which not only Lutherans but also Catholics would be instructed to receive the sacraments from Lutheran ministers, would shake the foundations of the Church, inasmuch as laymen would be administering holy things.”²

¹ *Cogitationes Privata*, apud Bossuet (Versailles, 1817), xxy, p. 271. Velit Pontifex ordinationes a Protestantibus hactenus factas, modo utrinque acceptabili, et qui neutri parti prejudicet, populosque circa sacramentorum usum, quantum ejus fieri poterit, quietos reddat, confirmare, ac ratas habere. De futurs enim, quæ, facta unione preliminarî, ab Episcopis more Romano fieri debebunt, nulla erit quæstio. Ubi probe notandum, nos ordinationum nostrarum confirmatione non propter nostros, quorum de illis dubitat nemo, sed propter Romano-Catholicos indicare, qui absque dicta confirmatione de valore sacramentorum, quæ post unionem preliminarẽ a nostra manu acceperint, essent dubitaturi ; ex quo patet etiam articuli hujus determinationem ad futurum Concilium differri non posse.

Bossuet translated this himself into French, as follows :

Que le Pape veuille confirmer et ratifier, d'ime manière que les deux partis puissent accepter, les ordinations faites jusqu'ici par les Protestans ; car pour celles qui se feront par les évêques selon le rit romain, après l'union préliminaire, il n'y a nulle difficulté. Mais il faut que les autres, qui sont déjà faites parmi les Protestans, soient ratifiées, non pour l'amour d'eux, mais pour l'amour des Catholiques romains, qui recevront les sacraments de la main des ministres protestans après l'union préliminaire, parce qu'autrement, ils seraient toujours dans la crainte ; ce qui fait voir que cet article doit être déterminé d'abord, et n'est pas de nature d'être renvoyé au concile.

• Quintum postulat, ut Pontifex ratas habeat Protestantum ordinationes modo utrinque acceptabili.—Igitur de illo modo prius convenire oportet, de quo toto scripto nihil legimus. Constat autem apud nos non esse in potestate Pontificis ut ratas habeat ordinationes a laicis factas : cujus generis esse ordinationes per totum Germaniæ tractum omnes Catholici atque ipse Pontifex pro indubitato habet ; cum constet ab origine non esse ab episcopis factas, sed ad summum a presbyteris, qui nullum ordinandi potestatem acceperant. --- Ac tametsi eo adduci possent

Then later on, the Bishop continues :

"Once accord has been reached on questions of faith, one could then treat with the Apostolic See concerning the things postulated, distinguishing between cities and districts in which there is no Catholic bishop but where the Augsburg Confession alone flourishes, and other regions :

1. In the former places, the Lutheran superintendents, having subscribed a formula of faith and brought their people back to the communion of the Church, could, if they were found worthy, be ordained bishops by the Catholic rite ; in other places they could be ordained priests, and be subject to the Catholic bishop.

2. In the former case, again, namely, where the Augsburg Confession alone flourishes, and there is no Catholic Bishop, if it seems good to them and to the Roman Pontiff, the German authorities also being consulted, new sees could be created and separated from the old dioceses, and again, the ministers could be ordained priests by the Catholic rite, and be given the cure of souls under the bishop, and these new sees would be under some Catholic archbishop.

3. . . .
4. As to bishops holding the Confession of Augsburg, *if there are any whose ordination and succession can be established*, these, having professed the true faith, could remain where they are, and the same would apply to priests."¹

ut etiam consentirent ordinari a nostris, de fide licet dissentientes, haud minus absonum videretur, totaque ea ordinatio utrinque esset ludibrio. Quare, et illa unio preliminaris qua non modo Lutherani, verum etiam Catholici a ministris Lutheranis sacramenta accipere docerentur, ipsius Ecclesie fundamenta quateret, cum pro sacrorum administris haberet laicos. (Bossuet, xxv, p. 368.)

Bossuet comments as follows : "On fait plus : on propose au Pape d'autoriser dans leur ministère, les surintendans et les autres pasteurs luthériens, qui n'ont été ordonnés tout au plus que par des prêtres, qui par conséquent, selon les maximes de l'Eglise romaine (maximes qui jusqu'ici n'avoient jamais été révoquées en doute) ne sont que de purs laïques : on veut, dis-je, que l'Eglise romaine ratifie leur ordination faite dans le schisme . . . sans avoir déclaré qu'ils la reçoivent. Et si l'on dit que l'on consentira que le Pape et les eveques catholiques les ordonnent de nouveau, ce ne sera pas une chose moins étrange en elle-meme, ni moins contraire aux maximes de l'Eglise romains, que d'ordonner des ministres avant qu'on soit convenu des conditions de les ordonner, dont la première est d'avoir une Confession de foi qui leur soit commune avec leur ordonnances." (*Ibid.*, 552.)

* Bossuet, xxv, pp. 464, 546, cf. Jordan, p. 226 :

"Sequentibus postulatis cum Sede apostolica pertractandis locus erit, posito discrimine inter civitates ac regiones in quibus nullus sedet catholicus episcopus, ac sola viget Augustana Confessio et alias :

1. Ut in illis quidem superintendentes subscripti formula suisque ad Ecclesie communionem adductis, a catholicis episcopis, si idonei reperiantur, ritu catholico in episcopos ordinentur, in aliis pro presbyteris consecrentur et catholico episcopo sub sint.

2.. In eodem priore casu, ubi scilicet sola viget Confessio Augustana nullique catholici episcopi sedem obtinent, si ipsis ita videatur ac Romano Pontifici, consultis etiam Germanis ordinibus, novi episcopatus fiant at ab antiquis sedibus distraherentur : ministri item in presbyteratum catholico ritu ordinentur et sub episcopo curati fiant : iidem novi episcopatus catholico archiepiscopo tribuantur.

3. . . .

We note here that Bishop Bossuet distinguishes between those Lutherans who had kept an episcopal succession and those, the greater number, who had lost it. The latter, he rightly says, are of course laymen, and their ordinations are certainly null and void. As to the former class—which exists in Sweden—he does not commit himself, but reserves their case for investigation. Obviously, if there were found an essential defect either in the matter or form of Order, or in the intention, their orders could not be allowed. Bossuet does not feel disposed to go into the question, and judgment on the subject is definitely reserved.¹

4. *Episcopi Confessionis Augustanæ, si qui sunt de quorum successione et ordinatione constituit, rectam fidem professi, suo loco maneant; idem de presbyteris esto judicium.*" (Bossuet, xxv, p. 464.)

Bossuet translates as follows :

° Cela fait, on pourrait disposer le Pape à écouter les demandes des Protestans, et à leur accorder que dans les lieux où il n'y a que des Luthériens et où il n'y a point d'évêques catholiques, leurs surintendans qui auroient souscrit à la formule de foi, et qui auroient ramené à l'unité les peuples qui les reconnoissent, soient consacrés pour évêques, et les ministres pour curés, ou pour prêtres, sous leur autorité.

" Dans les autres lieux, les surintendans, aussi bien que les ministres, pourront aussi être faits prêtres, sous l'autorité des évêques, avec les distinctions et subordina-
tions qu'on aviseroit.

" Dans le premier cas, on crigera de nouveaux évêchés, et on en fera la distraction d'avec les anciens. On soumettra ces nouveaux évêchés à un métropolitain catholique. ---

" Les évêques de la Confession d'Augsbourg, dont la succession et l'ordination se trouveront constantes, seront laissés en leur place, après avoir souscrit la Confession de foi, et l'on fera le même traitement à leurs prêtres." (*Ibid.*, p. 546.)

* It is interesting, and in its way significant, that the High Church Lutheran pastors of Germany and Switzerland who recently concluded that their own orders were insufficient, received fresh orders not from the Lutheran Bishops of Sweden, but from the " Gallican Church of the South of France," which in turn derives its orders from the Syrian Jacobites of Antioch. (See *Northern Catholicism*, p. 484.) At any rate these Lutheran High Churchmen could not be satisfied with either Swedish orders, or Anglican orders !

PART THREE

THE ENGLISH REFORMATION UNDER
HENRY VIII

CHAPTER I

THE BEGINNING OF THE REFORMATION UNDER HENRY, DOWN TO THE CONVOCATION OF 1536

This work is not intended to be a political history of the Reformation, and it is unnecessary for us to explain in detail the various stages in the break-away of England from Rome. The whole matter can be studied in the works of competent historians such as Gairdner, Pollard, and Belloc. We content ourselves here with a brief account of the salient facts, and of the chief actors.

1. We have already had occasion to mention that the new Lutheran ideas in religion were opposed by English Catholics, amongst them being King Henry VIII himself, who wrote the *Assertio Septem Sacramentorum*, defending not only the seven sacraments, including the Eucharist and Holy Order, but also the Papacy itself. We have also had occasion to mention the *Defensio Sacerdotis Catholici* of St. John Fisher, Cardinal Bishop of Rochester. England thus at first took the Catholic side, as against Luther. But the matrimonial difficulties of the king gradually brought about a change. Henry's marriage with Catherine of Aragon, the widow of his brother Arthur, had failed to produce a son and heir to the throne. A male child had indeed been born, but was dead. The other children, all girls, had also died, with the exception of Mary, afterwards Queen. It is said that Henry began to have doubts about the validity of the Papal dispensation which had been granted for his marriage with Catherine. In any case the position was complicated—or clarified?—by the passion which Henry conceived for Anne Boleyn, with whose sister, Mary, he had already had illicit relations. From this time onwards he endeavoured to obtain a “divorce” from the Pope, on various grounds. (Henry even instructed his ambassador to ask for permission to have a second wife in any case.) The King's ambassadors cajoled, and threatened. The Pope was in difficulties, and fully realised the seriousness of the situation, and its probable results. He took the only possible line for a Pope of the character of Clement VII:

he temporised over and over again. But when these expedients failed, he finally reserved the case to his own judgment, and it was clear that this would be against Henry. Accordingly, the King decided to take the matter into his own hands. In taking this step he was guided mainly by the advice of two prominent personages, Thomas Cromwell and Thomas Cranmer.

2. As to *Cromwell*, according to Gairdner he was

“said to have been the son of a blacksmith at Putney. He had lived a roving, disorderly youth . . . afterwards married a sheerman’s daughter in England, and applied himself to the arts of making money and gaining favour.”¹

And again :

“Cromwell had already been studying the principles of Macchiavelli, and disgusted Reginald Pole by telling him that the ABC of statesmanship was to discover and to follow up whatever the prince had in view, for princes were not bound by the same laws of honour as mere private persons. Cromwell—according to Pole’s firm belief . . . had already inspired the King with the idea that if he could not get his way from the Pope he could abolish Papal jurisdiction in England, and with it the theoretical exemption of the clergy from the civil power. It was monstrous, he suggested, to have two governments in one country. The King should make himself supreme head of the Church in England.”²

Gairdner continues :

“If counsel such as this was not actually breathed into the King’s ear by Cromwell as early as November, 1529, the whole course of public events . . . was certainly framed exactly upon these lines. But it should be noted that this advice itself suggested an interim policy of keeping friends with the Pope as long as convenient.”³

3. Henry’s other counsellor was *Thomas Cranmer*. In view of the important part he played in the English Reformation, we must give some account of his career.

He was born in 1489, went to Jesus College, Cambridge, in 1503, and obtained a fellowship there in 1510 or 1511. The celibacy incumbent upon fellows evidently did not commend itself to him, for he had soon to give up his fellowship on account of his having married a lady known as “Black Joan,” a relative of the landlady of the Dolphin Inn. The young couple took up their residence at the “Dolphin,” but the mother died in childbirth, and the child died as well, and through the influence of friends, Cranmer’s fellowship was restored to him. In 1523

1 Gairdner, *English Church*, p. 97. 2 Gairdner, *op. cit.*, p. 101. 3 *Ibid.*

he was ordained priest, and shortly afterwards took his degree as doctor in divinity, lecturing at his own college and also acting as public examiner in divinity at the University. About this time Erasmus was also lecturing in divinity at Cambridge, and the two must have come much into contact. Cranmer left Cambridge in 1529 owing to the prevalence of the sweating sickness, and went to the house of two of his pupils at Waltham Cross. It was there that he met Fox and Gardiner, and his views and suggestions about the projected divorce of the King were by them reported to His Majesty, who remarked that "this man has the right sow by the ear." King Henry sent him to Rome the next year (1530) on business connected with the divorce, and in 1531 he was also sent to Germany on an embassy to the Emperor. Part of his mission was to sound the Lutheran princes as to the possibility of a political alliance. At Nuremberg he became acquainted with Osiander, the Lutheran reformer, and Professor Pollard says that they had "frequent interviews, which had doubtless an important influence on Cranmer's opinions." In addition, in spite of his solemn vow of celibacy, Cranmer proceeded to marry Margaret, Osiander's niece, in 1532. Clerical celibacy was expected by State as well as by Church at this time, and Cranmer confessed at his trial that in the reign of Henry he kept this woman secretly and had children by her.

4. Beginning with the year 1531 a series of anti-Papal Acts were passed in England by a compliant Parliament, and, more serious still, Convocation, representing the Church, surrendered its independence, and with a certain amount of misgiving, agreed to the King assuming the title of "Head of the Church," adding the proviso, "as far as the law of Christ allow." That was on February 15th, 1531. The significance of this is given in a letter of Chapuys, the Emperor's Ambassador, to Charles V, dated February 14th, 1531 :

« The business which has just been concluded to the detriment of the Pope is that the clergy have been compelled to accept the King as head of the Church, which is, in fact, the same as if he had been declared the Pope of England. True, the clergy have added to this declaration that they accept this title only in the measure in which the law of God permits it, but so far as the King is concerned, this is just the same as if there had been no reservation made, for no one will henceforth dare to object to the King as to the extent of this reservation."¹

¹ *Letters and Papers*, V, No. 105 ; *Spanish Calendar*, Feb. 14th, 1531, No. 635.

5. On May 10th, 1532, the King sent down to the Convocation certain articles, with the intimation that they were all to be subscribed, and this was duly done, including an article to the effect that "Convocation should not pass any ordinance whatever without the King's approval and consent."

Convocation thus surrendered its independence, and was in future enslaved to the Royal power.

6. On August 23rd, 1532, Archbishop Warham died, and the See of Canterbury thus became vacant. The King realised his opportunity, and intimated to Cranmer, who was abroad, that he was to be appointed to the vacant primatial See. He sent off his wife to England (he had married her a few months previously), followed alone, and was duly consecrated Archbishop on March 30th, 1533. It is to be noted that Henry had caused the customary Bulls of Appointment to be obtained from Rome for Cranmer, and that the latter took the usual oath of obedience to the Pope in the ceremony of consecration. But before the function, Cranmer, attended by four notaries, made a solemn declaration in the Chapter House that by the Archiépiscopal oath he was bound to make he did not intend to do anything against the law of God or the rights and laws of the State, or to hinder the reforms which he was about to introduce into the laws of England.

7. But already before Cranmer's consecration, i.e., in January, 1533, Henry had been secretly "married" to Anne Boleyn, i.e., before any court had annulled or dissolved his marriage with Catherine. Cranmer presumably knew of this, or at any rate knew what was expected of him. In May, 1533, he held a court at Dunstable, pronounced Henry's marriage with Catherine invalid, and the marriage with Anne lawful.

8. All this time, further anti-Papal legislation was being passed through Parliament. In 1534, a law was passed providing for the election, investiture and consecration of bishops without any reference to the Holy See.¹ But the culmination of all was the passing of the Act of Supremacy, in November, 1534, which definitely annexed to the Crown the spiritual supremacy previously exercised by the Pope, and declared the King to be the Supreme Head of the Church of England—this time without any qualifying clause.

The importance of this step will be realised from the following facts :

(1) The Council of Florence, an Ecumenical Council, had decreed as follows in 1439 :

u The Holy Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff holds the primacy throughout the whole world, and the said Roman Pontiff is the successor of St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and the true Vicar of Jesus Christ, the Head of the whole Church, and the Father and Teacher of all Christians, and full power was given to him in Blessed Peter, by our Lord Jesus Christ, to feed, rule, and govern the universal Church, as is contained in the acts of ecumenical councils and in the sacred canons."

(2) Previously, the Council of Constance had condemned the following propositions of Wyclif:

7. Peter neither is nor was the head of the holy Catholic Church.

37. The Roman Church is the synagogue of Satan, and the Pope is not the proximate and immediate Vicar of Christ and of the Apostles.

41. It is not necessary for salvation to believe that the Roman Church is supreme amongst other Churches.

(3) And earlier still, in 1215, the Fourth Council of the Lateran had declared that 0 The Roman Church, as the mother and mistress of all the faithful, by the will of Christ, obtains primacy of ordinary power over all other Churches."

This Papal headship had received full expression in the general Canon Law of the Church, which had hitherto held good in England, and elsewhere. Small wonder that one early result of the Reformation was a proposal to abolish the old Canon Law and introduce a new one !

True, the Council of Florence had, according to Constant, "little authority for those who looked upon the Council of Basel as a legitimate Council."¹ True is it also that the Council of Constance had decided that a Pope was subject to a General Council, in a decree which the Popes had refused to ratify. And again it is true that there were some who were inclined to say that perhaps after all the Pope's headship was *in some respects* of ecclesiastical institution. But even with all these provisos the Pope's authority in the whole Western Church, and particularly in England, was a very real one. And it was one thing to discuss whether a general council was in certain circumstances above a Pope ; it was quite another to deny that the Pope had

238 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

any jurisdiction in England, and annex the supreme headship of the Church in this country to the Crown. This was indeed a startling innovation, which struck at the root not only of the Papacy as the supreme authority in the Church, but also at the very conception of the Catholic Church itself, as *one ecclesiastical organisation*. This, the traditional conception was, as we shall see abolished, and supplanted by that conception of *a group of independent national churches* which has been a classical tenet of Anglicanism ever since.

9. The Act of Supremacy of November, 1534, was followed swiftly by other measures which consummated the schism, and established the new National Church. In January, 1535, orders were sent to all the bishops to surrender all bulls of appointment, etc., received from Rome :

“Not a single one refused. . . . They retracted the oath given to the Holy See at the time of their consecration. . . . They declared ‘the papacy of Rome not to be ordained by God . . . but to be set up only by man.’ ”^x

Having surrendered their bulls of appointment, the bishops had to obtain new commissions from the King as Head of the Church. Burnet prints (iv, 410-413) the Commission given by the King to Bonner in 1539, upon his appointment as Bishop of London. Its terms must be carefully noted :

“Henry the Eighth . . . Defender of the Faith, and Supreme Head of the English Church on earth under Christ, to the reverend Father in Christ Edmund Bonner, Bishop of London, Health.

“Inasmuch as all authority of jurisdiction, and jurisdiction of all kinds, as well that which is called ecclesiastical as that which is secular, and all authority within our kingdom, flows in the first place from the royal power, as from the supreme head, fount and source. . . . And as our well beloved counsellor, Thomas Cromwell, Keeper of our Privy Seal, has been constituted, by letters patent confirmed with our Great Seal, by virtue of our authority as supreme head of the said Church of England, our Vicar-General for the transacting and carrying through of all ecclesiastical matters of whatsoever kind. . . .

“Nevertheless, because the said Thomas Cromwell is occupied with so great and so many arduous tasks . . . and is not able in his own person to execute all jurisdiction belonging to us as supreme head everywhere within our kingdom . . . we have decided to commit and licence You in our place in the way and form described below.

“You may, therefore, ordain anyone born in whatsoever part of your diocese of London whom you shall find worthy . . . to all orders, including sacred orders and the priesthood, and

present them to benefices. . . . You may make a visitation of the chapter of your cathedral church of London and the city of London, and all single monasteries, abbeys, priories, colleges, and other religious places and hospitals, and all clergy and people of the said diocese of London. . . .”

All this shows clearly exactly what was meant by the King's Headship. He was the fount and source of all ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and bishops could obtain it only from him. This indeed was expressly asserted in a later Act of Parliament, i.e., in 1545 : “Archbishops and other ecclesiastical persons have no manner of jurisdiction ecclesiastical, but by, under, and from His Royal Majesty.”¹

The English schism may, in a sense, be said to have been consummated by the passing of the Act of Supremacy in November, 1534, in view of the close relations which existed at that time between Church and State in England. Even so, it might be urged that this was, after all, only an Act of Parliament, and that no such Act could really affect the status of the Catholic Church in England. Accordingly, we prefer to seek elsewhere the definitive act which severed the English Church from Rome. The tentative and guarded concession by Convocation that the King was Head of the Church “so far as the law of Christ allows” could hardly be said to have put the Church in a state of schism. But the definite repudiation of Papal authority by the bishops, their surrender of their bulls of appointment by the Pope, and the taking out of fresh commissions acknowledging that they held their offices only from the King, undoubtedly put the Church in a state of schism. And as these Papal Bulls

¹ 37 Henry, cap. 17. This is one of the Acts repealed by Mary, but re-enacted in Elizabeth's Act of Supremacy.

The following report of Chapuys sent to Charles V on Jan. 28th, 1535, throws a flood of light upon the ideas now publicly expressed in England, apparently with royal approval:

“On Sunday last an Augustinian friar (Dr. G. Brown) . . . preached a very solemn sermon, maintaining that the bishops and all others who did not burn all their bulls obtained from the Holy See and get new ones from the King deserved very severe punishment, and that without that they could not discharge any episcopal duty ; that the sacred chrism of the bishops would be inefficacious, as made by men without authority, seeing that they obeyed the bishop, or idol, of Rome, who was a limb of the devil ; and that to-morrow or after, it would be a question whether to rebaptise those baptised during that time. This language is so abominable that it is clear it must have been prompted by the King or by Cromwell, who makes the said friar his right-hand man in all things unlawful.

“Cromwell does not cease to harass the bishops, even the good ones, like Winchester, and some others, whom he called lately before the Council, to ask them if the King could not make or unmake bishops at pleasure ; who were obliged to say Yes, else they should have been deprived of their dignities, as the said Cromwell told a person who reported it to me, and said the Council had been summoned to entrap the bishops.” [*Letters and Papers of Henry VIII*, viii, ix 1).

were all surrendered between January and February 2nd, 1535, we may justly regard the new national and schismatic Church of England as having been constituted at that particular time.

From February 2nd, 1535, then, the Church of England was merely a department of the State, deriving its authority from the King. It had cut itself off from the Centre of Christendom, the See of Rome, and from the Churches in communion with it. Hence, from now onwards we must decline to give to it the title of "Catholic," or to speak of its bishops as "Catholic bishops," even though they claim the title, and in other aspects defend the doctrines of the Catholic Religion. They belong from henceforth to a National Church, and their Catholicism is of an entirely new kind, i.e., a non-Papal National Catholicism. Accordingly, from now on, such of its bishops as defend the old doctrines on the Eucharist, etc., may well be called "Anglo-Catholics," meaning thereby bishops who belong to a National Church, but favour the Old Religion on certain matters.¹ Those who favour the new Reformed doctrines now being taught on the Continent we shall call Protestants, and in the next reign we shall distinguish a third category, whom we shall call Opportunists.

10. Once the Papal authority in the Church had been abolished, it was almost inevitable that sooner or later there should be a revision of doctrines and practices, and that those which seemed to rest upon Papal authority should be rejected. This, indeed, had already taken place in the Reformed Churches on the Continent.

Already, as we have seen, the Lutheran doctrine had had its sympathisers in England, and one of their chief representatives had now been appointed to the primatial see of Canterbury. Further, Henry had himself consulted the Continental reformers when the Divorce was in question. Political circumstances also doubtless suggested the advisability of a combination, or at any rate an *entente*. Henry himself seems to have wanted mainly a political combination, but Cranmer and Cromwell

¹ It need hardly be said that our adoption of this term "Anglo-Catholic" here does not in any way imply an admission that either these or later Anglicans really had any right to the title. But it is a convenient one to use, in view of the fact that these particular Anglicans wished in the main to retain the old Catholic teaching on the points disputed by the Reformers. And at any rate we can claim the authority of Maitland for the use of the title, in the case of the Henrician bishops (see Beck, in *Clergy Review*, July, 1935, p. 33).

evidently aimed at a doctrinal agreement as well, as did the Continental Reformers and Princes themselves. In any case, Henry himself was not always averse to dallying with unorthodoxy. He had begun to do so even before the Divorce was an accomplished fact, as Gairdner shows :

“ From the time of Wolsey's fall, the King was continually encouraging and trying to make use of heretics whose cause he did not openly advocate. . . . The result of course was a very large increase in the number of heretics.”¹

11. The first point of agreement between Henry and the Lutherans was concerned with the proposed General Council, which the Pope had at last convoked to meet at Mantua. Henry had in 1532 appealed to a General Council—as Luther had done—but now neither Henry nor Luther were willing to submit to the proposed Council. Cranmer and several of the English Bishops said the Pope had no right to call a Council, and that this could be done only by the Christian princes. Even Gardiner said that a Council called only by the Emperor would not be any good. Luther, in turn, wrote a pamphlet against the primacy of the Pope, and a series of “ Articles of Christian Doctrine, which indicate what we can, and what we cannot accept or grant ” in the event of a Council being called.

12. For these and other reasons, an understanding between Henry and the German Lutherans was desirable. Accordingly, early in 1535—the same year in which Henry appointed Thomas Cromwell, a layman, to be his ^o Vicar General in spiritual things”—Dr. Barnes was sent off to Germany. The choice itself was a significant one, for the envoy was an Augustinian prior who had been accused of heresy by Wolsey, had fled abroad and met Luther at Wittenberg, and had returned to England in 1531. He was followed by Edward Foxe, bishop-elect of Hereford, and Nicholas Heath, then Archdeacon of Canterbury. Foxe, on the King's behalf, asked that an embassy should be sent to England to discuss religious matters, and that a conference should be held beforehand in Germany itself.² The Lutherans in their answer expressed their joy at the proposed alliance, and their desire that the King should adopt the Augsburg Confession. In the meantime, they agreed to an immediate conference between their own theologians and the English representatives.³

¹ *History of the English Church*, p. 128.
² *Corpus Reformatorum*, II, col. 1028.

* *Ibid.*, II, col. 968 seq.

The Conference was duly held at Wittenberg. It began in January, 1536, and lasted till April the same year.

In the meantime, on March 12th, 1536, Henry had written expressing his desire for a doctrinal union between England and Germany, and said that for this purpose it would be necessary to modify some of the statements in the Augsburg Confession.¹

This doubtless had its effect upon the negotiations. The English were in constant communication with Luther, Melancthon, Bugenhagen, Justus Jonas, and Cruciger. Eventually, seventeen articles were drawn up for transmission to England, known as the "Wittenberg Articles." They were written by Melancthon, and approved by Luther. In these seventeen articles, the essential doctrines of Lutheranism are set forth, though here and there recourse is had to ambiguous language, in order not to offend Henry's susceptibilities. They do not form a separate formula of faith, but are a series of comments—" *repetitio et exegesis* " of the Augsburg Confession. The document begins thus: "Quod ad primum, tertium . . . articulos confessionis nostrae attinet . . . which shows that it was not to be adopted by the English as it stood. Only three sacraments are mentioned, as in the Augsburg Confession itself. The article on the Eucharist is as follows:

"VI. Quod ad decimum articulum confessionis nostrae attinet, constanter credimus et docemus quod in Sacramento corporis et sanguinis domini vere, substantialiter et realiter adsint corpus et sanguis Christi sub speciebus panis et vini, et quod sub eisdem speciebus vere et corporaliter *exhibeantur et* distribuuntur omnibus illis qui sacramentum accipiunt."

We note the appearance here of the significant word "*exhibeantur*." We have already pointed out its meaning.²

The eighth article, on the sacraments, is interesting because it allows that they are instituted "*ut sint certa quaedam testimonia et efficacia signa gratiae*" But this of course must be taken in conjunction with the denial of the Augsburg Confession that the sacraments confer grace *ex opere operato*.

The twelfth article says that the Mass is a remembrance

¹ *Corpus Reformatorum*, iii, 48. Responsum legatorum regis Angliæ ad Articulos ipsis a Confederatis d. 25 dec. 1535 Schmalkaldiae propositis: "Sua Sereniss. Majestas jussit ut ad articulos petitionum vestrarum ad hunc modum suae Majestatis nomine respondemus.** As to the proposal for a doctrinal conference between the two countries, "id non posse contingere nisi prius quaedam in vestra confessione et apologia quasi praeemoliantur per privata colloquia et amicas disputationes." (*Corpus Reform.*, iii, 48.) The points are not specified, but are probably connected with private masses, celibacy, etc.

² Cf. pp. 138, 163, 174.

of Christ's benefits, which promotes faith and thanksgiving, and in that sense is called a "sacrifice" by the Fathers. "Improbamus eos qui sentiunt usum sacramenti cultum esse applicandum pro aliis vivis et mortuis, et mereri illis remissionem culpae et poenae, idque ex opere operato." Accordingly, private Masses should be abolished.

Foxe thought that there would be no difficulty in getting these articles accepted in England. But in point of fact there were some points, such as the advocacy of clerical marriage and communion under both kinds, which Henry disliked very much. Further, Gardiner was always suggesting to the King that it was not fitting that an English King should accept a doctrinal standard made in Germany. But eventually, as we shall see, the Wittenberg Articles were transformed into the Ten English Articles.

13. There is another important matter which indicates the trend of events. The new Lutheran doctrines had, as we have said, found disciples in certain prominent members of the laity and clergy, at Cambridge and elsewhere. But what was far more serious was that, during the Anne Boleyn regime, several of these Lutheranising clergy were promoted to the episcopate, and thus, *for the first time there was in England a Protestant parly among the bishops*. By 1555 no less than seven out of the twenty-one existing sees were held by bishops more or less Lutheran in their sympathies—in other words, one-third of the Bishops were Protestant in their outlook.

Latimer had been appointed to Worcester in 1535.

Roland Lee, who had married Henry to Anne, was rewarded with the bishopric of Coventry and Lichfield in 1534.

Goodrich was appointed to Ely in 1534.

Shaxton went to Salisbury in 1535.

Foxe was given Hereford in 1535; and

William Barlow became Bishop of St. Asaph in 1536.¹

¹ The following citations from Gairdner are very much to the point:

(1) "Henry VIII advanced bishops like Cranmer, Latimer, and Shaxton, men of heretical minds. He promoted heresy also in other ways, and in respect of doctrine did much to undermine the authority of beliefs of which he was the professed defender. In fact, while disavowing heresy openly, and even persecuting it, he was glad to avail himself of the aid of heretics of any kind in the special business of overthrowing the Pope's authority." (*Lollardy*, i, 307.)

(2) "In the great rebellion in the north, Cranmer, Latimer, and other bishops placed in their sees for Ann Boleyn's sake, had been denounced as heretical by the insurgents who clamoured for their punishment." (*Ibid.*, i, 314.)

(3) "The King in truth was in sad perplexity as to the result of his own policy. The men of the New Learning were the most zealous friends of his own royal supremacy; the men of the Old Learning --- as orthodox as ever . . . could

The seventh member of the Protestant party was the most important of them all—Thomas Cranmer, Primate of All England.

After Anne Boleyn's fall, the balance was slightly redressed by the appointment of Repps or Rugge to Norwich in 1536, and of Sampson to Chichester in the same year, for neither of these was heretically inclined. But even so, there still remained a strong Lutheran party on the episcopal bench.

On the other hand, it would seem that the Lower House of Convocation, representing the inferior clergy, was still attached to orthodox Catholic doctrine, in spite of the repudiation of the Papal Supremacy, and that the clergy were genuinely alarmed at the spread of error and heresy. This is shown by the fact that they laid before the Upper House of Bishops in 1536 a list of "errors and abuses" which called for attention, and it is significant that it included errors on the subject of the Eucharist.

This Convocation of 1536 was of great importance, and we therefore devote the next chapter to it.

justify his statement to the world that the abrogation of papal authority had not made the English a nation of heretics." (*Ibid.*, i, 316.)

(4) "Ever since the establishment of Royal Supremacy, the persons appointed to bishoprics had been all of the New Learning (i.e., up to 1539)." (*Ibid.*, ii, 194.)

(5) "Henry had naturally filled up vacancies among the bishops by a new set of prelates, who easily accepted Royal Supremacy. . . . Such men were only to be found among those whose minds were more or less affected by the principles of Lollardy, and a new school of bishops thus arose. . . . At the time of the making of the Ten Articles, bishops of the new school had only been appointed during the previous three years. During those three years, what men had been promoted? First, Cranmer, who while in embassy in Germany had cultivated relations with the Protestants and married a niece of Osiander. . . . Then there were Roland Lee promoted to Coventry and Lichfield, Goodrich to Ely, and Capon to Bangor in 1534 all mere serviceable tools. Then foreigners were deprived of bishoprics by Act of Parliament, and in the places of two Italian absentees Shaxton was made Bishop of Salisbury and Latimer Bishop of Worcester—both favourable specimens of the new school, but both a little subservient. These two promotions were in 1535, as was also that of Foxe, Bishop of Hereford, who had assisted Gardiner in promoting the King's policy at Rome, and more recently had been trying to find a basis of religious concord with the Protestants in Germany. Finally there was William Barlow, made Bishop of St. Asaph . . . and three months later of St. David's, a very unscrupulous man. Eight bishops in all promoted under the Ann Boleyn influence, or more than one-third of the entire bench." (*Op. cit.* ii, 306*8.)

On Barlow, see pp. 285, 308 *et seq.*

CHAPTER II

THE TEN ARTICLES OF 1536

The Convocation of 1536 was presided over by Cromwell, who had been appointed the King's Vicar General on October 9th, 1534.

1. Latimer, Bishop of Worcester, preached a remarkable sermon to the assembled prelates, against the doctrine of Purgatory, and the veneration of Images. This sermon is of interest because it has been appealed to by Anglicans as providing evidence of the existence in England of the strange doctrine concerning the Mass referred to at the Confession of Augsburg in 1530, namely, that Christ atoned on the Cross only for original sin, while the Mass was the sacrifice for actual sin. (See p. 123.) Here are Latimer's words :

“ Was there not some that, despising the money of the Lord as copper and not current, either coined new themselves, or else uttered abroad newly coined of other ; sometime either adulterating the word of God, or else mingling it, as taverners do . . . sometime, in the stead of God's word, blowing out the dreams of men ? while they thus preached to the people *the redemption that cometh by Christ's death to serve only them that died before His coming* that were in the time of the Old Testament; and that now since* redemption and forgiveness of sins purchased by money and devised by men is of efficacy* and not redemption purchased by Christ:* (they have a wonderful pretty example to persuade this thing, of a certain married woman, which, when her husband was in purgatory, in that fiery furnace that hath burned away so many of our pence, paid her husband's ransom, and so of duty claimed him to be set at liberty) : while they thus preached to the people, that dead images . . . not only ought to be covered with gold . . . etc.”

Dr. Kidd, in his *Later Medieval Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice* comments as follows :

“ To have made such accusations in the face of such an assembly, Latimer must have been sure of his facts, and his language is evidence enough that opinions of the kind were commonly taught.”¹

But at the same time he adds :

“ It will be observed that Latimer states the popular doctrine in a form slightly different from that in which it is attributed to St. Thomas.”¹

Indeed, it needs only a little reflection to see that the doctrine which Latimer is attacking is *not* that ascribed to St. Thomas at Augsburg, but the ordinary Catholic doctrine of the necessity of good works for salvation, satisfaction for sins, indulgences, Masses, and in fact the whole Catholic system, whereas, according to Latimer, we are justified by faith only, by which the merits of Christ's passion are applied to us, and save us.

Accordingly, we must say that the sermon of Latimer furnishes *absolutely no evidence* of the prevalence in England of the erroneous doctrine concerning the relation between the Sacrifice of the Cross and that of the Mass. We shall discuss later on other “ evidence ” that has been appealed to.

2. However, the most important event in this Convocation was the drawing up and signing of the *Ten Articles of Religion* by the Bishops.

Foxe arrived from Germany on July 4th, 1536, and on the *nth* he presented Ten Articles to Convocation. Gairdner, in his *Lollardry and the Reformation*, says expressly that these Ten Articles were elaborated out of the Wittenberg Articles to which we have already referred.[®]

This can hardly be doubted. But there has been some controversy as to whether the Ten Articles are really Lutheran in character.

Constant, the latest writer on the subject, actually holds that they are *orthodox* ! He allows that there are passages in the Ten Articles which correspond to the Wittenberg Articles, but maintains that “ they refer to the common points of belief, such as certain developments of the Apostolic, the Nicaean and the Athanasian Creeds, Baptism, or the Real Presence in the Eucharist. But just where doctrinal differences begin, the concordance of the two texts ceases.”³

* *Ibid.*

¹ *Lollardry*, ii, 317.

• *Reformation in England*, p. 402. Constant says that where the Ten Articles correspond with the Wittenberg articles, it is only on points “ on which there is no dispute between Catholics and Protestants. . . . The first apparent concession, then, was the borrowing of certain non-heretical passages from the Wittenberg text. The second consisted in mentioning only three sacraments. . . . The third concession consisted in not alluding at all to transubstantiation or consubstantiation in the articles on the Eucharist ” (*op. cit.*, p.403). Constant admits, however, that “ the definition of justification was borrowed from Melancthon.” He says “ in

Gairdner says that "a good deal of their language is derived from Lutheran documents. . . . But these articles were by no means completely Lutheran. On the contrary, they contained very little *except in the way of omission*, to which the most orthodox Romanist could object."¹

Dixon, on the other hand, says that "the Articles bear the marks of many minds. . . . When they issued from the hands of the Convocation, they bore the character of a compromise between the Old and the New Learning. . . . That small but incessantly active party was conciliated by a secret infusion of Lutheranism, taken from the King's favourite divine of the Germans, Mclanchthon."¹

Dr. Darwell Stone says that the articles were "evidently the outcome of an attempt to formulate a statement upon which the more moderate advocates of the traditional doctrines, and the more conservative adherents of the Lutheran theology, could agree."¹

Dr. Darwell Stone goes on to comment on the fact that they were *signed by bishops of both parties*. This is indeed important, for it would seem to show that of necessity the formula is a compromise, so worded as to meet with the approval of both Lutherans and Anglo-Catholics.

Our own view corresponds more or less to that of Canon Dixon and Dr. Darwell Stone. It must be remembered in dealing with these Reformation formulae, that *they are significant, not only in what they say, but still more, in what they omit*. Omissions are often very important. In his *History of the English Church*, Gairdner maintained that these articles were "neutral in tone," and this seems a very fair description of them. It must be remembered that, as we have pointed out, *one-third of the episcopate was Lutheran in its sympathies*, and moreover, Henry's idea was doubtless to put forth a doctrinal formula which would provide a basis of discussion and perhaps of agreement with the Germans.

the same article, insistence is laid upon the necessity of good works." True, but the Augsburg Confession also describes them as "necessary": "ours teach that it is necessary to do good works; not that we may trust that we deserve grace by them, but because it is the will of God that we should do them" (art. 20). And the English article on Justification accordingly says, "God requireth and commandeth us that after we be justified we must also have good works," and then goes on to deny that they form part of our justification, just as the Augsburg Confession does. The utmost we can allow is that the English article does not expressly insist, as the Augsburg Article does, that justification comes from faith alone.

¹ *Lollardry*, ii, 310. Italics ours.

¹ *History of the Church of England*, i, 411, 415.

• *History of the Eucharist*, ii, 113.

248 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

He did not like taking the German scheme as a basis, and doubtless preferred to suggest one of his own.

3. Coming now to the contents of the Ten Articles, Gairdner summarises this formulary as follows :

“ It still upheld transubstantiation ; set forth three sacraments (baptism, penance, and the eucharist) without saying that there were no more ; declared that saints should be honoured, but not as intercessors ; favoured the continuance of old rites and ceremonies, and recommended prayer for departed souls, but objected to the speaking of purgatory, a name which had favoured the superstition of papal pardons.”¹

This summary is substantially accurate, *except in so far as the article on the Eucharist is concerned*. It is not true that the Ten Articles “ uphold transubstantiation.” The article in question is as follows :

“ As touching the sacrament of the altar, we will that all bishops shall teach . . . that under the form and figure of bread and wine, which we there presently do see and perceive by outward senses, is verily, substantially, and really contained and comprehended the very selfsame body and blood of Our Saviour Jesus Christ which was born of the Virgin Mary and suffered upon the cross for our redemption, and that under the same form and figure of bread and wine the very selfsame body and blood of Christ is corporally, really, and in the very substance, *exhibited*, distributed and received unto and of all them which receive the said sacrament. And that therefore the said sacrament is to be used with all due reverence and honour.”

Now this certainly seems at first sight to affirm the Real Objective Presence, and as the article is practically identical with the corresponding article drawn up at Wittenberg by the Lutherans, it is obviously meant to be capable of being understood in this sense. On the other hand, there are some very significant expressions. The Body and Blood are present not only under the “ form ” but under the “ figure ” of bread and wine. *Wyclif and Zwingli might have said the same*. Next, even Bucer was ready to allow that the Body and Blood were “ substantially ” present, i.e., present according to their substance. Then the article goes on to say that the body of Christ is corporally—“ exhibited.”

The use of this term “ exhibited ” is indeed most significant. This term, as we have shown, was adopted first by Bucer, as a compromise between Luther and Zwingli, as an ambiguous term, and was employed this same year, 1536, in the Wittenberg

¹ *History of the English Church*, p. 176.

Concord between Lutherans and Bucerians, and also in the First Helvetic Confession, drawn up by the Zwinglians. Also it was employed over and over again by Calvin, in his *Institutes*, first published this very year (see p. 174). And now, in this English Article, copied almost word for word from the Wittenberg Article sent over by the Lutherans and Bucerians for English acceptance, we are told that the corporeal presence is "exhibited" in the sacrament, and "distributed and received" by those who receive the said sacrament. One thing at least is clear, and that is that *this article does not teach Transubstantiation, which had hitherto been the Catholic faith in England, as elsewhere.* For it is important to bear in mind that there had been the Decree of the Latcran Council of 1215, which laid it down as of faith that *the bread is transubstantiated into the Body and the wine into the Blood*, and moreover, we have already called attention to the definite and explicit terms in which the English Provincial Synods taught Transubstantiation at the time of Wyclif's condemnation. If it was desired in 1536 to put forward an authoritative and *orthodox* statement of the doctrine of the Real Presence, *how comes it that these previous statements were laid aside and instead an ambiguous formula, heretical by implication, substituted?*

Next we call attention to the last sentence in this article, which states that the sacrament is to be used with "all due reverence and honour." But what is the "due reverence"? Are the consecrated elements to be adored with Divine Honour, since they are now Our Lord Himself, or are they merely to be "honoured and revered" as holy symbols? The implication is surely that the latter is the case. Let it be remembered that the First Helvetic Confession of the Zwinglians, issued in this same year, 1536, had said that the elements of bread and wine "are holy, and to be venerated, as exhibiting the things signified" (*sunt enim haec res sanctae venerandaeque*, etc.).

To conclude this point, we must express our entire and absolute disagreement with Constant, who says that in the case of the Ten Articles "the doctrine is entirely orthodox," and that the three Confessions of Henry's reign, the first being these Articles, "firmly and clearly enunciate Transubstantiation." We also disagree with Belloc, who in his *Short History of England* similarly maintains that "the legend that the Ten Articles were a sop to the Reformers disappears on an examination of them. They were wholly orthodox from beginning to end" (I).¹

It would be difficult to make a statement further removed from the actual truth.

4. The next point we must remark on is that, like the Augsburg Confession, the Ten Articles speak only of three Sacraments, Baptism, the Eucharist, and Penance. How are we to account for the omission of the other four? Pollard, in his *Cranmer*, says that "the mention of only three sacraments does not perhaps imply a repudiation of the other four, though the attempt then made to introduce a fourth, the sacrament of holy orders, failed."¹ Constant goes further, and says expressly that "the other four were not suppressed. The text concerning them was ready, and had been signed by Cromwell, but Henry delayed publication in order not to offend the German Reformers, for it would have meant a complete break from them, so different was the doctrine from their own. There was an omission, but not denial."²

But both Pollard and Constant are here assuming that some undated drafts of Articles to be found in manuscript form at the British Museum and the Record Office belong to this year, 1536. But they are *undated*, and it seems far more reasonable to suppose that they belong to the following year, 1537, when the four other sacraments were, as we know, definitely under consideration by the bishops, with a view to their insertion in the new formulary, the Bishops' Book, designed to take the place of the Ten Articles (see later). Constant is here relying on a statement first made by Jenkyns in his edition of *Cranmer*, and then copied by Hardwick into his *History of the Articles*, but no evidence is brought forward by these writers for the date 1536. And as to the Declaration on Holy Order in particular, to which Pollard refers, it is significant that Gairdner, who, in his *English Church* expressed the same view as Pollard, later on withdrew it in his *Lollardy and the Reformation*, II, 325. Estcourt pointed out long ago that all we can say is that the document belongs to the period between June 2nd, 1536, and August 19th, 1537. The Ten Articles were introduced into Parliament on July 4th, 1536. The discussion on the Seven Sacraments mentioned by Aless took place in February, 1537.³ The four sacraments omitted in the Ten Articles were "found again in the course of the spring of 1537."⁴ Accordingly we may attribute this Declaration on Holy Order to the early part of 1537. The Bishops' Book was

¹ Page 104.

• Gairdner, *op. cit.*, ii, 320.

■ *The Reformation in England*, p. 403.

⁴ Gairdner, *op. cit.*, 323.

apparently ready for press on July 17th/ though it was not published till August, 1537.²

5. On the other articles we will not comment, beyond calling attention to the last article, on Purgatory, we get the one solitary reference to the Sacrifice of the Mass (other than the ambiguous phrase, "The Sacrament of the Altar," which heads the article on the Eucharist). Here we are told that "it standeth with Christian charity to pray for souls departed . . . and also to cause others to pray for them in masses and exequies, and to give alms to others to pray for them, whereby they may be relieved and holpen, of some part of their pain." This, again, is in its way significant, inasmuch as the Mass is simply regarded as *an act of prayer*, and its sacrificial or propitiatory aspect is passed over.

6. This Convocation was almost immediately followed by the religious rebellion in the North in favour of the Old Religion, known as the Pilgrimage of Grace.

It is to be noted that the rebels denounced the Anne Boleyn bishops (Cranmer, Latimer and others) as heretical, and clamoured for their punishment.⁸

And the "rebels," marching with banners of the Crucifix, the chalice, and the sacred host, presented a petition containing 24 articles. One was to the effect that the title "Supreme Head, so far as it implies the care of souls, should be reserved for the Roman See, as it always used to be, and that bishops should receive their orders from the same." This does not sound like the hatred of the Pope so often attributed to the English people at the time of the Reformation !

More important for our immediate purpose is the fact, mentioned in Hall's *Chronicle*, that the rebels complained that in the Book of the Ten Articles only three sacraments were spoken of.*

7. Evidently as a result of this Rebellion, King Henry decided that it was dangerous to favour innovations in religion, and accordingly he summoned a new Convocation in 1537, to revise the Book of Articles passed in the preceding year, with a view to making good its deficiencies.

Attention was specially concentrated on the four missing sacraments. Questions on these were submitted to the bishops,

1 Gairdner, p. 324.
• Gairdner, *Lollardy*, I, 314.

* *Ibid.*, p. 331.
4 Gairdner, *Lollardy*, ii, 318.

and answers given in writing.¹ There are still extant the questions and answers given on the subject of Confirmation. They are printed in Strype, *Eccles. Mem.*, I, pp. 340 *et seq.* The questions were : (1) Is it a sacrament of the New Law ? (2) What are the external sign and inward grace ? (3) What promises be made to the receivers of them by God and of what efficacy they be of? With the result of this enquiry we deal in the next chapter.

¹ Constant says that "other questions were submitted by Cranmer, all of which seem to be an attempt to introduce a Lutheran reform, on the plea of combating Popery" (*op. cit.*, p. 408 note). This seems correct. But Constant is quite in error in saying that there are extant the answers on the bishops on *sacraments other than Confirmation* (p. 409). In this connection he quotes a statement by Barlow, to the effect that "ordination was not necessary in order to fulfil the Church's Ministry, and that any cobbler could be a bishop without receiving any Orders, provided he were designated by the king." But this is not part of an answer written by Barlow in reply to a questionnaire on the sacraments, but one of the Articles against Barlow of January, 1537. (See p. 313.)

CHAPTER III

THE BISHOPS' BOOK

1. Later on in the year 1537¹ there was a debate among the bishops, an account of which is given by a contemporary, Alcass.² The orthodox doctrine on the existence of seven sacraments instituted by Christ was defended by Archbishop Lee, of York, Stokesley of London, Longland of Lincoln, Clerk of Bath, Sampson of Chichester, and Rugge of Norwich. Even so, it is curious to note that, in his written answer, Stokesley of London says it is lawful to disbelieve in the baptism of infants and in the "*integritate perpetua Beata Virginis*," which shows how even the orthodox or "Anglo-Catholic" bishops were becoming to some extent affected by the new ideas. To return to the seven sacraments, the Anne Boleyn or Protestant bishops opposed the traditional doctrine of the four missing sacraments, i.e., Cranmer, Shaxton, Goodrich, Foxe, and Latimer. To these we may add Hilsey of Rochester, who says that Confirmation is a "godly ceremony," "not of such necessity, neither of such effect as it is taken for at this time." It was "begun by holy Fathers." Again Capon or Salcot, of Bangor, says Confirmation was instituted not by Christ but by the Fathers of the Church. A similar division is to be found among the answers given by doctors to the questions.

In the debate, Cranmer urged that it was after all only a question of "bare words. . . . But would the bishops venture to maintain that the ceremonies of confirmation, orders, annealing and so forth, which *could not be proved to have been instituted by Christ*, and which contained no word to assure remission of sins, *deserved to be called sacraments, as compared with baptism and the Lord's Supper?*"³

2. In the end, after various drafts of articles on the four missing sacraments had been discussed, and eventually passed,

¹ See Gairdner, *Lollardy*, ii, 320-1.

² Constant, *op. cit.*, pp. 301, 373, wrongly supposes that this discussion occurred *d propos* of the Ten Articles in 1536. Gairdner was once of this opinion, but later abandoned it.

³ Gairdner, *op. cit.*, ii, 321. Italics ours.

they were incorporated into a new and more elaborate formulary, *The Institution of a Christian Man*, or "Bishops' Book" as it is usually called. As we should expect, the work shows signs of having been compiled to meet divergent views. Dixon remarks that "so evenly balanced were the additions or alterations made (to the Ten Articles) that it was a disputed question whether of the two great religious parties gained or maintained the advantage. On the one hand, the New Learning were gratified by seeing Faith put before Sacraments, by the immense length at which the question of Faith was discussed, by the liberal allowance given to original sin, and by the scrupulous care with which the several elements of Justification were weighed against one another. On the other hand, the Old Learning perceived that the four doubtful sacraments were restored."¹ He adds that the composition of the work was mainly due to Cranmer and Foxe.

3. There are several features in the "Bishops' Book" to which we must call attention.

Thus, on p. 52, the Church is said to be one "in faith, hope, charity, and in the right use and ministration of the sacraments." Nothing is said about unity of government.

On pp. 55-6 we find the new theory of the Catholic Church as a *loose grouping of national churches* clearly set forth, for the first time :

"These particular churches, in what place of the world soever they be congregated, be the very parts, portions, or members of this catholic and universal Church. And between them there is no difference in superiority, pre-eminence, or authority, neither is any one of them head or sovereign over the other, but they be all equal in power and dignity, and be all grounded and builded upon one foundation. . . . And therefore the Church of Rome is not nor cannot worthily be called the Catholic Church, but only a particular member thereof, and cannot challenge or vindicate *of right* and by the word of God, to be head of this universal Church, or to have any superiority over the Churches of Christ which be in England, France, Spain, or in any other realm, but they be all free from any subjection unto the said Church of Rome, or unto the minister or bishop of the same."

Next we get the significant remark that these national churches may differ in their rites, ceremonies, traditions, and ordinances, according to the will of their several governors :

"The unity of this one Catholic Church is a mere spiritual unity, consisting in the points before rehearsed. . . . And therefore, although the said particular churches and the members of

the same *do much differ and be discrepant the one from the other*,¹ not only in the diversity of nations and countries . . . but also *in the divers using and observation of such outward rites, ceremonies, traditions and ordinances* as be instituted by their governors and approved among them, yet assuredly the unity of this Catholic Church cannot therefore or for that cause be any thing hurted, impeached or infringed in any point, but all the said churches do and shall continue still in the unity of this Catholic Church *notwithstanding any such diversity*, nor that any of them ought to be reputed as a member divided or precided from the same for any such cause of diversity or difference used by them or any of them in the said points. And I believe that all the particular churches in the world which be members of this Catholic Church may all be called apostolical churches, as well as the Church of Rome or any other Church, wherein the Apostles themselves were sometimes resident, forasmuch as they have received and be all founded upon the same faith and doctrine that the true apostles of Christ did teach and profess."

In another part, the Book insists that all bishops are equal, by divine law, and that any rank given to any among them is dependent upon royal sanction. And in particular it maintains that the Pope's power was a usurped one, and had been rightly abolished by the King :

"Whereas certain men do imagine and affirm that Christ should give unto the bishop of Rome power and authority, not only to be head and governor of all priests and bishops in Christ's Church, but also to have and occupy the whole monarchy of the world in his hands, and that he may thereby lawfully depose kings and princes from their realms, dominions, and seigniories, and so transfer and give the same to such persons as him liketh ; that is utterly false and untrue : for Christ never gave unto St. Peter, or unto any of the apostles, or their successors, any such authority. . . . As for the bishop of Rome, it was many hundred years after Christ before he could acquire or get any primacy or governance above any other bishops, out of his province in Italy. Sith the which time he hath ever usurped more and more. And though some part of his power was given unto him by the consent of the emperors, kings, and princes, and by the consent also of the clergy in general councils assembled ; yet surely he attained the most part thereof by marvellous subtilty and craft . . . whereby the said bishops of Rome aspired and arose at length unto such greatness in strength and authority, that they presumed and took upon them to be heads, and to put laws by their own authority, not only unto all other bishops within Christendom, but also unto the emperors, kings, and other the princes and lords of the world, and that under the pretence of the authority committed unto them by the gospel : wherein the said bishops of Rome do not only abuse and pervert the true sense and meaning

¹ *Italics ours.*

of Christ's word, but they do also clean contrary to the use and custom of the primitive Church, and also do manifestly violate as well the holy canons made in the Church immediately after the time of the apostles, as also the decrees and constitutions made in that behalf by the holy fathers of the catholic church, assembled in the first general councils, and finally they do transgress their own profession, made in their creation. For all the bishops of Rome always, when they be consecrated and made bishops of that see, do make a solemn profession and vow that they shall inviolably observe and keep all the ordinances made in the eight first general councils, among the which it is specially provided and enacted, that all causes shall be finished and determined within the province where the same be begun, and that by the bishops of the same province ; and that no bishop shall exercise any jurisdiction out of his own diocese or province. And divers such other canons were then made and confirmed by the said councils, to repress and take away out of the church all such primacy and jurisdiction over kings and bishops as the bishops of Rome pretend now to have over the same. (Ref. Concilium tertium Carthaginense, cap. 26). And we find that divers good fathers, bishops of Rome, did greatly reprove, yea and abhor (as a thing clean contrary to the gospel, and the decrees of the church), that any bishop of Rome, or elsewhere, should presume, usurp, or take upon him the title and name of the universal bishop, or of the head of all priests, or of the highest priest, or any such like title. (Ref. Gregorius, lib 4 epistolarum, indictione 13, cpist. 23.) For confirmation whereof, it is out of all doubt, that there is no mention made, neither in Scripture neither in the writings of any authentical doctor or author of the church, being within the time of the apostles, that Christ did ever make or institute any distinction or difference to be in the pre-eminence of power, order, or jurisdiction between the apostles themselves, or between the bishops themselves ; but that they were all equal in power, order, authority, and jurisdiction. And that there is now, and sith the time of the apostles, any such diversity or difference among the bishops, it was devised by the ancient fathers of the primitive church, for the conservation of good order and unity of the catholic church ; and that either by the consent and authority, or else at the least by the permission and sufferance of the princes and civil powers for the time ruling. For the said fathers, considering the great infinite multitude of Christian men, so largely increased through the world, and taking examples of the Old Testament thought it expedient to make an order of degrees, to be among bishops and spiritual governors of the church ; and so ordained some to be patriarchs, some to be primates, some to be metropolitans, some to be archbishops, some to be bishops. . . .

“ And whereas the king's most royal majesty, considering of his most excellent wisdom, not only the notable decay of Christ's true and perfect religion among us, but also the intolerable thralldom, captivity and bondage with the infinite damages and prejudices which we and other his subjects continually sustained, by reason of that long usurped and abused power which the

bishops of Rome were wont to exercise ere in this realm, hath now, of his most godly disposition, and by the consent of his nobles spiritual and temporal, and by the authority of the whole parliament, determined no longer to suffer the Bishop of Rome to execute any part of his jurisdiction here within this realm . . . surely we have great cause most joyfully and thankfully to embrace and accept the same. . .

Thus the Catholic Church as a whole no longer has any Visible Head or Centre of Unity !

We have noticed in one of the above passages that local churches may have a certain diversity of rites, ordinances, and traditions. But on p. 62 we are told that "all must refuse opinions contrary to the twelve articles condemned in the four holy Councils, Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus and Chalcedonense, and all other sith that time in any point consonant to the same." This is somewhat vague. Who is to decide what points are "consonant" to the first four Councils ?

4. Still more significant is the treatment of "The Sacrament of Orders" :

"All bishops shall teach . . . first how Christ and His Apostles did institute and ordain in the New Testament, that besides the civil powers and governance of kings and princes . . . there should also be continually in the Church militant certain other ministers or officers, which should have special power, authority, and commission, under Christ, *to preach and teach the word of God unto His people ; to dispense and administer the sacraments of God unto them*, and by the same to confer and give the graces of the Holy Ghost ; *to consecrate the blessed body of Christ* in the sacrament of the altar ; *to loose and absoyle* from sin all persons which be duly penitent and sorry for the same ; *to bind and to excommunicate* such as be guilty in manifest crimes and sins, and will not amend their defaults ; *to order and consecrate others* in the same room, order and office, whereunto they be called and admitted themselves ; and finally *to feed Christ's people*, like good pastors and rectors (as the Apostle calleth them), with their wholesome doctrine. . .

Note here that the general function of the ministry is to preach the word and administer the sacraments. Special mention is then made of some of these functions, such as "to consecrate the body of Christ in the sacrament of the altar,** but *nothing is said of offering any sacrifice.*

The article continues :

. . . "This power, office and administration is necessary to be preserved here on earth, for three special and principal causes. First, for that it is the commandment of God it should so be. . . . Second, for that God hath instituted and ordained

none other ordinary mean or instrument whereby he will make us partakers of the reconciliation which is by Christ . . . but only His word and sacraments. And therefore the office and power to minister the said word and sacraments may in no wise be suffered to perish, or to be abolished. . . . Thirdly, because the said power and office, or function, hath annexed unto it assured promises of excellent and inestimable things. For thereby is conferred and given the Holy Ghost. . . . This office, this power, and authority, was committed and given by Christ and His Apostles unto certain persons only, that is to say, unto priests or bishops, whom they did elect, call, and admit thereunto, by their prayer and imposition of their hands. . . .

"The sacrament of orders may worthily be called a sacrament, because it is a holy rite or ceremony instituted by Christ and His Apostles in the New Testament, and doth consist of two parts, like as the other sacraments of the Church do, that is to say, of a spiritual and an invisible grace, and also of an outward and a visible sign. The invisible gift or grace conferred in this sacrament is nothing else but the power, the office, and the authority before mentioned. The visible and outward sign is the prayer and imposition of the bishop's hands upon the person which receiveth the said gift or grace."

That sounds fairly orthodox and traditional. But what follows is by no means so conservative :

" . . . " Albeit the holy fathers of the Church, which succeeded the Apostles (minding to beautify and ornate the Church of Christ with all those things which were commendable in the temple of the Jews), did devise not only certain other ceremonies than be before rehearsed, as tonsures, rasures, unctions, and such other observances, to be used in the ministration of the said sacrament, but did also institute certain inferior orders . . . yet the truth is that in the New Testament there is no mention made of any degrees or distinction in orders but *only of deacons or ministers, and of priests or bishops*. Nor there is any word spoken of any other ceremony used in the conferring of this sacrament, but only prayer, and the imposition of the bishop's hands."

We call attention to the statement that so far as the New Testament is concerned, and therefore, so far as divine institution is concerned, there is no essential difference between priests and bishops. Also, the emphatic statement that only prayer and the imposition of hands is required for ordination seems to foreshadow the eventual abolition of the other ceremonies mentioned.

The article then goes on to say that:

"After the mind of certain doctors of the Church, this whole power and authority belonging unto priests and bishops¹ is divided into two parts, whereof the one is called *potestas ordinis*, and the other is called *potestas jurisdictionis*. . . . The jurisdiction

¹ Notice the equivalence once more.

committed unto priests and bishops . . . consisteth in three special points. The first is to rebuke and reprehend sin, and to excommunicate . . . and to absoyle and receive them again. . . . The second is to approve and admit such persons as (being nominated, elected, and presented unto them to exercise the office and room preaching the gospel, and of ministering the sacraments, and to have the cure of jurisdiction over these certain people within this parish or within this diocese) shall be thought unto them meet. . . . The said presentation and nomination . . . appertained unto the founders and patrons or other persons. . . . Within this realm the presentation and nomination of the bishoprics appertained unto the kings of this realm. . . . Unto the priests or bishops belonged by the authority of the gospel, to approve and confirm the person which shall be, by the king's highness or *de* other patrons, so nominated, elected and presented."

Next we get a significant statement:

"Surely the office of preaching is the chief and most principal office whereunto priests or bishops be called by the audority of the gospel, and they be also called bishops or archbishops, that is to say, superattendants or overseers, specially to signify that it is their office to oversee, etc. . . ."

This sounds very Lutheran. Note *de* emphasis on preaching, and the use of *de* Lutheran term "superattendants."

"The third point . . . is to make and ordain certain rules or canons concerning holy days, fasting days, the manner and ceremonies to be used in the ministration of the sacraments . . . *the diversity of degrees among the ministers* . . . and such other *rites^ ceremonies and. observances* as to tend and conduce to the preservation of quietness and decent order."

This again seems to foreshadow the drawing up of new rites, and *de* abolition of certain minor orders. The article continues :

"For *de* better declaration of which three points, two things are to be noted. First, that although the whole jurisdiction appertaining (as is aforesaid) unto priests and bishops be committed unto them in general words . . . yet *dere* is also a particular order, form, and manner requisite. . . . This . . . is not expressly declared, determined or prescribed in Scripture, but was and is left to be declared from time to time, and from age to age, by certain positive rules and ordinances, to be made by the ministers of *de* Church, *with the consent of the people* before such times as princes were christened, and after they were christened, *with the authority and consent of the said princes and their people***

Here comes in the control of *de* civil power | But *de* king does not claim *de* power of *order* :

260 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

“ We may not think that it doth appertain unto the office of kings and princes to preach and teach, to administer the sacraments, to absoyle, to excommunicate, and such other things belonging to the office and administration of bishops and priests, but we must think and believe that God hath constituted and made Christian kings and princes to be as the chief heads and overlookers over the said priests and bishops, to cause them to administer their office and power committed unto them purely and sincerely.”

Note that a bishop is an *overseer*, and a king an *overlooker* !

The two most significant features in the above are *the absence of distinction between bishops and priests*, and the statement that *the ministers of the Church can, with the consent of the royal power, decide what rites and ceremonies shall be used, how many grades of ministers there shall be*, and so on. All of which foreshadows changes.

5. Coming now to the other missing sacraments, *Matrimony* is said to have been instituted by God in the Garden of Eden, and “ accepted, approved, and allowed ” by Christ in the New Testament. Of the inward graces one is “ the dispensation whereby the act of procreation between man and woman, which is, as of itself and of its own nature, damnable, is sanctified.”

Confirmation is described as follows :

“ The Apostles used to go unto the people after they were baptised, and by their prayer, and laying of their hands upon them, did give and confer unto them the Holy Ghost. . . . The *Holy Fathers of the Primitive Church*, taking occasion and founding themselves upon the said acts and deeds of the apostles . . . *thought it very expedient to ordain* that all Christian people should, after their baptism, be presented to their bishops, to the intent that by their prayers and laying of their hands upon them and consigning of them with the holy chrism, they should be confirmed.”

Thus, by implication at least, the *Divine institution* of Confirmation is expressly denied.

The Sacrament of Extreme Unction is not much better treated :

“ Although it be not expressed in Scripture that the Apostles had then (when sent forth by Christ) any new commandment of Christ to anoint such as they had healed with oil, yet forasmuch as the holy Apostle St. James, endued with the Holy Spirit of Christ, prescribed a certain rule or doctrine, and gave in manner a commandment . . . and further added hereunto an assured promise . . . it shall therefore be very necessary and expedient that all true Christian people do use and observe this manner of anointing of sick persons, with due reverence and honour. . . .

The holy fathers of the Church, considering this place of St. James, and the manner also of anointing of sick men used by the Apostles, *thought it convenient to institute and ordain* that this manner of anointing of sick men prescribed by St. James should be observed continually in the Church. . . . And to the intent the same should be had in more honour and veneration, the said *holy fathers willed and taught that all Christian men should repute and account the said manner of anointing among the other sacraments of the Church. . . .*"

So, this sacrament too is of *ecclesiastical* and not of *divine* institution !

The Bishops' Book gives us a general note on the four sacraments thus reinserted :

"Although the Sacraments of Matrimony, Confirmation, Holy Orders, and Extreme Unction, have been of long time past received and approved by the common consent of the Catholic Church, to have the name and dignity of sacraments, as indeed they be well worth to have (forasmuch as they be holy and godly signs whereby, and by the prayer of the minister, be not only signified and represented, but also given and conferred, some certain and special gifts of the Holy Ghost . . .) yet there is a difference in dignity and necessity between them and the other three sacraments. . . . First, these three sacraments be instituted by Christ, to be as certain instruments or remedies necessary for our salvation. . . . Second, they be also commanded by Christ to be ministered and received in heir outward visible signs. Thirdly, they have annexed and conjoined unto their said visible signs such spiritual graces as whereby our sins be remitted. . . ."

This seems to imply that the four other sacraments were not instituted by Christ, but by the Holy Fathers !

Like the Ten Articles, the Bishops' Book contains no reference to the Sacrifice of the Mass, other than the very dubious statement to which we have already referred in connection with the Article on Purgatory (see p. 251).

6. It will be obvious now that we cannot agree altogether with Gairdner when he says! that this work was "on the whole, a great victory for the bishops of the old school." On the contrary, we think the document bears once again the obvious marks of a compromise, and an endeavour is obviously being made to reconcile the two conceptions, or at any rate not to exclude the Lutheran conception. That is presumably why it was signed by all the bishops, including those with Lutheran sympathies. Doubtless the latter would have preferred other phraseology here and there, and the same of course would apply to the "Anglo-Catholic" bishops. It must also be

pointed out that, as Gairdner himself confesses, concessions are made to Protestantism. Thus "Justification is set forth as due entirely to the merits of Christ, and the Romish doctrine of Purgatory was repudiated, though prayers for departed souls were declared to be laudable."¹

¹ *Op. cit.*

CHAPTER IV

THE NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE LUTHERANS IN 1538

1. In 1538, another attempt was made to negotiate an alliance between the German Lutherans and the English. The former sent envoys to England, at Henry's suggestion, to discuss a doctrinal agreement on the basis of the Augsburg Confession. On their arrival, Henry nominated a committee of three bishops—apparently Stokesley of London, Tunstall of Durham, and Sampson of Chichester—and four doctors, with Cranmer as president, to confer with them.¹ The bishops chosen were apparently of the "Anglo-Catholic" party, with the exception of Cranmer.

The German delegates brought with them Melancthon's *Wittenberg Articles*, which had already, two years previously, been brought to England by Foxe, and were transformed at that time into the *Ten Articles*. This time they resulted in the drawing up of a series of *Thirteen Articles*.² It is not certain whether these were drawn up by the English or by the Germans, but the point is not important, for it is agreed that these thirteen articles record the extent of the agreement reached between the two parties. They are also interesting, as Dr. Darwell Stone remarks, as "showing what at this time Cranmer and Tunstall could agree to assert," and because they "appear to have been the link between the Confession of Augsburg and the Articles which were eventually formed into the present Thirty-nine."³

3. Of the Thirteen Articles as a whole, Jenkyns remarks that "there is much similarity between the clauses of this document and the Augsburg Confession,"⁴ while Constant says that if we compare them with the *Wittenberg Articles* (which of

¹ Darwell Stone, *History of the Doctrine of the Eucharist*, ii, 113 *et seq.*

² Constant here falls into a strange confusion, and says [*Reformation in England*, p. 415] that, in addition to the *Thirteen Articles*, the Conference produced also a Book of *Thirty Articles*, entitled "Book containing divers Articles." That, however, is the title of the *Thirteen Articles* (see Cranmer's *Works*, P.S., II, p. 472.) There were no *Thirty Articles*.

³ *Op. cit.*, ii, 115.

⁴ Cranmer, P.S., ii, p. 472 note.

264 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

course were based on the Augsburg Confession), "an evident concordance will be noticed, which is also frequently a literal one."¹

The article on Justification (No. 4) is explicitly Lutheran. Good works are necessary, as a sign of real faith, but not as a means of justification.

Article 5 deals with the "Catholic Church," as contrasted with the "Roman Church." The former is recognised by its *profession of the gospel, and the communion of the sacraments. Traditions, rites and ceremonies which have been instituted by men either for adornment or order of discipline are not necessarily everywhere the same, but may vary in different places, and at different times.*

The article on Original Sin (No. 2) describes concupiscence as a "*vere peccatum*," while a later article (No. 6) allows that concupiscence remains in the baptised.

The seventh article on the Eucharist is as follows :

"In the Sacraments of the Body and Blood of the Lord, the Body and Blood of Christ are truly, substantially, and really present (*vere, substantialiter et realiter adsunt*) under the species of bread and wine (*sub speciebus panis et vini*), and under the same species they are truly and really *exhibited* and distributed (*sub eisdem speciebus vere et realiter exhibentur et distribuuntur*) to those who receive the sacrament, whether good or bad."

Here once more we notice the significant word "*exhibited*."

The eighth article, on Penance, describes auricular confession as "*valde utilem, ac summe necessariam*." This is exactly the phraseology used in the Ten Articles. But it is significant that in the manuscript of the Thirteen Articles there is a marginal note in Cranmer's handwriting substituting "*commodissimam*" for "*summe necessariam*," and a similar manuscript correction is made by Cranmer throughout the article.

The ninth article is on the Use of the Sacraments. They are said to be not only notes of profession among Christians, but testimonies and efficacious signs of grace. But they do not confer grace *ex opere operato*.

The tenth article, on the Ministry of the Church, says that, "No one ought to teach publicly or administer the sacraments unless he is rightly called, and *that indeed by those who, according to the word of God and the laws and customs of each region, have the right to call and admit*."^{*} Nothing is said about the *degrees* of the

¹ *Reformation in England*, p. 414.

* Cf. the corresponding statement in the 42 Articles of Edward VI, p. 539, and the 39 Articles of Elizabeth (Vol. II).

hierarchy, or about the *sacramental character of holy order*, or the *proper minister* of it. And the article is obviously intended to give equal recognition to the existing ministry in England, and to the Lutheran ministry in Germany.

4. There are also in existence some drafts for other articles, on private masses, the veneration of saints, and images.¹ These, according to Jenkyns, are drafts for articles "on which the English and German divines could not agree."² They have some marginal notes in Cranmer's handwriting, but it is impossible to say whether they emanate from German or the English side. *A fortiori* there is no evidence that they were written by Cranmer, or express his views. Internal evidence suggests rather that they are of German origin.

The article on the *biass* says that it is a good practice to have sacred readings and sermons in the Mass, and prayers, "et eucharistiam in missa populo exhiberi." (Note the favourite Bucerian expression "exhibited.") The prayers should be in the vulgar tongue. After lessons and prayers, "populus corpus Christi quod pro nobis traditum est, et sanguinem ejus qui pro nobis effusus est, in eucharistia sumebat, in memoriam videlicet mortis suae." Unfortunately, the article adds, all these good practices have been corrupted by the Ronjan Antichrist. The lessons and prayers are in a tongue unknown to the people, and "eucharistia a solo sumitur sacerdote, qui illa in turpissimum quaestum pro vivis ac defunctis applicat. . . . Damnanda est igitur impia illa opinio sentientium usum sacramenti cultum esse a sacerdotibus applicandum pro aliis, vivis et defunctis, et mereri illis vitam aeternam et remissionem culpae et poenae, idque ex opere operato." For Christ instituted the sacrament as a memory of his death, and each must receive the sacrament for himself. One man cannot communicate for another. "Qua re perpensa, facile apparebit privatarum missarum applicationes et nundinationes non amplius esse ferendas." For, as Augustine says, the rest of the Mass is simply praises, thanksgivings, and petitions, and the Eucharist itself only profits and applies to the person receiving, and hence there is no reason why masses should be bought. Some of the Fathers have indeed called the Eucharist a sacrifice, but this is because it is "in memoriam illius unici et semel peracti sacrificii, non quod ipsum opus sit sacrificium applicabile vivis et mortuis in remissionem pecca-

* Cranmer, *Works*, P.S., ii, 480-4.

† Jenkyns, *Cranmer*, I, p. 293 note.

torum. *Id quod papisticum duntaxat est figmentum*! ; et quoniam ab hac tam impia opinione et quaesta inde proveniente missae private, illacque pro magna parte satisfactoriae, in tantam multitudinem excreverunt . . . satisfactorias quidem prorsus abolendas, ceteras vero privatas vel in totum abrogandas, vel certe minuendas et reprimendas judicamus.”

The whole phraseology of this article is so reminiscent of Melancthon's writings that we cannot help thinking it was probably a draft brought from Germany. Notice also the suggestion about the use of the vernacular in the Liturgy. This had already been adopted in Germany, but not yet in England.

The other two articles on the Veneration of Saints and Images are unimportant.

5. Evidently no agreement was reached on these three matters, for the German representatives, before leaving for home, presented a long paper to the King concerning certain abuses, which they felt sure the King would cause his bishops and theologians to discuss ; just as they felt sure he would also purify the Liturgy from wicked cults and abuses introduced by the Roman bishop into the Church, and draw up a system of worship and ceremonies in harmony with the Word of God. They go on to say that there are three heads or foundations of the Pontifical idolatry and tyranny, and unless these are destroyed, it will be impossible to preserve pure religion. These three abuses are : communion under one kind, private masses, and the celibacy of priests.

On Private Masses they say :

“ In this matter the Christian religion has been so oppressed and obscured that the benefit of Christ, who by His death redeemed us and is alone the victim and satisfaction for our sins, has been wholly taken away, and in its place has been introduced into the Church an idolatrous cult for washing away sins. . . . For inasmuch as *the Mass is nothing else, and should be nothing else, than a communion* or synaxis, as Paul calls it . . . it is evidently repugnant that *ex opere operato*, as they say, the Mass should merit grace, and *take away the sins of the living and the dead*. . . . For if it is true that a Mass can be applied to others, that it takes away sins, and profits the living and the dead, it follows that justification comes from the work of Masses, not from faith. But this is altogether contrary to Scripture, which teaches that we are freely justified on account of Christ through faith. . . . ”

Then, after a long section, they repeat the accusation about Catholic teaching on the Mass first made at Augsburg in 1530 :

* Cf. Art. 30 in the 42 Articles of Edward VI, p. 549.

“And can anything more wicked be said than that which they have taught concerning these masses, namely, that Christ in His Passion satisfied for original sin, and instituted the Mass in which there should be an oblation for daily sins mortal and venial: when Christ commanded repentance and the forgiveness of sins to be preached, and instituted the Mass, i.e., the synaxis, to quite another end, namely, that the sacrament should be given to those in need of consolation, and that, believing, they should receive grace through the word and the sacrament, and the remission of sins—not in order that they should offer their work, which, whatsoever it may be, is a *human figment* and a human cultus, to God, and sacrifice it to God, against the Scripture. For this does not please God, as Christ Himself says, that is, being vainly worshipped by the commandments of men: for the Mass is not a work or a sacrifice such that it may merit grace and profit also others, and this is shown by the fact that the Mass or synaxis was instituted, *not that something should be offered to God*, but that those communicating should draw consolation, and receive as it were a pledge or certain sign of grace and of God's good will towards them, and that in this way they should remember the death of Christ, that is, the benefits which they receive through Christ. . . . *It is not a sacrifice*, i.e., a work which is offered to God and for the abolition of sins. Paul says: ‘you show forth the death of the Lord.’ To show forth is not to sacrifice, that is, present a work to God by which sins may be washed away. Moreover, the text of the gospel reads: ‘Take and eat.’ . . . But to take, eat, and drink, is not to sacrifice. Nor is it commanded by these words that we should offer anything to God, but rather that from Him we should receive, for it goes on: ‘which is given for you,’ and ‘the blood which is shed for you,’* which words show that a sacrifice is not made to God by those receiving the Eucharist, but a gift is given to men. . . . The sacred writings give no more reason why we should say that those who receive the Eucharist offer a sacrifice than that we should say this of any other sacrament such as baptism. . . . As to those who would endeavour to excuse the private Mass and to say that it is called a sacrifice *because it is a thanksgiving and a sacrifice of praise* these are convicted by their own testimonies and writings concerning the Mass. . . . For Thomas says in his opusculum *De Sacramento altaris*, that the body of the Lord was once offered on the Cross for the original debt, and is so offered for daily sins on the altar. . . .

“There was one only propitiatory sacrifice in the world, that is, the death of Christ. . . .

“From which things it follows that the Mass is not a sacrifice which can merit *ex opere operato* to the person offering or to others the remission of sins, as they have taught. . . .

“*By a legal fiction, the Mass can be called a memorial sacrifice, or a sacrifice of praise.* . . . But for the same reason, Christmas, or similar feasts which are celebrated, may be called memorial sacrifices or eucharistic sacrifices, indeed, the preaching of the gospel, faith, prayer, thanksgiving, afflictions, and all other good works of the saints, can more truly be called sacrifices, but they

cannot and ought not in any way to be called satisfactions or applications for others. . . .”^x

The last paragraph is important. It gives precisely that presentation of the Eucharist as a “*sacrifice of praise*” or “*memorial*” which we shall find later on adopted by the Anglican Reformers, and enshrined in the Book of Common Prayer.

6. To this somewhat lengthy tirade, Henry sent a reply (printed in Pocock’s *Burnet*, IV, 373 *et seq.*), dealing with the points raised. Part of the manuscript of this reply is in Tunstall’s handwriting, so he evidently had a hand in its composition, even if the whole is not due to him, as suggested by Kidd² and Dixon.⁸

On private masses, the King remarks that there is nothing ordained in the Church by Christ which at some time or other has not been abused, but that is no reason why something holily ordained should be rejected. Rather, abuses should be removed. He adds :

“ If the private Mass is to be abolished because of what you describe as wicked doctrines brought in by Thomas Aquinas, Gabriel and others, namely, masses merit grace *ex opere operato*, and take away the sins of the living and the dead, and can be applied to others—whatever it may be that they have asserted—they asserted it about *all* Masses, not only of private ones.”

It is to be noted that Tunstall passes over the particular accusation about Thomas Aquinas teaching that the Cross was a sacrifice only for original sin. The reply continues :

“ If a private Mass is properly carried out, *the faithful* present who repent of their sins and ask God’s mercy, and *offer themselves* as living and acceptable sacrifices to God, doubtless communicate spiritually with the priest, even if they abstain from corporal reception of the sacrament. . . .

“ You say that the sacrament of the Eucharist is not a sacrifice, because the one propitiatory sacrifice is the death of Christ, who dies no more, and was offered once for all for us, and that therefore there remains no further sacrifice but a spiritual sacrifice. . . . We wonder that anyone should be opposed to calling the Mass a sacrifice. . . . Therein is made a *consecration of the body and blood of the Lord in memory of His death*, . . . If Christ is both priest and sacrifice and victim, wheresoever Christ is, there is our victim, there is our sacrifice. . . . Moreover, because Christ our Sacrifice, who Himself dies no more, is in the Mass, and *we* also there, His body and members, *offer ourselves* with Him our Head to God as

¹ Latin text in Pocock’s *Burnet*, IV, pp. 352-372.

² *Later Medieval Doctrine*, p. 80.

⁸ *History of the Church of England*, II, p. 5 note.

living sacrifices, the Greeks call the whole an unbloody sacrifice. . . . Moreover, when in the Mass both priest and people, repenting of their sins, as Paul exhorts, exhibit themselves a holy and living sacrifice, sing praises to God and give thanks, who can doubt that for this reason also the Mass is rightly called a sacrifice ? ”

A striking feature in the above “ defence ” of the sacrificial character of the Mass is *the absence of any clear statement that in the Mass Christ Himself is offered*. There is a consecration of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, who offered Himself on the Cross and is therefore our sacrifice. The only offering mentioned is *the offering of ourselves*. This very low view of the Sacrifice is significant, as coming even from one of the Anglo-Catholic party, Tunstall of Durham. It shows how even the Anglo-Catholic bishops were beginning to be affected by the Reformed ideas, and presents a striking contrast to the exposition of the Sacrifice put forward by Catholic theologians abroad. (Cf. pp. 125, 126, 180, 186, 187, 192, 193, 194.)

7. In connection with this Conference of 1538, we must mention a Latin manuscript draft which exists in the Record Office, amongst Cranmer's Papers, and entitled *De Ordine et Ministerio Sacerdotum et Episcoporum*. It forms part of a collection of papers belonging apparently to the Conference between Anglican and Lutherans in 1538. But on the other hand, this particular paper contains some portions of the chapter on Orders which appeared in the “ Institution ” of 1537, and other portions which appeared later, in the treatment of Orders in the “ Necessary Doctrine ” of 1540. It seems fairly clear that part at least of the article on Orders in the “ Institution ” was written by Tunstall, Bishop of Durham, for in the Record Office there are drafts of the section on Jurisdiction in his own handwriting.

The present paper, *De Ordine et Ministerio*, may have been a first draft, into which Tunstall's section on Jurisdiction was incorporated (for itself contains nothing on this subject). It contains a long criticism of the Papal claims from the standpoint of history, which was not used in the Bishops' Book but was incorporated into the King's Book. The rest of the article corresponds fairly faithfully with the first part of the article in the Bishops' Book. But its beginning is noteworthy : “ Sacerdotum et episcoporum ordinem ac ministerium non humana auctoritate sed divinitus institutum, scriptura aperte docet.” The three arguments for the necessity of the Church's ministry

are set forth as in the Bishops' Book, including the third, "Potestatem seu functionem hanc Dei verbum et sacramenta ministrandi. . . . Christus ipse apostolis suis dedit, et in illis ac per illos eandem tradidit, haud promiscue quidem omnibus, sed quibusdam duntaxat hominibus, nempe episcopis et presbyteris, qui ad istud muneris initiantur et admittuntur."

The time of composition of this paper is, as we have said, uncertain. The same must be said of its authorship. It is not in Cranmer's handwriting, nor is it either annotated or signed by him. And it certainly does not represent his own views, for he attributed to the king the power to make a bishop. (See p. 286-287.)

Hence, whoever the author of this paper was, it was certainly not Cranmer.

CHAPTER V

THE SIX ARTICLES

1. In March, 1539, there occurred another event of great interest, namely, another German embassy, which again endeavoured to negotiate a religious compact with England. As Dixon says, this particular mission of the Germans has been almost overlooked by historians. They were apparently prepared to go far in the way of conciliation, in order to meet the English. Strype, in his *Eccles. Memorials*, I, 526, prints a list of "things admitted by Luther, Melanchthon, etc.," and presented here by the German delegates. This document begins by allowing that "there must be bishops in the Church." And it even goes on to say that "it is good and convenient that in the Church there be a bishop of Rome, that may be above other bishops, who may gather them together, to see to the examination of doctrine and the concord of such as do teach discrepancies in the Church." This of course must be understood in the light of Melanchthon's declaration, at Schmalkald in 1537, that he would admit a primacy in the Bishop of Rome provided this was recognised to be merely *jure humano*. The document goes on to remark that

** we do not admit the pomp, riches, and pride of the Bishop of Rome, who would make realms subject unto him.

"As regards ceremonies, there might an agreement be made early, if there could be a concord in the doctrine. . . . We judge it to be profitable that confession of sins be made in the Church . . . provided that the consciences be not overlaid with rigorous and exact rehearsal of all sins. . . .

"We use the accustomed fashion in the office of the Mass. For what should avail a change of ceremonies without necessity? But we admit not the private masses. . . .

"We believe that, like as Christ in His last Supper did give unto His disciples His true body to be eaten and His blood to be drunken, so he gives daily to us . . . as often as we keep the Supper. . . .

"Christ did give His body and blood under both species and kinds, and therefore we owe to observe the same."

2^2 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

These statements are of course significant in *what they omit*. Thus, the statement as to the conservation of the Mass must be interpreted in the light of the German rejection of the doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass, and the new liturgical forms for the Mass which they had already introduced. Also, the statement about the Real Presence is studiously vague, and could be accepted by a Zwinglian.

2. On April 1st, 1539, McLanchthon wrote to King Henry again urging reform on the lines of the Augsburg Confession and the conferences of 1536 and 1538. The letter is given in Pocock's *Burnet*.¹ He pertinently urges that, now that the King has shaken off the authority of the Roman bishop, he ought to give up the "abuses" which have arisen from or have been confirmed by the Pope.

These "abuses" included, of course, private masses, communion under one kind, and the celibacy of the clergy. There was, however, a strong party in England which was determined to retain these "abuses," in spite of the attempts of the Lutherans to abolish them. It was decided to have public debate upon these and other points, and accordingly, on May 16th, 1539, the Duke of Norfolk proposed the following questions for discussion in the House of Lords :

1. Whether in the most blessed sacrament of the altar remaineth, after the consecration, the substance of bread and wine.

2. Whether it be necessary by God's law that all men should be communicated with both kinds.

3. Whether priests may by the law of God marry after.

4. Whether vows of chastity or widowhood be by the law of God to be observed.

5. Whether private Masses stand with the law of God, and to be used and continued, as things whereby Christian people may and do receive godly consolation and wholesome benefits.

6. Whether auricular confession is necessary to be retained, continued, used and frequented.

¹ The above is the version of the questions given in the subsequent Act of Parliament itself. But Burnet² gives a different form, especially for the last question :

6. Whether auricular confession be necessary by the law of God?

It seems highly probable that the latter was the original form of the question, for reasons which we shall shortly explain.

A lengthy debate ensued, and as might be expected, the episcopate was divided, the Anglo-Catholic party defending the traditional conception, and the Lutherans striving for recognition of their Reformed ideas. The Anglo-Catholic view was championed by Archbishop Lee of York, and Bishops Tunstall of Durham, Gardiner of Winchester, and Aldrich of Carlisle. The Reformed view was defended of course by Cranmer, and in addition by Goodrich of Ely, Shaxton of Salisbury, Latimer of Worcester, Hilsey of Rochester, and Barlow of St. David's. The King himself, as the Act of Parliament tells us, took part in the debate, and according to the letter of a peer printed in Strype's *Cranmer*, App. xxvi, "never prince showed himself . . . so Catholic. . . . His highness confounded them all with God's learning." That might lead one to think that the king supported the Anglo-Catholic party throughout. But there is one important piece of evidence to the contrary, which has been strangely overlooked by most historians. Pocock's *Burnet* prints two important documents.¹ The first is headed, "Tunstall's arguments for the divine institution of auricular confession, with some notes written in the margin by King Henry's own hand." The tenor of these royal notes is explained in the second document, "A Letter of King Henry's to Tunstall, Bishop of Durham, against auricular confession being of divine institution." This second document begins as follows :

"Methought, my lord of Durham, that both the bishops of York, Winchester, and your reasons and texts were so fully answered this other day, in our House, as to my seeming and supposal, the most of the House was satisfied ; I marvelled not a little why eftsoons you have sent to me this now your writing, being in a manner few other texts or reasons than there were declared, both by the Bishop of Canterbury and me, to make small or nothing to your intended purpose."

This makes it evident that on this particular point of the divine institution of confession, at any rate, the King sided with Cranmer, as against Lee, Tunstall, and Gardiner.

And it is noteworthy that the Act of Parliament promulgates this particular article *without any reference to Divine institution*, as will be seen from the following official text of the "Six Articles" :

1. In the most blessed sacrament of the altar, by the strength and efficacy of Christ's mighty word (it being spoken by the priest), is present really, under the form of bread and wine, the natural

body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ, conceived of the Virgin Mary ; and after the consecration there remaineth no substance of bread or wine, or any other substance, but the substance of Christ, God and Man.

2. Communion in both kinds is not necessary *ad salutem* by the law of God to all persons. . . . In the flesh, under form of bread, is the very blood, and with the blood, under form of wine, is the very flesh.

3. Priests, after the order of priesthood received, may not marry by the law of God.

4. Vows of chastity or widowhood . . . ought to be observed by the law of God.

5. It is meet and necessary that private Masses be continued and admitted . . . whereby good Christian people, ordering themselves accordingly, do receive both godly and goodly consolations and benefits, and it is agreeable also to God's law.

6. Auricular confession is expedient and necessary to be retained and continued, used and frequented in the church of God.¹

3. The Act goes on to threaten very severe penalties indeed to any who deny these articles. As to the doctrine formulated in them, we may perhaps safely conclude that they represent the King's own views at this time, especially in view of the curious point about confession to which we have already referred. But at the same time it is worthy of mention that according to Foxe, these Six Articles, which were "devised by the cruelty of the bishops, but especially of the bishop of Winchester," were at length "also subscribed by King Henry, by the crafty policy of that bishop, who, like a lurking serpent, most slyly watching his time, took the king coming out upon a sudden," and that, had this not been the case, "it was thought and affirmed by certain who were then pertaining to the king, that Winchester had not obtained the matter so easily to be subscribed as he did." It is certainly curious that Henry, who was not accustomed to brook opposition, should have regarded Cranmer's criticisms of the articles in Parliament with singular benevolence, and should have expressly informed him that he admired his conduct in the debate. Also, the King raised no objection to the subsequent Act of Parliament mitigating the penalties attached to the Act.² But in any case, we may look upon the Six Articles as, in the main, a temporary triumph of the Anglo-Catholic party.

Even so, as Constant says, "Cranmer and Cromwell managed to make the Six Articles a dead letter, and to prevent the Protestant preachers from being troubled,"³ and the head of the

¹ Foxe, V, 262. ² 32 Henry 10 ; see Foxe V, ii, p. 822. ³ *Op. cit.* p. 379.

Lutheran embassy, Burchardt, was able to write to Melanchthon in October, 1539, that "the papistical faction has nowise obtained its hoped-for tyranny, nor, God willing, ever will in England." And Gairdner says that this "Bloody Statute . . . produced at the first nothing but a scare and some brief imprisonments." He adds that "Henry was not really halfso much bent on putting down heretical opinions as the title of the Act would suggest."¹

4. Melanchthon wrote a long expostulation to the King against the Act, which is printed in Foxe, V, 350. He remarks upon the cunning language of the articles, which are framed in such a way as to condone Popish errors. He points out various ambiguities. Thus the article on confession insinuates, but does not really say, that "rehearsing of sins" is necessary by God's word. Also, an article says that private masses bring consolations and benefits, but does not say what these are. And "although the supper of the Lord was truly instituted by Christ, yet the private mass is a wicked profanation of the Lord's supper, for in the canon, what a corruption is contained in this, where it is said that Christ is offered, and that the work itself is a sacrifice, which redeemeth the quick and the dead? . . . Christ willeth not himself to be offered up of priests, neither can the work of the offerer, or of the receiver, by any means be a sacrifice." Melanchthon says that the bishops who formulated the articles evidently *did not dare to teach the Catholic doctrine fully and explicitly*. This is worthy of note. In view of this undoubted lack of explicit formulation, which Melanchthon here points out, we should expect the next doctrinal formula, i.e., the King's Book, to be absolutely explicit, if it is desired that it should teach the Catholic doctrine. We shall see now how far this is from being the case.

Possibly as a result of Melanchthon's protest, an Act was later on passed mitigating the severity of the punishment attached to the infringement of the Six Articles.²

¹ Lollardy, ii, 204-5.

² 32 Henry, c. 10.

CHAPTER VI

THE REVISION OF THE BISHOPS' BOOK, AND THE ENQUIRY ON THE SACRAMENTS

A. THE REVISION OF THE "BISHOPS' BOOK."

1. The Bishops' Book of 1537 had been produced by the bishops themselves, but they had written a preface saying that they had composed it in obedience to the King's commands. They went on to affirm "with one assent" that it was in all points concordant with and agreeable to Holy Scripture, but even so, they offered it to the King for his correction.

This shows that it did not necessarily represent the views of any one bishop, e.g., Cranmer, or of the King himself. As a matter of fact, Cranmer himself expressed his dissatisfaction with one or two points in it.¹

2. Shortly after the publication of the work, in January, 1538, the King annotated a copy of it, and sent it to Cranmer for his observations. The notes and observations are printed in Cranmer, P.S., II, p. 83 *et seq.* They are quite interesting, as showing the doctrinal tendencies of the King and the Archbishop.

Thus, the original work had :

"If any shall commit deadly sin, let him consider and remember that Jesus Christ, by sacrificing and offering up his precious blood, made due satisfaction and propitiation unto God His Father, not only for all our sins, but also for the sins of all the world."²

Henry suggested that this should read : "became and made himself our redeemer, saviour, and intercessor." Cranmer observed on this :

* Thus the Archbishop writes (P.S., p. 91) : "This particule, I confess, I never well understood, neither as it was by us made, nor as it is now corrected, but I consented thereto only because there is no evil doctrine therein contained, as far as I can perceive and discern." Again, p. 96 : "Ten or twelve lines together need good interpretation, for they seem to attribute unto the words of consecration all things whatsoever we have of Christ." Also, in June, 1541, Cranmer said publicly at Canterbury that the Bishops' Book had been put forth *without his consent.* (L.P., xviii, ii, 546, *apud* Gairdner, ii, p. 359.)

• Page 69.

THE REVISION OF THE BISHOPS' BOOK

“ ‘ Satisfaction,’ which is put out, me seemeth in any wise should stand still, to take away the root, ground and foundation of the two chief errors whereby the Bishop of Rome corrupted the pure foundation of Christian faith and doctrine. For upon this satisfaction did he build his sticks hay and straw, satisfactory masses, trentals, scala coeli, foundation of chantries, monasteries, pardons, and those other abuses, to satisfy the coveteousness of him and his.”

This is noteworthy as showing that Cranmer had *already at this early date, i.e., 1537, abandoned the Catholic doctrine of* “satisfactory masses.”

The King suggests many alterations throughout the work. Most of them, however, are not of much significance. But, as the Parker Society editor remarks, he was evidently “much dissatisfied with the article on Orders, for the marks of his pen occur in all parts of it, and he has frequently expressed his dissatisfaction with particular passages by the word ‘nihil.’ . . . As might be expected from the king’s objections, the article is very much altered in the *Necessary Doctrine*.”

Some of the King’s alterations here are very interesting. Thus, the Bishops’ Book has :

“Christ and His Apostles did institute and ordain in the New Testament that besides the civil powers and governance of kings and princes there should also be continually in the Church certain other ministers and officers, which should have special power, authority and commission under Christ, to preach and teach the word of God . . . to dispense and administer the sacraments, etc.”

Henry here interpolates, after “under Christ” :

“as hereafter followeth, first that they (being *according to the laws of every region elect and constitute*) have cure of soul, authority to preach and teach, etc.”

This implies local variations in the method of appointment and constitution of ministers, and also that only those constituted by the local powers have religious authority.

Again, the “Institution” states that “this office, power and authority was committed and given by Christ and His Apostles unto certain persons only, i.e., to priests or bishops, whom they did elect, call, and admit thereunto by their prayer and imposition of their hands.” This ascribes election as well as ordination to the Apostles, and accordingly Henry inserts : “Note, that there were no kings Christian under whom they did dwell.”

278 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

Similarly, when the "Institution" says that part of the jurisdiction committed unto priests and bishops is to make rules concerning holy days, ceremonies to be used in the ministration of the sacraments, and other rites, ceremonies and observances," the King adds : " the king and his people giving their assent thereto."

And when the " Institution " says that the bishops and priests are to see that things are carried out in due order, the King adds : " videlicet, *asfar asyou have power.*"

Again, the " Institution " says that part of the King's office is to see that bishops and priests do their duty, " and in case they shall be negligent in any part thereof, to cause them to supply and repair the same again." To this the King adds significantly, " *or else to put other in their place.*"

Again, the " Institution " says that they break a commandment who " make any oath contrary to their lawful oath or promise made before, so long as their former oath or promise standeth in strength." The King adds, " and toucheth not their prince."

As to the ceremonies of the Church the " Institution " says that " although the said ceremonies have no power to remit sin, yet they be very expedient things to stir and cause us to lift up our minds unto God, etc. Therefore they be not to be condemned and cast away, but to be used and continued as things good and laudable for the purposes aforesaid." The King adds : " so long as it shall be seen *to the head rulers and chiefministers ofthe Church or Churches convenient to have them observed and kept* " !

Again, in connection with the second commandment, the Bishops' Book says :

" We be utterly forbidden to make or to have any similitude or image, to the intent to bow down to it or to worship it."

The King remarks : " they are not to be honoured as God." Cranmer comments : " images ought to have no manner of honour."

B. THE ENQUIRY ON THE SACRAMENTS.

1. Evidently, then, some revision of the Bishops' Book was in contemplation almost immediately after its publication. In the meantime, it was licensed in 1537 for three years. At the expiry of this period, i.e., in June, 1540, active steps were taken for the composition of a more authoritative formulary. Two

commissions were apparently appointed, one to deal with doctrine, and the other with ceremonies. The King sent numerous questions to the bishops and divines for their consideration. The questions concerning the sacraments, and some of the answers submitted, are given in Pocock's *Burnet*, VI, pp. 241 *et seq.*, and other answers in IV, pp. 442-496. Seventeen questions were submitted on this subject.

We are able to date these questions and answers very closely, for the latter mention Thirlby as "Bishop-elect of Westminster." Now he was appointed to Westminster on September 17th, 1540, and consecrated on December 29th, 1540, so the answers, at any rate, were sent in between September and December, 1540.

2. The questions were very carefully framed. It is important to notice the emphasis on the Scriptural basis for a doctrine, as distinct from the proof from Tradition. Thus, the first question asks, "What a sacrament is, by the Scripture." The second, "What a sacrament is by the ancient authors." The third, "How many sacraments there be by the Scripture?" The fourth, "How many by ancient authors?" The fifth asks whether the word "sacrament" be and ought to be attributed to the seven only, and whether the seven sacraments be found in any of the old authors. The sixth asks whether the determinate number of seven sacraments be a doctrine either of the Scripture or of the old authors, and so to be taught. The seventh question asks what is found in Scripture of the matter, nature, effect and virtue of the seven sacraments—"though the name be not there, yet whether the thing be in Scripture or no." The eighth question asks "whether confirmation, cum chrismate, be found in Scripture."

Questions nine to fourteen concern the sacrament of holy order, and are particularly interesting :

"Whether the Apostles, lacking a higher power, as in not having a Christian king among them, made bishops by that necessity, or by authority given them by God ?

"Whether bishops or priests were first? And if the priests were first, then the priest made the bishop ?

"Whether a bishop hath authority to make a priest by the Scripture or no? And whether any other, but only a bishop, may make a priest ?

"Whether in the New Testament be required any consecration of a bishop and priest, or only appointing to the office be sufficient ?

"Whether, if it fortune a prince Christian learned, to conquer certain dominions of infidels, having nothing but temporal learned men with him, it be defended by God's law that he and

they should preach and teach the word of God there or no?
And also make and constitute priests or no ?

“ Whether it be forfended by God’s law, that (if it so fortun’d that all the bishops and priests of a region were dead, and that the word of God should remain there unpreached, the sacrament of baptism and others unministered), that the king of that region should make bishops and priests to supply the same or no ? ”

The fifteenth question asks whether a man be bound by Scripture to confess his secret deadly sins to a priest if he may have him, or no ?

The sixteenth, if a bishop and priest, and only they, can excommunicate.

The seventeenth asks whether unction of the sick with oil, to remit venial sins, as it is now used, be spoken of in the Scripture, or in any ancient author.¹

The tendency of all these questions is, we think, sufficiently obvious, and it is surely very significant that they were drawn up by Cranmer himself.’

3. A certain number of answers to these questions are extant. Some are individual answers ; others are summaries.

As we should expect, the answers admit of a general division into “ Catholic ” and “ Reformed.” The Stillingfleet MS. (Lambeth, 1108) gives two convenient summaries of the answers given, one in Latin and the other in English. These were probably made for Cranmer himself, for they do not specify his own opinions.

In general, the Anglo-Catholic party uphold the seven sacraments as a doctrine founded, at any rate, in Scripture, and one which should be taught. Confirmation with chrism is founded in Scripture, or else is an Apostolic tradition. The power of ordaining priests and bishops belongs to the latter, who are the successors of the Apostles, who received this power direct from God. Episcopal consecration is necessary, and mere appointment would not suffice. A king could not ordain in ordinary circumstances, but some allow that in case of necessity, a monarch could make priests, and also that priests once made bishops. Confession is obligatory. Bishops and priests may excommunicate, and others can do so if appointed thereto. Thus, the traditional positions are maintained on some points, but are surrendered on others, by the “ Anglo-Catholic ” party.

The Reforming party, of course, goes further still. These

¹ Pocock’s *Burned* VI, 241-2.

* Constant, *op. cit.*, p. 425.

deny that there are really seven sacraments. Confirmation with chrism is but a tradition. Kings can ordain in case of necessity. Bishops and priests were the same office at the beginning. Bishops cannot make priests without the authorisation of the prince. Some even say that appointment is sufficient, and no ordination is needed. Confession is not necessary. Not only bishops and priests, but also the laity, and the prince, can excommunicate.

We proceed now to give an abstract of the individual answers given.

(a) Edward Lee, Archbishop of York. His answers are in general orthodox, but he apparently departs from the "*communis sententia*" in the matter of ordination, as we shall see. Although the word sacrament is applied in Scripture only to matrimony, the thing itself is there for others as well.

"The Scripture maketh no mention of the sacraments determined to seven precisely, but the Scripture maketh mention of seven sacraments, which be used in Christ's Church and grounded partly in Scripture, and no more be in use in the said Church but seven so grounded; and some of the ancient doctors make mention of seven and of no more than seven, as used in Christ's Church so grounded; wherefore a doctrine may be had of seven sacraments precisely used in Christ's Church, and grounded in Scripture."

Confirmation *cum chrismate* we find not in Scripture, but yet we find chrismation with oil used even from the time of the Apostles, and so taken as a tradition apostolic. The Apostles derived from Christ authority to make bishops, priests and deacons, and no other authority is required. The Apostles were priests before they were bishops, but the divine power which made them priests made them also bishops.

"As bishops be in degree higher, so in their consecration we find difference, even from the primitive Church." "That any other than bishops *or priest* may make a priest, we find neither in Scripture or out of Scripture." The Apostles ordained by imposition of hands, with fasting and prayer. Therefore, appointment only, without visible consecration is neither convenient nor sufficient. In case of necessity, a layman not ordained not only may but must preach Christ and His faith to infidels. But we find neither Scripture nor example that will bear that any man, *being himself no priest*¹ may give the order of priesthood to another, and authority to minister in the said order. . . . Although this authority to ordain be not to laymen expressly prohibited in Scripture, yet such a prohibition is implied. Princes therefore could not order priests nor bishops. Confession is obligatory. The power to excommunicate is given only to the apostles and their successors. "This kind of excommunication, whereby man is put out of the Church, no man may use but they only to whom it

1 Note his apparent admission that priests can ordain another priest.

is given by Christ." "Of unction of the sick with oil, and that sins thereby be remitted, St. James doth teach us."

(b) *Bishop Heath* of Rochester is also fairly orthodox, but he too makes dangerous concessions. He has not read penance called by the name of a sacrament in any of the old authors. Albeit the seven sacraments be in effect found both in the Scripture and in the old authors, and may therefore be so taught, yet he has not read this precise and determinate number of seven, neither in the Scripture nor in the ancient writers. Apostles made bishops by authority given them from God. The Scripture sheweth by example that a bishop hath authority to make a priest albeit no bishop subject to a Christian prince may either give orders or excommunicate or use any manner of jurisdiction or any part of his authority without commission from the king, which is supreme head of that Church whereof he is a member; but that any other man may make a priest beside a bishop he finds no example, neither in Scripture nor in doctors. As to the manner of ordination, Scripture speaks *de impositione manus et de oratione*, but of other manner of consecration he finds no mention in the New Testament expressedly, but the old authors make mention also of inunctions. As to what would or should happen in the case of a Christian king with no bishops or priests, *necessitas non habet legem*. Confession of secret deadly sins is necessary to attain absolution of them, but whether every man that hath secretly committed deadly sin is bound by *Quorum remisistis, etc.*, to ask absolution of the priest is a hard question. The surest way is to say that a man is bound to confess, etc.

As to whether any but a bishop and priest may excommunicate, this is a hard question, yet he thinks that it is not against the law of God that a layman should have authority to do it.

(c) *Bishop Bonner* of London is similarly orthodox with, however, some important reservations: While apostles made bishops by the law of God, if Christian princes had been then they should have named by right and appointed the said bishops to their rooms and places. In the beginning of the Church there was none, or else only a very small difference between a bishop and a priest, hence it is not of importance whether the priest then made the bishop or the bishop the priest. Consecration of a bishop and priest is required, in addition to appointing. As to the Christian prince with no priests or bishops, necessity might be a sufficient warrant to determine such cases, or else God would inspire the best remedy. As the sinner is bounden by *Quorum remisistis* to confess his open sins, so also is he bounden to confess his secret sins. Heath speaks a little vaguely as to whether others than bishops and priests may excommunicate.

(d) *Aldrich*, Bishop of Carlisle, quotes Walden against Wyclif and Berengarius, and seems orthodox on the whole. But he allows that where bishops and priests were lacking, a Christian prince might by the inward moving and calling of God supply the same.

Christian folk should confess their secret deadly sins to a priest there to be assoiled, without which mean there can be none other like assurance.

Bishops and priests may excommunicate. He has also read in histories that a prince hath done the same.

(e) *Dr. Day* (afterwards Bishop of Chichester) is orthodox, but makes dangerous concessions :

"The seven sacraments be found in ancient doctors under the name of sacrament, saying that I remember not that I have read in them penance called a sacrament." "Albeit the seven sacraments be not found in Scripture expressed by name, yet the thing itself, that is, the matter, nature, effect and virtue of them is found there." "Consecration of bishops and priests I read not in the New Testament but ordinatio *per impositionem cum oratione* is read there . . . and the only appointment as I think is not sufficient." In case of necessity a king may elect and appoint men to teach and preach and baptise. "*The prince himself might ordain both priests and ministers.*" "A man is bound to confess his secret deadly sins to a priest if he may conveniently have him, forasmuch as it is an ordinary way ordained by Christ in the gospel, by absolution to remit sins, which absolution I have never read to be given *sine confessione pravia*." "Bishops and priests, and others appointed by the Church may excommunicate."

(f) *Dr. Symmons* is orthodox on the seven sacraments, ordination, and confession.

(g) *Dr. Tresham's* views are as follows :

"I think that no man nor the whole Church hath power to institute a sacrament, but that such institution pertaineth alonely to God." "The thing, the matter, the nature, the effect and the virtue of them all (seven) be in the Scripture and all there institute by God's authority." "A bishop hath authority by Scripture to make a priest, and other than a bishop hath not power therein but only in case of necessity."¹ "There is a certain kind of consecration required, which is imposition of the bishop's hands with prayer, and the appointing only is not sufficient." *A Christian prince might in case of necessity ordain.* "Confession is a thing most consonant to the law of God . . . and a sure way for our salvation to confess if we may have a priest, yet I think that confession is not necessarily deduced of Scripture nor commanded as a necessary precept of Scripture."

(h) *Dr. Coren* holds to the seven sacraments. On ordination he says : "In the New Testament is required to the making of a bishop *impositio manuum cum oratione*, which I take for consecration, and appointment unto the office is not sufficient." On the other hand he allows that a Christian prince in case of necessity "would be made a bishop by internal working of God as Paul was." Confession is obligatory.

(i) *Dr. Edgworth* asserts the seven sacraments. On ordination he allows that the king may choose the bishops, and regulate the exercise of their functions. He sees no inconvenience in the idea that "the priests in the primitive Church made bishops." Still, he reads not that any other than a bishop ever made priest sith

Note this concession.

284 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

Christ's time. Deputation to the office is not sufficient to make a priest or a bishop. The Christian prince could instruct and baptise, but as concerns other sacraments he ought to abide and look for a special commission from God. Confession is obligatory.

(j) *Dr. Oglethorpe* holds to the seven sacraments. Ordination is necessary as well as appointment.

(k) *Skip*, Bishop of Hereford. His answers are not extant, but he is mentioned in some of the summaries.

He is against teaching that there are seven sacraments neither more nor less. He agrees that *a Christian prince could ordain in case of necessity*. He hesitates as to whether confession is obligatory. A layman may excommunicate if deputed *by the governor*. He doubts whether extreme unction is taught in Scripture. Other questions he does not seem to have answered.

(l) *Thirlby* of Westminster is generally orthodox. He distinguishes between ordination and election. The former is by divine authority and power. Nevertheless he also thinks that in case of necessity a layman could ordain, and he hesitates as to whether confession is obligatory.

(m) *Thomas Robertson* says : "nec opinor absurdum esse, ut sacerdos episcopum consecret, si episcopus haberi non potest." A Christian prince without bishops, etc., could be had *pro apostolo*, quum Deus sacramentis suis non sit alligatus." One is bound to confess secret deadly sins to a priest, "modo aliter conscientiac illius satisfieri nequeat."

(ri) *Dr. Redmayne* says :

"To ordain and consecrate pertaineth to the Apostles and their successors only, but to appoint or name pertaineth specially to the supreme heads and governors of the Church, which be princes."

Bishops and priests were at the beginning both one. In the case of a prince without bishops, etc., "the laymen make the whole Church there, and the authority of preaching and ministering is given immediately to the Church, and the Church may appoint ministers as is thought convenient."

Confession is a necessary medicine which all who fall into deadly sin ought, for the quieting of their conscience, to seek.

(o) *Dr. Cox* answers as follows :

By Scripture bishops and priests be one ; bishops as they be now were after priests and therefore made of priests. By Scripture there is no consecration of bishops and priests required, but only the appointing to the office of a priest *aim impositione manuum*. In case of extreme necessity a prince may make and institute ministers. Dr. Cox cannot find that a man is bound by Scripture to confess his secret deadly sins to a priest, unless he be so troubled in his conscience that he cannot be quieted without godly instruction. It is not against God's law for others than bishops and priests to excommunicate. Unction of the sick with oil consecrate as now used is not spoken of in Scripture.

(p) *Dr. Leighton* says :

That any other man than a bishop hath authority to make a

priest by Scripture he has not read, nor example thereof. A consecration is required, as by imposition of hands. A prince may ordain in case of necessity for "potestas clavium residet præcipue in ecclesia." Only such as have not the knowledge of the Scripture whereby they may quiet their consciences, be bounden to confess their secret deadly sins unto a priest. Any that have authority to appoint men to that office may excommunicate.

To sum up, none of the answers are wholly orthodox, but all, Anglo-Catholics and Protestants, abandon the traditional doctrine on some points.

4. Now we come to the most interesting answers of all, and the most unorthodox, those of *Barlow*, Bishop of St. David's, and *Cranmer*.

Barlow's full answers are unfortunately not extant, but his opinions are summarised for us. He says "there be but four sacraments in the old doctors, most chiefly spoken of, and they be baptism, the sacrament of the altar, matrimony, and penance." It ought not to be taught that there are seven by Scripture, for the nature, effect, and virtue of the four above-mentioned only are found in Scripture. Confirmation as a sacrament is not in Scripture. "Because they lacked a Christian prince, by that necessity the Apostles ordained other bishops." At the beginning bishops and priests were all one. "Bishops have no authority to make priests without they be authorised of the Christian prince." "Laymen have other-while made priests." "Only the appointing" of a bishop is required, consecration is unnecessary.¹ In case of necessity, laymen have authority to minister the sacraments and to make priests. No man is bound to confess in virtue of the text "*Quorum remisistis*" and suchlike. Laymen may excommunicate, if appointed thereto by the high ruler. "Unction of the sick with oil consecrate, as it is now used, to remit sin, is not spoken of in Scripture."

5. But still more astounding are the views expressed by *Archbishop Cranmer* in his own signed answers. Here are the main points :

"The Scripture sheweth not what a sacrament is. . . . The Scripture sheweth not how many sacraments there be. . . . But one *sacramentum* the Scripture maketh mention of, which is hard to be revealed fully, as would to God it were, and that is, *mysterium iniquitatis*, OR *mysterium meretricis magna et bestia*." . . . "By the ancient authors there be many sacraments more than seven. . . . All the parables of Christ, with the prophecies of the

¹ In Chapter ix, p. 313, we deal with an Anglican suggestion that *Barlow* is merely denying the necessity of *unctions*.

Apocalypse, and such other, be called by the doctors *sacramenta*. . . . The old authors never prescribe any certain number of sacraments, nor in all their books I never read these two words joined together, viz., *septem sacramenta*. . . . The determinate number of seven sacraments is no doctrine of the Scripture, nor of the old authors. . . . I find not in the Scripture the matter, nature and effect of all these which we call the seven sacraments, but only of certain of them, as of baptism . . . eucharist . . . penance. But the Scripture speaketh not of penance as we call it, a sacrament consisting in three parts, contrition, confession and satisfaction, but the Scripture taketh penance for a pure conversion of a sinner in heart and mind from his sins unto God, making no mention of private confession of all deadly sins to a priest, nor of ecclesiastical satisfaction to be enjoined by him. Of matrimony also I find very much in Scripture. . . . Of the matter, nature, and effect of the other three, that is to say, confirmation, order and extreme unction, I read nothing in the Scripture as they be taken for sacraments. . . . Of confirmation with chrism, without which it is counted no sacrament, there is no manner of mention in the Scripture.”¹

But the answer to question 9 deserves to be quoted in full. The question was “whether the Apostles lacking a higher power, as in not having a Christian king among them, made bishops by that necessity, or by authority given them by God?” Cranmer replies²:

“All Christian princes have committed unto them *immediately of God the whole cure* of all their subjects, *as well concerning the administration of God's word, for the cure of soul*, as concerning the ministration of things political and civil governance; and in both these ministrations, they must have *sundry ministers under them* to supply that which is appointed to their several offices.

“The *civil ministers under the king's majesty*, in this realm of England, be those whom *it shall please his highness* for the time to put in authority under him: as for example, the lord chancellor, lord treasurer, lord great master, lord privy seal, lord admiral, majors, sheriffs, etc.,

“The *ministers of God's word, under his majesty*, be the bishops, parsons, vicars, and such other priests as be appointed by his highness to that ministration, as for example, the bishop of Canterbury, the bishop of Duresme, the bishop of Winchester, the parson of Wynwicke, etc.

“*All the said officers and ministers, as well of the one sort as of the other, be appointed, assigned, and elected, and in every place, by the laws and orders of kings and princes.*

“In the admission of many of these officers, be *divers comely ceremonies and solemnities* used which be not of necessity, but only for a good order and seemly fashion; for *if such offices and ministrations were committed without such solemnity, they were nevertheless truly committed.*

¹ Answers to questions 1 and 8.

* Italics ours.

“*And there is no more promise of God, that grace is given in the committing of the ecclesiastical office than it is in the committing of the civil office.*”

“In the Apostles’ time, when there was no Christian princes, by whose authority ministers of God’s word might be appointed, nor sins by the sword corrected, there was no remedy then for correction of vice, or appointing of ministers, but only the consent of Christian multitude among themselves, by an uniform consent, to follow the advice and persuasion of such persons whom God had most endued with the spirit of counsel and wisdom ; and at that time, forasmuch as the Christian people had no sword, nor governor amongst them, they were constrained of necessity to take such curates and priests, as either they knew themselves to be meet thereunto, or else were commended unto them by other that were so replete with the spirit of God, with such knowledge in the profession of Christ, such wisdom, such conversation and counsel, that they ought even of very conscience to give credit unto them, and to accept such as by them were presented ; and so some time the Apostles and other unto whom God had given abundantly his Spirit, sent or appointed ministers of God’s word ; some time the people did choose such as they thought meet thereunto ; and when any were appointed or sent by the Apostles or other, the people of their own voluntary will with thanks did accept them ; not for the supremacy, empire, or dominion that the Apostles had over them to command, as their princes and masters, but as good people, ready to obey the advice of good counsellors, and to accept anything that was necessary for their edification and benefit.”

Constant’s comment on this is excellent: “It is difficult to deny the Sacrament of Holy Orders more peremptorily.”¹ We note that a *Christian priest or bishop is merely a functionary of the Crown*, and that *ordination is unnecessary, and is not a rite conferring grace*. Cranmer’s answers to other questions will amplify some of these points. Thus :

“Bishops and priests were at one time, and were not two things, but both one office in the beginning of Christ’s religion. . . . A bishop may make a priest by the Scripture, *and so may princes and governors also, and that by the authority of God committed them, and the people also by their election* ; for as we read that bishops have done it, so Christian emperors and princes usually have done it, and the people, before Christian princes were, commonly did elect their bishops and priests.”²

It might be objected that Cranmer here is merely talking about the *appointment or election* of priests and bishops, not about their ordination. *But he has already said that ordination is unnecessary*, and he repeats this now, in answer to question 12, which asked

¹ *Reformation in England*, p. 426.

² Answers to questions 10 and 11.

288 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

“whether in the New Testament be required any consecration of a bishop or priest, or only appointing to the office be sufficient?” Cranmer replies :

“In the New Testament he that is appointed to be a bishop or a priest needeth no consecration by the Scripture, for election or appointing thereto is sufficient.”

Similarly, in answer to questions 13 and 14, which asked whether in case of necessity a prince could “preach and teach the word of God . . . and also make and constitute priests,” Cranmer replies :

“It is not against God’s law, but contrary, they ought indeed so to do ; and there be histories that witnesseth, that some Christian princes, and other laymen unconsecrated, have done the same.

“It is not forbidden by God’s law.”

On Confession Cranmer writes :

“A man is not bound, by the authority of this Scripture *Quorum remisistis* and such like, to confess his secret deadly sins to a priest, although he may have him.”

And on excommunication :

“A bishop or a priest by the Scripture is neither commanded nor forbidden to excommunicate, but where the laws of any region giveth him authority to excommunicate, there they ought to use the same in such crimes as the laws have such authority in ; and where the laws of the region forbiddeth them, there they have none authority at all ; and they that be no priests may also excommunicate, if the law allow thereunto.”

This confirms that an ecclesiastic who excommunicates does so *merely as the delegate of the civil power.*

The last question of the seventeen concerned extreme unction, and on this Cranmer writes : “Unction of the sick, with oil, to remit venial sins, as it is now used, is not spoken of in the Scripture, nor in any ancient author.”

And at the end of this, his last answer, he writes : “This is mine opinion and sentence at this present, which I do not temerarily define, but do remit the judgment thereof wholly unto your Majesty.”

He will not, of course, presume to dictate to the Supreme Head of the Church, from whom all ecclesiastical authority and jurisdiction flows !

We call attention to the fact that these are the views expressed by Cranmer as early as 1540.¹

6. In addition to the answers we have already dealt with there are also extant a set of answers by an unknown author, and one general answer representing the views of the majority. Against some of these answers in these two documents someone has written in the margin the names of Cranmer and Barlow, from which it has been inferred that the answers in question represent the views of these two bishops. But they are diametrically opposed to the opinions set forth by these Bishops under their own names, and in a later chapter we show that the purport of the writing of their names in the margin of these other answers is to note their *disagreement* with them, and not their *assent*.

But these two sets of answers, the anonymous and the general one, are of particular interest because in the margins there are also some comments and questions in the handwriting of King Henry himself, which throw a flood of light upon his own ideas at this period.

To begin with the anonymous answer.¹ The first question, "What a sacrament is by the Scripture," is answered thus: "Scripture useth the word, but it defineth it not." King Henry writes in the margin: "Why then should we call them so?"

The fourth answer is: "Authors use the word sacrament to signify any mystery in the Old or New Testament; but specially be noted baptism, eucharist, matrimony, chrism, impositio manuum, ordo." Henry comments: "Why these seven to have the name, more than all the rest?"

The fifth answer is: "The word (sacrament), because it is

¹ Dixon describes Cranmer's answers as "loyal and enlightened" (ii, p. 307).

Collier on the other hand (ii, 198, 1714 edn.), describes Cranmer's views on Holy Order here expressed as "extremely wrong and unprimitive." But he appeals to the fact that some years before, i.e., in 1537, Cranmer had signed a draft "Declaration of the functions and divine institution of bishops and priests," subsequently incorporated into the Bishops' Book. But the fact that Cranmer signed this composite document some years previously hardly signifies much. He may not have felt strong enough to assert his own views then. Collier goes on to argue that in 1543, again, Cranmer was "overruled by a majority of the bishops, who set forth the *Erudition of a Christian Man* (the "King's Book"), and more than that, he seems to have recovered his former sentiment [i.e., the sentiment Collier supposes Cranmer to have held when the Bishops' Book was set forth], for he himself subscribed the *Erudition* . . ." But here again, the fact that Cranmer, probably under pressure, signed the King's Book, is hardly an index to his own views—and in any case, as we shall see, the King's Book is not so very orthodox, even on Holy Orders.

¹ Dixon (ii, p. 310) thinks this anonymous document was also a "digest" of "conclusions of the divines." But he has not noticed the use of the first person singular in the document, which disproves his contention.

290 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

general, is attribute to other than the seven ; but whether it ought specially to be applied to the seven only, God knoweth, and hath not fully revealed it so as it hath been received." The King comments : " Then why hath the Church so long erred to take upon them so to name them ? "

The seventh answer says : " Old authors number not precisely " the sacraments. The King comments : " Seven articles of the faith not numbered in Scripture, no ten commandments, but rather made one, dilectio. Seven petitions, seven deadly sins."

The eighth answer instead of speaking of " penance " speaks of " absolution." King Henry comments : " Penance is changed to a new term, viz., absolution. Of penance, I read that without it we cannot be saved after relapse, but not so of absolution ; and penance to sinners is commanded, but absolution yea in open crimes, is left free to the askers."

The same answer says of confirmation : " Laying on of the hands of the bishop after baptism, which is a part of that is done in confirmation, is grounded in Scripture." The King comments : " Laying of hands being an old ceremony of the Church (?) is but a small proof of confirmation."

The answer goes on to say, " Unction of the sick, with prayer, is grounded in Scripture." The King comments : " Then show where."

The answer also says : " The thing of confirmation is found in Scripture ; the name confirmation is not there. Of chrisma Scripture speaketh not expressly, but it hath been had in high veneration, and observed since the beginning." The King comments : " This answer is not direct, and yet it proveth nother any of the two points to be grounded in Scripture."

On the question whether a king in an emergency could teach and ordain, the answer says : " God in such case would further teach and inspire the conscience of such a prince what he should and might do." The King comments : " Necessity in things absolutely necessary containeth in it order, law, and authority."

The fourteenth answer says : " Since the beginning of Christ's Church, wherein Christ Himself made distinction of ministers, the order hath had a derivation from one to another, *per manuum impositionem cum oratione*. How it should begin again of another face, where it faileth by a case, Scripture telleth not, ne doctors writ of it that I have read." The King

comments : “ This question is without the compass of Scripture.”

7. We come now to the other document which evidently gives a general answer of the bishops. The ninth question was “ whether the Apostles lacking a higher power, as in not having a Christian king among them, made bishops by that necessity, or by authority given them by God ? ” This general answer replies as follows :

“ Making of bishops hath two parts ; appointment and ordering. Appointment, which the Apostles, by necessity, made by common election, and sometime by their own several assignment, could not then be done by Christian princes ; because at that time they were not ; and now, at these days, appertaineth to Christian princes and rulers. But in the ordering, wherein grace is conferred, as afore the Apostles did follow the rule taught by the Holy Ghost, *per manuum impositionem, cum oratione et jejunio.* ”

The King comments thus on the distinction between appointment and ordering : “ Where is this distinction ? Now, since you confess that the Apostles did occupate the one part, which now you confess bclongeth to princes, how can you prove that ordering is only committed to you bishops ? ” And on the statement that grace is conferred in ordering, the King writes, “ Ubi hoc ? ”

We must not exaggerate the significance of these comments. Henry evidently fancied himself as a theologian, and it *may* be that he was merely criticising the logical and Scriptural acumen of his bishops. But on the other hand it is clear that he thought he could ordain bishops and priests in a case of necessity, and practically all his bishops, including those of the “Anglo-Catholic party,” were willing to flatter him to the extent of conceding this.

CHAPTER VII

THE "KING'S BOOK"

THE KING'S BOOK

1. The next stage in the revision of the Bishops' Book was the examination of the various sections. This was done in 1543 by a Committee appointed by Convocation. The articles on the Seven Sacraments were examined by Archbishop Cranmer, and Bishops Thirlby, Heath, Salcot, and Skipp. Of these five, three (Thirlby, Heath and Skipp) belonged to the Anglo-Catholic school of thought: the other two, Cranmer and Salcot, favoured the New Learning. The other sections of the book were likewise overhauled. Accordingly, in its final form the book is said to have been "made by the consent of learned men of divers judgments," though it was "penned by the Bishops of Westminster, Chichester, and Rochester (i.e., by Thirlby, Sampson, and Heath), and Drs. Cox, Redman and Robynson," according to a letter written by the King to Sadler.¹ The King himself wrote a preface to the work, which was entitled *A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man, set forth by the King's Majesty of England*. It is usually called the "King's Book."

2. In his Preface, the King says :

M We be constrained . . . for reformation . . . and for avoiding diversity in opinions . . . to set forth with the advice of our clergy "this statement of doctrine, "which doctrine also the lords both spiritual and temporal, with the nether house of our parliament, have both seen and like very well."

The first section of the book deals with the Creed. The Introduction says that

"all must condemn opinions contrary to the twelve articles of our Creed which were of long time past condemned in the four holy councils, i.e., Nice, Constantinople, Ephese and Calcedonense."

This was also in the former book, but it was there followed by the words, "and all other sith that time in any point consonant to the same." These words are struck out of the new Book—

¹ *State Papers*, 1543, ii, p. 34.

a significant step, which prevents any appeal to a council subsequent to the four mentioned.

3. The article on the Church again sets forth the conception of the Catholic Church as a loose group of independent churches :

M All these churches . . . as they be distinct in places, so they have distinct ministers and *divers heads* on earth, governors and rulers, yet be all these holy churches but one holy church catholic.”¹

And again :

“ The unity of these holy churches, in sundry places assembled, standeth not by knowledging of one governor in earth over all churches. For neither the whole church catholic together, nor any particular church apart, is bound to acknowledge any one universal governor over the whole church other than by Christ, although by sufferance of some princes and potentates, not being truly instructed in the word of God . . . and by hypocrisy and usurpation of the see and court of Rome, the bishop of the same . . . hath long time gone about to obtain and establish unto himself such an universal authority. . . . The unity therefore of the church is not conserved by the bishop of Rome’s authority or doctrine. . .

And once more we have a statement that *diversity of rites, traditions, ordinances and policies* may exist among the churches :

“ This unity of the holy church is not divided by distance of place, nor by diversity of traditions and ceremonies. . . . For the church of Corinth and of Ephese were one church in God, though the one were far distant in place from the other ; and though also in traditions, opinions, and policies, there was some diversity among them, likewise as the church of England, Spain, Italy and Poole be not separate from the unity, but be one church in God, notwithstanding that among them there is great distance of place, *alterations in rites, ceremonies, and ordinances*, ^{q1} estimation of the same, as one church peradventure doth esteem their rites, traditions, laws, ordinances, and ceremonies to be of more virtue and efficacy than another church doth esteem the same. As the church of Rome doth affirm certain of their laws and ordinances to be of such estimation that they be of equal force with the word of God, and that whosoever disobeyeth or transgresseth the same committeth deadly sin ; yet we perceiving the same to be discrepant from the truth of scripture, must needs therein dissent from them. But such diversity in opinions and other outward manners and customs of policy, doth not dissolve and break the unity which is in one God, one faith, one doctrine of Christ and His sacraments, preserved and kept in these severed churches without any superiority or pre-eminence that one church by God’s law may or ought to challenge over another.”³

294 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

The way is thus opened for differences and divergences in rites, "policies," etc., and there is obviously no means provided for ending such differences.

Occasion has been taken above to attack the Papacy, and an attempt is made to destroy its foundation in Scripture :

"Therefore, the church of Rome, being but a several church, challenging that name of catholic above all other, doeth great wrong to all other churches, and doeth only by force and maintenance support an unjust usurpation : for that church hath no more right to that name than the church of France, Spain, England or Portugal, which be justly called catholic churches, in that they do profess, consent and agree in one unity of true faith with other catholic churches. . . . The bishop of Rome doeth contrary to God's law by challenging superiority and pre-eminence by a cloke of God's law over all. And yet to make an appearance that it should be so, he hath and doth wrest scripture for that purpose, contrary both to the true meaning of the same, and the interpretation of ancient doctors of the church ; so that by that challenge he would not do wrong only to this church of England, but also to all other churches in claiming this superiority without any authority of God so to him given."¹

Another attack on the Papacy will be quoted later, from the section on Holy Orders.

The article, having thus defined the Church as a number of local churches, proceeds to say that *everyone must belong to his own local church* ;

"This church of England, and other known particular churches, in which Christ's name is truly honoured, called on, and professed in faith and baptism, be members of the whole catholic church, and each of them by himself also worthily called a catholic church, when they merely profess and teach the faith and religion of Christ, according to the Scripture and the apostolic doctrine. And so every Christian man ought to honour, give credence, and to follow the particular church of that region so ordered (as afore) wherein he is born or inhabiteth. . . . Likewise so they be, by Christ's commandment, bound to honour and obey, next unto himself, Christian kings and princes, which be the head governors under him in the particular churches."²

Thus the conception of a number of particular churches, under distinct national rules, takes the place of the traditional conception of the One Catholic Church.

4. We now turn to the section on the Seven Sacraments.

There is nothing special to remark on in the article on Baptism. But the article on Confirmation, like the one in the Bishops' Book, implies that this is *merely an ecclesiastical institution* :

"*The holy fathers . . . did use and observe* that all Christian people should, after their baptism, be presented to their bishops, to the intent, etc."

The Sacrament of Penance receives a very strange treatment. The Bishops' Book had said that the sacrament consists of three parts, contrition, confession, and satisfaction.¹ But the King's Book says instead that "the sacrament of penance is properly the absolution pronounced by the priest,"² and the three things just mentioned are "ways and means expedient and necessary to obtain the said absolution."³ As to the necessity of the sacrament, the King's Book confines itself to saying that "confession to the priest is *in the Church profitably commanded to be used and frequented*" which implies definitely that confession is of *ecclesiastical, and not of divine institution*.

As to Matrimony, this is said to have been instituted in the Garden of Eden, and all that Christ did was to "accept, approve, and allow the same."⁴ There is no statement to the effect that Christ raised matrimony to the dignity of a sacrament.

Extreme Unction is evidently another rite *of ecclesiastical institution*, which may well be practised :

"We must understand how, according to Scripture and the rule and order prescribed by the holy apostle St. James, the catholic church of Christ hath observed and ministered this sacrament to such as have required it in their sickness. . . . For St. James saith . . . by which words . . . *the use of the sacrament is confirmed and proved, so that the church may well use the same,*"

5. The article on the Eucharist, however, is much more orthodox than the corresponding article in the former book. But the word Transubstantiation is curiously avoided. And while the article speaks of the "sacrament of the altar," the Body and Blood are said to be "offered," but "to such as in due manner receive this sacrament." There is no mention of any offering to God, but only of a "remembrance" and a "memorial" of Christ's death. And once more the significant word "exhibit" is somehow introduced. It would indeed seem that this article in particular is the product of many minds, "of divers judgments" as the King said. Here are the chief parts of this article :

"The sacrament of the altar was institute by our Saviour Christ the night afore he suffered . . . where He . . . willing all such sacrifices and sacraments of the Old Testament to cease, and declaring that they were but shadows and signs to signify

him . . . did then institute and ordain this most high and principal sacrament of the New Testament. . . . In this most high sacrament of the altar, the creatures which be taken to the use thereof, as bread and wine, do not remain still in their own substance, but by the virtue of Christ's word in the consecration be changed and turned to the very substance of the body and blood of our Saviour Jcsu Christ, so that although there appear the form of bread and wine after the consecration, as did before, and to the outward senses nothing seemeth to be changed, yet must we, forsaking and renouncing the persuasion of our senses in this behalf, give our assent only to faith, and to the plain words of Christ, which affirmeth that substance there offered, *exhibited*, and received, to be the very precious body and blood of Our Lord. . . .

"Wherefore . . . we must . . . apply our whole will and affection to attain the fruit and profit of this most holy sacrament towards our salvation, according to the intent of Christ's institution, who . . . that we should have continual remembrance of His most dear charity shewed towards us in His death and passion, did institute this sacrament as a permanent memorial of His mercy and the wonderful work of our redemption, and a perpetual food and nourishment for our spiritual sustentation. . . .

"How much ought all Christian men, when they come to be fed at the table of our Lord, and to receive this blessed and glorious sacrament, to have special and entire devotion, with most thankful remembrance to God for His goodness declared towards us in the benefit of our redemption? And therefore amongst other names, this sacrament is called *Eucharistia*, that is to say, the sacrament of thanks and blessing, forasmuch as it setteth before us and doth *exhibit unto us* the very price of our redemption and salvation, which is the body of our Lord that suffered and died for us. . . .

"He that receiveth this sacrament worthily under the one kind, as under the form of bread only, receiveth the whole body and blood of Christ. . . .

"We ought with all humbleness of heart and devotion to prepare ourselves that we may be partakers of such fruit and grace as undoubtedly is *offered* and given to *all such as in due manner receive* this sacrament. . . ."

6. The section on Holy Orders partly follows the article in the Bishops' Book and partly the draft we have mentioned in connection with the 1538 negotiations. This new article says that orders are to be conferred by the imposition of hands, because the Apostles did so, but it does not say that such a ceremony is really necessary. A large place is allotted to kings and princes in the appointment of ministers, and it is distinctly implied that there are only two degrees in the New Testament, bishops = priests, and deacons.

However, the conception of the priestly office is somewhat "higher" than the corresponding conception in the Bishops'

Book, inasmuch as it includes not only the authority to "consecrate" the Body and Blood of Christ, but also to "offer" the same. But it is not expressly said that these are "offered" to God, and the only other instance in which the word is used implies that they are "offered" to the communicants (see p. 296). Of course the royal supremacy and "overseeing" authority is emphasized. Here are the chief points :

"Order is a gift of grace of ministration in Christ's church, given of God to Christian men, by the consecration and imposition of the bishop's hands upon them, and this sacrament was conferred and given by the Apostles. . . . 2 Tim. i. 1 Tim. iv, Titus i.

"And here it is to be noted, that although this form before declared is to be observed in giving orders, yet there is no certain rule prescribed or limited by the word of God for the nomination, election, presentation, or appointing of any such ecclesiastical ministers, but the same is wholly left unto the positive laws and ordinances of every Christian region, provided and made or to be made in that behalf, with the assent of the prince and ruler. And as concerning the office and duty of the said ecclesiastical ministers, the same consisteth in true preaching and teaching the word of God unto the people, in consecrating and offering the blessed body and blood of Christ in the sacrament of the altar, in loosing and assoiling from sin such persons as be sorry and truly penitent for the same, and excommunicating such as be guilty . . . and will not be reformed . . . and finally in praying for the whole church of Christ, and specially for the flock committed unto them. And although the office and ministry of priests and bishops stand chiefly in those things before rehearsed, yet neither they nor any of them may exercise or execute any of the same offices, but with such sort and such limitation as the ordinances and laws of every Christian realm do permit and suffer. . . .

"As touching the order of deacons, we read in the Acts of the Apostles, that they were ordered and instituted by the same apostles by prayer and imposition of their hands upon them. . . .

"And of these two orders only, that is to say, priests and deacons, scripture maketh express mention, and how they were conferred of the apostles by prayer and imposition of their hands. And to these two the primitive church did add and conjoin certain other inferior and lower degrees . . . of the which mention is made in divers old councils, and namely, in the Fourth Council of Africa, in which St. Augustine was present, whereas all the kinds of orders which were then in the church be rehearsed, and also with what rites and ceremonies they were conferred and given at that time. And thus by succession from the apostles hath order continued in the church, and hath ever been called and counted for a sacrament. . . .

¹ This is interesting as showing that the canons thought to be those of the Fourth Council of Carthage, to which reference has already been made (see pp. 80-81), were known to the English Bishops at the time of the Reformation. This is an indication that they were also known to the compilers of the Edwardine Ordinal (see p. 454).

298 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

“All lawful powers and authorities of one bishop over another were and be given to them by the consent, ordinance, and positive laws of men only, and not by any ordinance of God in holy scripture. . . . Christ never gave unto St. Peter, or to any of the apostles or their successors, any such universal authority over all the other. . . .”

“To Christian kings and princes . . . of right and by God's commandment, belongeth . . . specially and principally to defend the faith of Christ and His religion . . . to oversee and cause that the said bishops and priests do execute their pastoral office truly and faithfully . . . and in case they shall be negligent in any part thereof . . . to cause them to redouble and supply their lack and if they obstinately withstand their prince's kind monition, and will not amend their faults, then and in such case to put other in their rooms and places. . . .”

So bishops may be deposed by the civil power ! The article also goes out of its way to uphold the primitive Church as the norm of purity :

“Therefore, it appertaineth to Christian kings and princes . . . to reform and reduce the pretended monarchy of the bishops of Rome unto the old limits and pristine estate of that power which was given to them by Christ, and used in the primitive church, for it is out of doubt that *Christ's faith was then most firm and pure*, and the scriptures of God were then best understood, and virtue did then most abound and excel. And therefore it must needs follow, that *the customs and ordinances then used and made be more conform and agreeable unto the true doctrine of Christ*, and more conducing unto the edifying and benefit of the church of Christ, than any other custom or laws used or made by the bishop of Rome, or any other addicted to that see and usurped power sith that time.”

This surely foreshadows very far-reaching liturgical and other reforms !

7. This article on Holy Orders contains also a vehement attack upon the Papacy from the standpoint of history, and expressly repudiates the Council of Florence :

“Whereas the Bishop of Rome hath before claimed and usurped to be head and governor of all priests and bishops of the whole catholic church of Christ, by the laws of God, it is evident that the same power is utterly unfeigned and untrue, and was neither given to him by God in His holy scripture, nor allowed by the holy fathers in the ancient general councils, not yet by the consent of the whole catholic church. For it is plain that Christ never gave unto St. Peter, or to any of the apostles or their successors, any such universal authority over all the other. But he set them all indifferently, and in like power, dignity, and authority. . . . And as concerning the most ancient and most famous holy general councils, it is evident that they gave the Bishops of Rome

no such authority, for in them be divers acts and decrees plainly testifying the contrary. . . .

“Whereupon two things are to be noted, as evident by the premises. First, that the bishop of Rome hath no such primacy, nor any such can challenge by any words in scripture, for then the bishop of Rome would at that time by his legates have alleged it. . . .

“Second, the bishops of Rome have no such power given them by any ancient general council. . . .

“Thirdly, that the bishops of Rome had no such universal primacy given unto them by the common consent of the whole catholic church, it well appeareth in that, that divers patriarchs and archbishops have of ancient time refused to owe unto them any such subjection as they, by colour of an universal primacy, challenged and required over them. . . .

“And if the bishops of Rome will allege any later councils for their pretended universal primacy, as the councils of Constance, Basil, and Florence, it is manifest and open that the councils of Basil and Constance were in the time of schisms. . . . And the great part of the learned men that were there were . . . obsequent to the pleasure and will of the bishops of Rome, and brought up only in this later scholastical doctrine, and little exercised or learned in the holy scriptures, or in the old ancient doctors and writers. . . . As to the council Florentine, over and besides that the greatest part of learned men there were such as we spake of before, the consent also in this matter of the Orientals and Grecians that were there seemed to the whole countries that sent them so far both against scripture and general councils and their ancient holy writers that they forthwith shewed themselves so much discontent with that consent of their ambassadors that they then neither would receive the determination concerning the universal primacy of the Bishop of Rome, neither sith that time could be induced to agree to the same.”

8. With the other parts of the King's Book it is not necessary for us to deal, but we may mention one addition to the article on prayer for the departed, which might, but need not, imply that the Mass is a sacrifice :

“As it is not in the power or knowledge of any man to limit and dispense how much, and in what space of time, or to what person particularly masses, exequies and suffrages do profit and avail, charity requireth that whosoever causeth any such masses, etc., to be done should yet, though their intent be more for one than for another, cause them also to be done for the universal congregation of Christian people, quick and dead.”

It is often said that the King's Book is thoroughly orthodox on all points save the Papacy, and Constant and Belloc especially maintain this. We have said sufficient to show that it contains a great deal of unorthodox teaching by implication, to say the

300 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

least. Constant says that the King's Book "appeared to Pole himself to be so consistent with the true doctrine that he ordered it to be read in the pulpit in Mary Tudor's time whilst waiting for a Book of Homilies to be published."¹

He refers in this connection to Pole's "Injunctions for the diocese of Gloucester," issued in 1555. But in point of fact, these Injunctions say that the priest may read parts of "the book entitled 'A Necessary Doctrine' *lately set forth*" and this undoubtedly refers, *not* to the King's Book, *which had been published some thirteen years previously*, but to *Bishop Bonner's book of homilies entitled A Profitable and Necessary Doctrine*, published in 1553 and again in 1554. This identification is admitted by Dixon,² and can be taken as quite certain. Hence, this supposed testimony of Pole to the orthodoxy of the King's Book collapses completely upon examination.

¹ *Reformation in England*, p. 429.

² *IV*, 595.

CHAPTER VIII

THE "RATIONALE" AND OTHER LITURGICAL PROJECTS

A. THE "RATIONALE."

b. Cranmer's views on the eucharist.

C. THE PROJECT FOR THE REVISION OF THE LITURGY.

D. GENERAL CONCLUSION ON THE REFORMATION UNDER HENRY VIII.

A. THE "RATIONALE."

1. About the same time that the King's Book was being prepared, a Commission appointed to deal with matters of liturgy and ceremonial produced an explanation of the existing rites of the Church, called the *Rationale*. For some reason or other this was not published at the time, and indeed was not printed until early in the eighteenth century.¹ Constant says it was drawn up by a Committee consisting of the Bishops of Bath, Ely, Salisbury, Chichester, Worcester, and Llandaff.² Strype, on the other hand, says it was devised by Gardiner.³ Dixon thinks it "very doubtful that Cranmer had anything to do with it."⁴

It is often said that the *Rationale* is rather on the Catholic side. Thus, Dixon says that in it "The Mass . . . was defended. . . . The liturgical principles of this remarkable *Rationale* must have been highly obnoxious to Cranmer, and it is probable enough that it was he who prevented it from seeing the light."⁶ Brightman similarly says that it was "influenced by the *Ten Articles*, and still more by the *Encheiridion* of Cologne."⁴ Darwell Stone says that it "assumes the doctrine taught in the King's Book," and that it "may have been the work of the commission which formed the King's Book."⁷

¹ By Collier.

² *Revue d'Hut. EaUs.*, 1911, p. 51. These Bishops were:—Bath: J. Clerk, Anglo-Catholic in tendency; Ely: Goodrich, Reformer; Salisbury: Salcot, a trimmer; Chichester: Sampson, Anglo-Catholic; Worcester: Latimer, Reformer; Llandaff: Holgate, Reformer—three Reformers, one Anglo-Catholic, and one "trimmer." Such a Committee would hardly be likely to produce a very orthodox work.

³ See Dixon, ii, 313 note.

⁴ *Op. cit.*

⁵ *Op. cit.*, ii, 313.

⁶ Article on *Common Prayer* in *Diet, of Engl. Ch. Hist.*, p. 129.

⁷ *Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, ii, 120.

2. The *Rationale* certainly adopts the terminology of the King's Book with regard to the *Real Presence*, and says that at the consecration, by the virtue and power of Christ's words, "the substance of bread is turned into the substance of the body of Christ, and likewise the substance of wine into His precious blood."¹ But on the other hand, a very "low" view of the *Sacrifice* is set forth, and the doctrinal position assumed throughout is that the Mass is a "memorial," and not an "offering" of Christ's Body and Blood. It emphasizes the sufficiency of the offering on the Cross, and speaks only of an offering *of ourselves*, and of *bread and wine* :

"The minister the which shall celebrate, in the beginning cometh forth as from some secret place to the middle of the altar, signifying thereby that Christ who is the High Priest, came forth from the secret bosom of His Father into this world, to offer sacrifice for man's redemption, and albeit that *that* sacrifice be a sufficient price and redemption for all the world, yet it is not efficient or effectual but only to them which acknowledgeth themselves with penance to be sinners. . . .

"The Offertory, whereby we learn to prepare *ourselves* by God's grace to be an acceptable oblation to Him, to the intent we may be partakers of the blessed Sacrifice which Christ offered for us upon the cross. . . .

"The Canon. . . . The priest begins to represent in this sacrifice of the Mass the most painful and bloody sacrifice once offered for our salvation upon the Cross, and prays the Father to accept these gifts prepared for the consecration. . . .

"After which the priest extends and stretches forth his arms in the form of a cross, declaring thereby that . . . he and the people not only have fresh remembrance of the Passion, but also of His Resurrection and glorious Ascension, and so proceeds to the second Memento."

And that is the only commentary upon the "Unde et memores . . . *offerimus tibi*" which follows the Consecration in the Latin Mass, which was still in use.¹

¹ *Apud* Danvell Stone, *op. cit.*, ii, 123.

* Note also the emphasis on the Mass as a remembrance of the Passion in the following:
 ** It is to be understood that the Mass is a remembrance of the Passion of Christ, whose most blessed Body and Blood is there consecrated, and the ceremonies thereof are not dumb, but be expressive and declarative of the same Passion, to die intent that by such signs and ceremonies they that be present hereat may the better be admonished and reduced into the memory of the same."

Also, note that the priest acts as the representative of the congregation : "It is to be understood that the priest is a common minister in the name and instead of the whole congregation, and as the mouth of the same, not only renders thanks to God for Christ's death and passion, but also makes the common prayers and commends the people and their necessities in the same to Almighty God."²

All this is, of course, capable of an ordodox interpretation, but it is equally capable of a Lutheran interpretation.

3. Equally significant is the treatment of the rite of *Ordination*, and its ceremonies :

“The ceremonies observed and prayers said and done in the consecration of bishops and giving orders to priests, deacons, subdeacons and other inferior ministers, as heretofore has been accustomed and as it is devised in the books called Pontificals . . . be very laudable and expedient to be used, for by these ceremonies and observances every man in his order, state and degree is admonished of the burdens of their offices.”

No distinction is here made between essential and non-essential ceremonies or prayers. All are merely “laudable and expedient.”

4. As to Brightman's statement¹ that the *Rationale* “is largely indebted to the *Encheiridion* of Cologne, from which a great part of the exposition of the ceremonies of baptism is derived, while traces of it are found throughout the book,” we can only say that a comparison of the two has failed to reveal any such dependence. Brightman refers us to the Alcuin edition of the *Rationale*, but the editor here merely mentions the *Encheiridion* with other works in a footnote, as containing *expositions of the rites of baptism*.

». Cranmer's views on the eucharist.

1. We have already seen now that Cranmer had by 1543 abandoned the Catholic conception of the Sacrament of Holy Order (see pp. 286-287), and likewise the Propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass (see p. 277). This will be a suitable point for a discussion of his views on the Real Presence at this time. One thing is quite clear, and that is that he had abandoned Transubstantiation already, for in 1539 he is said to have “argued very learnedly” in the House of Lords against the Six Articles, which *inter alia* taught Transubstantiation Communion under One Kind, etc.¹ We also know that, apparently in 1543, Cranmer was accused in the House of Lords of “manifest heresy against the sacrament of the altar in sermons and lectures.”²

¹ *English Rite*, I, Ivi.

² On this occasion Transubstantiation was also opposed by the Bishops of Ely, Salisbury, Worcester, Rochester, and St. David's, i.e., by the Lutheranising bishops *en bloc*. See letter in Gairdner, *Lollardy*, ii, pp. 195-6.

Note also that in 1542 Cranmer had allowed Scory, then one of his Six Preachers, to maintain from the pulpit that “the Supper of the Lord, which is sacrificium et hostia,” is not “hostia pro peccatis” but “hostia laudis” (Letters and Papers, xviii, ii, references in Gairdner, ii, p. 371 note.

³ Strype, *Memorials of Cranmer*, ch. xxviii.

2. On the other hand, it is said by Strypel that Cranmer at this time held the "Real Presence," and continued to do so until 1546, when he was converted by Ridley. He seems to be relying mainly on a letter which Cranmer sent in 1537 to a Zwinglian named Vadianus, who had sent the Archbishop a book against the Real Presence. In his reply, Cranmer criticises the opinion of (Ecolampadius and Zwingli, and says that the doctrine of the Real Presence "a primordio ecclesie, ab ipsis patribus et viris apostolicis nobis fuit propinatus."⁸ This would certainly seem to imply that at this time Cranmer believed in some kind of a Presence, but it may well have been in a Bucerian or Melancthonian sense.

Again, we are told that in 1538 Cranmer defended the Real Presence in the trial of Lambert.³ But he did so then in a feeble way, saying that if Lambert could convince him he would change his view.

Again in 1539, at the trial of Adam Damply, who was accused before Cranmer and other bishops of not holding the Real Presence, the Archbishop defended the doctrine, but at the same time "confessed openly and plainly that the Scripture knew no such term as Transubstantiation."⁴ The previous year, Cranmer had said in a letter to Cromwell⁵ that Damply was quite right in denying Transubstantiation.[®]

In 1541, at the trial of Barber, who denied the "corporeal presence," Cranmer is said to have defended the doctrine, but he could not tell how to confute Barber's arguments.

It would seem obvious that Cranmer had already abandoned Transubstantiation, but was not prepared to go the whole way with the Zwinglians. He probably held at that time some intermediate view. As we shall see, he finally abandoned the doctrine of the Real Presence (as distinct from the doctrine of Transubstantiation) a year or two before 1548, and probably in 1546, under the influence of Ridley. (See p. 327.)

C. THE PROJECT FOR THE REVISION OF THE LITURGY.

1. We have already indicated passages in the Bishops' Book and the King's Book foreshadowing liturgical innovations, and have mentioned that a Commission appointed by the King in 1540 produced the *Rationale*.

* Cranmer, ch. xviii.
 • Fox, V, pp. 229-233.
 • Aug. 15, 1538.

■ Strype, op. cit., app. xxv.
 4 Strype, op. cit., ch. xxv.
 • Letters, P.S., ii, 375.

2. In the Convocation of 1543, Cranmer made his own proposal for liturgical reform, and said that "the service should be made out of the Scriptures and other authentic doctors."¹ It was suggested that two bishops should assist in the work, namely, Capon of Salisbury, and Goodrich of Ely—a significant choice. We do not know whether the Committee was really appointed, or whether it functioned, but there are in existence two drafts for a new Breviary, in Cranmer's handwriting, and signed by him. They have been published *in extenso* by Dr. Wickham Legg.³ This draft is in two parts. The first part supplied the groundwork for the offices of Matins and Lauds in the First Prayer Book of 1549, and as Wickham Legg and Smyth point out, was "clearly inspired" by the *Pia Ordinatio* for Denmark and Norway, published by Bugenhagen in 1537, who had presented a copy to Henry VIII, now in the British Museum. Doubtless Cranmer had full access to this.³ Part Two was composed apparently under the influence of the Reformed Breviary published by Cardinal Quignon, and consists of "Sarum material worked up under Quignon influence."⁴

3. Not much, however, was actually accomplished in the way of liturgical revision in the reign of Henry. But in 1544 a new English Litany and Suffrages, which *Liturgy and Worship* describes as "the work, of course, of Cranmer himself,"⁵ was published by the King's orders. It was intended to take the place of the old Catholic Litany of the Saints. Brightman and Mackenzie say that in composing it, Cranmer used the Sarum Processional, Luther's Litany, and the Orthodox Greek Liturgy. But they have to admit that "of the petitions, only five are of Sarum, ten are in whole or in part from Luther, one and a part of a second from the Greek, and the rest are original." This is

¹ Dixon, *op. cit.*, ii, 315.

² *Cranmer's Liturgical Projects*, Henry Bradshaw Society.

³ See Smyth, *Cranmer*, p. 34.

⁴ Smyth, *op. cit.*, p. 74. As to the date of these two parts, Gasquet and Bishop assign Part One to "an early period in the reign of Edward VI" (*Edward VI and B. CP.*, p. 39), and Part Two "to some date between 1543 and Henry's death in 1547" (*ibid.*, p. 28). Dr. Wickham Legg says that "if Cranmer had been at all consistent in developing his opinions, Part the First would have been put together before 1546," but that "in a reform the simpler forms are not always the later" and that "there will very likely be a preponderance of opinion that the composition of Part the Second preceded Part the First." Part the First is preceded by a Preface, obviously based on the Second Edition of Quignon's Breviary, published in 1536, and Bugenhagen, as we see, published his work in 1537, and from this Smyth infers that Part One was composed certainly between 1537 and 1539, and probably in 1538, while he dates Part Two between 1543 and 1546. This would indicate that far-reaching liturgical reforms were already being prepared for in 1538.

⁵ Page 148.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 148.

a striking indication of the influence of the German Reformers in this country.

4. There is another significant piece of information, given in Foxe, and copied by Strype. Cranmer told a Commissioner early in the reign of Edward VI that in 1546-7 King Henry had commanded him to "pen a form for the alteration of the Mass into a Communion":

"Such communications were had between the King's Highness and the French King's ambassador concerning the establishing of true religion as a man would hardly believe. Nor I myself had thought the King's Highness had been so forward in those matters as then appeared. I may tell you, it passed the pulling down of roods, etc. . . . Few in England would have believed that the King's Majesty and the French king had been at this point, not only within half a year after to have changed the Mass into a communion, as we now use it, but also utterly to have extirpated and banished the Bishop of Rome and his usurped power out of both their realms and dominions. . . . They meant also to exhort the emperor to do the like. . . . And herein the King's Highness willed me to pen a form thereof, to be sent to the French king to consider of."¹

D. GENERAL CONCLUSION ON THE REFORMATION UNDER HENRY VIII.

We think the evidence set forth in this section should be sufficient to destroy the myth of the supposed "orthodoxy" of Henry VIII and of the English Church during his reign. For the first time in history, the Church had been cut off from the rest of Christendom, and definitely made into an independent national Church, under the headship of the Crown. In addition, one-third of its diocesan bishops had been chosen from those who were sympathetic to the German Reformation. Negotiations were constantly taking place with the Continental Reformers, and conferences were held. Their ideas were not adopted entirely, but on several fundamental matters such as the Eucharistic Presence, the Sacrifice and the Christian Ministry their phraseology was adopted, and formulæ which were, to say the least, ambiguous, were officially employed in the statements of doctrine authoritatively set forth in this reign. Further, the new national Church claimed the right to alter and modify ecclesiastical rites and ceremonies—provided of course the royal approval was forthcoming—and preparations were being made for a drastic revision of the liturgy. It is thus no exaggeration to

¹ Cranmer, *WWx*, P.S. II, p. 415, note 5. cf. Brightman and Mackenzie in *Liturgy and Worship* pp. 149-150.

say that *the seeds of the Reformation under Edward VI were all duly planted in the reign of Henry VIII*, and that the next reign merely saw the actualisation of what had been prepared under Henry.

There is one further point. While nearly all the projects of reformation were advocated in the name of a return to the purity of the primitive Church, it is important to note that this involved also a return to the *supposed doctrinal standards* of the primitive Church, as well as its liturgical standards. The revolt was, not only from mediaeval liturgical ideas, but definitely also from *medieval doctrinal standards*. And as, in point of fact, the doctrinal standard represented by the Reformers as the primitive standard, was not really that of the primitive Church, but a heretical version of this, it follows that the whole project of the Reformation, in this country as on the Continent, was tainted with heresy from the beginning.

CHAPTER IX

ADDENDUM ONE

BISHOP BARLOW'S CONSECRATION, ETC.

In view of the importance of Bishop Barlow, we think it advisable here to discuss very briefly his views, as expressed in this reign, and the vexed question of his episcopal consecration.

1 . He was an Augustinian, who about 1524 became Prior of Bromehill. This was one of the monastic houses suppressed in 1528 by Wolsey, and in that year Barlow began to write "a long series of heretical pamphlets, whose names clearly show their general tendency. They were : (1) 'The Treatise of the Buryall of the Masse 11; (2) 'A Dialogue betwene the Gentyllman and the Husbandman'; (3) 'The Clymbing up of Fryers and Religious Persones'; (4) 'A Description of Godes Worde compared to the Lyght'; (5) 'A Convicyous Dialoge against Saynt Thomas of Canterberye.' " These were condemned by the bishops in 1529. "Barlow however soon renounced the errors of these tracts, and wrote piteously to the King, imploring pardon for his attacks on Wolsey and the Church." This letter probably belongs to the latter part of 1529. He acknowledges in it that he has been guilty of errors and heresies "against the doctrine of Christ and the determination of Holy Church," that he had denied the Mass and Purgatory, and grievously erred against the Blessed Sacrament of the Altar.

This abject apology seems to have been successful, and Barlow was at once received into favour, and sent, with George Boleyn and Stokesley (afterwards Bishop of London) to France and Rome on matters connected with the Divorce (January, 1529-1530). Mgr. Barnes remarks that Barlow "thus came under Stokcleys's

1 In the *Burial of the Mass*, the Blessed Sacrament is ridiculed as "the god of bread," and the sacred elements are called the "idols of abomination." The Catholic clergy are attacked for making "of the damnable Mass --- a sacrifice."

1 T. F. Tout, in *Did. Nat. Biog.*

• T. F. Tout, *ibid.*

ADDENDUM ONE: BISHOP BARLOW'S CONSECRATION, ETC.'309

influence, and now wrote a book against the Lutherans with whom he had so lately been associating himself."¹ It is entitled *A Dialogue describing the Originall Ground of these Lutheran Factions and many of their Abuses*. It was published in 1531. Mgr. Barnes says that "the whole sentiment suggests Stokesley rather than Barlow, and the book may be due to his influence. If so, we can the more readily understand why it was that Stokesley, when he became Bishop of London, ordered all his clergy to read the book."² He adds that "the efforts put forth by Barlow to bring about the divorce attracted the notice and claimed the gratitude of the new Queen."³ (Boleyn was crowned Queen in 1533.) Professor Tout says: "Preferment after preferment was now lavished on Barlow. The special favour of Anne Boleyn made him prior of Haverfordwest."

Mgr. Barnes continues: "By this time, realising that Lutheranism was in the ascendant once more . . . he had begun preaching various heretical opinions, to the great scandal of all the neighbourhood," and was accused of heresy. Barlow wrote to Cromwell, the King's Vicar General, to implore his protection. Professor Tout says that these letters "show that he had already become a zealous reformer." Next year he was made Prior of Bisham, and sent on an embassy to Scotland. While thus engaged he was elected Bishop of St Asaph (Jan. 16th, 1535-6). But before he left Scotland he was translated to St. David's. . . . When on a short visit to London, Barlow was confirmed as Bishop of St. David's in Bow Church (April 21st, 1536). He immediately returned to Scotland, and there is no record of his consecration in Cranmer's registers of this time (Professor Tout). He took possession of his see of St. David's by proxy on May 1st, and was evidently back in London by June 30th, for he then took his seat in the House of Lords.

¹ *Bishop Barlow*, p. 5.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 6. It is only right to point out that the sentiments expressed in the book are so contrary to what is known *alimda* of Barlow's views that the genuineness of the work has been called in question by Burnet, and Antony á Wood. Burnet says the book was "set out in his name, whether written by him or forged and laid on his name I cannot judge. . . . I rather look on it as a forgery cast on his name, to disgrace the Reformation."

The book somewhat indirectly inculcates a belief in the Real Objective Presence, and the last editor of the *Dialogue*, the Rev. J. R. Lunn, actually maintain« on the strength of this, that Barlow was more "orthodox" than Oglethorpe, afterwards Bishop of Carlisle. But in explaining Barlow's views, Nir. Eunn is discreetly silent about his statements in the House of Lords in 1548 (see p. 406), and Bishop Hooper's statement that he held Zwinglian opinions (see p. 333). It is only fair to add that the Rev. T. A. Lacey allows that "there is a vein of exaggeration in Nir. Lunn's account of Barlow's career" (*Interpretation of the English Ordinal*, p. 7, footnote).

³ Page 6.

310 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

2. This raises the question of the fact and date of his episcopal consecration. Mgr. Barnes enumerates "thirteen documents, all of which ought to be available, and any one of which would be sufficient by itself to prove the fact" of Barlow's consecration.¹ To these he adds two other lines of evidence, making fifteen possible sources in all. He goes on to show that "every step of his history is in order, and can be proved by documentary evidence . . . his election, the Royal Assent to his election, the confirmation of the election by Archbishop Cranmer. But there the series stops short," and *no one of the fifteen proofs is to be found*. It will be interesting to give the comment of Canon Jenkyns on this, in his review of Mgr. Barnes' book in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. XXIV. He remarks that "Between Cranmer's consecration on March 30th, 1533, and the death of Henry VIII on January 28th, 1546-7, twenty-five men apart from Barlow held diocesan bishoprics in the Province of Canterbury who had not been consecrated before that time."² He has been able to investigate the documents in nine out of the fifteen possible sources enumerated by Mgr. Barnes, and says that "On the nine lines open to investigation, the facts recoverable show that in no case of the twenty-five are there less than three pieces of evidence for the consecration, and in twenty there are four or more. . . ." He allows that "*pro tanto*, the existence of this sufficient evidence in twenty-five cases tells against Barlow."³ On the other hand he says that "Barlow's return to London was some time between June 4th and nth."⁴ Now on June nth, there was a consecration of two bishops, Sampson and Repps, and accordingly, it has been conjectured by Haddan (in his edition of Bramhall, *Preface*) that Barlow was consecrated on the same occasion, i.e., June nth. Against this, Mgr. Barnes points out that there are no records whatever which say that he was then consecrated, and that there are two pieces of evidence against it: (1) The day *after* the supposed consecration, Cromwell issued a warrant in which Barlow was still spoken of as the "Bishop then elect of St. Asaph's, now elect of St. David's."⁵ (2) A letter written by Antony Waite, a servant of Sherburn, Bishop of Chichester, to Lady Lisle, tells how Dr. Sampson "was consecrated with the Abbot of St. Benet's, now Bishop of Norwich," on Trinity Sunday, but does not mention any third bishop. This letter was written from Calais on the

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 39.

² Page 19.

³ Page 1.

⁴ Page 4.

⁵ Barnes, *op. cit.* p. 76.

Friday after the consecration ceremony.¹ Dr. Jenkyns comments as follows : " The reviewer . . . is unable to persuade himself that if Barlow was consecrated on Sunday, June *n*th, Cromwell must necessarily have known of it when he wrote the letter of the following day, or that because Antony Waite mentions the new Bishop of Chichester as having been consecrated at the same time as someone else of whom he knew, therefore no one else was consecrated on that day, more especially as a careful study of the letter leaves him in doubt whether Waite was even present at the ceremony."

As to the absence of documents, Canon Jenkyns points out how carelessly these were issued and kept, and mentions the remarkable fact that " three weeks after his own consecration, Repps was taking part in the consecration of Wharton, the new Bishop of St. Asaph, on July 2nd," and yet that " two days later there was issued . . . a *significant* for his own confirmation and consecration."

To this we may add that it is not a case of the absence of certain documents from registers which are in every case extant, and otherwise complete. Some of the registers—those of St. David's, for instance—are non-existent. And as for the Canterbury registers, Mr. Haddon, in his edition of Bramhall (preface) has pointed out that " there are omitted in the same Register the confirmations prior to the statute in 1547 of *two*, and the mandates subsequently to that date for *three*, and the consecrations of no less than *eight* Bishops, exclusive of Barlow." Certainly the absence of documents from registers kept in this way has very little probative force.

As to *positive* evidence *for* the consecration. Canon Jenkyns remarks that " English bishops rank among themselves for all formal purposes in the order of their consecration. . . . On all occasions in which, as in the judgment in the case of Anne of Cleves, or in the matter of the Ten Articles, Convocation is acting in the most formal manner, Barlow appears as signing between Repps, consecrated on June *n*th, 1536, and Wharton, consecrated on July 2nd."³

And further, on p. 22, Jenkyns quotes a letter from Bishop Barlow's brother to Cromwell, which speaks of the Bishop's enthronement, which Mgr. Barnes describes as the thirteenth of the lines of evidence which " would be sufficient by itself to prove the fact of consecration."

¹ Jenkyns, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

• Page 18.

• Page 20.

To this we may add with Boudinhon that it is difficult to suppose that "Barlow was able to live as a bishop for more than thirty years, administer dioceses . . . take part in the consecration of bishops, sit as a bishop in parliament, without having received episcopal consecration, and that no one would have protested against so strange a situation, not even the Chapter of St. David's, with whom he had more than one quarrel."¹ The reference to "taking part in the consecration of bishops" is to the consecration of Bishop Bulkeley, on Feb. 19th, 1542, when Barlow acted as an assistant bishop. Boudinhon, Couraycr, and Haddon also argue from the fact that Barlow "held ordinations," but as these were *Anglican* ordinations in the reign of Elizabeth, we prefer not to invoke this fact. In any case, the other grounds seem fairly strong, especially when we add to them the fact that no one in Queen Mary's reign seems to have suggested that he was unconsecrated, and that the *Congé d'Elire* issued by Mary for his successor on March 13th, 1554, speaks of the "*resignatio ultimi episcopatus*" and the mandate for his successor's consecration has a similar phrase.

It only remains to add that the question of Barlow's consecration was, apparently, not raised till Mason published his Vindication of Anglican Orders in 1613. In this work he gave all other necessary dates and details, but merely said of Barlow that he was "consecrated in the reign of Henry VIII." This vague phrase was noticed by Mason's Catholic opponent, William Champneys, and pointed out in his *De vocatione ministrorum* published in 1616. From that time the controversy has been carried on intermittently down to our own days.

3. We now return to the question of Barlow's theological views. Much has been made of his *Dialogue*, published in 1531. Thus Dr. Whitney, Dixie Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Cambridge, writing in the *Dictionary of English Church History*, says that this *Dialogue* shows that Barlow "then had a strong dislike of Lutheran opinions, and the abuses springing from them; also that he was certainly not Lutheran in his views on the Eucharist." Mr. Lunn argues in the same way in his preface to his edition of the *Dialogue*. But it would seem more correct to say that Barlow at that time thought it more prudent to hide his real views. For his letters to Cromwell in 1535 "show that he had already become a zealous reformer,"² and moreover,

¹ *Validité des ordinations anglicanes*, p. 16.

• T. F. Tout, in *Diet. Nat. Biog.*

the accusation made against him by R. Lewes in Jan., 1537, in addition to a statement about the non-necessity of episcopal consecration, to which we refer below, contains the following: "He affirmed and said that whensoever two or three simple persons, as two cobblers or weavers, were in company and elected in the name of God, that there was the true Church of God. Item that it is not expedient to man to confess him, but only to God. . . . Item that there is not nor was any purgatory. . . ." And Professor Tout remarks : " The opinions he maintained make it remarkable that he should have managed to retain his position during the reactionary end of Henry VIIPs reign."¹

To the above we may add the fact that Bishop Barlow spoke against the Act of the Six Articles when this was before the House of Lords (see p. 273). And we shall show that in the reign of Edward VI, his heterodoxy cannot be called into question.

But before we leave him, we must mention a strange attempt which has been made, by the Rev. J. R. Lunn,² and the Rev. T. A. Lacey,³ to defend the orthodoxy of the answer Barlow gave in 1540^o when he said that " consecration " is not required for a bishop, but " appointment suffices " (see p. 285). On this Mr. Lunn writes as follows : " Barlow's answer means that anointing is not necessary to make a bishop, but that appointment with imposition of hands is, as specified by Archbishop Lee, Bishop Aldrich, Oglethorpe, and others."⁴

^Ir. Lacey is a little more guarded : " What appointment consists in he does not specify, but supposes it well known."⁵ " Many of the doctors distinguish consecration, and ordination *cum impositions manuum*."⁶

The best way to settle this matter is to consult the answers themselves, and see in what sense the word " consecration " is used. But first the terms of the question must be carefully noted : " Whether in the New Testament be required any consecration of a bishop and priest, or only appointing to the office be sufficient." Note the phrase " *any* consecration," i.e., of whatever kind.

Cranmer says in his reply that " he that is appointed to be a bishop or a priest needeth no consecration . . . for election or appointing is sufficient." This, taken in conjunction with his previous statement that α in the admission of bishops and other

* Op. cit.

² *A Roman Diary*, pp. 39, 93.

³ Op. cit., p. 93.

¹ Barlow's *Dialogue*, 1897.

⁴ J. R. Lunn, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 39.

ecclesiastics be divers comely ceremonies and solemnities used, which be not of necessity, for if such offices and ministrations were committed without such solemnity they were nevertheless truly committed," makes it clear that "consecration" is used in the general sense for the *whole ordination rite*. The same applies to the following :

Archbishop Lee : "The apostles ordained priests by imposition of the hand . . . and so *appointment only*, without *visible consecration* and invocation, is neither convenient nor sufficient."

Bishop Heath : "Scripture speaketh de impositione manus et de oratione, and of *other* manner of *consecration* I find no mention in the New Testament expressedly, but the old authors make mention also of inunctions."

"Consecration" here is taken evidently in the general sense.

Dr. Robertson : "Opinor requiri *consecrationem quandam, hoc est* impositionem manuum, rationem, jejunium."

Dr. Rcdmayn : "The apostles used *certain consecration*, by *imposition of hands* and prayer."

Dr. Leighton : "There is a *consecration* required, as by *imposition of hands*."

Dr. Tresham : "There is a *certain kind of consecration* required, which is *imposition of the bishop's hands* with prayer, and the *appointing only* is not sufficient."

Dr. Coren : "In the New Testament is required to the making of a bishop *impositio manuum cum oratione*, which I take for *consecration*, and *appointment* is not sufficient."

Anonymous answer : "Manuum impositio cum oratione is required, *which is a consecration*, so as *only appointing* is not sufficient."

In all these, "consecration" certainly does not mean merely the anointing.

Now we come to some ambiguous answers.

The Bishop of Carlisle does not use the word at all in his reply.

Dr. Day : "Consecration of bishops and priests I read not in the New Testament, but *ordinatio per manuum impositionem cum oratione* is read there . . . and the *only appointment*, as I think, is not sufficient."

This seems to mean merely that the *word* is not found in Scripture, though the *thing* itself is.

Bishop Bonner of London : "Consecration of a bishop and

priest be required, for that in the old law the consecration was required, as appeareth octavo Levitici."

This may mean simply that bishops must be consecrated *aliquo modo*, for old testament priests were consecrated *aliquo modo*.

Dr. Edgworth does not mention the word.

Neither docs Dr. Oglethorpe.

Not much argument could be derived from the above.

We now come to the *only cases in which the word does definitely seem to be used for anointing* :

Dr. Cox : " By Scripture there is no consecration of bishops and priests required, but only the appointing cum impositione manuum."

Dr. Symonds : " The appointing to the office per manuum impositionem is in Scripture, and the consecration of them hath of long time continued in the Church."

Now while the two last answers seem to take " consecration " to mean " anointing," they are careful to specify that appointing must be accompanied by the imposition of hands, i.e., ordination.

Bishop Barlow's answer is "*only* the appointing." Taken as an answer to the question whether *any* consecration is required, or *only appointing* be sufficient, it can have only one meaning : *no consecration of any kind is required.*

All this would harmonise with the statement attributed to Barlow by R. Lewes in November, 1536, namely that in a sermon he " affirmed and said that if the King's grace being supreme head of the Church of England did chuse, denominate and elect any layman, being learned, to be a bishop, that he so chosen, without mention made of any orders, should be as good a bishop as he is or the best in England."† This certainly shows that Barlow was accused of holding the non-necessity of episcopal consecration. Incidentally, it also seems to imply that he himself had nevertheless received such consecration.

† *Apud Jenkyns, op. cit., p. 21.*

CHAPTER X

ADDENDUM TWO : CRANMER'S VIEWS

ADDENDUM II. CRANMER'S VIEWS.

1. On p. 286 we have quoted at length the remarkably significant answers of Cranmer in 1540 on the subject of holy order, and kindred matters. But some Anglicans have suggested that Cranmer changed his mind, on the ground that there are extant two sets of answers to the questions, in the margin of which there is written here and there "Arch. Cant. B. Davies." Accordingly it is suggested that the answers thus marked are the second thoughts of these two bishops.

Mgr. Barnes has urged, on the contrary, that these answers just referred to were the "first thoughts" of Cranmer and Barlow, and that later, in consequence of the King's questions, also indicated on the margin of the manuscript, they gave the answers which we ourselves have ascribed to them. Cranmer's answer is in his own handwriting, and is signed by him, so there can be no question of its genuineness. Neither is there any reasonable doubt that Barlow's answer is correctly summarised.

But it is exceedingly difficult to suppose that either *before* or *after* these undoubtedly genuine answers, Cranmer and Barlow could have given the other answers, against which their names are written, for they are completely contrary. The manuscript containing these answers is *not in Cranmer's handwriting*, and the *names of Cranmer and Barlow are not in Cranmer's hand, nor in that of King Henry's*. The solution seems to be as follows :

2. *One* of the sets of answers is manifestly *a general summary* of the answers of the bishops, made for King Henry's use. It represents *the points upon which the bishops generally agreed*. In one case, however, question 15, there was so sharp a division of opinion that two alternative answers are given, with the names of those holding each, put in the margin. In some other cases, the names of Cranmer and Barlow are written in the margin against the

answers. But a careful examination will show that these are *answers to which these two would not agree*. This will be seen if we compare these particular answers with those elsewhere made by Cranmer and Barlow.

(a) The first answer against which these two names are written, is the answer to question 5, which asked "Whether the word sacrament be, and ought to be, attributed to the seven only, and whether the seven sacraments be found in any of the old authors or not?" To this the *general* answer replies: "Not only to the seven, but to many more. We [note the plural] find in the old authors, matrimony, the holy communion, baptism, confirmation, order, penance and extreme unction. In penance it is doubted of the name of sacrament."

Now, Cranmer, in his own answer, said, "I know no cause why this word sacrament should be attributed to the seven only, for the old authors never prescribe any certain number of sacraments, nor in all their books I have never read these two words joined together, viz., *septem sacramenta*." Obviously this is more radical than the general answer. Barlow's answer is extant only in a summary, as follows: "This word sacrament, in the old authors, is not attributed unto the seven only, *nor ought to be attributed*." The last part of the answer shows why Barlow could hardly be represented by the general answer.

(b) The next general answer with a marginal note is No. 7, which asks "what is found in Scripture of the matter, nature, effect and virtue of such as we call the seven sacraments, so as although the name be not there, yet whether the thing be in Scripture or no? and in what wise spoken of?"

The general answer includes the following:

"Of order (scripture speaketh) that by it, grace is given to minister effectually in preaching the word of God and ministration of the sacraments."

Against this is written: "Arch. Cant." Now Cranmer in his written answer says:

"Of the matter, nature and effect of the other three, that is to say, confirmation, *order* and extreme unction, *I read nothing in the scripture* as they be taken for sacraments."

Evidently Cranmer disagrees with the general answer here also.

(c) The general answer goes on to say:

"Of confirmation (which is contained in scripture, speaking of *de impositione manuum post baptismam*), it appeareth by scripture, how thereby increase of grace is given."

Against this is written : " Arch. Cant. B. Davyes." We have just shown that Cranmer finds *nothing in Scripture* about the sacrament of confirmation. And Barlow similarly said, " The nature, effect and virtue of these four sacraments only, baptism, the sacrament of the altar, matrimony, penance, is contained in the Scripture." So his name here signifies his disagreement also.

(d) Next, the general answer goes on to deal with " unction of the sick." Against it are written the names of " Arch. Cant. B. Davyes, M. Cocks." The two former have been dealt with. And Dr. Cox said that " unction of the sick, with oil consecrate, as now used, *is not spoken of in Scripture.*"

(e) Next we come to question 8, which asked " whether confirmation *cum chrismate* of them that be baptised be found in Scripture." The general answer says :

" *Impositionem manuum post baptismam*, which we call confirmation, we read in the scripture, but that it was done *chrismate*, we find not in the scripture expressed. But in the old authors we find that *chrisma* hath been used in the said confirmation."

Against this is written " Arch. Cant. B. Davyes." Cranmer, in his own answer, says, " Of confirmation with chrism, without which it is counted no sacrament, *there is no manner of mention in the Scripture,*" and Barlow similarly " *denieth to be in Scripture,* as we call it a sacrament." So here also they disagree with the general answer.

(f) Next we come to question 9, " whether the Apostles, lacking a higher power, as in not having a Christian king among them, made bishops by that necessity, or by authority given them by God ? " The general answer runs :

" Making of bishops hath two parts ; appointment and ordering. Appointment, which the apostles by necessity made by common election, and sometime by their own several assignment, could not then be done by Christian princes ; because at that time they were not : and now, at these days, appertaineth to Christian princes and rulers. But, in the ordering, wherein grace is conferred, as afore the apostles did follow the rule taught by the Holy Ghost, *per manuum impositionem, cum oratione et jejuniis.*"

Against this is written, " Arch. Cant." Now we have already quoted Cranmer's own answer to this question (see p. 286), and it is obvious that he regarded " ordering " merely as a " comely ceremony," in no wise necessary, and further, that there is nothing in Scripture to show that order is a sacrament at all. (See above, p. 286.) So it is obvious that the purpose

of writing Cranmer's name in the margin here is to note his *disagreement* with the general answer, and not his agreement with it, as supposed by Mgr. Barnes.

(g) Next we come to question 10 : "Whether bishops or priests were first, and if the priests were first, then the priest made the bishop." The general answer says :

"Christ made His apostles first, which were of His making both priests and bishops, but whether at one time some doubt."

Against this is written : "Arch. Cant. B. Davyes, M. Cockes."

Cranmer, in his own answer, says, "The bishops and priests were at one time, and were not two things, but both one office in the beginning of Christ's religion." Barlow similarly says that "at the beginning they were all one," and Cox says, "Although by Scripture priests and bishops be one, and therefore the one not before the other, yet bishops, as they be now, were after priests, and therefore made of priests." Evidently these views were much more radical than the general answer.

(h) Next we come to question 11, "Whether a bishop hath authority to make a priest by the Scripture, or no ? And whether any other but only a bishop may make a priest ?"

The general answer says :

"A bishop having authority of his Christian prince to give orders may, by his ministry given to him of God in scripture, ordain a priest. And we read not, that any other, not being a bishop, hath, since the beginning of Christ's church, ordered a priest."

Against this is written : "Arch. Cant."

Now Cranmer in his own written answer says :

"A bishop may make a priest by the scripture, and so may princes and governors also, and that by the authority of God committed them, and the people also by their election ; for as we read that bishops have done it, so Christian emperors and princes usually have done it, and the people, before Christian princes were, commonly did elect their bishops and priests."

Which is sufficiently different from the general answer !

(i) Next we come to question 12 : "Whether in the New Testament be required any consecration of a bishop and priest, or only appointing to the office be sufficient."

The general answer runs :

"Only appointment is not sufficient, but consecration, that is to say, imposition of hands with fasting and prayer, is also required. For so the apostles used to order them that were appointed, and so have been used continually, and we have not read the contrary."

Against this is written : " Arch. Cant. B. Davyes." Now, Cranmer, in his own answer, writes :

" In the New Testament, he that is appointed to be a bishop or a priest, needeth no consecration by the scripture, for election or appointing thereto is sufficient."

And Barlow says : " only the appointing " is required.

(j) The next question marked in the margin is question 15 : " Whether a man be bound by authority of this Scripture (*Quorum remisieritis*) and such like, to confess his secret deadly sins to a priest, if he may have him, or no ? " The general answer runs :

" He that knoweth himself guilty of any secret deadly sins, *must*, if he will obtain the benefit of absolution ministered by the priest, confess the same secret sins unto him."

Against this is written in the margin, " Arch. Cant." Cranmer, in his written answer, says :

" A man is *not bound*, by the authority of this scripture, *Quorum remisieritis* and such-like, to confess his secret deadly sins to a priest, although he may have him."

(k) Next, we come to question 16 : " Whether a bishop or a priest may excommunicate, and for what crimes ? And whether they only may excommunicate by God's law ? " The general answer runs :

" Bishops and priests authorised by the prince, may excommunicate, by God's law, for public and open crimes, but that other than bishops or priests may excommunicate, we have not read in scripture. Some schoolmen say that other than priests, or bishops, deputed thereunto by the church, may excommunicate, because it is an act *jurisdictionis* and not *ordinis*."

In the margin we have, " Arch. Cant. B. Davyes." Cranmer, in his own answer, says :

" A bishop or a priest by the scripture is neither commanded nor forbidden to excommunicate, but where the laws of any region giveth him authority to excommunicate, there they ought to use the same in such crimes as the laws have such authority in, and where the laws of the region forbiddeth them, there they have none authority at all, and they that be no priests may also excommunicate, if the law allow thereunto."

This evidently makes excommunication an act of the civic authority as such, and if bishops and priests excommunicate, they do so only by delegation from the prince. Similarly, Barlow says that " laymen may excommunicate, if they be appointed by the high ruler."

This careful examination of all the answers in this first set marked in the margin shows conclusively that *Cranmer and Barlow disagreed from the answers against which their names are written.*

3. Now we come to the *other* set of answers similarly marked. It is evidently the answer of one particular individual, for *the first personal pronoun is used.* It is, however, unsigned, and there is no clue as to its author. There is just one answer against which are written, "Arch. Cant. S. David's," and that is the answer on confirmation : "The thing of confirmation is found in Scripture, the name confirmation is not there." We have already shown above that Cranmer and Barlow *denied* that the sacrament of confirmation is to be found in Scripture, and so here again *the purport of the marginal note is to express the disagreement of these bishops with the answer given.*

Thus it is quite clear that *the views of Cranmer are those given in his own signed answer, and that he held these consistently, and the same must apply to Barlow.*

PART FOUR

THE ENGLISH REFORMATION UNDER
EDWARD VI

CHAPTER I

THE TWO CHIEF REFORMERS: CRANMER AND RIDLEY

Edward VI, then nine years of age, was proclaimed King on January 31st, 1547.

1. Henry, by his will, had committed the royal authority during his son's minority to a body of sixteen executors, with power to call in ten additional advisers, and in nominating the Council he had fairly evenly chosen men of the Old and the New Learning, i.e., "Anglo-Catholics" and "Protestants." The leaders of the orthodox party in the Council were the Earl of Southampton (Lord Chancellor), and Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester. The reforming party was headed by the Earl of Warwick (afterwards Duke of Northumberland); the unscrupulous Edward Seymour, Earl of Hertford; and, last but not least, Thomas Cranmer, the Archbishop of Canterbury, who took the chief part in the ecclesiastical innovations that were decided on. The first acts of the anti-Catholic party on the Council consisted in securing preponderance over the Catholic party, by the exclusion of the Earl of Southampton and Bishop Gardiner, and in obtaining from Edward letters patent appointing the Earl of Hertford Lord Protector, with full regal powers, without any obligation of consulting any member of the Council except as he should think proper.

2. It is matter of common knowledge that the Edwardine Reformation was fostered throughout by this Council, dominated as it was by its Protestant members. But the various stages in the doctrinal and liturgical Reformation, though doubtless engineered by the Council, were actually carried through by the *Protestant party in the episcopate* and certain Protestant "doctors" who assisted the bishops in this work. The episcopate seems to have been very servile indeed during this reign. But it must be remembered that the hierarchy had lost its independence already in Henry's reign by accepting his headship of the

326 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

Church (even with the proviso ° so far as the law of Christ will allow °), by surrendering their letters of appointment by the Pope, taking out fresh letters of appointment from the King, and further, by undertaking in Convocation not to legislate without the King's letters of business. This subjection of the bishops to the crown was emphasized early in Edward's reign, when the bishops were required to take out fresh commissions from the Crown, the King giving them faculties and jurisdiction "so long as they shall behave themselves." The bishops from now on were merely civil functionaries, deriving their jurisdiction from the Crown, the Supreme Head of Christ's Church in this country. And in practice, the Crown meant the Council, and that meant the Protestant members of the Council.

3. However, there can be no doubt that the doctrinal and liturgical reformation was the work in the main of *Archbishop Cranmer*, and that his chief assistant among the bishops was *Nicholas Ridley*, Bishop of Rochester, and afterwards Bishop of London.

We shall show that Anglican authorities are generally in agreement as to the part played by Cranmer in the composition of the new liturgical books, and as to Ridley, Procter remarks in his *History of the Book of Common Prayer*¹ that, next to Cranmer, it was he who had the largest share in the compilation of the Anglican formularies. Indeed, it was said by their contemporaries that Latimer leant upon Cranmer, Cranmer upon Ridley, and Ridley upon himself.

4. THOMAS CRANMER.

We have already outlined the early history of this remarkable man, and mentioned his principal activities in the reign of Henry VIII, and have called attention to the way in which, under his guidance, the great Reformation was already then begun. We have also pointed out that he had abandoned the Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation, though for a time he retained a vague belief in some kind of Real Presence. In any case, a year or two before 1548 he abandoned even this vague belief, as he tells us repeatedly. The change of view has been attributed to á Lasco, the Polish Reformer who came to England in 1550, but Cranmer himself attributed it to Bishop Ridley, for he said as follows in his examination in 1555 :

"I grant that then I believed otherwise than I do now, and so I did, until my lord of London, Doctor Ridley, did confer with me, and by sundry persuasions and authorities of doctors, drew me quite from my opinion."¹

As to the *date* of this change, the writer of the preface to the Latin edition of Cranmer's *Book on the Sacrament*, published at Emden in 1557, definitely asserts that the change was made "post multam scripturarum pervestigationem, ex unius beati martyris Ridley episcopi Londinensis institutione, sero tandem, *nimirum anno 1546.*"

Now Ridley's doctrine, as we shall see, was similar to that held by Calvin and Bucer. We have already described the views of these in previous chapters. Their doctrine was a *via media* between the Lutheran view, of a Real Presence in and with the bread and wine, and the Zwinglian view of a Real Absence, and may aptly be called the "Virtualist" view. Christ is present, *not in the bread and wine*, but *virtually*, by His power and grace, *in the rite*, and ultimately, *in the recipient*.

As Mr. Smyth puts it:

"What men desired was a *via media* between Luther's doctrine, which retained too much, and Zwingli's, which retained too little. That *via media* Suvermerianism might claim to supply. Suvermerianism was the name given by the Lutherans in derision to the doctrine of Martin Bucer and the Strassburg school. . . . *While the mouth receives the bread and wine, the worthy soul receives and feeds upon the very body and blood of Christ.* But in the case of unworthy receivers of the sacrament—and here the theory stands in accord with Zwinglianism and in antithesis to the Roman and Lutheran doctrines—only the bread and wine are received, because the soul from lack of faith cannot receive the body and blood of Christ."²

Or again, here is another account of the doctrine :

"The reception of the bread and wine may be accompanied by a special kind of experience on the part of the soul, yet only where the soul is qualified or adapted therefor by its own condition."³

Such was the view of the Eucharistic Presence held in 1546 by Cranmer. It must be obvious that it would of necessity affect his view of the Sacrifice of the Mass, and of the Priesthood. We have already shown that these two Catholic doctrines were formally and explicitly rejected by Calvin and Bucer, to whose views those of Cranmer approximated. And in any case, it is

¹ Cranmer, *Works*, P.S., ii, 218.

² *Ibid.*, p. 24.

³ Cranmer, p. 23. Italics ours.

clear that a person disbelieving in the Real Objective Presence could not accept the Catholic doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass and of the Priesthood. If Our Lord is not really and objectively present under the forms of bread and wine, and if that which is on the altar even after consecration is still only bread and wine, and not Our Lord's Body and Blood, then it is obvious that it is only bread and wine that the celebrant has at his disposal, and that he cannot offer up Our Lord's Body and Blood in any real sense to God the Father. He might conceivably offer up the bread and wine, but he could not do more than that. It is interesting to note that this was quite realised by Dr. Pusey, who remarked, *propos* of the Tridentine formulation of the Catholic doctrine : "The doctrine of the Sacrifice cannot be the same where Transubstantiation is held, and where it is not."¹

Further, even if Cranmer had retained a belief in the Real Objective Presence, it would not at all follow that he continued to believe in the Sacrifice or the Priesthood. Luther, as we have seen, continued to believe in the Real Objective Presence, though he taught Consubstantiation instead of Transubstantiation. Nevertheless, he vehemently denied the Sacrifice of the Mass.

Cranmer, on the other hand, expressly denied the Real Objective Presence, even as held by Luther. Hence it is clear that he could not have believed in the Sacrifice of the Mass, or in the Priesthood as Catholics understand it, and explicit testimonies to this effect would really be unnecessary. But in any case, Cranmer tells us expressly that he had abandoned the Catholic doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass together with that of the Real Presence :

"Not long before I wrote the said Catechism² I was in that error of the Real Presence, as I was many years past in divers

¹ *Tracts for the Times*, IV, 47. It might be objected to this statement of Dr. Pusey's, that after all, belief in Transubstantiation cannot be essential to belief in the Sacrifice of the Mass, for there were some early Scholastics, who, as we have seen, did not accept Transubstantiation, but nevertheless it is to be presumed that they accepted the doctrine of the Sacrifice. To this we will say "transubstantiation" but at any rate it is quite certain that belief in the Real Objective Presence of the Body and Blood under the forms or appearances of bread and wine, in such a way that it can be said that the Body and Blood are really and truly upon the altar (abstracting from a further determination of the mode of the presence), is necessary if one is to be able to hold that the Body and Blood are really and truly offered in the Mass. We have seen that belief even in this kind of presence would not itself necessitate belief in the Sacrifice. But no one denying the Presence could hold the Sacrifice. And it is precisely the Real Objective Presence, in any shape or form, that was denied by the English Reformers. The "Presence" they held was, at most, a "virtual" one, by grace, in the rite as such, or better still, in the soul of the communicant, but not in the bread and wine.

² Cranmer is writing, in 1550, of the Lutheran Catechism he had translated in 1548.

other ways, as of Transubstantiation, of the Sacrifice Propitiatory of the priests in the Mass . . . being brought up from youth in them. . . . But little by little I put away my former ignorance.

Cranmer's views of the *priesthood* must obviously have changed also : if he rejected the Propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass, as Catholics understood it, together with the doctrine of Transubstantiation, he cannot have believed in the Sacrificing Priesthood. In this connection we have already called attention to the ambiguities in the declarations on Holy Order in both the Bishops' Book and the King's Book, and the still more striking denial of the sacrament of Holy Order made by Cranmer in 1540.

All this is of the greatest importance in the interpretation of the new Anglican liturgical formularies.

5. As to the doctrines of Nicholas Ridley, we have already stated that he abandoned the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence in favour of a theory of Virtualism, in 1545, when Vicar of Heme in Kent.¹

In any case, we shall give later the "Determination" of Ridley at Cambridge in 1549, in which he rejects the Real Objective Presence, as believed by Catholics, and the Oblation of Christ in the Mass.

6. We shall have occasion later to give more detailed exposition of the views of Cranmer and Ridley as set forth from time to time in their writings, but we keep here to the rigorous chronological order, for various reasons. In any case, we think it sufficiently evident that, *at the beginning of Edward's reign, i.e., before the new liturgical works were published, the two principal authors of them disbelieved in the Real Objective Presence and in the Sacrifice of Christ's Body and Blood.* In consequence, they would naturally also disbelieve in the *Catholic doctrine of the sacrificing priesthood. A priesthood there might be, but not the Catholic priesthood, ordained to offer Christ's body and blood in the Sacrifice of the Mass.*

¹ This is the general opinion, accepted by historians. Ridley appealed to Ratramn's work, in support of his doctrine, and said he had read it. Now Ratramn's book was translated into English, and dedicated "to Henry." It was indeed published only in 1548, but the Editor of Ridley's Works in the Parker Society edition says, "It is supposed that Ridley met with it in the year 1545 or 1546."

CHAPTER II

THE THREE PARTIES IN THE EPISCOPATE UNDER EDWARD VI

It will be useful if, having dealt with Cranmer and Ridley, we proceed to explain the *attitude of the other English Bishops* in the reign of Edward. We have already pointed out the significant appointment by Henry VIII of no less than seven bishops of Protestant sympathies. In the reign of Edward, this group is enlarged, and comes out more definitely on the Protestant side. Against it there is an ever diminishing group of "Anglo-Catholic" Bishops whose sympathies are still with the traditional religion, although it must be remembered that they had all to a man repudiated the authority of the Holy See, assented to the idea of a national Church under royal control, entitled to its own rites, traditions and customs, and had thus opened the way for doctrinal and liturgical innovations. In addition, it will be useful to distinguish a central group of "Opportunist" or "doubtful" bishops, who seem to have been of uncertain convictions, or else who trimmed their sails to the prevailing wind. In classifications of this kind there is naturally room for difference of opinion as to where particular bishops should be placed, but we think the following classification of the position at the beginning of the reign is a fair one.

ANGLO-CATHOLIC PARTY :

Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester.	Thirlby, Westminster.
Bonner, London.	Rugg, Norwich.
Tunstall, Durham.	Voysey, Exeter.
Heath, Worcester.	Bush, Bristol.
Day, Chichester.	King, Oxford.
Aldrich, Carlisle.	

Total, ⁱⁱ bishops.
33°

THE THREE PARTIES IN THE EPISCOPATE

SSI

PROTESTANT PARTY :

Cranmer, Canterbury.	Barlow, Bath and Wells. ¹
Holgate, York.	Ridley, Rochester.
Goodrich, Ely.	Ferrar, St. David's?
Holbeach, Lincoln.	Bird, Chester.

Total, 8 bishops.

opportunist s :

Skip, Hereford.	Wakeman, Gloucester.
Sampson, Lichfield.	Wharton, St. Asaph.
Chambers, Peterborough.	Bulkeley, Bangor.
Salcot (Capon), Salisbury.	Kitchin, Llandaff.

Total, 8 bishops.

Thus, at the beginning of the reign of Edward VI, there were eleven "Anglo-Catholic" bishops, eight "Protestants," and eight "Opportunists."

We must now justify our classification of the bishops.

1. ANGLO-CATHOLIC BISHOPS.

Gardiner, Bonner, Tunstall, Heath, Day, and Voysey were all deprived of their sees during the reign of Edward VI, and all except Voysey were imprisoned for resistance to the orders of the Council. Their loyalty to the old faith (always excepting the Pope's Supremacy) admits of no question.

Aldrich, according to the *Dictionary of National Biography*, supported the Act of the Six Articles in the reign of Henry VIII, and "joined with a small minority in protesting against the introduction of the new liturgy' and against several other changes.

Thirlby voted against all the liturgical changes.

J?w^e, of Norwich, who died early in the reign, had manifested his Catholic sympathies by defending the seven sacraments against Cranmer in the previous reign (see p. 253).

Bush, of Bristol, according to the *Dictionary of National Biography*, "kept firm to the creed of Rome, and never by word or writing professed heresy." He did, indeed, take advantage of the relaxation of the law of celibacy, and took a wife, but in view of the above statement we include him among the Anglo-Catholic bishops.

⁴ Barlow was translated to Bath and Wells from St. David's in February, 1548. Bath and Wells had been vacant since 1541.

¹ Ferrar was appointed to St. David's in September, 1548, in succession to Barlow.

King, of Oxford, is called by Foxe "a persecuting bishop," which means that his sympathies were Anglo-Catholic. He was reconciled and reinstated as a Catholic bishop in the reign of Queen Mary.

2. We come now to those we have classified as Protestant bishops.

Cranmer and *Ridley* have already been dealt with.

Holgate Archbishop of York, is a rather puzzling character. He gives a comparatively orthodox answer on the oblation in the Mass, in 1548, as we shall see (it is very similar to that of Tunstall, and may have been influenced by the latter). Also, he protested to Queen Mary that he had not gone so far astray as others.¹

The *Dictionary of English Church History* says that "he appears not to have had any strong religious convictions, and to have been ready to conform to the opinions of the party in power." But it adds that "*In Edward's reign he passed as a Reformer*"² ordered the vicars-choral of the cathedral to have each a New Testament in English, that the works of Calvin and Bullinger should be included in the library (!), forbade the playing of the organ during service, and directed that all carving and images behind the high altar should be removed, and texts substituted." Strype calls him "A favourer of the Reformation"³; Burnet says "he concurred heartily in the Reformation, yet was considered a reproach to it." He certainly was a reproach to his see, for he impoverished it, making himself "the wealthiest prelate in England." He married when he was sixty-eight years of age, but informed Queen Mary that he did this out of pure fear of the Duke of Northumberland, and offered her a thousand pounds and his prayers if she would pardon and restore him. He died soon after, with his request ungranted.

On the whole, it seems safe to place him among the Protestants.

Holbeach of Lincoln. Bishop Hooper tells Bullinger that Holbeach "thoroughly comprehends the doctrine of Christ about the Lord's Supper." Strype describes him as "a true favourer of the Gospel."⁴ And, as we shall see, in 1548 he says that "there is properly no oblation nor sacrifice" in the Mass, "but a remembrance of the one oblation of Christ upon the Cross, made once for all."⁶

¹ *State Papers, Domestic, Queen Mary*, Vol. VI, No. 83.

* Italics ours.

² *Eccles. Mem.*, II, ii, 165.

⁴ *Eccles. Mem.*, II, ii, 167.

⁶ *Lambeth MS.*, fol. 1108, fol. 32; p. 350.

Goodrich, of Ely. Bishop Hooper, whose Protestantism is undoubted, as we shall see, mentions him as one of the six bishops who were "favourable to the cause of Christ, and held right opinions on the Eucharist." Hooper had conversed with him, and "discovered nothing but what was pure and holy."¹ If further evidence is desired, it was Goodrich who, as Lord Chancellor, signed the order to destroy altars to which we shall refer in due course. He was also one of the commissioners who deprived Bishops Gardiner, Day, Heath, and Tunstall. "Already at the end of the reign of Henry VIII, he had fallen under suspicion of favouring the reformed religion further than the King allowed."¹

Of *Barlow*, now Bishop of Bath and Wells, it is not necessary to add much to what has been said of him in connection with the reign of Henry VIII. We have explained his views on the Christian ministry, and on the Mass. His opinions on the Eucharist in this reign are still Protestant, for he is described by Bishop Hooper, in 1550, as one of those who "entertains right views," i.e., Zwinglian views, "on the Eucharist." And as to the Sacrifice of the Mass, we shall see that in 1548 he declares that "The Oblation and Sacrifice of Christ mentioned in the Mass is *memorial of Christ's only sacrifice on the Cross, once accomplished for ever*" (see p. 350). Strype³ calls him "a married man, and a real friend of the Reformation"

We now come to *Ferrer*, Bishop of St. David's. The *Dictionary of National Biography* says he "became widely known as a gospeller, and was selected to help Cranmer in disputing against Thirlby and Heath. . . . Hooper regarded him as one of the six or seven bishops who 'entertain right opinions on the matter of the Eucharist,' and were in general agreement with the Helvetic churches." Strype calls him "a real professor and friend of the Reformation."⁴ He signed the following declaration: "The Adoration of the Sacrament with honour due to God, the reservation and carrying about of the same, item, the Mass to be a propitiatory Sacrifice for the quick and the dead, or a work which pleases God—all these we confess and believe to be Antichrists doctrine."⁵

Bird, of Chester. The *Dictionary of National Biography* says that he was "a temporiser." But on the other hand, he wrote

¹ *Orig. Letters*, P.S., p. 76.
² *Eccles. Mem.*, II, ii, p. 168.
³ Bradford's writings, 373.

¹ *Dictionary of English Church History*.
² *Eccles. Mem.*, II, ii, p. 173.

two works, *Contra Missam Papisticam*, and *Contra Transubstantiationem*, and in addition, married, so that it seems safe to put him among the Protestants, at least so far as this reign is concerned.

3. OPPORTUNISTS.

We now come to those we have described as "Opportunists." In this class we put bishops of doubtful views, or temporisers, with apparently no settled convictions.

Skip, of Hereford. The *Dictionary of National Biography* writes of him as follows: "From the first, he to some extent favoured the Reformed way of thinking. . . . But despite his support of the Divorce, and his early Protestantism, he was at heart conservatively inclined. . . . He protested against the First Prayer Book, but had a hand, however, in preparing the Second Prayer Book. . . . He was on familiar terms with Parker." Strype says that he was "a forward man once for religion."¹ It would almost seem as if he were a Protestant at heart, with a dash of conservatism.

Sampson, of Lichfield. Strype says of him that "Though a papist, yet he complied so far that he continued bishop throughout Edward's reign." The *Dictionary of National Biography* says that "his general attitude was conservative, and he is said to have supported the six articles." Brewer calls him "a time serving ecclesiastic," and this would seem an apt description.

ChamberSy of Peterborough. The *Dictionary of National Biography* says he was "a safe and conformable person. By timely acquiescence, with only some external modifications, he maintained his position to the end of his life." Gairdner says he was "a serviceable tool." He was reconciled under Mary.

Salcote of Salisbury. "Protestant writers inveigh against him as a time server, and a papist."² Strype says that though a papist, he "made shift to keep in all this king's reign."³

Wakeman, of Gloucester. "An intriguing and servile ecclesiastic."⁴

Wharton, of St. Asaph. He voted for the Communion Book and for the First Prayer Book. He was absent when the Ordinal was voted, but voted *for* the Second Prayer Book. He also married. He was deprived by Queen Mary. Yet Strype says he was "well affected to Popery."

¹ *Eccles. Mem.y* II, ii, p. 171.

² *Diet. of Nat. Bior.*

³ *Diet. of Nat. Biog.*

⁴ *Eccles. Mem.y* II, ii, 167.

⁵ *Eccles. Mem.y* II, ii, 165.

Bulkeley, of Bangor. He was absent from the House of Lords on all occasions when liturgical changes were voted.

Kitchen, of Llandaff. The *Dictionary of Nat. Biography* says "he clung to his bishopric through all changes," and continued through from Henry VIII to Elizabeth.

Of these "opportunists," we might perhaps classify Sampson, Salcot, Chambers, and Wharton, as "Anglo-Catholics," and Skip as a "Protestant," leaving Wakeman, Bulkeley, and Kitchen, as still doubtful. That would make the figures twelve Protestants, twelve Anglo-Catholics, and three doubtful bishops. But as their conduct was not very consistent, it seems preferable to keep them all in this separate class, as "Opportunists."

Thus we may say that *at the beginning of the reign where were eleven Catholic bishops, eight Protestant bishops, and eight Opportunists.*

4. There can be no better indication of what transpired in this short reign of six years than to give a corresponding indication of the state of the episcopal bench at the *end* of the reign. It is as follows :

anglo-catholic party :

Thirlby, Norwich.
Bush, Bristol.

Aldrich, Carlisle.
King, Oxford.

PROTESTANT PARTY :

Cranmer, Canterbury.
Holgate, York.
Goodrich, Ely.
Taylor, Lincoln.
Barlow, Bath and Wells.
Ridley, London.
Ferrer, St. David's.

Poynet, Winchester.
Coverdale, Exeter.
Hooper, Worcester.
Harley, Hereford.
Scory, Chichester.
Bird, Chester.

opportunists :

Sampson, Lichfield.
Chambers, Peterborough.
Salcot, Salisbury.

Wharton, St. Asaph.
Kitchin, Llandaff.

5. Some of these names are new, and hence we must justify our classification of them.

There are no new names in the Anglo-Catholic party.

The following are newcomers in the Protestant ranks :

Taylor, of Lincoln. The *Dictionary of National Biography* says that though he opposed reformed doctrines during the reign

330 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

of Henry VIII, "under Edward VI he was at liberty to assert his real opinions." He was appointed Bishop of Lincoln by letters patent on June 18th, and consecrated by Cranmer on June 26th, 1552. He was deprived by Queen Mary, under circumstances that we shall discuss in due course. He was a thorough-going Protestant.

Poynt, of Winchester. He was, as we shall see, the author of a *Catechism*. In which he clearly denies the doctrine of the Real Presence and the Sacrifice of the Mass.

Coverdale, of Exeter. His views are decidedly Protestant. Thus, speaking of the Mass in his *Defence of a Certain Poor Christian Man*, he says :

"But let us look wherefore they call it a Sacrifice. Even because, say they, that in the Mass, Christ the Son is offered unto God His Father. *Oh, what a great blasphemy is this ! yea to be abhorred of all Christian men !* Why then do they call it a sacrifice, seeing that it is but a *remembrance of a sacrifice ?*"¹

"*This is a sacrament, not a Sacrifice* : for in this, using it as we should, we receive of God oblation and full certificate of Christ's Body broken for our sins, and His Blood shed for our iniquities."²

"Sacrifice" in the Mass he describes as an "abomination," and adds a few unsavoury adjectives to enforce that fairly expressive term.³

Here is a passage from his works on the Real Presence:

"Judge, whether Christ's body be very small, that it can be in so little a room. Judge whether Christ hath more bodies than one, when perchance the priest hath twenty or a hundred before him. Judge whether the priest brake not Christ's body in breaking of it. Judge whether it be seemly to chew Christ's body with the teeth. Judge whether Christ did eat His own body. Yea or no ? Christ did eat the Sacrament with His Disciples. Judge whether it be seemly that Christ should be kept so in prison as they keep Him. Judge whether it be seemly that Christ's body should be so dingle-dangled and used as they use it. Judge whether the people knocking and kneeling at the elevation of what they see (for they see but the forms of bread and wine, and not Christ's body, if it be as the Papists feign). Judge, I say, whether the people by the Papists' own doctrines be not made idolaters."⁴

Hooper, of Gloucester.

His words are at least impressive in the sense that they are those of a man who, in the reign of Mary, refused to fly from

¹ *Works*, p. 470.

² Page 266.

³ Page 267.

⁴ Page 263.

the country, sent his wife home to her German friends, stood his ground, and died for his convictions.

“No man can serve two masters : the religion of God and the superstition of man. Nor can he be saved that trusteth in Christ hanged upon the Cross, and Christ offered in the Mass, for the one is plain contrary to the other.”¹

In his treatise on the *True Doctrine and Use of the Lord's Supper* he describes how “the Pope, the first bom of Antichrist, uses the impious Mass (which he impiously calls the Lord's Supper !), and teaches others to use it.” Throughout the treatise he speaks of these followers of the Pope as “modems” (*neoterici*) and contrasts their teaching with those of the “Ancients,” whom he believes to be in accord with himself and the Reformers. Here are some other quotations :

“We believe and confess that there is no propitiatory Sacrifice from the death of Christ, that is, from the death and besides the death of Christ, there is no such Sacrifice or work that can appease God's wrath and indignation against sin, or obtain His grace for sinners to the remission of their sins. For this Christ once and by Himself did upon the Cross, nor in this kind of propitiatory Sacrifice, which is the price of our ransom from eternal wrath and damnation, does Christ suffer any partner or successor.”²

“Since then we see clearly from the Word of God that Christ once offered Himself for the remission of sins, we know that He cannot be offered by others, nor offered often, as the neoterics pretend. . . . Wherefore their doctrine and impious rites, as a pest, a poison and the bane of our salvation in Christ Jesus, we detest and hold in abhorrence.”³

Speaking of the Coming of Christ at the Last Judgment, he says :

“Until then He will not be corporally with us, nor can He be really offered for the redemption of sins, let the neoterics say what they will.”⁴

Speaking of the Real Presence, he says :

“The bread and the wine in the Supper lose their common use and become the Sacraments of the body and blood of the Lord, but retain their true nature and substance of bread and wine. But the Body and Blood (as far as concerns their substance), of which the bread and wine are the Sacraments, are *neither present nor reside substantially in their Sacraments*. But the body and blood (as far as concerns their corporal presence) are *absent from the signs*, but are *present to those who rightly use the signs offaith*, so

¹ *Sermon on Jonas, Early Writings*, p. 500.
• Page 511.

² *Ibid.*, c. iii.
4 Page 518.

that to those who rightly use them not only the *virtue* of the Sacrament (res sacramenti), *grace*, and God's promises are *represented*, but are confirmed and increased and exhibited in a Sacramental manner. For which benefits, obtained for us by Christ on the Cross, we return thanks to God through Christ ; and we do not offer Christ again to the Father. For Christ alone could offer Christ, which He Himself *did but once upon the Cross, so that neither by Himself nor by any other can He be offered again*⁹¹

The following passage shows how completely Hooper was at one with Cranmer in his conception of the Christian priesthood :

"In very truth, in the holy Supper of the Lord, the Minister of the Church doth not any more offer Christ than do the people who communicate with him. For he as the Minister dispenses to the people the sacred and venerable mysteries of God, and the people ought reverently to receive the same. But nevertheless they are the same mysteries, whether to the Minister or the people, and the *sacraments, tokens, and testimonies* of the body of Christ immolated, for which thanks are to be given by the whole congregation, by the Ministers, and the rest of the communicants ; but *by neither one nor the other can Christ be offered as a Sacrifice for sins.*"¹

"And this is the faith of the Holy Catholic Church. . . . But I admit that this is not the faith of the Catholic Church—that is of the Roman harlot, who is exceedingly Catholic and universal. . . . If anyone will compare the Roman Catholic Churches with the Holy Catholic Church of Christ . . . he will easily see that that Roman Catholic Church has with the Holy Catholic Church of Christ as much connection, society, bond, unity, light as Belial has with Christ."⁸

Incidentally, this gives us a clue to the sense which the Reformers attached to the phrase "Catholic Church" in the Greeds, etc. Thus, Hooper says elsewhere that the Church is "a visible congregation of men and women that hear the Gospel of Christ and use His Sacraments as he hath instituted them. . . . These two marks, the true preaching of God's word and the right use of the Sacraments, declare what and where the true Church is."⁴

It is hardly surprising that a man with these downright and extreme views was, as we shall see, hardly satisfied either with the First Prayer Book or the Ordinal. But of this more anon.

Harley, of Hereford. Strype says he was "a hearty friend to the Reformation," and that "in Queen Mary's reign he instructed his flock in woods and secret places, and administered sacraments according to the order of the English book, lurking

¹ Later Writings, p. 531.
• Page 532.

⁸ Pp. 531-2.
⁴ Later Writings, p. 87.

up and down in the nation, and died in the hard reign of the said Queen.”¹

Scory, of Chichester. We have already pointed out how he publicly denied in 1542 that the Mass is a sacrifice for sins, but said it was only a sacrifice of praise. (Cf. p. 303n.) We need only add here that *Strype* describes him as “a hearty embracer and furtherer of religion.” As we shall see, he fled abroad in the reign of Mary, and returned in Elizabeth’s reign, a thorough Protestant.

There were no new “Opportunists.”

6. Thus at the *end of the reign* there were only *four Anglo-Catholic bishops*, in place of *eleven* at the beginning, and *thirteen Protestant bishops* against *eight* at the beginning, while the “*Opportunists*” are only *five* instead of *eight*. Some bishops, of course, had died during the reign, and some had been deposed, but in any case the result was a *large increase in the Protestant party*, and a *diminishing of the Anglo-Catholic party* to an insignificant and powerless party of *four*. And this change was brought about in the space of *six years*,

We shall see that *all the doctrinal, disciplinary, and liturgical reforms of Edward’s reign were initiated by the Protestant party, and forced through, in spite of the strenuous opposition of the Anglo-Catholic bishops, who were silenced in great measure by deprivation and imprisonment*. The “Opportunist” bishops were guilty of not opposing the changes, and by their silence of condoning them. But they did not always vote in favour of them.

¹ *Eccles. Mem.*, II, ii, p. 171.

CHAPTER III

THE PLAN FOR A PROTESTANT GENERAL COUNCIL

1. The next point we must stress is the fact that *the main point in Cranmer's policy throughout this reign was to try to bring about a General Council of the Protestant Churches, in opposition to the Catholic Council of Trent*, which should draw up a *Protestant liturgy and creed*, to be adopted by all the new Churches.

This idea, of a Council of Protestant Churches, had indeed been under consideration in the previous reign. The first mention is apparently in a letter of Mclanchthon's of November 14th, 1537.¹ It is again mentioned in a letter from Mclanchthon to Henry VIII on March 26th, 1539, in which he writes as follows :

“Opto, ut antea sxpe scripsi, consensum pke doctrix constitui in iis Ecclesiis omnibus quae Romani Episcopi tyrannidem et impietatem damnant.”²

The great Council of Trent, so long mooted, had at last definitely opened in December, 1545, and by the end of January, 1547, had already passed important decrees formulating the Catholic position on the subject of the relation between Scripture and Tradition, and a Decree on Justification, etc., condemning the Protestant errors on this subject. In addition, preliminary discussions had been begun in preparation for decrees on the doctrine of the Sacraments, and the Protestant errors on this subject were being examined. We have shown how, in sessions subsequent to 1547, the Protestant doctrines on the Eucharist and Holy Orders were in due course condemned, and the Catholic doctrine restated and reaffirmed. Thus, in 1547, the Council of Trent was already in being, and could not be ignored.

2. Accordingly, the project was revived of an opposition

¹ *Corpus Reformatorum*, III, 451.

² *Corpus Reformatorum* III, 672. Obviously, then, this is not the first occasion on which the idea was mooted, as stated by Hardwick (*History of the Articles*, p. 77).

council of the Reformers.¹ It must be remembered in this connection that the *Continental Reformers*, together with their English colleagues, *claimed to be the true Catholics*, as opposed to the corrupt Catholics, “Papiculi,” “sacrificuli,” “Pontificii,” or “anti-christi” of Rome. It now occurred to Cranmer that this Council might well be held in England. Many of the foreign Reformers had already begun to come to England by December, 1547.² The firstcomers were Peter Martyr, the apostate Augustinian Canon; Bernardino Ochino, formerly a Capuchin friar; and John Tricellio, a converted Italian Jew. Amongst others who followed were Dryander, a Spanish Lutheran; V. Poullain, who had succeeded Calvin as pastor of the French church at Strassburg, Fagius, John a Lasco, and lastly, the great Martin Bucer himself, who, as we shall see, came in 1549, and after spending three months with Cranmer, was appointed to the chair of Divinity at Cambridge (Peter Martyr had been appointed to the corresponding chair at Oxford).

Cranmer accordingly wrote as follows to John a Lasco in July, 1548:

“We are desirous of setting forth in our churches the true doctrine of God . . . so that there may not only be set forth among all nations an illustrious testimony respecting our doctrine, delivered by the grave authority of learned and godly men, but that all posterity may have a pattern to imitate. For the purpose of carrying this important design into execution, we have thought it necessary to have the assistance of learned men, who having

• As Mr. Gairdner puts it, “Cranmer, it is evident, believed that by such consultations with learned foreigners in England it would be possible to set forth a scheme of theology no less weighty than that of the Council of Trent” (*Lollardy*, iii, 72). Here is Mr. Smyth’s account of Cranmer’s plan:

“If Melancthon, Bucer, and a Lasco could also be induced to come and to join with these other foreigners in conversations with the leaders of the Church of England they might draw up a formulary of faith that would command general obedience and a liturgy that would be adopted by all the Protestant Churches of Europe. . . . The conference was to effect a coalition of the moderate parties and to found a centre party upon a basis of uniformity of creed and ritual. The leading role was inevitably allotted to Melancthon. The Swiss were not represented, partly because Cranmer had no sympathy for their theology, and partly because they had wrecked so many conferences by their uncompromising temper, but it was vaguely hoped that they would accept the findings of this council if unanimous.

“The first essential was to persuade Melancthon to come. . . . But he showed an unaccountable reluctance. Cranmer wrote to him at least three times, urging him to come: he made Justus Jonas the younger, who was then in England, write to him to the same purpose; he wrote to k Lasco and to Hardenburg, begging them to persuade him to come at all costs. Melancthon sent two replies conveying his warm approval of the proposed Conference, but made the childish pretext of not observing that he had been invited to it.” (Cranmer, p. 39.)

• Strype, *Mem.*, ii, 78: “I find divers thw year at Canterbury: Utenhovius, pollanus.....”

compared their opinions together with us, may do away with doctrinal controversies, and build up an entire system of true doctrine. We have therefore invited both yourself and some other learned men, and as they have come over to us without reluctance, so that we scarcely have to regret the absence of any of them, with the exception of yourself and Mclanchthon, we earnestly request you, both to come yourself, and if possible to bring Mclanchthon with you. I am now sending a third letter to Mclanchthon, in which I exhort him to come to us.”¹

A similar letter was sent to Albert Hardenberg in the same month, and in October, 1548, Buccr was invited, but did not then come. Mclanchthon was written to again in February, 1549 :

“I am aware that you have often desired that wise and godly men should take counsel together, and having compared their opinions, send forth under the sanction of their authority some work that should embrace the chief subjects of ecclesiastical doctrine and transmit the truth uncorrupted to posterity. This object we are anxiously endeavouring to accomplish to the utmost of our power. We therefore request you to communicate your counsel and opinions with us in person.”²

3. Mclanchthon wrote warmly approving of the scheme, but never came himself. However, Cranmer did not give up the idea, and constantly renewed his invitations. He made yet further attempts in 1552 to bring about the proposed Protestant Council, as the following letters show :

Cranmer to Calvin, March 20th, 1552.

“As nothing tends more injuriously to the separation of the churches than heresies and disputes respecting the doctrines of religion, so nothing tends more effectually to unite the churches of God, and more powerfully to defend the fold of Christ, than the pure teaching of the Gospel and harmony of doctrine. Wherefore I have often wished, and continue to do so, that learned and godly men, who are eminent for erudition and judgment, might meet together in some place of safety, where by taking counsel together, and comparing their respective opinions, they might handle all the heads of ecclesiastical doctrine, and hand down to posterity, under the weight of their authority, some work not only upon the subjects themselves, but upon the forms of expressing them. Our adversaries are now holding their council at Trent for the establishment of their errors, and shall we neglect to call together a godly synod, for the refutation of error, and for restoring and propagating the truth ? They are, as I am informed, making decrees respecting the worship of the host ; wherefore we ought to leave no stone unturned, not only that we may guard others against this idolatry, but also that we may ourselves come to an agreement upon the doctrine of this sacrament. It cannot escape

¹ Cranmer's *Letters*, P.S., p. 422.

² *Letters*, P.S., p. 426.

your prudence how exceedingly the church of God has been injured by dissensions and varieties of opinion respecting this sacrament of unity, and though they are now in some measure removed, yet I could wish for an agreement in this doctrine, not only as regards the subject itself, but also with respect to the words and forms of expression. You have now my wish, about which I have also written to masters Philip (Melanchthon) and Bullinger; and I pray you to deliberate among yourselves as to the means by which this synod can be assembled with the greatest convenience.”¹

A letter was sent to Bullinger, on the same lines, suggesting England for the proposed council.² A letter from Cranmer to Melanchthon on March 27th, 1552, also suggests England :

“ It is to be desired that the members of *the True Church* [N.B.] should agree among themselves upon the chief heads of ecclesiastical doctrine. . . . It cannot escape your notice how greatly religious dissensions, especially in the matter of the Lord’s Supper, have rent the Churches asunder. . . . It is truly grievous that the sacrament of unity is made by the malice of the devil food for disagreement, and, as it were, the apple of contention. I could wish therefore that those who excel others in erudition and judgment should be assembled together after the example of the Apostles, and declare their judgment, as well respecting other subjects of dispute, as likewise especially respecting this controversy, and attest their agreement [!] by some published document.

“ The King places England at your disposal. . . . You wrote me word in your last letter that the Axeopagites of the Council of Trent are making decrees respecting the worship of the host. Wherefore, since the adversaries of the gospel meet together with so much zeal for the establishment of error, we must not allow them to be more diligent in confirming ungodliness than we are in propagating and setting forth the doctrine of godliness.”

Here is Calvin’s reply :

Calvin to Cranmer, Geneva, April, 1552.

“ You truly and wisely judge that in the present state of the church no more suitable remedy can be adopted than the assembling together of godly and discreet men . . . who shall openly profess their agreement in the doctrines of religion. . . . The hireling dogs of the pope are barking unceasingly, that the pure word of Christ may not be heard. . . . It is too well known by what reveries Osiander is deceiving himself and fascinating certain other persons. . . .

“ I wish it could be effected, that grave and learned men from the principal churches might meet together at a place appointed, and after diligent consideration of each article of faith, hand down to posterity a definite form of doctrine according to their united opinion. . . . I shall not shrink from crossing ten seas, if need be,

¹ *Letters, P.S.*, p. 433.

² *Letters, P.S.*, p. 431.

344 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

for that object. . . . But I hope my want of ability will occasion me to be excused. I shall have sufficiently performed my duty if I follow up with my prayers what shall be undertaken by others. . . . I not only exhort, but implore you to persevere, until at least something be effected.”¹

4. Cranmer's scheme was, then, for *a coalition of Protestant Churches—forming the true Catholic Church*—which should present a united front and an agreed dogma and ritual, in opposition to the “pseudo-Catholicism” then being defined at Trent. All this is of the greatest importance for the right interpretation of the Reformation movement in England during this reign. The idea did not, indeed, materialise in this reign, but it was again mooted in the reign of Elizabeth, and it has throughout formed a dominant factor in ecclesiastical policy in England.

¹ *Orig. Lett.*, p. 713-4.

CHAPTER IV

THE FIRST STEPS

- A. THE ROYAL VISITATION.
- B. THE MARRIAGE OF THE CLERGY.
- C. THE QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE MASS.

A. THE ROYAL VISITATION.

1. The first event of the new reign was the resolution by the Council that "whereas all bishops of the realm had authority of spiritual jurisdiction by force of instruments under the seal appointed *ad res ecclesiasticas* . . . it is thought convenient the same authority *be renewed unto them* ; it was therefore ordained . . . that they should cause new instruments to be drawn up *in form of the others they had before*" The new commissions like those of the previous reign (see p. 238), professed that "all ecclesiastical, as well as secular, jurisdiction proceeds from die King." Also the bishops were given therein the royal licence to ordain :

"Damus et concedimus per prasentes quod praefatus Episcopus libere, licite et quiete possit et valeat quoscunque clerios idoneos infra diocesem . . . ad omnes etiam sacros et presbyteratus ordines legitime ordinare et promovere."¹

2. In May, 1547, royal commissioners were sent throughout the country, partly clerical and partly lay, with power to summon all before them, including the bishops. They were given certain "godly injunctions," drawn up "by the advice of sundry bishops and others the best learned men of the realm."² King Edward, in his *Diary*, says that these injunctions "took away divers ceremonies, and commissioners were sent to take down images, and certain homilies were set forth to be read in the Church."³ Various alterations of a minor kind were made in the Church services, but others were not to be made "until

¹ Rymer, *Foederat*: xv, 221.

² Jetter, June 30th, 1547, in *Council Book*, I, p. 357.

³ Burnet, II, ii, p. 4.

such time as the same shall be otherwise ordered by the King's authority."

3. One result of this royal visitation was the imprisonment of Bishop Gardiner, of Winchester, and also, for a week, of Bishop Bonner of London as well. The Council Book states that "the Bishop of Winchester . . . having refused to receive the injunctions and homilies, because, as he said on being examined by their lordships thereupon, they contained things dissident with the Word of God, so as his conscience would not suffer him to accept them, was sent . . . to the Fleet."¹ He was released for the time being on January 7th, 1548.

It was on the occasion of this Visitation that Cranmer sent for the registrar, gave him certain instructions for the commissioners, and revealed the fact that in the last year of Henry's reign he had been commissioned by the King to prepare a form for turning the Mass into a Communion (see p. 306). And in the course of the same statement, Cranmer said :

"It was better to attempt such reformation in King Henry the VIII his days, than at this time, the king being in his infancy. For if the king's father had set forth any thing for the reformation of abuses, who was he that durst gainsay it? Marry, we are now in doubt how men will take the change or alteration of abuses in the church, and therefore the council hath forborne especially to speak thereof, and of other things which gladly they would have reformed in this visitation, referring all those ana such-like matters to the discretion of the visitors."

All this explains why and how the liturgical and doctrinal reformation was proceeded with gradually, and by degrees, in Edward's reign. The goal—the Protestantising of the Church—was aimed at from the outset, but the work was accomplished by degrees. Accordingly, we shall find first a Communion Office for communion under both kinds, inserted in the Latin Mass, then a Prayer Book in which the outward semblance of the Mass is to some extent retained, while its essential doctrines are excluded, and finally a new Prayer Book which is thoroughly and definitely Protestant in character. And between the First and Second Prayer Book a new Protestant Ordinal will be drawn up, in which some slight concessions will be made to Anglo-Catholic ideas and customs—the giving of the instruments to the priest and the pastoral staff to the bishop, and so on—which will be abandoned in the Ordinal in the Second Prayer Book. But all this will be made clear in its proper place.

¹ *Council Book*, Sept. 25th, 1547.

B THE MARRIAGE OF THE CLERGY.

1. The next point we must mention is the abolition of clerical celibacy. The first Convocation in the reign met on November 5th, 1547, and on December 17th a proposition was submitted abolishing all canons, statutes, etc., against clerical marriage. This was carried by 53 votes to 22. Meanwhile, Parliament had met on November 4th, and on December 19th a Bill was introduced into the House of Commons allowing married men to become priests and to hold benefices. This was read twice, and then sent to the Lords, but here it met with delay. On December 23rd, however, an Act was passed which, *inter alia*, abolished the statute of the Six Articles. That was all that could be done in that session. But in the second Parliament, which met on November 24th, 1548, a Bill allowing married men to be ordained was again introduced. It was read a first time on December 3rd, and again on the 5th and 6th. But on the 7th a revised Bill was introduced, allowing marriage to those already in orders. This was passed, and sent to the Lords on December 13th. Here it met again with delay, but was finally passed on February 19th, 1549. We are told that the Bill was passed, the following dissenting! :

Bonner, Bishop of London	- Anglo-Catholic.
Tunstall, Durham	- Anglo-Catholic.
Rugg, Norwich	- Anglo-Catholic.
Aldrich, Carlisle -	- Anglo-Catholic.
Heath, Worcester	- Anglo-Catholic.
Bush, Bristol	- Anglo-Catholic.
Day, Chichester -	- Anglo-Catholic.
Kitchen, Llandaff	- Opportunist.

The other bishops present were :

Cranmer, Canterbury -	- Protestant.
Holgate, York -	- Protestant.
Goodrich, Ely -	- Protestant.
Barlow, Bath and "Wells	- Protestant.
Holbeach, Lincoln	- Protestant.
Ridley, Rochester	- Protestant.
Ferrar, St. David's	- Protestant.
Salcot, Salisbury -	- Opportunist.
Sampson, Coventry	- Opportunist.
Skip, Hereford -	- Opportunist.
Thirlby, Westminster -	- Anglo-Catholic.

Obviously most, if not all, of these voted for the relaxation of clerical celibacy, but in the absence of a definite statement,

we cannot say with certainty that Thirlby of Westminster voted with the Protestant majority. He may have abstained from voting, and the same may apply to the Opportunists. It must be remembered that there were no less than 31 lay lords present on this occasion, as well as the bishops, so that there was no difficulty in getting a majority for the Bill, as apparently all the lay lords were in favour of it.

2. It is estimated that about one-fifth or one-sixth of the clergy of England took advantage of this legislation, and married.¹ It is impossible to give an *absolute* estimate of the number. There were, apparently, between eight and ten thousand benefices in England at that time? But in the beginning of Edward's reign the number of priests would doubtless be much greater than the number of benefices, owing to the number of religious who had been secularised in the previous reign. Archbishop Parker said that there were sixteen thousand clergy in England at the beginning of the reign of Mary.² That of course may be exaggerated, but twelve thousand would not, perhaps, be very far from the truth. And of these, we may safely say that about two thousand married.³

As to the *bishops*, there were at that time twenty-seven sees in England,⁴ and of course there were also a number of suffragan bishops. Of the twenty-seven diocesan bishops, apparently eleven married, Cranmer, Holgate, Poynet, Scory, Barlow, Bush, Hooper, Harley, Ferrar, Bird, and Coverdale. (Cranmer, of course, had married in Henry's reign.) Thus the inferior clergy were on the whole more faithful to their vows than the bishops.

C. THE QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE MASS.

1. In preparation for the liturgical changes, a questionnaire was submitted to certain bishops and divines early in Edward's reign.⁵ The questions, and replies, are printed in Pocock's *Burnet*, V, 197 *et seq.*⁶

¹ See Frere, *Marian Reaction*, pp. 52, 54.

² See Birt, *Elizabethan Religious Settlement*, p. 189.

³ According to H. G. Lea, *History of Sacerdotal Celibacy*, ch. xxvi, p. 412, 1932 edn.

⁴ Certainly not twelve thousand, as Parker thought (*apud* Lea, *op. cit.*).

⁵ Six of these were new sees, created by Henry VIII in 1541, namely, Bristol, Gloucester, Oxford, Peterborough, Chester and Westminster.

⁶ The exact date is uncertain. It was sent out most probably at the end of the year 1547, or the beginning of 1548. See Brightman and Mackenzie, in *Liturgy and Worship*, p. 153; Gasquet and Bishop, *Edward VI and B. C. P.*, p. 85.

⁷ Pocock's *Burnet* obviously prints some of the answers out of their proper place. I here attach them to the proper questions.

The questions were drawn up by Cranmer, whose original manuscript is in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.¹ His object evidently was "to see the amount of sympathy that he might expect in the policy which he had now in view, of changing the Mass into a Communion Service."²

The first question is as follows : " Whether the sacrament of the altar was instituted to be received of one man for another, or to be received of every man for himself? " To this all reply that each individual should receive for himself.

The second question carries the matter a little further : " Whether the receiving of the said sacrament of one man do avail and profit any other? " The answers to this are mostly in the negative, though some bishops remark that, in virtue of the doctrine of the mystical body, a good communion may avail for other members of the Church. Aldrich, Bishop of Carlisle, distinguishes between the " receiving of the sacrament," which benefits only the recipient, and " the thing which is sacred, offered and distributed," " which availeth and profiteth all present, absent, live and dead." The Bishop of Bristol (Bush) says that the receiving must be profitable to another, and appeals to St. Cyprian.

2. The third question is a more serious one: " What is the oblation and sacrifice of Christ in the Mass? "

We will this time classify the answers, giving first the *Protestant* replies.

(a) *Cranmer* replies as follows :

" The oblation and sacrifice of Christ in the Mass is so called, *not because Christ indeed is there offered and sacrificed by the priest and the people ffor that was done but once by himself upon the Cross*, but it is so called because it is a *memory and representation* of that very true sacrifice and immolation which before was made upon the Cross."

Goodrich, of Ely, replies thus :

" If oblation be taken *pro re oblata*, then, as ancient doctors write, it is *corpus et sanguis Christi verum et corpus Christi mysticum*. If ye take it *pro actu offerendi*, it is a *commemoration* and a *representation* of Christ's death once suffered upon the Cross, with thanksgiving for the same."³

Ridley, Bishop of Rochester, says :

"The representation and commemoration of Christ's death

¹ 105, ff. 230-1.

² Gairdner, *Lollardy*, III, 77.

³ This sounds fairly orthodox. But Goodrich adds : " *Hax jam mea est opinio sed sic ut audios mehonbus cedam.*" Subsequent events show that he soon came round to the Protestant view completely.

35° THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

and passion, said and done in the Mass, is called the sacrifice, oblation, or immolation of Christ, *non rei veritate* (as learned men do write) *sed significandi mysterio*."

Holbeach, Bishop of Lincoln, answers :

" *There is properly no oblation nor sacrifice, but a remembrance of the one oblation of Christ upon the Cross, made once for all* ; a giving of thanks for the same, and the prayer of the public minister for the whole congregation ; which prayer only taketh effect in them which by their own proper faith receive the benefit of Christ ; and where many of those authors do say there is an oblation and sacrifice, they speak so because in this sacrament we be admonished of the oblation and sacrifice of Christ upon the cross."

Barlow, Bishop of St. David's replies :

" The oblation and sacrifice of Christ mentioned in the Mass, is *a memorial of Christ's only sacrifice upon the cross, once offered for ever* ; *Unica enim oblatione, perfectos efficit in perpetuum eos qui sanctificantur.* Hebr. X."

Dr. Cox answers :

" The oblation of the sacrifice of Christ in the Mass is the prayer, the praise, the thanksgiving, and *the remembrance of Christ's passion and death.*"

Dr. Taylor:

" *There is no oblation*, speaking properly ; but some ancient doctors, and the use of the Church, calleth the receiving of it, with the circumstances then done, an oblation ; that is to say, *a memorial and remembrance* of Christ's most precious oblation upon the cross."

As we have put **Holgate**, Archbishop of York, among the Protestant Bishops in our classification, for reasons there given, we include his answer here among the Protestant answers, though in point of fact on this occasion he gives an orthodox answer, very similar to that of Tunstall, and possibly due to his influence :

" The oblation and sacrifice of Christ in the Mass is the presenting of the very body and blood of Christ to the heavenly Father, under the forms of bread and wine, consecrated in the remembrance of His passion, with prayer and thanksgiving for the universal Church."

(b) Here are some Anglo-Catholic answers :

Tunstall, Bishop of Durham :

" The oblation and sacrifice of Christ in the Mass is the presenting of Christ by the priest, in commemoration of His Passion, being our eternal and permanent sacrifice, present in the sacrament

by His omnipotent word, left to us, to have His death and passion in remembrance, with giving of thanks for the same, and prayer of the minister and them which be present, that the same may be available to the whole church of Christ, both quick and dead in the faith of Christ."

Aldrich, Bishop of Carlisle :

"The oblation and sacrifice of Christ in the Mass is even the same which was of Christ in the Cross, ever and everywhere abiding and enduring of like strength, virtue and power. The difference is, that on the Cross Christ being there both priest and sacrifice, offered Himself visibly ; and in the Mass, being likewise both priest and sacrifice, offereth Himself invisibly, by the common minister of the church, which in the name and stead of the whole faithful congregation offereth and presenteth, as he is bid and commanded by Christ."

A joint reply is given by the following bishops : *Bonner* of London, *Heath* of Worcester, *Skip* of Hereford, *Rugg* of Norwich, *Day* of Chichester, and *Wharton* of St. Asaph. (Of these, we have classified Skip and Wharton as Opportunists, and the rest as Catholics) :

"I think it is the presentation of the very body and blood of Christ being really present in the sacrament; which presentation the priest maketh at the Mass, in the name of the Church, unto God the Father, in memory of Christ's passion and death upon the Cross, with thanksgiving therefore and devout prayer that all Christian people, and namely they which spiritually join with the Priest in the said oblation, and of whom he maketh special remembrance, may attain the benefit of the said Passion."

Bush of Bristol replied as follows :

"It is in giving thanks unto the Father, as Christ did Himself at the supper, taking the bread and wine into His hands, and with the words of consecration consecrating the same, and then making presentation of the very body and blood of Christ unto God the Father. . . ."

(c) Coming now to the other Opportunists, *Salcot* of Salisbury, who, as we have said, had Catholic sympathies, replied as follows:

"The oblation made after the consecration in the Mass, is the offering unto the Father of the body and blood of Christ, by the minister, with the commemoration of the passion, and with thanksgiving for the same, and with the prayer of the minister and people that it may be available to all Christian people."

Sampson of Coventry and Lichfield, who also had Catholic sympathies, replied :

"I suppose the very oblation and sacrifice of Christ in the Mass is this : that after the benediction, that is to say, the words of

consecration spoken by the priest, and the divine working of Christ presently, by the which there is the very precious body and the precious blood of Christ present to be so received ; then the priest offereth up the holy memory of our redemption to God the Father, most humbly praying that as it was once offered up by Christ upon the Cross, for the redemption of mankind, so it may take effect now, and at all times, especially in those that with a true faith with a full trust and hope, shall so worthily receive it."

Thus, the answers reveal definitely Protestant views in Cranmer, Ridley, Holbcach, Barlow, and two Doctors, temporarily orthodox replies from Holgate and Goodrich, and orthodox replies from seven Anglo-Catholic and four Opportunist bishops.

3. The fourth question is : " Wherein consisteth the Mass by Christ's institution ? "

To this *Cranmer* replies that

" it consisteth in those things which be set forth in the evangelists."

Barlow says :

" Christ's institution compriseth no more in the Mass than the Communion of His body and blood, to be ministered and received under both kinds of bread and wine."

Dr. Cox, a Reforming divine, says :

" The Mass by Christ's institution, consisteth in thanksgiving to the Father, in distributing of the body and blood of Christ to the congregation to have the death and passion of Christ in remembrance, and in the end to laud and praise God."

Dr. Taylor, another Reformer, says :

" In giving of thanks to God the Father, and blessing and breaking it, and reverently receiving the holy sacraments, with all such rites and circumstances as Christ did, in both the kinds."

Holgate, Archbishop of York, again gives an orthodox reply:

" The Mass by Christ His institution, consisteth in the consecration and oblation of the very body and blood of Christ, with prayer, thanksgiving, and receiving of the same."

Ridley of Rochester, *Goodrich* of Ely, and *Holbeach* of Lincoln refer to the Gospels, and also to i Corinthians x and xi, and Acts ii.

Of the Anglo-Catholic bishops, *Tunstall* of Durham answers as follows :

" The Mass, by Christ's institution, consisteth in those things which be set forth by the evangelists . . . with humble and contrite confession, the oblation of Christ, as before ; the receiving of the sacrament, giving of thanks therefore, and common prayer for the mystical body of Christ."

Aldrich, Bishop of Carlisle :

“ The Mass, by Christ’s institution, consisteth in consecrating, offering, and distributing of the blessed body and blood of our Saviour Jesu Christ according to that He Himself did, willed, and commanded to be done. . . . But because Christ was, after His resurrection, long with His disciples, communicating and treating of the kingdom of God, what should be done here to come thither, it may be well thought that whatsoever He or His Holy Spirit left with the Apostles, and they with other after, which also the whole universal congregation of Christian people useth and observeth, most ancient and holy doctors in like form noteth, may likewise be said and taken as of Christ’s institution.”

Bonner of London, *Heath* of Worcester, *Skip* of Hereford, *Thirlby* of Norwich, *Day* of Chichester, and *Wharton* of St. Asaph send a joint reply :

“ It consisteth principally in the consecration, oblation and receiving of the body and blood of Christ, with prayers and thanksgiving, but what the prayers were, and what rites Christ used or commanded at the first institution of the Mass, the scripture dedareth not.”

Bush of Bristol says :

“ The Mass by Christ’s institution consisteth in those things and rights set forth in the first three Gospels, the tenth and eleventh chapters of First Corinthians, and in Acts ch. ii.”

Of the Opportunists, besides *Skip* and *Wharton* already mentioned, *Salcot* gives Scripture references similar to those of *Bush* of Bristol.

Sampson, of Coventry and Lichfield (Opportunist with Catholic sympathies), replies :

“ The Mass, by Christ’s institution, only expressing the form of Christ by the Scripture, consisteth in the taking of the bread and giving thanks to God the Father, in the benediction and consecration, in the receiving or distribution and receiving of them, to whom the distribution is made by the hands of the priest, as the eldest authors affirmeth, in the renewing of the memory of our redemption by an undoubted faith, and for that to give most humble thanks, so calling to remembrance, as often as it is thus done, the inestimable benefit of our redemption.”

The division in the answers is not so marked in this question, which hardly lends itself to much difference of opinion.

4. The fifth question asks, “ What time the accustomed order began first in the Church, that the priest alone should receive the sacrament.” *Cranmer* replies that it began “ not within six or seven hundred years after Christ.” The Bishops of London, Worcester, Hereford, Norwich, Chichester, and St. Asaph

354 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

(mostly Anglo-Catholics) say they know no such further order or commandment of the Church, but “ what time the devotion of the people was so greatly decayed that they would not come to receive the sacrament, then the priests were compelled to receive it alone.” Bush of Bristol sends the same reply.

The sixth question asks, “ Whether it be convenient that the same custom continue still within this realm ? ”

To this both parties say that if possible the laity should be persuaded to communicate more frequently. The Anglo-Catholics take care to add that “ if none will come to receive it, it is lawful and convenient that the priests may say Mass and receive the sacrament alone.”

5. The seventh question asks, “ Whether it be convenient that Masses satisfactory should continue, that is to say, priests hired to sing for souls departed ? ”

This is a much more significant question. The Protestant party reply of course that these Masses should not be continued. Thus *Cranmer* :

“ I think it not convenient.”

Holbeach :

“ St. Paul saith, Heb. x, that ‘ We are made holy by the offering of the body of Jcsu Christ once for all,* and Heb. ix, that ‘ Christ by His own blood entered in once into the holy place and found eternal redemption,’ which redemption and satisfaction, unless we think it insufficient, it were meet masses satisfactory to be taken away.”

Goodrich of Ely replies :

“ It is one thing to sing satisfactory, and another to be hired to sing Mass for the souls departed, for the first importeth that the Mass should be a satisfaction for the sins of the soul departed, which is not so ; but the second, that is, to sing or pray for the souls departed, is a laudable custom, and seemeth to have some ground in Scripture, which custom hath been always continued from the Apostles* time, and hath been used in the Mass, as appeareth by ancient doctors . . . and therefore this to continue I think it meet. But to say Mass for money, thinking it a commutation or a just compensation betwixt the prayer and the money that he is hired for, I think it soundeth to avarice and simony, and yet *dignus est operarius mercede sua.*”

This denies that the Mass is a satisfaction for the sins of the souls departed, but will allow prayer for the dead, even in the Mass, and some kind of honorarium for this purpose.

Ridley of Rochester replies like *Cranmer*, that it is “ not con-

venient" that Masses satisfactory should continue to be sung for souls departed by priests hired thereunto.

Dr. Cox replies that "sith Christ is the only satisfaction for all sin," "Masses to be said for satisfaction of sin is an abuse not to be continued, and priests to be hired only to sing for souls departed seemeth to be a superfluous function."

The Anglo-Catholic party, of course, defend the practice, and at the same time explain it.

Thus *Tunstall* of Durham: "All priests saying Mass be bound in the same to pray for the whole mystical body of Christ, quick and dead, though they be not hired thereto," and remarks that as St. Paul says, "Those that be partakers of spiritual things with other, ought to minister unto them temporal things in recompense."

Bonner of London, *Heath* of Worcester, *Skip* of Hereford, *Rugg* of Norwich, *Day* of Chichester, and *Wharton* of St. Asaph again send in a joint reply:

"Such of the schoolmen as do write of Masses satisfactory do define them otherwise than is declared in this question. Nevertheless, it is not against the word of God but that priests praying in the Mass both for the quick and the dead, and doing other things in the Church about the ministration of the sacraments, may take a living for the same."

Aldrich of Carlisle repudiates the notion that

"any action of the priest, or other, should be a full and perfect satisfaction of sins venial and mortal. . . . The full and perfect satisfaction of all manner of sins is to be attributed only to Christ His passion and justification. Nevertheless priests be ordered to say and sing their Mass having in their remembrance both generally and specially, as shall most appertain both the live and dead, and then, as they be worthy, must have their living by the altar which they serve, as St. Paul at large declareth."

6. The eighth question asks "whether the gospel ought to be taught at the time of the Mass, to the understanding of the people being present." This is interpreted to mean some kind of sermon or doctrinal exposition. Both parties defend this, but the Anglo-Catholic party remark that "the Mass may be done without it, and it done at other times as well as at the Mass."

The ninth question asks "whether in the Mass it were convenient to use such speech as the people may understand," i.e., whether Mass should be said in the vulgar tongue.

The Anglo-Catholic party defend the use of Latin, while the Protestant party advocate the use of English. *Cranmer*, however,

35^ THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

makes an exception for "certain secret mysteries, whereof I doubt."

The tenth question asks "when the reservation of the sacrament first began?" *Cranmer* says it began "six or seven hundred years after Christ." *Dr. Cox* ascribes it to the time of Ambrose, and *Holbeach* of Lincoln to the time of Innocent the Third. There are no other replies.

The eleventh question is, "When the hanging up of the same first began?"

Cranmer says "it began of late time," and *Dr. Cox* does not know either when it began, or for what purpose. No other answers are extant.

7. There are some answers also extant to some supplementary questions which were addressed to the Bishops of Worcester (Cath.), Chichester (Cath.) and Hereford (Opportunist), whose replies were evidently regarded as unsatisfactory. Here are the ones which interest us :

Question : "What thing is the presentation of the body and blood of Christ in the Mass, which you call the oblation and sacrifice of Christ? and wherein standeth it, in act, gesture, or words? and in what act, gesture, or words?"

Answer : "The presentation, etc., standeth in such words, prayers, supplications and actions as the priest useth at the Mass, having the body and blood of Christ there present in the sacrament."

Question : "Is there any rite or prayer not expressed in Scripture which Christ used or commanded at the first institution of the Mass, which we be now bound to use, and what the same be?"

Answer : "That Christ used rites and prayers at the institution and distribution of the sacrament, the Scripture declareth, but what rites and prayers they were we know not, but I think that we ought to use such rites and prayers as the Catholic Church hath, and doth uniformly observe."

Question : "Whether in the primitive Church there were any priests that lived by saying of Mass, mattins and evensong, and praying for souls only? And whether any such state of priesthood be allowed in the Scripture, or be meet to be allowed now?"

Answer : "There were priests in the primitive Church which preached not, but exercised themselves in prayer for the quick and the dead, and other spiritual ministrations in the Church; and accustomedly used common prayers both morning and evening, and such state of priesthood is not against the Scripture."

Question : "For what cause it were not expedient nor convenient to have the whole Mass in English?"

Answer : "The question is answered by Dionisius and Basill . . . and also an uniformity of all churches in that thing is to be kept."

8. To these three Bishops, Cranmer sent further question. Here are the most important ones :

"Whether the presentation of the body and blood of Christ in the Mass do stand in all the words and actions that the priest useth in the Mass ? And if not, then in which of them it standeth ?

"Whether we may change those rites and ceremonies of the Mass which we now use ?

"Why may we not as well alter the Mass into the English tongue, or alter the ceremonies of the same, as we alter the communion to be under both kinds, which in other churches is uniformly ministered to the people under one kind, seeing that the uniformity of all churches requircth not more the uniformity in one than in the other ? ni

The last question is interesting, as showing the logical result of the disclaiming of uniformity in rites and ceremonies which had already taken place in the reign of Henry VIII (see pp. 255, 293).

There is no record of any replies to these questions.

¹ Cranmer, *Remamr*, P.S., p. 153.

CHAPTER V

THE “COMMUNION BOOK”

1. The first liturgical reform to be carried out was the provision of a new rite for giving Communion under both kinds, to be incorporated, for the time being, in the Latin Mass. The first Parliament of the reign assembled, as we have said, on November 4th, 1547. A “Bill for the Sacrament of the Altar” was read in the Lords on November 12th, 15th, and 17th. On November 26th, a Bill “for the receiving of the Sacrament *sub utraque specie*” was read. It would seem that the first Bill was intended to curb the growing irreverence towards the Blessed Sacrament, which was being called “Jack in the box, with other divers shameful names.”¹ The second Bill was to authorise Communion under both Kinds. The promoters of this second measure evidently thought it would be a good idea to combine these two Bills into one, for in this way the Anglo-Catholic bishops might be induced to consent to Communion under both kinds, in order to suppress the insults to the Blessed Sacrament. Accordingly, one Bill covering the two purposes was introduced on December 7th and read again on December 10th.

2. This Bill was passed by the Lords, but even so, there was a significant division of opinion among the Bishops. It would seem that ten bishops voted for the measure, as follows³ :

Cranmer (Prot.),
 Goodrich of Ely (Prot.),
 Barlow of St. David's (Prot.),
 Holbeach of Lincoln (Prot.),
 Ridley of Rochester (Prot.),
 Tunstall of Durham (Anglo-Cath.),
 Aldrich of Carlisle (Anglo-Cath.),
 Bush of Bristol (Anglo-Cath.),
 Salcot of Salisbury (Opportunist),
 Wharton of St. Asaph (Opportunist).⁸

¹ *Greyfriars Chronicle*, p. 54, quoted in Gasquet and Bishop, *op. cit.*, p. 69.

² *House of Lords Journals*, Vol. I.

³ Gasquet and Bishop, *op. cit.*, p. 71-2 ; H. A. Wilson, *The Order of the Communion*, p. ix. Henry Bradshaw Society.

The following voted against the Bill :

Bonner of London (Anglo-Cath.),
Rugg of Norwich (Anglo-Cath.),
Heath of Worcester (Anglo-Cath.),
Day of Chichester (Anglo-Cath.),
Skip of Hereford (Opportunist).

Gairdner remarks that "no less than eleven bishops of the old school, including Gardiner who was in prison, were absent without proxies, so that the five whose dissent to it is recorded by no means represented the strength of the feeling against it entertained by the Bench."¹ Gasquet and Bishop similarly say that "on looking at the list of absentees, there does not seem to have been one amongst them who can fairly be classed among the advocates of change."²

In any case, one might infer that those three Anglo-Catholic Bishops who apparently voted for the Bill did so because, at any rate, it would put down irreverence to the Blessed Sacrament, and because after all. Communion under both kinds was merely a matter of discipline. It is only fair to point out that there is no evidence that these bishops knew of the actual contents of the new rite, which was not published till three or four months later. Nor is there any evidence that they had any part in its composition. It remains true that, on the whole, the Anglo-Catholic bishops were opposed to the Bill, and the Protestant bishops in favour of it.

3. The Bill passed the Lords on December 10th. On December 2nd, "the form of an ordinance" as to Communion under both kinds, signed by sixteen members out of forty-eight present on November 30th, was approved by Convocation *viva voce*. Mr. Wilson conjectures that this was "a draft or summary of the Bill introduced into the House of Lords . . . not the form which was afterwards issued as the ³ Order of Communion?"⁴

4. A week after the passing of the Act by Parliament, a Royal Proclamation was issued, forbidding irreverent language towards the Sacrament. But Dr. Darwell Stone significantly remarks that while this

"was evidently directed primarily against the successors of the Lollards, and the shocking profanities of which they were guilty in their ridicule of the doctrine of the Eucharist held in the Church

¹ Lollardy iii, 52-3.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 71.

³ *Op. cit.*, pp. x-xi.

. . . it appears to have been intended also to discourage any explicit teaching or defence of Transubstantiation, and to have aimed at there being as little definition as possible in regard to the Eucharist until further action had been taken by the king and council.”¹

5. The “Order of Communion” was duly published in March, 1548, and accompanied by another Royal Proclamation. In addition, letters were sent to the Bishops, ordering its use, in which it was stated that the King

u had caused sundry of his majesty’s most grave and well-learned prelates and other learned men in the Scripture, to assemble themselves for this matter, who after long conference together, have with deliberate advice finally agreed upon such an Order.”

Mr. Wilson remarks that

** this statement may perhaps represent the actual facts of the case, but no evidence, except the statement itself, is to be found which shows that such an assembly took place, or supplies any information as to the persons by whom the Order was framed. Its contents, indeed, may be said to show traces of the process of construction by a committee including persons of different opinions,² but they are such as to be consistent with the probability that *Cranmer was mainly responsible for the form.*”³

In this connection we would recall the fact that towards the end of the reign of Henry VIII, Cranmer had been ordered to draw up a form for turning the Mass into a Communion (see p. 306). Further, as apparently in these first months of 1548 Cranmer was consulting seventeen bishops and two divines on questions concerning the Mass (see Chapter XXXVI), he may well have consulted some of these about the proposed form for giving Communion under both kinds. But if he consulted them, it probably was simply *pro forma*, and hence, as Mr. Wilson says, Cranmer is mainly responsible for the result. Similarly, Brightman and Mackenzie say, “*No doubt Cranmer had the chiefhand in the compilation.*”⁴ They add that “probably the book was in existence before the Bill was drafted.”

6. Turning, now, to the *Order* itself, this consists of an exhortation to be read in church the day previous, another exhortation, with a warning and invitation, to be said at the time of communion, a general confession, a form of absolution, then

¹ *History of the Eucharist*, ii, 132. Italics ours.

² There is no evidence for the statement of Dr. Darwell Stone (*Hist. of Eucharist*, II, 132); Dixon (*Hist. of C. of E.*, II, 493-4), and others that the Communion Book was produced by the divines afterwards known as the Windsor Commission.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. xxiii.

⁴ *Liturgy and Worship*, p. 153. Italics ours.

THE COMMUNION BOOK

four "comfortable words," another prayer, the words of administration, and the blessing. There follow certain rubrics.

The *Order* is, as Dixon says, "mainly derived from a foreign model, that is, from the *Consultation* of Herman, Archbishop of Cologne. . . . The work, which had been translated into English about three months before, was used, but with discretion, by the English liturgists."¹

7. We must now examine the contents of this *Order* in detail.

The preliminary exhortation is "constructed after the model" of a corresponding exhortation in the Cologne book? It says that "*the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ*" is "to be taken *in the remembrance of*" the Passion, "by which Passion we have obtained remission of our sins." Our duty is "to come to *these holy mysteries* with most hearty thanks," in that Our Lord has not only "given His body to death and shed His blood, but also doth vouchsafe *in a sacrament and mystery*, to give us His said body and blood *spiritually*, to feed and drink upon." All this language is thoroughly Bucerian. Notice that the Body and Blood are given "in a mystery," to be taken "spiritually." The same exhortation contains a significantly Protestant innovation :

"If there be any whose conscience is troubled and grieved in any thing, let him come to me . . . and confess and open his sin and grief secretly, that he may receive such ghostly counsel, advice and comfort that his conscience may be relieved, and that of us as a minister of God and of the Church, he may receive comfort and absolution, to the satisfaction of his mind and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness ; requiring such as shall be satisfied with a general confession not to be offended with them that doth use, to their further satisfying, the auricular and secret confession to the priest, nor those who think needful or convenient for the quietness of their own consciences, particularly to open their sins to the priest, to be offended with them which are satisfied with their humble confession to God, and the general confession to the Church."

As Dixon says, "this was the first open stroke that was made by authority against secret or auricular confession. The general

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 496.

² Dr. Jacobs, *Lutheran Movement in England*, p. 241. Two English editions of the *Pia Consultatio* were published, one in 1547 and the other in 1548 (Gasquet and Bishop, *op. cit.*, p. 125 note). Constant says Cranmer did not utilise the English translation (*Revue d'hist. eccles.*, 1911, p. 70). On the other hand, Wilson says "the resemblance of the absolution in the *Order* to the English version is perhaps more marked than its likeness to the German" (*op. cit.*, p. 51). Gasquet and Bishop think the Carman original of 1543 was used (*op. cit.*, p. 227).

confession in the Church, though not substituted for the private act, was formally allowed instead of it.”¹

We now come to the actual form, to be used on the day of Communion. A preliminary rubric states that there is to be no other variation in the Mass “until other order shall be provided.” It also significantly speaks of “the receiving of *the Sacrament*” and “*the sacrament of* the Body.” Then comes an exhortation, in which it is said that “if with a true penitent heart and lively faith we receive this holy *Sacrament*, then we *spiritually* eat the flesh of Christ and drink His Blood,” and also that Christ “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, for us *spiritually* to feed upon.” Then the communicants are invited “to take this holy *Sacrament*,” first making a general confession, “about half of which is taken from Wied’s Cologne Order.”² There follows a form of absolution, resembling the Cologne form. After this come four “comfortable words,” three of which are from the Cologne book. Next comes the prayer usually known as “the prayer of humble access,” which begins, “We do not presume to come to this thy table,” and asks God to “grant us so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ and to drink His blood *in these holy mysteries*, that we may continually dwell in Him, and He in us, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His body, and our souls washed through His most precious blood.” This “seems in the main an original composition.”³ Doubtless Cranmer was its author. The prayer seems at first reading to imply a Real Presence, but it must be noted that it is “in these mysteries” that the Body and Blood are received. The prayer must also be taken in conjunction with the rest of the rite.⁴

Now come the words of administration, to be said when the priest “delivers *the sacrament* of the body” and “*the sacrament* of the blood.” The Sarum words of administration were :

“The body of our Lord Jesus Christ keep thy soul unto life everlasting.”

The new rite has :

“The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, *which was given for thee*, keep thy soul, etc.”

“The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, *which was shed for thee*, keep thy soul, etc.”

¹ *History of the C. of E.*, ii, 495.

• Wilson, *op. cit.*, p. 52.

• *Liturgy and Worship*, p. 153.

⁴ It is significant that Bucer approved of this prayer. See p. 515*

This is in accordance with the general directions of the Cologne *Consultatio*, and also with the Nuremberg Order, "which was doubtless known to Cranmer."¹ It definitely throws back the mind into the past, rather than the present. It speaks not of the Body which is being here and now given to the communicant, but rather that which was given in the past, and a prayer is made that that past giving may now benefit the present communicant.

There follows a rubric saying that if a deacon or other priest is present, he

"may follow with the chalice, and as the priest ministereth *the bread*, so shall he minister *the wine*."

The rite ends with a blessing. There follow two important rubrics. The first orders the "consecrated *bread*" to be "broken in two pieces at the least." It then adds :

"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 Jesu Christ."

This certainly seems to imply a Real Presence, but nevertheless it is capable of a Bucerian interpretation, and must be understood in the light of the expressions "consecrated *bread*," "*sacrament of the body*," and of Cranmer's disbelief at this time in the Real Presence. (Sec p. 327.)

The second rubric is much more serious. It says :

* * If the wine hallowed and consecrate doth not suffice or be enough for them that do take the Conunion, the priest . . . may go again to the altar, and reverently, and devoutly, prepare and consecrate another, and so the third, or more likewise, beginning at these words, 'Simili modo, postquam cenatum est,' and ending at these words, 'qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum,' and without any elevation or lifting up."

¹ Dr. Jacobs, *apud* Wilson, *op. cit.*, p. 52.

* Gasquet and Bishop, though pointing out "the unnecessary use of the word 'spiritually,' and the expressions 'minister the bread,' 'minister the wine,'" think there are other features, such as the formula for communion, and the first rubric, which "emphasize the ancient doctrine," and add, "It would almost seem that the action of two minds working with different intentions is to be traced in the composition of this Order" (*op. cit.*, p. 93, note). We do not think the formula of administration or the first rubric need have this orthodox sense. But it is not impossible that Cranmer was assisted by someone else in the composition of the rite, and it occurs to us that this assistant may have been Tunstall, "for whom during twenty years the Archbishop had the deepest friendship" (Gasquet and Bishop, *op. cit.*, p. 29), and who voted in favour of the Act authorising Communion under Both Kinds (see p. 358). We have pointed out that Tunstall put forward a very inadequate theory of the Sacrifice in Henry's reign (see p. 268), and we shall also see that in Mary's reign he seems to regret that the Church should have chosen to define the mode of the Presence.

364 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

Here we have a very important step in the transformation of the Mass from a Sacrifice into a Communion, for the Catholic Church has always taught that the twofold consecration is necessary for the Sacrifice, and consecration under one kind only has never been allowed. Mr. Wilson actually tries to find a parallel in the direction of the Missal that if the form of consecration of the wine has been said with *no* wine in the chalice, the priest shall put wine and water in it, and repeat the words of consecration II Comment is needless.

The Order of Communion contains no provision for consecrating again under the form of bread, but this was doubtless because, for the time being, reservation *sub speciepanis* continued in the churches.

The new rite was duly introduced into the Churches. Miles Coverdale, the Reformer, had it translated into German and Latin, and sent the German form to the Lutherans, and the Latin one to Calvin, inviting his "congratulations" on these "first-fruits of godliness."^{*}

^{*} *Op. cit.*, p. xvii.

• Gasquet, *op. cit.*, p. 94.

CHAPTER VI

THE IMPRISONMENT OF GARDINER, AND THE PUBLICATION OF CRANMER'S CATECHISM

1. The *Order of the Communion*, as we have seen, foreshadowed further changes in the Mass, and the Royal Proclamation which accompanied it promised "further godly orders." In the meantime, some took upon themselves to introduce further changes. Thus, after Easter, 1548, "all the service" in St. Paul's Cathedral and other London churches was in English, "both Mattins, Mass, and evensong."¹ Further, at the requiem for Henry on May 12th at Westminster, the whole Mass was sung in English, "with the consecration of the Sacrament also spoken in English, the priest leaving out all the canon after the Creed save the Paternoster, and then ministering the Communion after the King's Book."² Similarly, the English language was used on September 9th, 1548, at the consecration of Bishop Ferrar—"consecrata in lingua vemicula sacra Eucharistia."³ We are also told that incense was abolished at St. Paul's Cathedral at Whitsuntide in the same year.*

2. In May, 1548. Gardiner was summoned before the Council a second time, for carrying out certain ceremonies during Holy Week. No action seems to have been taken, but at the end of June he was ordered to preach a sermon approving of what had been done in regard to the abolition of Papal authority, the suppressing of monasteries, shrines and chantries, the abolition of candles and ashes, the optional character of auricular confession, processions, and the establishment of Common Prayer in English. This sermon was to be preached on June 29th. He was asked to submit a draft of the sermon for approval, but refused. On June 25th, Cecil warned him that the King would note every principal

¹ *Grey Friars Chronicle*, II, ii. Already at the opening of Parliament in Nov., 1547, the Gloria, Credo, and Agnus Dei had been sung in English. (*Stowe's Chronicle*, I, p. 187.)

² Constant says this Mass was celebrated by Cranmer (*Revue d'hist. eccl's.*, 1911, p. 59). But there is no authority for this statement.

* Wilson, *op. cit.*, p. xix.

* *Ibid.*, p. xx.

sentence, and two days later Cecil warned him not to touch upon the Sacrament of the Altar, or the Mass, for "the questions and controversies rest at the present in consultation, and with the pleasure of God shall be in small time by public doctrine and authority quietly and truly determined."¹

Gardiner, however, replied that "he could no wise forbear to speak of the Sacrament, neither of the Mass, this last being the chief foundation of our religion, and that without it we cannot know that Christ is our sacrifice." On June 28th, he was again ordered by the king's authority to "abstain from treating of any matter of controversy concerning the Sacrament and the Mass." This letter reached Gardiner between three and four o'clock in the afternoon on the day before his sermon, and in the interval he tells us that he neither ate nor drank nor slept.

3. The sermon was duly preached, before the King and the Council and a great multitude of people. According to the French ambassador, "he maintained the direct contrary of all the new opinions now approved . . . especially in regard to the Mass and the Holy Sacrament of the altar." But this is only hearsay : "as I have heard."

Some extracts from the sermon itself are given by Dr. Darwell Stone.² These show that Gardiner preached the "very presence of Christ's most precious body and blood in the Sacrament, which is the Catholic faith and no doubtful matter." But the most interesting part of the sermon for us is that part which deals with the Sacrifice of the Mass. On this he spoke as follows :

"Christ was sent to be our Sacrifice. . . . He was the Bishop that offered for our sins, and the Sacrifice that was offered. . . . And like as His Sacrifice then made was sufficient for us, to deliver us from our sins . . . so, to continue us in the same favour of God, He ordained a perpetual remembrance of Himself . . . not for another redemption, as though the first had not been sufficient, nor as though the world needed a new redemption from sin, but that we might thoroughly remember His passion. . . . And this daily sacrifice He instituted to be continued among Christian men, not for need of another redemption or satisfaction the sins of the world (for that was sufficiently performed by His sacrifice of His Body and Blood, done upon the Cross), neither that He be now our Bishop for need of any further sacrifice to be made for sin, but to continue us in the remembrance of His passion suffered for us. . . . And this is the true understanding

¹ Burnet, II, ii, p. 154.

² *History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, II, 148, et seq.

of the Mass, not for another redemption, but that we may be strong in believing the benefit of Christ's death and bloodshedding for us upon the Cross. . . . If chantries were abused by applying the Mass for the satisfaction of sin, or to bring men to heaven, or to take away sin, or to make men, if wicked, just . . . they might well be dissolved, for the Mass was not instituted for any such purpose. . . . For when men add unto the Mass an opinion of satisfaction, or of a new redemption, then do they put it to another use than it was ordained for. . . ."

Dr. Darwell Stone remarks upon the "great care and restraint" of this sermon, and "the assertion of the Eucharistic sacrifice in such a way as to avoid any risk of impairing the efficacy and sufficiency of the sacrifice of the Cross."¹ Certainly, the statement about the sufficiency of the satisfaction made upon the Cross, and the statement that the Mass is a "remembrance of Christ's passion" are, though quite orthodox, calculated to put in the background the true propitiatory character of the Sacrifice of the Mass. Gardiner is evidently labouring to make the Mass acceptable to his Protestant hearers, and is going out of his way to "water down" the doctrine of the Sacrifice. At the same time he safeguards himself by saying that the Mass is indeed the "daily sacrifice" instituted by Christ. But he fails to explain in what way it is a sacrifice, or what is offered. Gasquet and Bishop are probably right in saying that "it would not be proper to take it as a free and unfettered expression of his preferences. . . . The bishop took the circumstances as he found them, and 'condescended' to measures he had no power to hinder. This method of compliance was deliberately adopted in the hope of saving the essential feature of the ancient system which still remained. . . . He accepted what had been done in order to secure at least the maintenance of the Mass."²

4. In the meantime, we call attention to the *date* of this sermon. It was preached three months before the Commission met, which drew up the First Prayer Book, and the composer of the reformed "Canon" seems to have adopted some of the phraseology which Gardiner used, i.e., that concerning the sufficiency of the satisfaction of Christ on the Cross, and, at the same time, by omitting any reference to a "daily sacrifice" or to any oblation of Christ's body and blood, to have insinuated the Protestant denial of the sacrifice of the Mass. But of this more anon.

Dr. Darwell Stone also remarks upon Gardin^{pt}'s "recognition of abuses,"³ and seems to mean by this the oblique reference

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 150.

² *Edward VI and B.C.P.*, p. 116.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 150.

to the conception of the Mass as "another redemption . . . for the satisfaction of sin, or to take away sin, etc." But here again it seems hardly safe to infer that Gardiner really admitted the existence of this conception amongst Catholics. He is rather hypothetical : he says that "*If* chantries were abused in this way, they might well be dissolved." At the most it may be said that, as chantries had been dissolved, ostensibly for that reason, he bows to the fact, and notes the supposed reason. Accordingly, we cannot regard Gardiner's sermon as providing evidence for the supposed abuses in the doctrine of the Mass to which we have already referred.

In any case it is significant enough that this sermon of Gardiner's was, as Dr. Darwell Stone says, "regarded by the Council as the climax of all his offences, and on the following day, June 30th, 1548, he was committed to the Tower."¹ There he remained for a long time, but was eventually brought to trial for his "offences," these including, as we shall see, his refusal to approve of the new Prayer Book and Ordinal, and on February 14th, 1551/ deprived of his bishopric, into which Poyntet, a noted Reformer, was intruded on March 8th, 1551. Gardiner remained in the Tower until the advent of Queen Mary.

11.

1. There was another interesting event in the year 1548, and that was the publication of Cranmer's translation of a Latin catechism by the Lutheran, Justus Jonas, junior, which in turn was based on German Lutheran catechisms. Naturally, the Eucharistic doctrine of the original is entirely Lutheran in character, that is, it teaches the Real Presence in a form which implies Consubstantiation ; but Cranmer in his translation makes some significant modifications of the text. Thus, while on the one hand, as Dr. Darwell Stone says :

"there is nothing in this Catechism [i.e., Cranmer's translation] to *deny* the doctrine that the consecrated sacrament is the body and blood of Christ, and the body and blood are said to be taken by the 'bodily mouth,' there is no assertion of more than that they are received by the communicants, and a statement in the Latin catechism that the Sacrament is 'really the body and blood of Christ' is altered to the statement that 'in the Sacrament we receive truly the body and blood of Christ.'"³

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 150.

² There seems to be a slight disagreement among the authorities as to some of these dates.

³ *History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, II, 126.

Gasquet and Bishop call attention to another significant point. The original runs :

"God is almighty, therefore He can do all things that He wills. . . . *When He calls and names a thing which was not before, then at once that very thing comes into being as He names it.* Therefore, when He takes bread and says 'this is my body,' then immediately there is the body of our Lord, and when He takes the chalice and says 'this is my blood,' then immediately His blood is present."

Cranmer in his translation omits the sentence in italics, and translates the rest as follows :

"Therefore, when Christ takes bread and saith 'Take eat, this is my body,' we ought not to doubt but we eat His very body, and when He takes the cup and saith 'Take, drink, this is my blood,' we ought to think assuredly that we drink His very blood."¹

Accordingly, Jenkyns, in his edition of Cranmer's works, says "it is remarkable that many of the strong expressions of the original were studiously softened in the translation."²

This, of course, is what we should expect, seeing that, as we have pointed out, from his own testimony, Cranmer had already abandoned the doctrine of the Real Presence, as well as that of Transubstantiation (see p. 326).

2. Justus Jonas refers twice to the "Apostolic succession" of the Christian ministry. The first passage is as follows in Cranmer's version.³

"After that Our Lord Jesus Christ, by His death, Passion and Resurrection, had redeemed us . . . shortly after, in the feast of Pentecost, He sent down upon His Apostles the Holy Ghost, in the likeness of fiery tongues . . . and where they could not be present themselves or long abide and continue in their own {>resence, thither they sent their disciples and other godly and earned men, and to them they gave the Holy Ghost⁴ by laying their hands upon their heads.⁵ And this rite or ceremony to ordain preachers and ministers of God's word, hath continued in the Church even from the Apostles' time unto this day, and shall unto the world's end."⁶

The second passage is as follows⁷ :

"After Christ's ascension, the apostles gave authority to other

¹ Page 207 in the English edition, quoted by Gasquet and Bishop, *op. cit.*, pp. 130-1.

* *Preface*, hcox.

* Page 102 for Latin text, Cranmer's English version is on p. 120 of 1829 edition.

* Latin original : *Impertierunt eis Spiritum Sanctum.*

* *Per impositionem manuum.*

* *Hic ritus atque ordinatio, mansit usque in hodiernum, et manebit usque ap finem mundi.*

* Latin text *op.* 167, English translation, p. 196.

372 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

but all the dreams of Luther seem to him sufficiently well-grounded, perspicuous and lucid. Oh, how lamentable it is. . . .”¹

Here is another illuminating account of the result of its publication :

“ The Archbishop of Canterbury, moved, no doubt, by the advice of Peter Martyr and other Lutherans, has ordered a Catechism of some Lutheran opinions to be translated and imblished in our language. This little book has occasioned no little discord, so that fightings have frequently taken place among the common people, on account of their diversity of opinion, even during the sermons.”^a

¹ *Original Letters*, ii, p. 381.

■ John Burcher to Bullinger, Oct. 29th, 1548, in *Original Letters*, p. C43.

CHAPTER VII

THE FIRST PRAYER. BOOK

- A. THE "WINDSOR COMMISSION."
- B. THE SOURCES USED.
- C. GENERAL ANALYSIS.
- D. THE NEW COMMUNION SERVICE.
- E. THE DOCTRINE OF THE NEW SERVICE.

A. THE "WINDSOR COMMISSION."

1. We come now to the production of the first complete English Prayer Book, the "First Book" of 1549. We have already mentioned that the Communion Book announced future changes, and that a Royal Proclamation accompanying it promised "further godly orders." That was in March, 1548. We have also mentioned that in May of that year the Mass was said in English in various churches. On September 23rd, 1548, a Royal Proclamation definitely announced that the King was "minding to see very shortly one uniform order throughout the realm," "for which cause at this time certain bishops and notable learned men, by his highness' commandment, are congregate."

Some such gathering seems to have met first of all at Chertsey, for the *Grey Friars Chronicle*, under date September 23rd, states that "divers of the bishops sat at Chertsey Abbey for divers matters of the King and Council," and also, the French ambassador wrote on September 30th that

"there are daily fights in the London churches and elsewhere in the kingdom, whether there shall be Mass or not. To make some settlement a certain number of bishops and doctors are gathered at a place near the court called Chertsey, where they are to determine what is to be held in this kingdom about the Mass and the Sacrament of the Altar."¹

We have the further information that on September 9th, Ferrar was consecrated Bishop of St. David's by Cranmer, and that there were in addition present at the ceremony Holbeach of Lincoln, Ridley of Rochester, Thirlby of Westminster, and Doctors May, Haynes, Robertson, and Redman.

¹ *Apud Gasquet and Bishop, op. cit., pp. 143-4.*

But if the assembly began at Chertsey, it would seem to have been transferred soon to Windsor, for the Kling's diary states that in the second year of his reign "an uniform order of prayer was institute, before made by a number of bishops and learned men gathered together in Windsor."¹ Also, Archbishop Cranmer, in a letter to Queen Mary written in September, 1555, says that "a good number of the best learned men reputed within realm, some favouring the old, some the new learning . . . were gathered together at Windsor for the reformation of the service of the Church."²

2. This committee of bishops and divines has been called the "Windsor Commission." But Gasquet and Bishop say that "search has been made for any sign of a commission for either the Order of Communion or the Book of Common Prayer, through every series of documents and collection of papers which seemed to promise results, but in vain; no indication of any such commission has been met with."³ Also, W. Page, F.S.A., the writer of an article in the *Church Quarterly Review* for April, 1924, which is described by Dr. Brightman⁴ as "the best discussion of this matter," says that "it is clear that no commission under the Great Seal either for the Order of Communion or the Prayer Book was issued in 1548. The probability is that the committees assembled merely at the request of Somerset and Cranmer, in the King's name." Dixon⁵ thinks it probable that there was a written commission, but has to confess that it "has never been produced," and that "it is not certain that the thirteen divines commonly called the Windsor Commission ever had a written commission."

3. The first to give us a list of those who formed this Committee was Fuller, who in his *Church History*, published in 1657, says that its members were :

Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury,
Goodrich, Bishop of Ely,
Ridley, Bishop of Rochester,
Holbeach, Bishop of Lincoln,
Thirlby, Bishop of Westminster,
Skip, Bishop of Hereford,
Day, Bishop of Chichester,
Dr. May,

* Burnet, II, ii, p. 6, *apud* Gasquet and Bishop, *op. cit.*, p. 136.

» Gasquet and Bishop, *op. cit.*, p. 137.

• *Op. cit.*, p. 146 note.

◁ *Liturgy and Worship*, p. 155 note.

• *Op. cit.*, ui, 16 note.

Dr. Cox,
Dr. Taylor,
Dr. Haines,
Dr. Robertson, and
Dr. Redman.

We note that of these thirteen names, nine are already known to us as having been present at Chertsey for the consecration of Ferrar. And as we have this independent confirmation of the presence of nine out of the thirteen at Chertsey, and also know *aliunde* that a tenth, namely Bishop Day, was also a member of the Committee, it seems quite safe to suppose that Fuller's list, although published more than a century after the event, was based upon some authentic and written record. We therefore accept it.¹

Cranmer, in the letter to Queen Mary mentioned above, stated that the Committee consisted of men of both the Old and the New Learning, i.e., of Catholic and Protestant learnings. And in point of fact they could be so divided. But perhaps it will be better if we adopt our original classification into three categories, Anglo-Catholics, Protestants, and Opportunists. We then get the following result:

Anglo-Catholic party :

Day, Bishop of Chichester,
Thirlby, Bishop of Westminster,
Dr. Robertson.

Protestant party :

Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury,
Goodrich, Bishop of Ely,
Holbeach, Bishop of Lincoln,
Ridley, Bishop of Rochester,
Dr. May,
Dr. Haines,
Dr. Cox,
Dr. Taylor.

Opportunists or doubtful:

Skip, Bishop of Hereford,
Dr. Redman.

It will be seen that the Protestant party were in a very decided majority on this "Commission," and that even if we were to include Bishop Skip and Dr. Redman amongst the "Anglo-

* Gasquet and Bishop remark that Fuller "cannot be believed to have invented" his list (*op. cit.*, p. 146).

Catholics," they would still number only five, as against eight decided Protestants.

4. However, before we proceed we must justify our classification of the "doctors" (we have already dealt with the bishops on a previous page).

Dr. Robertson is described in *Original Letters of the Reformation* as "favourably inclined to Popery."¹ He remained true to the Catholic faith, became Dean of Durham under Queen Mary, in 1557 and refused to take the Oath of Supremacy under Elizabeth.

Coming now to the Protestant Doctors, we have first, *Dr. May*, He had been made Dean of London in 1546. He was deprived by Queen Mary.² According to Downe,³ "he continued to the utmost of his power to further and advance the Reformation." Queen Elizabeth named him Archbishop of York in 1560, but he died before taking possession of his see.

Dr. Haines was Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge University 1533, and was there mobbed by the students on account of his heretical teaching. He was imprisoned for heresy under Henry VIII. In 1537 he became Dean of Exeter, and in 1540 Prebendary of Westminster, and thus his heretical views did not interfere with his promotion under Henry VIII. He wrote protesting against the Six Articles, and affirmed that these have no authority in Scripture.⁴

Dr. Richard Cox was Dean of Christ Church, Oxford, and was deprived by Queen Mary. His views on the Sacrifice of the Mass were distinctly Protestant, as will be seen from a reference to his answers on p. 355. His notions on the subject of order will be seen from his answer in 1540 to the questions then put, and especially from the following: "By Scripture, there is no consecration of bishops or priests, but only the appointing to the office *of a priest cum impositione manuum*." It will be noticed that this excludes any consecration *of a bishop*. Under Queen Mary, he went abroad, and took a leading part in the proceedings of the Reformed Church at Frankfort. Queen Elizabeth made him Bishop of Ely, in succession to Bishop Thirlby. At Ely he showed himself a very energetic and zealous Protestant Reformer.⁵

Dr. John Taylor is described by Downes⁶ as a "Confessor of the

1 I, 264.

• Le Neve, *Fasti*, ii, 314.

2 *Lives of the Founders of the Liturgy*.

3 *Stttype's Ecclesiastical Memorials*, Appendix cviii.

4 See *Zurich Letters*, I, 66; *Parker's Correspondence*, 270.

5 *Op. cit.*

Reformation.” He denied in 1548 that there was any oblation in the Mass properly speaking (see p. 350). He was made Bishop of Lincoln in the last year of Edward’s reign, but was deprived by Queen Mary for heresy and other causes.

We come now to *Dr. Redman*, whom we have classified as an “Opportunist.” In *Original Letters of the Reformation*, I, 264, he is said, together with Robertson, to be “favourably inclined to Popery.” But Foxe gives documents purporting to prove that when dying in November, 1551, he declared his disbelief in Purgatory, Transubstantiation, and the offering of Masses for the sins of the living and the dead,¹ and accordingly, Downes² and Hook maintain that he died a Protestant. But as he once held Anglo-Catholic views, it would seem safer to place him in the 0 Doubtful ” category.

5. Thus, the Editorial Committee consisted of three Anglo-Catholics, eight Protestants, and two Doubtfuls, and of the last mentioned, Skip might perhaps be placed with the Anglo-Catholics, and Redman with the Protestants, which would make four Anglo-Catholics, opposed by nine Protestants !

It might, however, be argued that even so, the Anglo-Catholic minority might have influenced the resulting work. But in point of fact it is generally stated that the Anglo-Catholic party had little or no hand in the composition of the Prayer Book. We know for a fact that Bishops Day, Thirlby, and Skip protested against its Eucharistic doctrine (see later, p. 405-6), and that Bishop Day, in particular, refused to “sign” the Book. Strype remarks that in his opinion “Robertson and Redman liked it as little.”³ And Soames goes so far as to suggest that “Before the Commissioners brought their labours to a close, such of them as dissented from those who possessed most influence withdrew, and allowed the rest to complete the task.”⁴

Mr. Page similarly remarks that “The Bishop of Chichester disputed fundamental points, and refused to subscribe the book, and the Bishop of Westminster had grave misgivings. It is possible that these two bishops retired before the committee completed their work.”⁵

6. In spite of these statements, however, we are inclined to think that the Anglo-Catholics may have succeeded in obtaining

* *Acts and Monuments*, VI, Part One, pp. 267-274.

† *Lives of Compilers of the Liturgy*.

• *Eccles. Mem.*, II, i, 134.

« *History of the Reformation*, III, 355.

* *Church Quarterly Review*, April, 1924, p. 62.

one or two slight concessions, and that to meet their objections, a form for blessing the font was introduced, though in the wrong place (sec p. 381), and that similarly Cranmer inserted the word "oblation" somewhere in the Communion service, but removed it before the Book was presented to the House of Lords (seep. 405).¹

However, Strype would seem to be justified in his "conjecture" that "the main part of the work went through some few of these men's hands" only.¹ Dr. Brightman remarks that "it is not to be supposed that the 'Commissioners' were the authors of the book, but rather that it had been already drafted by Cranmer, with whatever assistance," and had possibly provided the "Mass, matins, and evensong and all divine service" already known to be in use in the King's chapel, and at Oxford and Cambridge. "The business of the company must have been rather to discuss, criticise, or emend."²

It seems safe to follow this statement of Dr. Brightman, and to hold that *Cranmer had the chief part in the compilation of the First Prayer Book*.^{*} But even so he may have made some concessions to prejudice, and have thought it politic to proceed by slow stages in the work of reform. Indeed, Bucer and Fagius wrote to their old colleagues at Strassburg saying that "certain concessions have been made, both out of respect for the past, and to the infirmity of the present."³

Similarly, Dr. Darwell Stone states⁵ that "it is probable that the Prayer Book of 1549 represented rather what it was thought safe to put out at the time than what Archbishop Cranmer

¹ We base this on the supposition that the statements made by the Bishops in the House of Lords refer to what actually took place in the "Windsor Commission" itself. See p. 403.

² *Eccles. Aient.*, II, i, 134.

³ In *Liturgy and Worship*, p. 155.

⁴ Cf. Page, in *Church Quarterly Review*, April, 1924 i

"The evidence both internal and external points to the Order of Communion and the Book of Common Prayer having both emanated from Cranmer" (p. 56). . . . "In the case both of the Order of Communion and the Book of Common Prayer there can be little doubt that they were practically in their final form before they were considered by any Committee. Some historians write of the compilation of these books by the committees, but it is clear from what the Bishop of Westminster said in the debate on the Act of Uniformity that the book was placed in the hands of the clergy appointed to examine it, for disputation only" (*ibid.*).

Cf. also Constant, in *Revue d'Hist. Eccles.*, 1911, p. 52 : "Ce qui est certain c'est qu'à Cranmer revient la part principale de l'inspiration et la composition du livre." He adds indeed that "la présence d'évêques Henriens et le désir d'avoir leur approbation tempérèrent la réforme liturgique, et furent cause en grande partie du compromis . . . ainsi que de l'ambiguïté voulue de certaines formules" (*ibid.*). Even so, ⁵ "Pour la messe, il s'agissait avant tout de lui enlever son caractère de sacrifice" (*ibid.*).

^{*} *Alfred Smyth, Cranmer*, p. 41.

⁵ *History of the Doctrine of the Eucharist*, ii, p. 139.

and those who were acting with him wished, and that at the time of the publication of the book they already had in view a revision of it which would approach much more nearly the position of the extreme Reformers."

B. THE SOURCES USED.

1. We must now consider the sources used by Cranmer in the compilation of this Prayer Book. We may classify them as (*a*) Catholic, and (*b*) Protestant sources.

(*a*) Catholic sources. Of ancient Catholic sources, Gasquet and Bishop mention the following :

- 0 The Sarum, York, and Hereford liturgical books.
- 1 The Quignon Breviary.
- 3) The Greek Liturgies.
- (4) The Mozarabic rite of Spain.

2. We shall discuss the extent to which the first category contributed to the new Book in due course.

The *Quignon Breviary* only affects the General Preface, the Lectionary, etc., and need not be further considered.

As to the *Greek liturgies*, these had been known in England, both in the original, and in ancient and sixteenth-century Latin translations. As early as 1510 or 1511, Erasmus gave to Bishop Fisher a translation which he had made of the Mass of St. Chrysostom, and this Latin version had been printed at least three times before the compilation of the Prayer Book. In 1526 Bishop Stokesley of London was able to lend to Fisher a printed copy of the Masses of St. Chrysostom and St. Basil. Numerous printed editions had appeared of these by 1548. Altogether, the following seems to have been available in 1549 :

The Clementine Liturgy, and that of St. James, known by extracts in Bessarion.

The Liturgy of St. Basil, Greek text and Latin translation.

The Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, Greek text and Latin translations.

These are freely quoted by writers on the Anglo-Catholic side during this period, such as Smith, Tunstall, and Gardiner (see for instance the debate in the House of Lords in 1548 mentioned on pp. 402 *et seq.*). There are also references to them in Cranmer's *Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine*, published in 1551, and also a quotation from the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom in his *Common Place Book* in the British Museum.¹

¹ MS. Reg. 7 B, xii, fol. 164 a.

380 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

The same *Common Place Book* contains several extracts from the *Antididagma* of the Canons of Cologne, in which they replied to the *Pia Consultatio* of Herman the Lutheran Archbishop.

3. We come now to the *Protestant* sources.

The influence of the Cologne *Pia Consultatio* on the Communion Book has already been pointed out. We shall find its influence upon other offices in this new Prayer Book. In addition, there is every reason to think that Cranmer was acquainted with the Protestant Church Orders of Brandenburg and Nuremberg, put forth by his friend Osiander, with whom he had once stayed, and whose niece he married (see p. 236). Further, there is strong evidence that he utilised the Church Order of Bugenhagen, a copy of which had been presented to King Henry VIII (see p. 188). In addition, Cranmer was undoubtedly acquainted with the ideas and writings of Luther, Melancthon, Bucer, etc., and we have already mentioned the number of foreign Reformers who had already come to England, and with whom Cranmer was in constant touch.

4. The existence of these two groups of sources enables us to understand the general character of the work. The Preamble to the Act of Uniformity authorising the book states that the compilers had "as well an eye and respect to the most sincere and pure Christian religion taught by the Scripture, as to the usages in the Primitive Church." This of course merely means that, like all the Protestant Reformers, Cranmer aimed at a return to what he regarded as primitive purity and simplicity, in contrast to the corruption and error of later Catholic times.

We cannot, of course, give here a complete analysis of the book, but we will glance briefly at the treatment of the Sacraments, and show how closely the Protestant models were followed.

C. GENERAL ANALYSIS.

1. We begin with the new rite of *baptism*. This commences with an exhortation, which according to Dr. Lowther Clarke, in *Liturgy and Worship*, is "based in part on Hermann's *Consultation*." It is followed by a prayer, which is taken from Luther's Baptismal Office and also comes in the *Consultation*. Then comes the signing with the cross on the forehead, as in the Catholic rite. This is followed by a prayer, also from the Sarum rite, and an exorcism from the same source. Next we have a passage from a Gospel, but instead of taking this from St.

Matthew, as in the Sarum manual, the Prayer Book takes it from St. Mark, herein following Hermann's Reformed Book. After this there is another exhortation, which is based in part on Hermann's *Consultation*, and is partly original. The Our Father and Creed come next, and then another prayer, taken also from Hermann. The child is then taken towards the font, and the priest then addresses the sponsors, in words which are partly original and partly from the Cologne Reformed rite. There follow the renunciations, as in the Catholic service, and the actual baptism. There is no mention in the actual rite of any blessing of the font or water, but nine prayers for this purpose, together with a direction that the water is to be changed once a month occur at the end of the service for *private* baptism. These seem to be derived from the Mozarabic rite, according to a writer in the *Church Quarterly Review* for January, 1891 (p. 430). The position of these prayers is a curious one. The Cologne book had no blessing of the water, and this is true also of the Brandenburg and Nuremberg ordinance put forth by Cranmer's friend, Osiander, who says that the blessing of the font is rather a hindrance than a furtherance of baptism, and serves only for superstition.¹ It would seem that these blessing prayers were added as an afterthought into the new Anglican rite, possibly as a concession to the Anglo-Catholic party. The nine prayers were reduced to four in the Second Prayer Book, and those retained contained no blessing of the water. After the baptism, the white garment is given to the child, as in the Catholic rite. The service ends with an exhortation to the sponsors, an original composition, which replaces an exhortation in the Sarum service.

It will be noticed that various ceremonies in the Catholic rite have been altogether omitted or reduced, and in particular, exorcisms, the use of salt, the ephpheta, the anointings, and the giving of a lighted candle, have been excluded. In this the Anglican rite resembles the Reformed Continental ones. However, the matter and form of the sacrament are retained, and the prayers also express the Catholic conception of the sacrament. Even so, the fact that so much material is borrowed from Protestant sources is very significant.

2. As to *Confirmation*, the new service follows the main outline of the Catholic rite, but it is important to note that the anointing with chrism is omitted, and the form correspondingly changed.

¹ Richter, I, 197.

The blow on the cheek is also omitted, and the service concludes with a prayer of Lutheran origin. We have already pointed out that Confirmation was regarded by the English and Continental reformers as a rite of ecclesiastical institution, and not as a true sacrament. (See pp. 197, 260.)

In *Matrimony*, the modifications are not of much importance. But Dr. Wickham Legg mentions that the direction to place the ring on the third finger of the left hand, instead of on the right, as was the previous Catholic practice, comes from the Strassburg school.¹ Various homilies are introduced, of uncertain origin. A rubric indicates that the newly married persons are to receive Holy Communion, but the beautiful Nuptial Mass and Blessing are conspicuous by their absence. In conclusion, it must be borne in mind that, like Confirmation, Matrimony was not looked upon as a sacrament of the Gospel by the Protestant Reformers.

The "*Sacrament of Penance*" is allowed for to the extent that there is a form of absolution, to be employed if a sick person makes a special confession, which he is to do "if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter." A rubric directs that "the same form of absolution shall be used in all private confessions," but private confession is in ordinary cases optional only, as we have seen from the provision in the Communion Book, which is incorporated into this new Prayer Book. All this is a striking departure from Catholic practice, and from the law of annual confession imposed by the Fourth Council of the Lateran in 1215.

As to *Extreme Unction*, this is reduced to an anointing on the forehead or breast of a sick man, which is included in the general rite for the visitation of the sick. But its use is specified only "if the sick person desire to be anointed," i.e., like private confession, it is quite optional. Thus again a great Christian Sacrament begins to disappear from general use. It is to be noted also that there is no provision in the Book of any blessing of the oil by the Bishop.

D. THE NEW COMMUNION SERVICE.

We now come to the most important part of the First Prayer Book, the new "Communion Service"—"The Supper of the Lord and the Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass."¹ Here we will show how the traditional Catholic Mass had been

¹ *Notes on the Marriage Service*, St. Paul's Eccles. Soc., iii, 165.

• The last part of the title ("the Mass") would seem to have been added after the debate in the House of Lords. See p. 404.

changed by the Lutherans, as instanced in the Latin Mass published by Luther in 1523, and how Cranmer correspondingly changed the Sarum Mass hitherto used in England.

1. Luther first stipulates that notice is to be given by those intending to communicate. This of course was necessary because of the abolition of reservation, and corresponds with the similar direction in the first, second, and third rubrics prefixed to the English Communion service.

Luther next says that the vestments hitherto in use may still continue. This corresponds to the fourth rubric in the English rite.

2. Coming now to the rite itself, Luther directs that the Mass is to begin with the Introit, though "we should prefer that the whole psalm were sung, as formerly." The English service adopts this suggestion.

Luther sweeps away the rest of the beginning of the Roman Mass, with its psalm *Judica me* and the *Confiteor*. On the other hand, some of the Lutheran orders, such as the Brandenburg-Nuremberg order of 1533 and the *Pia Consultât*TM of Hermann of Cologne, allow some kind of confession of sins. The English rite follows Luther in sweeping away the psalm *Judica me*, with its statement, "I will go to the altar of God," omits the *Confiteor* entirely, and puts in its place the Lord's Prayer and a Collect.

3. Next, according to Luther, there are to follow the *Kyrie*, *Gloria*, and the ancient collects (provided they are pious !), the Epistle, Gradual (if short), Gospel, and Nicene Creed. In the English rite accordingly we now have the *Kyrie*, *Gloria*, Collects (with some new ones), Epistle, Gospel, and Creed. The Gradual is omitted altogether.

4. Luther says a sermon may be preached either after the Creed, or before the Mass. The English rite gives here two of the exhortations which had formed part of the Order of Communion, slightly revised and rearranged. The most significant change in them is the alteration in the position of the word "spiritually." This will best be seen by a comparison of the relevant sentences :—

Order of Communion :

"[He] doth vouchsafe in a sacrament and mystery to give us His said body and blood *spiritually* : to feed and drink upon."

384 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

Prayer Book :

“ [He] doth vouchsafe in a sacrament and mystery to give us His said body and blood to feed upon *spiritually*. ”

Order of Communion :

“ 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, for us *spiritually* to feed upon. ”

Prayer Book :

“ 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*. ”

The following sentence remains the same in both :

** then we *spiritually* eat the flesh of Christ and drink His blood. ”

Evidently the position of the word is changed because, as placed in the *Order of Communion*, it might have implied a spiritual *presence*, instead of a spiritual *eating*, which is all that is intended to be taught in the new Prayer Book, and was probably intended in the Order of Communion as well.

5. After this, Luther says that there follows in the Roman Mass :

“ all that abomination called the Offertory, and from this point almost everything stinks of oblation. Therefore, casting aside all that savours of oblation with the entire Canon, let us keep those things which are pure and holy. Accordingly, after the Creed or Sermon, there is to be sung a German psalm or hymn, during which the communicants go into the choir, men to the right, and women to the left. Here the priest prepares the bread and wine, and places them on the altar, and meanwhile a collection for the poor may be made. ”

Luther views with disfavour the practice of mixing a little water with the wine for the chalice.

Luther, then, sweeps away the whole of the Offertory in the Roman rite, with the prayers accompanying the ritual acts. Similarly, the English rite abolishes all this part of the service, i.e., the oblation of the host and the chalice, with the accompanying prayers. In place of all this there is to be recited a verse of Scripture on almsgiving, etc., and therefore suitable to accompany the “ collection ” which is now to take place.

Afterwards,

“ so many as shall be partakers of the Holy Communion shall tarry in the choir or in some convenient place near . . . men on the one side, the women on the other, ”

just as Luther directed. Next, without any ceremony whatever, "the minister shall take so much bread and wine as shall suffice, laying the bread upon the corporal or else in the paten or in some other comely thing."

Next he is to put wine into the chalice, adding, however, a little water—a very unimportant variation from Luther's recommendations; Cranmer had noted in his *Common Place Book* the chapter in the *Antididagma* in which the Canons of Cologne defend this particular practice.

6. The Offertory is followed in the Roman missal by the prayers known as the "secret prayers," which in almost every case mention the "oblations" of bread and wine, which are to become the Body and Blood of Christ. Luther omits all these—naturally—and directs the priest to go straight on to the dialogue and the preface which follows. He retains the greater part of the ancient Preface. The English rite similarly directs that the priest, immediately after placing the bread and wine on the altar, shall commence the dialogue and go on to the Preface. The secret prayers are thus all abolished. The Prefaces themselves are reduced from ten to five, and of these, two are entirely new, a third is new in part, a fourth is reduced to half its original length, and the fifth is slightly modified.

7. After the Preface, there follows in the Latin rite the ancient and venerable Canon of the Mass, which goes back in its present form to the time of Pope Gregory the Great, and can be traced back in its essential elements to the third century at least. (See p. 29.)

Luther abolishes the Canon, and directs that after the Preface the words of Institution are to be pronounced aloud. Then is to be sung the *Sanctus* and *Benedictus*, and while the latter is being sung, the host and chalice are to be elevated. It would seem, however, that in practice the *Sandus* continued to be sung immediately after the Preface in most Lutheran churches. The elevation after the consecration was discontinued by Luther in 1539 for a time at least, but continued elsewhere.¹

It is here that the English rite makes the most important departure from Luther, inasmuch as we have some kind of a Canon, bearing a faint resemblance to the old one. Much has been made of this, and Constant, for instance, says, "Le Canon est une concession. . . . Les Luthériens blâmèrent les anglicans de l'avoir conservé."² He gives a reference to Bucer, *Scripta*

¹ Cf. p. 118.

² *Revue d'Hist. Ecclés.*, 1911, p. 65.

Anglicana, p. 371. This should be p. 374, and turns out to be a reference to a Latin version of the Prayer Book, made by Alexander Aless, who, in his preface, says that

“in the book there will be noted, in the first place, a certain similarity of common observances with those which are used by the Romanists. . . . We may truly say that it is a very good thing, in all changes, to recede as little as necessary from the common use, because sudden and great changes are always very dangerous.”

But this is a *general* reference to the Book *as a whole*, and has nothing specially to do with the Communion Service. On this particular subject, Aless merely points out that the Anglicans omit the elevation, which the Lutherans practise, and remarks that this is an indifferent matter. Moreover, it must be remembered that, though Luther himself had no Canon, the Nuremberg rite had one, and so had the Protestant Communion rite drawn up by Bucer for Strassburg, so that the inclusion of a Canon was not so great an innovation after all !

But a comparison of the Catholic Canon of the Mass with Cranmer's new Canon will reveal some striking differences.

8. The Latin Canon consists of a number of separate prayers. First we get the “*Te igitur*” which begs God to bless “these gifts, these presents, these holy unspotted sacrifices through Jesus Christ (here a rubric in the Sarum Missal directs the priest to kiss the altar “at the right hand of the sacrifice”), and goes on to say that these sacrifices are being offered for the Holy Catholic Church. Then comes a special prayer for the Church, together with Pope, bishop, and king. Next comes the “commemoration of the living,”

“for whom *we offer*, or *who offer* Thee, this sacrifice of praise, for themselves and for all theirs, for the redemption of their souls, for the hope of health and salvation, and for which they now render their vows to Thee, the Eternal, Living and True God.”

In place of these, the Anglican rite has a “Prayer for the Church,” which excludes any reference to “these unspotted sacrifices,” and prays instead that God will mercifully receive “these our prayers! which we offer unto thy Divine Majesty.” Then the priest prays for “the whole state of Christ's Church,” with special mention of the King, bishops, and pastors, “that they may both by their life and doctrine set forth Thy true and

¹ It seems that, to please the Amdo-Catholic party the words “and oblations” were added here, but withdrawn before the Book was submitted to the House of Lords. See note on p. 405.

lively word, and rightly and duly administer Thy Holy Sacraments." Next comes a prayer for the sick, etc., and for the congregation "assembled to *celebrate the commemoration* of the most glorious death of Thy Son." Note the substitution of "celebrate the commemoration" for "we offer."

9. The Latin Mass then passes on to the "*Communicantes*" with its mention of Our Lady, the twelve apostles and twelve saints specially venerated in Rome. The English rite does not "communicate with" or "venerate the memory of" these saints, but instead "give praise and thanks for the grace and virtue declared in all the saints from the beginning," especially in the glorious and most blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of Thy Son, Jesus Christ our Lord" (the Latin Mass speaks of "the most glorious *ever-* virgin Mary,¹ Mother *of our God* and Lord Jesus Christ"), and in the patriarchs, prophets, apostles and martyrs." The English rite introduces here the commemoration for the dead, which in the Latin rite comes after the consecration. The Latin rite asks God to be mindful of His servants gone before us in the sign of faith and who rest in the sleep of peace. "To these, O Lord, and to all who rest in Christ, grant, we beseech Thee, a place of refreshment, light, and peace." The English rite has a somewhat longer prayer, which does not call for special comment.

10. Next, the Latin (Sarum) rite directs that the priest shall turn his eyes to the host, "with great devotion," and recite the "*Hane igitur*" :

"This, therefore, the oblation of service and of all thy familii, we beseech Thee, O Lord, that Thou wouldst graciously accept, that Thou wouldst dispose our days in peace, deliver us from eternal damnation, and deign to rank us in the flock of Thy elect, through Christ our Lord."

This is replaced, in the English rite, by a most significant prayer :

"O God . . . which didst give Thine only Son Jesu Christ to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption, who made there, by His One Oblation, Once Offered, a full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, and did institute and . . . command us to celebrate a perpetual Memory of that His most precious death, until His coming again. . . ."

¹ It is hard to think that the omission of ♀-Virgin" from the English rite is a mere accident, in view of Stokesley's statement in 1537 that it was lawful to doubt the perpetual integrity of Our Lady. (See p. 253.)

388 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

It has been suggested by the late Canon Brightman, Dr. Darwell Stone and the Rev. T. Jalland, that this part of the English Canon is based on the *Antididagma* of the Chapter of Cologne. In an earlier section we have given quotations from this work, and indicated the particular phrases which are said to have been adopted by Cranmer.¹ The reader has only to glance at them to see that if Cranmer has really utilised the *Antididagma*, he has copied merely the phrases referring to the Sacrifice of the Cross, and left entirely aside those referring to the Sacrifice of the Mass. True, there is one passage in the *Antididagma* on the Mass which Cranmer is supposed to have "copied," but a glance at the two will show what a difference there is between the original and the "copy" :

Antididagma.

Pncipitque ut sanctissimum *illud sacrificium* patri coelesti iterum atque iterum ac semper quosque veniat, spiritualiter et commemorative *offeramus*.

Prayer Book.

And did institute, and in His holy gospel command us to *celebrate* a perpetual *memory* of that His precious death, until His coming again.

The sacrifice referred to in the *Antididagma* as "*illud sacrificium*" is described in the passage immediately preceding as "a certain image of Christ's bloody sacrifice, a sacrifice whereby we might thenceforth *again and again offer sacrifice* in the Church," and this is the sacrifice which we "*offer*." Cranmer merely talks about "*celebrating*" a "*memory*" of Christ's death. There is all the difference in the world between "*offering a sacrifice*" and "*celebrating a memory*" *of a sacrifice*.*

11. The passage we have just quoted from the Anglican rite develops into an "epiclesis" :

"Hear us, O Merciful Father, and with Thy Holy Spirit and Word, vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these Thy creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of Thy dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ."

Gasquet and Bishop remark, concerning the first part of this :

** there can be no reasonable doubt that this passage was suggested by the invocation of the Holy Ghost found after the words of institution in the Greek liturgies. The forms of this invocation in the Clementine liturgy, and in those of St. James, St. Basil, and

¹ See pp. 192-194.

¹ For references and a discussion of this whole question see my article in the *Clergy Review* for November, 1934. In this I suggest that, *inter alia*, Cranmer may have borrowed his phraseology on the sacrifice of the Cross from Gardiner's Sermon of June 29th, 1548.

St. Chrysostom, were well known at this time, from Bessarion's tract *De Sacramento Eucharistia*, and it seems not unlikely that it was the special form in St. Basil's liturgy, the only one in which both words 'bless and sanctify' occur, which set the model."¹

On the other hand, a writer in the *Church Quarterly Review* for January, 1891, p. 435, suggests that it is the liturgy of St. John Chrysostom which was employed, and calls attention to the fact that Cranmer in his *Common Place Book* gives quotations not only from this particular liturgy, but also gives an extract from St. John Chrysostom's work *De proditiōe Juda*, and in a marginal note remarks: "Divina virtute et verbo consecrantur in corpus et sanguinem Christi." This would certainly explain the curious phrase "with Thy Holy Spirit and Word" which Cranmer has used.

It is to be noted that this first Prayer Book allows two signs of the cross to be made over the elements at the words "bless and sanctify." This, as we shall see, was criticised by Bucer, and omitted in subsequent editions, together with the prayer for the blessing of the elements.

But a much more significant fact is that Cranmer's rite prays that the "creatures of bread and wine" "may *be unto us* the body and blood." The Latin Canon has not "*sint*" but "*fiant*" i.e., not "that they may *be*," but "that they may *become*" or "*be made*." If Cranmer had consulted Bessarion, as he probably did, he must have noted that the Greek liturgies speak of "*ejjiciat*" or "*faciat*" and in point of fact his change of word here was deliberate, as we gather from his subsequent controversy with Gardiner (see p. 441). As Gasquet and Bishop remark, in Cranmer's form, as it is inserted in the book of 1549, "there is nothing which is not perfectly reconcilable with the Helvetian doctrine of the Lord's Supper."²

12. Next, in the Latin and English rites, we get the commemoration of the Institution of the Eucharist, with the recital of the words of Consecration. But the Anglican form differs in many respects from the form in the Missal, and while it resembles in some ways the form in the Mozarabic rite, it resembles still more closely a Lutheran form, and Gasquet and Bishop conclude that "there can be no doubt that the words were derived from the Lutheran liturgy of Brandenburg-Nuremberg."³ The Nuremberg formula was set forth in the Catechism of Justus Jonas, which Cranmer had already translated into English.

* *Op. cit.*, p. 204 note.

• *Loc. cit.*

• *Op. cit.*, p. 207.

390 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

The English rite is conservative to the extent that it translates “*benedixit*” by “blessed.” As Gasquet and Bishop show, this word was appealed to by the Catholics, and it disappears from subsequent Prayer Books. It is not found in the Nuremberg formula, but may have been introduced from the Missal. The “bread” and “cup” are held in the priest’s hands when they are being consecrated, as in the Latin rite.

In the Catholic rite, the consecrated elements are elevated and shown to the people. But a rubric in the English rite directs that there is to be “no elevation, or shewing the Sacrament to the people.”

13. After the Consecration, the Catholic rite continues with the “*Unde et Memores*” with its solemn oblation of the consecrated host and chalice :

“Wherefore we Thy servants, calling to mind the blessed passion of the same Christ Thy Son our Lord, His resurrection from the dead, and glorious ascension into heaven, offer unto Thy most excellent Majesty, of Thy gifts bestowed upon us, a pure Host, a holy Host, a spotless Host, the holy Bread of eternal life, and the Chalice of everlasting salvation.”

The Anglican rite puts instead the following significant and colourless words :

“Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, according to the institution of Thy dearly beloved Son . . . we *celebrate* and make here before Thy divine majesty with these Thy holy gifts the *memorial* which Thy Son hath willed us to make, having in remembrance His blessed passion. . . .”

Here, then, the “pure, holy and spotless victim, the *holy Bread of eternal life and the Chalice of everlasting salvation*” are not “*offered to God's most excellent Majesty*” but instead, with “*these holy Gifts*” a “*memorial*” is “*celebrated* and made before God's divine majesty.” There is all the difference in the world between these two formula; !

14. The Latin rite continues : “*Supra qua*” :

“Upon which (holy bread of eternal life, and chalice of everlasting salvation) vouchsafe to look with a propitious and serene countenance, and to accept them, as Thou wast graciously pleased to accept the gifts of Thy just servant Abel, and the Sacrifice of our patriarch Abraham, and that which Thy high Priest Melchisedeck offered to Thee, a Holy Sacrifice, and Unspotted Victim.”

In place of this, the Anglican rite has :

“ rendering unto Thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same (Passion), entirely desiring Thy fatherly goodness to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, most humbly beseeching Thee to grant that by the merits and death of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in His blood, we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His Passion. And here we offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto Thee.”

Thus, whereas the Catholic rite glances back to the sacrifices of Abel, Abraham, and Melchisdeck, and begs God to accept the “ *holy Bread of eternal life and the Chalice of everlasting salvation* ” which have just been *offered to Him*, the Anglican rite instead thanks God for Christ’s passion, and begs Him to accept this “ sacrifice ” of *praise and thanks* for the death of Christ. And then, in addition to praise and thanksgiving, the worshippers *offer themselves* to God.

The Catholic rite goes on, “ *Supplices te rogamus* ” :

“ We most humbly beseech Thee to command these things (the holy bread of eternal life, and the chalice of everlasting salvation) to be borne by the hands of Thy holy Angel to Thy *altar* on high, in the sight of Thy Divine Majesty, that as many as shall partake of the most sacred Body and Blood of Thy Son at this *altar*, may be filled with every grace and blessing.”

Instead of this, the Anglican rite follows up the “ offering of ourselves ” with these words :

“ humbly beseeching Thee that whosoever shall be partakers of this holy Communion may worthily receive the most precious body and blood of Thy Son Jesus Chnst, and be fulfilled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction, and be made one body with Thy Son Jesu Christ, that He may dwell in Him and they in Him.”

Here we note that whereas the Catholic rite speaks of “ those who partake of the *most sacred Body and Blood at this altar* ” the Anglican rite speaks instead of those who partake of *this holy Communion*, and asks that these may “ worthily receive the Body and Blood,” as though this were distinct from the Communion itself, and, as it were, a reward for it. The Anglican rite then continues :

“ And although we be unworthy . . . to offer unto Thee any Sacrifice, yet we beseech Thee to accept this our bounden duty and service, and command these our prayers and supplications by the ministry of Thy holy angels, to be brought up into Thy holy tabernacle, before the sight of Thy Divine Majesty.”

392 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

The "bounden duty and service" which is described as a "sacrifice" is not further specified, but it presumably applies to the things offered already, i.e., "praise and thanksgiving," and "ourselves"—unless it be taken to refer to the "prayers and supplications" mentioned in the next phrase. It is *these prayers and supplications* not the holy Bread of eternal life* and the Chalice of everlasting salvation^ which are to be borne by the hands of the angels, not to the altar on high, but "into the holy tabernacle." The denial of the Catholic doctrine of the Sacrifice is here most evident, and the exclusion of the Real Objective Presence almost as explicit.

15. In the Latin rite, there now come the *Memento* of the Dead, and the prayer for those present (*Nobis quoque peccatoribus*). The former we have dealt with, and the latter has no special equivalent in the Anglican rite.

The Latin rite finishes with a long doxology :

"Through Christ our Lord, by whom, O Lord, Thou dost always create, sanctify, quicken, bless and give us all these good things : Through Him, with Him and in Him be to Thee, God the Father Almighty, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honour and glory, for ever and ever. Amen."

And while these words are said, the chalice and host are elevated, this being what is called the "Lesser Elevation." It is, in point of fact, the original elevation, and corresponds to the "*Sancta sanctis*" in the Eastern rites. The Anglican rite has a simpler doxology, without, of course, any elevation.

16. In Luther's rite, after the consecration and elevation, the Lord's Prayer is to be said, with the usual introduction. But the "*Libera nos*" which follows in the Catholic rite is to be omitted, together with the breaking of the host, and the "*Pax Domini*" is to follow immediately.

In the Anglican rite, the Lord's Prayer occurs, but the introduction is slightly changed. The "*Libera nos*" is omitted, as Luther directs, and the breaking of the host also.

17. In the Catholic rite, the *Agnus Dei* is now said, and then a portion of the host is now dropped into the chalice, with the words "*Hac commixtio* :

"May this most sacred mixture of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ be made to me and to all who receive it, health of mind and body, and a salutary preparation for the winning of life everlasting."

Luther makes no provision for this act or this prayer, and puts the *Agnus Dei* later, as we shall see. *

The Anglican rite also postpones the *Agnus Dei*, and omits the commixion and its accompanying prayer, and substitutes the following :

“ 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.”

This is evidently meant to take the place of the recitation of the *Agnus Dei*. But in the Catholic rite, the *Agnus Dei*, etc., is obviously addressed to Our Lord present in the Blessed Sacrament, for the priest recites it while he holds the host in his hands (in the Sarum rite). The Anglicans instead replace it by words addressed, not to Our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament, but to the *people*, and simply reminds them that Our Lord was offered *in the past, once for all*.

18. In the Catholic rite there now follow some very beautiful prayers in preparation for Communion. In the Sarum rite, the priest prays as follows :

“ O Lord, Holy Father, Almighty Eternal God, grant that I may so worthily receive this, the most holy Body and Blood of Thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ, that I may deserve to receive the pardon of all my sins, and be filled with Thy Holy Spirit, and to have peace. . . .

“ O God the Father, fount and source of all goodness, who, moved by Thy mercy, hast willed that Thy only begotten Son should for us come down to this world below and take upon Himself human flesh, which I, unworthy as I am, here hold in my hands, I adore Thee, I glorify Thee, I praise Thee with all the strength of my heart, and I beseech Thee that Thou wilt not abandon us Thy servants, but wilt forgive us our sins, so that we may merit with a pure mind and a chaste body to serve Thee alone, the true and living God.”

The above two prayers are peculiar to the Sarum rite. In the Roman rite their place is taken by a prayer for unity. Then, in both rites, comes the following :

“ Lord Jesus Christ . . . who . . . hast by Thy death . . . given life to the world, deliver me by this most sacred body and blood from all my iniquities and from all evils. . . .

“ O Lord Jesus Christ, although, unworthy as I am, I receive the sacrament of Thy Body and Blood, let it not be to my judgment and condemnation, but through Thy mercy let it be to the salvation of my soul and body. Amen.”

After this, in the Sarum rite, the priest says :

“ Hail, for ever, most holy Flesh of Christ, the sovereign sweetness to me before all things and above all things.”

This is absent from the Roman rite.

Luther allows the priest to say the first of the prayers in the Roman Missal, i.e., the prayer for peace, which has no reference to the Blessed Sacrament. The Anglican rite here incorporates the rest of the Order of Communion of 1548 (two of the exhortations having been used in place of a sermon, as we have seen). Thus *Cranmer deliberately excludes the Sarum and Roman prayers, with their definite implication of the Real Objective Presence.* These are replaced by an exhortation to “ draw near and take this holy sacrament to your comfort,” a confession and absolution, the comfortable words, and the “ Prayer of Humble Access.” We have discussed the phraseology used in this in our treatment of the Order of Communion of 1548.

19. After these preparatory prayers, in the Catholic rite, the priest receives the Body and Blood, saying, “ May the Body (or Blood) of our Saviour Jesus Christ keep my soul to life everlasting.” And then he administers the Body to communicants, if there are any. In the Sarum rite, the priest says “ May the Body of Our Lord Jesus Christ be to me a sinner the way and the life, in the name of the Father, etc.” Luther directs that the formula of administration is to be unchanged, but people are to receive under both kinds, and while they receive the *Agnus Dei* is to be sung. In the Anglican rite, the same is done. But the form of administration is not the usual Catholic one, but the new form as used in the Communion Book of 1548, in which the words “ which was given for thee ” are inserted after “ The body of our Lord Jesus Christ,” thus once more directing the attention to an act of sacrifice which *took place in the past*, rather than to any oblation in the present.

There is, however, one interesting change in the rubrics accompanying the administration. The Order of Communion, as we have seen, said that an assistant priest could “ minister the *wine* ” while the celebrant “ ministereth the *bread*.” The preceding rubric, on the other hand, spoke of “ the *sacrament of the body*,” and “ the *sacrament of the blood*.” The 1549 Prayer Book uses these latter phrases also in the rubric about the assistant priest or deacon, instead of the terms “ *bread* ” and “ *wine*.” As Bonner criticised the first draft of the book precisely because it

employed these terms "*bread*" and "*wine*" (see p. 405) it seems likely that this particular change was made because of his objection.¹ After all, the doctrine implied by the book was made sufficiently clear in the rest of the service!

The rubric in the 1548 rite providing for the consecration of more wine is omitted from the 1549 book, but this is doubtless because the rubric at the "Offertory" has directed "the minister" to "take so much bread and wine as shall suffice for the persons appointed to receive the holy Communion," and accordingly, a second consecration would presumably be unnecessary.

20. After the reception and distribution of Communion, the Roman rite has the "Ablutions," in which the chalice is cleansed with wine and water, while the following prayers are said :

Quod ore sumpsimus : "Grant, O Lord, that what we have taken with our mouth, we may take with a pure mind, and that from a temporal gift, it may become to us an eternal remedy."

Corpus tuum : "May Thy Body, O Lord, which I have received, and Thy Blood which I have drunk, cleave to my bowels, and grant that no stain of sin may remain in me, whom these pure and holy sacraments have refreshed."

The Ablutions are omitted by Luther, but he allows the two prayers to be said.

The Sarum rite has the *Quod ore sumpsimus*, as above, and in place of the "*Corpus tuum*" the following :

"May this communion, O Lord, purify us from sin, and make us partakers in the heavenly remedy.

"Let us worship the sign of the Cross, through which we have taken the sacrament of salvation."

The purification of the chalice, and all these prayers, disappear in the Anglican rite.

After the Ablutions, the Catholic rite has what is called the "Communion," a sentence representing a psalm originally sung while the people were receiving Communion. Luther says that the Communion of the old missals may be sung if desired. The

¹ Constant, in *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, 191 x, p. 78, is very inaccurate on this point. He says that a rubric which spoke of "the sacrament of the bread" was changed into "sacrament of the body." But there is no evidence that any rubric spoke of "the sacrament of the bread," and there was certainly no such rubric in the Order of Communion. Constant actually goes on to remark that by the phrase "sacrament of the body," "la présence réelle semblait nettement affirmée." Constant has evidently derived his information from p. 214 of Gasquet and Bishop, but he misquotes and misunderstands these authorities.

370 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

good and holy men to minister God's word,¹ and chiefly in those places where there were Christian men already which lacked preachers, and the apostles themselves could not longer abide with them. For the apostles did walk abroad into diverse parts of the world, and did study to plant the gospel in many places. Wherefore where they found godly men, and meet to preach God's word,² they laid their hands upon them, and gave them the Holy Ghost, as they themselves received of Christ the same Holy Ghost, to execute this office. And they that were so ordained were in deed and also were called the ministers of God as the Apostles were, as Paul saith unto Timothy.³ And so the ministration of God's word,⁴ which our Lord Jesus Christ Himself did first institute, was derived from the Apostles unto other after them, by imposition of hands and giving the Holy Ghost, from the Apostles' time to our days. And this was the consecration, orders, and unction of the Apostles, whereby they, at the beginning, made *bishops and priests*, and this shall continue in the Church, even to the world's end.⁶ And whatsoever rite or ceremony hath been added more than this cometh of man's ordinance and policy, and is not commanded by God's word."⁶

We note from the above that, while the Christian ministry may, in a sense, claim Apostolic descent, it is only a "Gospel" ministry, i.e., the "ministry of the word," which is thus handed on to «priests».⁷ But again we emphasize the fact that the Lutheran ministers (including their superintendents) are of course considered by Justus Jonas to be in this Apostolic succession. Moreover, this conception of the ministry must be harmonised with the Lutheran conception of the universal priesthood of all believers, and with the idea that the minister is the delegate of the congregation, which is the ultimate repository of the power to administer the word and the sacraments. This becomes clear from the following further passage :

"The Christian Church . . . is one holy congregation or assembly. And this congregation receiveth of their head and lord Jesus Christ all spiritual riches and gifts that pertaineth to the sanctification and making holy of the same body. And these ghostly treasures be common to the whole body and to every member of the same. . . . And these are the said gifts which be common to the whole Church of Christ, and to every member

1 *Mandarunt ministerium verbi.*

* *Idoneos ad ministerium verbi.*

• *Illi tunc erant veri et vocati ministri Dei, non aliter atque ipsi apostoli, sicut Paulus in Ep. ad Tim. clare ostendit.*

• *Ministerium verbi.*

■ *Haec vera est apostolica consecratio, ordinatio, et unctio, qua consecrandi sunt sacerdotes inde ab initio, quae et in ecclesia manebit usque ad finem mundi.*

• *Quicquid praeterea additum est caeremoniarum, sine necessitate inventum et additum est ab hominibus.*

⁷ *Sacerdotes* : there is no mention in Justus Jonas of *episcopi*.

of the same . . . preaching the gospel, the administration of baptism, and the sacrament of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, etc. . . ."¹

Further, it is the Church which "doth appoint and ordain us to be preachers and ministers of these most precious treasures."²

3. It is difficult to say definitely whether this sets forth the conception of the Christian ministry which Cranmer himself held in 1548. A translator does not *necessarily* identify himself with everything contained in a work he translates. In any case, though some kind of Apostolic Succession is here inculcated, it must be borne in mind that it is merely a succession of evangelicals, ministers of the word, or "preachers of the Gospel." Further, though it allows for imposition of hands and the giving of the Holy Ghost, as a rite "derived from the Apostles," "whereby they made bishops and priests," and states that this rite "shall continue," it carefully does *not* say that Holy Order is a *Sacrament*. It is a "rite or ceremony to ordain preachers and ministers of God's word." And this implies, both in Cranmer and in Justus Jonas, the Evangelical or non-sacerdotal conception of the Christian ministry. We know that this was the conception held at this time by Cranmer, for he had already abandoned the doctrine of the Real Presence and of the Propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass. (See pp. 328-329.)

4. As this Catechism was, in any case, a Lutheran production, and seemed to inculcate some kind of Real Presence, its translation was naturally not welcomed by the Zwinglians in England. Thus John ab Ulmis wrote to Bullinger on August 18th, 1548 :

"Thomas . . . has lately published a Catechism, in which he has not only approved that foul and sacrilegious Transubstantiation of the papists in the Holy Supper of our Saviour,³

^x Page 124.

¹ *Ibm.* p. 125. "Omnes thesauros et opes spirituales quae pertinent ad sanctificationem . . . sunt bona omnibus et singulis communia. . . . Haec autem sunt bona quae Christiani! et tota Christi Ecclesia habet communia . . . evangelium . . . baptismus, sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Domini Nostri Jesu Christi . . . oratio. . . . Quando ergo vera Ecclesia, habens Spiritum et verbum, haec tanta et tam accumulata bona nobis promittit, non dubitare debemus, nos ea jam accepisse. Et quando in his bonis et opibus constituit nos oeconomus, ministros, et concionatores, non dubitandum est quin Deus efficaciter nobiscum operetur" (pp. 105-6).

• This interpretation of Cranmer's language is not justifiable, as we have seen. "Cranmer indeed disclaimed this inference, maintaining that the language of the Catechism was to be understood *spiritually*; and it is remarkable that many of the strong expressions of the original were studiously softened in the translation, for the sake, as it appears, of admitting such a sense."—Jenkyns' *Preface* to Cranmer's works, p. hoax.

Anglican rite gives instead a selection of verses from Scripture which may be used for the purpose.

21. After the "Communion," in the Catholic rite there comes the "Post Communion," a variable collect. Luther directs that this is to be omitted, "because it is suggestive almost always of sacrifice." The Anglican rite similarly omits it.

Then, in the Catholic rite, there comes "*Ite⁹ missa est*" and the prayer *Placeat*:

"Let the homage of my service be pleasing unto Thee, O Holy Trinity, and grant that the Sacrifice which I, though unworthy, have offered up in the sight of Thy Majesty, may be acceptable to Thee, and through Thy mercy be propitiatory for me and for all those for whom I have offered it."

Luther abolishes this altogether. The Anglican rite replaces it by the following :

"Almighty and everlasting God, we most heartily thank Thee 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. . . . Assist us with Thy grace. . . ."

Here we have no prayer for the acceptance of a sacrifice offered, but thanks are given for "spiritual" food—note the word "spiritual" here.

Finally, the service ends with a Blessing. The Latin rite adds the Last Gospel, but this is absent, both from the Lutheran and from the Anglican rite.

22. At the end of the English Communion service there follow a number of rubrics. The first allows for the saying of the Communion Service as far as the Offertory inclusive, if there are none to communicate with the priest. The second rubric allows a similar "celebration" on other days. The third stipulates that there shall be no celebration anywhere except there be some to communicate with the priest. The fourth rubric states that the bread is to be unleavened, but "larger and thicker than it was, so that it may be aptly divided in divers pieces," and then comes the statement taken from the Communion Book, that "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 Jesu Christ." We have discussed the implication of this on a previous page. The fifth rubric allows the faithful to give money instead of bread at the Offertory. The sixth repeats that there must be communicants at every celebration. The

seventh says that people must communicate once a year at the least in their parish church. The eighth explains why the previous method of administering the host is retained :

“Although it be read in ancient writers, that the people, many years past, received at the priest's hands the Sacrament of the body of Christ in their own hands, and no commandment of Christ to the contrary : Yet, forasmuch as they many times conveyed the same secretly away, kept it with them, and diversely abused it to superstition and wickedness : lest any such thing hereafter should be attempted, and that a uniformity might be used throughout the whole Realm, it is thought convenient the people commonly receive the Sacrament of Christ's body in the mouths, at the priest's hand.”

23. This will be a suitable place to consider the arrangements made for Communion of the Sick. There is a rubric to the effect that if parishioners often receive communion in church, “they shall have no cause, in their sudden visitation, to be unquieted for lack of the same.” This obviously strikes a blow at the practice of receiving viaticum. The rubric goes on to say that

“if the sick person be not able to come to the church, and yet is desirous to receive the communion in his house, then he must give knowledge . . . to the curate, saying how many be appointed to communicate with him. And if the same day there be a celebration . . . in the church, then shall the priest reserve (at the open Communion) so much of the sacrament of the body and blood as shall serve the sick person and so many as shall communicate with him (if there be any), and so soon as he conveniently may, after the open Communion ended in the church, shall go and minister the same, first to those that are appointed to communicate with the sick (if there be any) and last of all to the sick person himself. . . . But if the day be not appointed for the open communion in the church, then (upon convenient warning given) the curate shall come . . . and there celebrate the holy communion. . . . And if there be more sick persons to be visited the same day that the curate doth celebrate in any sick man's house : then shall the curate there reserve so much of the sacrament of the body and blood as shall serve the other sick persons . . . and shall immediately carry it and minister it unto them. But if any man either by reason of extremity of sickness, or for lack of warning given in due time to the curate, or by any other just impediment, do not receive the sacrament of Christ's body and blood, then the curate shall instruct him, that if he do truly repent . . . and steadfastly believe . . . giving hearty thanks . . . he doth eat and drink spiritually the body and blood of our Saviour Christ, profitably to his soul's health, although he do not receive the sacrament with his mouth.”

There are several points to be noted here. It is obvious that these rubrics are intended to discourage the previous Catholic practice of reserving the Host in Church, and communicating the sick therefrom. Instead, the sacrament is to be taken from a Communion service, or else, if necessary, a Communion service is to take place in the sick man's rooms. It is absurd to suggest, as Hanis does,¹ that "the two methods of communicating the sick provided by the First Prayer Book were intended to be supplementary to the traditional method."² It is painfully obvious that the intention is to *supplant* the old. Note also that the sick man is to be told that if the arrangements made do not admit of his receiving communion, provided he repents, has faith, etc., he receives the body and blood "spiritually"—which is all that the ordinary communicant does in Church, so that there is ultimately no difference between "sacramental" and "spiritual" communion!

It is of interest to note that Mr. Harris allows that some of the phraseology of these rubrics is derived from the corresponding rubrics in the Lutheran Brandenburg Church Order of 1540, "which was in the hands of the 1549 revisers."³ He describes the Brandenburg arrangements, which are not altogether dissimilar to the English ones, and remarks of them that "Continuous Reservation for the purpose of providing viaticum is obviously not here contemplated."⁴ He also remarks that "the continental Reformers—even those of the Lutheran school—attached far less importance to ministrations to the sick and dying than did the early and mediaeval Church,"⁵ and it seems evident that the same must be said of the English Reformers. As to the Calvinistic Churches, "not a few" of their Church Orders "ignore the needs of the sick and dying altogether," but those which provide for the communion of the sick "agreed in insisting on the presence of fellow-communicants at all sick Communion services as a matter of principle,"⁶ so that it is from the Calvinistic churches that the English Prayer Book has adopted this strange practice!

¹ *Liturgy and Worship*, p. 553.

* The only evidence Mr. Harris produces in support of his extraordinary interpretation is the continued existence and use of Pyxes. But these would naturally be used for carrying the host to the sick, after the communion service, in accordance with the new rubric. Presumably the consecrated wine would be taken in some other vessel.

• *Op. cit.*, p. 553 note.

• Page 575.

• Page 574.

* Page 575.

E. THE DOCTRINE OF THE NEW SERVICE.

Summarising the new Communion service as a whole, we may say, with Gasquet and Bishop, that it coincides with Luther's service in all features save in the one point of the retention of a Canon. Luther swept the Canon away altogether, Cranmer preferred to follow the example of the Reformed liturgies of Brandenburg and Strassburg, and so wrote a new Canon, ° leaving in it a few shreds of the Ancient one, but divesting it of its character of sacrifice and oblation. Even the closest theological scrutiny of the new composition will not detect anything inconsistent with, or excluding, Luther's negation of the sacrificial idea of the Mass.¹ But this question of the Sacrifice is worthy of a little more consideration. The *Antididagma*, as we have shown in a former section, finds four sacrifices in the Mass : (i) the symbolical offering of bread and wine ; (2) the offering of the Body and Blood of Christ to God the Father, in memory of the Passion ; (3) a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving ; (4) the offering of ourselves. The Anglican rite sweeps away the first two, and retains only the two latter. And the only difference between the Anglicans and the Lutherans is that the latter recognised the existence of the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, and the offering of ourselves, but preferred not to express these verbally in the prayers of their new liturgy, while the Anglicans both recognised them and expressed them in their prayers. But they all agreed that there was no offering of Christ's Body and Blood in the Mass, and any terms implying any such sacrifice, or even any symbolical offering of bread and wine, were rigorously excluded.

The concession that in the Eucharist there is a " sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," and an " offering of ourselves," will account sufficiently for the retention of the terms " altar" and " priest," which are sometimes invoked as a proof that the new Anglican rite retained the ancient Sacrifice. As to the term « priest," we have seen that the Continental reformers constantly employ this term for their ministers, even in its Latin form *sacerdos*.² Moreover, Bucer even speaks of the " *sacerdotium*."*

¹ Gasquet and Bishop, *op. cit.*, pp. 223-4.

Gasquet and Bishop conclude: " Looking therefore at the characteristics of the new Anglican service, and contrasting it on the one hand with the ancient Missal, and on the other with the Lutheran liturgies, there can be no hesitation whatever in classing it with the latter, not with the former " (*loc. cit.*).

* See pp. 145, 146, 168, 190.

* See passages cited in my *Lutheran Origin of the Anglican Ordinal*, p. 55.

400 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

But all these denied the Catholic doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass, and by “*sacerdos*” merely one who is deputed to exercise vicariously the universal priesthood of all believers. As to the word “altar,” an official explanation of the meaning of this term was soon put forth by the English Reformers, as we shall see,¹ and in any case, it is evident that the term must be understood in relation to the “sacrifice” offered, i.e., the “sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving,” and the “offering of ourselves.”

The next point is the doctrine of the *Presence*. It is often contended that the First Prayer Book teaches, suggests, or at any rate does not exclude, the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence. Thus Dr. Darwell Stone says that “the new office did not contain any sign of a change of doctrine. . . . At the administration the consecrated elements are called ‘the sacrament of the body of Christ.’”² But he allows that “it did not commit those who used it to one opinion or to another as to whether the substance of the bread and wine remains after consecration.”³ It is somewhat surprising to find that the Abbé Constant similarly says that in this First Prayer Book “la doctrine de la présence réelle subsiste en son intégrité”!⁴ This is simply to ignore the most patent facts. We have shown how all the phrases in the ancient service which implied the Real Objective Presence are changed and modified, and that the new service speaks of the consecrated elements, not as the *Body and Blood*, but as the *sacrament of the body* and the *sacrament of the blood*, and that furthermore it goes out of its way to emphasize that there is only a *spiritual reception* in the Supper, making a significant change in this respect to the already doubtful expressions in the Order of 1548. True, there are still a few ambiguous expressions which remain, and we shall show how these were appealed to by Gardiner, criticised by Bucer, and accordingly altered in the Second Book. The most definite of these is the rubric saying that in each particle of the consecrated bread there is received the whole body of Christ. The significant word here is “received” as Cranmer subsequently pointed out.

We allow, however, that some kind of a Presence is implied in this First Communion Service. But if its phraseology is

^x See p. 508.

^{*} *History of the Doctrine of the Eucharist*, ii, p. 137.

Darwell Stone similarly says of the Order of Communion of 1548 that “No change in doctrine was asserted or implied in it”! (*Op. cit.*, p. 132.)

[•] *Ibid.*

^{*} *Eucharistia*, p. 222.

compared with that used by Bucer and Calvin, it will be seen that the kind of Presence envisaged is *precisely the kind allowed by these Continental Reformers*. It is hardly the presence as understood by the Lutherans, and it is manifestly *not* the Real Objective Presence by Transubstantiation which was the hitherto received doctrine of the Catholic Church in England, as elsewhere.

CHAPTER VIII

THE DEBATE ON THE EUCHARIST IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS, AND THE VOTING ON THE ACT OF UNIFORMITY

A. THE DEBATE IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

1. Having now analysed the new Prayer Book, and especially the new Communion service contained in it, we must now pass on to consider its reception by the ecclesiastical authorities. The records of Convocation for this period are no longer extant. Gasquet and Bishop have shown that Convocation probably met at the same time as Parliament, i.e., in November, 1548.¹ King Edward VI in a letter to Bonner dated July 23rd, 1549, seems to state that the new Prayer Book was approved by the clergy in Convocation, but on the other hand, Heylin, who knew of the contents of the Records of Convocation, which had not then been destroyed, seems to allow that the clergy had not approved of the book.² In any case, it seems clear that the new Prayer Book was not approved by the bishops sitting in Convocation.³ It is, however, suggested by Gasquet and Bishop, and accepted by others,⁴ that the new Prayer Book, or at any rate the Communion service contained in it, was submitted by Somerset to a meeting of Bishops before the assembly of Parliament, and probably in October, 1548.⁵ We know, of course, that bishops and others met at the end of September, to compile or discuss the new Prayer Book (the "Windsor Commission"). And on examination, the evidence for this *further* and *distinct* meeting of the bishops is very slight indeed. It consists of a letter of Butcher of Strassburg written on October 29th, to the effect that the government, roused by the brawlings as to the sacrament, "have convoked a synod of the bishops to consult about religion."⁶

* *Op. dt.*, p. 149.

^a See Gasquet and Bishop, *op. dt.*, ch. x.

^y See Gasquet and Bishop, *op. cit.*, p. 152, Proctor and Frere, *History of*

⁵⁰ æ

P*⁴ By Dr. Brightman, for instance in *Liturgy and Worship*, p. 155.

^a *Op. di.*, p. 178.

• Gasquet and Bishop, *op. cit.*, p. 178.

But this might well refer to the "Windsor Commission." (b) The second line of evidence is that in the debate in the House of Lords, Somerset speaks of "the bishops' consultation,"¹ which "was appointed for unity." But why should not this also signify the "Windsor Commission," which was appointed to produce "one uniform order throughout the realm"? The only other line of evidence is that Thirlby says that the bishops signed the book, not to signify their assent to its doctrine, but "only in disputation" and because it was agreed on that many things were to be treated afterwards.² But why should not this refer again to the "Windsor Commission"? Thirlby was one of the members of this, and if he signed, on the understanding that certain things were to be dealt with afterwards, surely it is likely that he did so at the end of the sittings of the "Commission" which "produced" the book rather than at a meeting of bishops to review it?

There seems, then, to be no positive evidence of any such supplementary meeting of the bishops. And as against such a meeting, there is the remarkable fact that in the debate in the House of Lords, the only Bishops who speak in such a way as to imply that they had formed part of a commission or committee to discuss the Book were precisely those bishops who were members of the "Windsor Commission." The other bishops confine themselves to discussing the Real Presence as such, save Bonner, who condemns the Book without implying that he had had any part in its production, as, of course, he had not. And the same applies to the Bishop of Durham.⁸

2. We conclude, then, against Gasquet and Bishop and Brightman, that there was *no* meeting of Bishops to discuss the Prayer Book between the sittings of the "Commission" which produced it, and the debate in the House of Lords. To this debate we must now briefly refer. This debate was a "discussion

* *Ibid.*, p. 178 note.

• *Ibid.*, p. 163, pp. 403-5.

• We might add that the documents of this reign speak only of the Commission of bishops and clergy which drew up the Prayer Book, the approval of the clergy in "their synods and Convocations provincial/* and the approval of the Bishops in the House of Lords, and of the Commons. There is no claim to a *separate* approval of the Bishops either in Convocation, or in any special meeting convoked for the purpose. (See the quotations from the documents in Gasquet and Bishop, pp. 152-3.) Surely, if there had been such a special approval by the Bishops in Convocation this would have been appealed to. In the House of Lords, Somerset merely speaks of a "consultation" of the Bishops "for unity/* which may well mean the Commission which was "consulting together" to provide "one uniform order.*" Heylin, again, does not seem to believe in any such special meeting of the bishops. Nor does Mr. Page (*Church Quarterly Review*, April, 1924, p. 62).

on the doctrine of the Sacrament," intended to prepare the way for the "introduction of a Bill imposing the new Prayer Book." The discussion began on December 14th, 1548, and extended over some days.

But unfortunately we have no record of what took place on the first day. It seems that the new Communion service was then read through, and that the bishops were invited to give it their official approval, but that at once several of the Anglo-Catholic party, including some who had formed part of the "Windsor Commission," and others who had not, objected to the doctrine it implied. In particular, three doctrinal points would seem to have been raised: (1) the Real Presence; (2) whether the Body be received of an evil man, or not; (3) of Transubstantiation, and whether the bread be the very substance of the Body or not.¹ In addition, it would seem that Bishop Tunstall complained that the service was not spoken of as "the Mass."

Accordingly, on the next day, Saturday, which Gasquet and Bishop call "the first day," Somerset said they would have to agree to some order in the things to be debated, and that the best way would be to begin with No. 3, "whether bread be in the sacrament after the consecration or not."

Tunstall, of Durham (Anglo-Catholic), however, started off by saying that "The Mass used to be called so,"² until Somerset reminded him that the discussion was to be on "the consecration." Accordingly, in the rest of the debate, Tunstall states that after consecration no bread remains,³ and complains that "the adoration is left out of the book," because the doctrine set forth in it is that "there is nothing in the sacrament but bread and wine."⁴ This is important, as showing how one Anglo-Catholic bishop, and that a great friend of Cranmer, interpreted its phraseology!

We will now summarise the other views expressed.

Bishop Day, of Chichester (Anglo-Catholic), defended the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

To this we must add that according to Somerset, "Only the Bishop of Chichester refused to agree" to the Book, i.e., to sign it and this he did for the following reasons:

¹ See statement by Thirlby, Bishop of Norwich, on second day of debate, in Gasquet and Bishop, *op. cit.*, p. 407.

* It is on this that we base our supposition that the service in the original draft was not called "the Mass."

• Gasquet and Bishop, *op. cit.*, pp. 391, 401, 426.

* *Ibid.*, p. 397.

1. In Confirmation there was no anointing with oil.
2. The Communion service prayed that the bread "may be to us," instead of "be made unto us" the Body of Christ.
3. He wanted certain words added after the Consecration, i.e., "Command . . . that these Sacrifices and oblations, etc."¹

Heath, of Worcester (Anglo-Catholic) similarly defends the Catholic doctrine that the bread is converted into Our Lord's Body, which is received both by the good and by the bad communicant. There is a "*signum*," or thing seen, and a "thing hid," which is Our Lord's Body.²

Thirlby, of Westminster (Anglo-Catholic), said that the Book had been signed only for purpose of disputation, and that for his part he did never allow the doctrine contained in it.³ He had signed the Book in that sense, (1) because "although of some there is in it too much, yet he allows that it stands with Scripture"; (2) "Many things were wanting in it, but these were agreed to be treated on afterwards," and in these "he desired to agree with other churches"; (3) he signed "for the sake of unity at home." He deplored, however, the absence of the Elevation, and of adoration. Further, when he signed "there was in the book Oblation, which is left out now."⁴

Bonner, of London (Anglo-Catholic), said that the doctrine contained in the book "is not decent, because it hath been condemned abroad as an heresy, and in this realm. . . . There is heresy, because it is called bread."⁵ Bonner saw clearly what doctrine the Book was intended to teach.⁶

Rugg, of Norwich (Anglo-Catholic), defended the orthodox doctrine.⁷

Sampson, of Lichfield (Opportunist), said he "thought the

¹ Gasquet and Bishop, *op. cit.*⁹ p. 404. Note that the absence of these words was one of the reasons why Day (who was on the Commission which "compiled" the Book) refused to approve it. On the other hand, as we shall see, when *Thirlby* (also a Commissioner) approved it, the service had the word "Oblation" in it. We suggest that these two facts can be reconciled if we suppose that the word "oblations" was inserted (temporarily) after "these our prayers" in the "Prayer for the Church" preceding the Consecration, but that *Cranmer* refused to insert "Command . . . that these sacrifices and oblations" after the Consecration, and adhered to the actual form used, "command that these our prayers." He also subsequently struck out the word "oblations" in the "Prayer for the Church" as *Thirlby* complains.

² Pp. 399, 417, 419, 420, 425.
³ Page 403.

⁴ Pp. 403-5. This would seem to imply that the Anglo-Catholic party had secured the temporary insertion of the word "Oblation," probably in the "Prayer for the Church," preceding the Consecration. See note above.

⁵ Pp. 406-7.

⁶ The reference seems to be to one of the rubrics for the giving of Communion. See p. 405. It was apparently modified in consequence of Bonner's criticism.
⁷ Page 408.

doctrine of the book very godly.”¹ He did not believe in Transubstantiation, for he thought ever that could not be, but in Transmutation,² not into the “gross body of Christ,” but into the “glorified body,”³ yet withal “a natural body.”⁴

Skip, of Hereford (Opportunist), defended the Catholic doctrine, and appealed to Lanfranc.⁵

Aldrich of Carlisle (Anglo-Catholic), agreed with the Bishop of Hereford.⁶

Thus, the Anglo-Catholic party defended the orthodox doctrine, the Opportunists were divided. The Protestants, as we might expect, reject the Catholic doctrine :

Holbeach of Lincoln, said that Transubstantiation could not be proved by Scripture.⁷ The elements remain unchanged, except in a mystical sense.⁸ Is not the Body in the receiver rather than in the sacrament ?⁹

Ridley of Rochester, defended his idea of a Virtual Presence, and denied Transubstantiation.¹⁰

Barlow, of Bath, said that the sacrament is a *figure* of Christ's body.¹¹

Goodrich, of Ely, denied that a visible thing could be God, or that a sick man can “see” the body and blood of Christ when he seeth bread and wine. Worshipping of bread is wrong, for the Bible condemns idolatry.¹²

But the most significant attitude was that taken up by *Cranmer*¹³ who defended the *Real Absence*. “Our faith is not to believe Him to be in bread and wine, but that He is in heaven.” “The eating of the body is to dwell in Christ, and this may be though a man never taste the Sacrament. All men eat not the body in the Sacrament.” “The wicked eat not the body of Christ, but eat their condemnation.”¹⁴ “Christ is eaten with the heart. The eating with our mouth cannot give us life. . . . Only good men can eat Christ's body. When the evil eateth the Sacrament, bread and wine, he neither hath Christ's body, nor eateth it.”¹⁵ “Eating with his mouth giveth nothing to man, nor the body being in the bread. . . . Christ gave to His disciples bread and wine, creatures among us, and called it His body.”¹⁶ “Bread is a sign of the body.”¹⁶ “After the consecra-

1 Page 407.

4 Page 440.

7 Page 412.

10 *JP*, 414-5.

*. Pages 400-1.

14 Page 419.

• Page 415.

• Page 430.

• Page 411.

11 Page 402.

• Page 407.

• Page 431.

• Page 403.

14 Page 420.

14 Page 418.

*, Page 425.

sion, it signifies the body of Christ.”¹ “This is my body” means “this is a figure of my body.”² w When Christ bids us eat His body, it is figurative, for we cannot eat His body indeed. . . . To eat His flesh and drink His blood is to be partaker of His passion.”³ “The bread and wine are not changed outwardly, but inwardly. . . . The change is inward, not in the bread but in the receiver.”⁴

3. Somerset significantly remarked in the course of the debate that “in Councils, though some consent not unto the thing, yet by the most part it is concluded”—this in special reference to the fact that Thirlby of Westminster and Day of Chichester had stated that they had not approved of the Book—and perhaps also in view of the fact that Tunstall of Durham, though not one of the Commissioners, had taken the opportunity to criticise it.

Obviously, then, the Book was *not* unanimously agreed upon, as Somerset claimed in his letter to Pole of June 4th, 1549 (“by one consent of the upper and nether house of the Parliament finally concluded and approved”).⁵ The last statement is an *absolute falsehood*.

The same must be said of the statement that the new Liturgy was produced by “one uniform agreement” (Act of Uniformity); Edward VI’s letter to Bonner dated July 23rd, 1549, saying that the book was set forth “not only by the common agreement and full assent of the nobility and commons of the late session of our late parliament, but also by the like assent of the bishops in the same parliament,”⁶ and other like statements.

4. The impression made by this debate upon the Continental Protestants in England, as revealed by their letters at this time, is a very illuminating one. Thus, while Traheron, writing to Bullinger, the leader of the Zwinglians, on August 1st, 1548, had expressed his disapproval of the views of Latimer and Cranmer,⁷ he was able to write on September 28th that “Latimer has come over to our opinion respecting the true doctrine of the Eucharist, together with the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the other bishops who heretofore seemed to be Lutherans,”⁸ and wrote as follows of the Debate in the Lords :

¹ Page 428.

• Page 430.

• Page 434.

* Page 440.

• Quoted in Gasquet and Bishop, *op. cit.*, p. 181 note.

• *Apud* Gasquet and Bishop, *op. cit.*, p. 152.

f *Original Letters*, P.S., p. 320.

• Page 322.

"The Archbishop of Canterbury, contrary to general expectation, most openly, firmly and learnedly maintained your opinion upon this subject. . . . Next followed the Bishop of Rochester (Ridley), who handled the subject with so much eloquence, perspicuity, erudition, and power, as to stop the mouth of that most zealous Papist the Bishop of Worcester (Heath). The truth never obtained a more brilliant victory among us. I perceive that it is all over with Lutheranism, for those who were considered its principal and almost only supporters, have altogether come over to our side."¹

Again, John ab Ulmis writes to Bullinger on November 27th, 1548 :

"The bishops entertain right and excellent opinions about the holy supper. . . . That abominable error and silly opinion of a carnal eating has been long since banished and entirely done away with. Even that Thomas (Cranmer) himself, about whom I wrote to you when I was in London, by the goodness of God . . . is in a great measure recovered from his dangerous lethargy."²

And Peter Martyr writes to Bucer on December 26th, 1548 :

"There is much contention among our people about the eucharist. . . . Even in the supreme council of the state . . . there is so much disputing of the bishops among themselves, and with others, as I think was never heard before . . . Hitherto the popish party has been defeated, and the palm rests with our friends, but especially with the Archbishop of Canterbury. . . . Believe me, he has shown himself so mighty a theologian against them as they would rather not have proof of, and they are compelled, against their inclination, to acknowledge his learning, and power and dexterity in debate. Transubstantiation, I think, is now exploded, and the difficulty respecting the presence is at this time the most prominent point of dispute, but the parties engage with so much vehemence and energy as to occasion very great doubt as to the result, for the victory has been hitherto fluctuating between them. . . . With respect to the change of religion, they can no longer retrace their steps, for such great innovations have everywhere taken place, and all things are so changed and removed from their former state, that if they were long suffered to remain so, disorder would ensue. Wherefore I have no doubt but that something must be decided upon. . . ."³

Similarly, John ab Ulmis wrote to Bullinger on March 2nd, 1549, about "what has been done and determined in this present Parliament respecting the Lord's Supper," and remarked that :

"The Archbishop of Canterbury, a man of singular worth and learning, has, contrary to the general expectation, delivered his opinion upon this subject learnedly, correctly, orderly, and clearly ; and by the weight of his character, and the dignity of his language

¹ Letter of December 31st, 1548, *Original Letters*, p. 323.

² *Original Letters*, p. 383.

³ *Original Letters*, pp. 469-470.

and sentiments, easily drew over all his hearers to our way of thinking.”¹

This almost universal testimony to the Zwinglian views expressed by Cranmer is hard to reconcile with the Bucerian doctrine which he is supposed to have held still at this time ! Smyth admits the difficulty, and allows that “ Traheron was not far from the truth when he said that Cranmer maintained the Zwinglian doctrine,”² but suggests in explanation that “ that was not the only doctrine which he maintained ”—in other words, that he maintained two different doctrines at one and the same time. But this must have been difficult, even to a versatile mind like Cranmer’s.

B. THE VOTING ON THE “ ACT OF UNIFORMITY.”

1. An “ Act of Uniformity,” insisting on the use of the new Prayer Book, under pains and penalties for its non-observance, was read in the House of Lords for the first time on January 7th, 1549, the second time on the 10th, and the third time on the 15th. It was then sent to the Commons, and duly passed. The new Book was to come into use on Whitsunday, June 9th, 1549.

2. The point which interests us is the voting of the Bishops upon the Act at its final reading in the Lords on January 15th. There were present, apparently, eighteen bishops, and of these ten voted for the measure, and eight against it.³ The votes may be classified as follows :

For the Prayer Book :—

Protestants :

Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury.
Holbeach, Bishop of Lincoln.
Goodrich, Bishop of Ely.
Ridley, Bishop of Rochester.
Barlow, Bishop of Bath.
Holgate, Archbishop of York.

Anglo-Catholic :

Bush, Bishop of Bristol.

Opportunist:

Salcot, Bishop of Salisbury.
Sampson, Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield.
Chambers, Bishop of Peterborough.

¹ *Original Letters*, p. 388.
² *House of Lords Journals*, Vol. I.

³ *Cranmer*, p. 67.

410 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

Against the Prayer Book :—

Anglo-Catholics :

Bonner, Bishop of London.
Tunstall, Bishop of Durham.
Heath, Bishop of Worcester.
Thirlby, Bishop of Westminster.
Rugg, Bishop of Norwich.
Aldrich, Bishop of Carlisle.
Day, Bishop of Chichester.

Opportunist:

Skip, Bishop of Hereford.

If we include proxies, we must add the following, in all probability :

For:

King (Anglo-Catholic ; proxies : Holbeach and Ridley).
Wharton (Opportunist; proxies : Goodrich and Salcot).

Against:

Bird (Protestant; proxies : Bonner and Thirlby).

Neutral:

Bulkeley (Opportunist; proxies : Salcot, Thirlby, and Bush).

This would make the voting as follows :

For the new book :

12 (6 Protestants, 2 Anglo-Catholics, 4 Opportunists).

Against:

9 (1 Protestant, 7 Anglo-Catholics, 1 Opportunist).

The voting shows that *the Protestant party was practically unanimous in favour of the Book. The Anglo-Catholic party voted against it, with the exception of Bush of Bristol, and King of Oxford (by proxy). Bush had married, and may well have thought it politic to vote for the Reformers. King of Oxford appointed two Protestant proxies, but was absent himself. The scale was turned by the Opportunists. One voted against the book (Skip of Hereford), but four voted in favour (one by proxy). Of these four, Chambers was "a conformable person," Salcot was "a time server," Sampson had expressed his disbelief in Transubstantiation in the preceding debate, and Wharton of St. Asaph had voted for the Communion Book, and was also married.*

Accordingly, we conclude that *the new book was carried by the Protestant party, with the help of time-serving and "conformable" Opportunists, one married Anglo-Catholic bishop, and another who stayed away but appointed Protestant proxies. It was carried against*

the practically unanimous opposition of the Anglo-Catholic party. (Voysey's proxy arrived too late ; Gardiner was already in prison, otherwise there would doubtless have been two more Anglo-Catholic votes against the Book.)

This is a very valuable indication of the nature of the Book, and the light in which it was regarded by the Anglo-Catholic party. It completely destroys the contention of some modern Anglicans that it was " a Catholic production," or at any rate one intended to satisfy the Anglo-Catholic as well as the Protestant party (Smyth).

We have shown, on the contrary, that the new Prayer Book was *the work of Cranmer, assisted by a " Committee " in which the Protestants had a decisive and controlling majority, and that it was passed by the Protestant and Opportunist votes, in opposition to the Anglo-Catholic bishops.*

CHAPTER IX

THE RECEPTION OF THE FIRST PRAYER BOOK

- A. IMPRISONMENT OF BISHOPS BONNER AND GARDINER.
- B. THE OPINIONS OF THE FOREIGN REFORMERS IN ENGLAND.
- G. THE OPINION OF CALVIN.
- D. THE OPINION OF CARDINAL POLE.

A. IMPRISONMENT OF BISHOPS BONNER AND GARDINER.

1. One immediate result of the promulgation of the new Prayer Book was the imprisonment of Bishop Bonner, who thus came to share the fate of Gardiner. Bonner, it seems, was very remiss in using the Prayer Book, or in insisting upon its use throughout his diocese. "Divers, as well in London as in other parts of your diocese," wrote the Council, "do frequent and haunt foreign rites and masses, and contemn and forbear to praise God and pray for His Majesty after such rites and ceremonies as in this realm are approved and set out by our authority." Accordingly, as had happened in the case of Gardiner, Bonner was ordered to preach a sermon setting forth certain articles to be prescribed by the Council, on September 1st, 1549. He duly preached, but "maintained with all his might the corporeal presence in the Lord's Supper."¹ He was summoned to the Council, tried, and committed to the Marshalsea prison on September 20th, and on October 1st, 1549, was deprived of his see, and Ridley of Rochester translated in his place.

2. Gardiner had been in prison since June 30th, 1548 (see p. 368), for preaching a sermon in defence of the Mass. In June, 1549, the Lord Chancellor told him that if he would conform to the new Prayer Book, he would ask the King to be merciful to him. Gardiner replied by declining to "go to school in prison," and adds, in his account of the incident, that:

"I desired them to remember that I refused not the book by way of contempt, nor in any evil manner."²

¹ Micronius to Bullinger, Sept. 30th, 1549, *Original Letters*, p. 557.

² Foxe, VI, p. 73.

In July, 1550, Gardiner was called upon in prison to subscribe six articles. He said, "I am loth to disobey where I can obey, and not wrest my conscience"; and signed the articles. The third article was as follows:

"The King's majesty hath most christianly and godly set forth . . . a devout and Christian book of service of the church . . . which book is to be accepted and allowed by all bishops, pastors, curates, and all ministers ecclesiastical of the realm of England, and so of them to be declared and commended in all places where they shall fortune to preach or speak to the people of it, that it is a godly and Christian book and order, and to be allowed, accepted, and observed. . . ."

The sixth article was as follows:

"His Majesty and his successors have authority in the said Church of England to alter, reform, correct and amend all errors and abuses, and all rites and ceremonies Ecclesiastical as shall seem from time to time to His Highness and his successors most convenient for the edification of his people, so that the same, alteration be not contrary or repugnant to the Scripture and the law of God."¹

Furthermore, on January 8th, 1551, Gardiner presented a "Long Matter Justificatory" to the Commissioners who were then trying him. This contained the following statements:

"Book of Common Prayer. . . . The said bishop answered in this wise. That book he would not have made after that form, but, as it was, he could with his conscience keep it, and cause others in his diocese to keep it, and diligently see that it should be kept. . . ."

"The said bishop then told them why he liked the said book, and noted unto them how, notwithstanding the alteration, yet touching the truth of the very presence of Christ's most precious body and blood in the sacrament, there was as much spoken in that book as might be desired, and that although the elevation was taken away, yet the adoration, in one special place, was indeed reserved; and showed it them, adding, it must needs be so, affirming also there was never more spoken for the sacrament than in that book, wherewith might be confuted all that spoke against it, if they would take it for authority.

"Further, the said bishop showed them how he liked the declaration of the cause of the change, in the end of the book, whereby appeared the Catholic doctrine not to be touched, but only ceremonies removed."²

3. These declarations by Gardiner have sometimes been quoted in proof of the orthodox character of the First Prayer

¹ Foxe, p. 81.

² Foxe, VI, p. 114.

Book.¹ But in considering their weight, it must be borne in mind that *Gardiner had been in prison since June, 1548, and was constantly being pressed to approve the King's proceedings.* He may well have tried to go as far as he could in this direction. *In order to approve the Book of Common Prayer, he attributed to it the orthodox Catholic doctrine on the Real Presence, on the strength of a few ambiguous phrases, to which we have already alluded.* *He ignored the passages which point clearly in an opposite direction.* We shall see that *Cranmer repudiated the interpretation which Gardiner gave to these ambiguous passages.* And also it is important to note that Gardiner's acceptance of the Prayer Book on the ground that it was an orthodox work did not win him his liberty, but *he was required further to approve the abolition of the Mass, etc.,*² which made it quite clear how the Book was interpreted by the authority which put it forth.

4. The opposition to the new Prayer Book manifested by the Anglo-Catholic Bishops in the House of Lords was reflected in the country by unmistakable signs of dislike. Details can be read in Gasquet and Bishop, but we must single out for special mention the determined action of the Catholics of the West, who rose up in Devon and Cornwall, and demanded that they should have their Mass and Matins in Latin as heretofore, and that the Blessed Sacrament should be worshipped as it was wont to be, and complained that the new service was but a Christmas game !

B. OPINIONS OF FOREIGN REFORMERS IN ENGLAND.

1. The opposition to the new Prayer Book in the country was sternly repressed by the Government, and the new Book enforced. Accordingly many of the clergy endeavoured to make the best of an evil situation, and used the new Communion service as though it were the same as the ancient Mass, which, of course, it was never intended to be.

2. The letters of the Reformers are full of complaints in this respect. Thus Hooper, afterwards Bishop of Gloucester, writing to Bullinger on December 27th, 1549, complains :

“Although the altars are here in many churches changed into tables, the public celebration of the Lord's Supper is very far from the order and institution of Our Lord. Although it is

¹ For instance, they are referred to by Constant, in *Revue d'hist. ecclis.*, 1911, p. 242.

¹ See p. 499.

administered in both kinds, yet in some places the Supper is celebrated three times a day. Where they used heretofore to celebrate in the morning the mass of the Apostles, they now have the communion of the Apostles ; where they had the mass of the blessed Virgin they now have the communion of the virgin ; where they had the principal or high mass they now have, as they call it, the high communion. They still retain their vestments and the candles before the altars. . . . And that popery may not be lost, the mass-priests, although they are compelled to discontinue the use of the Latin language, yet most carefully observe the same tone and manner of chanting to which they were heretofore accustomed in the papacy.”¹

Similarly, Bucer,² in his work *De Regno Christi*, addressed to Edward VI, begun in 1549 and completed in 1550, complains (p. 60) as follows :

“Not a few of the *sacrificuli* set forth the holy communion of Christ as the popish Mass, nor are the people of a different mind. Whence in many places, just as once in the case of Masses, so now they celebrate three communions in one day, and decorate them with the names of the saints and of the mother of the Lord, calling the services the Mass of St. Nicholas, of the Virgin, or of other saints. In addition, there are scarcely any who receive the sacrament at the table of the Lord, except one of the *sacrificuli*, or of his household, and him unwillingly. But by these horrible goings-on, the wrath of God is being most gravely provoked.”

Again, Bucer writes to Calvin from Cambridge on Whitsunday, 1550 :

“Sometimes, many of the parochial clergy so recite and administer the service, that the people have no more understanding of the mysteries of Christ than if the Latin instead of the vulgar tongue were still in use.”

Also, Bucer writes to Hooper, in November, 1550 :

“The Last Supper is in very many places celebrated as the

¹ *Orig. Letters*, p. 72.

² This great Reformer, who had spent most of his life in trying to bring about a rapprochement between the Lutherans and the Zwinglians, accepted an invitation from Cranmer to come to England and help in building up the new Church in this country. He arrived on April 25th, 1549, and for several months was the guest of Cranmer, first at Lambeth Palace, and then at the Archbishop's summer residence at Croydon. In the autumn of 1549 he was appointed Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, but illness, and the death of his fellow Reformer, Fagius, made it impossible for him to go to Cambridge until after November 13th. He doubtless remained in close touch with Cranmer while at Cambridge, and also, at the instance either of Cranmer or of Goodrich, Bishop of Ely and Lord Chancellor, wrote a lengthy criticism of the First Prayer Book, to which we shall refer in due course. He brought with him to England many of his own works, which were afterwards transmitted to the publisher at Bale by Archbishop Grindal in 1577. But his most important influence was on the composition of the English Ordinal. Bucer was also on the friendliest terms with Matthew Parker, who translated his *Defensio* from German into Latin (see p. 196), and who preached the panegyric at his funeral in 1551.

Mass, so much indeed that the people do not know that it differs, beyond that the vernacular tongue is used.”¹

3. Accordingly, it is not surprising that some of the English Reformers began to find fault with the new Prayer Book, which could lend itself to such practices. Thus Hooper writes to Bullinger on March 27th, 1550 :

“The form which our senate, or parliament, as we commonly call it, has prescribed for the whole realm, is very defective, and of doubtful construction, and in some respects indeed manifestly impious. . . . I am so much offended with that book, and that not without abundant reason, that if it be not corrected, I neither can nor will communicate with the Church in the administration of the Supper.”²

But, as we shall see, Hooper's main grievance was to the continued use of the vestments. Others, while admitting that there was room for improvement, had great praise for the Book as a whole. Thus, Richard Hilles writes to Bullinger on June 4th, 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* ; for they do not yet feel inclined to adopt your rites respecting the administration of the sacraments. . . . For the preservation of the public peace, they afford no cause of offence to the Lutherans, pay attention to you very learned German divines, submit their judgment to them, and also retain some popish ceremonies.”³

But the most interesting account of the Book is that sent by Bucer and Fagius to the ministers at Strassburg on April 26th, 1549 :

“The cause of religion, as far as appertains to the establishment of doctrines and the definition of rites, is pretty near what could be wished. Efforts must now be made to obtain suitable ministers, who will carry these wholesome doctrines into practice, and deliver them to the people. . . . We hear that some concessions have been made, both to a respect for antiquity, and to the infirmity of the present age ; such, for instance, as the vestments commonly used in the sacrament of the eucharist, and the use of candles ; so also in regard to the commemoration of the dead, and the use of chrism, for we know not to what extent or in what sort it prevails. They affirm that there is no superstition in these things, and that they 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. This circumstance, however, greatly refreshed us, that all the services in the churches are read and sung in the vernacular

¹ *Apud Smyth, op. cit.*, p. 13.
² *Original Letters*, p. 266.

³ *Original Letters*, p. 79.

tongue, that the doctrine of justification is purely and soundly taught, and the eucharist administered according to Christ's ordinance, private masses having been abolished."¹

Subsequently, as we have seen, Bucer learnt that the Communion was being turned once more into a simulated Mass. For this and other reasons, he later on made certain suggestions for the improvement of the book, which were duly adopted.

Here is the opinion expressed by Francis Dryander, writing to Bullinger on June 5th, 1549 :

"A book has recently been published, a month or two back, which the English churches received with the greatest satisfaction. . . . You will see that the summary of doctrine cannot be found fault with, although certain ceremonies are retained in that book which may appear useless, and perhaps harmful, unless a candid interpretation be put upon them. . . . You will also 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, that the bishops could not for a long time agree among themselves respecting this article, and it was a long and earnest dispute among them whether transubstantiation should be established or rejected."²

4. But all this merely means that *the language of the Book was not sufficiently Zwinglian to please the followers of the Swiss reformer*. In this connection it must be remembered that not only did the Lutherans and Zwinglians hate each other, but also that *the Zwinglians cordially disliked Martin Bucer and he disliked them*. Thus, Bucer criticises the Zwinglian doctrine in the following letter, written to Brentius from Cambridge on May 15th, 1550 :

"Among the nobility of the kingdom those are very powerful who would reduce the whole of the sacred ministry into an arrow compass. . . . While they seek to provide against or bringing down Christ the Lord from heaven and confining Him in the bread, and offering Him to the communicants to be fed upon without faith, a thing that none of our party ever thought of; they themselves go so far as, without any warrant of holy Scripture, to confine him to a certain limited place in heaven; and talk so rapidly about His exhibition and presence in the supper (nay, some of them cannot even endure these words), that they appear to believe that nothing else but the bread and wine is there distributed. . . . They assume that it cannot with reason be supposed of Christ, that He is in heaven without being circumscribed by physical space; and since He is thus in heaven, as they take for granted, they insist not only upon what no one will allow them,

but also without any solid reason, that it cannot be understood that the same body of Christ is in heaven and in the supper : and when we reply, that no one supposes a local presence of Christ in the supper, they again say that the body of Christ cannot be understood to be present anywhere without being locally circumscribed. The sum therefore of their argument is to this effect. Reason does not comprehend what you teach respecting the exhibition and presence of Christ in the supper ; therefore they are not true, and the Scriptures which seem to prove them must be otherwise interpreted.”¹

The following extracts will show how the Zwinglians in turn disliked Bucer :

John Utenhovius to Bullinger, Strassburgh, July 7th, 1549 :

“ Send me whatever you have to Bucer’s on the Lord’s Supper, written by him *before he began to dote.*”²

Burcher to Bullinger, April 20th, 1550 :

“ Bucer has had a dangerous relapse. . . . *In case of his death England will be happy*, and more favoured than all other countries, in having been delivered in the same year from two men of most pernicious talent, namely, Paul (Fagius) and Bucer.”³

Burcher to Bullinger, Strassburg, June 8th, 1550

“ Bucer is more than licentious on the subject of marriage. I heard him once disputing at table upon this question, when he asserted that a divorce should be allowed for any reason however trifling. . . . I am ignorant as to what the hireling Bucer . . . is plotting in England. He is an invalid, and as report says, is either becoming childish, or is almost in his dotage, which is the usual result of a wandering and inconstant mind.”⁴

Burcher to Bullinger, Strassburg, Aug. 3rd, 1551 :

“ The death of Bucer affords England the greatest possible opportunity of concord. The leading men of England are desirous of a successor not less learned than himself, to supply his place. For my own part, I desire one who may be more sincere and steady.”⁵

5. England was indeed at this time in a desperate situation, for the country was swarming with all sorts of heretics, as the following letters show :

Micronius to Bullinger, May 20th, 1550 :

“ It is a matter of the first importance that the word of God should be preached here in German, to guard against the heresies which are introduced by our countrymen. There are Arians,

¹ *Orig. Letters*, pp. 544-5.

² *Original Letters*, pp. 662-3.

³ *Original Letters*, p. 678.

⁴ *Original Letters*, p. 583.

⁵ *Original Letters*, p. 665-6.

Marcionists, Libertines, Danists, and the like monstrosities, in great numbers. A few days since, namely, on the and of May, a certain woman was burnt alive for denying the incarnation of Christ.¹

"The churches of Bremen and the rest are strengthening themselves, but are far more injured by their private disagreements in matters of religion than by any external violence. They are disputing about the descent of Christ into hell, and about the allowance or prohibition of things indifferent. Marvellous is the subtlety of Antichrist in weakening the churches of Christ."²

The same to the same, London, Aug. 14th, 1551 :

"We, who are desirous to hand down to the churches the sincere doctrine of God, are attacked on every side. We have not only to contend with the papists . . . but much more with the sectaries and Epicureans and pseudo-evangelicals. In addition to the ancient errors respecting paedobaptism, the incarnation of Christ, the authority of the magistrate, the [lawfulness of an] oath, the property and community of goods, and the like, new ones are rising up every day, with which we have to contend. The chief opponents, however, of Christ's divinity are the Arians, who are now beginning to shake our churches with greater violence than ever, as they deny the conception of Christ by the Virgin. Their principal arguments may be reduced under three heads : The first is respecting the unity of God, as declared throughout all the Scriptures both of the Old and New Testament; and that the doctrine, as well as the name, of the Trinity is a novel invention, as not being mentioned in any part of Scripture. Their next argument is this : the Scripture, they say, which everywhere acknowledges one God, admits and professes that this one God is the Father alone (John xvii, 3, who is also called one God by Paul (1 Cor. viii, 6). Lastly, they so pervert the passages which seem to establish the divinity of Christ, as to say that none of them refer intrinsically to Christ Himself, but that he has received all from another, namely, from the Father (John v, Matt, xxviii), and they say that God cannot receive from God, and that Christ was only in this respect superior to any of mankind, that He received more gifts from God the Father."³

C. OPINION OF CALVIN.

As to the impression created upon *foreign* Reformers by the new Prayer Book, we have two interesting letters of Calvin. The first was sent to Somerset on October 22nd, 1549, in which, after general praise, he said :

"Let me point out some corruptions. There is used among you a prayer for the dead at Communion. I know it is not to favour the Pope's purgatory. . . . But the Supper of the Lord ought not to be tainted with men's inventions. There are other things,

¹ Joan Boshier, burnt under Cranmer's auspices.

² *Original Letters*, pp. 560-1.

³ *Original Letters*, p. 574.

perhaps less reprehensible, which nevertheless cannot be excused, such as the ceremonies of chrism, and unction.”¹

This letter is noteworthy because the only defect in the Communion Service which Calvin thinks fit to mention by name is the prayer for the dead. *He makes no objection to the language of the book on the Presence or the Sacrifice.*

D. OPINION OF CARDINAL POLE.

As to the knowledge possessed by the *Continental Catholics* of this new Book, it is interesting to note that account of the new services was sent to Venice by Barbaro, the Ambassador here, and also that on June 4th, 1549, Somerset wrote to Pole, enclosing a copy of the First Prayer Book, and claiming that :

“ By a common agreement of all the chief learned men in the realm . . . as well bishops as other equally and indifferently chosen of judgment, not co-acted with superior authority, nor otherwise invited, but of a common agreement amongst themselves, there was first agreement on points, and then the same coming to the judgment of the whole parliament . . . by one whole consent of the upper and nether house of the the parliament finally concluded and approved, and so a form and rite of service, a creed and doctrine of religion . . . set forth and established by act and statute, and so published and divulged to so great a quiet as ever was in England, and as gladly received of all parts.”

He went on to invite Cardinal Pole to give his judgment on the new Book.²

Pole sent a long reply to this dishonest letter, and accused Somerset of lying as to the agreement of the Bishops on the Prayer Book. He added that in view of the rising in the West, it was not necessary for him to give his own opinion on the new Book.³

¹ *State Papers, Dom. Ed.*, VI, V, No. 8.

² See the whole letter in Pocock, *Troubles connected with the Prayer Book of 1549*, pp. vi to xiv. This letter, written by Somerset in 1549, has actually been quoted to prove that the *Ordinal of 1550* was in possession of the Roman authorities at that time ! This remarkable statement is made by Father Sidney Smith, S.J., in his article in the *Dictionnaire Apologétique*, III, col. 1197. But the Popes cannot claim such intimate knowledge of future events !

³ *Venetian Calendar*, Vol. V, pp. 241-267.

CHAPTER X

THE VISITATION AND DEBATES AT OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE

1. In order to enforce the general acceptance of the new Prayer Book and its accompanying reforms, a royal visitation was made in the year 1549 of the two Universities of Cambridge and Oxford. The declared object was "to take away superstition and eradicate error," and on May 26th, orders were given to destroy six altars and break up images at Jesus College, Cambridge. The leader in this work was Bishop Ridley. In June, Ridley arranged for a great public disputation at *Cambridge* on the two following theses :

(1) Transubstantiation cannot be proved by the plain and manifest words of Scripture, nor can thereof be necessarily collected, nor yet confirmed, by the consents of the ancient fathers for these thousand years past.

(2) In the Lord's Supper is none other oblation or sacrifice than one only remembrance of Christ's death, and of thanksgiving.

The account of this disputation is given at length in Foxe. We quote the following from Ridley's *Determinations* :

Transubstantiation :

"This Transubstantiation is deane against the words of Scripture, and consent of the ancient catholic fathers. . . . So far off is it that they do confirm this opinion of Transubstantiation, that plainly they seem unto me, both to think and to teach the contrary. . . . The third ground is the nature of the sacrament. . . . The fourth ground : they which say that Christ is carnally present in the Eucharist do take from Him the verity of man's nature. . . . The fifth ground is the certain persuasion of this article of faith : He ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God. . . ."

The Sacrifice :

"In the latter conclusion concerning the sacrifice, because it dependeth upon the first, I will in few words declare what I think ; for if we did once agree in that, the whole controversy in the other would soon be at an end. . . . Scriptures do persuade me to believe that there is no other oblation of Christ (albeit I am not ignorant

422 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

there are many sacrifices), but that which was once made upon the cross.”¹

It is worthy of note that Ridley's clear mind sees that the *Catholic doctrine of the Sacrifice depends upon the Catholic doctrine of the Real Objective Presence.*

2. The visitation of the *University of Oxford* was similarly the occasion of a disputation, in the presence of the King's "Visitors," who were Bishop Holbeach of Lincoln, Dr. Cox, Dr. Haines, the Dean of Exeter, and two others. The disputation began on May 28th, and lasted for four days. The theses were set forth by Peter Martyr, the foreign Reformer who had been made professor of divinity at Oxford, and were as follows :

1. In the sacrament of thanksgiving there is no Transubstantiation of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ.

2. The body and blood of Christ be not carnally, or corporally, in the bread and wine, nor, as others use to say, under the kinds of bread and wine.

3. The body and blood of Christ be united to bread and wine sacramentally.

Peter Martyr's doctrine is described by Smyth as "Suvermerian," with a tinge of Zwinglianism. It is set forth in a little tract published in 1548, *On the Sacrament of Thanksgiving* and the Preface sums it up in the following propositions :

1. Christ is in the Holy Supper to them that do come to His table, and He doth verily feed the faithful with His body and blood.

2. There is no transubstantiation.

3. There is no intermixture of the natures or substances of bread and wine, and body and blood.

4. But they are so united that as often as the one is faithfully received, the other also is.

5. The presence of Christ belongs more properly to the receivers than to the tokens, that is, to those receivers that do rightly and faithfully come to the communion.

6. The presence is not at any time but in the use of the Supper.

7. Only the good receive the body and blood; the wicked receive nothing but the tokens of bread and wine.

8. When the Sacrament is received, "the faithful" ought to worship "in their mind Christ Himself, and not the tokens."

9. The residue of this Sacrament, after the communion is finished, ought not to be kept, as we see it used now in popish churches."²

It was this same doctrine which as defended by Peter Martyr at Oxford in June, 1549. Small wonder that John ab

¹ Foxe, VI, Part One, pp. 332-3.

² a Gasquet and Bishop, *op. cit.*, p. 159.

Ulmis should have written enthusiastically to Bullinger in August 7th of the same year :

“ There has been a sharp disputation at Oxford respecting the Eucharist, where the subject was made so clear and easy of comprehension, in the very presence of the King’s commissioners, that any lay person of ordinary capacity might easily understand on which side the truth lay, and detect the absurdities of our opponents.”¹

Peter Martyr’s views were much more advanced and more Zwinglian than those of Bucer, who regretted the debate at Oxford and the subsequent publication of Martyr’s thesis. Bucer writes thus to Brentius on May 15th, 1550 :

“ I am sorry for master Martyr’s book as anyone can be, but that disputation took place, and the propositions were agreed upon, before I arrived in England. At my advice he has inserted many things in the preface whereby to express more fully his belief in the presence of Christ.”²

The Editor of the *Original Letters* has this interesting footnote here :

“ Peter Martyr and Melanchthon thought it convenient, in speaking of the Eucharist, to express themselves with perspicuity and distinctness. Bucer, on the contrary, for the sake of peace, recommended the use of more *dark and ambiguous forms of speech*, that might be taken in a larger acceptance.”

¹ *Original Letters*, p. 391.

² *Original Letters*, p. 544.

CHAPTER XI

CRANMER'S BOOK ON THE EUCHARIST

1. During the year 1549, Cranmer was at work upon a new book, in which he set forth his Eucharistic doctrine in unmistakable language. It was duly published early in 1550, under the title *A Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ, with a Confutation of Sundry Errors concerning the Same*. It consisted of five parts :

1. Of the true and Catholic doctrine and use of the Sacrament.
2. Against the error of Transubstantiation.
3. The manner how Christ is present in His Holy Supper.
4. Of the eating and drinking of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ.
5. Of the oblation and sacrifice of our Saviour Christ.

The Preface “rather offensively”—to use Gairdner’s words²—says that

“the Romish Antichrist taught that Christ’s sacrifice on the Cross was not sufficient without another sacrifice, devised by him and made by the priest, or else without indulgences, beads, pardons, pilgrimages, and other such pelfray, to supply Christ’s imper-

Gairdner continues :

“The writer goes on to show that in England the face of religion has been happily changed by the King and his Father (Henry). But two chief roots of corruption remain not yet pulled up—the Popish doctrine of Transubstantiation—of the real presence of Christ’s flesh and blood in the Sacrament, and of the sacrifice and oblation of Christ made by the priest for the salvation of the quick and dead. These, if suffered to grow again, would cover the whole ground once more with the old errors and superstitions.”

¹ Note that Cranmer claims that his doctrine is “Catholic”—as Luther and indeed all the reformers did—which shows yet again that they sharply distinguished between their own doctrine, which they claimed to be *M Catholic*, and the “corrupt” doctrine of the Church in union with Rome.

* *Lollardy and the Reformation*, iii, 226.

Gairdner remarks that there can be no doubt that Cranmer is here giving free utterance to a belief which he had long entertained. He continues : " None the less was it *an amazing thing for an Archbishop of Canterbury to condemn outright in this fashion the eucharistic doctrine of a long line of predecessors.*"¹

2. This work is noteworthy because of its fairly correct exposition of the Catholic doctrines which it attacks. In Book One, Chapter XVII, Cranmer says that " The principal points wherein the Papists vary from the truth of God's word be chiefly four " :

1. " First, the Papists say, that in the supper of the Lord, after the words of consecration (as they call it), there is none other substance remaining but the substance of Christ's flesh and blood, so that there remaineth neither bread to be eaten, nor wine to be drunken. And although there be the colour of bread and wine, the savour, the smell, the bigness, the fashion, and all other (as they call them) accidents, or qualities, and quantities of bread and wine, yet, say they, there is no very bread nor wine, but they be turned into the flesh and blood of Christ. And this conversion they call 'transubstantiation,' that is to say, 'turning of one substance into another substance.'"²

Against this first error Cranmer asserts that

" we receive very bread and wine in the most blessed supper of the Lord, as sacraments to admonish us that as we be fed with bread and wine bodily, so we be fed with the body and blood of our Saviour Christ spiritually : as in our baptism we receive very water, to signify unto us, that as water is an element to wash the body outwardly, so be our souls washed by the Holy Ghost inwardly."

2. " The second principal thing, wherein the Papists vary from the truth of God's word, is this :

" They say that the very natural flesh and blood of Christ, which suffered for us upon the Cross and sitteth at the right hand of the Father in heaven, is also really, substantially, corporally, and naturally,³ in or under the accidents of the sacramental bread and wine, which they call the forms of bread and wine."⁴

¹ Italics ours.

² Page 46.

³ Here Catholics are said to teach that Our Lord is present in the Eucharist, (1) really, (2) substantially, (3) corporally, and (4) naturally. In the text, on p. 46, Cranmer goes on to add that " Some say that the very natural body of Christ is there, but not naturally nor sensibly. And other say that it is there naturally and sensibly." So that we will add a fifth supposed characteristic of the Presence—(5) sensibly. In his reply to Cranmer, with which we deal later, Gardiner of course accepts (1) and (2), i.e., that Christ is present " really" and "substantially." " Corporally" he accepts as relating to the truth of the body present, but not to the manner of the presence. Similarly, it is true that Christ is present " naturally," in the sense that, as Gardiner says, p. 112, " there is present by God's power the very true natural body and blood of Christ." As to (5) " sensibly," Gardiner points out, p. 155, that the body is " sensibly there," i.e., " to be received with our hands and mouths." But " corporally," " naturally" and " sensibly" " are not to be understood in the manner of presence " (*ibid.*).

⁴ Page 46.

Against this, Cranmer says that

“ Christ in His human nature is substantially, really, corporally, naturally, and sensibly present with His Father in heaven. . . . Yet sacramentally and spiritually He is here present. For in water, bread and wine, He is present as in signs and sacraments ; but He is indeed spiritually in those faithful Christian people which according to Christ's ordinance be baptised, or receive the holy communion, or unfeignedly believe in Him.”

That is, Christ is present *sacramentally*, i.e., as *in signs*, in the elements of baptism and the Lord's Supper ; *spiritually* He is present in the soul of the faithful.

The third error is that

“ Papists say that evil and ungodly men receive in this sacrament the very body and blood of Christ, and eat and drink the self-same thing that the good and godly men do.” .

Cranmer says, on the contrary, that

“ all those that be godly members of Christ, as they corporally eat the bread and drink the wine, so spiritually they eat and drink Christ's very flesh and blood. And as for the wicked members of the devil, they eat the sacramental bread and drink the sacramental wine, but they do not spiritually eat Christ's flesh, nor drink His blood.”¹

The fourth error is that

“ Popish priests say that they offer Christ every day for remission of sin, and distribute by their masses the merits of Christ's passion.”

Note that Cranmer perfectly well understands that the Mass is a sacrifice which *applies the merits of the Sacrifice of the Cross*. Against this “ error ” Cranmer asserts that

“ Christ Himself in His own person made a sacrifice for our sins upon the Cross . . . and so did never no priest, man, nor creature but He, nor He did the same never more than once. And the benefit hereof is in no man's power to give unto any other, but every man must receive it at Christ's hands Himself, by His own faith and belief.”²

3. In Book Three, Cranmer explains his own view, as to “ How Christ is present in the Sacrament,” and in Chapter II, contrasts his own view with the “ papist ” doctrine :

i. “ They teach that Christ is in the bread and wine, but we say that He is *in them that worthily eat and drink the bread and wine*. . . .”³

¹ Page 47.

² Page 47.

³ Page 52. Italics ours, throughout these citations from Cranmer.

3. "They say that Christ is received in the mouth, and entereth in with the bread and wine. We say that He is received in the heart and entereth in by faith. . . ."¹

7. "They say that every man, good and evil, eateth the body of Christ. We say that both do eat the sacramental bread and drink the wine, but none do eat the very body of Christ and drink His blood but only they that be lively members of His body."²

8. "They say that good men eat the body of Christ and drink His blood only at that time when they receive the Sacrament. We say that they eat, drink and feed of Christ continually, so long as they be members of His body. . . ."³

10. "They say that the fathers and prophets of the Old Testament did not eat the body, nor drink the blood of Christ. We say, that they did eat His body and drink His blood, although He was not yet born nor incarnated. . . ."⁴

12. "They say that the Mass is a sacrifice satisfactory for sin, by the devotion of the priest that offereth, and not by the thing that is offered. But we say that their saying is a most heinous, yea and detestable error against the glory of Christ, for the satisfaction for our sins is not the devotion nor offering of the priest, but the only host and satisfaction for all the sins of the world is the death of Christ, and the oblation of His body upon the Cross, and never but once, nor never any but He.

"And therefore that oblation which the priests make daily in their papistical masses, cannot be a satisfaction for other men's sins by the priest's devotion, but it is a mere illusion, and subtle craft of the devil."

The last difference is :

"They say that Christ is corporally in many places at one time, affirming that His body is corporally and really present in as many places as there be hosts consecrated. We say, that as the sun corporally is ever in heaven, *and nowhere else*, and yet by his operation and virtue the sun is here in earth, by whose influence and virtue all things in the world be corporally regenerated, increased, and grow to their perfect state, so likewise our Saviour Christ bodily and corporally is in heaven, sitting at the right hand of His Father, although spiritually He hath promised to be present with us upon earth unto the world's end. And whensoever two or three be gathered together in His name, He is there in the midst among them, by whose supernal grace all godly men be first by Him spiritually regenerated, and after, increase and grow to their spiritual perfection in God, spiritually by faith eating His flesh and drinking His blood, although *the same corporally be in heaven, far distant from our sight*."⁵

4. Book Four deals with "The eating and drinking of the body and blood of Christ." Cranmer begins thus :

"The gross error of the papists is, of the carnal eating and drink-

¹ Page 57.
² Page 74.

³ Page 68.

⁴ Page 70.
⁵ Page 89.

ing of Christ's flesh and blood with our mouths. For they say that 'whosoever eat and drink the sacraments of bread and wine, do eat and drink also with their mouths Christ's very flesh and blood, be they never so ungodly and wicked persons.' But Christ Himself taught clear contrary in the sixth of John, that we eat Him not carnally with our mouths, but spiritually with our faith."¹

In Chapter II, Cranmer further explains "What is the eating of Christ's flesh and drinking of His blood" :

"Every good and faithful Christian man feeleth in himself how he feedeth of Christ, eating His flesh and drinking of His blood. For he putteth the whole hope and trust of his redemption and salvation in that only sacrifice which Christ made upon the cross. . . . This great benefit of Christ the faithful man earnestly considereth in his mind, sheweth and digesteth it with the stomach of his heart, spiritually receiving Christ wholly into him, and giving again himself wholly unto Christ. And *this is the eating of Christ's flesh and drinking of His blood.*"²

Chapter IX deals with "The adoration in the sacrament" :

"It is requisite to speak something of the manner and form of worshipping of Christ by them that receive this sacrament, lest that in the stead of Christ Himself be worshipped the sacrament. For as His humanity joined to His divinity, and exalted to the right hand of His Father, is to be worshipped by all creatures . . . even so if in the stead thereof we worship the signs and sacraments, *we commit as great idolatry as ever was, or shall be to the world's end.*"³

There follows a long diatribe against the "very antichrists," i.e., the "Papists," who have led the multitude into this idolatry. He continues :

"The subtle papists do colour and cloke the matter never so finely, saying that they worship not the sacraments which they see with their eyes, but that thing which they believe with their faith to be really and corporally in the sacraments."⁴

To this he replies that *besides bread and wine there is nothing in the sacrament, and therefore Papists either worship bread and wine, or nothing at all:*

"To eschew one inconvenience (that is to say, the worshipping of the sacrament), they fall into another as evil, and worship nothing there at all. For they worship that thing (as they say) which is really and corporally and yet invisibly present under the kinds of bread and wine, which (as before is expressed and proved) is utterly nothing. And so they give unto the ignorant occasion to worship bread and wine, and they themselves worship nothing there at all."⁵

In Chapter XI he explains "the true honouring of Christ in the sacrament," thus :

"All that love and believe Christ Himself let them not think that Christ is corporally in the bread, but let them lift up their hearts unto heaven, and worship Him sitting *there, at the right hand of His Father*. Let them worship Him *in themselves*, whose temples they be, in whom He dwelleth and liveth spiritually : but *in no wise let them worship Him, as being corporally in the bread*. For He is not in it, *neither spiritually*, as he is in man, *nor corporally*, as He is in heaven, *but only sacramentally, as a thing may be said to be in the figure, whereby it is signified*^

Cranmer's doctrine, therefore, can be summed up thus : Christ's Body and Blood is "naturally" only in Heaven. "Spiritually," i.e., by grace, he dwells in the human soul, and is therein received by faith. He is not present in the sacramental bread and wine except as a thing may be said to be in a figure whereby it is signified. It does not seem exaggerated to describe this as *the doctrine of the Real Absence*.

In accordance with this doctrine, Cranmer explains in Book Three that "the sentences of Christ, 'This is my body,' 'This is my blood,' be figurative speeches."² Or, as he explains a little further on, when summing up his position :

"Christ called bread His body, and wine His blood, and *these sentences be figurative speeches* ; and Christ, as concerning His humanity and bodily presence, is ascended into heaven with His whole flesh and blood, and *is not here upon earth* ; and *the substance of bread and wine do remain still*, and be received in the sacrament, and although they remain, yet they have changed their names, so that the bread is *called* Christ's body, and the wine His blood ; and the cause why their names be changed is this, that we should lift up our hearts and minds from the things which we see unto the things which we believe and be above *in heaven* ; whereof the bread and wine have the *names*, although they be *not the very same things in deed*."³

Q^t again :

☞ in plain speech it is *not true* that we eat Christ's body and drink His blood. . . . These speeches, * To eat Christ's body and drink His blood,' be speeches not taken in the proper signification of every word, but by translation of these words 'eating' and 'drinking' from the signification of a corporal thing to signify a spiritual thing, and by calling a thing that signifieth by the name of the thing which is signified thereby."⁴

Of especial importance is the fact that Cranmer entirely likens the "sacramental presence of Christ in the bread and

wine” to the “presence” (!) in the water of baptism. It is again of importance to note that, in a sense, Cranmer is still willing to say that Christ is present “in the sacrament.” But, of course, everything here depends upon the meaning attached to the word “sacrament.” And here he makes things perfectly clear in his preface to the edition of 1551 :

* This word “sacrament” I do sometimes use (as it is many times taken among writers and holy doctors) for the sacramental bread, *water*, or wine. . . . But where I use to speak sometimes (as the old authors do) that Christ is in the sacraments, I mean the same as they did understand the matter ; that is to say, not of Christ’s carnal presence in the outward sacrament, but sometimes of His sacramental presence.¹ And sometimes by this word ‘sacrament’ I mean the whole ministration and receiving of the sacraments, either of baptism or of the Lord’s Supper ; and so the old writers many times do say, that Christ and the Holy Ghost be present in the sacraments, not meaning by that manner of speech that Christ and the Holy Ghost be present in the water, bread, or wine (which be only the outward visible sacraments), but that in the due ministration of the sacraments according to Christ’s ordinance and institution, Christ and His Holy Spirit be truly and indeed present by their mighty and sanctifying power, virtue, and grace, in all them that worthily receive the same.

“Moreover, when I say and repeat many times in my book, that the body of Christ is present in them that worthily receive the sacrament, lest any man should mistake my words and think that I mean, that although Christ be not corporally in the outward visible signs, yet He is corporally in the persons that duly receive them, this is to advertise the reader that I mean no such thing; but my meaning is, that the force, the grace, the virtue and benefit of Christ’s body that was crucified for us, and of His blood that was shed for us, be really and effectually present with all them that duly receive the sacraments : but all this I understand of His spiritual presence. . . . Nor *no more truly is He corporally or really present in the due ministration of the Lord’s supper, than He is in the due ministration of baptism.*”

A later edition adds here, “that is to say, in both spiritually and by grace.”

5. Just as Cranmer explains away the language of Scripture on the Real Presence, so also he explains away the Fathers.

“Whether the authors, which they allege, say that we do eat Christ’s flesh and drink His blood, or that the bread and wine is converted into the substance of His flesh and blood, or that we be turned into His flesh . . . these and all other like sentences may not be understood of Christ’s humanity literally and carnally, as the words in common speech do properly signify, for so doth no

¹ He elsewhere explains that “sacramental presence” merely means “as a thing is present in the sign whereby it is signified.”

man eat Christ's flesh nor drink His blood, nor so is not the bread and wine after the consecration His flesh and blood. . . . But these and all other like sentences, which declare Christ to be here in earth, and to be eaten and drunken of Christian people, are to be understood either of His divine nature (whereby He is everywhere), or else they must be understood figuratively, or spiritually. *For figuratively he is in the bread and wine, and spiritually He is in them that worthily eat and drink the bread and wine; but really, carnally, and corporally. He is only in heaven.*"⁷¹

6. This work of Cranmer's is also important because he explains the meaning of certain phrases in the *Catechism* of Justus Jonas which he had translated. Thus, he says, on p. 226 :

"In a catechism by me translated and set forth, I said that with our bodily mouths we receive the body and blood of Christ. Which my saying divers ignorant persons, not used to read old ancient authors, nor acquainted with their phrase and manner of speech, did carp and reprehend for lack of good understanding. For this speech --- *be not understood of the very flesh and blood of our Saviour Christ* (which in very deed we neither feel nor see), but *that which we do to the bread and wine, by a figurative speech is spoken to be done to the flesh and blood*, because they be the very *signs, figures, and tokens* instituted by Christ, to *represent* unto us His very flesh and blood. And yet as with our corporal eyes, corporal hands, and mouths, we do corporally see, feel, taste, and eat the bread, and drink the wine (being the signs and sacraments of Christ's body), even so with our spiritual eyes, hands, and mouths, we do spiritually see, feel, taste and eat His very flesh and drink His very blood."

And again, p. 227 :

"In that Catechism I teach not, as you do, that the body and blood of Christ is contained in the sacrament, being reserved, but that in the *ministration* thereof we receive the body and blood of Christ; whereunto if it may please you to add or understand this word *spiritually*, then is the doctrine of my Catechism sound and good in all men's ears which know the true doctrine of the sacraments."

7. The last book deals with "The Oblation and Sacrifice of Christ," and in this he refutes the fourth Papist "error" already briefly mentioned at the beginning (see p. 426). The key to Cranmer's view is contained in Chapter III :

"Christ's sacrifice once offered was sufficient for evermore. And that all men may the better understand this sacrifice of Christ, which he made for the great benefit of all men, it is necessary to know the distinction and diversity of sacrifices.

"One kind of sacrifice there is, which is called a propitiatory or merciful sacrifice, that is to say, such a sacrifice as pacifieth

God's wrath and indignation, and obtaineth mercy and forgiveness for all our sins, and is the ransom for our redemption from everlasting damnation. And although in the Old Testament there were certain sacrifices called by that name, yet in very deed there is but one such sacrifice . . . the death of the Son of God . . . nor never was any other sacrifice propitiatory at any time, nor never shall be. This is the honour and glory of this our high priest, wherein He admitteth neither partner nor successor. . . . And whosoever deprive Him of this honour, and go about to take it to themselves, they be very antichrists, and most arrogant blasphemers against God and against His Son. . . .

Another kind of sacrifice there is which doth not reconcile us to God, but is made of them that be reconciled by Christ, to testify our duties unto God, and to shew ourselves thankful unto Him. And therefore they be called sacrifices of laud, praise, and thanksgiving.

"The first kind of sacrifice Christ offered to God for us ; the second kind we ourselves offer to God by Christ. And by the first kind of sacrifice Christ offered also us unto His Father, and by the second we offer ourselves and all that we have unto Him and His Father. And this sacrifice generally is our whole obedience unto God, in keeping His laws and commandments."¹

Obviously this excludes the Catholic doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass, which is expressly denied by Cranmer in Chapter VI:

"The offering of the priest in the Mass, or the appointing of His ministration at His pleasure, to them that be quick or dead, cannot merit and deserve, neither to himself, nor to them for whom he singeth or saith, the remission of their sins ; but such popish doctrine is contrary to the doctrine of the gospel, and injurious to the sacrifice of Christ. For if only the death of Christ be the oblation, sacrifice, and price wherefore our sins be pardoned, then the act or ministration of the priest cannot have the same office. Wherefore it is an *abominable blasphemy* to give that office or dignity to a priest which pertaineth only to Christ, or to affirm that the Church hath need of any such sacrifice : as who should say, that Christ's sacrifice were not sufficient for the remission of our sins, or else that His sacrifice should hang upon the sacrifice of a priest.

"But all such priests as pretend to be Christ's successors in making a sacrifice of Him, they be His *most heinous and horrible adversaries*. For never no person made a sacrifice of Christ, but He Himself only. . . . All popish priests that presume to make every day a sacrifice of Christ, either must they needs make Christ's sacrifice vain, imperfect, and insufficient, or else is their sacrifice in vain which is added to the sacrifice which is already of itself sufficient and perfect."²

Cranmer is, of course, aware that Catholics maintain that the Mass is the same sacrifice with that of the Cross :

"The Papists, to excuse themselves, do say that they make no new sacrifice, nor none other sacrifice than Christ made (for they be not so blind but they see, that then they should add another sacrifice to Christ's sacrifice, and so make His sacrifice unperfect) ; but they say that they make the self-same sacrifice for sin that Christ Himself made.

"And here they run headlong into the foulest and most heinous error that ever was imagined. For if they make every day the same oblation and sacrifice for sin that Christ Himself made, and the oblation that He made was His death . . . they every day slay Christ."¹

But this is the true sacrifice of Christians :

"Forasmuch as He hath given Himself to death for us, to be an oblation and sacrifice to His Father for our sins, let us give *ourselves* again unto Him, making unto Him an oblation, not of goats, etc., but . . . of ourselves . . . These be the sacrifices of Christian men. . . . And as Christ offered Himself for us, so is it our duties after this sort to offer ourselves to Him again. . . . And if we put the oblation of the priest in the stead of the oblation of Christ, refusing to receive the sacrament of His body and blood ourselves, as He ordained, and trusting to have remission of sins by the sacrifice of the priest in the Mass . . . we do not only injury to Christ, but also commit most detestable idolatry. . . .

"And forasmuch as in such Masses in manifest wickedness and idolatry, wherein the priest alone maketh oblation satisfactory, and applieth the same for the quick and the dead at his pleasure, all such popish Masses are to be clearly taken away out of Christian churches, and the true use of the Lord's Supper is to be restored again, wherein godly people assembled together may receive the sacrament every man for himself, to declare that he remembereth what benefit he hath received by the death of Christ, and to testify that he is a member of Christ's body, fed with His flesh, and drinking His blood spiritually."²

A similar denial of the Sacrifice of the Mass is contained on page 352 :

"Christ never gave this honour to any creature, that he should make a sacrifice of Him, nor did not ordain the sacrament of His holy supper to the intent that either the priest or the people should sacrifice Christ again, or that the priests should make a sacrifice of Him for the people : but His holy supper was ordained for this purpose, that every man, eating and drinking thereof, should remember that Christ died for him, and so should exercise his faith, and comfort himself by the remembrance of Christ's benefits, and so give unto Christ most hearty thanks, and give himself also clearly unto Him. . . .

"But the humble confession of all penitent hearts, their acknowledging of Christ's benefits, their thanksgiving for the same . . . etc., is a sacrifice of laud and praise, accepted and

434 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

allowed of God no less than the sacrifice of the priest. . . . And as for the saying or singing of the Mass by the priest, as it was in time passed used, it is *neither a sacrifice propitiatory, nor yet a sacrifice of laud and praise, nor in any wise allowed before God, but abominable and detestable*!

8. Cranmer is, of course, aware of the strong patristic testimony for the sacrificial character of the Mass. But he sweeps it all away as follows :

“ The adversaries of Christ gather together a great heap of authors which, as they say, call the Mass or holy communion a sacrifice. But all those authors be answered unto in this one sentence, that they call it not a sacrifice for sin because that it taketh away our sin, which is taken away only by the death of Christ, but because the holy communion was ordained by Christ to put us in *remembrance* of the sacrifice made by Him upon the cross, *for that cause it beareth the name of that sacrifice.*”²

And thus he explains a plain passage in St. John Chrysostom as meaning :

“ Although in *a certain kind of speech*, we may say that every day we make a sacrifice of Christ, yet in very deed, *to speak properly, we make no sacrifice of Him, but only a commemoration and remembrance of that sacrifice which He alone made, and never none but He.*”³

We may sum up Cranmer's doctrine as follows : in the Holy Communion there is a “ sacrifice ” of praise and thanksgiving, and an “ offering ” of ourselves. There is also a “ commemoration and remembrance,” i.e., recalling to mind, of the Sacrifice of the Cross. But there is *no offering of Christ by either priest or people*. Cranmer complains that Gardiner makes his “ issue of the sacrifice generally,” whereas the “ matter in question is of the ‘ sacrifice propitiatory.’ ”⁴ Still, it is perfectly clear *what kind of sacrifice he allows, and what kind he disallows*.

Similarly, answering a supposed statement on the Eucharist made in the First Council of Nicea, recorded in the *History of the Council* by Gelasius, now rejected as mythical, but then accepted by both parties, which statement says that Christ is sacrificed by the priest, *sed non victimorum more*, Cranmer says :

“ The Council in these words signified a difference between the sacrifice of the priest, and the sacrifice of Christ, which upon the cross offered Himself to be sacrificed after the manner of a very sacrifice, that is to say, unto death, for the sins of the world. Christ made the bloody sacrifice, which took away sin : the priest with the Church make *a commemoration thereof with lauds and thanks*.

* *Ibid.*

• Page 351.

• Page 352.

4 Page 397.

giving, offering also *themselves*, . . . And yet this our sacrifice taketh not away our sins, nor is not accepted but by His sacrifice.”¹

9. In Chapter X, Cranmer says that “Christ did not ordain His sacraments to this use, that one should receive them for another, or the priest for all the lay people, but He ordained them for this intent, that every man should receive them for himself.”²

This leads him on to explain his conception of the priesthood, as distinct from the popish priesthood :

“Therefore Christ made no such difference between the priest and the layman, that *the priest should make oblation and sacrifice of Christ for the layman*, and eat the Lord's supper from him all alone, and distribute and apply it as him liketh. Christ made no such difference, but the difference that is between the priest and the layman in this matter is *only in the ministration*; that the priest as a common minister of the Church, doth minister and distribute the Lord's supper unto other, and other receive it at his hands. But the very supper itself was by Christ instituted and given to the whole Church, not to be offered and eaten of the priest for other men, but by him to be delivered to all that would duly ask it.

“As in a prince's house the officers and ministers prepare the table, and yet other, as well as they, eat the meat and drink the drink ; so do the priests and ministers *prepare* the Lord's supper, read the gospel, and rehearse Christ's words, but all the people say thereto Amen. All remember Christ's death, all give thanks to God, *all* repent and *offer themselves an oblation to Christ*, all take Him for their Lord and Saviour, and spiritually feed upon Him, and in token thereof they eat the bread and drink the wine in His mystical supper.”³

This, says Cranmer, does not diminish the dignity of the priesthood and other ministers of the Church, but rather the contrary.

“For if they are much to be loved, honoured and esteemed, that be the kings, chancellors, judges, officers and ministers in temporal matters, how much then are they to be esteemed that be *ministers of Christ's words and sacraments*, and have to them committed the keys of heaven, to let in and shut out by the ministration of His word and gospel ? ”⁴

Note here the adoption of the phraseology used in the ordination of priests, and the interpretation thereof. The power of the keys consists in the “ministration of the word and gospel,” and priests are “ministers of the word and sacraments” because,

in the case of the eucharist, they read the gospel, rehearse Christ's words, receive bread and wine, and give the same to others. Note there is *no reference here to any power of consecration*. But this will be understood if we read the following, p. 177:

"Consecration is the separation of any thing from a profane and worldly use into a spiritual and godly use. And therefore when usual and common water is taken from other uses, and put to the use of baptism in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, then it may rightly be called consecrated water, that is to say, water put to a holy use. Even so, when common bread and wine be taken and severed from other bread and wine to the use of the holy communion, that portion of bread and wine, *although it be of the same substance* that the other is from the which it is severed, yet it is now *called* consecrated, or holy bread and holy wine. *Not that the bread and wine have or can have any holiness in them*, but that they be *used to a holy work*, and *represent* holy and godly things. . . . But specially they may be called holy and consecrated when they be separated to that holy use by Christ's own words, which He spake for that purpose, saying of the bread, 'This is my body,' and of the wine, 'This is my blood.' So that commonly the authors, before those words be spoken, do take the bread and wine but as other common bread and wine ; but after those words be pronounced over them, then they take them for consecrated and holy bread and wine. *Not that the bread and wine can be partakers of any holiness or godliness, or can be the body and blood of Christ*, but that they *represent* the very body and blood of Christ, and the holy food and nourishment which we have by Him. And so they be called by the names of the body and blood of Christ, *as the sign token, and figure is called by the name of the very thing which it sheweth and signifieth*!

So that all a "priest" does when he "consecrates" the Eucharistic bread and wine is to "set them apart for a holy use," in the sense that they are to "represent" the body and blood of Christ, which are "spiritually" received "by faith" by those who worthily receive these "creatures of bread and wine," which though in this sense "consecrated," remain in themselves unchanged.

It must surely be admitted that *it requires no supernatural power or authority thus to "consecrate" bread and wine* ; all that can be required is *a certain delegating or appointing thereto*. At any rate there seems to be here no essential power which an ordinary layman does not possess.

CHAPTER XII

GARDINER'S REPLY, AND CRANMER'S REJOINDER

1. This remarkable work of Cranmer's appeared, as we have said, in 1550. Gardiner was at that time in prison, but found means at once to write an answer, entitled *An Explication and Assertion of the True Catholic Faith concerning the Most Blessed Sacrament of the Altar, with Confutation of a book written against the same*. He managed to get it published in France. In this work, as we should expect, he gives a very correct exposition of the Catholic doctrine, and defends it from Cranmer's attacks and misrepresentations. Thus, on the Real Presence, he asserts "the truth of the presence of Christ's body, as the true Catholic faith teacheth," and as a consequent "and "necessity" thereof, the doctrine of Transubstantiation.¹ At the same time he is careful to point out the meaning of the term "corporal presence," as used by Catholic theologians; and also the other terms of like import:

"When we acknowledge by faith Christ's body present, although we say it is present truly, really, substantially, yet we say our senses be not privy to that presence, or the manner of it, but by instruction of faith, and therefore we say Christ's body to be not locally present, nor by manner of quantity, but invisibly, and in no sensible manner, but marvellously in a Sacrament and mystery truly, and in such a spiritual manner as we cannot define and determine. . . .

"The word 'corporally' may have an ambiguity and doubleness in respect and relation; one is to the truth of the body present, and so it may be said Christ is corporally present in the Sacrament; if the word 'corporally' be referred to the manner of the presence, then we should say, Christ's body were present . . . in a spiritual manner . . . in such manner as God only knoweth, and yet doth us to understand by faith the truth of the very presence, exceeding our capacity to comprehend the manner 'how.'

"No Catholic teaching is so framed with such terms as though we should eat Christ's most precious body grossly, carnally, joining those words so together. . . ." ²

¹ In *Cranmer's Works*, P.S., p. 239.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 62, 89, 112.

438 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

Gardiner reminds Cranmer that “there are three manner of eatings of Christ’s body according to Catholic teaching, one spiritual only another both sacramentally and spiritually the third is sacramentally only.”¹ This enables him to deal with Cranmer’s statement that the Old Testament Fathers received Christ as we do :

“The Fathers did eat Christ spiritually, believing in Him that was to come, but they did not eat Christ’s body present in the sacrament, sacramentally and spiritually, as we do.”²

2. Similarly, he gives a very careful exposition of the real Catholic doctrine on the Sacrifice of the Mass :

“The oblation and sacrifice of our Saviour Christ was and is a perfect work, once consummate in perfection without necessity of reiteration, as it was never taught to be reiterate, but a mere blasphemy to suppose it. It is also in the Catholic teaching . . . agreed that the same sacrifice once consummate was ordained by Christ’s institution in His most holy Supper to be often remembered and showed forth in such sort of showing as to the faithful is seen present the most precious body and blood of our Saviour Christ under the forms of bread and wine . . . -acknowledging the same precious body and blood to be the sacrifice propitiatory for all the sins of the world, whereunto they only resort and only account that their very perfect oblation and sacrifice of Christian people, through which all other sacrifices necessary on our part be accepted and pleasant in the sight of God. . . .

“The Catholic doctrine teacheth not the daily sacrifice of Christ’s most blessed body and blood to be an iteration of the once perfected sacrifice on the cross, but a sacrifice that representeth that sacrifice, and sheweth it also before the faithful eyes, and refresheth the effectual memory of it; so as in the daily sacrifice, without shedding of blood, we may see with the eye of faith the very body and blood of Christ by God’s mighty power . . . distinctly exhibit³ . . . which is a lively memorial to stir up our faith. . . . The Catholic doctrine teacheth the daily sacrifice to be the same in essence that was offered on the cross once. . . . The offering on the cross was, and is, propitiatory and satisfactory for our redemption and remission of sins. . . . The daily offering is propitiatory also, but not in that degree of propitiation as for redemption, regeneration, or remission of deadly sin, which was once purchased, and by force thereof is in the Sacraments ministered, but for the increase of God’s favour, the mitigation of God’s displeasure . . . the subduing of temptations, and the perfection of virtue in us. All good works, good thoughts, and good meditations may be called sacrifices, and the same be called sacrifices propitiatory also, for so much as in their degree God accepteth

¹ Page 70.

² Gardiner for once employs the Bucerian term. Even so, he employs it in connection with the *Sacrifice* rather than the *Presence*,

· Page 74.

Even so, he employs it in connection with the *Sacrifice* rather than the *Presence*,

and taketh them through the effect and strength of the very sacrifice of Christ's death. . . . Because the priest in the daily sacrifice doth as Christ has ordered to be done for showing forth and remembrance of Christ's death, that act of the priest . . . must needs be propitiatory. . . . To call the daily offering a 'sacrifice satisfactory' must have an understanding that signifieth not the action of the priest, but the presence of Christ's most precious body and blood, the very sacrifice of the world once perfectly offered being propitiatory and satisfactory for all the world. . . . The only immolation of Christ in Himself upon the altar of the Cross is the very satisfactory sacrifice for reconciliation of mankind to the favour of God. . . . Christ liveth ever, and therefore is a perpetual everlasting priest, by whose authority priesthood is now in this visible Church . . . which priests, visible ministers to our invisible priest, offer the daily sacrifice in Christ's Church, that is to say, with the very presence, by God's omnipotence wrought, of the most precious body and blood of Our Saviour Christ, showing forth Christ's death, and celebrating the memory of His supper and death according to Christ's institution, so with daily oblation and sacrifice of the self-same sacrifice to kindle in us a thankfull remembrance of all Christ's benefits unto us."¹

3. We have already recorded the fact that while in prison Gardiner expressed his readiness to assent to the Book of Common Prayer, on the ground that it taught the true and Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist. In order to show this, he appeals to certain ambiguous phrases used in it. Thus, on p. 92, he says that "the true faith of this holy mystery . . . is well termed in the Book of Common Prayer, not distant from the Catholic faith, in my judgment." And again, on p. 51, he remarks that Cranmer incorrectly attributes to Catholics the doctrine that "Christ is *in* the bread and wine." On the contrary, says Gardiner, Catholics

"agree in form of teaching with that the Church of England teacheth at this day, in the distribution of the Holy Communion, in which it is there said, the body and blood of Christ to be under the form of bread and wine."

To this criticism of Gardiner's Cranmer wrote a *Rejoinder*, and in it he says :

"When you shall shew 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."²

Cranmer was, of course, right on this particular point. The phrase in question is not used in the words of administration, or anywhere else.

44° THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

Gardiner writes again on p. 62 :

“ In the Book of Common Prayer now at this time set forth in this realm, ‘ It is ordered to teach the people, that in each part of the bread consecrate broken is the whole body of our Saviour Christ, which is agreeable to the Catholic doctrine¹ ”

To this Cranmer replies :

“ As for the Book of Common Prayer, although it say that in each part of the bread broken is received the whole body of Christ, yet it saith not so of the parts unbroken, nor yet of the parts or whole reserved, as the papists teach. But as in baptism we receive the Holy Ghost . . . as well if we be christened in one dish full of water taken out of the font, as if we were christened in the whole font or river, so we be as truly fed, refreshed and comforted by Christ receiving a piece of bread at the Lord’s holy table, as if we did eat an whole loaf. For as in every part of the water in baptism is whole Christ and the Holy Spirit sacramentally so be they in every part of the bread broken, but not corporally, and naturally, as the Papists teach.”¹

Gardiner also appeals to this same rubric as implying Transubstantiation.² To this Cranmer replies :

“ What could you have alleged more against yourself? . . . This place speaketh of ‘ consecrated bread.’ . . . But yet will you say, peradventure, that although this make against Transubstantiation, yet it proveth the Real Presence of Christ’s body, seeing that it is whole in every part of the bread.’ It is whole indeed in every part of the bread divided, as it is in the whole bread undivided; which is, sacramentally, riot really, corporally, carnally, and naturally, as you feign and imagine.”³

Again, p. 79, Gardiner says **that**:

“ The body of Christ is by God’s omnipotency, who so worketh in His word, present unto us at such time as the Church pray it may please him so to do, which prayer is ordered to be made in the Book of Common Prayer now set forth, 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, which they cannot be, unless God worketh it, and make them so to be.”⁴

Cranmer answers :

“ *The* bread and wine be made unto us the body and blood of Christ (as it is in the Book of Common Prayer), but not by changing the substance of bread and wine into the substance of Christ’s natural body and blood, but that in the godly using of them they be unto the receivers Christ’s body and blood, as of some the Scriptures saith that their riches is their redemption, and to some it is their damnation. . . . So is the water in baptism, and the bread and wine in the Lord’s Supper, to the worthy receivers

Christ Himself and eternal life, and to the unworthy receivers everlasting death and damnation, not by conversion of one substance into another, but by godly or ungodly use thereof. And therefore, in the book of the Holy Communion, we do not pray absolutely that the bread and wine may be made the body and blood of Christ, but that unto us in that holy mystery they may be so, that is to say, that we may so worthily receive the same that we may be partakers of Christ's body and blood, and that therewith in spirit and in truth we may be spiritually nourished."¹

Again, p. 229, Gardiner attempts to defend the adoration of Christ present in the Eucharist by appealing to the First Prayer Book :

"As touching the adoration of Christ's flesh in the Sacrament . . . it is in my judgment well set forth in the Book of Common Prayer, where the priest is ordered to kneel and make a prayer in his own and the name of all that shall communicate, confessing therein that is prepared there ; at which time nevertheless that is not adored that the bodily eye seeth, but that which faith knoweth to be there invisibly present, which and there be nothing, as this author now teacheth, it were not well."²

Cranmer, as Gasquet and Bishop remark, does not meet this objection directly, but says that he has already

"showed what idolatry is committed by means of the papistical doctrine concerning adoration of the sacrament."

He does, however, add that, though Christ is present corporally only in heaven, "He is to be worshipped, not only there, but here in earth also . . . at all times, in all places."³ But this, of course, does not mean that He is to be adored as present under the forms of bread and wine.

Gardiner likewise makes an attempt to find the Propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass in the Communion Service. He can, however, only find one obscure prayer to which to appeal. He says that it is fitting that, as Christ in the Mass offers Himself

"as our mediator, and so therewith recommendeth to His Father the Church His body, so also the Church at this time remembers with prayer all estates of the Church,"⁴

and then Gardiner remarks that this is found in the Book of Common Prayer, in the part of the Canon which prays for the whole Church. Cranmer makes no comment on this in his rejoinder, but as we shall see, in the Second Prayer Book he moves

¹ Page 79.
• Page 320.

• Page 229.
* Page 84.

this particular prayer to an earlier part of the service, where it is altogether removed from any proximity to the consecration.¹

In one passage, Gardiner appeals to the *Catechism* of Justus Jonas, which Cranmer had translated, as well as to the *Book of Common Prayer*. This *Catechism*, he says,

“willeth children to be taught that they receive with their bodily mouth the body and blood of Christ, which I allege, because it shall appear it is a teaching set forth among us of late, as hath been also and is by the *Book of Common Prayer*, being the most true Catholic doctrine of the substance of the sacrament, in that it is there so catholicly spoken of, which book this author doth after specially allow, howsoever all the sum of his teaching doth improve it in that point.”²

To this Cranmer replies that

“these speeches must be understood *figuratively*. . . . And yet the *Book of Common Prayer* neither useth any such speech, nor giveth any such doctrine, nor I in no point improve that godly book, nor vary from it.”

We quote on another page the passage in which Cranmer explains that “not long before” he translated this *Catechism* he was in error, holding still to the doctrine of a Real Presence (see p. 443).

5. Gardiner also referred to Luther, Bucer, Melancthon, and (Epinus, as believing in the Real Presence. To this Cranmer replies :

“Although these men in this and many other things have in times past, and yet peradventure some do (the veil of old darkness not clearly in every point removed from their eyes) agree with the papists in part of this matter, yet they agree not in the whole. . . . Not one of these new men whom you allege do thoroughly agree with your doctrine, either in transubstantiation, or in carnal eating and drinking of Christ’s flesh and blood, or in the sacrifice of Christ in the Mass, nor yet thoroughly in the real presence. For they affirm not such a gross presence of Christ’s body as expelleth the substance of bread, and is made by conversion thereof into the substance of Christ’s body, and is eaten with the mouth.”³

“Bucer . . . saith no more but that the body and blood of Christ be exhibited unto the worthy receivers of the sacrament, which is true, but yet spiritually, not corporally. I never said that Christ is utterly absent, but I ever affirmed that He is truly and spiritually present and truly and spiritually exhibited unto the

¹ Elsewhere Gardiner appealed to the First Prayer Book against Hooper, Bishop of Gloucester, in defence of the use of altars, pointing out that the word “altar” is used as well as “table” there (Smyth’s *Cranmer*, p. 235). We shall see that the word “altar” is removed from the service in the Second Prayer Book.

• Page 55.

• Page 21.

godly receivers, but corporally is He neither in the receivers, nor in or under the forms of bread and wine, as you do teach clearly without the consent of master Bucer, who writeth no such thing.”¹

“The change of bread and wine in this sacrament, which Melancthon speaketh of, is a sacramental change, as the nature of a sacrament requireth, signifying how wonderfully God by His omnipotency worketh in us His lively members, and not in the dead creatures of bread and wine. And the change is in the use, and not in the elements kept and reserved, wherein is not the perfection of a sacrament.

“Therefore, as water in the font or vessel hath not the reason and nature of a sacrament but when it is put to the use of christening, and then it is changed into the proper nature and kind of a sacrament . . . such is the change of the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper. And therefore the bread is called Christ's body after consecration, as St. Ambrose saith, and yet it is not so really, but sacramentally.”²

6. Cranmer's first book was also critipised by Dr. Richard Smith in a work entitled *A Confutation of the "True and Catholic Doctrine," etc.* Cranmer wrote a special *Answer to Smith's Preface*, which he published at the end of his reply to Gardiner. We must refer to this because it is sometimes appealed to in proof of the contention that Cranmer really did not deny the Sacrifice of the Mass. Here is the passage usually quoted :

“He belieth me in two things. . . . The one is that I deny the sacrifice of the Mass, which in my book have most plainly set out the sacrifice of Christian people in the holy communion or Mass (if Dr. Smith will needs so term it).”³

But the very next sentence explains Cranmer's meaning :

“and yet *I have denied that it is a sacrifice propitiatory for sin, or that the priest alone maketh any sacrifice there.* For it is the sacrifice of all Christian people *to remember Christ's death, to laud and thank Him for it, and to publish it and shew it abroad unto other.*”⁴

He gives similar explanations of his doctrine on the “presence” in the Eucharist, and of the phraseology used in his Catechism, etc. :

“He (Dr. Smith) reporteth untruly of me that I in that book did set forth the real presence of Christ's body in the sacrament. . . . But this I confess of myself, that not long before I wrote the said *Catechism*, I was in that error of the real presence, as I was many years past in divers other errors, as of transubstantiation, of the sacrifice propitiatory of the priests in the mass, of pilgrimages, purgatory, pardons, and many other superstitions and errors that came from Rome. . . . For the which and other mine offences in youth I do daily pray for mercy and pardon.”⁵

444 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

In his rejoinder to Gardiner, Cranmer explains once more his doctrine on the Presence, the Sacrifice, and the Priesthood. Here are some extracts :

On the *Real Presence* :

“As concerning holiness of bread and wine (whereunto I may add the water in baptism), how can a dumb or an insensible and lifeless creature receive into itself any food and feed thereupon ? No more is it possible that a spiritless creature should receive any spiritual sanctification or holiness. And yet do I not utterly deprive the outward sacraments of the name of holy things, because of the holy use whereunto they serve, and not because of any holiness that lieth hid in the insensible creature. . . . And they be no vain or bare tokens . . . but in the due ministration of the sacraments God is present, working with his word and sacraments. And although, to speak properly, in the bread and wine be nothing indeed to be worshipped, yet in them that duly receive the sacraments is Christ Himself inhabiting, and is of all creatures to be worshipped. . . .”^x

“You flee into a new scope, that I should absolutely deny the presence of Christ, and say that the bread doth only signify Christ’s body absent, which thing I never said nor thought. . . . Christ is with us spiritually present, is eaten and drunken of us, and dwelleth within us, though corporally He be departed out of this world, and is ascended into heaven.”²

“We be agreed, as me seemeth, that Christ’s body is present, and the same body that suffered, and we be agreed also of the manner of His presence. . . . If there be any difference between us two, it is but a little, and in this point only, that I say that Christ is but spiritually in the ministration of the sacrament, and you say that He is but after a spiritual manner in the sacrament.”³

“As for the real presence of Christ in the sacrament, I grant that He is really present after such sort as you expound really in this place, that is to say, in deed and yet but spiritually.”⁴

“As for this word ‘really,’ in such a sense as you expound it (that is to say, not in fantasy nor imagination, but verily and truly), so I grant that Christ is really, not only in them that duly receive the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, but also in them that duly receive the sacrament of baptism, and in all other true Christian people at other times when they receive no sacrament. . . . And although in them that duly receive the sacrament he is truly and in deed, and not by fancy and imagination, and so really (as you understand ‘really’), yet is he not in them corporally, but * spiritually, as I say, and ‘only after a spiritual manner’ as you say.”⁶

“I use not this speech, that we receive not the body of God at all, that we receive it but in a figure. For it is my constant faith and belief that we receive Christ in the sacrament verily and truly. . . . But that ‘verily’ . . . is not of such a sort

1 Page 111.
* Page 197.

1 Page 12.

• Page 92.
• Page 140.

as you would have it. . . . My doctrine is that the very body of Christ . . . as concerning His corporal presence, is taken from us and yet is He by faith spiritually present with us, and is our spiritual food. . . . And this feeding is a spiritual feeding. . . . This is the true understanding of the true presence."¹

"The sum of my teaching in this fourth book is that in the true ministration of the sacrament Christ is present spiritually, and so spiritually eaten of them that be godly and spiritual. And as for the ungodly and carnal, they may eat the bread and drink the wine, but with Christ Himself they have no communion or company, and therefore they neither eat His flesh nor drink His blood."²

To sum up, Cranmer teaches a *spiritual* presence, in the *communicant*[^] but *not in the bread and wine*. And as Cranmer was the effective author of the Communion Services in the Edwardine Prayer Book, *this must be taken to be the doctrine therein taught*

On the *Sacrifice of the Mass* :

"Forasmuch as every priest (as the papists say) maketh the same sacrifice in his Mass (as Christ made on the Cross), therefore consequently it followeth that we must seek our redemption at the priest's sacrifice. And so Christ's blessed passion was not the only and sufficient sacrifice for remission of our sins."³

"The Scripture calleth not the declaration of Christ's will in His last supper to suffer death by the name of a sacrifice satisfactory for sin, nor saith not that He was there offered in deed. . . . I say precisely, that Christ offered Himself never but once. . . . I declare in my last book that all our whole obedience unto God's will and commandments is a sacrifice acceptable to God, but not a sacrifice propitiatory, for that sacrifice Christ only made, and by that His sacrifice all our sacrifices be acceptable to God, and without that none is acceptable to him. And by those sacrifices all Christian people offer themselves to God but they offer not Christ again for sin, for that did never creature but Christ Himself alone, nor He never but upon Good Friday. For although He did institute the night before a remembrance of His death, under the sacraments of bread and wine, yet He made not at that time the sacrifice of our redemption and satisfaction for our sins. . . . The cause why Cyprian and other old authors say that Christ made an oblation and offering of Himself in His last supper, was not that He declared there that He would suffer death . . . but that there He ordained a perpetual memory of His death, which He would all faithful Christian people to observe from time to time, remembering His death, with thanks for His benefits, until His coming again. And therefore the memorial of the true sacrifice made upon the cross, as St. Augustine saith, is called by the name of a sacrifice, as a thing that signifieth another thing is called by the name of the thing which it signifieth, although in very deed it be not the same. . . . And He offered not Himself

then for them upon the cross and now offereth Himself for us daily in the Mass, but upon the cross He offered Himself both for us and for them.”¹

“As for offering Himself now as He did then (at His last supper), indeed He offered Himself a sacrifice propitiatory for remission of sin in neither of both, but only upon the cross. . . . Forasmuch as you say that Christ offereth Himself in the celebration of the supper, and also that the Church offereth Him, I would have you declare how the Church offereth Christ, and how He offereth Himself, and wherein those offerings stand, in words, deeds, or thoughts, that we may know what you mean by your daily offerings of Christ. Of offering ourselves unto God in all our acts and deeds, with lauds and thanksgiving, the Scripture maketh mention in many places, but that Christ Himself in the holy communion, or that the priests make any other oblation than all Christian people do, because these be papistical inventions without Scripture, I require . . . that you should plainly set out these devised offerings, that men might plainly understand what they be, and wherein they rest.”²

“The Nicene Council speaketh of a sacrifice of lauds and thanksgiving, which is made by the priest in the name of the whole Church, and is the sacrifice as well of the people as of the priest . . . but it speaketh not one word of the sacrifice propitiatory, which never none made but only Christ, nor He never made it any more than once. . . . He shall never be sacrificed again, but the Church continually, in remembrance of that sacrifice, maketh a sacrifice of laud and praise, giving evermore thanks unto Him for that propitiatory sacrifice. . . . Christ made the bloody sacrifice, which took away sin : the priest with the Church make a commemoration thereof with lauds and thanksgiving, offering also themselves obedient to God unto death. And yet this our sacrifice taketh not away our sins, nor is not accepted but by His sacrifice. The bleeding of him took away our sins, not the eating of Him.”³

“In the holy communion, the act of the minister and other be all of one sort, none propitiatory, but all of lauds and thanksgiving. And such sacrifices be pleasant and acceptable to God . . . but they win not His favour.”⁴

“Because Christ is a perpetual and everlasting priest, that by one oblation made a full sacrifice of sin for ever, therefore His priesthood neither needeth nor can pass to any other ; wherefore the ministers of Christ's Church be not now appointed priests to make a new sacrifice for sin, as though Christ had not done that at once sufficiently for ever, but to preach abroad Christ's sacrifice, and to be ministers of His word and sacraments.”⁵

“The sacrifice that Malachi speaketh of is the sacrifice of laud and thanks, which all devout Christian people give unto God, whether it be in the Lord's supper, in their private prayers, or in any work they do at any time or place to the glory of God.”⁶

¹ Page 86.

⁴ Page 362.

² Page 88.

⁵ Page 363.

³ Page 356.

⁶ Page 366.

To sum up, Cranmer denied that there is any offering in the Eucharist other than (1) the "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," and (2) the offering of ourselves. There is a "remembrance" of the Passion, but *there is no offering of the Body and Blood*. The Communion Service, and the Ordinal with which we shall next deal, must be understood in this sense.

There is really only one passage in Cranmer which can be urged *against* the above (apart from one in his Answer to Smith's *Preface*, to which we have already referred). Gardiner had said :

"The Catholic doctrine teacheth the daily sacrifice to be the same in essence that was offered on the cross once, assured thereof by Christ's words when He said, 'This is My body that shall be betrayed for you.' ni

Cranmer comments as follows :

"That it is the same body in substance that is daily, as it were, offered by remembrance, which was once offered in the cross for sin, we learn not so plainly by these words, 'This is my body,' as we do by these, 'This Jesus was taken up into heaven,' and 'he' that descended was the same Jesus that ascended above all the heavens." 2

This passage has actually been quoted by Smyth in order to maintain that "Cranmer was groping for a more inclusive doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice than he was able to express." 3 But the passage merely shows that Cranmer, paraphrasing and "interpreting" Gardiner, is willing to allow that "*as it were*"—notice this phrase—the Body of Christ is offered "by remembrance." This obviously means "by remembering that Christ died for us," not by *really offering Christ's Body and Blood* once more, in remembrance of His Passion. And note that according to Cranmer, the "remembrance" by which we "*as it were*" offer Christ, consists in "*the eating of Him*" 4 by faith. "Take and eat this, in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on Him in thy heart with thanksgiving." 6 To read into Cranmer's words an admission of any real offering of Christ in the Mass is to disregard completely the thousand and one passages in which Cranmer repeats that there is *no such offering in the Communion Service*.

1 Page 360.

2 *Chichester Diocesan Gazette*, Feb., 1935, p. 61.

4 Page 246.

• *Ibid.*

4 Second Prayer Book.

CHAPTER XIII

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE NEW ORDINAL

- A. THE PASSING OF THE BILL.
- B. THE COMMITTEE.
- G. PREVIOUS ORDINATIONS.
- D. CATHOLIC SOURCES.
- E. PROTESTANT SOURCES.
- F. THE PREFACE.

A. THE PASSING OF THE BILL.

We now come to the most important event in the history of the English Reformation, the introduction of a new Ordinal.

A Bill to provide for a new Ordinal was introduced into the House of Lords on January 8th, 1550. It passed its first reading on January 23rd, and was finally voted on January 25th. It was delivered to the Commons on January 29th, and passed there on the 30th, apparently with some alterations, for on January 31st it was once more before the Lords, who passed it then in its amended form.¹

The Bill as passed authorises and approves beforehand a new Ordinal which, "By six prelates and six other men learned in God's law, by the King's Majesty to be appointed and assigned, or by the most number of them, shall be devised for that purpose." The provision that a majority of the Editors shall suffice, is very significant. Evidently the promoters of the scheme had learnt their lesson from the disagreement of the Committee appointed to produce the First Prayer Book!

The Bishops in the House of Lords were thus required to approve *in advance* an Ordinal not yet drawn up, to be framed by a Committee of unknown composition. But still, its probable nature could be guessed in advance, and also those likely to be chosen to compile it.

The voting by the bishops on the First Bill on January 25th was as follows :

¹ Gasquet and Bishop, *op. cit.*, p. 261, corrected by Gairdner, *Lallardy*, iii, 178.

For the new Ordinal:

Protestants :

Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury.
 Goodrich, Bishop of Ely.
 Barlow, Bishop of Bath?
 Holbeach, Bishop of Lincoln.
 Ridley, Bishop of Rochester.
 Ferrar, Bishop of St. David's.

Opportunists :

Wharton, Bishop of St. Asaph.
 Sampson, Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield.
 Skip, Bishop of Hereford.

Total, 6 Protestants and 3 Opportunists = 9.

Against the new Ordinal:

Anglo-Catholics :

Tunstall, Bishop of Durham.
 Heath, Bishop of Worcester.
 Day, Bishop of Chichester.
 Thirlby, Bishop of Norwich.
 Aldrich, Bishop of Carlisle.

Total, 5.

It must be remembered that Gardiner and Bonner were now in prison, Rugg of Norwich was dead, and Voysey, Bush, and King were absent. The first Bill was thus, in effect, *passed by the Protestant party, assisted by three Opportunists, against the solid opposition of the Anglo-Catholic bishops present.*

The revised Bill was passed on January 31st. The Bishops then voted as follows :

For:

Protestants :

Cranmer,
 Goodrich,
 Barlow,
 Holbeach,
 Ridley,
 Ferrar.

Against:

Anglo-Catholics :

Tunstall,
 Aldrich,
 Heath,
 Thirlby,
 Day.

Passed by six Protestants, against five Anglo-Catholics I

450 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

B. THE COMMITTEE.

A few days after the passing of the Act, the Council appointed the “bishops and learned men to devise orders for the creation of bishops and priests.” Their names are, unfortunately, not recorded in the *Council Book*, but it is generally thought that they were in the main the same as those chosen for the First Prayer Book. But whereas there were thirteen for the Prayer Book, there were, apparently, to be only twelve for the Ordinal. Moreover, as we shall see, we know that Bishop Heath of Worcester was placed on the Committee. In view of what happened, we are inclined to think that his appointment was a deliberate plan to ensure his imprisonment for refusing to sign the new Ordinal. It is difficult to say whose place Heath thus took on the “Commission” which produced the Prayer Book. We are inclined to think that, as stated by Heylin, he was a substitute for Bishop Day of Chichester, who had so strongly criticised the Prayer Book, and had refused to sign it. We are also inclined to think that Thirlby did not sit on this Committee, for otherwise there would be thirteen instead of twelve.¹ If these suppositions are correct, the Committee would have been composed as follows :

Bishops :

Anglo-Catholic :

Heath.

Protestants :

Cranmer,
Ridley,
Holbeach,
Goodrich.

Opportunist:

Skip.

i Anglo-Catholic, i Opportunist, 4 Protestants.

Divines :

Anglo-Catholics :

Robertson,
Redman.

¹ Thirlby opposed all the new Reforms in the House of Lords, but as he was useful for sending on diplomatic missions abroad, it was probably not desired to put him in a false position at this stage. If, however, Thirlby was really on the Committee, some other bishop must have been displaced, and in any case, the clear majority of the Protestants on it would remain. Remember that Thirlby voted against the Bill in the Lords.

Protestants :

May,
Haines,
Cox,
Taylor.

2 Anglo-Catholics, 4 Protestants.

Thus, altogether there would have been *eight Protestants against four Anglo-Catholics and one Opportunist. The Protestants thus had a clear majority, both on the whole Committee and in each of the two groups composing it. And it was especially provided in the Act that a majority should suffice ! The nature of the result was thus assured in advance.*

We have little or no knowledge of what transpired in the Committee, but the Council Book tells us that on February 8th, 1550—*six days after the appointment of the Committee*—Bishop Heath was called before the Council, “for that he would not assent to the book made by the rest of the bishops and clergy appointed.” He was imprisoned, and remained there till the end of the reign. We shall see that, as he repeatedly refused to subscribe the Ordinal, he was eventually deprived of his see.

C. THE PREVIOUS ORDINATIONS.

The fact that Heath was thus called up six days after the appointment of the Committee would seem to make it clear that, as in the case of the first Prayer Book, the business of the Committee must have been, *not to draw up an Ordinal, but to approve of one already compiled.* Dr. Firminger allows that the incident of Heath “seems to confirm the belief that the book had been in existence for some time.”¹ In any case the book was duly approved by the Committee, or by a majority of its members, and published in March, 1550.

As to the previous existence of the Book, there are one or two points which call for discussion. Just as the publication of the First Prayer Book had been preceded by the use of an English service in certain places (see p. 365), so also it is quite conceivable that modifications of the Ordinal had already been made before the production of the English Ordinal in 1550.

¹ *Liturgy and Worship*, p. 663.

Smyth also remarks : “ It is almost certain that the function of the Commission was not to devise a new Ordinal, but to accept or suggest improvements to one that had already been drawn up, presumably by Cranmer and Ridley, on the basis of a draft made by Martin Bucer.* (Cranmer, p. 229.)

There are two occasions usually referred to when some modifications may have been made.

1. The first is the consecration of Bishop Ferrar, which took place at Chertsey in September, 1548 (see p. 373). An account of this is given in Cranmer's *Register*, and is printed in Estcourt, *Question of Anglican Ordinations*, pp. xxvii-xxviii. After the reading of the King's "Significavit" and the taking of the oath renouncing the Pope's authority, there were "lectis publice communibus suffragiis de more Ecclesiae Anglicanae usitatis." We suspect that this means that there was recited the English Litany introduced in the reign of Henry VIII to replace the Catholic Litany of the Saints (see p. 305). After this, according to the Register, Ferrar was

"consecratus et benedictus, per impositionem manuum Episcoporum . . . qua peracta, Reverendissimus [Archiepiscopus] publice et palam recitatis quibusdam psalmis, hymnis et orationibus, una cum epistola Pauli et evangelio Matthaei, consecrata in lingua vernacula sacra Eucharistia, Reverendissimus communicavit Sacramentum Corporis et Sanguinis . . . in verbis Anglicis."

As the phrase "consecratus et benedictus" is followed only by the words "per impositionem manuum episcoporum," we are inclined to think that the unctions were omitted. There is also no mention of the giving of the episcopal insignia. And in view of the known opinions of Cranmer, the principal consecrator, and Ferrar, the bishop elect (see pp. 328, 333), it is by no means unlikely that modifications were made in some of the prayers used. In any case, as we shall see, Ferrar's consecration was treated as invalid in the reign of Queen Mary, and presumably there was some sufficient reason for this.¹

2. The other instance is an ordination which according to Strype was held by Cranmer and Ridley at St. Paul's Cathedral in 1549, after the deprivation of Bishop Bonner. Strype says that "The old Popish order of conferring of holy orders was yet in force, but this ordination was celebrated after that order which was soon established." He also gives the names of two

¹ The authors of *Priesthood in the English Church*, an answer to the *Vindication* of Cardinal Vaughan and the English Catholic Bishops, maintain (p. 22 note) with Frere that "the evidence goes to prove that Ferrar was consecrated by the old rite," and Dr. Firminger similarly holds that "there is little reason for supposing that, save in the use of the vernacular, the consecration of Ferrar varied from the Pontifical, and even in this respect the innovation seems to have been in regard to the Mass, and not the Consecration" [*The "Vindication" of the Bull*, p. 13. Cf. also *Liturgy and Worship*, p. 663]. But on the other hand, Smyth allows (*Cranmer*, p. 228) that Ferrar was consecrated "after a manner that differed considerably from the Roman ritual."

then ordained, and one of these was a certain Sampson. But Bishop Frere points out¹ that Strype must be wrong, for Sampson was in point of fact ordained deacon by Ridley on August 10th, 1550.

The other person mentioned by Strype as being ordained on this occasion was Robert Drakes, who was appointed as Vicar of Thundersley on January 29th, 1550. Foxe and Strype say that this man "was made deacon by Dr. Taylor, of Hadley, and at the commandment of Dr. Cranmer." Dr. Taylor was only in priest's orders, and Frere remarks that "If the account is to be trusted, it seems probable that Cranmer in this did an unusual but not unparalleled act."² He is said to have been "admitted minister of God's holy word and sacraments" "by the said Archbishop and Dr. Ridley" in 1549, i.e., some time before January 29th, 1550, New Style, which would be January 29th, 1549, Old Style. This would seem to show that the *new Ordinal* was actually used in January, 1550. Frere remarks that "there seems no reason to doubt that Cranmer may have used the new rite before it was expected, or even before it was published."³

Strype remarks that this was "a great ordination, consisting of such chiefly as showed themselves favourers of the king's proceedings, to be sent abroad to preach the Gospel, and to serve in the ministry of the Church. . . . At this ordination great favour was shown, and connivance to such who, otherwise being well qualified for piety and learning, scrupled wearing the habits used by the Popish priests."* As this ordination was carried out by Cranmer and Ridley, who were the principal authors of the new Ordinal, it may well have been an experimental ordination, to see how it worked in practice. Bishop Frere⁵ says it took place at Canterbury. Gasquet and Bishop on the other hand say⁶ that it took place at St. Paul's, and this would seem to be more likely.

D. CATHOLIC SOURCES.

We now come to the question of the *sources* used in the compilation of this new Ordination rite. The compilers—whoever they were—had of course the *pre-Reformation Catholic ordination rites*, as used in this country, and it is at least possible that the *Magdalene College Pontifical* mentioned on p. 62, or a similar one, was known to the Committee, and also they may have known of the *Exeter Pontifical*.

¹ *Marian Reaction*, p. 88 note.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 88 note.

• *Marian Reaction*, p. 218.

³ *Marian Reaction*, p. 116.

⁴ Ch. xi. Italics ours.

• *Edward VI and B.G.P.*, p. 260.

As to other Catholic sources, Heylin, in his *Ecclesia Restaurata*, published in 1661, says¹ that the Commissioners

“applied themselves unto the work, following therein the rules of the primitive Church, as they were rather recapitulated than ordained, in the fourth Council of Carthage, anno 401, which, though but national in itself, was generally both approved and received (as to the form of consecrating bishops and inferior ministers) in all the churches of the West.”

Burnet (1679) similarly says **that**:

“As for the forms of ordination, they found that the Scripture mentioned only imposition of hands and prayer. There is no more in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, or the *Fourth Council of Carthage*. Therefore the anointing and giving the vestments were later additions, as well as the delivering the vessels to the priest with power to offer sacrifice.”²

Collier writes in the same strain³ :

“The Committee struck off the additions of later ages, and governed themselves by the forms of the ancient Church.”

There is no reason to doubt that the compilers were aware of the supposed Canons of the Council of Carthage, which, as we have seen, were part of the common theological knowledge of the time, and were incorporated into the Pontificals themselves.⁴ It is also not impossible that the Committee may have known of the Ordination rite in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, for a Latin translation of this work had been printed in 1546. There is, however, no definite evidence that these works were used, and there is, on the contrary, definite evidence to show that *if these works were consulted their provisions were rejected*. Thus, as we have seen, the prayer for the consecration of a bishop in the *Apostolic Constitutions* is very clear on the *sacrificial character* of the ministry, which the Anglican rite *excludes*. And as to the supposed Canons of Carthage, there are only two which are *ad rem*, and these are the following :

Canon 2.—Episcopus, cum ordinatur, duo episcopi ponant et teneant evangeliorum codicem super caput et cervicem ejus, et uno super eum fundente benedictione, reliqui omnes episcopi qui adsunt, manibus suis caput ejus tangunt.

In contrast with this, as we shall see in the Anglican rite, the Archbishop only, and not the two assistant bishops, lays a Bible (not the Book of the Gospels) upon the neck (not the head and

¹ Page 83.

² II, p. 143.

³ *Eccles. Hist.*, ii, p. 288.

⁴ They were also mentioned in the *King's Book* of 1543. See p. 297

neck) of the bishop elect, and this takes place after the laying on of hands, and not before, as stipulated by the Canons of Carthage.

The other Canon is No. 3 :

Presbyter cum ordinatur, episcopo eum benedicente et manum super caput ejus tenente, etiam omnes presbyteri qui praesentes sunt, manus suas juxta manum episcopi super caput illius teneant.

This certainly seems to be followed in the new Anglican rite. But again we stress the point that *these canons were incorporated into the ancient Catholic Pontificals, and so may have been taken from these.*

Of other Catholic works, the Committee, or at any rate some of them, such as Cranmer, were aware of the *Antididagma* of Cologne, and may also have known of the *Encheiridion* of Cologne, the Provincial Council of Cologne, and the Council of Mainz, with its *Institutio* (see pp. 92, 183 *et seq.*).

E. PROTESTANT SOURCES.

It is surely remarkable that *not one of the Anglican writers we have quoted even suggests the possibility that Cranmer and his colleagues may have consulted, or even known of the recent Protestant productions on the subject of Holy Order.* Yet there is every reason to believe that he and they were well acquainted with these. We have mentioned the close contact between Cranmer and the foreign Reformers in England, and also his correspondence with those abroad, such as Melancthon, Calvin, etc.¹ It is hardly conceivable that he was ignorant of their doctrine on the subject of Holy Order, and of the new ordination rites which they had drawn up in accordance with their doctrine. And in particular, we have already mentioned that the *Ordinatio* of Bugenhagen was at Cranmer's disposal, and that this work comprised an ordination service for Lutheran presbyters, and another for superintendents or bishops.

But most important of all is the influence undoubtedly exerted by Martin Bucer. We have already outlined the doctrine of this remarkable man (see pp. 162 *et seq.*), and the ordination rite he drew up for use in his church at Strassburg.² We must now call attention once more to the fact that he came to England at

¹ We have already called attention to his translation of the *Catechism* of Justus Jonas, which deals with the subject of Orders. See p. 369.

² For the Latin text of this, see *The Lutheran Origin of the Anglican Ordinal*, 1934* (2s. 6d.).

456 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

Cranmer's special invitation, arriving on April 25th, 1549, bringing with him several of his works. He was the guest of Cranmer for some months in the summer of 1549, and then went to Cambridge, in November of that year. Now there is amongst his *Scripta Anglicana*, i.e., works which were either written here in England, or brought by him to England, and subsequently sent to Bale by Grindal and published in 1577, a work called *De Ordinatione Legitima*, which is written in response to an enquiry as to the method of ordination adopted in the churches abroad. There was obviously only one person who would have thus been anxious to know what was the custom abroad, and that must have been Cranmer himself, and it is only necessary to mention the fact that *precisely at the time when Bucer was Cranmer's guest, the Archbishop was contemplating and preparing for the production of a new Ordinal*. We shall find that *this new English rite is inspired throughout by Bucerian ideas, and that to an enormous extent it merely paraphrases or rather translates his Latin Lutheran rite*.

F. THE PREFACE TO THE ORDINAL.

Bucer's rite allows for three orders, bishops, presbyters, and deacons, but the one rite is to serve for all three, with minor variations in solemnity, etc. He abolishes all the minor orders. Bugenhagen gives one rite for ordaining presbyters, and another for bishops. He has none for a deacon, and *a fortiori* none for the minor orders. Indeed, this wholesale abolition of the minor orders was a general feature of the Continental Protestant Churches.

So that the *first* point we must notice is that *Cranmer similarly decides to retain only three orders, deacons, priests, and bishops*, and his new Ordinal does not provide for any minor orders.

Cranmer decides, however, to follow Bugenhagen rather than Bucer in the matter of *separate rites*, and to have distinct services for the ordinations of deacons, priests, and bishops. This is, *pro tanto*, a concession to traditional use. But Cranmer's attitude on this matter will be best studied in the important *Preface* which appears in front of the new Ordinal. Its language is very carefully chosen, and *it is significant, like all these Reformation documents, not only in what it says, but also in what it abstains from saying*.

It begins as follows :

“ It is evident unto all men, diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time, there hath been

these orders of Ministers in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons."

This simply mentions the *constant existence* of these three orders, *as a historical fact*. It does *not* say that they are *of divine institution*, or that they are *absolutely necessary*. Nor does it say that a *bishop is essentially superior to a priest*.

Cranmer continues :

° Which offices were evermore had in such reverent estimation, that no man by his own *private authority* might presume to *execute* any of them, except he were first called, tried, examined, and known to have such qualities as were requisite for the same. And also by public prayer, with imposition of hands, *approved and admitted* thereunto."

Note here that "calling, examining, and admitting with imposition of hands" is required that a man may have *public authority* to *execute* the office in question, and not merely exercise them by his own *private authority*. This certainly does not imply that the office confers a *sacred character* or is a sacrament, or that ordination is *absolutely necessary* for the exercise of functions. Furthermore, there is *no statement as to who is to lay on hands*, and whether *only a bishop may validly ordain to the higher orders*. The statement is *one which would evidently apply to all the Lutheran ordinations which had taken place abroad*, for it does not say or imply that *priests or presbyters may not ordain a bishop or superintendent*.¹

The Preface continues :

"And, therefore, to the intent these orders should be continued, and reverently used and esteemed in this Church of England, it is requisite that no man (not being at this time present Bishop, Priest or Deacon) shall *execute* any of them, except he be called, tried, examined and admitted according to the form hereafter following."

Note here that the "calling and admission" is required (a) for the *execution* of orders rather than for the giving or conferring of orders, and (b) the form following, with any implications it may possess, *holds good only for the Church of England*. The ministry may not be executed or exercised *in the Church of England* unless the minister has been "admitted" to the office by episcopal ordination, or is already a bishop, priest, or deacon. This leaves entirely open the question whether a minister might be constituted

* Dixon pertinently remarks that "Throughout the new formulary there was manifest the intention of lessening the distance between the priesthood and the episcopate" and that "in the consecration of bishops it was that the old forms exhibited, the new form abrogated, the greatest number of significant and solemn rites." (*History of the Church of England*, III, pp. 192-3.)

by any other method, and *abstains from passing any judgment on the validity of orders not conferred by a bishop.*

We have seen that the Lutherans freely allowed that the episcopal form of government was the *most suitable*, and that the function of ordaining might well be left to the bishops, provided these adopt the Lutheran or Evangelical conception of the ministry and the Christian religion. It is only in cases where the bishops will not come into line that, in Melancthon's words, "*ecclesia retinet jus suum*" and that the presbyters themselves may ordain. We have also pointed out that in at least one Lutheran church the episcopal "succession" was thus retained, and it was this "ideal" form of ecclesiastical government which Cranmer favoured for the Reformed Church of England. Episcopal government had existed hitherto in this country, and he decided to retain it. He did so, not because episcopal government is absolutely necessary for a Church—Cranmer nowhere says or implies this—nor because it is a feature of the Catholic and Roman Church, but because it is the form of government which, historically, has been in existence from the beginning. Thus, even if not absolutely necessary, it is at any rate the best form, and the one most conducive to law and order. Cranmer does not, indeed, say this in so many words, but he seems to imply it.

There is another important point. It is noteworthy that this Preface speaks throughout of the *authority to execute an office*, and is absolutely silent as to the conferring of any *power* by ordination. The language used here is undoubtedly Lutheran, and this fact is very significant. We have already called attention to the Lutheran use of these terms. (See pp. 142, 148, 151.) We shall find a similar emphasis on "authority to execute the office," and absence of reference to the conferring of any *power*, throughout the Anglican Ordination rite.

We must now discuss the precise meaning of the words "to the intent that these orders be continued." It has constantly been argued by Anglicans that this constitutes a definite intention to continue the Catholic hierarchy in this country. We are of opinion that Cranmer really did mean to "continue" a threefold ecclesiastical ministry in this country. But, emphatically, he did not mean to "continue" the ecclesiastical ministry *precisely as it had existed in this country hitherto*. His intention is altogether governed by his conception of the *nature* of the ministry which admittedly exists in three grades. It is to be a *ministry of the word and of the sacraments*, and not, as hitherto, a *sacrificial priesthood*.

It is the ministry as, according to Cranmer, the Apostles conceived it, and as the early Church received it, and not as the Papists have transformed and disfigured it. He intends to make bishops, priests, and deacons as, in his opinion, they were in the beginning, and as they ought to be, and not as they had been regarded under the Roman corruption. *Only thus can we reconcile Cranmer's statement that he intends to "continue" the threefold ministry with the patent fact that he at the same time draws up an entirely new rite of ordination, in which the sacrificial function, so prominent in the ancient rite, is, not merely put in the background, but, as we shall see, is altogether excluded, and excluded in such a way as to make it plain that its exclusion is deliberate, and is equivalent to a denial that any such powers belong to the Christian ministry.*

CHAPTER XIV

THE ORDINATION OF DEACONS

THE ORDINATION OF DEACONS.

We shall now proceed to an examination of the new Anglican rite, and compare it with the ancient Catholic rite hitherto used in England.¹ We have shown that the Catholic rite, both in its prayers and in its accompanying theological exposition, sets forth the Christian ministry as a *sacrificial* one. The *priest* is *ordained to offer sacrifice*, i.e., *the body and blood of Christ in the Mass*. He is, of course, ordained for *other* purposes as well, and we shall have occasion to point out that, so far from excluding these other functions, or in any way diminishing them, the Catholic rite for ordination gives them *adequate and beautiful expression* in its prayers. But nevertheless *the Catholic rite was rejected*, and precisely *because it sets forth not only these secondary functions, but also the function of consecrating bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ and offering them to God the Father in the Sacrifice of the Mass*. That is the doctrine implied in the Pontificals and rejected by the Reformers, and that will account for all the changes manifested in the new Ordinal in England, as it accounts equally for the changes in the Protestant ordinals introduced on the Continent.

FORM AND MANNER OF ORDERING OF DEACONS.

1. In the Catholic rite, the Archdeacon presents the candidates for Orders to the bishop, saying :

“ Reverend Father, this Holy Church asks that these men should be *consecrated* to their respective orders by Your Paternity.”

The Anglican rite has :

“ Reverend Father in God, I present unto you these persons present to be *admitted* deacons.”

In the Catholic rite, the Bishop answers :

“ See that those persons who are by you introduced, and indeed those who shall be by us ordained in the House of God, be such,

¹ i.e., the rite as found in English Pontificals of the time just before the Reformation, e.g., the Bainbridge Pontifical.

by nature, knowledge and conduct, that the evil one may be driven far away, and the clergy be multiplied for Our God.”

In the Anglican rite, the Bishop says :

“ Take heed that the persons whom ye present unto us be apt and meet, for their learning and godly conversation, to *exercise* their ministry duly to the honour of God and edifying of His Church.”

In the Catholic rite, the Archdeacon answers :

“ As far as human scrutiny can perceive, they are held to be worthy by nature, knowledge and conduct so that, God willing, they may be made in these things approved fellow workers.”

In the Anglican rite the Archdeacon briefly answers :

“ I have enquired of them and also examined them, and think them so to be.”

2. After this, the Catholic rite has an interrogation of the people, in these words :

“ With the help of the Lord and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, our brethren here present have been by us elected into Sacred Order by us and by the clergy serving this holy see, some to the office of the priesthood, diaconate, subdiaconate, the rest to the other ecclesiastical grades. Wherefore we admonish and request both you, the clergy, and the rest of the people, that with pure hearts and earnest minds you will be pleased to intercede with the Divine Mercy for them and for us, so that He may make us worthy to be heard in their behalf, and vouchsafe to consecrate each one in his order by our hands. But if anyone have anything against these men, for God and in God's name, let him come confidently forth and say it, but all the whole being mindful of his fellowship.”

In the Anglican rite, the Bishop addresses the people thus :

“ Brethren, if there be any of you who knoweth any impediment or notable crime in any of these persons presented to be ordained deacons, for the which he ought not to be admitted to the same, let him come forth in the name of God, and show what the crime or impediment is.”

So far there is no serious difference, but the preference of the Anglican rite for the word “ admitted ” is to be noted.

3. There follows in the Catholic rite the Litany of the Saints,¹ in which, after the prayer for the Pope, the Bishop rising prayed :

“ That Thou wouldst vouchsafe to bless these elect, We beseech Thee, hear us.

¹ It was not in twelfth-century English pontificals, but was introduced subsequently.

462 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

“ That Thou wouldst bless and sanctify these elect. We beseech Thee hear us.

“ That Thou wouldst bless, sanctify and consecrate these elect, We beseech Thee, hear us.”

The bishop made the sign of the Cross over the *ordinandi* at the words “ bless,” “ sanctify,” and “ consecrate.”

In the Anglican rite, the Litany is the new English Litany based on Luther's Litany (see p. 305), with a petition against the Bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities. And after the prayer for the King and the bishops, pastors, and ministers of the Church, there is added :

“ That it may please Thee to bless these men, and send Thy grace upon them that they may duly *execute the office now committed* unto them, to the edifying of Thy Church and to Thy honour, praise, and glory, We beseech Thee to hear us, good Lord.”

We call special attention to the phrase we have italicised. The deacons are given authority to execute an office, not a special *power*.

This English litany is followed by the accustomed two prayers, to which is added this third special prayer :

“ Almighty God, which by Thy divine Providence hast appointed diverse Orders of ministers in the Church, and didst inspire Thine holy Apostles to choose unto this order of Deacons, the first Martyr St. Stephen, with other : mercifully behold these Thy servants, now called to the like office and administration ; replenish them so with the truth of Thy doctrine, and innocency of life, that, both by word and good example, they may faithfully serve Thee in this office, to the glory of Thy name, and profit of the congregation, through the merits of our Saviour Jesu Christ, who liveth and reigneth with Thee and the Holy Ghost, now and ever. Amen.”

This prayer is reminiscent of some Catholic ordination prayers for deacons (see pp. 50-51). But whereas in Catholic rites these prayers are the sacramental “ form,” and are associated with the laying-on of hands, it is to be noted that in this new Anglican rite it is followed by “ the Communion of the Day,” with its epistle, oath of supremacy, and examination, which last is to determine the disposition and fitness of the candidate. Hence in the Anglican rite it is obviously *not intended to constitute the “form” conferring the office of the diaconate*.

4. After the Communion service has commenced and gone as far as the Epistle, the Oath of Supremacy is administered to the candidate for the diaconate, and then the Bishop proceeds

to an "examination" of his dispositions and fitness, in the form of seven questions, accompanied by appropriate answers. Three of these questions are based on Bucer's rite, a fourth is in Bucerian language, and the remaining three are original. The questions and answers are as follows :

Bishop : "Do you trust that you are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon you this office and ministration, to serve God, for the promoting of His glory and the edifying of His people ?" Answer : "I trust so."

Bishop : "Do ye think that ye truly be called according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ and the due order of this realm to the ministry of the Church ?" Answer : "I think so."

Bishop : "Do ye unfeignedly believe all the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament ?" Answer : "I do believe."

Bishop : "Will you diligently read the same unto the people assembled in the Church where you shall be appointed to serve ?" Answer : "I will."

Bishop : "It pertaineth to the office of a deacon in the church where he shall be appointed, *to assist the priest in divine service, and specially when he ministereth the Holy Communion, and to help him in distribution thereof, and to read holy Scriptures and the Homilies in the congregation, and to instruct the youth in the Catechism, to baptise and to preach if he be admitted thereto by the Bishop.* And furthermore, it is his office where provision is so made, to search for the sick, poor, and impotent people of the parish, and to intimate their estates, names and places where they dwell to the Curate, that by his exhortation they may be relieved by the parish or other convenient almshouse ; will you do this gladly and willingly ?" Answer : "I will so do by the help of God."

Bishop : "Will you apply all your diligence to frame and fashion your own lives, and the lives of all your family according to the doctrine of Christ, and to make both yourselves and them as much as in you lieth, wholesome examples of the flock of Christ ?" Answer : "I will so do, the Lord being my helper."

Bishop : "Will you reverently obey your ordinary and other chief Ministers of the Church, and them to whom the government and charge is committed over you, following with a glad mind and will their godly admonitions ?" Answer : "I will thus endeavour myself, the Lord being my helper."

There is no interrogation corresponding to this in the Catholic rite, but instead, the Bishop sets forth the office of a deacon, as follows :

"A deacon should minister at the altar, read the Gospel, baptise, and preach."

This statement is elaborated in later Pontificals into a long exhortation to the ordinand. Here is the form from the present Roman Pontifical, which goes back for many centuries :

464 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

“Dearly beloved sons, who are about to be raised to the order of levites, mark well how high in the Church is the rank to which you rise. For a Deacon must *minister at the altar, must baptise, and preach*. Indeed, in the old law, the tribe of Levi alone of twelve was chosen to be especially devoted to the service of God's tabernacle, and His sacrifices in never ceasing ritual. . . . In our own day, dearly beloved sons, you hold both their name and office, since you are chosen in the office of levites to minister in the tabernacle of the testimony, that is, in the Church of God. . . . That Church of God you ought to bear like the tabernacle, and defend with holy ornament, with divine preaching, with perfect example. . . . And because you are joined to the service and dispensation of the Lord's body and blood, keep aloof from every allurement of the flesh. . . . Think on Blessed Stephen. . . . Take heed that to all to whom you preach the Gospel with your lips, you set it forth by your living deeds. . . .”

5. Then, in the Catholic rite, we come to the oldest and most important part of the rite, the actual laying-on of hands, with the ancient prayers. The Bishop first lays his hand on the head of the candidate. This was originally done in silence, but in the thirteenth or fourteenth century it became the custom for the bishop to say at this moment, “Receive the Holy Ghost for strength, and to withstand the devil and his temptations. In the name of the Lord.” Then comes the Invitatory, *Oremus dilectissimi*;

“Let us pray God the Father Almighty, beloved brethren, that He may in His mercy pour forth the grace of His blessing on these His servants, whom He has been pleased to raise to the office of the diaconate, that in His loving kindness He will preserve in them the gifts of consecration bestowed upon them.”

The original invitatory ended here, but in later Pontificals it continued thus :

“that He may mercifully hearken to our prayers so that what we do by our ministry He may graciously further by His help, and those whom, according to our knowledge, we deem fit to present for carrying out the sacred mysteries, He may hallow and strengthen with His blessing. Through His only Son, etc.

“Let us pray. . . .”

“Hear, O Lord, our prayers, and send forth the spirit of Thy benediction upon these Thy servants, so that being endowed with Thy heavenly gift, they may both obtain the favour of Thy majesty, and may offer to others the pattern of a good life. Through our Lord Jesus Christ. . . .”

Then after the dialogue comes the consecratory prayer in the form of a Preface :

“. . . Eternal God, the giver of honours, the dispenser of orders, the disposer of offices, who, abiding within Thine own self,

yet renewest all things and orderest all things by Thy word, might and wisdom, even Jesus Christ Thy Son our Lord, providest all things by thine eternal foreknowledge, and dispensest all things as divers occasions may require ; whose body, Thy Church, distinguished by a variety of heavenly gifts, yet knit together out of the diversity of its members, joined by the marvellous law of the whole structure, Thou makest to grow and extend, for the increase of Thy temple, establishing for the service of the holy office, three ranks of ministers to serve in Thy name, even as in the beginning the children of Levi were chosen to remain as *watchers over the mystical celebrations of Thy House*, and to hold as a privilege for ever the heritage of Thy blessing. We beseech Thee, O Lord, look graciously on these Thy servants, also, *whom we suppliantly dedicate to the service of Thy Holy Altars* (or Sanctuaries) *in the office of Deacon*. We indeed judge of their lives so far as we may, as mere men, knowing not the divine sense nor the supreme judgment, but what is unknown to us cannot escape Thee, O Lord, nor do hidden things deceive Thee. Thou art the knower of secrets, and the searcher of hearts. Thou canst sift these men's lives by Thy heavenly judgment, whereby Thou dost ever prevail and canst purge away what they have committed, and enable them to carry out what they do. *Send forth, we beseech Thee, O Lord, upon them, the Holy Spirit*, that by Him they may be strengthened by the gift of Thy sevenfold grace. May every kind of virtue abound in them, authority without arrogance, steadfast chastity, purity and innocence, observance of spiritual discipline. May Thy commandments so shine forth in their demeanour that the example of their chastity may be a pattern of holiness to the people, and bearing about them the witness of a good conscience, may they keep strong and steadfast in Christ, and through Thy grace become worthy by honourable progress to rise from a lower rank to higher things. Through the same Jesus Christ."

This long but beautiful prayer is the original consecratory prayer of the Roman rite. Note that a deacon is said to be *ordained to the service of the altar or sanctuary*. That was sufficient to condemn the prayer in the eyes of Cranmer and his colleagues. Accordingly, instead of this prayer immediately after the examination of the candidate, the bishop lays hands on the ordinand, and says :

"Take thou *authority* to *execute the office* of a deacon in the Church of God committed unto Thee, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Amen."

Once more we call attention to the significant use of the phrase "authority to execute an office." *No power* is being conferred.

6. After the Consecration prayer, the Catholic rite proceeds with the investiture. First, the bishop places the stole on the new deacon, saying :

1 Some Pontificals have *** altaribus*" others "*sacranis*."

“ In the name of the Holy Trinity, receive the stole of immortality : fulfil thy ministry, for God is mighty to increase His grace in thee, who livest and reignest, etc.”

Then the bishop gives him the Book of the Gospels, saying:

“ In the name of the Holy Trinity, *receive the power* of reading the gospel in the Church of God, both for the living and for the dead, in the name of the Lord. Amen.”¹

Here we have the express conferring of a *power*.

The new English rite abolishes this investiture, and merely arranges for the Bishop to present a Bible to the new deacon, saying :

“ *Take thou authority* to read the Gospel in the Church of God, and to preach the same, if thou be thereunto ordinarily commanded.”

Authority is given, not *power*.

7. The Catholic rite is now in all essentials finished, but as we have explained, the later Pontificals have added at the end the invitatory and consecration prayer from the Gallican rite. These are as follows :

“ Let common prayer follow on our common desire, that these who are prepared for the ministry of the diaconate may through the prayer of the whole Church shine forth in the order and blessing of levites, and be distinguished by the grace of holiness. . . .

“ O Holy Lord, Father of faith, hope and grace, and Rewarder of all growth in virtue, who by heavenly and earthly mysteries everywhere appointed dost spread abroad through all the elements the effect of Thy power, vouchsafe to behold these Thy servants, so that being ready for Thy service, they may become pure ministers *at Thy holy altars*, and becoming more pure by Thy forgiveness, become worthy to rank with theses even whom the Apostles chose at the direction of the Holy Ghost, with blessed Stephen as their chief and leader, so that, being endowed with every virtue by which they ought to serve Thee, they may be well pleasing in Thy sight. Through our Lord Jesus Christ.”

This prayer had, in Cranmer's eyes, the defect of speaking of “ ministers at holy altars,” and so the Anglican rite naturally excludes it. But at the end of the Communion service, which here follows, there is to be said a prayer containing portions of the Roman consecratory prayer, *Deus honorum dator*, but omitting all the references to the levites, and the service of the sanctuary or altar:

“ Almighty God, giver of all good things, which of Thy great goodness hast vouchsafed to accept and take these Thy servants

¹ In late Pontificals, the deacon is also invested in a dalmatic, but at first it was only the deacon who was to sing the Gospel at the Mass who was so invested.

unto the office of Deacons in Thy Church ; make them, we beseech Thee, O Lord, to be modest, humble, and constant in their ministration, to have a ready will to observe all spiritual discipline, that they, having always the testimony of a good conscience and continuing ever stable and strong in Thy Son Christ, may so well use themselves in this inferior office that they may be found worthy to be called unto the higher ministries in Thy Church, through the same Thy Son our Saviour Christ, to whom be glory and honour, world without end, Amen."

8. Let us now point out the *essential part* in the two rites, and the *difference between them*. The Catholic rite has the laying-on of hands, accompanied by an invitory, and a consecratory prayer in the form of a preface, which likens the deacons to the *levites of the Old Testament*, and says the deacons are to be *servants in the holy sanctuary, or at God's holy altars*, and calls down upon them the *Holy Spirit*, that they may worthily fulfil their ministry. Then comes the *vesting*, and the giving of the book of the Gospels, with *power to read the gospel for the living and the dead*.

The Anglican rite has as its form : "Take *authority to execute* the office of a deacon committed unto thee." Note that the rite merely gives *authority to execute an office*, and not any *special character or power*. The office of the deacon has been explained in the interrogatory. It is to *help in the distribution of Holy Communion* (i.e., *bread and wine*, see p. 389), to *read the Scripture*, *instruct in the Catechism*, *baptise*, and *preach* "if admitted thereto," and to *search out the sick and poor*.

There is *no investiture in stole*, etc., but the *Bible* is given, with "*authority to read and preach if thereunto commanded*."

This makes it perfectly plain that *what is being conferred in* the Anglican rite is the first grade of a Gospel ministry*. It gives, not a *power*, but *authority to execute the office of preaching*, and of *helping to distribute the holy bread and wine in the Eucharist*, etc. But the Catholic rite, on the other hand, regards the deacon as a person who, *having received the Holy Ghost for this purpose*, has *power to assist in the offering of the Holy Sacrifice at the Altar*, to *read the Gospel in Masses for the Dead as well as in Masses for the living*, and of course to *preach and baptise*.

Lastly, the Anglican "form" for the diaconate has this one good feature : alone among the three orders it mentions *by name* the office conferred. But even so, the specification of its functions, as set forth elsewhere in the service, makes it clear that *the conception of the office is not that of the ancient Catholic rite*.

CHAPTER XV

THE ORDINATION OF PRIESTS

1. The *Catholic* rite for the ordination of a *priest* begins with the *Presentation of the candidate by the Archdeacon*, and the *Interrogation of the People*, as in the rite for a *deacon* (see p. 460). The *Anglican* rite similarly has the *presentation and interrogation*, as given above, on p. 461. We note again that while the *Catholic* rite speaks of “consecration” the *Anglican* presentation speaks of those “admitted to the order of priesthood.” Also, the *Anglican* “Presentation” is preceded by “*Veni Creator Spiritus*,” which, as we shall see, occurs later in the *Catholic* rite.

2. After the *Presentation and Interrogation*, there follows, in the *Anglican* rite, the *Lutheran Litany*, as in the rite for *Deacons* (see p. 462), with its petition, “That it may please Thee to bless these men, and send Thy grace upon them, that they may *duly execute the office now to be committed unto them*” And, just as the *Litany* is followed, in the case of the *diaconate*, by a special prayer, so also in the case of the rite for the *priesthood*, the *Litany* is to be followed by this prayer :

“Almighty God, giver of all good things, which by Thy Holy Spirit hast appointed diverse orders of ministers in Thy Church, mercifully behold these Thy servants, now called to the office of Priesthood, and replenish them so with the truth of Thy doctrine, and innocency of life, that both by word and good example they may faithfully serve Thee in this office, to the glory of Thy name, and profit of the congregation, through the merits of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who liveth and reigneth, etc.”

This is obviously reminiscent of the *Catholic* Consecration prayer for *deacons*, *Deus honorum dator*, but the reference to the *Levites*, and the “service of Thy holy altars” is omitted. Instead, there is mention of “the office of Priesthood,” but what this office is is not further specified. Conceivably in a *Catholic* ordination rite this would be a sufficient “form.” But note its position here : it comes *before the Oath*, *before the Admonition to the Candidate*, and *before his Examination*, which is to determine his dispositions and fitness for the office to be conferred upon him.

It is evident then that *it is not in the Anglican rite intended to be the form which actually confers the office.*

3. In the *Catholic* rite, the Presentation and Interrogation are followed immediately by an Admonition to the Candidate, and the Litany comes after the Admonition, whereas in the Anglican rite it precedes it.

The Sarum rite contained a long admonition, with sections for the various orders. It was not so much a part of the rite as a supplement to it, for the use and convenience of the Bishop. These admonitions could be given by the Bishop, or the Arch-deacon, and, like an ordination sermon, might be in any terms suitable for the occasion. The present form in the Roman rite, "*Consecrandi*" certainly goes back to a time before the twelfth century, and is found, for instance, in an old Rheims manuscript.¹ The Sarum Admonition is given in Maskell, *Monumenta*, ii, 245, and is said to have been taken from the *De Sacramentis* of Hugh of St. Victor. Martene gives a form found in an ancient pontifical of Rouen,² and the Sarum Admonition would seem to be an enlargement of this.

The Sarum Admonition begins by stating clearly the *analogy between the priesthood in the New Law and the priesthood of the Old*, and declares that the Order of Priesthood has its beginning in the sons of Aaron :

"Those who then were called priests (*sacerdotes*) are those who now are called presbyters, and those who were then called high priests (*principes sacerdotum*) are now called bishops."

Then it proceeds to say what functions are peculiar to the episcopate, and what are common to both bishops and priests :

"To bishops alone is entrusted the *ordination of clerics*, the dedication of churches, the laying-on of hands, and the general blessing of the people.. But other sacraments, whether of catechising or of baptising, whether of *celebrating Mass and consecrating the body and blood of Christ*, or of preaching in Church, are common to both orders."

It remarks that:

"Bishops are the successors of the Apostles, and they seek the ministry of priests as a help and supplement of their office, just as Moses in the desert chose the seventy men."

Next, the Admonition brings out the *mediatorial office* of the priesthood, for priests pray for the people, and by absolving them reconcile them to God.

¹ Tixeront, *Holy Order*, p. 223.

· *De Ant. rit.*, ii, 17.

After reminding them of the sanctity required by their state, the Admonition points out that the hands of the candidates will be *anointed*, in order that they may know that they receive by this sacrament *the grace to consecrate*. The stole will be placed over the shoulders, and crossed on the breast, to show that they are to put on the armour of righteousness on the right and on the left, and neither to be cast down by adversity nor lifted up by prosperity.

Then candidates are reminded that the chalice and paten, with the host, will be placed in their hands

“that they may know that they have received the *power to offer pleasing sacrifices to God*, for to them it pertaineth to make the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of the Lord upon the altar, also to say prayers, and to bless the gifts of God.

“This office was used by Jesus Christ our Lord, when, after the supper, He *changed bread into His Body and wine into His Blood*, and commanding, instituted that His disciples should do the same in memory of His passion. He also most excellently fulfilled this office when He offered Himself, Priest and Victim, to God the Father upon the altar of the Cross for the sins of the human race, and through His own blood, entered the eternal holy place, and made peace between heaven and earth.

“In this we see how excellent is the office of the priesthood, through which day by day *the Passion of Christ is celebrated at the Altar*, and guilty ones, being converted from their sins, are reconciled to God.”

This Sarum Admonition thus constitutes *a complete exposition of the Catholic Sacerdotium*, with its typical origin in the Old Law, its Sacrificial Office, its Mediatorial Office, its pastoral and absolving power, the symbolism and explicit signification of these powers in the ritual, and its conclusion.

The present Roman admonition, which, as we said, goes back to the twelfth century at least, is similarly definite and explicit:

“The priest has to offer sacrifice, to bless, govern, preach, and baptise. . . . Conform your lives to your ministry, and as often as you celebrate the mystery of the death of the Lord, mortify your members of vices and lusts. Let your teaching be spiritual medicine for God's people, let the sweet savour of your life be a delight to Christ's Church, that by your preaching and example you may build up the house and household of God, so that neither we for promoting you to so high an office, nor you for receiving it, may deserve to be condemned of the Lord, but rather rewarded.”

Cranmer and company, however, swept this Catholic Admonition away completely, and replaced it by *the new one composed by*

Martin Bucer for his Strassburg presbyters. This Reformed or Protestant Admonition presents a conception of the Christian Ministry precisely such as we should expect from a man like Bucer, who denied the Catholic doctrine of the Objective Presence, the Sacrifice of the Mass, and the Sacrificial Priesthood. After the fashion of all reformed Ordination rites, it duly mentions the *pastoral office*, while of the *sacerdotium* or *sacrificial priesthood* as such there is not a single word. The chief reference to the functions of the ministry is the following :

“Now we exhort you, in the name of Our Lord Jesus Christ, to have in remembrance into how high a dignity and how chargeable an office ye be called, that is to say, to be the messengers, the watchmen, the pastors, and stewards of the Lord, to teach, to premonish, to feed, and to provide for the Lord’s family, to seek for Christ’s sheep that be dispersed abroad, and for His children which be in the midst of this naughty world.”

The rest of the exhortation is concerned with prayer, study of the Scriptures, and an exemplary life. *This Admonition is exactly the same in the Bucerian and Anglican rites.*

Here, then, we have a number of young men about to be ordained to the “priesthood,” or rather to be “admitted” to the same. The Bishop proceeds to admonish them and to explain to them the nature and meaning of the ministry he is about to confer upon them. And for this purpose, Bucer and Cranmer put into the mouth of the ordaining bishop :

(1) an admonition in which all mention of the Sacrificial office—the very essence of the Sacerdotium—is conspicuously excluded.

(2) and one which was in point of fact written by Bucer himself, the German Reformer whose whole teaching was directed against the Catholic Doctrine of the Objective Presence and the Sacrifice of the Mass.

And yet, it is of this Bucerian admonition with its palpable ignoring of the Sacrificial Priesthood, that the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, in their reply to Pope Leo, speak of as

“that noble address which the Bishop has to deliver, and the very serious examination which follows, in words which must be read, weighed and compared with the Holy Scriptures, or it is impossible to really know the worth of our Ordinal.”

Vie cordially agree that these two parts of the Anglican Ordinal give the clue to its interpretation and meaning.

4. After the Admonition in the Catholic rite, there follows the Litany of the Saints, with the special petitions for the blessing, hallowing, and consecrating of the ordinands (much more suggestive than praying for grace that they may “duly execute the office now to be committed unto them”).

In the Catholic rite, the Litany is immediately followed by the laying-on of hands, and the Consecration prayer.

5. The Anglican rite, as we said, puts the Litany before the Admonition. After the Admonition, the Bucerian and Anglican rites have a new feature—the “examination” of the candidate. There was no such examination in the Catholic rite in the case of the priesthood. Bucer inserts into his rite nine questions and answers. *Cranmer translates them all except one.* The persons to be ordained are to declare their persuasion that they are “truly called according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ and the order of this Church of England to the ministry of priesthood,” that they believe that “the Scriptures contain all that is required for salvation,” that they will “minister the doctrine and Sacraments and the discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded and as this realm has received the same,” that they will “drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God’s word,” that they will be diligent in prayer and in reading the Scriptures, that they and their families will be wholesome examples to the flock of Christ, and that they will maintain peace and quietness, and render obedience to their ordinary and other chief ministers.

The questions and answers throughout presuppose the *Evangelical conception of the Christian ministry*. There is *not one word of any sacerdotal powers*.

6. We now come to the Ordination proper. In the Catholic rite, this consists of the laying-on of hands by the bishop and priests in silence, followed by an invitation to prayer, *Oremus fratres charissimi*” a prayer “*Exaudi*” and a long consecratory prayer in the form of a Preface. All three are definite. The first begs the faithful to pray that God would multiply His heavenly gifts upon these His servants, whom He has chosen “for the charge of the *priesthood*.” The second begs God to pour down upon His servants the blessing of His Holy Spirit, and the *virtue of priestly grace*, upon those who are being presented to him for *consecration*.

In the Bucerian and Anglican rites, corresponding to this, there is simply a rubric saying that the faithful are to pray secretly. There is nothing corresponding to the second prayer.

The third or consecratory prayer, in the Catholic rite, can be divided into two parts. The first sets forth the *analogy of the Christian Priesthood with the Old Law* :

“ Whence the priestly degrees and levitical offices instituted in mystical sacraments have increased.” “ So also didst Thou transfuse into Eleazar and Ithamar, the sons of Aaron, the fulness of their father’s grace, so that they might be a sufficient ministry of priests for the salutary sacrifices, and sacraments of more frequent ministering.”

There is of course *no analogy between the two priesthoods of the Old and New Law in the Bucerian or Anglican rites.*

The Catholic prayer goes on :

“ Give, we beseech Thee Almighty God, to these Thy servants the dignity of the priesthood {presbyterii}.⁹⁹

This first part of the prayer goes back *at least* to the ninth century, when it formed *the* ordination prayer for priests in the Roman rite.

The *second* part of the Sarum consecratory prayer is the *Deus Sanctificationum omnium*, the original Consecration Prayer in the Gallican rite (see p. 59).

It implies that the ordination is a true consecration :

“ O God, the Author of all sanctification, to whom belongeth true consecration and the fulness of blessing, do Thou, O Lord, pour down upon these Thy servants the grace of Thy blessing.”

Then there comes the mention of the *pastoral* office of the ministry :

“ Meditating day and night upon Thy law, may they believe what they read, and teach what they believe, may they show forth in themselves justice, constancy, mercy, strength, and other virtues, etc.”

And then the *consecrating power* of the priesthood is clearly set forth in the following terms :

“ May they preserve pure and unspotted the gift of this ministry, and for the service of Thy people change by their immaculate blessing the bread and wine into the body and blood of Thy Son⁹⁹

Between these two consecratory prayers, the Sarum Pontifical inserted an “ Investiture,” in which the Bishop put the stole and chasuble on the *ordinandi*. The formula for the latter was :

“ Receive this priestly vestment, by which charity is signified.”

7. Thus, to sum up so far, the Catholic Pontifical comprised :

First laying-on of hands,

Oremus dilectissimi.

Exaudi,

Deus honorum dator (the ancient Roman form),

Giving of stole and chasuble.

Deus sanctificationum omnium (the ancient Gallican form).

Now the Bucerian and Anglican rites both entirely omit this first solemn laying-on of hands by the bishop and the presbytery, and the prayers immediately following, which were *the* matter and form of the ordination rite, and its most ancient feature.

The following quotations from the Reply of the Anglican Archbishops to Pope Leo XIII are very apposite :

“ In the old Roman Sacramentary, which may perhaps be assigned to the sixth century, only three prayers are employed for the ordination of presbyters. Two are short collects, namely, *Oremus dilectissimi*, and *Exaudi nos*, and a third longer, like a Eucharistic preface, which is the real Benediction, and was in former times attached to the laying-on of hands, which begins *Domine sancte, Pater omnipotens, aterne Deus, honorum omnium, etc.* These prayers from the sixth to the ninth century and perhaps later, made up the whole rite for ordaining a presbyter in the Church of Rome, with no other ceremonies whatever. These prayers, scarcely altered, are retained in the Roman Pontifical, and form as it were the nucleus of the service for the ordering of a presbyter.”¹

“ The prayer which is called the ‘ Consecration ’ in ancient books, is considered by weighty authorities since the time of Morinus, to be the true ‘ form ’ of Roman ordination, and doubtless was in old days joined with the laying-on of hands. --- If the old Roman ordinations are valid, directly this prayer has been said, the ordination of presbyters is complete in that Church, even at the present day. For any ‘ form ’ which has once sufficed for any Sacrament of the Church, and is retained still unaltered and complete, must be supposed to be retained with the same intent as before. --- In any case, the intention of the more recent part of the Roman formulary cannot have been to empty the more ancient part of its proper force.”²

Now it is precisely this ancient form which the Reformers abolish entirely, and substitute a prayer composed a few years before, of a completely different character !

This abolition of the Catholic consecration prayer is thus commented on by Proctor and Frere in their *History of the Book of Common Prayer* :

“ Those who are familiar with the old services will regret that the revisers abandoned the great consecratory prayer, prefaced by the solemn bidding, the salutation, and the *Sursum Corda*. The prayers themselves were fine, and there was nothing in them to which exception could be taken, and further, it is now seen that the use of such a type of prayer as the central point of the service is a characteristic deep rooted in the ancient services. . . . Such prayers were abandoned, no doubt, because of the wish to shorten, simplify, and compress the ordination.”³

* Page 21.

1 Page 35.

2 Pp. 660-1.

But surely, the reason why these prayers were omitted is precisely that they *did* contain things to which the Reformers objected, such as the expressed *analogy between the priests of the Old Law and those of the New*, and the prayer that the ordinands may “for the services of Thy people change bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Thy Son.”

And in place of these most ancient prayers, the Anglican ^w revisers ” put the recent composition of Martin Bucer, which, as Dr. Brightman says, is “*rather for the Church in general than for the ordinands in particular*.”¹ Moreover, this new prayer does not even specify the particular office which is being conferred, but merely speaks in general of the “Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Doctors and Pastors,” and says that the candidates are called *M* to the same office and ministry of the salvation of mankind.” It is impossible not to conclude that *the exclusion of all reference to the sacrificial function of the priesthood and its replacement by a colourless reference to the whole Christian ministry in general, stressing its “evangelical” character, is deliberate.*

8. These new Protestant rites also omit the *investiture in stole and chasuble*, with the accompanying prayers. They also omit the *blessing and anointing of the priest's hands*, which comes after the two Consecratory Prayers in the Catholic rite. The following are the prayers used in the Catholic rite for these ceremonies :

“**Bless, O Lord, and sanctify these, the hands of Thy priests (sacerdotum) to consecrate the sacrifices which are offered for the sins and negligences of the people, and to bless all other things necessary for its service.**”

And for the anointing :

“**Vouchsafe, O Lord, to consecrate and sanctify these hands by this unction and our blessing, that whatsoever they shall consecrate may be consecrated, and whatsoever they shall bless may be blessed and sanctified, in the name of Our Lord Jesus Christ.**”

These ceremonies and prayers were very ancient indeed, and as we have said, there was a blessing of the priest's hands even in the pre-Augustinian British Church. But the antiquity of these prayers did not save them : *they were redolent of sacrifice, and therefore were abolished.*

9. Next we come to the *most recent* additions to the Catholic rite, the “tradition of instruments,” with a formula conveying explicitly the power to sacrifice ; and the *final laying-on of hands*,

at the end of the Ordination Mass, with the explicit conferring of the power to forgive sins. The formula used at the tradition of instruments was :

“Receive the *power to offer sacrifice* to God and to *celebrate Masses for the living and the dead*, in the name of Our Lord Jesus Christ.”

Note the use of the term “power” here.

At the final laying-on of hands, the bishop says :

“Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whose sins, etc.”

Though these are the *latest additions* to the Pontifical, *they were adopted into the Anglican rite*¹ but of course transformed in such a way as to *change their significance*. For after the colourless prayer from Bucer which takes the place of the old Roman and Gallican consecratory prayers, we get the *one and only laying-on of hands* in the Anglican rite, followed by a “tradition of instruments.”

At this, the most important point of the service, Bucer's rite similarly had a laying-on of hands, but there was no tradition of instruments. Also, Bucer had one form only for all the three orders, as follows :

“**May the hand of Almighty God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, be upon you, protect and govern you, that you may go and bring forth abundant fruit by your ministry, and may it remain with you unto life eternal. Amen.**”

Bucer, however, arranged that his rite should be administered with greater or less solemnity according to the office conferred, and there is no reason to think that he would object in the least to separate “forms” being used for each order, provided these express the “Protestant” conception of the ministry, as is the case with the Anglican rite. In any case, Cranmer preferred a separate form to accompany the laying-on of hands for each other. In the case of the priesthood, his form is as follows :

“**Receive the Holy Ghost, whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven, and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained, and be thou a faithful dispenser of the word of God and of His Holy Sacraments.**”

As to the first part of this form, the words “Receive the Holy Ghost, whose sins, etc.,” these are, as we have said, used in the Pontifical rite, at the final laying-on of hands. But it is not necessary to suppose that this explains Cranmer's adoption of

¹ We have pointed out on p. 64 that these were both of late introduction. The tradition of instruments was introduced about the eleventh century, and the final laying-on of hands with the formula “Receive the Holy Ghost” hereafter common only in the fourteenth century.

them. The passage, after all, is from Scripture, and moreover, the phrase had been adopted a few years previously for the ordination rite of the Lutheran Church in Hesse :

“ The Church shall be assembled, and all shall pray in common for the elect. . . . Then the elect shall be set in the midst, and three at least shall lay hands on each of them . . . of whom one shall say, in a loud voice, * Receive the Holy Ghost, whose sins thou shalt forgive,’ etc., or else * Receive the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, whatsoever thou shalt bind,’ etc.”¹

The words do not occur in Bucer’s ordination rite, but he certainly would not have objected to them, for in the very work *De Ordinatione Legitima*, written for Cranmer’s information, he says that in Strassburg the candidate for orders is asked, *inter alia*, “ whether he believes that . . . by these means (lawful calling, proving, and imposition of hands with prayer), the *of the Holy Ghost* is prayed for and exhibited, in order that he may discharge his office the more duly, and for the better edification of the Church.”²

Let us now consider the significance of the words themselves, and their adequacy as a form for ordination. We must remark, in the first place, that when Our Lord first said them, the Apostles had already been given the essential power of the priesthood, i.e., the power to celebrate the Eucharist and therefore they were not ordained priests by these words. Secondly, though these words had been introduced into the Western ordination rite, it is evident that they were not at any time intended to convey the essential power of the priesthood, i.e., the power to offer sacrifice. Thirdly, though some theologians had regarded this final laying-on of hands and the commission to forgive sins as *part* of the form for the priesthood, no theologian had ever maintained that this commission, taken by itself, would constitute an adequate form. Nor does it seem that it was so regarded by the Anglican Reformers, for there is a second part of the form, with which we must now deal, namely, the exhortation, “ Be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God and of His Holy Sacraments.”

We have already noted the use of this phrase, the “ ministry of the Word and of the Sacraments,” in the Bishops’ Book written in the reign of Henry VIII (see pp. 257, 258). It also occurs elsewhere, e.g., in letters written by Bishop Tunstall, and Cardinal Pole (see Volume Two). This shows that in itself it need not

¹ *Reformatio Ecclesie Hassia*, in Richter, *Kirchenordnungen*, I, p. 65.

² *Scripta Anglicana*, p. 249.

necessarily have a heretical signification. Indeed, we may allow that in itself, the phrase is not unsuitable as a general description of the pastoral functions of the Christian ministry, taken as a whole, in all its degrees. But even so, we should have to point out that it would be unsuitable as a form of ordination to a particular degree or order, precisely by reason of its vagueness, and general applicability. After all, not only priests, but deacons and bishops minister the Word and some of the Sacraments, at any rate.

But there is a far more serious point which must be considered here. This very phrase, "the ministry of the Word and the Sacraments," was precisely the one which the Continental Reformers expressly selected, and consistently employed, in order to describe the Evangelical or Protestant conception of the Christian ministry, as distinct from the Catholic conception of the priesthood. We have pointed out that Melanchthon, for instance, insists that the function of the priesthood is to minister the Word and the Sacraments, and *not* to offer Sacrifice (p. 14\$), and that the phrase is also used over and over again by Calvin, in the same sense (see p. 176). Further, in the ordination rite drawn up by Bugenhagen, contained in the very work which Cranmer utilised when compiling the First Prayer Book, the phrase occurs at the beginning of the rite for ordination of a presbyter: "*Est ordinatio nihil aliud quam ritus ecclesiasticus, vocandi aliquem in ministerium verbi et sacramentorum,*" and similarly in his rite for the ordaining of a bishop or superintendent, Bugenhagen says that the imposition of hands spoken of by St. Paul is spoken "*de praedicatoribus et doctoribus ecclesiarum . . . non de Missariis.*"¹ Again, Bucer employs the same phrase in his own Ordination rite, to set forth his evangelical or non-sacrificial conception of the Christian ministry, and this is all the more significant if we bear in mind that it was precisely this rite of Bucer which Cranmer took as his model for his new Anglican rite. And to come to England itself, Hooper of Gloucester, preaching before the King and Council in Lent, 1550, immediately after the publication of the new Ordinal, employs this very phrase in an unmistakable way:

"First let us speak of the bishops and priests. Their office was, in the primitive and first Church, to be preachers of God's word, and ministers of Christ's sacraments; not to sacrifice for dead nor live, nor to sing or mass, or any such-like."²

¹ See pp. 157, 158.

² *Early Works*, p. 480.

Lastly, we must point out that the phrase had never been employed in any Ordination rite used in any part of the Catholic Church, as a form of ordination, or as part of a form.

All this makes it perfectly clear that what the English Ordinal intends, to make, in common with the Continental Protestant ordination rites, is a Protestant "minister of the Word and the Sacraments," and *not* a Catholic "sacrificing priest."

After the laying-on of hands and its accompanying formula, the Anglican rite directs that the bishop is to give to the ordinand "a Bible in the one hand, and the chalice or cup with the bread in the other hand,"¹ saying :

« Take thou authority to preach the Word of God, and to minister the Holy Sacraments in this congregation where thou shalt be so appointed."

The Catholic rite for the priesthood, as we have said, has a "tradition" of the chalice and paten, with the words, "Receive the *power to offer sacrifice*" etc. There is no giving of the Bible. The Anglican rite arranges for the Bishop to give both the Bible and the "instruments," but instead of conferring any power to offer sacrifice, he merely gives *authority to preach and minister the sacraments*. The substitution is deliberate, and significant. We have already explained the Protestant sense of the words used. We have also called attention to the significance of the phrase "authority to execute an office," as contrasted with "power," and of the Anglican adoption of this Lutheran phrase. (See p. 458.)

10. Finally, at the end of the Ordination Mass, the Catholic Pontifical provides a special blessing for the newly-ordained priests :

"The Blessing of God Almighty, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, descend upon you, that you may be in the sacerdotal order, and offer for the sins and offences of the people acceptable sacrifices to Almighty God, to whom be honour and glory for ever, Amen."

There is *no such blessing in either the Bucerian or Anglican rite*, but in its place, Cranmer puts a colourless collect, in which there is *no allusion to anything besides preaching*, and from which *all mention of the sacrificial office is absent* :

^x It is strange that this inclusion of a "tradition of instruments," i.e., of chalice and bread, in the Anglican rite for the priesthood in the First Ordinal, has been entirely overlooked, and even denied, by Mr. Joseph Clayton. See his *Protestant Reformation in Great Britain*, p. 116, and also his paper on "The English Disruption in the Sixteenth Century," in *The Church : Catholic Summer School Papers*, 1927, p. 281.

“ Most merciful Father, we beseech Thee so to send upon these Thy servants Thy heavenly blessing, that they may be cfad about with all justice, and that *Thy word spoken by their mouths* may have such success, that it may never be spoken in vain. Grant also that we may have grace to hear and receive the same as Thy most holy word, and the mean of our salvation, that in all our words and deeds we may seek Thy glory, and the increase of Thy kingdom, through Jesus Christ our Lord, Amen.”

»

CHAPTER XVI

THE CONSECRATION OF BISHOPS, AND SUMMING UP

THE consecration of bishops.

We now come to the Anglican “Form for Consecrating of an Archbishop or Bishop.” As in the case of the diaconate and the priesthood, we shall find that the new Anglican rite *preserves the non-essential and adventitious features* in the main, but *excludes the oldest and most essential prayers.*

1. The rite begins, as in the Catholic rite, with a *Presentation* of the Bishop-elect to the Consecrator. (This Presentation is absent in some English uses, but is found in the Roman and several other Pontificals.)

2. The new English rite then provides for the reading of the “King’s mandate to the Archbishop for the Consecration.” Corresponding to this, there is in the Catholic rite the reading of the Pope’s mandate.

3. Next there comes in the Anglican rite the “Oath of the King’s Supremacy,” and the Oath of Due Obedience to the Archbishop. The Catholic rite had an Oath of Obedience to the Pope, as successor of Blessed Peter, and also an Oath of Obedience to the Metropolitan See of Canterbury, “*secundum decreta Romanorum pontificum.*” Needless to say, the new English oath of obedience to the Archbishop is much simpler and shorter, and omits all reference to the “decrees of the Roman Pontiffs.”

4. Next, the two rites have an Examination, and the Litanies. But the order is inverted : the English rite puts the litanies first, while in the Catholic rite the Examination came first.

The Litany to be used in the English rite is of course the new Lutheran litany already referred to (p. 462). It is preceded by a prayer :

“Brethren, it is written in the Gospel of St. Luke, that Our Saviour Christ continued the whole night in prayer, or ever

that He did choose and send forth His twelve Apostles. It is written also in the Acts of the Apostles, that the disciples which were at Antioch did fast and pray, or ever they laid hands upon, or sent forth Paul and Barnabas. Let us therefore, following the example of our Saviour Christ and His Apostles, first fall to prayer, or that we admit and send forth this person presented unto us, to the work whereunto we trust the Holy Ghost hath called him."

Here we note that the "consecration" of a bishop consists in "admitting and sending him forth to a work," rather than conferring any special *powers* upon him.

The Litany contains, in place of the special petitions in the Catholic litany that God would "bless, sanctify and consecrate" the elect, a prayer :

- "That it may please Thee to bless this our brother elected, and to send Thy grace upon him, that he may duly *execute the office* whereunto he is called, to the edifying of Thy Church, and to the honour, praise and glory of Thy name."

Note the phrase "execute the office."

At the end of the Litany is said this prayer :

"Almighty God, giver of all good things, which by Thy Holy Spirit hast appointed diverse orders of ministers in Thy Church, mercifully behold this Thy servant now called to the work and ministry of a Bishop, and replenish him so with the truth of Thy doctrine and innocency of life, that both by word and deed he may faithfully serve Thee in this office, to the glory of Thy name and profit of Thy congregation. Through the merits of our Saviour Jesus Christ."

It will be observed that this is precisely the same prayer as that ordered to be said at the end of the litany in the rite for ordaining priests, with the single substitution of the word "bishop" for "priest," and "work and ministry" in place of "office." We have pointed out before (p. 468) that it is based on the Catholic "form" for the diaconate. *It cannot be the "form" for the episcopate*, for the reason that in the Anglican rite *it precedes the examination of him that is to be consecrated.*"

5. Now we come to the *Examination*. There had been for centuries an Examination in the Catholic rite, and we shall derive much instruction by a comparison of the old Examination with the new.

In the Catholic rite, the first two questions concern the Catholic rule of Faith, i.e., Scripture and Tradition, as interpreted by those in communion with the Holy See :

« Are you willing to teach by word and example the people to whom you shall be ordained, those things which you understand from Holy Scripture ?” “I am.”

5 “ Will you reverently receive, teach and observe the traditions of the orthodox fathers, and the decretal constitutions of the Apostolic See?” “ I will.”

In place of this, the English Ordinal substitutes the Protestant rule of Faith, the Bible only :

« Are you persuaded that the Holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all doctrine required of necessity for eternal salvation through faith in Jesus Christ. And are you determined with the same Holy Scriptures to instruct the people committed to your charge, and to teach or maintain nothing as required of necessity to eternal salvation but that you shall be persuaded may be concluded and proved from the same ?” “I am so persuaded and determined by God's grace.”

This particular question is taken verbatim from Bucefs ordination rite.

In the chief Catholic Pontificals in England (Sarum, Winchester, and others) and also in some of the Pontificals of France (used at Rouen, Tarentaise, and Tours) from the eleventh century, it had been the custom to insert a special question, in answer to which the Bishop-elect professed his belief in transubstantiation :

“ Dost thou believe that the bread which is placed on the Table of the Lord is bread only before the Consecration, but that in the Consecration itself, by the ineffable power of the Godhead, its nature and substance are changed into the nature and substance of the Flesh of Christ, the same Flesh that was conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary ?” “I believe.”

“ In like manner, that the wine which, mixed with water, is put in the chalice, is truly and essentially changed into the Blood which flowed from the side of the Lord, wounded by the lance of the soldier ?” “I believe.”

The authors of the Ordinal, as we might expect, excluded bodily these questions and answers from their Examination.

The Pontifical further required the Bishop-elect to anathematise “ every heresy uplifting itself against the Holy Catholic Church.”

Then there follow questions on personal conduct.

The Anglican rite, instead of the questions on Transubstantiation and Heresy, have the following :

“ Will you then faithfully exercise yourself in the said Holy Scriptures, and call upon God by prayer for the true understanding of the same, so as ye may be able by them to teach and exhort

with wholesome doctrine, and convince the gainsayers ? ” “ I will so do. . . . ”

This is from Bucer. It is followed by :

“ Be you ready with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine, contrary to God’s word, and both privately and openly to call upon and encourage other to the same ? ” w I am ready.”

This is based upon a question in Bucer’s rite.

After this come three other questions, on personal conduct, differing from those in the Pontifical, and couched in Bucerian language.

6. After the “ Examination,” the Catholic rite passes on to the central and most ancient part of the rite, the laying-on of hands,¹ and the placing of the Book of the Gospels on the neck of the elect, accompanied by the consecratory prayers. (These were in later times preceded by the *Veni Creator*.)

The first prayer is the “ *Propitiare* ” :

“ Mercifully hear our prayers, O Lord, and turning upon this Thy servant the horn of Thy *sacerdotal grace*, pour forth upon him the strength of Thy blessing, Through our Lord Jesus Christ.”

Then after the Dialogue, we get the “ *Deus donor omnium dignitatum* ” in the form of a Preface. This long consecration prayer is divided into two parts by the anointings. The first part contains three separate expressions of the Sacerdotium. First, it declares that the *Sacerdotium of the Old Law* (*sacerdotii anterioris*) and its sacerdotal vesture is the *type of that of the New*.

Secondly, it prays that “ this grace,” i.e., the grace thus typified, may be given to “ this Thy servant whom Thou hast chosen to the *chief Sacerdotium* (*summum sacerdotium*) or High Priesthood.

Thirdly, it beseeches God to fulfil in “ this Thy priest (in sacerdote tuo) the fullness of Thy ministry.”

This is followed by the petition “ Do Thou sanctify him with the outpouring of the unction from above,” and here, naturally, the rite introduces the anointing of the bishop’s head.

Then comes the *second* part of the Consecratory Prayer. This sets forth the *pastoral and judicial* function of the episcopate, in Scriptural words :

¹ The custom of saying at the laying-on of hands “ *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum* ” now found in the Roman Pontifical, was a very late introduction. It does not occur in any Pontifical earlier than the fourteenth century, and so far as England is concerned, the only Pontifical which has it is the Exeter Pontifical, and thus the words had hardly ever been used in any episcopal consecration in this country.

“ May his feet, by Thy grace, be beautiful to preach the gospel of peace, bearing glad tiding? of Thy goodness. Grant him, O Lord, the ministry of reconciliation, in word and in deed, and in the power of signs and wonders. May his speech and preaching be not in the persuasive words of human wisdom, but in the showing forth of the spirit and of power. Bestow on him, O Lord, the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, that he may use, and not boast of, the *power* Thou givest him, for edification and not for destruction. Whatsoever he shall bind on earth, may it be bound also in Heaven, and whatever he shall loose on earth, may it be loosed also in Heaven. Whose sins he shall retain, may they be retained, and whose sins he shall remit, do. Thou remit them. . . . Grant to him, O Lord, the *episcopal chair*, to ride Thy Church and the people committed to his charge. Be Thou unto him authority, power and steadfastness. . . .

In place of this long and beautiful Consecration Prayer, which follows on the laying-on of hands, the Anglican compilers, abolishing the unctions, order the saying of the following prayer *before* the laying-on of hands :

“ Almighty God and most merciful Father, which of Thy infinite goodness hast given to us Thy only and most dear beloved Son Jesus Christ to be our Redeemer and author of everlasting life, who after that He had made perfect our redemption by His death, and was ascended into Heaven, poured down His gifts abundantly upon men, making some Apostles, some Prophets, some Evangelists, some Pastors and Doctors. . . .”

So far, this prayer, like the corresponding prayer in the ordination of a priest, comes from Bucer's rite. The Anglican prayer now diverges from Bucer :

“ to the edifying and making perfect of his congregation : grant, we beseech Thee, to this Thy servant such *grace that he may be ever more ready to spread abroad Thy gospel.* . . . ”

This is doubtless taken from the Catholic consecration prayer : “ May his feet be beautiful to preach the Gospel of peace.” The Anglican prayer continues :

“ and glad tidings of reconciliation to God.”

The Catholic prayer asks God to give the Bishop “ the ministry of reconciliation.” The Anglican prayer asks instead that the Bishop may preach the *tidings* of reconciliation. The Anglican prayer goes on :

“ and to use the *authority* give unto him, not to destroy but to save, not to hurt but to help.”

The Catholic rite prayed that the bishop might so use the “*power*” given him. The Anglican rite adopts the sentiment

but speaks instead (as throughout the whole ordination rite) of "authority." It goes on :

"so that he as a wise and a faithful servant, giving to Thy family meat in due season, may at the last day be received into joy, through Jesus Christ our Lord, who with Thee and the Holy Ghost liveth and reigneth one God, world without end, Amen."

The reference to the "wise and faithful servant" is taken from the Consecration prayer in the Pontifical.

Cranmer thus selects *certain portions* of the Pontifical prayer, and perhaps one feature from the Greek Consecration prayer, and *rejects others*. Those he accepts are those which speak of the "evangelical" or "pastoral" side of the ministry, which was the only side allowed by the Lutherans. Even here Cranmer introduces *significant modifications*. Instead of speaking of "the ministry of reconciliation" he speaks of preaching glad tidings of reconciliation. Instead of speaking of "power" he speaks of "authority." He omits all the comparisons with the *Old Testament priesthood*; he does not once use the word "priest" or "bishop." He excludes the petition "give him the *Episcopal chair*." He also omits the reference to the *power of forgiving sins*, and of binding and loosing.

But the most significant feature of all, perhaps, is the *omission of any mention of the episcopal office*. Instead of saying "give to this man the *high priesthood*" or "the *episcopate*" or "the *episcopal chair*" the Anglican rite says : "give to this Thy servant *grace . . . to be ready to spread abroad Thy gospel*."

7. The Consecration prayer in the Catholic rite is followed in the Sarum books by another prayer, shorter than the preceding. It is as follows :

"O Holy Father, Almighty God, who hast created all things from the beginning through Jesus Christ our Lord, and afterwards, in the end of time, according to the promise received by Abraham our patriarch, didst found the Church by gathering together the saints, having ordered those things through which, by laws given by Thee, the bond of discipline should be upheld, grant that this Thy servant may be worthy of faithfully fulfilling all Thy ministries, so that he may be able to celebrate the *mysteries of the sacraments* instituted of old, and may be consecrated through Thee to the *High Priesthood* to which he is raised. May Thy blessing be upon him, although it be administered by our hand. Command him, O Lord, to feed Thy flock, and grant that as a watchful shepherd he may guard the sheep committed to his care. May Thy holy imparter of heavenly gifts assist, so that, as the chosen doctor of the Gentiles laid down, he may be not lacking in justice, but endowed with kindness, and generous in hospitality. . . .

May he regard the priesthood itself (*sacerdotium ipsum*) as a work, and not as a dignity. May the increase of honour profit him even to the increase of merits, so that as through these ceremonies he is admitted into the sacerdotium, by us, so by Thee he may afterwards be admitted into the kingdom."

Then came the "Blessing of the Sevenfold Spirit," and this was followed by the consecration of the new bishop's hands.

This whole prayer, sevenfold blessing, and anointing were omitted by the Anglican rite. Instead, immediately after the colourless "Consecration Prayer" from which as we have seen all reference to the priestly or episcopal office has been carefully removed, we come to the laying-on of hands, with a new formula :

"Then the Archbishop and Bishops present shall lay their hands upon the head of the elect bishop, the Archbishop saying :

* Take the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee, by imposition of hands ; for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and of soberness.' "

The latter part is, of course, a text from Scripture,¹ but note that, while it claims to confer a certain grace, it does not specify at all what this grace is. And the presumption is that it refers to the grace *impeetrated in the prayer immediately preceding* ; "Grant to this Thy servant *such grace that he may be evermore ready to spread abroad Thy gospel, and glad tidings of reconcilment, and to use the authority given unto him, not to destroy but to save.*" It is a grace to preach, and to use authority well. It is not in any sense a sacerdotal power that is given. Nor does it avail to suggest that when St. Paul uses these words he is referring to Timothy's consecration to the episcopate, or at least that that was commonly held in Cranmer's time. (It is, for instance, stated in Erasmus's *¶ Paraphrase*," which by order of Edward VI was placed in all the churches in England.) For it is one thing to tell a person to stir up the grace given him *when he was made* a bishop, and another to *make* him a bishop. And even if we allow, as we must, that the ultimate and underlying object of this Anglican rite is to make a *¶* bishop"—and, if our Anglican friends insist, a *M* bishop"—such as Timothy was—this intention is vitiated by the way in which the whole rite makes it perfectly plain that *the kind of "bishop" which is being made*—and the kind which the compilers considered Timothy to have been—is *the Protestant or Evangelical kind*, as allowed or accepted in the Lutheran com-

munities abroad—a “*superintendent*” a “*preacher*” and “*ruler*” but *not* a “*High Priest*.”

As to the opening words of the Anglican Form, “Take the Holy Ghost,” we have already pointed out that this was one of the most recent introductions into the Catholic rite, and is found in only one late English Pontifical, that of Exeter.

8. After the anointing of the hands, the Catholic rite proceeds to the *Investiture*. In the earliest English Pontificals this consisted of the giving of the *crozier* and *ring*. In later pontificals, there was added the giving of the *gloves*, *mitre* and *Book of the Gospels*. The Anglican compilers decided to retain some kind of investiture. But instead of conserving the earliest elements, the giving of the crozier and ring, and rejecting the later additions of glove, mitre, and Bible, they retained but one, the *giving of the pastoral staff*. As to the Book of the Gospels, they were aware that the supposed Council of Carthage ordered that two Bishops should lay this Book on the shoulders of the elect, while hands were laid upon him by the Consecrating Bishop, and the Consecration prayer was being said. This, as we have seen, was carried out in the Catholic rite. Doubtless to be able to say that they respected this custom of antiquity, the Anglicans arrange for the *Archbishop* (not the two assisting bishops) to lay the *Bible* (not the Book of the Gospels) upon the *neck* (not the shoulders) of the elect, *after*, not *at*, the laying-on of hands with its accompanying Formula. When the Archbishop thus lays the Bible on his neck, he is to say :

“Give heed unto reading, exhortation and doctrine. Think upon these things contained in this book, be diligent in them, that the increase coming thereby may be manifest unto all men. Take heed unto thyself, and unto teaching, and be diligent in doing them, for by doing this thou shalt save thyself and them that hear thee, through Jesus Christ our Lord.”

An excellent sentiment, no doubt, but one that would equally well suit *a lay reader*. In the later Catholic Pontificals, the Bishop was to say, when the Book of the Gospels was given :

“Take the Gospel, and go, preach to the people committed unto thee, for God is able to increase His grace in thee. Who liveth and reigneth, etc.”

After this ceremony with the Bible, the Anglican rite directs that the Archbishop shall put into the hands of the new bishop the *pastoral staff*, saying :

“Be to the flock of Christ a shepherd, not a wolf: feed them,

devour them **not**; hold up the weak, heal the sick, bind together the broken, bring again the outcasts, seek the lost. Be so merciful that you be not too remiss, so minister discipline that ye forget not mercy ; that when the chief shepherd shall come, ye may receive the immarcessible crown of glory, through Jesus Christ our Lord."

The Prayer used in the Catholic Pontifical at the giving of the crozier is as follows :

" O God, the stay of human weakness, do Thou bless this staff, and may Thy gracious merry working internally, effect in the conduct of this Thy servant what is outwardly signified by it, through Christ our Lord.

" Take this staff of the pastoral office, that in correcting vice thou mayest be mercifully severe, maintaining judgment without anger, the while encouraging virtue, thou mayst soothe the souls of thy hearers, nor neglect in thy calmness severe reproof."

There is no *blessing* of the staff in the Anglican rite. The prayer specified for the giving of the staff certainly exhorts the new bishop to be *a shepherd to Christ's flock*, but after all, *this was a phrase which no Protestant minister would repudiate.*

9. After the investiture, the Catholic proceeds to the celebration of the Mass, and the Anglican rite to the celebration of the Communion service. The Catholic rite provides for special prayers for the new bishop in the Canon of the Mass itself. The Anglican rite arranges instead for a prayer after the last collect, as follows :

« Most merciful Father, we beseech Thee to send down upon this Thy servant Thy heavenly blessing, and so endue him with Thy Holy Spirit, that he, *preaching thy word*, may not only be earnest to reprove, beseech, and rebuke with all patience and doctrine, but also may be to such as believe an wholesome example in word, in conversation, in love, in faith, in chastity, in purity, that faithfully fulfilling his course, at the latter day he may receive the crown of righteousness laid up by the Lord, the righteous judge, who liveth and reigneth. . . ."

The sentiments are excellent, and Scriptural, but once again, there is nothing here which could not be said for *any clergyman* or *gospel preacher*.

SUMMING UP OF THIS NEW ORDINAL.

This careful examination of the new Anglican Ordinal, and comparison with the Catholic rite, reveal some striking facts, which we will now proceed to point out.

1. The pretence of returning to Antiquity was merely a *pretence*, and nothing more. The compilers had certain Catholic material before them, and they could not have been unaware of the lateness of the introduction of certain features of the Catholic rite. A moment's examination of the Pontificals then in England, some of which, such as the Magdalene Pontifical, are still in existence, would have showed them clearly what really were the most ancient parts of the rite. But instead of conserving the most ancient parts, i.e., the great Consecratory Prayers, they reject these practically completely. They similarly reject the anointings, which go back to early British times. They retain, on the other hand, some of the most recent innovations, in a modified form. Thus they retain the form attached to the last laying-on of hands for the priesthood; they retain and amplify the recently-introduced words said at the laying-on of hands at the consecration of a bishop.

In place of the ancient prayers which are thus discarded they introduce new ones, borrowed in great measure from a Lutheran ordination rite composed a few years before by Martin Bucer.

2. But in all cases, whether the source be old or new, the prayers chosen are those which set forth the "evangelical" character of the Christian ministry. Naturally the prayers of Bucer's rite are regarded as ideal for this purpose, and so they are adopted unchanged in the rite for the priesthood. But in the case of the prayers adopted from the Pontifical, these are so modified and changed that only the "pastoral" aspect of the ministry is set forth, and the "sacerdotal" aspect is not merely put in the background, but is excluded altogether. *Anything savouring of priesthood or sacrifice goes.*

3. The new Anglican rite comprises a laying-on of hands with a form of words, and then some kind of "tradition of instruments" or insignia. In addition, in the case of the priesthood and the episcopate, the laying-on of hands is preceded by a prayer which seems intended to replace the Consecration Prayer in the Catholic rite.

4. Bearing this in mind, we can analyse the essential or central parts of the Anglican rite as follows :

Deacons.

No "Consecratory Prayer."

Laying-on of hands, accompanied by words :

«Take thou *authority to execute the office* of a deacon in the Church of God committed to thee, in the name, etc.”

of New Testament, with words :

Giving thou *authority to read the Gospel* in the Church of God and to preach the same, if thou be thereunto ordinarily commanded.”

Consecratory Prayer ” mentioning “Apostles, Prophets, Lists Doctors and Pastors,” and thanksgiving that God Evangel these thy servants here present to the same office has i^try of the salvation of mankind.”

311 Having-on of hands, with words :

ia7 Receive the Holy Ghost, whose sins, etc. And be thou a *faithful dispenser of the Word of God and of His Holy Sacraments*. In the name, etc.”

Giving of Bible, and chalice with bread, with words :

“Take thou *authority to preach the word of God* and to *minister the holy Sacraments* in this congregation where thou shalt be so appointed.”

Bishops.

“Consecratory Prayer,” which, as in the case of priests, mentions “Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Pastors and Doctors,” and asks for “*grace that he may be evermore ready to spread abroad Thy gospel and glad tidings of reconciliation to God, and to use the authority given unto him, not to destroy but to save, not to hurt but to help.*”

Laying-on of hands, with words :

“Take the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee, by imposition of hands, for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and of soberness.”

Laying of Bible on neck, with words :

“Give heed unto reading, exhortation and doctrine. Think upon these things contained in this book. . . .”

Giving of the pastoral staff, with words :

“Be to the flock of Christ a shepherd, not a wolf, feed them, devour them not . . . that when the chief shepherd shall come, ye may receive the immarcessible crown of glory.”

In the “form” which accompanies the laying-on of hands, the order conferred is not mentioned by name, save in the case of the diaconate, and the only functions mentioned are the w evangelical ” functions of preaching, administering sacraments, and the forgiveness of sins, which is presumably to be understood as “preaching the tidings of reconciliation.” *In no case is there any mention of any power to consecrate and/or offer the Body and Blood of Christ.*

5. This leads us to another remarkable feature of the Anglican Ordinal, and that is its significant omission of the conferring of any "power," and its insistence that what is being given is "authority to execute an office." We once more remind the reader of the Lutheran significance of this terminology. (See pp. 142, 148, 151, 458.)

6. The situation is thus adequately and fairly summed up by Pope Leo XIII in his Bull *Apostolic# Cura* :

M In the whole English Ordinal, not only is there no clear mention of the sacrifice, of consecration, of the sacerdotium, and of the power of consecrating and offering sacrifice, but every trace of these things which had existed in those prayers of the Catholic rite not wholly rejected was deliberately removed and struck out,"

This passage is quoted by Dr. Dowden, Anglican Bishop of Edinburgh, in his book *Further Studies of the Prayer Book*,¹ His Lordship adds :

"The Bull of the 13th September, 1896, is justly reckoned vulnerable in many particulars, but it is not vulnerable here,"²

It is also significant that the writer of an article in the *Church Quarterly Review* for January, 1878, remarks that "we should advise nobody to study the real history of this matter" (the composition of the new Ordinal) "who has not nerve enough to recognise how close the Church of England lay in those days to mere Protestantism !"³

¹ London, 1908, p. 303.

¹ Italics ours.

• Page 269.

CHAPTER XVII

THE RECEPTION OF THE NEW ORDINAL

- A. BY THE PROTESTANTS.
- B. BY THE ANGLO-CATHOLICS.
- G. THE USE OF THE ORDINAL AND THE NUMBER OF ORDINAND.

THE RECEPTION OF THE NEW ORDINAL

A, *By the Protestants.*

1. Naturally the new Ordinal was approved by the main body of Protestant opinion in England. But even so, it did not go far enough for those whose sympathies were with the Zwinglians. The opposition centred round the figure of *John Hooper*, an out-and-out Protestant, one fully in sympathy with the Zwinglian party, and in constant correspondence with Bullinger. In February, 1550, he received through Cranmer orders to preach the Lenten sermons before the Court. He chose for his subject the prophet Jonas, and in the course of his sermons, took occasion to attack the new Ordinal :

“ I happened to see of late a certain book for the making of deacons, priests and bishops, wherein is required an oath by saints, whereat I did not a little wonder. And how it is suffered, or who is the author of that book, I well know not. --- I marvel that in the same book it is appointed, that he that will be admitted to the ministry of God's word or His sacraments must come in white vestments, which seemeth to repugn plainly . . . with the doctrine that confessed the only Word of God to be sufficient. And sure I am, they have not in the word of God that thus a minister should be apparelled, nor yet in the primitive and best Church. It is rather the habit and vesture of Aaron and the gentiles, than of the ministers of Christ. Further, where, and of whom, and when have they learned, that he that is called to the ministry of God's word, should hold the bread and chalice in one hand, and the book in the other hand ? Why do they not as well give him in his hand the fount and the water ? for the one is a sacrament as well as the other. If the fount be too great, take him a basin with water, or such-like vessel.”¹

¹ *Early Works*, P.S., p. 479.

He goes on to say that these are doubtless "tolerable things to be borne with for the weak's sake awhile," but exhorts the King and his Council to "redress it as soon as may be . . . and to restore us to the primitive Church, which never yet had nor shall have any match or like. Before all things beware of an oath by any creatures, except ye will be glad to have God's displeasure."¹

2. This criticism of the Ordinal was resented by Cranmer, who accused him before the Council, but no further proceedings were taken. Indeed, at the end of the course of sermons, he was offered the bishopric of Gloucester. He at first declined this, on account of the mention of the saints in the oath, and the use of the alb, etc.² He explained his objections to the Council, and at first won his case, for the King with his own hand struck out the obnoxious clause from the Oath, and the Council sent a letter to Cranmer, desired him to yield to Hooper's scruples, and the King also issued a dispensation to the Archbishop freeing him from any pains and penalties he might incur by departing from the usual form of consecration. But the Bishops objected to this, especially Ridley and Cranmer, who maintained that the vestments were in themselves indifferent. In the end, Ridley offered that if Hooper would

"revoke his errors, and subscribe to the doctrine, and not to condemn that for sin that God never forbade, ungodly adding unto God's word, he would not, for any necessity that he put in these vestments, let to lay his hands upon him and to admit him bishop, although he came, as he used to ride, in a merchant's cloak, having the king's dispensation for the act, and my lord Archbishop's commission orderly to do the thing."³

3. The "subscription to the doctrine" which Ridley required was apparently the subscription of "certain articles" which the Council had proposed to him. Micronius, writing to Bullinger on May 28th, 1550,⁴ tells us that these articles had been put to Hooper, and that:

"He excepted against three of them. One is, that the sacraments confer grace. He wished the word 'confer' to be changed

» Ibid.

¹ Letters written during this time from foreign Protestants in England to their colleagues abroad show that amongst other things, Hooper also objected to the "popish ceremonies" of the placing of the Bible on his shoulders, and the giving of the pastoral staff, in addition to the other points already mentioned (the wearing of the alb, the mention of the saints in the oath of the King's Supremacy, and the giving of the chalice and paten to priests).

² Preface to Hooper's *Later Writings*, p. 13.

³ *Original Letters*, p. 563.

into * seal ' or * testify to.' The second is, that the book set forth by the bishops must be diligently observed in every particular without any alteration whatever. The last is, wherein he is required to approve the book of ordination of ministers of the Church."

This is interesting, as showing the existence early in 1550 of some doctrinal and disciplinary articles resembling some of the later 42 Articles.

4. Hooper, however, still held out, and refused to be consecrated according to the form prescribed, and continued his public denunciation of this. He was ordered by the Council to keep silence, but as he printed his *Confession of Faith*, "wherein was contained matter he should not have written," the Council on January 13th, 1551, gave him over to Cranmer's custody, and on the 27th he was committed to the Fleet. This seems to have produced the desired effect, and he wrote to the Council expressing his willingness to comply with their demands, and also to Cranmer, acknowledging "the liberty of the sons of God in all external things," and agreed that the particular things in question were "not *in se* wicked, or their use, but only their abuse." That was on February 15th, 1551. He was thereupon set at liberty, and was consecrated on March 8th, 1551. "The conditions imposed on him being, that he should wear the prescribed vestments at his consecration, and when he preached before the King, or in his cathedral, or on any public occasion : at other times he was left to the exercise of his own discretion."

5. In the course of the dispute, Cranmer wrote to Bucer for his opinion on the matter, and Bucer wrote two letters, one to Cranmer, and the other to Hooper, himself, on the subject. Bucer argued that "the ministers of the Church of England may use the vestments without offending God," and held that "he that affirms it unlawful, or refuseth to use these garments, sinneth against God . . . and against the magistrate."² In addition, Peter Martyr wrote to Hooper from Oxford on November 4th, saying that he, too, would like, to see the vestments abolished, as they had been at Strassburg, and that in rites he desired to get as close as possible to Scripture and the better times of the

* Editor of Parker Society's edition of *Later Writings*, p. 16.

Dixon says Hooper was allowed after his consecration "to discard the detested livery, unless he were preaching before the King, or on other extraordinary occasion" (III, p. 256). But Butcher, writing to Bullinger on June 8th, 1550, mentions only the wearing of the "white linen robe when he goes to Parliament."

² Strype, Cranmer, with references to *Scripta Anglicana*, pp. 705 and 681.

Church, but even so, he could not agree that the use of vestments was destructive, or *in se* contrary to the word of God, but rather than it was an indifferent matter. Indeed great good might follow from the present use of the vestments, namely, that if in the meantime the Gospel were well preached, men would more easily be persuaded to forgo these outward customs. It would be impolitic at this moment to maintain that things indifferent are really impious, as that might alienate the minds of all, and so hinder the preaching of the Gospel.¹

6. We can imagine that the hated vestments were not worn very often ! And in any case there are some important points to note. One is, that after his consecration, Hooper was on very good terms with Cranmer, as is evident from the following letter sent by Cranmer to Bullinger on March 20th, 1552 :

“ The private affair upon which you wrote to me was, that I should put an end to the controversy between the Bishop of London and Hooper, Bishop of Gloucester. . . . You have been informed long since that this controversy has been entirely settled. And Master Hooper is in such great esteem among us, that he is now appointed Bishop of Worcester ; and he is at this time living in my house upon the most intimate terms, during the sitting of Parliament.”²

And in proof of this good favour we may mention that Hooper was appointed to the Commission entrusted with the Revision of Ecclesiastical Laws, which produced the *Reformatio Legum*, to be dealt with later (see Chapter XXI).

7. Finally, it must be mentioned, and stressed, that *every single one of the features in the First Ordinal to which Hooper had objected were duly removed from the Second Ordinal in the Prayer Book of 1552*.

8. As to the attitude of foreign Protestants to the Ordinal, we may mention that Hooper's objection to the oath by the saints was shared by Calvin, who in a letter written to King Edward VI on January 1st, 1551, specified it as a “manifest abuse . . . not to be endured.”³

But it is of the utmost importance to note that *neither the English extremists, nor Calvin, raised the slightest objection to the continuance of the threefold ministry, in England, or to the conception of that ministry as set forth in the English Ordinal*.

¹ Strype's *Cranmer*, ch. xvii.
[•] *Original Letters*, P.S., 707.

^{*} Cranmer, *Letters*, P.S., p. 431.

B. RECEPTION BY THE CATHOLICS.

We now come to the reception of the Ordinal by the Anglo-Catholic party.

1. We have already mentioned that *Bishop Heath* of Worcester was sent to the Fleet prison in March, 1550 "for that he would not assent to the book made by the rest of the bishops and clergy appointed." He was called before the Council again on September 22nd, 1551, and the account of his appearance there is so interesting that it is worth quoting from the *Council Book* :

"22nd September, 1551. Nicholas, Bp. of Worcester, by express commandment from the King's Majesty given to the same Council, was sent for, and came before the Lords and others, to whom was repeated the cause of his imprisonment to be for that he refused to subscribe the book devised for the form of making of archbishops, bishops, priests and deacons, being authorised by Parliament at the time, of which refusal being not only gently and reasonably required to subscribe it, but also being manifestly taught by divers other learned men that all things contained in that book were good and true, and that the book was expedient and allowable; the said Bishop declared himself to be a very obstinate man, and for that his doing it was now shewed to him that he deserved longer imprisonment. Nevertheless the King's Majesty's clemency was such that now if he had or would reconcile himself and obey His Majesty in this former commandment he should recover the King's Majesty's favour, for which cause it was told to him that he was then presently sent for and willed now to subscribe the same. Whereunto he answered confessing that he took the cause of his imprisonment to be as they alleged, and that also he was very gently used, rather like a son than a subject, nevertheless, he said he remained in the same mind, not willing to subscribe it, although he would not disobey it, and although he was reasoned with all by other of the said Council, in disproving his manner of answer that he would not subscribe it, being everything in the said book true and good, and being devised by eleven other learned men, to the which he was joined as the twelfth, and received of all the whole estate of the realm, agreeing also that he would obey it but not subscribe it, which contained a contradiction in reason, but while as a man not removeable from his own conceit he refused to subscribe it. Whereupon to prove all manner of ways for the winning of him to his duty, he was offered to have conference with learned men, and to have time to consider the matter better; whereunto he said that he could have no better conference than he had had heretofore, and well might he have time but of other mind he thought never to be, adding that there be many other things whereunto he would not consent if he were demanded, as to take down altars and set up tables, and in this sort, seeing him obstinately

settled in mind not to be conformable, he was in the King's Majesty's name expressly commanded and charged to subscribe the said book before Thursday next following, being the 24th hereof, upon pain of deprivation of his bishopric, to all and singular effects which might follow thereof; and hearing that commandment, he resolutely answered he would not find in his conscience to do it, and should be well content to abide such end either by deprivation or otherwise as pleased the King's Majesty, and so as a man incorrigible he was returned to the Fleet."

This luminous account shows the uncompromising attitude taken up by this Anglo-Catholic bishop, *who chose to be deprived of his see rather than subscribe to the Ordinal*. It is, perhaps, hardly surprising that various attempts have been made by Anglican writers to weaken the force of this fact. Thus, the Rev. T. A. Lacey,¹ and even Mr. Pocock,² say that Bishop Heath was not deprived merely because he would not subscribe to the Ordinal, but because he would not consent to the destruction of altars. But the record in the Council Book makes it perfectly clear that it was *Heath himself* who introduced this other matter of the destruction of altars, and the rest of the document makes it plain that in any case *the deprivation was threatened and inflicted because of the refusal to sign the Ordinal*.

Other Anglicans have fastened on the statement made by Heath that, though he would not *subscribe* the Ordinal, he would not *disobey* it, and have argued that this means he was willing to use it. This is categorically stated by Lacey,⁸ and by the writer of the article on Bishop Heath in the *Dictionary of English Church History*, etc. But this is quite an unwarrantable inference. It must be remembered that the Act providing for the New Ordinal enacted that "such form as shall be devised and set forth under the Great Seal before the first of April shall be lawfully exercised and used, *and none other*." And Heath's statement that he would not disobey may quite well have meant that *he would not hold ordinations according to the Pontifical rite*. It does not imply that he himself would have held ordinations according to the new English rite. At the most it might mean that he would give dimissorial letters to candidates for ordination, for them to be ordained elsewhere, by some other bishop who was willing to use the Ordinal.

And here we may also point out another unjustifiable state-

¹ *Interpretation of the English Ordinal*, p. 22.

² *Troubles connected with the First Prayer Book*, p. 138 note.

⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 23.

ment made by reputable Anglican authorities. A previous entry in the Council Book runs thus :

"Feb. 28th (1550). It is thought convenient by the Lords, that seeing the rest appointed to devise the book for consecrating of priests have agreed upon the book, and set their hands to the same, that the bishop of Worcester also shall do the like, specially for that he cannot deny but all that is contained in the book is good and godly."

On the basis of this, the writers on Heath in the *Dictionary of National Biography* and the *Dictionary of English Church History* both state that Heath allowed or confessed that the new ordinal "was good and godly." But the entry in the *Council Book*, compared with the longer entry given *in extenso* above, makes it clear that *the statement emanated, not from Heath, but from the Council itself*. Heath may have found it impossible to "deny that the Book was good and godly" in the sense that the Scripture lessons contained in it, and some of the prayers, were "good and godly." But that would not mean that it was either a *suitable* or an *adequate rite* for ordaining priests, etc.

The attitude of the Bishops in the House of Lords to the Bill for the new Ordinal, and Heath's resolute refusal to subscribe the Book, are thus candidly commented on by Gairdner¹:

"It is clear that the ordinal by which bishops and priests were afterwards consecrated in England was objected to from the first by several of the bishops, and that one of those appointed to the task of drawing it up absolutely refused to act, and was imprisoned for so doing. In view of this I fear that, as to a recent controversy with Rome, truth compels us to confess that the sufficiency of Anglican Orders was by no means generally admitted when the new form of consecration was first composed. The new Ordinal was thrust upon the Church . . . not because it was approved by the bishops, but because it suited the higher powers to have it so."

2. We must now return to *Bishop Gardiner*. We have already mentioned (see p. 413) that in July, 1550, he signed a document approving the First Prayer Book, on the ground that it was "godly and Christian," because it set forth the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist. The very same month twenty further articles were sent him to sign. These covered the whole ground of the Reformation so far accomplished, and made it quite clear what the First Prayer Book was really meant to teach. Thus, Article VII said that *the Mass was full of abuses, and therefore justly taken away, and the Communion placed instead thereof is very godly, and agree-*

^x Lollardy and the Reformation, iii, p. 178.

• Italics ours.

able to the Scripture. It was *good and godly* to ordain that *the sacrament should not be lifted up and shewed to the people to be adored*. Then Article 16 approves of the *Ordinal* :

"The Book set forth by the King's Majesty, by authority of Parliament, containing the form and manner of making and consecrating of archbishops, bishops, priests and deacons, is godly, and in no point contrary to the wholesome doctrine of the gospel, and therefore ought to be received and approved of all the faithful members of the Church of England, and, namely, the ministers of God's word, and by them commended to the people."

Also Article 17 stated that:

"The Orders of subdeacon, benet, and colet, and others, be justly left out in the said Book of Orders."¹

Gardiner thereupon said that it was unreasonable that he should subscribe these in prison.²

He was then called once more before the Council (July 29th, 1550). He again refused to subscribe or consent to the twenty articles, "forasmuch as there were divers things required of him that his conscience would not bear."

The explanation of all this is to be found in a statement contained in Gardiner's *Long Matter Justificatory*, presented by him to the commissioners trying him, on January 8th, 1551 :

"After the aforesaid communication, the Duke of Somerset said, 'There is another book, for making of priests. What say you to that?' Whereupon the bishop pulling it out of his bosom said . . . it touched the honour and dignity of the king's person and succession, who, by this order, should never after be anointed, having no Samuel left to execute it; 'and it is a terrible saying, Cessabit unctio vestra; and the Book of Common Prayer admitteth unctio with baptism, which the priest, not anointed, cannot minister?'

"Whereunto was no reply made, but it was said that the bishop should find other faults than that in it. As for that, the bishop said there was matter like all other points of other laws, which either must be kept or observed, or the punishment appointed to be suffered for breach of them: after which sort the said bishop desired he might be admitted to live without any other speciality in his person, but to be taken as another bishop of the realm."

This presumably means that, like Heath, Gardiner was prepared to undertake *not to disobey* the Ordinal, i.e., not to use the Pontifical, but it hardly justifies the conclusion that *he himself would use it*. Nor does it follow that because the *only* fault specified by Gardiner was the omission of the unction, that he had no other fault to find with the Ordinal. In any case Gardiner's statement makes it quite clear that he regarded both the forms for the

priesthood and the episcopate as equally invalid, and that in consequence there would be no Samuel to anoint a future king. It only remains to add that Gardiner was deprived of his see, and kept in prison for the rest of the reign.

3. As for foreign Catholic knowledge of the Ordinal, the only evidence in existence is in the report sent to Venice by Barbaro, in May, 1551, in which he says that:

"In 1549-50 by royal authority another book was published and confirmed in Parliament containing the form of conferring holy orders, nor do they differ from those of the Roman Catholic religion save that in England they take an oath to renounce the doctrine and authority of the Pope."¹

Presumably this Ambassador means that the *ranks* of bishop, priest, and deacon are retained, and in that sense "they do not differ from those of the Roman Catholic religion." He can hardly have meant that the *rite* for conferring them did not differ—or if he did, we can only say that his judgment was sadly at fault. It would be *one* thing to maintain that the grave differences were not of theological import, it would be *another* to maintain that there were *no differences at all*!

4. We must now ask *how many persons were ordained* according to this Edwardine Ordinal. For our information on this subject we are indebted entirely to the painstaking researches of Dr. Walter Frere, sometime Bishop of Truro, who published the results of his enquiries in 1896 in his work entitled *The Marian Reaction*. He there tells us that, there were *five bishops* consecrated with the Ordinal of 1550, and *one* with the Second Ordinal of 1552, all consecrated by Cranmer, and this is duly stated in Cranmer's Register.² But the information is not so satisfactory concerning the ordination of *priests and deacons*. Apparently the diocesan registers were not very well kept in those days, and indeed many registers are no longer extant. In *twelve* dioceses there are no ordinations recorded at all.³ In some cases we know there were ordinations, although the records are not to be found.⁴

Even so,

"there are various circumstances which go to prove that the loss has not been so great as at first one might be tempted to conjecture. . . . Before the introduction of the English Ordinal, the number of ordinations and candidates had been reduced enormously;

¹ *Venetian State Papers*, V., 347-53.
• See Frere, *op. cit.*, p. 91.

* Frere, *op. cit.*, p. 90.
• *Ibid.*, p. 98.

in some places this was largely due to disapproval of the new ways. Both at Chester and at Durham the ordinations came to a dead stop in 1547, and were not resumed till the Marian regime. . . . At Durham the bishop would probably abstain from ordaining from want of sympathy with the new developments/ and it may be fairly surmised that in other cases where we have no such obvious data, the same cause was operative.”²

“This conclusion is reinforced by the large number of candidates ordained under letters dimissory.”³

“All this leads clearly to one conclusion, viz., that in the middle of the sixteenth century, ordination went on only at a few centres. . . .”⁴

Analysing the available evidence, Bishop Frere states that “the Edwardine Ordinal was in use in at least six dioceses : London, Exeter, Oxford, York, Norwich, Lincoln.”* Registers are extant in the case of four of these, and some indirect evidence in the case of the remaining two.

An examination of these registers, etc., leads Frere to state that:

“Putting all these together, we arrive at a list of six bishops and no other clergy, who are the only ones that so far can be discovered from the Registers to have received Orders under the English Ordinal. Most of them (seventy-one) seem to have been admitted deacons only, but thirty-two proceeded to the priesthood. There are also six names of men ordained to the priesthood of whose diaconate nothing is known.”⁶

We thus have 6 bishops, 38 priests, and 71 deacons ordained according to the new rite, and most of them by the First Ordinal. It must be obvious that the number of priests and deacons thus ordained was very small indeed, compared with the total number then in England (ten to twelve thousand). The position in the episcopate is more serious : six out of twenty-six sees were held by Edwardine bishops.

We shall see, in the next volume, that there is no single case in which Edwardine bishops were recognised as such when England was reconciled to Rome, and that of the lower clergy those who were accepted or reinstated were reordained, while the majority either fled the country, or remained in hiding. But there is no single case where it can be proved that the Edwardine orders of anybody, priest, bishop, or deacon, were accepted under the reign of Mary.⁷ On the contrary, there is abundant

1 We italicise this significant admission.

• Page 100.

• Page 103.

* *Op. cit.*, p. 99.

4 Page 101.

• *Op. dt.*, p. 105.

» We will deal in the next volume with the few cases in which Frere alleges that Anglican Orders were accepted by the Catholic authorities.

evidence that Edwardine Orders were from the first regarded as null and void.

5. In the meantime, it will be of interest to see *where* these Ordinations took place, and *which bishops* used the Ordinal.

The *majority* of the new clergy¹ were ordained by *Ridley*, who held 13 ordinations at London, one at Cambridge, and in addition seems to have officiated with Cranmer at an Ordination according to the new rite at St. Paul's, some time before Jan. 29th, 1550.² In addition, *Ridley* ordained a deacon at Cambridge. Also, there were two other ordinations at London* by *Coverdale* of Exeter and *Ferrar* *Qi* St. David's.³

Coverdale also held six ordinations at his own cathedral of Exeter, in the course of which he ordained nine deacons and five priests.

Also, at some date unknown, Bishop *Taylor* ordained one priest at Lincoln.

Ridley, Ferrar, Coverdale and Taylor were of course all stout Protestants.

6. But now we come to bishops of a somewhat different category.

First at *Oxford*. Here *Bishop King* ordained one person as a deacon on March 22nd, 1550, and raised him to the priesthood on April 6th, 1550. Presumably he used the Edwardine rite. Subsequent ordinations at Oxford were carried out by his Auxiliary Bishop, *Lewis Thomas* of Shrewsbury, who, in four ordinations, ordained nine deacons and three priests.

Next, we have ordinations at *York*. These were all carried out by *Bishop Purglove*, of Hull, who in seven ordinations ordained ten deacons and two priests.

Finally, there was one deacon ordained at *Norwich*.

Now these cases must be carefully considered, for it is urged that here we have instances of the use of the new Ordinal by bishops of undoubted Catholic sympathies, and hence the Ordinal was obviously capable of a Catholic interpretation, and must have been regarded by them as valid.

¹ Ridley ordained 71 deacons out of the 103, and 26 out of the 38 priests ordained according to the new Ordinal.

² This Ordination is obviously the one mentioned by Strype as having taken place in 1549 at St. Paul's (Jan. 29th, 1550, would be Jan. 29th, 1549, Old Style) and concerning which he writes: "The old Popish order . . . was yet in force, but this ordination was celebrated after that order which was soon established." (Cf. p. 452.) Frere for some unknown reason describes this as "a Canterbury ordination" (*Marian Reaction*, p. 218). See above, p. 453.

* Coverdale ordained one deacon, and Ferrar one deacon and one priest.

First, then, we have the Oxford ordinations, carried out by *Bishop King* and his suffragan. King himself ordained one man as a deacon and priest, and *it is most significant that the very same person was reordained as deacon and priest by King's own auxiliary three years later, according to the Catholic rite!* (See Vol. II.)

And of those ordained according to the Edwardine rite by *Bishop Thomas*, numbering eleven persons in all, we have evidence that *no less than four of them were reordained under Mary*, and we know that three others fled abroad, and that one resigned his living under Mary. And of the four reordained, *some at least were reordained by the very same bishop who had given them Edwardine orders a few years previously.* This makes it perfectly clear what Bishops King and Thomas later thought of the Edwardine orders they had conferred!

Next we come to the *Tork* ordinations. They were, as we have said, all carried out by *Bishop Pursglove*, of Hull. This individual does not seem to have been very strong in his convictions. He was a Prior, who surrendered his monastery to Henry VIII, and was by him made an Auxiliary Bishop to York. He seems to have acquiesced in all the changes in Edward's reign, but not to have married. He must have made his peace with Rome under Mary, as he continued to act as Auxiliary to Heath when the latter was made Archbishop of York. *He must accordingly have been held to have consented to the reordinations which took place in Mary's reign.* (It is known that *three out of the twelve persons ordained at Tork by Pursglove were reordained under Mary.*) Pursglove refused the Oath of Supremacy in Elizabeth's reign, and was deprived of his benefices. On the other hand, he opened two Grammar Schools, and placed them under the visitorship of the Anglican Archbishop of York, which the writer in the *Dictionary of National Biography* interprets as showing that he finally acquiesced in the Elizabethan Religious Settlement. If that were so, he was a somewhat inconstant person. But in any case, as we have said, *he must be presumed to have acquiesced in Mary's reign in the reordination of those he ordained under Edward*, and hence his opinion of the Anglican Ordinal could not have been a very high one, at any rate at that time.¹

¹ The argument in the text supposes that Pursglove was really sincere in his recantation and reconciliation under Mary, for otherwise, of course, the contention that he was Catholic in his opinions collapses, and his use of the Edwardine Ordinal has no weight at all. But in point of fact it is by no means certain that Pursglove's sympathies were really on the Catholic side. The Rev. J. R. Lunn, in two letters written to the *Church Times* (July 28th and August 4th, 1882) pointed out that Pursglove was chosen by Cranmer at a time when the Archbishop wanted to manifest

We are left with the ordination of one deacon, which took place at *Norwich* on November 21st, 1550. There are no ordination registers at *Norwich*, and so it is impossible to say whether this ordination was carried out by *Thirlby himself*, ^{q1} by *Salisbury*, who was Dean of *Norwich* and Suffragan Bishop of *Thetford*. It is not at all impossible that the ordination was carried out by *Salisbury*. He married, and was deprived under *Mary*, but came to the fore again under *Elizabeth*. His sympathies thus must have been with the *Protestant* cause.¹ The alternative possibility is that the ordination was carried out by *Thirlby himself*, and in any case, on the principle "qui facit per aliud facit per se," he must be held responsible for the ordination, even if carried out by his suffragan. It still remains true that the man was ordained at *Norwich only to the diaconate*, and that when six months later he was to be raised to the priesthood, *Thirlby* gave him dimissorial letters, and he was ordained by *Ridley* in *London*. It would seem as though *Thirlby* was prepared to recognise the *Edwardine* rite for deacons, which after all did name the office in the "form,"² but was not prepared to recognise the rite for the priesthood. In any case, as we shall see, *it was Thirlby whose embassy to Rome in the reign of Mary resulted in the definitive condemnation of Anglican Orders by the Holy See.* (See

In addition to the above cases, it is urged that in *one episcopal consecration out of the six*, an *Anglo-Catholic* bishop acted

his zeal on the Reforming side. And *Mr. Lunn* continues: "I cannot form a self-consistent account of him without assuming that he was a fairly pronounced Reformer, but a moderate one." He also points out that the epitaph on his tomb is of a marked Protestant character. This might indicate that he was really a Protestant at heart, and only conformed under *Mary* in order to retain his position. In any case³ seems safe to say that big religions opinions are doubtful. To all this we may add that, as *Bayne* shows in his *Anglo-Roman Relations*, *Pursglove* advised Catholics to conform to the *Elizabethan Church*, and indeed, an *Oscott* manuscript says that "Mr. *Pursley* ... in the beginning of the late schisme was exceedinge farre out of the right way" and could never be reclaimed perfectly untill his death, in soe much that ordinarily he was accompted amongst catholykes of all sortes noe better than a schismatyke, and rather thought to be a scandalous newter to the destruction of many simple soules, which by his schismatical actions were seduced and kepte in schisme then to give any good example of Christian dutye at all, much more tymorous to incurre the danger of temporall lawes, than forward to doe his dutye to God." (p. 289). If that was how Catholics in 1588 regarded *Bishop Pursglove*, not much importance attaches to his use of the *Edwardine Ordinal* in 1550-1555!

¹ *John Salisbury* was known as a "Gospeller" in the reign of *Henry VIII*, and was imprisoned for a year by *Wolsey* on account of his heretical opinions. Under *Elizabeth* he was temporarily suspended from his Deanery at *Norwich* "for seeming to prefer the popish to the reformed religion," but he soon afterwards made a satisfactory explanation of this. See article in *the Dictionary of National Biography*.

² So that some sort of a case might be made out for its validity, in the absence of any authoritative decision to the contrary.

as assistant bishop, namely, Aldrich of Carlisle, who assisted at the consecration of Harley to Hereford, by Archbishop Cranmer, according to the Second Ordinal, in May, 1553.¹

Aldrich was not one of the strongest bishops on the Catholic side, and the fact that he retained his see throughout Edward's reign is conclusive proof that he did not oppose the changes too violently. He must indeed have acquiesced in them to some extent, and the part he played in this episcopal consecration, though a minor part, must be borne in mind. Even so, he may have done so unwillingly, in obedience to royal orders, to retain his see, and his real sentiments would seem to be revealed by the fact that *he made his peace with the Church under Mary, and was re-instated as Bishop of Carlisle. And as a Catholic bishop under Mary he must have acquiesced in the condemnation of Anglican orders, and the reordinations which took place then.*²

This temporary acquiescence in, and use of the new Ordinal by Pursglove, King, Thomas, Thirlby, and Aldrich, in isolated cases, is very different to its wholehearted acceptance by the Protestant party. And in view of the later attitude of these Anglo-Catholic bishops, their weakness on this occasion does not destroy the force of the opposition displayed by Heath, Gardiner, and others.³ At the most it manifests a temporary division of opinion among the Anglo-Catholic bishops, and we should want to know *why the Anglicans of to-day consider that those Anglo-Catholics of Edward's time who sided with the Protestants in this matter were in the right, while those who opposed them were wrong.*

¹ Lacey, *Interpretation of the Ordinal*, p. 18, referring to Stubbs, *Reg. Sac. Angl.* p. 81.

² At the first episcopal consecration according to the 1550 Ordinal, Cranmer was assisted by Bulkeley, of Bangor. But he was of such doubtful theological views that we have classed him as an Opportunist, and no one has suggested that he was definitely Catholic in his sympathies.

³ Though Bishop Bonner was not apparently asked for his opinion about the Ordinal, he made it quite clear by beginning reordinations immediately after the commencement of Mary's reign, without waiting even for any royal injunctions on the subject. (See Vol. II.) Bonner was of course in prison for most of Edward's reign.

CHAPTER XVIII

THE DESTRUCTION OF ALTARS, AND THE PREPARATIONS for the revision of THE PRAYER BOOK

A THE DESTRUCTION OF ALTARS.

1. The Introduction of the First Prayer Book and the New Ordinal was accompanied by another significant "reform," the wholesale destruction of the altars hitherto used in the Churches for the offering of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, and substitution of wooden tables placed in the chancel.

This destruction of altars began quite early, for on November 27th, 1548, John ab Ulmis wrote to Bullinger as follows :

"At this time, those privileged altars are entirely overthrown in a great part of England, and by the common consent of the higher classes altogether abolished. Why should I say more? Those idolatrous altars are now become hogsties, that is the habitation of swine and beasts."¹

Again, during the vacancy in the See of Norwich which preceded Thirlby's translation there (i.e., from Feb. 21st, 1549, until April, 1550), Cranmer instituted a visitation of the diocese, and Thirlby tells us that "the most part of all altars within this my diocese be already taken down, by commandment of my lord of Canterbury's grace's visitors in his late visitation."²

A similar destruction of altars had taken place in London itself, for Hooper wrote to Bullinger under date March 27th, 1550:

"Many altars have been destroyed in this city (London) since I arrived here."³

Hooper at this time was preaching the Lenten sermons before the King and Council, and he took the opportunity to urge the complete abolition of altars, and substitution of tables, in a passage which is most significant, because it explains exactly what kind of "sacrifice" remained in the Christian Church :

^x *Ara facta stmt hara. Original Letters, p. 384.*

^{*} Gasquet and Bishop, *op. cit.*, p. 256.

Original Letters, p. 79.

“Is there then no sacrifices now left to be done of Christian people? Yes, truly, but none other than such as ought to be done without altars. And they be of three sorts. The first is the sacrifices of thanksgiving. . . . The second is benevolence and liberality to the poor. . . . The third kind of sacrifice is the mortifying of our own bodies, and to die from sin. --- If we study not daily to offer these sacrifices to God, we be no Christian men. Seeing Christian men have none other sacrifices than these, which may and ought to be done without altars, there should among Christians be no altars. . . . It were well then that it might please the magistrates to turn the altars into tables, according to the first institution of Christ, to take away the false persuasion of the people they have of sacrifices to be done upon the altars, for as long as the altars remain, both the ignorant people, and the ignorant and evil-persuaded priest, will dream always of sacrifice.”¹

Meantime, the work of destruction went on, and in June, 1550, Wriothesley writes :

“All the altars in every parish church throughout London were taken away, and a table made in the choir for the reception of the Communion.

“On the night of St. Barnabas’ day was the altar in Paul’s pulled down . . . and the table set up beneath the steps.”²

In November or December, 1550, Bucer wrote to a certain friend (possibly Dr. Matthew Parker), giving reasons why altars should be suppressed, and tables substituted.³

On December 7th, 1550, the removal of all stone and other altars was ordered throughout the diocese of Ely, their place to be taken by a “table or board.”⁴

2. But even so, the work of destruction was not sufficiently thorough, and on November 24th, 1551, “to avoid all matters of further contention and strife,” the Council sent directions to the Bishops that *every altar should at once be taken away from all churches everywhere!* This letter was signed by Cranmer, and Goodrich, Bishop of Ely, then Lord Chancellor. It was accompanied by a set of reasons “why the Lord’s board should be rather after the form of a table than of an altar.”

The first reason is :

“The form of a table shall more move the simple from the superstitious opinions of the Popish Mass unto the right use of the Lord’s supper. For the use of an altar is to make sacrifice upon it : the use of a table is to serve for men to eat upon. Now when we come unto the Lord’s board, what do we come for? To sacrifice Christ again, and to crucify Him again, or to feed upon Him that was once only crucified

^{*} *Early Writings*, p. 488.

[†] Gasquet and Bishop, *op. cit.*, p. 264.

[»] Gorham, *Gleanings of the Reformation*, p. 209.

⁴ Ely Episcopal Registers, *apud* Gorham, *Gleanings of the Reformation*, p. 213.

and offered up for us? If we come to feed upon Him, spiritually to eat His body, and spiritually to drink His blood, which is the true use of the Lord's supper, then no man can deny but *the form of a table is more meet for the Lord's board than the form of an altar?*'

The second reason is as follows :

"Whereas the *Book of Common Prayer* maketh mention of an altar, wherefore it is not lawful to abolish that which that book alloweth ; to this it is thus answered : the *Book of Common Prayer* calleth the thing whereupon the Lord's Supper is ministered *indifferently* a *table*, an *altar*, or the *Lord's board*, without prescription of any form thereof, either of a table or of an altar : so that whether the Lord's board have the form of an altar, or of a table, the book of Common Prayer calleth it both an altar and a table. For, as it calleth it an altar, whereupon the Lord's supper is ministered, a table, and the Lord's board ; so it calleth the table where the Holy Communion is distributed, with lauds and thanksgiving unto the Lord, an altar ; *for that there is offered the same sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.*"*

All this is significant enough, and we have here an official "explanation" of the use of the word "altar" in the First Prayer Book.

This Order of the Council for the destruction of all altars led to the imprisonment and deprivation of yet another Bishop, Day, of Chichester, for he said he "could not conform his conscience to do what he was by the said letters commanded."² Bishop Day thus joined Gardiner, Heath, and Bonner in prison, and in this way the number of Anglo-Catholic bishops able to oppose the innovations was effectively reduced.

B. PREPARATIONS FOR THE REVISION OF THE PRAYER BOOK.

1. From what we have said, it is clear that the First Prayer Book had not been quite satisfactory. On the one hand^a Bishop Gardiner had been able to appeal to it as insinuating the Catholic doctrine it was intended to reject, and as we have seen, many "Popish priests" up and down the country were celebrating the Communion service as though it were the Mass. We have also seen that some of its features were distasteful to some of the more extreme Protestants. Probably it had never been intended to be more than a temporary measure (see Bucer's letter quoted on p. 416)[»] and accordingly, preparations were made for its revision. These are mentioned in a letter written by James Haddon to Bullinger in August, 1552 :

t Cf Ridley's *Works*, P.S., p. 322.

"It is reported that the Book --- in which is contained and explained the manner of divine worship and the mode of prayer to God, commonly set forth among us (and to be used of all persons in public) is about to be amended in certain places; in what, however, and in how many doth not yet appear. There were certain prayers for the dead, which did not seem very suitable. Moreover, in the celebration of the Lord's Supper there is something either to be altered or entirely expunged."¹

2. In preparation for this revision, detailed criticisms of the First Prayer Book had been sought, both from Peter Martyr at Oxford and Bucer at Cambridge. The former is not extant, although we know something of its nature. The latter, however, is in existence. It is Bucer's famous *Centura*, sent in January, 1551 to Goodrich, Bishop of Ely, who was then Bucer's "Ordinary," but it was obviously intended ultimately for Cranmer, to whom it was clearly transmitted. It is a comprehensive criticism of the Prayer Book, in which all its parts are passed under review, and suggestions made for its revision. Bucer explains that there is not much fundamentally wrong:

"When I first came into this realm (in 1550), I inquired into its public doctrines and rites, to find out whether I could join my ministry thereto with full consent, and accordingly as far as I could I examined this book diligently, with the help of an interpreter. As a result, I gave thanks to God, who had granted you to reform these ceremonies to such a degree of purity, for neither did I discover anything in them which is not taken from the Word of God, or at any rate is not opposed to that Word so long as it be suitably interpreted. For there are a few small things which, if they be not honestly interpreted, might seem to be not sufficiently in harmony with the Word of God."²

And thus, to begin with, he suggests that the Mass vestments should be wholly forbidden, and no longer tolerated as optional:

"I wish these vestments to be taken away—not that I think there is anything wicked in them taken in themselves so that religious men may not use them religiously, but because I see that they encourage superstition too much in many people." Moreover, it is fitting "that we should show in every way that there is nothing common between us and them, and least of all with the Romish Antichrists."³

3. Next Bucer gives general praise to the Communion Office :

"Concerning this office, I give the utmost thanks to God who has given it to be drawn up so pure and so scrupulously faithful to the word of God, especially at the time at which this was done. For, excepting a very few words and signs, I perceive

nothing in it at all which cannot be drawn out of Holy Scripture, if only everything be worthily accepted and explained to Christian people.”

He then proceeds to explain what things he “could wish to be more fully explained, perfected, or corrected in this office:”

He deals first with the *four introductory rubrics*. The first three are all right. But the fourth, concerning *vestments*, meets with his criticism :

“These vestments I desire to be taken away, not that I think there is anything impious in them taken in themselves, so that pious men may not use them piously, but because I see that they are regarded by very many as superstitious, because they are a source of contention, and because we ought to aim at apostolic simplicity in all external things, and to testify in all possible ways that there is *nothing in common between us and the Roman antichristians*, out that we defend and follow Christian liberty.”

then passes to the *seven rubrics at the end of the service*, the first of these allows under certain circumstances the Communion office to be said up to the offertory. “This,” he says, is a counterfeit of the Lord’s Supper, borrowed from the perversity of the Roman Antichristians, and it is used to bolster up the *wicked trust of superstitious people in the Mass*. . . . There are *little sacrificers* who celebrant such ‘memorials’ on behalf of the more superstitious of the people.”¹

The second rubric, which allows a celebration of the communion in side chapels or in private houses is also, according to Bucer, open to grave abuse.

The third rubric, concerning the quality, etc., of the bread to be used, is all right, save for the final sentence, which says, in connection with the breaking of the host, that “men must not think less to be received in part than in the whole, but in each of them the whole body of Jesus Christ.” These words, Bucer says, may to simple folk become an occasion of contention, as to whether they affirm that the body of Christ which is offered as it were locally enclosed in the particle of bread. And therefore in place of these words might be substituted something like this :

c C The leaking of the bread and the distribution of the portions
01 the bread is ordered only for the fuller representation of what the
Lord did in His last supper and that He wishes to give to each and
all communicating at His table, the food of eternal life.”

Or else, adds Bucer, the words might be omitted altogether.⁸

The fourth rubric is all right.

The fifth, which allows some who are to communicate to nominate others, may lead to abuse.

The sixth, which specifies communion once a year, is shocking. Christians ought to communicate every Sunday.

The seventh rubric says the

“ Sacrament of Christ’s body [Bucer calls it * the Lord’s bread *] is to be put, not in the hands of the communicant, but in his mouth, lest they should convey the sacrament away secretly and use it superstitiously, is unsatisfactory, and the reason given is not conclusive. For the minister can easily see what the communicant does and whether he eats it or not, although it be placed in his hand. And indeed, the custom of putting the sacrament in the mouth arose out of a twofold superstition, one being false honour which the Papists wished to be given to the Sacrament, and the other being the wicked arrogance by which the priests claimed a greater sanctity than that possessed by the people, in virtue of the oil of their consecration. . . . And since all this superstition of the Roman Antichrist is to be detested, I would desire --- the priest to teach the faithful that it is superstitious and wicked to think the hands of the priest more holy than those of the laity.”

Next, Bucer deals with the *four rubrics which follow the Offertory sentences*. The first and second pass without comment. As to the third, Bucer does not think it desirable that the sexes should be separated. Then we come to the fourth, which says that the minister is to prepare just as much bread and wine as is required for the communicants. On this Bucer comments as follows :

“ Some make this a cause of superstition, and think that it is wrong to allow any bread and wine that remains, to come into ordinary use, as *if there were in this bread and wine some sanctity per se even outside the use of communion*, Accordingly, they think that no matter how much bread and wine remains over from the communicants, they must consume it all. And so men are to be taught that Christ the Lord is offered to pious minds through the word of God and these symbols, and *not by or in the bread and the wine*, And therefore, *outside the use of the communion which the Lord instituted, the bread and wine, although they may have been put on the Lord’s table, have no holiness in themselves, more than that of other bread and wine*, . . . And since we see how Satan, through his Roman Antichrists endeavours by such powerful and pestiferous tricks to take from us all our service and adoration of Christ, and has for so many centuries offered us bread to be adored in place of Christ, we must cast away as far as possible from our Churches anything whatsoever which may seem to favour this bread-worship.

“ Christ the Lord does indeed give Himself to His faithful people . . . and so they truly receive Him by the apprehension of their faith and spirit, whosoever with true faith in Christ communicate in these mysteries as He instituted them. And so *in this use*

. . . the bread and wine are *symbols* of the body and blood of Christ, by which He offers Himself to us. But *outside this use, they are what other bread and wine are. Yet nothing of their nature is changed, and Christ the Lord is not present in them, but in the minds of the faithful.*"

Next, Bucer deals with the *rubrics at the end of the Prayer Book*. The first and second concern vestments, and have already been dealt with. The third says that "touching, kneeling, crossing, holding up of hands, knocking upon the breast, and other gestures may be used or left as every man's devotion serveth without blame."

This rubric, Bucer says,

"has been twisted by very many to most grave injuries to Chnst, namely, those who by their genuflections, signs of the cross in the air, lifting up of hands, striking their breasts, and other gestures of the never-sufficiently-to-be-execrated Mass, which they use in the administration of the Holy Supper, endeavour to retain the thrice impious and wicked trust of the simpler and more superstitious folk in the Mass. . . . This liberty to use popish gestures, which seems to be allowed by this rubric, must be altogether taken away."¹

4. Coming now to the service itself, he recommends that the *Sanctus* and *Agnus Dei* should not be sung until the minister has finished the preceding prayers, for this is an abuse frequently committed.

He next comments on the Prayer for the Church, at the beginning of the Canon. This contains a prayer for the souls of the departed, which is superstitious, and should be struck out.²

Next, Bucer deals with the Prayer of Consecration, and first with the words "bless and sanctify these gifts that they may be unto us the body and blood." He says :

"This prayer for such a blessing on the bread and wine on the Lord's table that they may be to us the body and blood of the Lord, is not commanded by the Lord, and is twisted by the Antichrists to confirming and retaining horrible impieties. I know indeed that the Lord will bless all things for our use. . . . And I know that among the Greeks, or rather the more recent ones, the deacon is accustomed, when offering the bread, to say to the priest, 'bless this bread,' and that then the priest prays 'make this bread the precious body of Thy Son,' and that the same is done with the chalice, and that the priest then adds, 'Changing it by Thy Holy

¹ Page 465.

² Here are Bucer's words : "In hac precatone commendantur defuncti Deo. . . . Scio esse pervetustam hanc precandi pro pie defunctis consuetudinem. . . . Attamen nostrum est tanto anteferre omni humane autoritati divinam. . . . Jam orare pro defunctis nullae docent Scripturæ, sive verbo sive exemplo. . . . His itaque de causis optarim commendationem defunctorum, et precem pro æterna eorum pace, pratermitti." (*Scripta Anglicana*, pp. 467-8.)

Spirit? However, we also know that by no commandment of Christ, and no word or example of the Apostles are we taught to ask from God such a blessing upon the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper that they may be to us the body and blood of the Lord. And we know that this prayer is at present still twisted by the Antichrists to retain and confirm that doctrine of infinite impiety and contumely towards God, the transubstantiation of the bread and the wine into the body and blood of Christ. For the bread worship stands mainly in this, that the bread is adored in the place of Christ. Who does not know how we must strain every nerve that we admit nothing whatsoever which is not commanded by the Lord and from which we see some commendation of impiety to be sought? "x

Next he deals with the two signs of the cross, which at this point the Prayer Book allows to be made over the bread and the wine :

"The same applies to those signs of the cross . . . and to the direction that the minister shall take the bread and wine into his hands when he recites the words of the Lord. . . . Some do this, inclining themselves to the bread and the wine, and breathing on them, as though the words ought to be said to the bread and wine *and not to the people present*, or as though by the pronouncing of these words something should be changed in these elements. . . . The same is shown by the fact that several who, forced by the King's law, now recite those words louder, so that they may be heard by the people, nevertheless they recite the words with that action over the bread and wine so that *they seem to wish to change the bread and wine by these words into the body and blood of the Lord rather than to arouse those present so that . . . denying their own flesh and blood, they may more fully receive the flesh and blood of Christ.* And therefore I would desire those black crosses, and that rubric * taking the bread and wine into his hands? to be removed, together with that little prayer for the blessing of the bread and wine, and their hallowing, by which they may be to us the body and blood of Christ."²

Bucer also criticises the passage in the prayer after the recital of the words of institution, in which the minister asks God to "command these our prayers and supplications, by the ministry of Thy holy angels, to be brought up into Thy holy Tabernacle." He says that Christ, and not an angel, is our mediator, and suggests that the passage should read, "graciously receive these our prayers and supplications."

Bucer has no criticism whatever to make of the phraseology concerning the one sacrifice of the Cross, and the "memorial" made in the Supper, with the "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving" and "offering of our-

selves." Evidently in this respect the Communion Service could not, in his view, be improved.

Bucer has nothing but praise for the "Prayer of Humble Access," to which Gardiner had appealed.

« Do not let us avoid the words of presence of the Lord, in which He testifies that He is, remains, and dwells amongst and with and in us, simply because there are some who imagine this presence to be a local one.»¹

5. At the end of his *Censura* on the Prayer Book, Bucer remarks that even if the book is thus purged from its imperfections, it can be of little use to the Church unless steps are taken to provide fit and faithful ministers. He also says that

"it will be necessary to set forth a brief and clear Confession or Creed of all the doctrines of the Christian religion, and especially of those which are controverted at this time. And to this creed should be added a fuller and more explicit Catechism."²

This was written by Bucer in January, 1551, and it is interesting to note that the Anglican Articles and Catechism were published in May, 1553.

Bucer continues :

"A canonical examination of all those who are to be admitted to the ministry of the Church should be restored with the greatest care, no matter how the candidates may seem to excel in knowledge and godly conversation, and in this examination the whole rule of the Holy Ghost laid down through the Apostle Paul in his epistles to Timothy and Titus . . . should be applied with singular severity. There is indeed the recently published formula of Ordination in which there is something prescribed about this examination, but the Holy Ghost requires a much more exact investigation about them. . . ."³

And after much more on this subject, Bucer concludes :

"Hence Your Lordship may know why I have added this appendix concerning the search for, formation, and examination of ministers of the Churches --- to the discussion of the Prayer Book, which alone Your Lordship asked from me."

Evidently Bucer found nothing special to complain of in the *First Ordinal* of 1550, for he would presumably have taken the opportunity of mentioning it here. We have already shown that the main part of the *Ordinal* is copied from his own Ordination rite, and so he would of course not object to that. And the implication is that he did not object to the adaptations and changes by which his own single rite was expanded into three separate rites, for the three orders of the Church.

6. A copy of this *Censura* of Bucer on the Prayer Book was sent to his fellow reformer, Peter Martyr. The latter said he agreed with Bucer on every point save one : he did not approve of the rubric allowing the sacrament to be taken from the Church to a sick person. The bread and wine should always be consecrated in the sick chamber.

In this connection, Peter Martyr asks what objection there can be to reciting the words of institution in the sick chamber, seeing that, quite unnecessarily, it is the custom to recite the words over more wine, if there be not enough for the communicants—although the latter have heard the words already :

“ Mirandum est, quomodo ea, conspectu aegroti, verba dicere graventur, cui maxime utilia sunt, cum inutiliter eadem repetere velint, quando inter communicandum in templo vinum in poculo deficere contigerit, cum homines qui adsunt, et sacramenta sumunt, ilia jam audiverint.”¹

This makes it clear that in Peter Martyr's mind at any rate, *the words of Institution are recited simply for the edification of the hearers.*

¹ Strype, *Cranmer*, App. Ixi.

CHAPTER XIX

THE SECOND PRAYER BOOK

- A. ITS COMPILERS.
- B. THE VOTING IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS.
- C. ANALYSIS OF THE NEW BOOK.
- D. THE CHANGES IN THE ORDINAL.
- E. THE "BLACK RUBRIC."
- F. THE RECEPTION OF THE NEW BOOK.

A. ITS COMPILERS.

1. The first steps in the Revision of the Prayer Book were, as we have seen, the requests to Bucer and Peter Martyr to draw up their own proposals for revision. Their suggestions were favourably received, as we gather from a letter from Peter Martyr to Bucer, written from Lambeth on January 10th, 1551 :

"I thank God who has afforded us an opportunity of admonishing the Bishops. --- It has now been determined in this conference of theirs, as the Most Reverend has reported to me, that many things will be changed."¹

2. The next thing we hear is that, on October 6th, 1551, a Commission of Thirty-two persons was nominated for the revision of the ecclesiastical laws. It consisted of bishops, clergy, and lawyers, all belonging to the Protestant party. On January 10th, 1552, John ab Ulmis wrote to Bullinger from Oxford :

"Most excellent and learned men are to deliberate and consult about a proper moral discipline, and the purity of doctrine. The Archbishop of Canterbury and Peter Martyr, the Archbishop of York and the Bishop of London, together with the Bishop of Ely, and Skinner, are to form a Select Committee on these points. The affairs will then be submitted to the approbation of every member of Parliament."²

This shows that one and the same commission was to concern itself with the "purity of doctrine" as well as "moral discipline."

3. Convocation met on December 12th, 1551, and Skinner wrote to Bullinger from Oxford on January 5th, 1552 :

* Strype, *Cranmer*, App. bd.

Original Letters, p. 443.

“They have lately assembled a Convocation, and appointed certain persons to purify our Church from the filth of Antichrist, and to abolish those impious laws of the Roman Pontiff by which the spouse of Christ has for so long a time been so wretchedly and shamefully defiled.”¹

This confirms the impression that one commission was entrusted with both tasks.

There was evidently some discussion of points connected with the Prayer Book in the Convocation itself, for Heylin says :

“The first debate among the prelates was of some doubts as had arisen about some things contained in the Common Prayer Book, and more particularly, touching such feasts as were retained, and such as had been abrogated by the rules thereof, the form of words used at the giving of the bread, and the different manner of administering the Holy Sacrament. Which being signified unto the Prolocutor and the rest of the clergy, who had received somewhat in charge about it the day before, answer was made that they had not yet sufficiently considered of the points proposed, but that they would give their lordships some account thereof in the following session.”²

4. On March 9th, 1552, Micronius wrote to Bullinger saying :

“We have great hopes of a reformation both in church and state during this Parliament. For there are appointed to the reformation of the church eight godly bishops, among whom is Hooper, eight doctors in divinity, among whom is master John à Lasco . . . and master Peter Martyr.”³

5. On the basis of this information, there can be little doubt that the members of the Commission for the Revision of the Prayer Book were also entrusted with the Revision of Ecclesiastical Laws, or at any rate that *Cranmer, Martyr, Holgate, Ridley, Goodrich, and Skinner* were on the Prayer Book Commission. And as *Dr. Cox* wrote to Bullinger on October 5th, 1552, to say that “they had already altered the rites of the public prayers and sacraments, and framed them according to the rules of God’s word,”⁴ we may infer that he was also one of the number, especially as he had acted on the Commissions for the First Prayer Book and the Ordinal. As Smyth says :

“It may easily be established that all Edward’s commissions were composed of much the same people, apart from the steady weeding out of Papists. --- It is more than probable that the

¹ *Original Letters*, p. 314.

² *Ecclesia Restaurata*, I, 227-8. Heylin supposes this to have taken place at the Convocation of 1550-1, but Gasquet and Bishop give good reasons for supposing that it really refers to that of 1552. (*Op. cit.*, p. 286 note.)

³ *Original Letters*, p. 580.

⁴ *Original Letters*, p. 123.

majority at least of the 32 had a hand in the Revision of the Prayer Book.»¹

Cranmer had thus surrounded himself with some trusted Protestant advisers.² For there can be little doubt that they were still only *advisers*, and that *Cranmer was really responsible for the result*. As Strype says, *à propos* of this Second Prayer Book :

“Cranmer’s authority was now very great, so there was undoubtedly a great deference paid to it, as also to his wisdom and learning by the rest of the divines appointed to that work, so that, as nothing was by them inserted into the Liturgy but by his good allowance and approbation, so neither would they reject or oppose what he thought fit should be put in or altered.”³

6. The work was carried through rapidly, for the Second Act of Uniformity, authorising the new Prayer Book, was introduced into the House of Lords on March 9th, and passed in April. The Act refers to the First Prayer Book as “a very godly order, agreeable to the Word of God and the Primitive Church, very comfortable to all good people . . . and most profitable to the estate of the realm.” Notwithstanding this fact, “a great number of people in divers parts of the realm do wilfully and damnably refuse to come to their parish churches,” and doubts had arisen “in the use and exercise of the aforesaid Common Service in the Church over the fashion and manner of the ministration of the same, rather by the curiosity of the minister and mistakers than of any worthy cause.”

Accordingly, the object of the new Book was the “explaining, perfecting, and making the same prayer and service more earnest and fitting to stir Christian people to the honouring of Almighty God.”⁴

B. THE VOTING IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

The Second Prayer Book does not seem to have been submitted to Convocation. Cardwell says :

“Convocation was not permitted to pass its judgment on the Second Service Book.»⁶

^x Cranmer, p. 250.

^{*} Dr. Gee (*Elizabethan Prayer Book*, p. 225) has suggested that Guest was also a member of the Commission, and had a large part in the composition of this Second Prayer Book. He does this on the supposition that an undated letter of Guest’s, generally referred to the first years of Elizabeth, really has to do with the Book of 1552. But I prefer the usual view. If Guest had such a prominent part in the composition of the Second Prayer Book, it is strange that no one should have mentioned his name in connection with it.

^{*} Cranmer, I, p. 385, 1853 edn. Italics ours.

⁴ Statute 5 and 6 Edw. VI, c. 1, 1552.

• Cardwell-, *Synodalia*, I, pref. x.

520 THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

But it was duly approved by both Houses of Parliament. The Act was introduced first in March, 1552, and finally voted on April 6th. The voting in the House of Lords is interesting. The old Anglo-Catholic party among the Bishops was sadly depleted. Bonner had been deprived and sent to the Fleet prison, and his place taken by Ridley. Tunstall had been deprived of his see of Durham. Gardiner had been deprived of Winchester, and his see given to Poynt. Heath had been deprived of Worcester, Hooper had succeeded Wakeman in Gloucester, Voysey had been deprived of Exeter and his see given to Coverdale. Thus there were only four Anglo-Catholic bishops left: Thirlby of Norwich, Bush of Bristol, Aldrich of Carlisle, and King of Oxford. The Bishops present voted as follows :

For the new Prayer Book :

Cranmer, Protestant.
Holgate, Protestant.
Ridley, Protestant.
Poynt, Protestant.
Barlow, Protestant.
Ferrar, Protestant.
Hooper, Protestant.
Coverdale, Protestant.
Bird, Protestant.
Bush, Anglo-Catholic.

Against:

Thirlby, Anglo-Catholic.
Aldrich, Anglo-Catholic.

Thus the Book was carried by an overwhelming majority often bishops against two, but the majority was made up of nine Protestant bishops and one Anglo-Catholic, with two Anglo-Catholic bishops voting against. Bush's position was not an enviable one. He had, however, married, and doubtless thought it safer to vote with the majority, if he wished to retain his see.

In any case, the figures are so significant that they call for no comment. The Prayer Book was obviously a Protestant production, and accordingly met with the unanimous approval of the Protestant bishops.

C. ANALYSIS OF THE NEW BOOK.

The following changes were made¹ :

1. In *Baptism*, the exorcism, benediction of the water, chrism and unction are all abolished.

¹ Cf. *Liturgy and Worship*, pp. 177 *et seq.*

In *Confirmation*, the sign of the cross which in 1549 accompanied the imposition of hands, is omitted, and a prayer substituted for "I sign thee with the sign of the cross, and lay my hand upon thee," the prayer being the colourless "Defend, O Lord, this child with Thy heavenly grace, etc.," as in the present rite—a prayer which is surely quite inadequate as the "form" for confirmation.

All *prayers for the dead* disappear. The *Burial Office* is also radically changed.

The offices of *morning and evening prayer* are altered, and penitential prayers introduced, which "may have been suggested by a somewhat similar arrangement in Pullain's *Liturgia sacra* q1 Laski's *Forma et ratio*."

But these are all minor changes, compared with the changes in the Communion Service, and in the Ordinal, which this time was incorporated with the Prayer Book.

2. THE COMMUNION SERVICE.

(a) First, the *Title* is changed. The First Prayer Book spoke of "The Supper of the Lord and the Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass." The Second Book speaks of "The Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion." The word "Mass" disappears.

(£) Of the *four introductory rubrics*, Bucer had accepted the first three, but recommended the abolition of the vestments allowed in the fourth. The fourth rubric is accordingly changed, and merely says that the Communion-table, covered with a white linen cloth, shall stand in the body of the church, or in the chancel. And a rubric elsewhere forbids the minister at the time of communion to use alb, vestment, or cope: a bishop shall wear a rochet, and priests and deacons are to wear surplices only.

(c) As to the *seven rubrics at the end* of the First Book, the one allowing the Communion office to finish at the offertory is retained. The reference to side chapels in the second, to which Bucer had objected, disappears. The sentence at the end of the third rubric, which seemed to imply some kind of Presence, disappears. The fifth rubric, which Bucer said might lead to abuse, was omitted. The sixth, to which he objected, was modified, and the seventh omitted altogether, as Bucer suggested.

(d) As to the *four rubrics following the Offertory* sentences, the separation of the sexes, which Bucer deprecated, disappears, and the rubric concerning the quantity of bread and wine, which

Bucer said might promote superstition, and imply some kind of holiness in the bread and wine, disappears.

(*g*) As to the *Notes at the end of the Prayer Book*, the one permitting certain gestures, to which Bucer strongly objected, is omitted.

(*f*) As to the *Sanctus* and *Agnus Dei*, the new book omits the direction to sing the Sanctus, and the Agnus Dei is omitted altogether, thus getting over Bucer's difficulty.

3. We can now pass on to the *service itself*. Here the changes were very great indeed, and the new service lost any resemblance to the old Mass. The extent of the change may be seen from the following scheme. Here are the various parts of the service in the First Book :

- A. (Lord's Prayer) ; B. (Collect) ; C. (Kyrie) ;
- D. (Gloria) ; E. (Collect) ; F. (Epistle) ;
- G. (Gospel) ; H. (Creed) ; I. (Exhortation) ;
- J. (Offertory sentences) ; K. (Preface) ;
- L. (Prayer for whole state of Church) ;
- M. (Prayer, "O God our Heavenly Father") ;
- N. (Words of Institution) ;
- O. (Prayer, "Wherefore, O Lord") ;
- P. (Our Father) ;
- Q. (Peace of the Lord) ;
- R. (Christ our Pasch is offered) ;
- S. (Exhortation, "You that do truly repent") ;
- T. (General confession and absolution prayer) ;
- U. (Comfortable words) ;
- V. (Prayer of Humble Access) ;
- W. (Communion) ;
- X. (Mercy sentences) ;
- Y. (Post Communion) ;
- Z. (Blessing).

The revised rite runs as follows :

A, B, (C), E, F, G, H, J, L, I, T, U, K, V, M, N,
W, P, O, D, Z.

The more important changes are as follows :

(a) The *Kyrie* becomes a responsary submerged in the recital of the Ten Commandments,¹ which had been used in this way by Luther (whose form was translated into English by Coverdale), and also at Strassburg.

(b) The *Gloria* is transferred from the beginning to the end of the service.

(c) The prayer preceding the words of Institution in the

¹ *Liturgy and Worship* tries to suggest that this was a Catholic practice, because in connection with the sermon or prone in pre-Reformation times, the Ten Commandments were often expounded ! (Page 139.)

"Canon" of the First Book was cut into two, and between the parts were inserted the Exhortation, the General Confession and Absolution Prayer, the Comfortable Words, and the Preface.

(d) After the recital of the words of institution, the Communion follows immediately. After Communion comes the prayer corresponding to the post-Consecration part of the Canon in the first Book, and then the Gloria.

(e) The *Pater Noster* is removed from before and after the Communion.

4. Coming now to *details*, we notice that after the Offertory sentences and the collection, there comes the "Prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church," which formed part of the Canon in the First Book. But its title is changed: "Let us pray for the whole state of Christ's Church *militant here in earth*. And in order to suit its new place, after the collection, the passage in the First Book, "we beseech Thee most mercifully to receive these our *prayers*" is changed to "we beseech Thee most mercifully to *accept our alms*, and to *receive these prayers*. A petition is inserted for *all* Christian kings and princes, as well as for James the First. But the prayer ends with the mention of those in trouble, sorrow, need, sickness, or any other adversity, and the rest of the prayer in the First Book, including the special petition for this congregation assembled to celebrate the commemoration of the most glorious death of Thy Son," the thanksgiving for the "wonderful grace and virtue declared in all the saints, and the commemoration of the departed—is *wholly omitted*

After this Prayer, the Second Book inserts a new exhortation,¹ to be read "when the Curate shall see the people negligent to come to the Holy Communion."

It says that "we be come together at this time . . . to feed at the Lord's Supper" . . . and repeats that "it is duty to receive the Communion together in remembrance of His death. . . . It is said unto all: * Take ye and eat. Take and drink ye all of this : this do in remembrance of me . . . etc. The prayer does not specify what is received in Communion, and it seems to go out of its way to avoid quoting the words "This is my body," "This is the chalice of my blood."

After this new address, the Second Book gives a modified

¹ It is significant that this new Exhortation is from the pen of *St. Peter Martyr*, for it is printed in an enlarged form in his *Epistole Theologicæ* (1503 *et seq.*). The authorship was mentioned by Pocock (*Abolition of the Articles*, in Shipley, *Studies in Modern Problems*, I, p. 14), but is not usually adverted to by Anglican writers.

and rewritten version of an exhortation in the First Book. It begins :

“Dearly beloved, forasmuch as our duty is to render to Almighty God our heavenly Father most hearty thanks, for that He hath given His Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, not only to die for us, but also to be our spiritual food and sustenance, as it is declared unto us, as well by God’s word as by the holy Sacraments of His blessed body and blood. . . . My duty is to exhort you to consider *the dignity of the holy mystery*. . . .”

The First Book spoke instead of “*the greatness of the thing*.”

The First Book went on to say that :

“If there be any of you whose conscience is troubled and grieved in any thing, lacking comfort or counsel, let him come to me, or to some other discreet and learned *priest* . . . and confess and open his sin and grief secretly, that he may receive such ghostly counsel, advice and comfort that his conscience may be relieved, and that of us (as of the ministers of God and of the Church) he may receive comfort and absolution, to the satisfaction of his mind, and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness.”

The Second Book has a similar proviso, but it is made much more exceptional, and the nature of the absolution is made much less sacramental:

“If there be any of you which *by the means afore said cannot quiet his own conscience*, but requireth further comfort or counsel; then let him come to me, or some other discreet and learned *minister of God’s word*, and open his grief, that he may receive such ghostly counsel, advice, and comfort, as his conscience may be relieved ; and that *by the ministry of God’s word* he may receive comfort and the benefit of absolution, to the quieting of his conscience, etc.”

Then comes a third Exhortation, a slightly modified form of the First Exhortation in the First Book. But there is a striking change towards the end. The First Book had this expression:

“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.”

In the Second Book this is changed into the following :

“He hath instituted and ordained holy mysteries, as pledges of His love and continual remembrance of His death, to our great and endless comfort.”

Thus *Our Lord is no longer said to have left us His body and blood, even in “these mysteries.”*

After this, the Second Book has the General Confession, which in the First Book preceded the distribution of Communion.

But whereas the First Book invited the communicants to " make your humble confession to Almighty God *and to His holy Church* here gathered together in His name," the Second Book has : "make your humble confession to Almighty God *before* this congregation."

Then come the Comfortable Words, and the Preface, with the Sanctus.

Immediately after the Sanctus comes the " Prayer of Humble Access," " We do not presume to come to this Thy table," which the priest says kneeling. But as the bread and wine are not consecrated, the kneeling posture cannot be mistaken for any adoration of any real presence.

After the Prayer of Humble Access comes the vestige of the First Canon represented by the Prayer concerning the One and Sufficient Sacrifice of the Cross. But whereas the First Prayer Book spoke of the " command to *celebrate* a perpetual memory of that His precious death," the Second Book speaks of the ' command to *continue* ' that memory.

After this, the First Book contained the blessing of the elements, and the prayer that they might be " to us the body and blood." We have seen that Gardiner appealed to this as teaching the Real Presence, and that Cranmer explained that it did not teach it. We have also seen Bucer's criticism of the passage. *Cranmer alters the prayer completely, abolishing the blessing of the elements :*

" Grant that we, receiving these Thy creatures of bread and wine according to Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's institution, in remembrance of His death and passion, may be made partakers of His most precious body and blood."

Thus, instead of the " gifts and creatures of bread and wine " being " to us the body and blood," we are to pray that *we ourselves, receiving the bread and wine*, may be partakers of the body and blood. This makes it perfectly clear that the *effect is in the recipient, and not in the elements.*

There follow the Words of Institution. But the First Book directed that the priest should " take the bread into his hands, and likewise the cup," when saying the words. Bucer had severely criticised this, and the direction accordingly disappears. The First Book contained a rubric saying that the words were to be said " without any elevation, or showing the sacrament to the people." This rubric is omitted : evidently it was now regarded as quite unnecessary.

In the First Book, the Consecration was followed by the rest

of the "Canon," beginning with a garbled version of the "*Unde et memores.*" In the Second Book, the "consecration" is followed immediately by the consuming of the elements ! The form of administration in the First Book was :

"The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul, etc."

Gardiner had argued that these words implied that the body and blood of Christ are present under the forms of the bread and wine. Cranmer said this was "a plain untruth" (see p. 439). But to make the matter quite clear, the form in the second book becomes instead :

"Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on Him in thy heart by faith, with thanksgiving.

"Drink this in remembrance that Christ's blood was shed for thee, and be thankful."

And thus *all reference to the Body and Blood is avoided!*

After the reception of the communion, the Second Book inserted the Lord's Prayer, and then comes a very much modified version of the prayer which follows the consecration in the First Canon. But the passage,

"Wherefore --- we Thy humble servants do celebrate and make here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these holy gifts, the memorial which Thy Son hath willed us to make, having in remembrance His blessed passion, etc.,"

is entirely omitted, and the prayer commences instead with what follows :

"We Thy humble servants entirely desire Thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving."

Then comes the offering of "our souls and bodies," as in the First Book, but whereas this First Book asked that

0 whosoever shall be partakers of this holy Communion may worthily receive the most precious body and blood of Thy Son and be fulfilled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction,"

the Second Book not only makes the verbal change necessitated by the fact that the Communion is already past, but also significantly *omits the reference to the Body and Blood :*

"beseeching Thee that all we which be partakers of this holy Communion may be fulfilled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction."

Next comes the phrase, "Although we be unworthy to offer unto Thee any sacrifice, yet we beseech Thee to accept this our

bounden duty and service.” That is conserved in the Second Book. But in the First Book it was followed by this :

“ Command these our prayers and supplications, by the ministry of Thy holy angels, to be brought up into Thy holy Tabernacle before the sight of Thy Divine Majesty, not weighing our merits but pardoning our offences. . . .”

This expurgated version of the “*Supplices te rogamus*” had been greatly criticised by Bucer, and accordingly the Second Book omits it all as far as the words “not weighing our offences.”

Next in the Second Book comes, as an alternative to the above prayer, a modified form of the “Post Communion” prayer in the First Book. There are some significant changes. The Prayer in the First Book began :

“ 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.”

The Second Book changes this into :

“ We most heartily thank Thee, for that Thou dost vouchsafe to feed us, which have duly received these holy mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ.”

This makes a very clear distinction between the receiving of the bread and wine, and the spiritual reception, by the good, of the Body and Blood.

After this, the Second Book inserts the *Gloria in Excelsis*, and finally the Blessing.

5. There are a few other points which call for mention. The First Book occasionally spoke of the “altar.” The Second Book speaks instead of “the table” of “God’s board,” but never of “the altar.”

But special attention must be called to the rubric concerning the bread and wine. Whereas in the First Book this was to be unleavened, the Second Book directs that

“ it shall suffice that the bread be such as is usual to be eaten at the table with other meats. . . . And if any of the bread or wine remain, the Curate shall have it to his own use.”

This must be taken in conjunction with the fact that Bucer had criticised the rubric in the First Book which said that the priest should “take as much bread and wine as shall suffice for the persons appointed to receive,” precisely on the ground that this might imply some special sanctity in any consecrated bread and wine left over (see p. 512). Accordingly this particular

rubric is omitted in the Second Book, and the one we have quoted above takes its place. The inference is irresistible that it applies to any of the "consecrated" bread and wine remaining after the communion.

And yet, in spite of all this, the Abbé Constant, who said that in the First Prayer Book the doctrine of the Real Presence "reste intégrale," still thinks that the form of administration in the Second Book "reste assez vague toutefois pour qu'on y puisse voir désignés ce corps et sang," and adds "Même la doctrine de la permanence n'est pas niée."¹

Again :

"C'est du pain et du vin offerts en excédent par les fidèles et non consacrés que vise la rubrique, si on se reporte aux Prayer Books de 1559 et de 1604, qui l'ont conservée, et disent quelques lignes avant : 'On ne doit pas croire moins recevoir dans une Isarcelle de l'hostie que dans l'hostie entière, chacune contenant e corps entier de N.S.J.C.' La revision de 1662 est tout à fait claire : 'S'il reste du pain et du vin non consacrés. . . .'"²

It would be difficult to make a more misleading and inaccurate statement. There *never was in any Anglican book any rubric saying that each part of the host "contains" Our Lord's Body, but that "in each part" the Body is "received"* which is quite another thing. Secondly, this rubric, which the Abbé says appears in the Books of 1559 and 1604, *did not appear in any Book after the First Book of 1549.* In point of fact, the insertion of the all-important word "unconsecrated" in the rubric about the remainder of the elements was suggested first by Cosin in 1627, while the added provision that the remainder of the "consecrated elements" should be consumed in Church was *first inserted in the Scotch Book of 1637, and copied from that into the Book of 1661.* The Abbé Constant seems strangely ignorant of the true facts.

It is interesting to compare this apologia for the Second Prayer Book by the French Abbé with the somewhat unwilling admissions made by Dr. Darwell Stone on the subject in his *History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist* :

"This new book bore evident marks of the opinions to which Cranmer was now committed. . . . The word 'Mass' was omitted. . . . The office was broken up with obviously controversial intentions. . . . The words preceding the recital of the institution were altered. . . . The order that the priest was to 'take the bread into his hands' and to 'take the cup into his hands' in connection with the words of institution was omitted, an omission which, *if designed* [1], *may* imply that the recital of our Lord's

¹ *Eucharistie*, p. 222.

² *Eucharistic*, p. 222.

■ Italics ours.

action at the Last Supper was regarded rather as a mere historical account than as an act of consecration, *although* . . . the recital was still embedded in a prayer. . . . The old words of administration . . . were abandoned. . . . The description of the consecrated elements as 'the sacrament of the body of Christ,' 'the sacrament of the blood' . . . were omitted, as was the sentence 'we do celebrate . . . with these Thy holy gifts, the memorial.' . . ."^x

And yet he continues : " There was nothing indeed explicitly to deny the doctrines which were preserved in the book of 1549?" However, he allows that " the new book, as a revision of 1549, could hardly have been the work of men who believed those doctrines. . . . Thus the book *may* [!] be regarded as having been designed to teach some form of receptionist or even virtualist doctrine, such as that now held by Cranmer."²

6. As to the *Communion for the Sick*, whereas the First Book allowed either the elements to be taken from the Communion Service in the Church, or a celebration in the sick man's room, the Second Book omits the former alternative, and thus gives no further countenance to any kind of reservation. In this matter Peter Martyr's suggestion was accepted.

D. THE CHANGE IN THE ORDINAL.

Passing over other features of the Second Prayer Book, we come to the alterations made in the Ordinal, which now became an integral part of the book.

The Oath of the King's Supremacy, which occurs in all three orders, is " purified " from the reference to the saints and the Evangelists," which had given Bishop Hooper so much pain. And it was no longer specified that the candidates for the diaconate and priesthood should wear a plain alb.

There are a few changes in the rite for the *diaconate*, but they are not important. The bishop lays on hands, and gives the Bible as before.

The principal change in the rite for the *priesthood* is that *the chalice and bread are no longer presented to the candidate, but the Bible only*. And thus the " Bible " becomes the only " instrument " given to the new priest.

In the form for *bishops*, the bishop-elect is no longer directed to wear " surplice and cope," and there is no direction that the assistant bishops shall similarly wear surplices and copes, and have

their pastoral staves in their hands. The oath of obedience to the Archbishop omits the reference to the "holy Gospel." In all this the influence of Hooper is manifest. Also, the Archbishop no longer lays the Bible on the neck of the new bishop, but gives it to him instead. The giving of the pastoral staff is abolished, and the prayer which accompanied it is incorporated with the prayer accompanying the giving of the Bible.

E. THE "BLACK RUBRIC."

The Second Prayer Book was, as we have said, voted on April 6th, 1552, and was to come into force on November and. Many copies had already been printed ready for publication when an important change was made. Apparently John Knox, chaplain to the Duke of Northumberland, preached before the King and Council a sermon "in which he inveighed with great freedom against kneeling at the Lord's Supper."¹ The sermon was perhaps preached on September 25th. Early in October the Council wrote to Cranmer and asked him to consult Ridley, Peter Martyr, and others as to the advisability of disallowing kneeling for Communion. Cranmer on October 7th "expressed" himself as ready to obey the Royal Command, but protested vigorously against the alteration of what had been settled by Parliament with the King's assent, and defended the practice of kneeling when actually receiving communion, as the two prayers preceding and the two following the communion were to be said kneeling.²

Eventually on Oct. 27th the Council ordered Bishop Goodrich, of Ely, Lord Chancellor, "to have joined unto the *Book of Common Prayer* lately set forth a certain declaration signed by the King's Majesty," "touching the kneeling at the receiving of the Communion."³ The Declaration, known as the "Black Rubric," contains the following statement⁴ :

"Whereas it is ordained in the *Book of Common Prayer* . . . that the Communicants kneeling should receive the Holy Communion, which thing being well meant for a signification of the humble

¹ Knox was not the first to criticise the kneeling position, for Hooper, in his Lenten Sermons preached before the King and Council in 1550, had said :

"Seeing kneeling is a shew and external sign of honouring and worshipping, and heretofore hath grievous and damnable idolatry been committed by the honouring of the sacrament, I would wish it were commanded by the magistrates, that the communicators and receivers should do it standing or sitting. But sitting, in mine opinion, were best, for many considerations." (*Early Works*, p. w6.)

² *State Papers*, Ed. VI, Dom. 15.

³ *Dixon, op. cit.*, iii, 483.

⁴ Italics ours.

and grateful acknowledgement of the benefits of Christ, given unto the worthy receiver. . . . Lest yet the same kneeling might be thought or taken otherwise, we do declare that *it is not meant thereby that any adoration is done, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread or wine there bodily received, or unto any real and essential presence there being of Christ's natural flesh and blood.* For as concerning the sacramental bread and wine, *they remain still in their very natural substances,* and therefore may not be adored, for that were idolatry to be adhorred of all faithful Christians. And as concerning *the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ, they are in heaven and not here.* For it is against the truth of Christ's true natural body to be in more places than in one, at one time."

It is our considered opinion that this rubric was drawn up by Cranmer himself, for *there is nothing in it that cannot be paralleled in his book on the Sacrament written in 1550,* and also in the Article on the subject which appeared this same year 1552, and was in all probability written by Cranmer, or was at any rate approved by him.¹

As Cranmer deprecated the change of the kneeling posture, nothing is more likely than that in return for its retention he consented to an explanation of its purpose. The "Black Rubric" would thus have the approval of the Archbishop himself, and presumably also of Ridley and Peter Martyr, whom he promised to consult on the matter. In addition, it had the approval of Bishop Goodrich, one of the "liturgical commissioners" in this reign. Further, it had the approval and authority of the Council, and lastly, that of the King Himself, the Head of the Church. To describe it, then, as "of no authority," as is so often done, is surely incorrect.²

F. THE RECEPTION OF THE NEW BOOK.

It sounds scarcely credible, but even this Second Prayer Book did not altogether satisfy the extreme Reformers. Knox described "crossing in baptism, kneeling at the Lord's Table, mummulling and singing of the Litany" as "diabolical inven-

¹ See p. 545.

¹ Dr. Darwell Stone's comment is interesting:

"Very much of the phraseology used in this declaration is capable in itself of being explained in harmony with the belief that the consecrated sacrament is the body and blood of Chnst [!] . . . But when the declaration is viewed in relation to the known opinions of Cranmer, to the whole character of the Prayer Book to which it was affixed, and to the object of the addition as described in the declaration itself," this interpretation, "in the abstract possible, becomes incredible." "Historically considered, the declaration . . . must be regarded as a denial of the doctrine that the consecrated sacrament is the body and blood of Christ." (*Op. cit.*, II, p. 141. Italics ours.)

tions.”¹ Similarly Gasquet and Bishop mention² that Calvin thought it still contained “many tolerably foolish things,”³ and Bullinger objected to the use of the surplice, private baptism, the churching of women, the ring in marriage, etc. But no objection was raised at all to the doctrinal standard of the book.

Gasquet and Bishop mention also⁴ a Catholic opinion of the book, put forth in 1560 by Schulting. He remarks that “in almost everything it follows the customs and rites of the orthodox Lutherans except in the order of the Supper.” This latter is observed “according to the rite and order of Bucer.” This, however, was really an opinion expressed on the Latin translation of the Elizabethan Prayer Book, made in 1560.

¹ *Liturgy and Worship*, p. 180 note.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 305.

• This should read: “many foolish things which are nevertheless tolerable.”
The Latin is: “*tokrabiles ineptue.*”

⁴ Page 306.

CHAPTER XX

THE FORTY-TWO ARTICLES OF RELIGION

THE FORTY-TWO ARTICLES OF RELIGION.

1. We have already mentioned the Ten Articles of 1536, and the Thirteen Articles of 1538, and have shown that in both cases they resulted from discussions with German Lutherans. Melancthon did not care much for the Ten Articles, but the Thirteen were much more closely related to the Augsburg Confession, the standard Creed of Lutheranism. As Gairdner says, "they breathe the spirit of the Augsburg Confession, and some of them are identical, or nearly so, in the wording with those of that great Lutheran formula."¹ Similarly Dr. Tyrrell Green of Lampeter allows that "much of their language was adopted" from the Augsburg Confession.²

2. Some Articles of Religion were already in use in England early in Edward's reign, for at the end of 1549, Hooper wrote to Bullinger saying that Cranmer "has some articles of religion, to which all preachers and lecturers in divinity are required to subscribe, and in these his sentiments respecting the Eucharist are pure and religious, and similar to yours in Switzerland."³ And again in February, 1550, he wrote: "The Archbishop of Canterbury gives to all lecturers and preachers their licence to read and preach. Every one of them, however, must previously subscribe to certain articles . . . one of which respecting the Eucharist is plainly true, and that which you maintain in Switzerland."⁴ We call attention to this testimony to the Zwinglian character of these early Articles. It used to be the fashion to say that the Forty-two Articles were, like the earlier Anglican formularies, based on the Lutheran Confession of Augsburg.⁵ But, as Mr. Pocock remarked,

all the foreigners who came over were either thorough Zwinglians, or else, like Bucer and the school of Strassburg, held an intermediate

¹ Lollardy, III, 323.

² *Original Letters*, pp. 71-2. ³ *Ibid.*, p. 76.

⁴ See, e.g., Abp. Laurence's Bampton Lectures of 1804.

position, wishing to compromise matters between the Lutheran view and the Zwinglian, and the result was that . . . excepting so far as Zwingli and Calvin agreed with the Augsburg Confession, its terms were not adopted.”¹

These Zwinglian articles, which included one on the Eucharist, were presumably accepted by Hooper before he preached the Lenten Sermons before the Court in 1550, in which he set forth the pure Zwinglian view of the “Presence.” Later on in the same year, as we have said (p. 494), further articles of a doctrinal and disciplinary character were administered to him.

Again, certain Articles of Religion were in turn administered by Hooper to the clergy in his diocese, first in the form of fifty Visitation Articles for the Diocese of Gloucester in 1551 and next in the form of Nineteen Articles for the clergy of Worcester in 1552. In addition, Hooper set forth his own Creed in 1550 in the form of a hundred articles to which he gave the title, “A Brief and Clear Confession of the Christian Creed.”

3. Thus, when Bucer in his *Censura* urged the necessity of a public statement of Reformed Doctrine, dealing especially with points disputed at the time (see p. 515), and when, in 1551, according to Strype,² the Council ordered Cranmer to frame a Book of Articles “for the preserving and maintaining peace and unity of doctrine in the Church, that, being finished, they might be set forth by public authority,” there was plenty of material at his disposal.

The draft articles, when ready, were evidently submitted to the Bishops, as we gather from an entry in the Council Book. Gairdner says that this took place, no doubt, on the occasion of the Convocation which began in 1550 Old Style, “but what criticism they received there we cannot tell.”³

Next, the draft articles, then apparently forty-five in number, were sent to the Council and by them submitted to the Six Royal Preachers, on October 21st, 1552, i.e., to Harley, Bill, Horne, Grindal, Perre, and Knox.

This draft, together with a Protest by John Knox against the article on the Book of Common Prayer (see later), was on November 21st returned to Cranmer, who made an alteration in the article in question, and returned the draft to the Council on November 24th.⁴

¹ “Abolition of the Articles,” in Shipley, *Studies in Modern Problems*, p. 4.

² *Cranmer*, ch. xxvii.

³ *Lollardy*, iii, 325.

⁴ *Smyth, op. tit.*, p. 259.

The draft was then evidently approved by the Six Preachers, and signed by them.¹

After that the Council would seem to have sent the Articles once more to Cranmer for a final revision and in the course of this they were reduced from 45 to 42, by the combination of four articles into one. There were also slight changes in terminology. The final form was signed by the King on June 12th, 1553² before his death, and were printed off, in Latin and English.

4. The Articles were doubtless drawn up by Cranmer himself, as Strype intimates. But it is extremely likely that he had advisers in this as in other matters, and that for the purpose he availed himself of the assistance of the members of the Commission for the Reform of Ecclesiastical Laws who had already helped him in the compilation of the Second Prayer Book. This is accepted by Smyth and Dixon :

"It is evident from Martyr's letter to Bullinger on June 14th, 1552, when after the Prayer Book was finished and 'everything removed from it that could nourish superstition,' the Commission set themselves to draw up the Articles."³

"This great design of reforming the laws of the Church went hand in hand with another scarcely less arduous undertaking, the composition of a new body of Articles of Religion. . . . The same men, it cannot be doubted, were consulted about them both."⁴

Nevertheless, as in the case of the Prayer Book, "It is indisputable that the principal burden of the work was borne by Archbishop Cranmer" himself.⁴

In this particular task Cranmer had the encouragement of Calvin. He wrote to him to tell him of the project, and Calvin replied in June, 1552, saying, "I greatly approve of the decision you have taken."⁶

5. Of these 45 or 42 Articles, the only ones which interest us here are those on the Church and the Ministry, the Sacraments in General, and the Eucharist in particular, as Sacrament and Sacrifice. Now we have already mentioned the articles administered at Gloucester and Worcester by Hooper. Hardwick points out⁶ that the articles are closely related to the Nineteen Articles of Hooper. Ten coincide precisely with the Latin

¹ The signed draft is in *State Papers, Domestic.*, Edw. VI, Vol. XV, No. 28.

² Smyth, *Cranmer*, p. 257.

³ Dixon, *History of the C. of E.*, III, 382.

⁴ Hardwick, *History of the Articles*, p. 79.

⁶ *Apud. Gorham, Gleanings of the Reformation*, p. 77.

· Page 78.

articles of 1552, while of the nine remaining, seven are as obviously the same in substance, though not so fully enunciated, as certain parallel definitions of the older formula. These nineteen are, in their turn, frequently identical with those which he offered in 1552 to Worcester. Similarly, Gairdner has given details of the correspondence between the earlier and later Articles.¹

This makes it important to study Hooper's own articles. We shall then be in a position to interpret the meaning of the Forty-two Articles, and to determine the significance of any variations in phraseology between the two sets. And as Hooper's meaning can be illustrated from his *Brief and Clear Confession* of 1550, we will give quotations from this work also on the particular points which interest us.

Hooper's general attitude is, of course, well known. He was an out-and-out Zwinglian. And in this connection it is important to record the publication in 1549 of the *Consent of Zurich*, a document of 26 Articles drawn up by Galvin, as an agreement between himself and the Zwinglians. Bullinger wrote to Dryander, then at Cambridge, on August 31st, 1549, and informed him that he and Galvin had sent the heads of their Agreement to Hooper. Bullinger wrote also to Utenhovius at Cambridge to the same effect. Thus Hooper was in possession of the *Consent of Zurich*, and was, moreover, throughout in constant communication with Bullinger.

Peter Martyr wrote to Bullinger on April 25th, 1551, declaring his assent to the *Consent of Zurich*,² Peter Martyr was, of course, a prominent figure in all the reforms in the latter part of this reign. Smyth also remarks³ that "the alliance between Zurich and Geneva, the Consensus Tigurinus of 1549, seemed to supply the nucleus of Protestant Reunion" at which Cranmer was aiming.

Bucer approved in general of the Consent of Zurich, but wished that the extreme anti-Lutheran party would not exclude Christ's Presence from the Supper.⁴

Bucer was now dead, but Martyr and Hooper remained, and were on the friendliest terms with Cranmer. Martyr was on most of the Committees, as we have seen, including the one for the revision of the Prayer Book and the Ecclesiastical Laws, and was evidently also on that for the Articles. (See later.)

As Martyr and Hooper were pronounced Zwinglians, we must

¹ Lollardy, iii, pp. 327 *et seq.* · See Smyth, *Cranmer*, p. 131. · Page 254.
⁴ Letter to Calvin, August, 1549, in Gorham, *Gleanings of the Reformation*, p. 99.

expect the Articles to be Zwinglian in their general tone, except where they were over-ruled by others who were less Zwinglian.

We will now consider the 42 Articles on the subjects which interest us, prefixing the corresponding Articles from Hooper.

6. ARTICLES ON THE CHURCH AND THE MINISTRY.

(-4) *Hooper's Articles.*

Fifty Articles :

Art. 4. "The Church of God is the congregation of the faithful, wherein the word of God is truly preached, and the sacraments justly administered according to the institution of Christ, and His doctrine taught unto us by His holy word. The Church of God is not by God's word taken for the multitude or company of men, as of bishops, priests, and such other, but it is the company of all men hearing God's word, and obeying unto the same ; lest any man should be seduced, believing himself to be bound unto any ordinary succession of bishops and priests, but only unto the word of God, and to the right use of His sacraments."

"Brief and Clear Confession" :

Art. 47. "I believe and confess one only catholic and universal Church, which is an holy congregation and assembly of all faithful believers, which are chosen and predestinate unto everlasting life, before the foundations of the world were laid.

Art. 48. "I believe that this Church is invisible to the eye of man, and is only to God known. . . . As touching the visible Church, which is the congregation of the good and of the wicked, of the chosen and of the reprobate, and generally of all those which say they believe in Christ, I do not believe that to be the Church, because that church is seen of the eye, and the faith thereof is in visible things."

Art. 52. ". . . The true Church is maintained and upholden by the Spirit of Christ, is ruled and governed by His holy word, and is nourished and fed with His holy sacraments."

Nineteen Articles :

Art. 4. "Sicut erravit ecclesia Hieros. Alexandria et Antioch, ita erravit et ecclesia Romana, non solum quoad agenda, verum etiam in his quae credenda sunt."

On the Ministry.

Fifty Articles ;

Art. 17. "It is not lawful for any manner of person, of his own private authority, to take upon him to preach the word of God, or to minister His sacraments openly, unless the same be lawfully called or sent; and those do we think only lawfully called or sent, which are called and sent of God, whose calling and sending ought to be known either by manifest signs and tokens

out of heaven, or else by such men unto whom appertaineth
' (by office) to appoint and sent forth ministers into the Lord's
vineyard and Church. . . . We understand by the ministry
and know it not by the name alone, but by the work and adminis-
tration in it, to the edifying of the Church and body of Christ
by the faithful administration of God's word and His sacraments,
according unto the commandment of Christ; from the which if
any minister cease, he leaveth to be a minister, and should not
to be taken for such one."

Hooper also sets forth his views in his *Godly Confession and Pro-
testation of the Christian Faith*, published in 1550. Article 20
is as follows :

"As concerning the ministers of the Church, I believe that the
Church is bound to no sort of people, or any ordinary succession
of bishops, cardinals, or such-like, but unto the only word of God.
--- I am sorry therefore with all my heart to see the Church of
Christ degenerated into a civil policy, for even as kings of the
world naturally by descent from their parents must follow in civil
regiment, rule and law, as by right they ought; even so must such
as succeed in the place of bishops and priests that die, possess
all gifts and learning of the Holy Ghost, to rule the Church of
Christ, as his godly predecessor had, so that the Holy Ghost
must be captive and bondman to bishops' sees and palaces.
And because the Holy Ghost was in St. Peter at Rome, and in
many other godly men that have occupied bishoprics and dioceses,
therefore the same gifts, they say, must needs follow in their
successors. . . . But thus I conclude of the ministers of what degree
or dignity soever they be, they be no better than records and
testimonies, ministers and servants of God's word and God's
sacraments, unto the which they should neither add, diminish,
nor change anything."

(B) 42 Articles.

On the Church:

Art. 20. "Ecclesia Christi visibilis est coetus fidelium in quo
verbum Dei purum praedicatur, atque Sacramenta quoad ea
quae necessario exiguntur, juxta institutum Christi recte adminis-
trantur.

"Sicut erravit Ecclesia Hierosolymi, Alexandria et Antioch,
ita erravit et Ecclesia Romana, non solum quoad agenda et cere-
moniarum ritus, verum in his etiam quae credenda sunt."

On the Ministry :

24. "Non licet cuiquam sumere sibi munus publice praedi-
candi aut administrandi sacramenta in ecclesia bene constituta,
nisi prius fuerit ad hac obeunda legitime vocatus et missus. Atque
illos legitime vocatos et missos existimare debemus, qui per
homines quibus potestas vocandi ministros atque mittendi in

vineam Domini juxta verbum Dei publice concessa est in ecclesia cooptati fuerint et asciti in hoc opus."

The first part of the Article on the Church is found in Hooper's Gloucester Articles, No. 4. The only difference is that the new article inserts "*quoad ea qua necessario exiguntur*" into the statement about the right administration of the Sacraments. Hooper's statement in his Gloucester articles about the non-necessity of the ordinary succession of bishops and priests is omitted.

The second part of the article, about the Churches which have erred, comes from Article 4 in Hooper's Worcester Articles. But there is inserted a statement that these churches have erred also "*quoad ceremoniarum ritus.*"

Article 24, on admission into the ministry, comes from Article 17 in Hooper's Gloucester Articles. But Hooper's alternative that a calling may be known by manifest signs and tokens from heaven is omitted. Also, Hooper's statement that the calling may alternatively be known by men to whom it pertains *by office* to appoint and send ministers, is altered to the statement that those are legitimately called and sent who are co-opted and admitted into the ministry by those to whom *the power has been publicly granted in the Church* of calling and sending ministers.¹ This is a most significant phrase, and is capable of a congregational or of an Erastian interpretation. Hooper's version is much more orthodox, inasmuch as the power belongs to the *office*, and is not merely *publicly granted* to the individual in question. It is important to note that this form, as found in the 42 Articles, was also in the draft of 45 signed by the Six Chaplains, i.e., presumably it was in the draft as originally drawn up by Cranmer and approved by the Bishops.

Pocock remarks that "Nothing was further from the minds of the Reformers when they drew up their Article on ministering in the congregation, than any idea of an Apostolical succession of bishops."² At any rate it must be confessed that the doctrine taught in this article is perfectly consistent with, and reminiscent of, the doctrine taught by Cranmer in 1540 (see p. 286).

¹ The English version of this article runs: "... Those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation, to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard." The whole Article should be compared with Art. 14 of the Augsburg Confession (cf. p. 144), on which it is doubtless based. The Augsburg Article was, of course, intended to include the Lutheran ministry. Note that whereas Hooper speaks of "power," Cranmer's article speaks of "authority."

² *Abolition of the Articles*, p. 13.

7. On the Nature and Number of the Sacraments.

A. hooper's ARTICLES.

Fifty Articles (Gloucester) :

Art. 12. "The Sacraments are so necessary to our salvation that whosoever receiveth them with faith according to the institution of Christ, by the secret working of the Holy Ghost, receiveth also necessarily the things that be promised, signified and represented by the sacraments : yet be not the sacraments to be judged so necessary, that whosoever use them any other way than God hath appointed, receiveth His salvation, or that God cannot save the children, or such elder persons as believe His word, without them, when they be omitted in any case of necessity."

Art. ii. "They which unworthily do come to baptism or unto the supper of the Lord, do not receive the virtue and true effect of the same sacraments, although they receive the external signs and elements of the sacraments."

Art. 2i. "He (Our Lord) hath in like manner instituted a small number of sacraments . . . which we do see in baptism . . . and the communion of the body and blood of Christ."

Art. 22. "The sacraments are instituted of Christ to be used, and not to be gazed upon, and all they which shall worthily use the same with faith shall thereby receive the increase and confirmation of all the fruits of health and salvation."

Art. 23. "The said sacraments are not only signs and notes of the profession of Christian men, but also certain impressions or prints of the grace and good-will of God towards us, which thing is made perfect in us, when inwardly the Holy Ghost worketh that our faith may apprehend the thing that is signified by the word and the sacraments."

Art. 24. "The sacraments are not of any force by virtue or strength of any outward work of the same (which of superstition is called *opus operatum*), but only by the virtue and means of the Holy Ghost working in the hearts of the doers and receivers by faith, lest that any man should trust or have confidence in the outward works."

Art. 26. "That which is spoken of the sacraments, that they were not instituted for a spectacle or wondering-stock, doth evidently prove that they ought not to be kept or worshipped, or any other ways to be used than as Christ did institute them, who, speaking simply and plainly of baptism by these words, 'Do ye baptise,' said also of the bread and wine, 'Take, eat, and drink you all,' of the which words we learn that as many as be present ought to communicate, or to depart in the time of the administration." †

Art. 39. "Forasmuch as our Lord Jesus Christ, very God and man, hath commanded and instituted but only two sacraments in number, that is to say, baptism and the communion of His supper, by the communicating whereof He would give Himself unto us, no man therefore ought to be so bold as once to invent or make any more. And albeit that the imposition of hands

be tokens of the approbation of the ministry of the Church, according to the example of the Apostles, yet it may not therefore be called a sacrament by like reason as the other two sacraments are."

"Brief and Clear Confession" :

Art. 58. "I believe also the holy sacraments (which are the second mark or badge of the true Church) to be the signs of the reconciliation and great atonement made between God and us through Jesus Christ. They are seals of the Lord's promises, and are outward and visible pledges and gages of the inward faith, and are in number only twain, that is to say, baptism and the holy supper of the Lord. The which two are not void and empty signs, but full, that is to say, they are not only signs whereby something is signified, but also they are such signs as do exhibit and give the thing that they signify indeed, as by God's help we will declare hereafter. But, as touching all the other five sacraments which with great abuse and superstition are received and used in the papistical Church, that is to say, confirmation, confession, marriage, absolution, otherwise called the sacrament of the priesthood, and extreme unction or annealing : I say that all these were ecclesiastical ceremonies, the which the holy fathers in their time used holily without any superstition, even as by their example the same may be used this day, so that it be done without any error, abuse and superstition."

Nineteen Articles :

Art. 10. "Qui indigne ad baptismum et ad coenam Domini accedunt, quamquam percipiunt sacramenta, non tamen rem et salutarem effectum sacramentorum sumunt, imo, quemadmodum Paulus dicit, damnationem sibi ipsis accersunt."

Art. 14. "Sacramenta non sunt instituta a Christo ut spectarentur aut circumferrentur, sed ut rite illis uteremur, et in his duntaxat qui digne percipiunt, salutarem habent effectum, idque non ex opere (ut quidam loquuntur) operato, quae vox ut peregrina est et sacris literis ignota, sic parit sensum minime pium, sed admodum superstitiosum : qui vero indigne percipiunt, damnationem (ut inquit Paulus) sibi ipsis acquirunt."

B. FORTY-TWO ARTICLES.

On the Sacraments.

26. "De sacramentis.

"D.N.J.C. sacramentis numero paucissimis, observatu facilimis, significatione praestantissimis, societatem novi populi colligavit, sicuti est Baptismus et Coena Domini.

Sacramenta non instituta sunt a Christo ut spectarentur aut circumferrentur, sed ut rite illis uteremur ; et in his duntaxat qui digne percipiunt, salutarem habent effectum, idque non ex opere (ut quidam loquuntur) operato, quae vox ut peregrina est et sacris literis ignota, sic parit sensum minime pium, sed admodum

superstitiosum: qui vero indigne percipiunt, damnationem (ut inquit Paulus) sibi ipsis acquirunt.

“Sacramenta per verbum Dei instituta non tantum sunt note professionis Christianorum, sed certa quaedam potius testimonia et efficacia signa gratiae, atque bonae in nos voluntatis Dei, per quae invisibiliter ipse in nobis operatur, nostramque fidem in se non solum excitat, verum etiam confirmat.”

The first part of this Article corresponds to Article 21 in Hooper's Gloucester Articles. These were combined in Articles 26 and 39 of the 45. But in the draft as signed by the Six Chaplains, there was a definite statement, as in Hooper, that *only two Sacraments were instituted by Christ Our Lord, and have the true nature of Sacraments*: “Baptismus et Coena Domini, quae duo tantum in Ecclesia pro Sacramentis a Christo Domino sunt institutae, et quae sola sacramentorum propriam rationem habent.” This phrase is struck out of the 42 Articles. Evidently it was intended thereby to leave open the question whether, for instance, Penance might be a Sacrament instituted by Christ, as taught sometimes by Luther.

The second part of the article comes from Article 14 in Hooper's Worcester Articles, and is unchanged throughout.

The third part has no exact correspondence in Hooper, and indeed, its phraseology would not have been quite pleasing to him. He says in Article 58 of his *Brief and Clear Confession* that the sacraments “are such signs as do exhibit and give the thing that they signify indeed.”

There is an interesting letter extant, written by Peter Martyr to Bullinger on June 14th, 1552, which explains the difference of opinion which arose in the Committee on this article:

“The Book or Order of Ecclesiastical Rites and the Administration of the Sacraments is reformed, for all things are removed from it which could nourish superstition. But the chief reason why other things which were purposed were not effected was that the subject of the sacrament stood in the way; not, truly, so far as regards Transubstantiation or the Real Presence (so to speak) either in the bread or in the wine, since, thanks be to God, concerning these things there seems to be now no controversy as regards those who profess the Gospel; but whether grace is conferred by virtue of the sacraments is a point about which many are in doubt, and there have been some who have altogether held the affirmative, and were desirous that this doctrine should be established by public authority. But when others clearly saw how many superstitions such a determination would bring with it, they made it a primary point to endeavour in all ways to show that nothing more is to be granted the sacrament than to the external Word of God, for by both these kinds of word is signified and shewn to us the salva-

tion obtained for us through Christ, which as many are made partakers of as believe these words and signs ; not indeed by the virtue of the words or of the Sacraments, but by the efficacy of faith. Moreover, it was added that it was impossible that the Sacraments should be worthily received unless those who receive them have beforehand that which is signified by them, for unless faith is present, they are always received unworthily, but if they who come to the sacraments are endued with faith, they have already received through faith the grace that is proclaimed to us in the sacraments, and then the reception and use of the Sacraments is the seal and obsignation of the promise already apprehended. . . . We were anxious that these things should be determined and established by authority concerning the Sacraments. . . . But it was opposed, and many are of opinion, and those otherwise not unlearned nor evil, that grace is conferred, as they say, by virtue of the Sacraments.”¹

One thing at least follows from this letter, and that is that, in view of the division of opinion in the Committee, the resulting Article has been framed so as to admit of either opinion, and to teach neither to the exclusion of the other. This shows us how the phrase “efficacious signs of grace” is to be understood. It may be either “in virtue of the sacrament,” or “in virtue of faith.” And in any case, if the former is chosen, it must be reconciled with the express denial that the sacraments confer grace *ex opere operato*—which is, of course, the Catholic doctrine, as defined at the Council of Trent.

8. *The Eucharist.*

a. hooper's articles.

Fifty Articles (Gloucester) :

Art. 10. “In the sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord, there is no transubstantiation of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, or any manner of corporal or local presence of Christ in, under, or with the bread and wine, but spiritually by faith, believing the Son of God Jesus Christ to be made man, and that by His death He might satisfy for the sins of the world. So we receive the confirmation and augmentation of all the merits and deservings of Christ. . . .”

Art. 27. “No man ought to receive the communion of the body and blood of our Lord for another, neither yet one for many, but every man for himself; for no more doth the communion prevail, being taken of one for another, than doth baptism. Wherefore the communion ought not to be kept or celebrated within the church, unless that the whole congregation (or at least a good part of the same) do receive it.”

Art. 30. “Item, that the supper of the Lord ought not to be celebrated or kept in any one church but once in the day, and that in one place only.”

¹ *Apud Gorham, Gleanings of the Reformation.*

The "Brief and Clear Confession" 99 :

Art. 63. ¶ (The holy sacrament of the supper is an holy and outward ceremony, instituted by Jesus Christ in the gospel a day before His death, in the nature and substance of bread and wine, in remembrance and for a memorial of His death and passion, having and containing in it a promise of the remission of sins. By this sacrament we are indeed made partakers of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, and be therewith nourished and fed in the house of the Lord. . . . The same ought to be given and ministered to all under both the kinds, according to the ordinance and commandments of Christ, for the altering whereof none ought to be so hardy as to attempt anything."

Art. 64. "In this holy sacrament these signs or badges are not changed in any point, but the same do remain wholly in their nature : that is to say, the bread is not changed and transubstantiated (as the fond papists and false doctors do teach, deceiving the poor people) into the body of Jesus Christ, neither is the wine transubstantiated into His blood ; but the bread remaineth still bread, and the wine remaineth still wine, every one in his proper and first nature. For the words that Christ spake to His disciples in giving them the bread, saying, * This is my body,' I understand and believe to be spoken by a figurative manner of speech, called *metonymia*, which is a manner of speaking very common in the Scriptures, as the same was understood and also declared by the writings of the holy fathers and doctors of the Church . . . which lived before the Council of Lateran, where it was concluded that the bread was transubstantiated into the body of Christ, and the wine into His blood ; and then was it given forth for an article of our faith, to the great dishonour of God, and to the great slander of all the Church. And it was done in the year of our Lord 1050, by Pope Leo the Ninth : in the which time the devil was unbound, as it was prophesied of in the Apocalypse, and troubled the Church of Christ more than ever He did before."

Art. 65. "All this sacrament consisteth in the use thereof; so that without the right use the bread and wine in nothing differ from other common bread and wine that is commonly used ; and therefore I do not believe that the body of Christ can be contained, hid, or inclosed in the bread, under the bread, or with the bread ; neither the blood in the wine, under the wine, or with the wine. But I believe and confess the very body of Christ to be in heaven on the right hand of the Father (as before we have said) and that always and as often as we use this bread and wine according to the ordinance and institution of Christ, we do verily and indeed receive His body and blood."

Art. 66. "This receiving is not done carnally, or bodily, but spiritually, through a true and lively faith ; that is to say, the body and blood of Christ are not given to the mouth and belly for the nourishing of the body, but unto our faith for the nourishing of the spirit and inward man unto eternal life. And for that cause we have no need that Christ should come from heaven to us, but that we should ascend unto Him, lifting up our hearts

through a lively faith on high unto the right hand of the Father, where Christ sitteth, from whence we wait for our redemption ; and we must not seek for Christ in these bodily elements."

Art. 67. "This holy supper is a sacrament of faith unto the faithful only, and not for the infidels, wherein a man findeth and receiveth no more than he bringeth with him, saving peradventure the increase of faith, grace and virtue. And therefore they only find and receive Jesus Christ unto salvation, which through true and lively faith bring the same with them, but the others find and receive only the outward and visible signs, and that to their condemnation."

Art. 68. "This sacrament containeth two things : the one is earthly, carnal and visible ; and the other is heavenly, spiritual and invisible. And I confess that as our body and outward man receiveth the thing that is earthly and visible, which is the bread and the wine, whereby the body is nourished and fed, even so verily our spirit and inward man receiveth the thing that is heavenly and spiritual, which is signified by the bread and wine, that is to say, the body and blood of Christ."

Art. 69. "The holy fathers, patriarchs, prophets . . . saw Him beforehand which was to come, and received as much and the same thing that we receive by the sacraments."

Nineteen Articles :

Art. 17. "Sacramentum Eucharistiae nec ex institutione Christi, nec ex usu primitivae Ecclesiae, servebatur, circumferebatur, aut elevabatur ut adoretur."

Art. 9. "Panis et vini transubstantiatio in Eucharistia ex sacris literis probari non potest, sed apertis scripturae verbis adversatur, et multarum superstitionum dedit occasionem."

B. FORTY-TWO ARTICLES.

On the Eucharist,

29. "De Cana Domini,

"Coena Domini non est tantum signum mutuae benevolentiae Christianorum inter sese, verum potius est sacramentum nostrae per mortem Christi redemptionis. Atque adeo rite, digne et cum fide summentibus, panis quem frangimus est communicatio corporis Christi; similiter poculum benedictionis est communicatio sanguinis Christi.

"Panis et vini transubstantiatio in Eucharistia ex sacris literis probari non potest, sed apertis scripturae verbis adversatur, et multarum superstitionum dedit occasionem.

"Quum naturae humanae veritas requirat, ut unius ejusdemque hominis corpus in multis locis simul esse non possit, sed in uno aliquo et definito loco esse oporteat, idcirco Christi corpus in inultis et diversis locis, eodem tempore praesens esse non potest. Et quoniam, ut tradunt sacrae literae, Christus in coelum fuit sublatus, et ibi usque ad finem seculi est permansurus, non debet quisquam fidelium carnis ejus et sanguinis Realem et Corporalem (ut loquuntur) praesentiam in Eucharistia vel credere vel profiteri.

54\$ THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD

“Sacramentum Eucharistiae ex institutione Christi non servabatur, circumferebatur, elevabatur, nec adorabatur.”

The first part of this Article is new in form. The second corresponds to Article 19 in Hooper's Worcester Articles, and is unchanged throughout.

The third corresponds to the famous “Black Rubric,” with which we have already dealt. It may be compared with Article 66 in Hooper's *Brief and Clear Confession*. There is a slight variation in the 42 and the 45 Articles here, but it is not of much significance :

45. “**Quum naturae humanae veritas requirat ut in multis locis simul esse non possit, sed certo quodam et definite, idcirco Christi corpus. ---**”

42. “**Quum naturae humanae veritas requirat, ut unius ejusdemque hominis corpus in multis locis simul esse non possit, sed in uno aliquo et definite loco esse oporteat, idcirco Christi corpus. . . .**”^x

The last part of the Article corresponds to Article 17 in Hooper's Worcester Articles. But there is one interesting change. Hooper's article ran: “Sacramentum Eucharistiae nec ex institutione Christi, *nec ex usu primitive Ecclesia* servebatur, circumferebatur, aut *elevabatur, ut adoretur.*” The 45 and 42 Articles leave out the reference to the primitive Church—for it must have been realised that reservation *was* practised in the primitive Church—and confined itself to the assertion that such practices were not in accordance with Christ's institution. Further, Hooper said that the sacrament should not be elevated in order that it might be adored. This did not in itself rule out adoration. Accordingly, in the 45 and 42 Articles the point is cleared up, and adoration is totally excluded, as well as elevation: “*nec elevabatur, nec adorabatur.*”

Dixon's comment on this article is perfectly candid :

“In the Article on the Lord's Supper . . . ‘the real and corporal presence’ was denied, and the argument from circumscribed locality (as Peter Martyr termed it) was alleged, that ‘the Body of Christ is in heaven.’ In the same article Transubstantiation was denied, and the highest divine worship was consistently refused to the Eucharist: it was said not to be by the command of Christ reserved, carried about, elevated, or adored.”

¹ Gairdner says this article was “doubtless one of Cranmer's drawing up,” and calls attention to the similarity with the Black Rubric. Cranmer drew up the Article before the Black Rubric, and “it was natural enough that he should seek to set forth in the Articles what he had taught in his book on the Sacrament” (*Lollardy and the Reformation*, iii, 362).

And in a footnote :

“ These observances had been recently affirmed at Trent. ‘ In Sacramento Eucharistiae Christum esse cultu latriæ adorandum, solemniter circumgestandum, populo proponendum ’—Sess. xiii (1551) > caP* can* §» * Eucharistiam in sacrario reservari,’ can. 7.”¹

To this we must add that *the Real Presence and Transubstantiation, which this Article formally denies, had already been solemnly defined at the Council of Trent, so that this Article is deliberately and formally heretical.*

9. SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.

(A) *Hooper's Articles.*

Fifty Articles :

Art. 15. “The oblation of Christ once made on the Cross is a full satisfaction for all manner of sins, be they original, actual, present, past, or to come, to all men believing in the same sacrifice ; and there is not other means, propitiation, redemption, satisfaction, or sacrifice for sin.”

Art. 28. “Such doctrines doth plainly approve that the popish Mass is a mere enemy against God's word and Christ's institution, and albeit it doth retain in it certain lessons of the holy Scriptures, yet it is nothing better to be esteemed than the verses of the sorcerer or enchanter, that be nothing more to be esteemed than for certain holy words murmured and spoken in secret.”

Art. 40. “Item, that you do not read any such injunctions as extollet and setteth forth the popish Mass, candles, images, chantries, and such-like.”

Art. 41. “Item, that none of you do counterfeit the popish Mass in blessing the Lord's board, washing your hands or fingers after the gospel, or receipt of the holy communion, shifting the book from one place unto another, laying down and licking of the chalice after the communion, blessing his eyes with the sudary thereof^ or paten, or crossing his hands with the same, holding up his forefingers and thumbs joined together towards the temples of his head after the receiving of the sacrament, breathing on the bread or chalice, saying the ‘Agnus’ before the communion, shewing the sacrament openly before the distribution of the same, or making any elevation thereof, ringing of the sacring-bell, or setting any light upon the Lord's board.”

Art. 42. “Item, that you make no market of the holy communion by buying or selling the receipt thereof for money, as the popish Mass in times past was wont to do.”

Art. 43. “Item, whereas in divers places some use the Lord's board after the form of a table, and some of an altar, whereby dissension is perceived to arise among the unlearned, therefore, wishing a godly unity to be observed in all our diocese, and for

¹ *History of the C. of E.*, iii, 523.

that the form of a table may more move and turn the simple from the old superstitious opinions of the popish Mass, and to the right use of the Lord's supper, we exhort you to erect and set up the Lord's board after the form of an honest table, decently covered, in such place as shall be thought most meet, so that the ministers and communicants may be seen, heard and understood of all the people there being present, and that ye do take down and abolish all the altars or tables. Further, that the minister in the use of the communion and prayers thereof turn his face towards the people."

"Brief and Clear Confession" :

Art. 27. "I believe that Jesus Christ by the sacrifice of his body, which He offered upon the tree of the Cross, hath defaced and destroyed sin, death, and the devil, with all his kingdom; and hath wholly performed the work of our salvation, and hath abolished and made an end of all other sacrifices, so that from thenceforth there is none other propitiatory sacrifice, either for the living or the dead, to be looked for or sought for, than the same; for by this one only oblation hath He consecrated for ever all those that are sanctified."

Art. 28. "I believe that the holy Supper of the Lord is not a sacrifice, but only a remembrance and commemoration of the holy sacrifice of Jesus Christ. Therefore it ought not to be worshipped as God, neither as Christ therein contained, who must be worshipped in faith only, without all corruptible elements. Likewise I believe and confess that the popish Mass is the invention and ordinance of man, a sacrifice of Antichrist, and a forsaking of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, that is to say, of His death and passion; and that it is a stinking and infected sepulchre, which hideth and covereth the merit of the blood of Christ; and therefore ought the Mass to be abolished, and the holy Supper of the Lord to be restored and set in His perfection again."

Art. 71. "I believe that the popish Mass is not, neither can be, the holy Supper of the Lord, but the mere invention of men, which were both liars and wicked; yea, it is as contrary to the holy supper as the night is unto the day, and Belial to Christ. . . . And therefore the Mass can be no remembrance of true sacrifice, that is to say, of the death and passion of Christ, as the holy supper is; but the Mass is an utter forsaking of the same, because it doth attribute and ascribe to itself that which doth appertain only to the blood of Christ shed upon the Cross, that is to say, satisfaction, purgation, and remission of sins, with the increase of grace; and because men are compelled to do godly honour unto the creature instead of the Creator, to a morsel of bread in the stead of Jesus Christ our only Lord, Saviour, and Redeemer."

Nineteen Articles:

Art. 11. "Oblatio Christi semel facta, perfecta est redemptio, propitiatio et satisfactio pro omnibus peccatis totius mundi, tarn originalibus quam actualibus, neque prater illam unicam est ulla alia peccatis expiatio. Unde Missarum sacrificia, quibus

vulgo dicebatur sacerdotem offerre Christum, pro vivis et defunctis, figmenta sunt et perniciosae imposturae."

(B) *Forty-two Articles.*

On the Mass.

30. "De unica Christi oblatione in cruce perfecta.

"Oblatio Christi semel facta perfecta est redemptio, propitiatio, et satisfactio pro omnibus peccatis totius mundi, tam originalibus quam actualibus; neque praeter illam unicam est ulla alia pro peccatis expiatio. Unde Missarum sacrificia, quibus vulgo dicebatur, sacerdotem offerre Christum in remissionem poenae aut culpa pro vivis et defunctis, figmenta sunt et perniciosae imposturae."

This article corresponds to Article 11 in Hooper's Worcester Articles. The first part is also in Hooper's Gloucester Articles (Art. 15). The whole Article should be compared with Zwingli's Article, quoted on p. 170, on which it is undoubtedly based.

There is only one slight variation between the 45 and the 42, and that is the insertion of "*in remissionem poena aut culpa*" after "*offerre Christum*" and before "*pro vivis et defunctis.*" This insertion is undoubtedly due to Cranmer himself, for he made a similar insertion into the corresponding statement in the *Reformatio Legum*[^] as we shall see. This fact robs it of any special doctrinal significance; that is to say, as Cranmer evidently denied that Christ is offered in any real sense in the Mass, the purpose of the insertion is simply to record the avowed purpose of the offering of Christ in the Mass, and not to suggest that it would be lawful to offer Him for any other purpose. A careful reading of the whole article will show that the purpose of the insertion is to make clear the connection between the two parts of the Article. Christ satisfied for all sins on the Cross, *therefore* the Mass is a figment and a pernicious imposture, precisely because in it Christ is said to be offered for remission of pain or guilt.

That no other kind of "offering of Christ" is either contemplated or allowed will be clear from the fact that in a previous Article the Real Presence has been expressly denied, and, of course, the priest cannot "offer" for any purpose whatsoever something which is not really there!

* Cf. also the Article *De Missa Privata* of 1538, in which we read of the Eucharist: "cjuam et sacrificium nonnulli orthodoxi patres nominaverunt, quod videlicet in memoriam illius unci et semel peracti sacrificii fuit, non quod ipsum opus sit sacrificium applicabile vivis et mortuis in remissionem peccatorum; id quod papisticum duntaxat est figmentum." Cf. p. 267.

It follows that we disagree entirely with Dr. Darwell Stone, who says that

“when it is remembered how easy it would have been to find phraseology which would have unmistakably repudiated any doctrine of the Eucharist as a sacrifice of Christ’s body and blood, it appears probable that this article was intended to leave open any further questions than those necessarily involved in the explicit condemnations which it contains,” i.e., “it condemns any opinion which might conflict with the complete efficacy of the offering of Christ made once for ever, and in particular, any view that the sacrifice of the cross was offered for original sin only, and that the sacrifice of the Mass was a distinct and parallel sacrifice for actual sin.”¹

We also disagree with Dr. Kidd, who writes :

“Article 31 does not condemn simply ‘the offering of Christ for quick and dead,’ but ‘for quick and dead, to have remission of pain or guilt.’ . . . Cranmer cannot have been ignorant of the distinction . . . nor that the one was a primitive practice recognised by the Fathers and common to all the ancient liturgies, while the other belonged to the ² doctrine lately brought in.”²

Cranmer, as we have shown (see pp. 426, 433), was well aware of the way in which Catholic theologians explained that the efficacy of the Sacrifice of the Mass was derived from that of the Cross. But that did not prevent him from denying in the plainest possible terms that there is any real offering of Christ in the Mass, and the only sacrifice he allows for is a *sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving*, and an *offering of ourselves*. (See pp. 432, 433.) Moreover, the terminology he employs to describe the purpose of the Sacrifice of the Mass is *perfectly accurate* from the Catholic point of view, and *represents the doctrine defined at Trent*. (See p. 212.)

Nor can it be urged that Cranmer is merely condemning the idea that the Mass is a sacrifice for actual sin, while the Cross was the sacrifice for original sin. As Dimock says³ :

“There is in the doctrine described in the Article not one of the distinguishing features of this gross superstition.”

The same author candidly allows that “there seems to be something like a conspicuous lack of evidence to show” that this particular superstition “had ever taken root itself in English soil.”¹

It is sometimes urged that the article condemns, not the “Sacrifice of the Mass,” but “the sacrifices of Masses.” We

¹ *History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, ii, p. 146.

² *Later Mediaeval Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice*, p. 21.

³ *Dangerous Deceits*, p. 22. « *Ibid.* »

need only point out in reply that this latter phrase had already been employed at the Council of Florence (see p. 114)/ and was itself used at the Council of Trent,² which was *at this very moment* engaged in discussing the Protestant doctrines on the Mass, for extracts from Protestant writers on the subject had been distributed to the theologians in December, 1551, discussions had taken place, and canons, together with a doctrinal statement, drawn up and distributed to the bishops on January 20th for examination and consideration. At the fifteenth session on January 25th, 1552, a decree was read stating that matters had been prepared relating to the Sacrifice of the Mass, etc., but that as the Protestants had not arrived, the matter was to be deferred till the session of March 19th. But though the Protestant theologians had not arrived, the Saxon and Wurtemberg ambassadors were there,³ and doubtless knew what discussions were taking place in the Council, and would have informed their Protestant friends accordingly. And it is a significant fact that the letter which Cranmer wrote to Calvin on March 20th, 1552 (see p. 342) shows that he was aware of the trend of discussions in the Council, and especially of its attitude on the Eucharist. Accordingly, if the article we are considering is compared with the Canon passed later by the Council of Trent which follows, *there can be not the slightest doubt that the one contradicts what the other affirms :*

te Si quis dyerit Missae sacrificium tantum esse laudis et gratiarum actionis, aut nudam commemorationem sacrificii in cruce peracti, non autem propitiatorium, vel soli prodesse sumenti, neque pro vivis et deunctis, pro peccatis, pamis, satisfactionibus et aliis necessitatibus offerri debere, Anathema Sit.”⁴

10. Lastly, we come to the Article approving of the Second Prayer Book, with its Ordinal. There was, of course, no Article corresponding to this in Hooper's Articles.

It is evident that in the draft sent to the Six Chaplains the article ran more or less as follows :

“The Book of Common Prayer now last published by the King's Majesty --- is confirmed to be holy, godly, and not only by God's Scriptures probable in every rite and ceremony, but also in no point repugnant thereto, as well concerning common

¹ Council of Florence : “ Prodesse eis (animabus in Purgatorio detentis) fidelium vivorum suffragia, Missarum scilicet sacnficia, orationes, et eleemosynas. . .

² Council of Trent, Session XXV : “ Caveant episcopi, ut suffragia fidelium viventium, scilicet sacrificia missarum, orationes. . .

³ The Saxon ambassadors arrived on January 23rd and the Wurtemberg ambassadors on January 24th.

⁴ Session XXII.

prayers and administration of the Sacraments, as the ordering and admission of priests, deacons, bishops and archbishops."

Now the King's Preachers, or at any rate Knox, strongly disapproved of the attitude of kneeling for communion, as we have seen, and he felt he could not sign an article which pronounced this to be, not only "godly," but "probable by Scripture." Accordingly the article was changed, and read, when signed by the Six Preachers, as follows :

"Liber . . . et libellus . . . quoad doctrinae veritatem pii sunt, et quoad ceremoniarum rationem salutari Evangelii libertati, si ex sua natura ceremoniae illae estimetur, in nullo repugnant, sed probe congruunt, et eandem in complurimis promovent; atque ideo, etc."

Gairdner remarks that

- ° there are qualifying expressions. . . . Here it is only asserted that . . . the ceremonies are not repugnant to Gospel freedom if judged simply as ceremonies. . . . That is a very different thing from saying that the whole contents of the books, and even every ceremony, could be justified out of Scripture."

In the 42 Articles as eventually issued, this particular article runs as follows :

"Liber qui nuperrime autoritate Regis et Parlamenti Ecclesiae Anglicanae traditus est, continens modum et formam orandi et sacramenta administrandi in Ecclesia Anglicana, similiter et libellus ille, eadem autoritate editus De ordinatione ministrorum ecclesiae, quoad doctrinae veritatem pii sunt, et salutari doctrinae evangelii in nullo repugnant, sed congruunt, et eandem non parum promovent et illustrent, atque ideo ab omnibus ecclesiae Anglicanae fidelibus membris, et maxime a ministris verbi, cum omni promptitudine animorum et gratiarum actione recipiendi, approbandi, et populo Dei commendandi sunt."

Gairdner considers this final form is much stronger than the form signed by the Six Chaplains, and that it goes "a degree further in unqualified commendation of the book."² But this is not really the case, for a careful examination will show that while the chaplains were requested to approve in some way of the *ceremonies* in the books in question, as well as of the *doctrines*, and did so, the final Article *omits all reference to the ceremonies*, and confines itself to the doctrine of the books. So the final form is the mildest of all !

So far we have viewed the article only as directed against the extremists such as Knox. But an examination of its language, and the circumstances of the time, will show that *it was equally*

directed against the Anglo-Catholics. Knox and Hooper had found no fault with the *doctrine* of the Second Prayer Book or the Ordinal, but only with some remaining *ceremonies*. The final form of the Article, as we have seen, omits all reference to the *ceremonies*^a but insists that the *doctrine* of the Prayer Book and the Ordinal is “pious, and in no way repugnant to the Gospel.” Against whom was this directed? Obviously not against Hooper and Knox, who agreed with the doctrine, but against the *Anglo-Catholic party*^b who had opposed both the Second Prayer Book and the Ordinal. We shall find that later forms of this same Article attempt to defend the Ordinal similarly against attacks from both sides, but it is important to note that *it was found necessary from the very first to defend it against criticisms from the Anglo-Catholic side.*

11. We ought perhaps to mention one other Article, No. 23 in the 42 :

“Scholasticorum doctrina de Purgatorio, de Indulgentiis, de veneratione et adoratione tum imaginum tum reliquiarum, necnon de invocatione Sanctorum, res est futilis inaniter conficta, et nullis Scripturarum testimoniis innititur, imo verbo Dei perniciose contradicit.”

The draft of 45, signed by the Six Chaplains, had an additional clause, “*deprecatione pro defunctis*” which does not appear in the 42. This raises two questions : (1) what is the significance of this omission, so far as prayers for the dead are concerned ?—(2) what is the significance of the phrase “*scholasticorum doctrina*” ?

(1) It will be noted that the Article condemns the practices in question, not only as “based on no testimony of Scripture,” but also because they “contradict the Word of God.” Now there can be little doubt that Cranmer thought this would apply to all the practices mentioned in the final Article, but someone may well have questioned whether prayers for the dead “contradict the Word of God.” What possible text could be adduced, which they *contradict* ? There is no text which says that one must *not* pray for the dead. On the contrary, there is a text in Maccabees which says that it is a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead,¹ and it must be remembered that Cranmer and the others had not at this time excluded these “deutero-canonical” books from Scripture, but had included lessons from nearly all of them in his Calendar in the First and Second Prayer Books. Strangely enough—or is it strange?—he does not arrange for any lessons from the Books of Maccabees, and so

these are presumably regarded as "books and chapters which be least edifying, and might best be spared, and therefore are left unread."¹ It seems certain that Cranmer did not altogether like prayers for the dead. Indeed, he made this perfectly plain in the Answer he made to the Devon Rebels in 1549, in connection with the doctrine of Purgatory. The "rebels" had said :

"We will have every preacher in his sermon, and every priest at the Mass, pray specially by name for the souls in Purgatory, as our forefathers did."

Cranmer replies :

"First tell me, I pray, if you can, whether there be a purgatory or no ; and where, or what it is. And if you cannot tell, then I may tell you that you ask you wot not what. The Scripture maketh mention of two places where the dead be received after this life, of heaven and of hell; but of purgatory is not one word spoken. . . . The defenders of purgatory within this realm . . . say that it is a third place, but where or what it is, they confess themselves they cannot tell. And of God's word they have nothing to shew, neither where it is, nor what it is, nor that it is. But all is feigned of their own brains, without authority of Scripture...."

"They say it is a place of punishment, whereby they be purged from their sins, that depart out of this life not fully purged before. I cannot tell whether this saying be more foolish, or more contumelious to Christ. For what can be more foolish than to say, that pains can wash sin out of the soul ? . . . And what a contumely and injury is this to Christ, to affirm that all have not full and perfect purgation by His blood, that die in His faith. . . ."

"True it is that Scripture maketh mention of paradise and Abraham's bosom after this life, but those be places of joy and consolation, not of pains and torments. . . ."

"Furthermore, seeing that the Scriptures so often and so diligently teach us, almost in every place, to relieve all them that be in necessity . . . and so to all others that have need of our help, and the same in no place make mention either of such pains in purgatory, or what comfort we may do them, it is certain that the same is feigned for lucre, and not grounded upon God's word. For else the Scripture in some place would have told us plainly what case they stood in that be in purgatory, and what relief and help we might do unto them."²

Cranmer here conveniently overlooks the text in Maccabees, but even so, there are some few prayers for the dead in the First Prayer Book. There is a commemoration for the dead in the Communion Service, and a commendation of the soul of the departed in the funeral service. And the Act of Uniformity authorising the Second Prayer Book expressly said that the First Book was "agreeable to the word of God and the primitive

¹ First and Second Prayer Book, Calendar.

² *Cranmer* P.S., II, p. 161-2.*

Church, very comfortable . . . and most profitable," which would imply that such prayers for the dead as had been retained were at any rate not *contrary* to the Word of God. It may be considerations such as these which led Cranmer to omit the reference to such prayers in the 42 Articles.¹ There is the further point that Purgatory itself was definitely repudiated, and so prayers for the dead were really unnecessary, as was indeed implied by their omission from the Second Book.

(2) This brings us to the phrase "*Scholasticorum doctrina*." It is quite evident that by this phrase, Cranmer means the Scholastic theologians of the Church, i.e., the authentic and recognised expositors of Catholic doctrine and practice. It must be remembered that, apart from the definition of Florence, which Cranmer would reject, as not a really General Council,² there was no definition on Purgatory, and therefore the phrase "*M Scholasticorum doctrina* " was quite a reasonable one to use.

We shall see that in the Elizabethan Articles the phrase was replaced by "*Doctrina Romanensium*" the doctrine then having been defined officially by the "Roman" Council of Trent.

12. The Articles are thus seen to be a moderate, but definite statement, of Protestant teaching, as affirmed by the Church of England at this particular time. It must be remembered all through that Cranmer still hoped for a General Council of Protestant Churches, which would put forward a Common Liturgy, and a Common Creed. And he would naturally prefer on the whole to avoid committing himself too strongly on points upon which the Protestants themselves disagreed.³ But even so, the Articles are conspicuous for their apparent departure from Lutheran standards and terminology. As Dixon says, "the declining influence of the Protestant Confession of Augsburg is apparent, on comparing the Articles with the last attempt to frame an Anglican confession, the abortive draft of the latter years of Henry VIII."⁴

Similarly, Dr. Tyrrell Green says in his Article in the *Dictionary of English Church History* that "the 42 Articles are less Lutheran than the Articles of 1538," that "distinctive Lutheran language is avoided on Justification," and that "the Calvinistic catch-

¹ Even Bp. Goodrich, the Lord Chancellor, was not averse to *all* prayers for the dead. See his answer on p. 354.

² Cf. the King's Book, p. 299.

³ The Articles are said to be "for the avoidance of controversy in opinions, and the establishment of a godly concord in matters of religion."

⁴ *Op. cit.*, III, 523.

words are absent from the treatment of Predestination, the essential point of reprobation not even being mentioned."

Even so, the articles in the main lean towards the modified form of Swiss theology which was put forward by Calvin, especially on such matters as the Eucharist. So that it would seem that at this time *Cranmer was seeking in Calvinistic ideas a basis for the future agreement of the Protestant Churches.*

He was, as we have seen, careful to choose a middle course between the various views of the efficacy of the Sacraments. As to their number, he avoided committing himself definitely to the statement that there are only two real sacraments instituted by Christ. This would leave the path open for an agreement with any Protestants who felt inclined to regard Absolution as a third Sacrament instituted by Christ. But on the Eucharistic Presence, on the other hand, Cranmer definitely repudiates Lutheran views, and comes down heavily on the Zwinglian or Calvinistic side. The language may still be reconciled with some kind of a spiritual presence, but if so, it must be understood in the sense of a virtual presence, as taught by Calvin. Dr. Harwell Stone sets forth Cranmer's Virtualistic doctrine in the following terms¹:

"The faithful communicant sacramentally receives those effects of Christ's life and death which would be conveyed if there were a beneficial reception of His actual body and blood."²

Or again :

"The faithful communicant receives the virtue and grace of Christ's body and blood, which are themselves absent."³

On matters such as that of *Church organisation* and the *ministry*, Cranmer adopts language which would be acceptable to practically all Protestant parties. He avoids any statement or suggestion that episcopacy is necessary for a Church, or that those not ordained by a bishop are not real ministers. All that is required is that the ministers should be commissioned by those who have public authority in the Church for the purpose.

On matters on which all Protestants were agreed, as in the case of the repudiation of the Sacrifice of the Mass, Cranmer's language leaves nothing to be desired.

It would thus not be unfair to call the Forty-two Articles a moderate exposition of general Protestant doctrine, with a somewhat heavy bias against the Lutheran, and towards the Calvinistic or Zwinglian conception of things.

¹ Italics ours. ■ *History of the Doctrine of the Eucharist*, ii, 127. · *Ibid.*

But with regard to *specifically Catholic doctrines*, the case is altogether different. There can be no doubt whatever that *the 42 Articles were definitely intended to repudiate the official Catholic doctrine on points denied by the Reformers*, where such doctrines had been officially set forth. And where they had not yet received official expression, as in the case of Purgatory, or the Sacrifice of the Mass, language was used which made it plain that it was the accepted Catholic doctrinal standard which was being abandoned.

. It follows from this that, *objectively and historically, attempts to maintain that the Articles, at least as set forth in the reign of Edward VI, are "patient of a Catholic interpretation," or "not meant to exclude official Catholic doctrine, but only certain mediaval exaggerations," etc., are unfounded, and really dishonest.* It may be that, as Pocock says, present-day Anglicans are not called upon to subscribe the articles in their historical sense, or in the *sensu auctoris*. With that question we have no concern here. But one thing is quite clear, as Pocock says, and that is that *the Forty-two Articles, in their historical meaning, and in sensu auctoris, were fundamentally and thoroughly Protestant, definitely anti-Catholic, and formally and deliberately heretical.*

13. It only remains to say that when the Forty-two Articles were issued in 1553, it was officially stated in the title that they had received the approval of Convocation of 1552. Dr. Darwell Stone says that this was an "official fiction"; Dr. Gairdner is more emphatic and describes the statement as "a shameful piece of official mendacity."¹ It seems quite certain that the Articles were not submitted to the Convocation of 1552 or approved by it. Even so, there can be no doubt as to its *official character*. It was drawn up by a Committee consisting of bishops, etc., appointed for the purpose, the draft had been sent to the bishops, and the final form was approved and signed by the King, the Head of the Church. The Royal Mandate of June, 1553, ordered that all clergy, schoolmasters, and members of the universities, should subscribe to these Articles, which thus became the official doctrinal standard of the Church of England of that time.

¹ Lollardy, iii, p. 375.

CHAPTER XXI

THE CATECHISM, AND THE *REFORMATIO LEGUM*

A. THE CATECHISM.

After the Articles we must consider the “Catechism,” which was published at the same time. The First and Second Prayer Book had contained a short Catechism, which was to be learnt by children before confirmation. It comprised the Apostles’ Creed, the Ten Commandments, and the Our Father, but contained no instruction on the Sacraments. An almost identical catechism was also included in a *Primer*. Yet another catechism was composed by Poynt, Bishop of Winchester, and published in 1553, together with a royal Injunction commanding all schoolmasters to use it, and saying that it had been examined and approved by certain bishops, whose judgment the King highly esteemed. This is the Catechism published with the Articles. In it, the sacraments are described as “certain reasonable reverent doings and ceremonies ordained by Christ, that by them He might put us in remembrance of His benefits, and we might declare our profession that we be of the number of them which are partakers of the same benefits.” There is no reference here to the *giving of any grace through the sacraments*. The Catechism then goes on to discuss the two sacraments of baptism and the Lord’s Supper, without asking whether there are only these two. *Baptism* is described as an act by which a child is “openly, as it were, enrolled” into the Church, and the minister prays that it may “please God to grant him His grace, whereby he may answer in belief and life agreeably to his profession.”

Baptism also “*represents, and sets before our eyes,*”¹ that “we are by the Spirit of Christ new born, and cleansed from sin, that we be members and parts of His Church. . . . For water signifieth the Spirit. Baptism is also a figure of our burial in Christ, and that we shall be raised up again with Him.” There

x Italics ours throughout these citations.

is nothing here implying the *giving* of any grace, but only the *signification* of grace.

The Lord's Supper is described as

- 0 a certain thankful remembrance of the death of Christ, forasmuch as the bread representeth His body . . . the wine standeth in stead and place of His blood. . . . And even as by bread and wine our natural bodies are sustained and nourished, so by the body, that is the flesh and blood of Christ, the soul is fed through faith, and quickened to the heavenly and godly life. . . . These things come to pass by a certain secret mean, and, lively working of the Spirit; when we believe that Christ hath, once for all, given up His body and blood for us, to make a sacrifice and most pleasant offering to His heavenly Father, and also when we confess and acknowledge Him our only Saviour. . . ."**

The master here remarks to the pupil:

"Methinketh the meaning is : that faith is the mouth of the soul, whereby we receive this heavenly meat."

All this must be taken in conjunction with a statement concerning the Presence of Christ, in an earlier part of the Catechism, i.e., in the treatment of the Ascension article of the Creed :

"As touching the bodily presence of Christ here in earth (if it be lawful to place in comparison great things with small), Christ's body is present to our faith : as the sun, when it is seen, is present to the eye ; the body whereof, although it do not bodily touch the eye nor be presently with it together here in earth, yet is it present to the sight, notwithstanding so large a distance of space between. So Chnst's body, which at His glorious going up was conveyed from us, which hath left the world and is gone unto His Father, is a great way absent from our mouth, even then when we receive with our mouth the holy sacrament of his body and blood. Yet is our faith in heaven, and beholdeth that Sun of righteousness, and is presently together with him in heaven, in such sort as the sight is in heaven with the body of the sun, or in earth the sun with the sight."

This is the doctrine of the Real Absence in the plainest possible terms. It is not surprising that Dr. Darwell Stone should feel that this catechism "conveys either a receptionist or a virtualist doctrine,"¹ and that as Gairdner tells us, on Oct. 18th, 1553, Dr. Weston told Convocation (under Queen Mary) that it was "a book very pestiferous, and full of heresies."²

B. THE REFORMATIO LEGUM.

The last work we have to mention in connection with the Reformation under Edward VI is the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*.

¹ *Op. at.*, ii, 146.

^{*} *Lollardy*, iii, 377.

1. The abolition of the Papal Supremacy in the reign of Henry VIII dealt a tremendous blow, of course, to Church Law, and rendered a complete revision necessary. The immediate needs were met by Acts of Parliament, which were quite in accordance with the new polity, for the King had succeeded to the Pope as Head of the Church, with supreme jurisdiction in matters spiritual as well as temporal. Meantime, in the "Submission of the Clergy" Act of 1532, the clergy engaged to submit the canons of ecclesiastical law to a Royal Commission of thirty-two persons, half of them laymen, and the rest clergy. But this proposed Commission seems not to have met in Henry's reign.¹ Under Edward VI, however, the project was revived, and in 1551, a Commission of Thirty-two was actually appointed. The work was delegated to a sub-committee of eight, consisting of Archbishop Cranmer, Bishop Goodrich of Ely, Dr. Cox, the King's almoner, Peter Martyr, Dr. William May, Dr. Rowland Taylor, and two laymen, John Lucas and Richard Goodrick. They had apparently completed their labours by 1553, for it was presented by Cranmer to Parliament in March of that year. But three months later Edward VI died, and so nothing further was done in the matter until Elizabeth's reign. The Gode was then revised by Archbishop Parker, and printed by Foxe in 1571. But it was not officially adopted. Even so, its interest is great, for it contains *doctrinal statements of great importance*, seeing that *it was drawn up by those who were also responsible for the liturgical Reformation under Edward*,

2. As an illustration of the intolerant spirit even of the Protestants of the time, it is interesting to note with Dixon that the work is put into the mouth of the King, as Supreme Head on earth of the Church of England, and that "the King has not uttered five sentences before he threatens the goods and lives of his subjects who may meditate or do aught against the Christian religion" as defined by His Majesty.² Like the Decretals and the *Provinciale* of English Canon Law, this new work begins with an exposition of the Christian faith. But whereas the former works began with the Trinity and the Sacraments, this begins with the Trinity and Holy Scripture.

"The terms in which it lays forth the former carry the mind back, not to the majestic expressions of Innocent the Third,

¹ Cardwell, however, holds that the work was practically finished before the death of King Henry. (*Reformation of the Eccles. Laws*, Appendix, p. 325.)

² *History of the C. of E.*, iii, 371.

nor to the praiseworthy exposition of Archbishop Peckham, but to the days of Henry the Eighth, to the Augsburg Confession, or rather to those drafts of Articles that were made when the German orators visited England.”¹

3. Gap. 10, *De Haresibus*, condemns the *Mass* :

“*Nimis est curiosa perversitas qui veniam quidem peccatorum expectant, sed hanc morte Christi per solam fidem ad nos accomodatam non credunt et omnibus partibus impleri. Qua propter alia conquirunt sacrificia, quibus perpurgari possint, et ad hanc rem missas exhibent in quibus sacrificium Deo Patri credunt oblatum esse, nimirum corpus et sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu Christi vere, quomodoque illi dicunt realiter, ad veniam peccatorum impetrandam, et salutem tam, mortuorum quam vivorum procurandam.* . . . *Qua in re sacrificium illud unicum (quod Christus Dei Filius in cruce Deo Patri repraesentavit et plenissime exhibuit) largite imminuunt.* . . .”

The similarity between this and the corresponding Article is manifest.

4. Gap. 17 in the same section explains that sacraments are not merely nude signs, but rites by which faith is confirmed, and the promise of pardon of sins intrinsically “exhibited,” and extrinsically known {*cognoscatur*} as by a certain seal.

The number of sacraments is elsewhere specified as two only: “*Nos haec duo (Baptisma et Goena) sola pro veris et propriis N. Testamenti sacramentis ponimus.*”⁸

5. Passing over the article on baptism, we come to cap. 19, *De transubstantiatione in Eucharistia, et impanatione, ut vocant, corporis Christi*. This is very definite in its rejection of the real objective presence :

“*Obrepsit etiam in eucharistia periculosissimus error eorum qui docent, concionantur et contendunt, virtute certorum verborum quae minister ad symbola hujus sacramenti insurerrat, panem converti vel (ut ipsi loquuntur) transubstantiari in Christi corpus, et itidem vinum in sanguinem. Quod sane dogma quoniam sacris literis adversatur, a natura sacramenti discrepat, et verum Christi corpus ita pravat. . . . Totum hoc papisticae fecis somnium auferri volumus, et naturam veram panis et vini in eucharistia remanentem plane agnoscere, quomodo Spiritus sanctus apertis verbis attestatur. Itaque nec in altum tolli sacramentum hoc, nec circumferri patimur, nec conservari nec adorari; denique nullam relinquimus majorem eucharistia venerationem, quam baptismi et verbi Dei. Symbola vero panis et vini nisi prout et institutum a Scripturis usum communionis retineant, non majorem*

¹ Dixon, *op. cit.*

⁸ The phrase “ad veniam . . . procurandum” is added in Cranmer*« own handwriting, and corresponds to the similar addition to the 42 Articles. See p. 549.

* *De Sacram.* cap. 2.

astimationem habere volumus, quam panis et vinum habent qua quotidie inter nos in usu habentur."^x

Not content with thus condemning Transubstantiation, this new Code also rejects *Consubstantiation* :

"In eodem luto haerent qui panis et vini substantiam in eucharistia ponunt, sed vi consecrationis per ministrum appositae corpus et sanguinem Christi verum et naturalem adjungi putant, et cum symbolorum naturis permisceri, et subter eas subjici, usque adeo ut sive pii sint sive impii qui ad Domini mensam se admovent, verum et naturale Christi corpus et expressum ejus sanguinem, una cum pane et vino sumant."

Then we get a formal denial of the Real Presence :

"Verum symbola sacramentorum quoniam res quas significant, non intra se clausas realiter et substantialiter (ut loquuntur) continent; deinde cum sacris Scripturis determinatum sit Christum suam in coelum humanam naturam invexisse, nec cum illa sit in terras ante tempus extremi judicii descensurus ; praeterea cum haec commentitia naturalis corporis Christi praesentia nullum habeat majus momentum ad aedificationem nostrae religionis quam haec Christi praesentia quae fide percipitur, imo multas secum afferat quaestiones inexplicabiles, ac assertiones falsas et portentosas : absurdam hanc doctrinam qua Christi corpus et sanguis naturaliter et substantialiter (ut illi loquuntur) ad eucharistiam adrepunt, et in eam includuntur, prorsus aboleri volumus."

Also, in the Section *De Sacramentis*, cap. 4, we get another treatment of the Eucharist, which seems to contemplate reception in a sitting posture :

"Eucharistia sacramentum est, in quo cibum ex pane sumunt, et potum ex vino, qui convivae *sedent* in sacra Domini mensa; cujus panis inter illos et vini communicatione obsignatur gratia Spiritus sancti, veniaque peccatorum, ad quam ex eo perveniunt, quod fide comprehendunt et percipiunt Christi sacrosanctum corpus respectu nostrae salutis aa crucem fixum, et cruorem pro tollendis fusum nostris peccatis. . . . Cum autem ad haec omnia nec transubstantiatione opus sit, nec illa quam fingere solebant reali praesentia corporis Christi sed potius haec curiosa hominum inventa primum contra naturam humanam sint a Filio Dei nostra causa sumptam . . . ista tanquam frivola quaedam somnia merito desecanda curavimus, et oblivione obruenda."

6. In connection with *matrimony*, re-marriage after divorce is allowed in case of adultery, and annulment in cases of attempts to poison, etc.

As to *Holy Order*, cap. 16 in the section *De Haresibus* deals with "ministis et ordinibus," and condemns

illorum amentia qui . . . nec admittunt legitima« vocationes,

nec solemnem manuum impositionem, sed per omnes publice docendi potestatem divulgant, qui sacris literis utcunque sunt aspersi, et Spiritum sibi vindicant; nec illos solum adhibent ad docendum, sed etiam ad moderandam Ecclesiam et distribuenda Sacramenta.”

Similarly, in the section *De Sacramentis*, cap. 6 :

“ In praeficiendis Ecclesiarum ministris (quales sunt diaconi, presbyteri, et episcopi), ceremoniam manuum imponendarum retineri placet, quoniam illius in sacris Scripturis mentio sit, et perpetuum habuerit usum in Ecclesia.”

Thus, *the threefold ecclesiastical ministry is to be conserved, and the ceremony of laying-on of hands.* But even so, the rest of the Code has made it quite plain that it is a *Protestant ministry* which is thus to be perpetuated, and *not a sacrificial priesthood* in the Catholic sense.

CHAPTER XXII

CONCLUSION OF VOLUME ONE

Summing up the result of the Reformation in this reign of Edward VI, we call attention to the following points :

1. *The personnel of the Episcopate had been radically changed.* At the beginning of the reign there were eleven Anglo-Catholic bishops. In the course of the reign six were imprisoned, deprived, or forced to resign, one had died, and thus their number was reduced to four. The Protestant bishops, on the other hand, who numbered eight at the beginning of the reign, numbered thirteen at the end. There were eight Opportunists at the beginning, five at the end. *The Protestants thus had a majority over the Anglo-Catholic party, and, indeed had a bare majority over all the other bishops.*

2. *This Protestant party in the episcopate, with the assistance, positive or negative, of the Opportunists, carried through, in spite of the sustained opposition of the Anglo-Catholic party, a series of most radical changes in doctrine and discipline, all of which were of a Protestant character, and were calculated, and doubtless intended, to assimilate the Reformed Church of England to the Protestant Churches on the Continent. The celibacy of the clergy was abandoned; communion given under both kinds, the sacraments reduced effectively from seven to two, with a possible third. But far more serious was the change in the theology of the Eucharist. The doctrine of the Real Objective Presence was definitely rejected, and a " Virtual " or " Spiritual " and indefinite " presence " allowed in its stead. Concurrently with this the Sacrifice of the Mass had been abolished. To express the denial of the old teaching, and to inculcate the new, a new Communion Service had been introduced, and the stone altars were destroyed, and replaced by wooden tables or " boards."*

3. *Next came the abolition of the old conception of the Catholic priesthood, with its seven degrees, and its replacement by a Protestant ministry, in three degrees. The old Catholic Pontifical was replaced by a new Ordinal, based upon a German Lutheran rite, and breathing*

the spirit of Protestantism throughout. This new ordinal was already in operation. Six out of twenty-six diocesan bishops had been consecrated by it, and while the number of new Protestant clergy was as yet insignificant as compared with the whole, the ultimate replacement of the old Catholic priesthood by the new Protestant ministry would have been only a question of time.

4. In nearly all these reforms, we find that *the Protestant party were merely carrying to their logical conclusion certain ideas already set forth in the reign of Henry VIII.* And indeed, once the Church of England had cut herself off from the rest of the Catholic Church, and above all from its centre of unity, the See of Peter, and had surrendered itself body and soul to its new Royal Head, it is difficult to see how the course of events could have been otherwise than it was. So long as an "Anglo-Catholic" monarch such as Henry VIII was the Head of the Church, the dream of a non-Papal "Anglo-Catholicism" might seem to have some reality. But that could not be a permanent state, and when the reigning monarch happened to have other views, the character of the Church's doctrine and discipline was bound to change with it. Further, as the Continental Protestants such as Melancthon were never tired of urging, it was illogical, after breaking with the Pope, to conserve doctrines and practices which after all rested only on the authority of the Papal Church. Once Henry had gone, there was nothing to check the carrying out of the Reformation to its logical conclusion, and the bringing of the Church of England into line with the Reformed Churches abroad. This was accomplished in the reign of Edward VI, with *the help and assistance of the foreign Reformers who flocked to this country.* With their help and advice, the Protestant party succeeded in imposing upon the Church a new English service book, containing a Communion Service drawn up on Lutheran lines, then a new Ordinal, based on that of Bucer, and then a second Service Book and Ordinal which were more decidedly Calvinistic and Zwinglian in tendency. A new set of Articles of Religion became the Creed of the new Church, and emphasized its entirely Protestant character. Thus was the Church of England assimilated to the Protestant Churches abroad. *It was these Churches that the new Church of England looked upon as its sister Churches,* and together the Reformed Churches made up a loosely-knit association, all of them having separated from the Papal See, and in consequence, from the Churches which remained in communion with

it. We thus see Christian Europe definitely split up into two great camps : the great body of the Catholic Church, still rallying round its centre in the See of Rome, and once more formulating its doctrine and discipline, against Protestant errors and innovations, at the Council of Trent. The other camp is the very loose association of Protestant Churches, striving at this time to unite more closely against the common foe—an endeavour which was doomed to failure inasmuch as there was no longer any principle of cohesion, or centre of unity.

5. Accordingly, we need not be surprised to find statements which prove that by the Catholic Churches abroad, the new Church of England was regarded as *just one more Protestant Church*, and that the Continental Protestants regarded it in the same light. The two following quotations will bring this out very clearly. The first is from Dixon's *History of the Church of England, I*:

“ In Paris the Lenten preachers denounced the English as heretics, as one with the Lutherans. --- At Angers a friar, a celebrated preacher, denounced the King of England as a heretic. . . . The fame of the nation for impiety reached the height when three or four vessels, laden with the images that had been cast out of the English churches, anchored in the Seine, and opened their venerable wares to the reverent emulation of Rouen and of Paris. --- At the court of the Emperor the English name was in no better reputation. . . . The ambassador at Brussels, Chamberlain, wrote that ‘ people say that England is at this day the harbour for all infidelity.’ In Italy, as in France, the King and Council were called Lutherans. . . .”

Our second quotation is from a *Disputatio* by Martin Bucer, the apostate Dominican, at Cambridge, on August 6th, 1550:

“ If we are to listen to that part of the world which to-day claims the name of Christ, then England will be judged to have fallen away from Christ the Lord and from His Catholic Church, both in doctrines and in rites. But it is evident to all orthodox, and truly Catholic and Holy Churches, that those other churches, and their pseudo-bishops who pass this judgment on England, err most gravely, both in this their judgment, and in the whole ministration and life of religion.”

INDEX

- Abyssinian ordination rite, 54
 Abraham, 14, 15, 17, 20, 24, 390, 391
 Accidents, 102, *in*, 112, 210
 "Accipe Spiritum Sanctum, etc." in
 Roman Ordination Rite for priests,
 62-66, 142, 176, 215, 216, 219, 476
 "Accipe Spiritum Sanctum, etc." as
 partial form, 84, 92, 187, 477
 "Accipe Spiritum Sanctum, etc." in
 rite for consecrating bishops, 64, 66,
 94, 484
 Achelis, 41
Acts of Apostles, 26, 27, 33-36
Act of Supremacy, Henry VIII, 236
 -----of Elizabeth, 239 n.
 Adoration of the Sacrament, 118, 140,
 174, 175 n., 206, 209, 249, 342,
 343, 405, 413, 428, 441, 512,
 530 n., 531, 545, 546, 561
 Aerius, 144
 à Lasco, 326, 341, 518, 521
 Albert the Great, on tradition of in-
 struments, 82
 -----on Sacrifice of the Mass, 126-128
 Aldrich, Bp., 273, 282, 313, 330, 331,
 335, 347, 349, 35b 353, 355, 358,
 406, 410, 449, 506, 520
 Aicher of Liège, 99
 Aless, 250, 253, 386
 Alexandria, Ordinations at, 33 n., 38 n.,
 77
 Altars, destruction of, in England, 507
 et seq., 564
 — Anglican interpretation of, 399, 400,
 4*4, 5*4, 421, 442 n., 508, 509,
 527, 547, 548
 Ambrose, St., 24, 25, 106, 443
 Arnisdorf, consecrated by Luther, 160
 Anabaptists, 119
 Anaphora. See *Consecration Prayer*,
 Canon..
 Anglo-Catholic bishops, under Henry
 VIII, 240, 565
 — under Edward VI, 330, 565
 Anglo-Saxon ordination rite, 61
 Anne of Cleves, 311
 Anselm, St., 98
 Anspach, Peter, 126
Antididagma, 191 *et seq.*, 200, 380, 385,
 388, 399, 455
 " Antiochene rite, 38
Apocalypse, 23
Apostolicae Curae, xi, 492
Apostolic Constitutions, 42, 46, 54, 60, 454
 Apostolic Succession, 161, 297, 3^9-37L,
 A 538, 539
Apostolic Tradition, 29-31, 37, 42, 44>
 45» 54-56 n
 Armenian nte, 49, 67, 89, 90
 Articles, Schmalkaldic, 138, 271
 — Ten, 138, 243, 244 n., 245 *et seq.*, 253,
 263, 264, 301, 311, 533
 — Thirteen, 263 *et seq.*, 533, 555
 — Six, 271 *et seq.*, 303, 313, 331, 347>
 376
 — administered to Hooper, 494, 495,
 534
 — Gloucester (50), 534 *et seq.*
 — Worcester (19), 534 *et seq.*
 — Forty-two, 533 *et seq.*, 565
 — Thirty-nine, 133, 555
 Article Thirty-one (on Sacrifice of the
 Mass), 114, 124, 133, 170, 266,
 547, 548
 Arundel, Abp., *in*
 Augsburg, Confession of, on sacraments,
 121, 144
 — on Mass, 123-134
 — on ministry and orders, 143-145
 — Catholic Reply to, 124-126, 135, 144,
 179, 180
 — See also pp. 121 *et seq.*, 173, 241, 242,
 245-247, 250, 263, 532, 534, 539,
 A 555, 561
 Augustine, St., 24, 106, 445
 — on heretical baptism, 70
 à Wood, Antony, 309 n.
 Bainbridge Pontifical, 460 n.
 Bandinus, 86
 Baptism, heretical, 70
 — matter and form, 72
 — infant, 253
 — Catholic rite, 303
 — Anglican rite, 380, 381, 520
 — Luther and, 117
 Barbaro, 420, 501
 Barber, Trial of, 304
 Barlow, Bp., 243, 244 n., 252 n., 273,
 285, 289, 303 n., 308 *et seq.*,
 316-321, 331, 333, 335, 347, 348,
 350, 352, 358, 4*6, 4*9, 449, 520
 Barnes, Dr., 241
 Barnes, Mgr., xii, 308-311, 316, 319
 Barton, Very Rev. Dr., xii
 Basel, Confession of, 172

- Basil, St., 24
 \$ 379, 389
 oatiffol, Mgr., 13 n.
 Baumgarten, 119
 Bayne, 505 n.
 Bec, Pontifical of, 64 n.
 Beck, Fr., 240 n.
 Bel, Mgr., 54
 Belgian Confession, 177
 Bellarmine, St. Robert, and corporeal presence, **non**.
 — on Sacrifice of the Mass, 126
 Belloc, H., x, 233, 249, 299
 Benedict XIV and Greek Orders, 91, 92
 Berengarius, 96-98, 106, 109, **in**, 282
 Berne, abolition of Mass at, 164
 Bessarion, 90, 389
 Bethune-Baker, Dr., 13
 Bickford, Mgr., xii
 Biel, Gabriel, 268
 Bill, Dr., 534
 Billot, Card., 76 n.
 Bird, Bp., 331, 333-335, 348, 410, 520
 Birt, Dorn Norbert, 348 n.
 Bishops, in New Testament, 33, 76, 77
 — and priests, 74, 76, 145, 215-219
 — ordination rite in *Apostolic Tradition*, 38
 — ditto in *Canons of Hippolytus*, 41
 — in *Apostolic Constitutions*, 42, 43
 — in Serapion, 44
 — in Greek rite, 48, 49
 — in Nestorian rite, 51
 — in Syro-Jacobite rite, 52
 — in Coptic rite, 53
 — in Abyssinian rite, 54
 — in Armenian rite, 67
 — in Roman rite, 58
 — in Gallican rite, 59
 — in later Pontificals, 63, 66
 — Lutheran consecration of, 156, 222
 — Anglican rite for, 158, 481
 — Luther and, 141 *et seq.*, 151
 — Melancthon and, 146, 147, 458
 — Bucer and, 166, 167
 — Zwingli and, 172
 — Herman von Wied and, 190, 195
 — General Protestant conception of, 204, 326, 457, 458
 — cf. also *episcopate*.
Bishops' Book, 250, 251, 276, 304, 477
 Black Rubric, 530, 531, 546
 Boleyn, Anne, 233, 236, 243, 244 n., 251, 253, 309
 — George, 308
 Bonaventure, St., on bishops, 75
 — on ordination by heretics, 79
 — on unctions, 87 n., 88, 94
 — on tradition of instruments, 83-85, 87, 88, 94
 Boniface IX, Pope, and ordinations, 77
 Bonner, Bp., 238, 282, 314, 330, 331, 346, 347, 35b 353, 355, 359, 394, 402, 403, 405, 407, 410, 412, 449, 452, 5⁶ n., 509, 520
 Bonner, Bp., *Profitable and Necessary Doctrine*, 300
 Bosher, Joan, 4*9 »
 Bossuet, Bp., and Lutherans, 226-229
 Boudinhon, 312
 Bramhall, Abp., 310, 311
 Brandenburg, Ordinations at, 155
 — Liturgy of, 380, 381, 383, 389, 398, 399
 Brenz, John, 139, 423
 Brewer, 334
 Brightman, Dr., 192, 203, 301, 303, 305, 306, 360, 374, 378, 388, 402 n., 403, 475
 British Ordination rite, 61, 64
 Bucer, "Martin, 119, 134, 137, 138, 155, 162 *et seq.*, 172, 173, 188, 201 n., 341, 362 n., 400, 408, 416, 418, 423, 455, 45j, 495, 508, 509, 517, 532-534, 536, 576
 — doctrine on Eucharist, 162-164, 202, 214, 248, 327, 385, 386, 389, 401, 417, 418, 442
 — on Sacrifice of Mass, 164, 197-199, 211
 — on ministry and orders, 166, 215, 399
 — new Communion rite of, 164, 191
 — new Ordination rite of, 168, 169, 451 n., 455, 456, 463, 47b 472, 476-479, 483-485, 490, 565
 — *Constans Defensio*, 196, 197 *et seq.*, 415 n.
 — on Anglican Prayer Book, 510 *et seq.*, 521 *et seq.*
 — on Anglican Ordinal, 515
 Bugenhagen, 148, 149, 153, 156, 158, 159, 222, 242, 305, 380, 455, 456, 478
 Bulkeley, Bp., 312, 331, 335, 410, 506 n.
 Bullinger, 172, 177, 211, 332, 343, 371, 407, 408, 412 n., 414, 417-419, 423, 493-496, 507, 509, 517, 518, 532, 533, 535, 536, 542
 Burchardt, 275
 Burcher, John, 372, 402, 418, 495 n.
 Burnet, 238, 273, 279, 309, 332, 348
 Bush, Bp., 330, 331, 335, 347-349, 35b 353, 354, 358, 4<9>, 410, 449, 520
 Byzantine Rite, 28
 Caesarius of Arles, 80
 Cahors, Pontifical of, 64 n.
 Cajetan, 86
 Calixtins, 221
 Calvin, 138, 172, 173 *et seq.*, 211, 214, 215, 332, 342, 343, 364, 401, 415, 419, 455, 496, 532, 534, 536, 55b 556
 — and Augsburg Confession, 173
 — on number of sacraments, 173
 — on Real Presence, 173, 202, 249, 327, cf. *Virtual Presence*.
 — on Sacrifice of Mass, 174
 — and priesthood, 176
 — and bishops, 176
 — and ordination rite, 176, 177 n.
 — on sacrament of order, 177 n.

- Campbell, J. Y., 9
 Canon Law, 237, 560. Cf. *Reformatio Legum*.
 Canon of Mass, 28, 29, 213, 302, 385, 386 *et seq.*
 — abolished by Luther, 117, 385
 — abolished at Cologne, 191, 197
 Canon, in Bucer's Communion service, 165, 166
 — in Strassburg Communion service, 386
 — in Nuremberg Communion service, 386
 Canons of Hippolytus, 40, 41
 Canterbury and York, Reply to Leo XIII, 471, 474
 Capon, Bp., see *Salcot*.
 Capito, 173
 Cardwell, 519, 560 n.
 Carlstadt, 119
 Carthage, Canons of Fourth Council, 58, 66, 80, 81, 88, 93, 297, 454, 488
 Cassel, Church order of, 191
 Catechisms, Luther, 161
 — Justus Jonas, 161, 222, 368 *et seq.*, 389, 455 n.
 — Geneva (Calvin), 177
 — Heidelberg, 177
 — Trent, 214
 — Anglican, 558
 Catechumens, liturgy of, 28
 Catharinus, 126, 134
 Catherine of Aragon, 233
 ° Catholic, "as used by Luther, etc., 159, 191, 264, 341
 — new Anglican conception of, 240, 254, 255, 293, 294, 338, 341, 424 n.
 Cecil, William, 365, 366
 Celibacy, 224-226, 242, 243, 272, 274,
 Chad, Reordination of, 78
 Chaldean rite, see Nestorian Liturgy.
 Chambers, Bp., 331, 334, 335, 409, 410
 Champneys, Wm., 312
 Chapuys, 235, 239 n.
 Chasuble, 64, 222
 Chemnitz, Martin, 140, 204 n.
 Chrysostom, St. John, on Real Presence, 13» 389
 — on Sacrifice of Mass, 25, 434
 — Mass of, 379, 389
 Church Orders, 37
 Church Quarterly Review, 381, 389, 492. *cf. page, W.*
 Church Times, 221 n., 222 n.
 Church, Unity of, 254, 255, 257, 293
 Cistercians, power to ordain deacons, 77
 Clarke, Dr. Lowther, 380
 Clayton, J., 479 n.
 Clement I, Pope, *Epistle to Corinthians*, 22, 27, 37
 Clement VII, Pope, 233
 Clement VIII, Pope, and Greek Orders, 91
 Clement, Liturgy of, 379, 388
 Clerk, Bp., 253, 301
 Clergy Review, 192, 240 n., 388
 Cochlaeus, John, 124
 Collier, 289 n., 454
 Cologne, Provincial Council of, 185, 455
 — Reformation at, 164, 169, 185 *et seq.*
 — cf. Hermann, *Encheiridion*, etc.
 — new Communion service, 203
 Commandments, Ten, 522
 Communion Book (1548), 358 *et seq.*, 378 n., 383, 384, 394, 400 n.
 Communion Service, in First Prayer Book, 306, 367, 382 *et seq.*, 510 *et seq.*
 — in Second Prayer Book, 521 *et seq.*
 Communion under one or both kinds, 118, 207, 243, 274, 358, 359
 — Protestant teaching on, 204, 207, 272
 — Bucer on, 197
 — Abp. Hermann von Wied on, 189, 190, 194
 Concélébration, 30
 Concord, Formula of, 140
 Concupiscence, 264
 Confession, Auricular, 223, 264, 272-275, 280-285, 288, 295, 382
 — cf. *Penance*
 Confirmation, Council of Trent on, 206
 — Bishops' Book, 260, 261
 — King's Book, 294
 — Henrician Bishops on, 253, 279-281, 285, 286, 290, 317, 318
 — Anglican rite of, 381, 382, 405, 521
 — matter and form of, 72
 — Melancthon on, 122
 — Luther on, 179 n.
 Consecration Prayer in Mass, 27, 28. See also *Canon*
 Consecration Prayer in Ordinals, 60
 Consecration, in Bucer's Communion service, 165, 166
 — in Cologne service, 194, 197
 — cf. also 211
 Constance, Council of, 107, 108, 112, 113, 237
 Constant, Abbé, x, xn, 237, 246, 249, 250, 252 n., 253 n., 263 n., 274, 280 n., 287, 299, 300, 301, 361 n., 378» 385, 395 «» 400, 414 n., 528
 Consubstantiation, 115, 117, 119» 120, 202, 246 n., 562
 Convocations, 236, 311, 402, 403, 518, 519, 534, 557, 559
 Coppens, Abbé, xii, 37 n., 40 n., 43
 Coptic rite, 44, 53
 Corbey, Pontifical of, 64 n.
 Coren, Dr., 283, 314
 Corinthians, *Epistle to*, 9, 18, 19
 Cornelius, Pope, 70
 Cosin, Bp., 528
 Courayer, 312
 Courvoisier, 166

- Corporeal Presence, **no**, 119, 425, 427,
 CouncHst^accepted by Anglican Church,
 257, 292
 Coverdale, Bp., 335, 336, 348, 364, 503,
 520, 522
 Cox, Dr., 284, 292, 315, 318, 319, 350,
 352, 355, 356, 375, 376, 422, 45b
 518, 560
 Cranmer, Thomas, Abp., 234-236, 240,
 243 n., 244 n., 251, 253, 254,
 263-265, 270, 273, 274, 276, 280,
 289, 292, 301, 310, 325, 331, 333,
 335, 336, 34b 347, 340, 352, 355,
 356, 358, 373, 374, 409, 449, 450,
 452, 455, 493, 496, 50b 503,
 506-508, 510, 517, 518, 533-535,
 55b 560, 561
 — translation of Justus Jonas, 166, 328,
 368 *et seq.*, 431, 442, 443
 — and Bugenhagen, 149
 — and Bucer, 169, 201 n., 415 n.
 — and *Antididagma*, 192 n., 195, 196
 — on Sacrifice of Mass, 277, 327-329,
 349, 354, 426, 427, 431-434, 443,
 445-447, 549
 — on sacraments, 285, 286, 317, 318
 — on Holy Order, 286-288, 313, 314,
 328, 329, 371, 435, 436, 446, 457,
 458
 — on Real Presence, 303 *et seq.*, 326, 329,
 368, 369, 379, 400, 406-409, 414,
 424 *et seq.*, 440, 444, 531
 — and General Council of Protestants,
 340 *et seq.*
 — liturgical reforms of, 305, 326, 346,
 348 *et seq.*, 360, 374, 375, 378, 389,
 399, 405 n., 4^c, 45b 518, 520,
 53^o
 — Commonplace Book, 379, 380, 385,
 389
 Cromwell, Thomas, 234, 238-240, 245,
 250, 274, 304, 309, 3^c, 3²
 Crozier, see *Pastoral Staff*
 Cruciger, 242
 Cyprian, St., on Sacrifice of Mass, 24, 445
 — on heretical baptism, 70
 Cyril of Alexandria, St., 13, 25
 Cyril of Jerusalem, St., 12, 24, 30
- D'Alès, 84 n., 86, 90
 Damply, Adam, 304
 Day, Bp., 283, 314, 330, 331, 333, 347,
 35b 353, 355, 35^a, 359, 374, 375,
 377, 404, 405 n., 407, 410, 449,
 45², 529
 Deacons, in New Testament, 33, 215, 297
 — ordination rite, in New Testament, 34
 — ditto, in *Apostolic Tradition*, 39
 — in *Canons of Hippolytus*, 42
 — in *Apostolic Constitutions*, 44
 — in Serapion, 45
 — in Greek rite, 47
- Deacons, in Nestorian rite, 49, 5^o
 — in Syro-Jacobite rite, 51
 — in Coptic rite, 53
 — in Abyssinian rite, 56
 — in Roman rite, 57
 — in Gallican rite, 58
 — in later Pontificals, 460 *et seq.*
 — mediaeval theology of, 73
 — ordination of, by abbots and priests,
 — Anglican ordination rite, 460 *et seq.*
 Dead, Prayers for, 262, 387, 392, 420,
 513, 52b 553-555
 — cf. *Purgatory*.
 Denmark, Lutheran Bishops in, 156, 189,
 222, 308
 Denny and Lacey, *De Hierarchia Anglt-*
 cana, 92
 Development of doctrine, 3-5
 Dictionary of National Biography, 331,
 333-335» 499, 504, 505,
 Dictionary of English Church History, 312,
 322, 498, 555
 Didache, 22, 27, 37
 Dimock, *Dangerous Deceits*, 124 n., 550
 Dixon, *History of Church of England*, xi,
 247, 254, 268, 271, 289 n., 300,
 301, 36b 374, 457 n., 495 »^c,
 530 n., 535, 546, 555, 560, 561
 Donatists, 70
 Dowden, Bp., 492
 Downe, 376, 377
 Drakes, Robert, 453
 Dryander, 341, 417, 536
 Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, 30, 38 n.,
- Durandus, *Rationale*, 65, 73, 82, 87, 94
 — on bishops, 75
 — on heretical ordination, 7g
 — on Canons of Carthage, 81
 — on tradition of instruments, 82, 87
 — on unction, 87, 94
- Easton, B. S., 30, 38-40
 East Syrian rite, see *Nestorian Liturgy*.
 Eck, John, 125, 135, 180, 183
 Eddi, *Life of St. Wilfrid*, 78 n.
 Edward VI, x, 325, 531, 564-566
 Edgworth, Dr., 283, 315
 Egbert Pontifical, 59, 64 n.
 Elephantine, Jewish Colony at, 17
 Elevation, 118, 385, 386, 390, 405, 413,
 525, 545-547, 561
 Elevation, Lesser, 392
 Elizabeth, Queen, xi, 312, 376, 504, 505
Encheiridion of Cologne, 87, 91, 186, 301,
 303, 455
 English Church Union, 223
 Ephrem, St., 24
 Epiclesis, 388
 Episcopate and priesthood, 32, 33, 219,
 258, 260, 281, 282, 284, 285, 287,
 457 n

- Episcopate, matter and form of, 93, 94
 Erasmus, 235, 379, 487
 Escourt, 54, 250, 452
 Eucharist, Catholic and Protestant con-
 ceptions of, ix
 — Scriptural teaching on, ix
 — Patristic teaching, ix
 — Liturgy of, in New Testament, 26, 27
 Eugenius IV, Pope. See *Florence, Council of*
 Eusebius, 129
 Evennett, H. O., xii
 Examination of deacons in Anglican
 ordination rite, 563
 — of priests in Anglican rite, 472
 — of bishops, in Anglican rite, 481-483
 — of bishops, in Roman rite, 64, 66, 67,
 482, 483
 Exeter Pontifical, 66, 453, 484 n., 488
 ²² exhibited, 123, 137, 138, 163, 172,
 174, 188, 202, 206, 207, 210, 242,
 248, 264, 265, 295, 296, 417, 418,
 438, 442, 477
 Extreme Unction, Melancthon on, 122
 — Luther on, 179 n.
 — Hermann von Wied on, 195
 — in Bishops' Book, 260, 261
 — in King's Book, 295
 — Henrician Bishops on, 282, 284, 285,
 288, 290, 318
 — in First Prayer Book, 382

 Fagius, 341, 415 n., 416, 418
 Faithful, Mass of the, 28
 Farel, William, 173
 Febronius, 223 n.
 Ferrar, Bishop, 331, 333, 335, 348, 365,
 373, 375, 449, 452, 503, 520 n.
 Ficker, J., 125 n.
 Finland, Lutherans in, 222
 Firmilian, on heretical baptism, 70
 Firminger, Dr., xii, 38 n., 39 n., 41 n.,
 59 n., 64 n., 65 n., 74 n., 451,
 452 n.
 Fisher, St. John, 16, 96 n., 179, 183, 233,
 379
 Florence, Council of, and Purgatory, 555
 — and Sacrifices of Masses, 113, 114, 551
 — and Primacy of Pope, 237, 298, 299
 — Decree *ad Armenos*, 71, 89-92, 94, 183
 Fofi, Abbot, 77
 Foix, Pontifical of, 65
 Form of sacraments, imperative, 71
 — alteration of, 79
 Forse, Rev. E., 221 n.
 Fox, Bp. of Hereford, 235, 241, 243,
 244 n., 246, 253, 254, 263
 Foxe, Martyrologist, 274, 275, 306, 332,
 377, 421, 453, 560
 France, Reformation in, 306
 Frankfort, Reformers at, 376
 Frere, Bp., 40 n., 348 n., 452 n., 453,
 501-503
 Fuller, 374, 375

 Gairdner, Dr., xii, 108 n., 233, 234, 240,
 243 n., 244 n., 246-248, 250,
 253 n., 261, 262, 275, 334, 341 n.,
 349 n., 359, 425, 448 n., 499,
 533-535, 546 n., 552, 557, 559
Galatians, 117
Gallican Confession, 177
 Gallican rite, 56-58, 61-64, 66, 67, 80,
 446, 473, 474
 Gardiner, Bp., 235, 241 n., 243, 244 n.,
 273, 274, 301, 325, 330, 331, 333,
 346, 359, 365, 366, 379, 388 n.,
 411-414, 449, 499, 509, 520
 — and corporal presence, *no n.*, 119 n.,
 389, 400, 425 n., 437 *et seq.*
 — and sacrifice of Mass, 193 n., 366-368,
 434, 438
 — and Book of Common Prayer, 413
 et seq., 439 *et seq.*, 499, 515, 525,
 526
 — and Ordinal, 500, 501, 506
 Gasquet and Bishop, *Edward VI and Book of Common Prayer*, xii, 305 n.,
 358 n., 359, 361 n., 363 n., 367,
 373-375, 379, 388-390, 395 n.,
 399, 402-405, 414, 441, 448 n.,
 453, 509 n., 518 n., 532
 Gebhardt, 41
 Gee, Dr., 518 n.
 Gelasian Sacramentary, 58, 59, 81
 Gelasius, *History of Council of Nicaea*, 434
Genesis, 14, 24
 Geneva, Communion rite, 203
 Gerbert, 96
 Gerebrar, 17
 Gerson, John, 86
 Gildas, 64
 Gnostics, 10
 Goodrich, Bp., 243, 244 n., 253, 273, 301,
 3*3 n., 305, 331, 333, 335, 347,
 349, 352, 354, 358, 374, 375, 406,
 409, 410, 415 n., 449, 450, 508,
 510, 517, 518, 530, 531, 555 n.,
 560
 Goodrick, Richard, 560
 Goossens, Dr., xii, 6
 Gore, Bp., 59 n.
 Gorham, 508 n., 535 n., 536 n., 543 n.
 Gotti, Cardinal, 83
 Greek Ordination rite, 44, 46, 81, 90-92,
 486
 Greek Liturgies, 379, 513
 Green, Dr. Tyrrell, 533, 555
 Gregory IX, Pope, and reordinations, 88
 Grindal, Abp., 415 n., 456, 534
 Grisar, 117
 Groepper, John, 185 n., 186, 191
 Grynaeus, 172
 Guest, Bp., 518 n.

 Haddon, Editor of *Bramhall*, 310-312
 Haddon, Henry, 509
Hall's Chronicle, 251

- Haneberg, 41
Hardenburg, 341 n., 342
Hardwick, *History of Articles*, 250, 340 n., 535
Harley, Bp., 335, 338, 348, 506, 534
Harnack, 41
Harris, 398
Haynes, Dr., 373, 375, 376, 42s, 451
Hebrews, Epistle to, and Real Presence, 9
— and Sacrifice of Mass, 14, 19*21, 129, 130, 135, 180
Hefele, 222 n.
Heidelberg Catechism, 177
Helvetic Confession, First, 172, 249
— Second, 177
Heath, Abp., 241, 282, 292, 314, 330, 331, 333, 347, 351, 353, 355, 356, 359, 405, 408, 410, 449, 450, 451, 497-500, 504, 506, 509, 520
Henry VIII, Reformation under, x, 306, 307
— *Assertio Septem Sacramentorum*, 179, 181, 233
— Marriage with Anne Boleyn, 236
— and revision of Bishops* Book, 276 *et seq.*
— on Holy Order, 277, 278, 290, 291, 316
Hermann von Wied, 185, 188, 196, 201, 205, 206
Hesse, Ordination rite, 154
Heylin, 402, 403 n., 450, 454, 518
Hierarchy, grades of, and origin of, 32 *et seq.*
Hildebert, 86
Hilles, R., 416
Hilsey, Bp., 253, 273, 303 n.
Hincmar of Rheims, 96
Hippolytus, Anaphora of, 28, 29. Cf. *Apostolic Tradition*,
History, appeal to, 5
Holbeach, Bp., 331, 332, 347, 350, 352, 354, 356, 358, 373-375, 406, 409, 410, 422, 449, 450
Holgate, Abp., 301, 331, 332, 335, 347, 348, 350, 352, 409, ÖH, 518, 520
Homilies, 345
Homocousion, 5
Honorius of Autun, 65, 86
Hook, 377
Hooper, Bp., 19 n., 309 n., 33s, 333, 335-338* 348, 414-416* 44a n., 478, 493-496, 507, 518, 520, 529, 530 n., 533-543* 553
Home, Bp., 534
Hubert, 165
Hugh of St. Victor, 65, 73, 81, 82, 469
Hugon, Père, 76 n.
Huss, 105, 106, 112, 113
Hymns, liturgical, 27
Ignatius of Antioch, on Sacrifice of Mass, 23
— on episcopate, 33
Immaculate Conception, 5
Impanation, 8, 99, 107, 561
Infallibility, 5
Innocent III, Pope, 356, 560
Innocent IV, and reordination, 88
Innocent VIII, and ordination, 77
Institution of a Christian Man, see *Bishops* Book*
Institution, Words of, 8, 18, 19, 107, 514, 516, 525
Intention, doctrine of, 70, 79, 206, 223
Intention of Anglican Ordinal, 457-459
Irenaeus, St., on Real Presence, 10, 137
— on Sacrifice of Mass, 23
Isidore, St., *De Officiis*, 58
Ivo of Chartres, 65, 81
Jacob, Canon, 128
Jacobs, Dr., 361 n., 363 n.
Jalland, Rev. T., 388
James, Liturgy of St., 29, 388
Jerome, St., on bishops, 76, 141, 146, 167
Jerome of Prague, 105, 106, 112, 113
Johai, Rabbi, 16
John ab Ulmis, 371, 408, 423, 507, 517
John, Gospel of St., and Real Presence, 6
— and Sacrifice of the Mass, 18
John VIII, Pope, and reordination, 78
Jordan, Rev. Dr., 224
Josephus, 15
Journal of Theological Studies, 310
Judges, *Book of*, 16
Jurisdiction of bishops, 151, 259
Justification, 246, 247 n., 254, 262, 264, 555
Justin Martyr, on Real Presence, 10
— on Sacrifice of the Mass, 22, 23
— on Eucharistic rite, 27, 28
Justus Jonas, 159, 160, 242, 341 n.
— Catechism of, 161, 222, 368 *et seq.*, 389* 455 n.
Kidd, Canon, xi, xii, 127, 132, 170, 172, 180, 221 n., 245, 268, 550
King, Bp., 330, 332, 335, 410, 449, 503, 504, 506, 520
Kimhi, Rabbi, 16
King's Book, 269, 289 n., 292 *et seq.*, 301, 302, 304, 454 n.
Kitchin, Bp., 331, 335, 347
Knox, John, 630, 531, 534* 552, 553
Lacey, Rev. T. A., 309 n., 313, 498, 506
Lambeth Conference and Swedish Orders, 223
Lambert, Trial of, 304
Lanfranc, 97 n., 98, 406
Last Supper, 8, 26, 33
Iceland, Lutherans in, 222
Ignatius of Antioch, on Real Presence, 10

- Lateran, Council of (1215), 99, 102, 106,
112, 237, 249, 382, 544
- Lattey, Rev. C., 18
- Latimer, Bp., 243-246, 251, 253, 273,
3°x 3°3 n., 326, 407
- Laurence, Abp., 533 n.
- Laurentius Petri of Upsala, 222
- Lea, H. C., 348 n.
- Lebreton, Père, 13 n.
- Lee, Edward, Abp., 253, 273, 281, 313,
334
- Lee, Dr. Roland, 243, 244 n.
- Leaning, Rev. B., xii
- Legg, Dr. Wickham, 159, 305, 382
- Leibnitz, 224, 226
- Leighton, Dr. 284, 314
- Leo IX, Pope, 544
- Leo XIII, *Apostolica Cura*, 492
- Leonine Sacramentary, 57, 58, 474
- Le Plat, 123, 125, 222
- Lewes, R., 313, 315
- Lietbert, *Life of*, 65
- Lisle, Lady, 310
- Litanies, in Roman Rite, 57, 63, 66, 461,
471, 481
- *9re^>* 305
- Anglican, 305, 452, 462, 468, 471,
481, 482, 531, 532
- Liturgy and Worship*, xi, 38 n., 59 n., 64 n.,
65 n» 74 n., 191, 305, 374 n., 380,
398, 402 n., 451, 520, 522 n.,
532 n.
- Lollards, 108, 109, 044
- London, Council of, **m**, 112
- Longland, Bp., 253
- Loofs, 13
- Lorentz, R., 37 n.
- Lorraine, Cardinal of, 217
- Lubeck, 133
- Lucas, John, 560
- Lunn, Rev. J. R., 309 n., 312, 313,
504n., 505 n.
- Luther, 106, 112, 115 *et seq.*, 162, 179 n.,
204-207, 241, 242, 522
- and corporeal presence, **no n**,
327, 442
- and Consubstantiation, 115, 117, 119,
120, 206, 214
- and Transubstantiation, 115, 138
- and Sacrifice of the Mass, 116, 133,
134, 137, x79 n» 211, 328
- and priesthood, 116, 141 *et seq.*,
x5, 0, 15X, 181, 182, 184, 215, 328
- and bishops, 141-144, 148, 151, 152,
x59, 160, 229 n.
- and number of sacraments, 117, 205
- and Confession of Augsburg, 121
- censured by University of Paris,
179 n., 181
- Catechism of, 161
- Ordination rites of, 152 *et seq.*, 159,
222
- new Latin Mass, 117, 118, 203, 383
et seq.
- Luther, new German Mass, 117, 191,
203
- Lutheran Orders, 221 *et seq.*
- Lyons, Second Council of, 71, 100
- Maccabees*, 553, 554
- Macchiavelli, 234
- Mackenzie, see Brightman
- Maclear, 133
- Magdalene College Pontifical, 62-64, 66,
453, 49°
- Mainz, Council of (1549), 66, 92, 93, 455
- Ordination rite at, 65, 66, 92, 93
- Maitland, 240
- Malachias, 17, 19, 22, 23, 180, 212, 446
- Marburg, Conference at (1529), **no**
- Marcion, **n**
- Maronite rite, 44, 52
- Martene, 469
- Martin V, Pope, 112
- Mary, B. V. M., 253, 387
- Mary, Queen, xi, 80, 312, 332, 334, 336,
368, 374, 375, 377, 452, 504-506
- Maskell, *Monumenta*, 469
- Mason, Archdeacon, 312
- Mass, Sacrifice of, 4, 5, 14 *et seq.*, 107,
123, 128 *et seq.*, 135, 179, 180,
185-187, 192, 193, 212-214, 438,
see also, "*Sacrifices of Masses*."
- Luther and, 116 *et seq.*
- Reformers and, 203, 210, 214, 246,
267
- Tunstall on, 268, 269
- in Ten Articles, 251
- in Bishops' Book, 261
- in King's Book, 296, 297, 299
- in *Rationale*, 302
- Bp. Coverdale on, 336
- Bp. Hooper on, 337
- Matrimony, Sacrament of, 562
- Melancthon on, 122
- Henrician Bps. on, 281, 286
- in Bishops' Book, 260, 261
- in King's Book, 295
- Anglican rite of, 382
- May, Dr., 373-376» 45X, 560
- Medler, Nicholas, 160
- Melancthon, 118, 119, 162, 188, 242,
246 n., 247, 263, 271, 272, 275,
340-343, 455, 533 y
- Confession of Augsburg, 121, 122,
136, 173, x74 0
- on Real Presence, 138, 140, 202, 423,
442, 443
- on Sacrifice of Mass, 126, 127, 133,
136, 137, 200, 211, 266
- on ministry and orders, 143, 145-150,
156, 159» 215, 458, 478
- Melchisedech, 14-17, 19, 20, 24, 176, 179
- Micronius, 418, 419, 494, 518
- Midrash, 16
- Mitre, 64, 67, 222, 488
- Moberly, R. H., xii

- Molanus, 224, 225
 Monarchical Episcopate, 76
 Monophysites, 13, 54
 Mordheisen, 140
 Morinus, 47, 61, 65 n., 474
 Moses Hararsan, 16
 Moses, Rabbi, 17
 Moss, Rev. G. B., 223
 Moyes, Mgr., xii
 Mozarabis Rite, 58, 379, 381, 389
 Myconius, 172
- Necessary Doctrine and Erudition of a Christian Man. See King's Book.*
 Nestorian Liturgy, 29, 49
 Nestorius, 13
 Nicaea, First Council of, 5, 434, 446
 Nominalists and Real Presence, 99.
 Cf. William of Occam and Peter d'Ailly
 Northumberland, Duke of, 332
 Norway, Lutheran Bishops in, 156, 222, 305
 Nuremberg rite and Sacrifice of Mass, 132, 133> 363» 380> 381> 383, 389j 390» 416
- Ochino, 341
 (Ecolampadius, 172, 173, 206, 304
 Offertory, 28, 117, 118, 302, 384, 395, 396, 523.
 — in Bucer's rite, 104
 Oldcastle, Sir John, 109, **in**, 112
 Old Catholics, xi
 Order, Sacrament of, Catholic teaching on, 32, 73 *et seq.*, 181-184, 187, 195, 206, 214
 — matter and form of, 80 *et seq.*, 91-94, 183
 — minister of, 74-77
 — changes in form of, 79, 84, 89, 92
 — Luther on, 116, 140 *et seq.*, 181, 182
 — Melancthon on, 145 *et seq.*
 — Hermann von Wied on, 190
 — Bucer on, 168, 169, 200
 — Zwingli on, 172
 — Calvin on, 176
 — General Protestant teaching on, 204
 — Henrician Bishops on, 280-284, 313, 316 *et seq.*
 — Barlow on, 313
 — Cranmer on, 286-288, 313, 314, 316 *et seq.*
 — in Bishops' Book, 257, 258, 261, 269
 — T in Thirteen Articles, 264, 265
 — in King's Book, 269, 296, 297
 — in Forty-two Articles, 538, 539
 — in *Reformatio Legum*, 562, 563
 Orders, Anglican, condemned by ecclesiastical authorities in England, xi
 — by Rome, xi
- Orders recognised by Old Catho. ›
 — recognised by Eastern Patriar. 'go
 Ordinal, Anglican, x, >>, 80> x49, 3^o * 447, 448 *et seq.*, 529, 555» 552, 553, 564, 565^
 — Bucer and, 169, 455, 450
 Ordination rite in Pontifical, 3^o 3, 4^{go}
 Ordinations, heretical and simoniacal, 71, 78 *et seq.*
Ordines Romani, 58
 Origen on Eucharist, 23, 24
 Original Sin and Sacrifice of Mass, 123 *et seq.*, 245, 267, 55^o
 Osiander, 235, 244 n., 380, 381
 Oxford, University of, on Wycli, 109-m, 119 n.
- Page, W., 374, 377, 378, 403 n.
 Paschasius Radbertus, 95-97
 Pastoral Staff, 63 n., 64
 Paul, St., Ordination of, 35, 38
 Paul III, Pope, and Luther, 153
 Parker, Dr. Matthew, Abp., 560
 — translation of Bucer's *Constans Defensio*, 196, 201, 334, 348, 415 n. 508
 Peckham, Abp., 561
 Penance, Sacrament of, Luther on, 117
 ----- Melancthon on, 121
 ----- Hermann von Wied on, 195
 ----- Henrician Bishops on, 282, 283, 286, 290
 ----- in Thirteen Articles, 264
 ----- in King's Book, 295, 297
 ----- in First Prayer Book, 382
 ----- cf. *Confession*
 Perre, 534
 Peter d'Ailly, 100-102, 107
 Peter Martyr, 341, 372, 408, 422, 495, 510, 516-518, 523, 629-531, 535, 538» 542, 548, 560
 Peter Lombard, on heretical ordination, 78
 — on tradition of instruments, 82
 — on unctions, 86
 Peter of Tarentaise, 85
 Philip of Hesse, Landgraf, 155
 Philippson, 221 n.
 Philo, 15
 Phinehas, Rabbi, 16
 Pighius, Albert, 126
 Pilgrimage of Grace, 251
 Pocock, 273, 348, 420 n., 498, 523 n., 533» 539, 557
 Poissy, Colloquy of, 221
 Pole, Cardinal, 234, 407, 420, 477
 — and King's Book, 300
 Pollanus, 341 n., 521
 Pollard, 233, 235, 250
 Poynt, Bp., 335, 336, 348, 368, 520, 558 *et seq.*
 Prague, 141

Prague, University of, 112
 Prayer of Humble Access, 302» 394» 441»
 515, 525
 Presbyter, 32, 35, 4°
 Priesthood in the English Church, 59 n.,
 452 n.
 Priest and priesthood, ix, x, 4» 33»
 v 73i 74
 — when instituted, 33
 — ordination of, in New Testament, 35
 — in *Apostolic Tradition*, 38, 39
 — in *Apostolic Constitutions*, 43
 — in *Canons of Hippolytus*, 41, 42
 — in Serapion, 44, 45
 — in Greek rite, 48
 — in Nestorian rite, 50
 — in Syro-Jacobite rite, 52
 — in Coptic rite, 54
 — in Abyssinian rite, 56
 — in Roman rite, 57
 — in Gallican rite, 58-59
 — in Armenian rite, 67
 — in later Pontificals, 61, 64, 468 *et seq.*
 — in Anglican rite, 468 *et seq.*
 Priests, as ministers of ordination, 39,
 76, 77, 147, 204, 215-217, 219 n.,
 281, 283, 284
 Proclamation, in Greek rite, 47, 48
 — absent from Nestorian rite, 51
 — in Syro-Jacobite rite, 51, 52
 — in Coptic Rite, 53
 — in Armenian rite, 67, 68
 Procter, 326, 402, 474
 Psalm 109, 14, 18
 Psalm 72, 16, 17
 Pseudo-Dionysius, 46, 82, 88, 93, 197
 Punit, Dom, 33 n.
 Purgatory, doctrine of, 223, 245, 248,
 251, 261, 262, 553, 554, 555, 557
 Pursglove, Bp., 503-506
 Purvey, John, 108
 Pusey, Dr., 328
 Qüiignon, Cardinal, 305, 379
 Ranke, 133
Rationale, 193 n., 301 *et seq.*, 304
 Ratramnus, 96, 329
 "Receive the Holy Ghost," in ordination
 rite of Hesse, 155, 477
 — in Anglican rite for priests, 476, see
 also, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*.
 Redmayne, Dr., 284, 292, 314, 373, 375,
 nr 377, 450
Reformatio Lsgum, 496, 517, 535, 559
 et seq.
 Reformation, Continental, ix, 105 *et seq.*
 Regemann, 133
 Reppes, Bp., 244, 253» 3'0, 311, 330,
 33b 347, 35b 355, 359, 405, 4'0,
 44-9
 Reservation of the Sacrament, 140, 206,
 209, 356, 393, 529, 543, 545, 546,
 561

Review of the Churches, 224
 Rhaban Maur, 96
 Ridley, Bp., 305, 326, 327, 329, 331, 335,
 347, 349, 352, 354, 358, 373-375,
 406, 408-410, 412, 421, 449-454,
 5°3, 505, 517, 518, 520, 530, 531
 — and Paschasius Radbertus, 96 n.
 Ring, use in ordination, 63, 64, 67, 488
 Rivière, 185
 Robert, Abp. Benedictional of, 62-64
 Robert of Jumièges, Pontifical of, 59
 Robertson, Thomas, 284, 314, 373»
 v 375-377, 450
 Robynson, 292
 Roman Canon, 29
 Roman Ordination rite, 56., 57, 61
 et seq., 63, 460 *et seq.*
 Rome, Council of (1059), 97
 Rorer, G., 152
 Rouen, Pontifical of, 469, 483
 Royal Supremacy, 237-239, 260, 297,
 298, 326, 345
 Rudolph, *Life of St. Lietbert*, 65
 Rugge, see *Reppes*
 Russell, Dr., of Maynooth, 224, 225
 Sacraments, Theology of, 69
 — Matter and form, 70-72
 — number of, 71, 117, 121, 144, 173,
 179, 186, 188, 191, 196, 204, 242,
 246 n., 248, 250, 251, 253, 254,
 261, 279 *et seq.*, 281, 285, 289, 290,
 S94, 540-542, 556, 558, 561
 Sacrifice of the Mass. See *Mass*,
 Sacrifice of
 "Sacrifices of Masses," 113, 114, 548-
 551, 561
 "Sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving,"
 117, 136, 138, 139, *75, '88, 189,
 198-200, 203, 213, 243, 267, 268,
 39b 399, 446, 447» 503, 526, 550
 Sadler, 292
 St. Osyth, Abbot of, and ordinations, 77
 Sarum Rite, 305, 379-381, 392-394, 4'9,
 486
 Salcot, Bp., 241 n., 253, 292, 301, 303 n.
 305, 33b 334, 335, 347, 35b 353»
 358, 409, 4'0
 Salisbury, Bp. of Thefford, 505
 Saltet, 78, 86, 87
 Sampson, 453
 Sampson, Bp., 244, 253» 263, 292, 301,
 3'0, 311, 33', 33b 335» 347» 35b
 353, 405, 406, 409, 410, 449
 Samuel ben Nahman, 16
 Samuel, Rabbi, 17
 Saxon Confession, 138
 Schmalkald, Articles of, 138, 146, 271
 Schornborn, Abp. von, 223
 Schulting, 532
 Scory, Bp., 303 n., 335, 348, 509 n.
 Scotus, 64 n.
 — on bishops, 75

- Scotus on ordination by heretics, 79
 — on tradition of instruments, 84, 85
 — on Real Presence and Transubstantiation, 99, 100
 Scripture and tradition, 3
 Secret Prayers, 118, 385
 Serapion, Anaphora of, 28, 30
 — Ordination prayers of, 44, 56
 Seymour, Edward. See *Somerset*
 Shaxton, Bp., 243, 244 n., 253, 273
 Sherburn, Bp., 310
 Sicard, Bp. of Cremona, 65, 86, 87, 94
 Sick, Communion of, in Bucer's rite, 165
 — in Anglican rite, 397, 398, 529
 — in Calvinist and Lutheran rites, 398
 Silva-Tarouca, Rev. Fr., xii
 Simcox, Rev. Dr., xii
 Skinner, 517, 518
 Skip, Bp., 284, 292, 331, 334, 347, 351, 353, 355, 356, 359, 374, 375, 377, 406, 410, 449, 450
 Smith, Rev. S., S.J., 420 n.
 Smith, Dr. Richard, 379, 443, 447
 Smyth, Rev. C., 305, 327, 341 n., 409, 411, 416, 522, 442 n., 447, 451 n., 452 n., 518, 534 n., 535, 536
 Soames, 377
 Solomon Rashi, 16
 Somerset, Duke of, 325, 339, 348, 509 n.
 Southampton, Earl of, 325
 Spalatin, 133
 Spinola, Bp., 224 *et seq.*
Statuta Ecclesia Antiqua, see *Carthage, Canons of Fourth Council of*
 Steinly, Martin, 180
 Stephanus de Balgiaco, 86
 Stillingfleet MS., 280
 Stokesly, Bp., 253, 265, 308, 309, 379, 387
 Stone, Dr. Darwell, xi, xii, 132, 133, 137, 162, 180, 188, 207, 214, 247, 301, 302, 359, 366-368, 378, 388, 400, 528, 529, 531, 550, 556, 557, 559
 Strassburg, abolition of Mass at, 164
 — Communion rite, 164, 191, 203, 399
 — marriage rite, 382
 — cf. *Bucer*,
 Strype, 252, 271, 273, 301, 304, 306, 332-334, 339, 341 n., 376-378, 452, 453, 495, 496 n., 503, 534, 535
 Stubbs, Bp., 506 n.
 Suarez, on Melchisedech, 17
 Subdiaconate, 73
 Sweden, Reformation in, 159, 220, 222, 223, 229
 Syrian Liturgy, 29
 Syro-Jacobite rite, 51
 Symmonds, Dr., 283, 315
 Tablet, xii
 Taylor, Dr., 453, 560
 Taylor, Bp., 335, 336, 350, 35a, 375-377, 45b 503
 Tertullian, on Real Presence, II
 — and ordination, 184
 Theodore of Tarsus, 78
 Thirlby, Bp., 279, 284, 292, 330, 333, 335, 347, 348, 353-373-378, 403-405, 407, 410, 449, 450, 505-507, 520
 Thomas Aquinas, on bishops, 74, 75
 — on ordination by heretics, 79
 — on alteration of form, 79, 80
 — on tradition of instruments, 82, 83, 05, 87, 89, 90
 — on Transubstantiation, 99, 100
 — on Sacrifice of Mass, 127 n., 132
 — on Priesthood before Moses, 217 n.
 Thomas Aquinas, pseudo, on Sacrifice of Mass, 126, 127, 133, 130, 267, 268
 Thomas, Bp. of Shrewsbury, 503, 504, 506
 Timothy, 33-36, 81, 181, 218, 487
 Tixeront, 33 n., 37 n., 469
 Tout, T. F., 308, 309, 313
 Tradition of Instruments, 64, 68, 80-86, 89-92, 94, 142, 183, 470, 475, 476, 479, 490, 49b 493, 494 *, 529
 Traheron, 407, 409
 Transubstantiation, 3, 5, 6, 8, 12, 13, 99, 100, 101, 106, 109, no., 115, 137, 138, 140, 178, 196, 202, 206, 225, 246 n., 248, 249, 295, 303, 304, 328, 401, 404, 406, 421, 422, 425, 483, 542, 544, 545, 561
 Tremellio, 341
 Trent, Council of, 3-6, 33, 105, 138, 139, 153, 202 *et seq.*, 225, 241, 340, 341 n., 342-344, 555
 — on number of sacraments, 205
 — on effect of sacraments, 543
 — on institution of sacraments, 71, 205
 — on Real Presence, 208, 209
 — on Transubstantiation, 102, 208, 209
 — on Sacrifice of Mass, 132, 212-214, 550, 551
 — on Adoration of Blessed Sacrament, 209, 210, 547
 — on Reservation, 209, 210
 — on Holy Order, 91, 215-218
 — Catechism of, 214
 Tresham, Dr., 283, 314
 Trinity College, Cambridge, Pontifical of, 62
 Trinity College, Dublin, Pontifical of, 61, 63
 Tunstall, Bp., 193 n., 263, 268, 269, 273, 330-333, 347, 350, 352, 355, 358, 363 *, 379, 403, 404, 407, 410, 449, 477, 502, 520
 Turner, Prof. C., 41
 Tyndale, 25
 Ubiquity, Lutheran theory of, 119, 140

- Unctions in ordination rite, 52, 60,
 63-64, 67, 68, 82, 86, 91, 92, 94,
 150, 176, 177 n., 188, 195, 215,
 216, 219, 258, 282, 452, 475,
 484, 485, 487, 490, 500
Universe, 222 n.
 Urban II, Pope, and unctions, 86
 Urban VIII, Pope, and Greek orders,

 Utnehovius, 341 n., 418, 536

 Vacant, Dr., 128
 Vadianus, 304
 Van Rossum, Cardinal, xii, 81, 84 n., 86,
 88 n.
 Vasquez, on minister of Order, 76 n.
 Vaughan, Cardinal, 452 n.
Veni Creator Spiritus, 62, 63, 65, 66, 156,
 160, 468, 484
Veni Sancte Spiritus, 156, 158
 Vergerlo, 153
Vindication of the Bull, 452 n.
 Virtual Presence, 173, 202, 327, 329,
 529, 556, 559
 Voysey, Bp., 330, 331, 411, 449, 520

 Waite, Antony, 310, 311
 Wakeman, Bp., 331, 334, 335, 520
 Walden, 282
 Warham, Abp., 236
 Wesaliensis, Arnold, 124
 Wessel, John, 113
Westminster Version, 17
 Weston, Dr. 559
 Wharton, Bp., 311, 331-335, 35b 353»
 355, 358, 410, 449

 Whitney, Dr., 312
 William of Occam, 100
 Williams, 133
 Wilson, H. A., 59, 358-361, 363-365
 Winchester Pontifical, 483
 Windsor Commission, 373-375, 378 n.,
 402-404, 450
 Wittenberg Articles, 242, 243, 246, 248,
 249, 263
 Wittenberg, Concord of, 137, 249
 Wittenberg, ordinations at, 152, 156
 Wolsey, Cardinal, 241, 308
 Word and Sacraments, Ministry of,
 141-145, 149, 151, 153, 155, 158,
 *59, 167, 176, 190, 203, 205, 206,
 216, 219, 220, 257-260, 297, 435,
 477-479, 493, 537, 538, 563
 Wordsworth, Bp. John, 40, 41
 Works, Good, 225, 246, 247 n., 264
 Wriothsley, 508
Wurtemberg Confession, 139
 Wyclif, 105, 106, 108, 109, in-113,
 119 n., 237, 248, 249, 282

 Zurich, Communion rite, 203
 Zurich, Consent of, 177, 178, 536
 Zurich, Disputation of (1523), 180
 Zwingli and Zwinglians, 25, 119, 121,
 122, 137, 138, 162, 170 *et seq.*,
 177, 34i n., 171, 417, 418,
 493» 533» 534» 536, 537
 — on Real Presence, 170, 171, 202, 206,
 214, 248, 249, 327
 — on Mass, 170, 211
 — on priesthood and order, 172
 — new Communion rite, 172, 203
 — Cranmer and, 304, 409