

WYCLIFFE

An Historical Study

by the

Rev. Dyson Hague, M.A.

Rector Memorial Church, London, Ont., and (Hon.) Canon St. Paul's Cathedral, London, Ont.
Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Huron, and Lecturer in Liturgics, Wycliffe College, Toronto.

187157.
31.1.24.

The Church Record S. S. Publications, Confederation Life Building
TORONTO

ACAREER like Wycliffe's should never be forgotten by men who speak the English tongue, and love the thing called British liberty. He was such a splendid Englishman, such a splendid scholar, and, above all, such a splendid Christian. It does one good in these modern days to freshen up one's knowledge of the man and his work. Though dead and gone over 500 years, one cannot read of his day and doings without getting a clearer vision of the needs and questions of this twentieth century, and the present-day problems of the Church. Like the wave pulses that go on and on and on, the influences of his epoch-making life are still spreading with most persistent force. John Wycliffe being dead, yet speaketh.

I have endeavored to verify with the utmost care every quotation, reference, and historic fact.

My chief authorities have been: Green's History of the English People; Fisher, D'Aubigné, Blunt, Beckett, Geikie, Massingberd, on the Reformation; Wylie's History of Protestantism; the well-known works on Wycliffe, such as The Religious Tract Society's, Burrows, Varley, Pennington, Poole, S. G. Green, Le Bas, Sergeant, Carrick; and, above all, the great works of the German writers, Professor Lechler, of the University of Leipsic, and Professor Loserth, of the University of Czernowitz. For the quotations and references I have also used the writings of Wycliffe by the Religious Tract Society, the English works of Wycliffe, by F. D. Matthew, and, above all, the invaluable editions of his Latin works by the Wyclif Society, especially the *de Eucharistia*, *de Ecclesia*, *de Veritate Sacrae Scripturae*, and the *Opus Evangelicum*.

D. H.

John Wycliffe.

John Wycliffe was a Yorkshireman. He belonged to a family which had been lords of the manor from the days of the Conquest. He was born probably about 1320, or perhaps 1324. It is impossible to fix the date with exactitude. He died on the last day of the last week of 1384.

If not the greatest man of his age, John Wycliffe was the greatest Englishman. He was its foremost scholar. He became its most influential teacher. He was the most outspoken nationalist of his day. He was, as Lechler, the German biographer, puts it in a word, the centre of the whole pre-reformation history. In insight, vivid ; in living, holy ; in preaching, fervent ; in organization and labors, unwearying ; he came to be, to slightly alter Lowell's words :

"The kindly, earnest, brave, foreseeing man,
Sagacious, patient,
New birth of our new soul, the first great Englishman."

The life and work of John Wycliffe may be regarded as a proof of the providential disposals of the great Head of the Church. He seems to have been purposely raised up to do a work that only could have been performed in the age in which he lived by a man of his varied attainments and official character.

The Age in which Wycliffe lived.

The age in which Wycliffe lived was one of the epoch-marking eras of England's history ; the

fourteenth century. It was the golden age of reform before the Reformation. It was the age of Edward III., the royal upholder of England's national rights. It was the birth age of England's national consciousness. It was the age of the emergence of that little island kingdom upon the sphere of history as the realm of a strong and liberty-loving people. The distant island kingdom of the northern seas had long ceased to be the haunt of warring and barbarian tribes. For England then was becoming a nation, and its name, even then, was identified with the ideas of valor, of independence, of justice, and of law. The masterful blood of the Norman had mingled with that of the stalwart and patriotic Saxon, and the blend had produced the Englishman, the English language, the English constitution, and the English nation.

The restless Dane, the hardy Celt, the sturdy Saxon,
The Norman, dauntless, dominant,
These are the bloods that intermingling form
The modern Briton;
These are the strands that interwoven blend
To make the race that conquering rules,
And finding takes, and taking holds,
For liberty, and law, and righteousness, and God.

It was during the fourteenth century that these elements of national greatness, which have since lifted England to the highest rank, came into operation. It was during the fourteenth century that the inflated increase of the Papal pride synchronized with the emerging dignity of

English nationalism. It was during the fourteenth century that the English language emerged from the chaos of centuries, and became fixed as the language of the nation. In 1356 Sir John Mandeville wrote the first book ever produced in English, and in 1362 English became the authorized language of the law courts.

In 1327, when Wycliffe was a mere child at his mother's side, Edward III. ascended the throne of England. The imperial and independent characteristics of William the Norman, of Stephen Langton, and of Robert Grosseteste, blended in his royal character. He was a typical Englishman. Edward III. believed in English supremacy, and had an Englishman's impatience of foreign interference. He had a constitutional contempt for foreigners. Thus it was, that at a time when England's realm and England's church were simply overrun with foreigners; when Italians and Frenchmen were sent by Papal authority to occupy the most valuable positions in England; when the nobles were wearying of clerical misrule, and the rulers and lawgivers were awakening to the intolerableness of Rome's demands; it was at this time that God raised up John Wycliffe and brought into the political and ecclesiastical arena of the great fourteenth century an English Churchman who was not only the outstanding Englishman of the century, but was destined to be the first, if not the greatest, of the reformers the world has known.

The Distinctive Work of Wycliffe.

The distinctive peculiarity of the work of Wycliffe was neither its national devotedness nor its antipapal zeal. It was neither the vigor of his exposure of abuses nor the amazing valor of his defiance of the popes. It was something different from this. It was something deeper and more real. It was, rather, the fact that he was the first great Catholic Churchmen to discern the falsity of Rome's doctrinal position, and to boldly announce and rehabilitate the truth as the truth is in the Bible and the teaching of Christ.

Others, doubtless, had seen and known these things. To the Cathari and the Waldenses, to Claude of Turin, and Peter Waldo, it was given to understand through the Scriptures not only the glory of the Gospel, but the corruptions and apostasy of the Church of Rome. But of Wycliffe it may be distinguishingly asserted, that he was the first really great and enlightened advocate of the supremacy of the Scriptures, and the first great practical expositor of the falsity of the keystone doctrines of the Roman Church. Others had done, and were doing, the political part of Protestant reform. Grosseteste had done it. Edward III. had done it. Parliament had done it, and would do it again. But the work of John Wycliffe was higher and deeper. Wycliffe's work was the complement of this. It was the indispensable other half, without which all the mere anti-papal legislation and anti-vice preaching in the

world would never have freed the Church from Popery. It was the shaking not merely of Papal pretensions, but of Papal falsities. It was the impeachment not merely of vices, but of errors. It was the propagation not merely of negative protests, but of evangelical principles.

One of the commonest fallacies of history is the fallacy of speaking of Wycliffe's reformatory work as if it were a mere reform of morals in the Church, and a mere correction of national abuses.

This is a great mistake.

It is the mistake that makes men completely misapprehend the English Reformation. The English Reformation was not merely a reform *in* the Church. It was a doctrinal reform *of* the Church. This was in essence also the work of Wycliffe two centuries or so before. While its negative aspect dealt largely with the exposure of Papal abuses and clerical vices, it derived its chief strength from its positive features ; the exposure of doctrinal errors widely received as Scriptural truths, of Papal falsities long believed as Catholic verities, and the dauntless declaration of the teachings of the Apostles of Christ. Other men had whispered ; he cried aloud. Others had spoken in the secrecy of closets ; he proclaimed on the housetops. Others had denounced the vices of popes ; he denounced the very foundation principles of the Papal Church system. It is this that constituted Wycliffe not merely the morning star, but the rising sun, of the Reformation.

The reforming zeal of John Wycliffe may be traced to two great fountainheads. It was from these that the final movement of the reformation of the Church of England sprang a century and a half or two centuries later. Those two great fountainheads were personal conversion and Scriptural enlightenment. It was his knowledge of a personal Saviour in the newness of life that was the secret of Wycliffe's greatness. He loved Christ. He knew whom he had believed. He spake that which he knew. Therefore, also, he loved the Word of God. That path of life which he had found therein he determined all his life long to make known to others.

The reformation of England's Church owes its foundation and inception to the Scriptural illumination of men taught and led by the Spirit. The nation was weary of the yoke of Rome. The people were disgusted with the lives of the clerics, and the degradation of religion. It was, of course, a great matter to rid the Church of the Papal exactor. It was a great matter to rid the Church of immoralities and abuses. But any nationalist, a man of the world like Simon de Montfort, or an Englishman of pride like John of Gaunt, could move measures against Papal interference. Any man of earnest life could declaim against the vices of the day in convent, court, and cloister. But the greatest evil, the root evil, was the yoke of Romish bondage; the bondage of unscriptural eccle-

siasticism, and of idolatrous superstition. He alone could see this and remove this who had been himself enlightened through the understanding of the Holy Scriptures.

It is in this, therefore, that the hand of God is so evident. Not merely in the raising up of a man of such splendid patriotism and colossal mental power, but in the selection of a man who, by the devoutness of his Christian life, the strength of his will, and the depth of his convictions, would stand forth before the world as the Apostle of truth and the Apollyon of falsehood; one like the Seraph Abdiel:

“Faithful found,
Among the faithless, faithful only he;
Among innumerable false, unmoved,
Unshaken, unseduced, untterrified,
His loyalty he kept, his love, his zeal;
Nor numbers, nor example, with him wrought,
To swerve from truth, or change his constant mind,
Though single.”

The reforming work of Wycliffe in the fourteenth century was characterized very largely, also, by the same features as the reformation of the Church of England in the sixteenth century. It not only sprang, as that did, from the personal enlightenment of the leader of leaders; it had three distinct parts or movements.

The first stage was the political.

The second stage was the ethical.

The third stage was the doctrinal.

First of all there came the political or antipapal stage, during which the national Church spirit aroused him in defiance of the pretensions and claims of the Pope. Then there followed the moral or anti-vice stage, when the infamous lives of monks and friars and ecclesiastics generally were arraigned for popular indignation. Last of all came the doctrinal or anti-error stage, when the cardinal doctrines of Popery, or the Roman system, were attacked, and the true doctrines of the Apostles of Christ were expounded. First the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear, as the Master said. Or in other words: first of all there was the removal of external obstructions; then the rectification of internal conditions; and then the rehabilitation of foundation principles.

Wycliffe as a National Champion.

It was in the character of a national champion, the champion of the rights of the Sovereign and of the people of England, that Wycliffe started his public career, treading in the steps of Langton, Grosseteste, and Richard Fitzralph or Radulphus, the brave Archbishop of Armagh.

Born, as it has been conjectured, about 1320 or 1324, and educated at Oxford, a doctor of divinity, a master of logic and philosophy, Wycliffe was about forty when he stepped into the arena as a nationalist. The air was full of the strife of tongues, and all England was aflame at the time on account of the

insolence of Pope Urban V., who had demanded, for the first time for 33 years, the arrears of the annual rental which used to be paid to the Pope as a sign of the vassalage of the realm.

It was a bad time for a Pope to make any demands on England for tribute money to Rome. The first Statute of Provisors, which was the first great parliamentary attempt to limit the temporal power of the Pope, and cut away the very root of the Papal power in England by taking the appointments to all Church benefices out of the hands of the Pope, had been passed in 1351. The Statute of *Præmunire*, which abolished the Court at Rome as the final court of appeal for Englishmen, had been passed in 1353. Thirty-three years had gone by without a mention of any Roman tribute, and England was in a very different state from what it was in 1213, and Edward III. was a very different man from King John. Besides that, what had touched England to the quick was the exasperating fact that the money demanded by the Pope had been handed over to the French to help them fight against England, and England had twice thrashed the French, and thrashed them badly, at Crecy in 1346, and Poitiers in 1356. However. In 1366, Pope Urban V. thought it was about time to collect the neglected tribute, and summoning Edward III. to recognize him as legitimate sovereign of England, demanded the payment of all the arrearages, this annual sum of twelve thousand pounds, as England's grateful tribute

for the privilege of having such a spiritual blessing as the lordship of the Pope.

The answer of the Parliament was short enough. Neither King John nor any king could subject himself, his kingdom or his people without their consent. They would not pay it.

The episode is remarkable as a proof of the growing sense of national rights. But to us of to-day it is remarkable, also, for the fact that it brought out upon the stage of England a Churchman who was destined to become her foremost defender against Rome. The ablest man of his day, Wycliffe, took up the matter in dead earnest. Before the King's Council he exposed the Roman pretensions with masterly force. He took the claims of Rome and with relentless logic tore them in pieces one by one. He showed that the exaction of a tribute by an alien was subversive of the primary principles of constitutional government. A tribute is, constitutionally speaking, a *quid pro quo*. It is given rightly only to him who can guarantee protection in return. This the Pope could not grant. Therefore the State need not pay a subsidy. Going deeper, he showed that the supreme and final lordship of the realm was neither in the King nor in the Pope, but in Christ, and Christ alone. The Pope, as a man, subject to sin, has no control over that which is held for Christ. The claim of a Pope to hold and control a kingdom like that of England was a clear violation of the spiritual principles of the kingdom of Christ.

These were daring words for 1366. And they were startling theorems. England was delighted. The whole kingdom rang with his propositions, and the name of Wycliffe was soon in every mouth. Preachers in the pulpit and politicians in Parliament alike were eager to employ his arguments. He found himself famous, as it were, in a day.

From that day, Wycliffe was the hero of England's people. From the highest to the lowest, in court and castle, in Parliament House and homely fireside, his name was regarded as that of a man to be always relied on to stand up for the people's rights. To the mass of the people John Wycliffe became the spokesman and champion of the nation on every moral, social, and ecclesiastical question.

A year or two after this he brought out his famous treatise, "De Dominio Divino," in which he formulated the sublime propositions that all dominion is founded in God; that that power is granted by God not to one person, as the Papacy alleged, who is His alone vicegerent, but to all; that the king is as much God's vicar as the Pope, the royal power is as sacred as the ecclesiastical; that each individual Christian is himself a possessor of dominion held directly from God; that God himself is the tribunal of personal appeal. If these things were so, then it followed that all men, in the eyes of God, have a sublime equality as the children of God who have been made in His image; and that all His sons are of the royal birth, and all his subjects priests of God.

In the Church, save for the purposes of law and order, there are and can be no lords over the soul of man. Priests, and prelates, and Popes, and people, hold equal place in the eye of God, and are responsible directly and immediately to Him.

It is doubtful whether even Wycliffe himself perceived at that period the results of his reasoning, and the consequences of such audacious assertions. But whether he knew it or not, there seems to be truth in Green's statement, in his History of the English People, that by this theory, which established a direct relation between man and God, he swept away the whole basis of a meditating priesthood, the very foundation on which the mediæval Church was built.

At that time Wycliffe seems to have been thinking more of the Pope as a pretentious tribute-exactor than of the Papacy as an apostate Christian system; and it was as a civil and national champion, perhaps, as much as a religious, that he waged this warfare against Papal claims. Not that his religious convictions had nothing to do with his position, as one would infer almost from the way some have written about him. They had much to do with it. He was in no sense a mere politician. But the tone of his campaign at that time was political rather than spiritual. And though it was as a member of the national Church that he wrote and spoke, it was the independence of the crown, and the liberty of the people, rather than the independence of the clergy, and the

nationality of the Church, for which he was fighting.

Erat homo certans pro patribus. He was as a man fighting for his home. From this time the Court, and the Commons, and the country, were, almost to a man, on the side of Wycliffe. But on the other hand, the priests, the prelates and the Pope were, almost to a man, against him.

Not long after, (1374), he was sent as a member of a royal commission to Bruges, in Flanders, to negotiate with the Pope's representatives. It was not only a high honour for Wycliffe, as Lechler says, but it throws light upon the political situation in England, that a man of the type of John Wycliffe should have been made a royal commissioner for these diplomatic transactions with the Roman Court. The results of the conference, on the whole, were not satisfactory to the people, for they were a compromise to the Pope's advantage. But one result must be regarded as satisfactory. From that time onwards Wycliffe became a more determined opponent than ever of the Papacy. At this conference he met the foremost Papal dignitaries of the day, and their haughtiness, pretentiousness, and lordly indifference so disgusted him that his antagonism to the Papacy as a spiritual system claiming the rights over kings and kingdoms, and lives and lands, became finally and permanently settled as a conviction of his soul. As one modern writer puts it, Bruges was to Wycliffe what Rome was to Luther; a place of revelation. That was the real date of the beginning

of that feature of his career which is graven in the monument that stands to-day in the old church at Lutterworth, to perpetuate his name: "His whole life was one perpetual struggle against the corruptions and encroachments of the Papal Court."

Wycliffe did not long continue in the rôle of a national or political champion. Little by little, he seems to have abandoned the more political side of his work, becoming more and more absorbed in the spiritual or religious. As D'Aubigné tersely puts it, he busied himself less and less about the kingdom of England, and occupied himself more and more with the kingdom of Christ. If he began in the political road as an Englishman rather than as an ecclesiastic, and was led in the first instance along what might be called the path of patriotic nationalism, he soon recognized that that was not the highest path. It led him into questionable alliances and doubtful partnerships, just as many a godly evangelical of the Irish Church has been identified in his antipapal zeal with men who, for all their Protestantism, are utterly devoid of the Spirit of Christ. It yoked him with John of Gaunt and Lord Percy, and that class of men. It threw him in with the great herd of the anticlerical rabble, good, bad, and indifferent, some with base aims, some with high aims, but all glad to have in their fight against an alien Pope, and a purse-proud priesthood, the alliance of so illustrious a man as John de Wycliffe, the pride of Oxford, and the friend of the King.

But Wycliffe did not stay all his life in that path. Gradually, as the eyes of his mind were illumined, he turned to a truer work; not the examination of Papal claims and parliamentary rights, but of the state of the Church of Christ, and the needs of the day. Without ceasing to be a patriot or a Protestant, he was led to a distinctly higher work. And that was the work of exposing the abuses and false doctrines which were universal in the Church.

Wycliffe as an Ecclesiastical Reformer.

It seems almost impossible for us to believe the stories which are told of the state of things in the Church of England in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. If they were told of ignorant Italians, or of degraded Romanists in Guatemala, or Peru, it would be credible enough. But to be told that the lives not merely of the English people, but of the bishops and clergy of the Church of England, were, in the majority of cases, immoral and discreditable, is hard for us in a Protestant land to understand.

Yet the statements are established by multiplied and unimpeachable authorities. Churches abounded. Religious houses were everywhere. Ecclesiastics of all sorts swarmed in city, town and country. Crosses dotted every highway. Shrines attracted innumerable devotees. The mass was celebrated daily on thousands of altars. The worship of the Virgin, the adoration of saints and images and relics, and the

bones and clothing of departed saints, was everywhere indulged in. There was plenty of religion; that is, the Romish religion. But the lives, the lives of the clergy as a whole, were scandalous to a degree.

They were immersed in the most absolute depravity. If there is any truth in contemporary evidence, and the witness of men of the day, it is certain that multitudes of the priests of Holy Church, that is, the Holy Roman Church, of which the Church of England was then a part, the professing successors of the Apostles and teachers of the Christian religion, were walking as enemies of the Cross of Christ. Their god was their belly. Their glory was in their shame. They seemingly lived wholly for the world. The very dignitaries of the Church, from the Pope downwards, lived the foulest of lives, when, as their own Cardinal Baronius said: "Harlots governed at Rome, and their paramours were intruded into the See of Peter." It was a Roman Archbishop who charged fifty of the Popes with grievous criminalities. It was not an uncommon thing for bishops to keep mistresses, and for priests and monks to resort to the nunneries as depraved men in our cities to-day resort to houses of ill fame.

They were, moreover, men of corrupted minds, bereft of the truth, looking upon religion as a way of gain. The Pope, cried one of the Roman Catholic saints in a work authenticated, it is said, by Pope Benedict XIV., has changed all the Ten Commandments into this one; Money, Money! Religion

was, indeed, a way of gain. It was the most paying thing of the age. They had the monopoly of merits, which had a splendid sale and commanded great prices until Luther broke up the demand. They fattened on the wealth of the land and waxed wanton. In fact, the great mass of the wealth of the land was in the hands of the clerics and of the friars. Many were literally clothed in fine linen, and purple and scarlet, and were decked with gold and precious stones and pearls. Their luxury exceeded description. They lived deliciously, and their merchandise was gold, and silver, and marble, and incense, and ointment, and horses, and chariots, and the bodies and souls of men. (Rev., xviii: 7-16.)

As to the mass of the clergy, secular and regular alike, parish priests, and monks and friars, their condition, for the most part, was shameless. There were, no doubt, scattered here and there throughout the Church, men of simple and beautiful piety. Many a case of lovely Christian purity and virtue was doubtless known. But of the great body! alas! one of themselves, a prophet of their own, said in a later day: "They pretend to resemble the Apostles, and they are filthy, ignorant, impudent vagabonds. They are sots, wasps, whoremasters, vultures, born fools. Instead of going about doing good, and winning men for God, they haunt taverns, ask men to drink, lead disgraceful brawls, and are notorious for their profanity." "They waste their time and wealth in gambling and revelry; go about the streets

roaring and outrageous, and sometimes have neither tongue, nor eye, nor hand, nor foot, to help themselves for drunkenness." The reader is referred to that remarkable work, Froude's Erasmus 12-15; 59-68.

Nor were they in the slightest degree ashamed when they committed these things. So far from blushing at their conduct, they gloried in it, and lorded it over the people by their power of the keys, and the terror of their censures and excommunications. "The clergy seemed to exult in showing contempt of God and man by the licentiousness of their lives and the insolence of their dominion. They ruled with self-made laws over soul and body. As successors of the Apostles they held the keys of hell and heaven. Their excommunications were registered by the Almighty. Their absolutions could open the gates of Paradise."

No wonder, then, that a man like Wycliffe, whose canon was God's Word, turned with his might against such men, and against such ways. He was not the first, by any means, nor the only one to turn the searchlights on their lives. Fitzralph, Vice-Chancellor of Oxford, and afterwards Archbishop of Armagh, had done similar work some years before, and John de Polliac also. Geoffrey Chaucer also, in his Canterbury Tales, had pictured them with scorn, and Dante the poet likewise. But what Fitzralph, the Irishman, began, John Wycliffe, the Englishman, carried on to perfection. His increasing study of God's Word opened more and

more the eyes of his understanding. Controversy sharpened his weapons and multiplied his arguments. His visit to Bruges had brought out in more lurid light the corruptions of the whole Romish system. And Wycliffe, like John Knox, was one who never feared the face of man.

It is well known with what a vehemence of righteous indignation he indicted the clerics as a class, and especially with what splendid audacity he turned upon the friars.

But before we speak of this it may perhaps be helpful to say a few words of explanation.

The monks and friars mark a curious stage in the evolution of the ecclesiastical character. The specialty of the monks originally had been the mission of retirement. Their ideal, in theory at any rate, was, to their mind, excellent. It was to withdraw from the wickedness of the world, and spend the days in quietness and prayer. Their vows were those of poverty, celibacy, and, to a greater or less degree, of silence. In carrying them out they became the builders, the architects, the copyists, the agriculturalists, the chroniclers, and the philanthropists of the Middle Ages. In theory and ideal they were the Pietists of Mediævalism, with their mission of quietness, peace, and purity of life. But alas! alas! for poor human nature, they developed into anything but apostles of gentleness and poverty and devotion. Their wealth became enormous. Instead of the plain and simple life of

poverty, they erected edifices that were palaces, and oftentimes lived like kings on lordly fare, being clothed in fine linen and purple.

The friars, on the other hand, had for their specialty, evangelization. The monks were men who withdrew from the world. The friars were men who went out into the world. Their idea was to go out among their fellow men to seek and save the lost. It was a noble intention. And at first the Franciscans, the Grey Friars, named after the famous pietist, Francis of Assisi, and the Black Friars, the Dominicans, which means the Lord's Watchdogs, poor, bareheaded and barefooted, went out in the highways and byways to compel men to come in by their forceful evangel. They were the Methodists, the street preachers, and the Salvationists of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. But alas! they also fell. The ideal was too high for poor human nature. Soon they came to be mere heresy-hunters. Then they fell still lower. They sank into many foolish and hurtful lusts which drown men in destruction and perdition. They became enormously wealthy. As they grew in power and numbers, they went from pride to pride, from insolence to insolence. They entered parish after parish, and snapped their fingers at the authority of the parish priest. With alarming rapidity they amassed great properties, secured emoluments, pushed their way into nearly all the leading posts in the universities, until they became, as a modern

writer tersely puts it, dangerously rich, alarmingly powerful, hopelessly lazy.

We can well imagine how creatures like these must have seemed in the eyes of a man like John Wycliffe. The sturdy Yorkshireman, who hated shams and religious humbug above all things, and looked at things in the light of common sense, regarded them simply as a lot of sanctimonious rascals. He exposed their corruptions with unsparing thrusts. The *Cui Bono* question was always in John's mind. What are they *for*? What do they *do*? What *good* are they? They profess to be preachers; what do they preach? They profess to be benefactors; whom do they benefit? Their self-assurance, their indecent irreverence, their self-glorifying ignorance, their immoralities, and above all their menace to the liberties of the people, snatching from the people their possessions and their rights, and crushing them by the terrorism of the Holy Father; these were the leading points in his indictment of the friars. To the end he continued his warfare, undaunted by Papal bulls or clerical menace. And the story has become famous how the sturdy reformer one day, during an illness, was visited by a body of friars, who held their crosses before him and called on him to abjure his heresies. The old man listened for a while, and then calling on an attendant to help him sit up, he awed them into retreat by the vehement words that have passed into history: "I shall not die, but live, and declare the evil deeds of the friars."

But the friars were not the only ones, or even the first, that he attacked. The lives of prelates and priests were as bad, if not worse, and their worldliness, and pomp, and pride, aroused his indignation to the extreme. The more he searched the Word of God, the more he saw their inconsistency with the teaching of Christ and His Apostles. Christ and His Apostles were poor men. These men were great and rich. The Apostles were unworldly and heavenly-minded. These men were earthly and worldly-minded. They cared nothing for worldly things. These men seemed to care for nothing else. He and they worked. These men lived in ease. They sought peace and quietness. These fought and stirred up strife. They lived among the people and sought their good. These left the people and sought their goods. Christ and His Apostles owned no property and desired none. These added lands to lands, and house to house, lived in wealth and grandeur, drawing all they could from the living of the people, until almost half the wealth and a third of the land came into their possession.

The scorn of Wycliffe knew no bounds. His indignation was unmeasured. He denounced their wealth. He laughed to scorn their pomp and show. He questioned their right to riches and estates. He held that it became no minister of Jesus Christ to live in possession of such property, and most strenuously denounced their vast endowments and princely wealth.

Of course, he was misunderstood then. Of course, he is misunderstood now. His enemies calumniated him then. Their descendants calumniate him to-day. To be great, says Emerson, is to be misunderstood. They called him a communist. They decried him as the friend of anarchists and spoilers. They called him the father of insurrection and disorder. They blamed him for all the riots and revolts of the times. And to-day, even, there are Church writers who seek to belittle his greatness as a reformer by depicting him as a revolutionist.

His theories in his work on Civil Lordship were certainly curious. On a surface reading, they look like a mixture of the modern philosophic humbug of Christian Science and the Platonic doctrine of community. "Sin is nothing, and sinners are nothing. Therefore sinners, as they are nothing, can logically possess nothing. They can have apparent possession, but not real; the righteous only can have real possession in God. All things are yours." Such were his eccentric words. Yet to those who read a little more deeply it seems clear that Wycliffe merely held that God is the giver of all, and therefore all things are to be held for God, and that all true Christians should hold their possessions as a stewardship of God for the use of man, and what the ungodly have and hold they do not have and hold as their own. It is God's property they are holding. There can be no doubt that many of the views fathered upon him, and the theories with

which he was charged, are the outcome of the hatred and misrepresentation of his Romish opponents, and of those who dislike his evangelical doctrine.

For after all, there is no clear evidence that Wycliffe ever patronized socialists, or advocated socialism. He may have held, and probably did hold, a pretty strong theory of Church disendowment, and pretty advanced ideas on the communizing of goods. Thousands of clergy have done the same, who in nowise can be called socialists. But that he ever advocated or patronized the wild communism of a John Ball or a Wat Tyler is an assertion that proceeds only from ignorance, as Green says in his *History of the English People*.

To denounce the greed and pomp of ecclesiastics was one thing; to advocate the spoliation of property, another thing altogether. He was entirely opposed to this. His aim, as a modern writer says, was not to favor a communistic reorganization of the State. Nor is there any clear evidence that the views of Wycliffe with regard to Church property and clerical possessions were at variance with the plain teaching of Scripture and the words of Christ. There was really nothing in Wycliffe's ideas about money, and the right of the clergy to wealth and property, that is beyond the fair and honest interpretation of the teaching of the New Testament on the subject. He seems only to have taught what Christ Jesus taught (Matt., vi.: 19, 20 ; x.: 9 ; Luke, xii.: 33, 34); and to have advocated what His Apostles

advocated (Acts, xx.: 33; II. Cor., xii.: 14; I. Peter, v.: 2). When we consider these passages, and remember, in addition, the startling wickedness of the clergy and the corruptions of the age, we need not be surprised to find that a man like Wycliffe should have taken the stand he did, or have spoken the strong words he is said to have spoken. He was not immaculate. He had John the Baptist work to do, and he did it. It was no time for rose-water and soft platitudes. He had to speak sternly and strongly. As he was human, he may at times have spoken almost violently. Strong diseases require strong treatment. But that he never acted the part of a communistic incendiary, or advocated the spoliation of ecclesiastical possessions, is the testimony of nearly every reliable English historian.

Wycliffe as a Doctrinal Reformer.

It is not easy to fix the exact date at which Wycliffe emerged in his last and greatest character, and stood forth not merely as a reformer of abuses, but as a reformer of the fundamental doctrines of the Roman Church. For a long time he had been steadily growing in the clearness of his spiritual insight, and in the fervour of his anti-Romish zeal. Roughly speaking, however, the year 1378 may be taken as the starting point of the most important epoch in Wycliffe's reforming career. In February, 1377, Wycliffe had been formally charged with heresy. He was summoned by the Archbishop of

Canterbury, as the representative of the Roman See, to appear in the Lady Chapel of St. Paul's Cathedral, in London, to answer to the charges laid against him. The year before his enemies had sent nineteen articles and extracts from his writings to the Pope, and during 1377, the Pope replied with five bulls. In these he declared that Wycliffe was a pestilential heretic, whose damnable doctrines were to be plucked up by the roots, lest they should defile the faith and bring into contempt the Church of Rome; and he called upon the Archbishop, the King, and the university to deal summarily with the heretic. (Which things prove in a very practical manner, by the way, the position then occupied by the English Church as an integral part of the Church of Rome.)

The damnable doctrines complained of were only questions, however, that touched the wealth and power of the Church: the binding and loosing power of the Pope; the right of the temporal lords to deprive wicked clerics of their temporalities; and other matters. The trial, as every one knows, came to nothing. John of Gaunt, the Duke of Lancaster, and Lord Percy, the Lord Marshal of England, both stood bravely by the reformer, and the assembly broke up in confusion. Popular opinion was on Wycliffe's side, and the proceedings were stopped by a representative of the Regent.

The effect of this trial upon Wycliffe was important. It strengthened his courage. It deepened his conviction. It fortified him in his defence of

what he was seeing more and more clearly to be true. It emboldened him in his defiance of what he saw more and more clearly to be false.

Early in the following year, 1378, he was summoned by the new Primate to appear at Lambeth Chapel before himself and the Bishop of London as the Pope's Commissioners. The same thing happened again. Wycliffe repudiated the political dominion of the Pope with unshaken boldness. He repudiated absolutely his political supremacy. He disclaimed his power of absolution, save only as he is obedient to the law of Christ. "It seems to me," said the grand old man, "that he who usurps this power must be the man of sin." He faced the representative of the great power of Rome as fearlessly as a child. A strange sensation of fear seemed to have suddenly swept over the Bishops, and once more the trial came to nothing.

In the meantime a momentous event was transpiring in the Roman world. It was the Papal schism, the crowning scandal of Papal Christianity. For seventy-three years, from 1305 to 1378, there had been no Pope in Rome. The seven Popes of that interim were Frenchmen, who transferred the Papal headquarters to Avignon, a city on the Rhone, in the south of France. It was a bad state of things indeed. But worse was to follow. For in 1378, the Roman Cardinals, who were nearly all Frenchmen, elected an Italian, Urban VI., as Pope to reign at Rome, and then another set of Cardinals

chose a Frenchman, Clement VII., to reign as Pope at Avignon.

There they were, the two infallible heads of the Catholic Church, fighting each other like wolves. Each claimed to be infallible. Each claimed his own right. Each claimed to be the Vicegerent of Christ. Each claimed to be the representative of the unity of the Godhead in Heaven, and the Church on earth. Urban VI., the Pope of Rome, excommunicated his rival, the impostor at Avignon. Clement VII., the Pope at Avignon, excommunicated his rival, the impostor at Rome. Each promulgated decrees, scattered bulls, issued anathemas, and played the rôle of the visible head of Christ's Church. The effect of this upon Wycliffe was electric. For a long time, doubtless, the seeds of suspicion with regard to the whole Romish system had been ripening within his mind. The Christianity of Christ was utterly irreconcilable with the Christianity of the Pope. The teachings of the Apostles were so absolutely contrary to those of the Papists. His work as a patriot and constitutional reformer had opened his eyes to the falsity of the Papal claims. His impeachment of the morals of the clergy had convinced him of the corruption of the Papal communion. But now he seems to have reached his final conclusion. The whole fabric of the Papal system was anti-Christian. The Pope was Antichrist. The Popish system was a mass of error. The Papal decrees were the laws of the enemy of Christ.

He wrote a tract entitled *Schisma Papae*, the schism of the Papacy, in which he not only described the Papal system as Antichrist, but actually urged the sovereigns of Europe to seize this opportunity for destroying a structure already shaken in its foundations. It is absurd, he argued, to speak of infallibility in connection with such a system. "God hath cloven the heart of Antichrist, and made the two parts fight against each other." He declared that the position he had before asserted, that the Church of Rome is not the head of the Churches, and the Pope of Rome invested with no greater jurisdiction, was now established by the facts. The whole system of Rome was contrary to the Gospel of Christ. Its authority and rule were not the canons of Scripture. Its doctrines were not the doctrines of the New Testament. Its practices were not the practices of the Apostles. And chief of all its errors, the fountain and heart of all, was the Roman doctrine of the Eucharist. This, as Archbishop Cranmer wrote nearly two centuries after, is the chief root of all Roman error. The rest is but branches and leaves. The very body of the tree is the Popish doctrine of transubstantiation.

Turning, then, from his pursuit of friars and monks, and his sarcastic impeachment of the follies of the day, Wycliffe addressed himself to the more serious task of exposing and destroying the doctrinal corruptions of the Church, and restoring the foundations of primitive truth; not of denouncing and

destroying error merely, but of setting forth in its simplicity the doctrine of Christ and His Apostles.

Wycliffe's greatest task in this course was unquestionably the exposure of transubstantiation. This was the key dogma of Rome's position, and around it gathered, as towers around a citadel, the various doctrines of Popery.

It was in 1381 that Wycliffe first attacked the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation, and denied that the elements in the Sacrament of the altar could undergo any material change by reason of the words of the consecration of the priest. It is possible that the initial incentive of Wycliffe's attack upon the sacrificial teachings of the Church was the monstrous usurpations of the men who pretended to have the power of making the Body of Christ. "Nothing," he wrote in his *De Eucharistia*, "is more horrible than that any priest, in celebrating, daily makes or consecrates the body of Christ. Our God is not a recent God."

He based his attack upon two grounds: first, on the ground of Scriptural inconsistency; next, on the ground of philosophical impossibility. Wycliffe had been for some time a diligent student of the Bible, and a man who studied the Gospels and read the Epistles of the New Testament, especially the Epistle to the Hebrews, could not long hold the Roman teaching with regard to the Eucharist. The two were irreconcilable. The monstrous position that the priest renews at each sacrament the pro-

pitiatory sacrifice of Calvary, and stands daily offering that offering which the Scripture expressly asserts was once for all offered "one sacrifice for ever," was as repugnant to his enlightened spirit as the equally monstrous position that at the word of a simple and ignorant man the Lord of Heaven descends from His throne and suffers Himself to be immolated upon the altar, and expelling the substance of the bread and wine, incorporates in the place thereof His glorious Body. As he said in a tract he wrote on the subject, called the Wicket: "Thou, then, that art an earthly man, by what reason mayest thou say that thou makest thy Maker?" Christ ascended into heaven. There He sits at the right hand of God. The whole tenour of the New Testament is opposed to the figment of His corporal presence on the altar. He is not here. He is risen. "The natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here," as the Prayer Book of the Anglican Church teaches now.

But Wycliffe's objection to the doctrine of transubstantiation was also philosophical. It was based on reason. We must remember that Wycliffe was one of the profoundest thinkers of the day. He was a logician of no mean order. His life as a schoolman had been passed in discussing theological questions in an argumentative manner. Reason, therefore, as well as Scripture, became his strength. When first he began to doubt the universal opinion that the accidents were

separated from the substance in the act of transubstantiation, he seemed to have held somehow the philosophical subtilty that "a mathematical body" was the substance of the accidents. Then he seems to have passed into what Carlyle would have called the centre of indifference, doubting most positively the Roman dogma that after consecration no substance of the bread remained, but only the substance of Christ, God, and man; and yet affirming that there was some substance to the accidents, he did not know what. Slowly, but sureiy and triumphantly, he reached his Everlasting Yea, that after consecration the bread is bread, remains bread, and that it is the Body of Christ figuratively and symbolically and sacramentally only.

This, then, was his final position.

It is contrary to reason to assert that the accidents of the bread can remain in the eucharist after consecration, and the substance of the bread not be there. That is, it is utterly unphilosophical and unreasonable to say that the piece of bread can look the same, and feel the same, and weigh the same, and taste the same, and smell the same, and yet not be bread at all, but something else than bread. The thing is impossible. If the accidents of a thing are there, then the substance of the thing is there also. If they seem to be bread and wine, they are bread and wine. Now, it is undeniable, that after consecration the consecrated bread is to all appearance bread, just the same as before. That is. The so-called accidents of the bread

remain. This is fact. But it is equally true that the accidents of a thing cannot remain without its substance. That is philosophy. The corporal presence of Christ, or transubstantiation, is therefore impossible. God requires us to believe many things which are above reason, but never anything that is contrary to reason. To believe a mystery is one thing; to accept a thing that contradicts common sense is another. To say that what is seen is bread, but what is there is not bread, but the physical body of Christ, is not faith, but superstition.

But then came at once the objection. What, in that case, of the words of Christ, "This is My body"? Did He mean, this is My body, or did He mean something else? If he meant this is my body, then the substance or subject after consecration must be, not bread, but Christ's body.

Wycliffe's argument in answer to this was ready. The words, "This is My Body," were intended by Christ in a virtual, figurative, and sacramental sense. The bread after consecration is still bread. Substantially or really, as regards its subject, it is what its accidents declare it to be; bread, real bread. But sacramentally it is the Body of Christ. "The bread, by the words of consecration, is not made the Lord's glorified body, or His spiritual body, which is risen from the dead, or His fleshly body as it was before He suffered death; but the bread still continues bread." This, Wycliffe contended, in the teeth of an angry Church, was not only the true doctrine of

Scripture, but the ancient doctrine of the Catholic Church. "In all Holy Scripture, from the beginning of Genesis to the end of the Apocalypse, there be no wordes written of the makynge of Christe's body." His doctrine, he contended, moreover, was the doctrine of the primitive Church, St. Augustine, and the great Fathers of the faith. "The consecrated host we priests make and bless," he said further in his work on the Eucharist, "is not the body of the Lord, but an effectual sign of it." "It is not to be understood," he declared in the *Trialogus*, "that the body of Christ comes down from heaven to the host consecrated in every church. No. It remains ever fast and sure in heaven."

Wycliffe never retracted these views. On the contrary, when the University of Oxford proceeded to condemn him and his opinions, Wycliffe stood firm. His friends were timid. John of Gaunt, his former patron, refused any longer to champion him. It mattered not. The courage of Wycliffe was invincible. He had ceased to put his trust in princes. His help was in the Lord.

In the latter part of the year 1382, he stood before the convocation of Oxford, before Archbishop Courtney, and the bishops, and the doctors, and his answer to their excommunications and suspensions was a bold confession, in which he declared that there is a real presence in the sacrament, but not a corporal presence. That is, the Body of Christ is present, but not substantially or corporeally. Substantially

the bread is bread ; sacramentally it is the Body of Christ. It is true that in some of his arguments he employed subtle phrases and certain obscure and equivocal expressions. But this was to be expected. Wycliffe was a schoolman, and delighted in the subtilties of the schools. The main thing is that he still stood to his point ; that the bread is still bread and the wine still wine after consecration. The best proof of his not having recanted is the fact of the unrelenting persecution of his enemies.

The Church condemned him, but the Commons exculpated him, and Wycliffe never flinched. He had put his hand to the plough, and he did not turn back. "*Finaliter veritas vincit*" was his proud avowal. I believe that in the end truth will conquer. And again he passed forth from the proud throng unscathed.

Nor did he lack adherents and supporters. When the whole current of Church thought swept fiercely against him, and prelates and doctors denounced him as an apostate, a growing band of faithful ones clung closely to him. They believed his teachings. They became apostles of his doctrines. They went from parish to parish, and town to town ; and soon in every hamlet, village, town, and castle, his disciples abounded. They grew in spite of hatred, and death, and recantations, and persecutions. They sprang up in the schools. They appeared in the North on the streets of Edinburgh. They were found on the continent as far South as Bohemia. They waxed bold

in the Universities. They appeared even amongst the nobles.

Wycliffe maintained to the end his vigorous denunciations of the errors of Rome. Living in quietude in the peaceful rectory of Lutterworth, in the wonderful providence of God, he was unmolested by persecution, and devoted his few remaining years with tireless assiduity to the great cause of truth. Nor did he confine himself to the doctrine of transubstantiation, by any means. He assailed every superstitious practice and doctrine of the Church. And he did better. For while with relentless logic he shook to the base the fabric of error, he set forth also the great positive principles of evangelical truth.

Wycliffe's Tracts.

The two great instruments employed by Wycliffe during these prolific years were his tracts and his Bible. The influence of the tracts was very great. They were simply appeals to the people. They were not addressed to the learned and logical, the scholars and schoolmen of the day, but to all classes of Churchmen. He had addressed the University, and the University, at the dictate of a Roman legate, had hardened its heart. The doctors had ears to hear, but they would not hear. As the Apostle of old said to the envious Jews: "It was necessary that the Word of God should first have been spoken to you; but seeing you put it from you, lo, we turn to the peoples." So Wycliffe turned to the people of the

land. He addressed them in their own mother tongue.

With an amazing industry, Green tells us, he issued tract after tract in the tongue of the people. "The dry, syllogistic Latin is suddenly flung aside, and in the rough, clear, homely English he woos the hearts of the masses." And with wonderful effect. The influence of those easily read little pamphlets was extraordinary. They spoke to them not in French, the language of the Court, or in Latin, the language of the Church, but in English, the language of the people and of every-day life. They were circulated widely. They were read voraciously. They were earnestly believed. They created thinkers. They enlisted the devotion of awakened lives. It was the first Tractarian movement in the English Church.

Wycliffe's tracts were partially negative, partially positive. They exposed and destroyed the erroneous; they explained and restored the true. Nearly every distinctive tenet and dogma of Romanism, or, as it was then and is now so falsely called, the "Catholic" faith, was denounced and proved false. The great canon of the true religion of Christ, the Word of God, and the teaching of the Apostles, was unflinchingly upheld. What saith the Scriptures? What did Christ and His Apostles teach? These seem to have been the only authority and rule of Wycliffe's positions. He had arrived at the conclusion which was the reason of the Reformation; the conclusion that all Christian doctrine is to be tested by God's Holy Word.

The result was a revelation. The things that were most widely and firmly believed by English Churchmen were without a shadow of foundation in Scripture. The great and massive structures of the Roman temple were built on quagmires of superstition and fable. Pardons, indulgences, pilgrimages, auricular confession, image worship, saint worship, the adoration of the host, the absolution of the priest, the infallibility of the Pope; these things were the very substance of Church religion.

And they were all wrong; they were false.

This was a tremendous conclusion for a man in that age to arrive at. But God was his judge, and the Word of God his authority.

They were not in the Scriptures. They were without authority there. Therefore they could not be true. As he said of the host in his tract, the Wicket: "They have made us believe a false law; the falsest belief is taught in it. For where do you find that ever Christ, or any of His disciples or apostles, taught any man to worship it?" He found no adoration of the host in the Word of God. It had no right, therefore, to be practised in the Church. Or, as the Church of England teaches to-day: "No adoration is intended, or ought to be done, for that were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians." With regard to the asserted power of the priest to transform the piece of bread by the words of consecration into the Saviour's real body, he said

again: "You cannot create the world by using the words of creation. How shall you make the Creator of the world by using the words by which ye say He made the bread His body?"

With regard to the doctrine of pardon and indulgences, and the supererogatory merits of the saints, there is no warrant for these things in the Word. They are false, and therefore should not be taught in the Church. "Do they imagine," said he, "that God's grace may be bought and sold like an ox or an ass? The merit of Christ is of itself sufficient to redeem every man from hell." He reprobated the idea of worshipping of images, and cut in twain the casuistry of the Romish defence. "We worship not the image, but the being represented by the image, say the patrons of idolatry in our times. It is sufficient to say the idolatrous heathen did the same." He opposed the celibacy of the clergy. He denied the necessity of prayer to the saints, or saint worship. He rejected the doctrine of purgatory (though some have questioned this), and the value of the Latin tongue in the services of the Church. He impugned the practice of private masses, and of extreme unction. He denounced the artificiality of the chanting of the priests, and the use of oil and salt in the consecration. In short, in his tracts and treatises, Wycliffe either denied or questioned every prominent feature of the Romish system of religion.

In fact, he went almost beyond this.

He took the position, as Fisher says in his history of the Reformation, not only of a Protestant, but, in many important particulars, of a Puritan. Wycliffe certainly did make statements that were capable of misconstruction, and in rejecting totally ecclesiastical tradition as a guide, assumed positions that laid him open to the charge of iconoclasm. If the statements with which he is credited are true, he would not only have abolished Popery, but episcopacy; and destroyed not merely the doctrine of transubstantiation, but all ceremonial worship.

If the statements are true!

That is just the point. For we must remember in the first place, that until lately the accounts we had of Wycliffe's teaching were largely gathered from Romish sources. In the second place, that his protests were largely against the abuses and misuses of things, and are not to be considered as denials of their use, as his idea, for instance, with regard to the rite of confirmation. And, in the third place, as Fuller so wisely said, many of his phrases, which are heretical in sound, would appear orthodox in sense.

However, the influence of the tracts, as we said, was enormous. They found their way into many hearts, and wherever they went they arrested and awakened. If the evidence of a contemporary historian is to be relied on, every second man on the highway was a Wycliffite; that is, a man who, by the teachings and writings of Wycliffe, had come to

doubt and deny the Romish system, and to think for himself on religious subjects.

Wycliffe's Bible.

The Bible of John Wycliffe was his greatest achievement. The work of translating fragments of the Bible into the vulgar tongue had been frequently attempted before Wycliffe's day. Two English versions of the Psalms were made in the reign of Edward the Third by William of Shoreham. But none of the translators, from Bede's day onwards, had the honour of Wycliffe. Wycliffe's honour was not merely his assertion of the theoretical right of Christians to read the Word of God for themselves, but his giving *the whole of the Bible* to the people in their own tongue. The version of St. John's Gospel by Bede was in Saxon. So were the fragments of King Alfred. The scholastic version of the Bible, the Vulgate, was in Latin. The portions of Archbishop Aelfric, and Rolle, and William of Shoreham were, to all practical purposes, ecclesiastical curiosities. Nobody knew anything about them. The Church, so far from encouraging the reading of the Bible, encouraged its obscurity. The Church of England, or rather the Church of Rome in England—for that is what it practically was—so far from ordering it to be read in the churches, was soon about to order to prison everybody who read it at all. No jailer ever kept a prisoner more secure in an inner prison than the Church of Rome kept the

Word of God. A few persons here and there could read it in Latin; but the majority cared nothing about it. The most learned and intelligent of the clergy, on their own confession, knew less of the Bible than many of the Wycliffites. The Bible was a sealed book, imprisoned, unknown; an antiquarian curiosity.

Wycliffe boldly claimed the Bible for the people. The Bible, he said in effect, is the faith of the Church. If it is heresy to read the Bible, then the Holy Ghost Himself is condemned, who gave tongues to the Apostles of Christ to speak the Word of God in all languages under heaven. If the faith of the Church is in the Bible, then the Bible should be in the hands of the people. If God's Word is the life of the world, and every word of God is the life of the human soul, no Antichrist can take it away from those that are Christian men, and thus suffer the people to die from hunger. All truth is contained in Scripture. There is no Court besides the Court of Heaven. Though there were one hundred priests, and all the friars in the world were turned into cardinals, yet should we learn more from the Gospels than we are taught by that multitude. True sons will in nowise go about to infringe the will of their heavenly Father. These were his words. These were the impulses that spurred Wycliffe on in his great work of translation.

Wycliffe's Bible in English was first published in 1382. Though printing was, of course, uninvented,

the devotedness of his transcribers produced copies in abundance. Hundreds of busy hands were at work to meet the demand that it instantly created, and there are still extant, it is said, about one hundred and fifty hand-copied versions of Wycliffe's Bible.

This year 1382 is a great date in English history. It is a year to be had greatly in honour of Englishmen. The Bible is now in the hands of the people, and the truth is abroad. The foundation stone of the reformed Church of England is laid. The Reformation has begun.

The Bible of John Wycliffe was the masterpiece of his life. To repeat. Its distinctiveness was that it was the first real attempt to give the whole Bible to the people of England in their own tongue. It was not merely that he conceived the idea, but that with the dogged determination of the Yorkshireman, with invincible patience, he carried it into final effect. He only had the Vulgate, the Latin translation of the Bible, to translate from. His knowledge of Greek was limited, and his acquaintance with Hebrew practically nil. Yet in spite of his limitations, Wycliffe's Bible, the first of all our Bibles, produced in an age of comparative critical ignorance, has maintained its position to this day as the parent not only of our present authorized version, but of the majority of versions since his day. Not only so, but the Bible that has been given to the world in four or five hundred languages is the English Bible, which was the direct child of Wycliffe's version.

Thus, as a modern writer says, Wycliffe's Bible became the parent Bible of all the Bibles in the world, and the English language was given the honour of being the first of all the modern tongues into which the Word of God was translated.

But more than this.

In the pages of Wycliffe's Bible, the language of our forefathers suddenly, almost dramatically, stood forth in its final English form. The mass of the people had spoken for many years a language which was merely an Anglo-Saxon, Latinic, Teutonic, Franco-English jumble. But the language which we now call our English language found its earliest popular written expression in the pages of Wycliffe's Bible. If Chaucer and Sir John de Mandeville fixed the language for the cultured, the Bible of John Wycliffe marked the settlement of the English language for the people. Wycliffe's version of the Bible, says Wylie in his exhaustive History of Protestantism, powerfully contributed to form the English language. If Chaucer is the Father of English poetry, Wycliffe is the Father of English prose. Dr. Lechler says that Wycliffe's translation of the Bible marks as great an epoch in the development of the English language as Luther's translation in the history of the German language. This more recent philologists have come to acknowledge.

Wycliffe lived but a short time after this. He did not appear again before the public eye. But, though he lived in retirement, he accomplished a vast

amount of work. He labored with untiring enthusiasm, as far as his failing health permitted, in his parish at Lutterworth, preaching sermons, writing tracts, and scattering his writings abroad over the land. An idea of his enormous working power may be gathered from the fact that his published works in Latin and English are estimated at about one hundred and sixty-one.

Little is known of his life during these latter days. The only incident of importance that is generally related is the Brief of the Pope Urban demanding his appearance at Rome, and Wycliffe's alleged reply, so full of gentle sarcasm and innocent instruction. He told the Pope he would be delighted to explain his teachings to anyone, but especially to him, because, as the first follower of Christ in Christendom, he would, of course, be the humblest, and most exempt from worldly honours! And as he, of all men, was most bound by the law of Christ, he would naturally leave all temporal dominion and rule to the secular power! He regretted that he was unable to appear before the Pope in person, but would, both by himself and with others, remember him in his prayers. The letter is given in full in Foxe's Book of Martyrs. It is really a delicious bit of reading.

Wycliffe died on the last day of the last month of 1384, leaving behind him a noble heritage of truth, and a record of untarnished devotion to the cause of Christ.

He was not only the greatest reformer of the

Church of England; he was the first reformer of Europe. His reputation was continental. He anticipated the Reformation of the sixteenth century in England and abroad. If Luther was the Joshua of the Reformation movement, Wycliffe was its Moses. Here again was that saying verified; one soweth and another reapeth. Wycliffe sowed, Luther reaped. Wycliffe spake, Cranmer and Ridley re-echoed the words. As far as his influence in England is concerned, a modern Oxford professor describes it as wholly unapproached in the entire history of the nation for its effect on English theology and English religious life. To Wycliffe, says Professor Burrows, we owe more than to any one person who can be mentioned, our English language, our English Bible, and our reformed religion.

But his influence was not confined to England. The works of Wycliffe scattered through the Continent became the seeds of reformations. They influenced the universities. Students from Bohemia, encouraged by the Queen of King Richard II., herself a Bohemian princess, to study at Oxford, returned to their homes with Wycliffe's tracts and Scriptures. The Continental Church world was shaken by John Hus, the brilliant reformer of Prague; and the salient subject of the magnificent Council of Constance, with its babel of voices, was the doctrine and the teaching and the works of the man who died in quiet Lutterworth. He being dead yet spake. These cardinals, and archbishops, and bishops, and kings,

and dukes, and marquises, and counts, condemned his writings, and commanded his bones to be exhumed and burnt. But in vain. In vain did Romish bishops burn his books. In vain did an Anglican bishop exhume his bones and cast his ashes on the flowing stream. "The brook called the Swift conveyed his ashes into Avon, Avon into Severn, Severn into the narrow seas, they into the main ocean." The very ashes of Wycliffe became an emblem of his doctrine dispersed over the world.

Wycliffe's Influence and Abiding Work.

As this is perhaps the most important as well as the most interesting phase of our study, we will endeavor, before we conclude, to show in a more detailed manner the effect of this life and teaching of Wycliffe upon the subsequent history of Europe. A great man does not work during his lifetime only. He leaves forces working afterwards. He projects his personality far into the future, and in proportion to his greatness is the impress that he makes upon the after generations. It is only of recent years that the magnitude of Wycliffe's personality and "the epochal importance" of his labors have been intelligently appreciated.

The effects of Wycliffe's life-work may be epitomized thus :—

1st. Its influence upon the British character and nation.

2nd. Its influence upon the constitution and doctrine of the modern Church of England.

3rd. Its reactionary influence upon the Church of Rome.

4th. Its more extensive influence upon the northern continental nations.

1st. *Wycliffe's Influence upon the British Nation and Character.*

It may be unquestioningly said that John Wycliffe was the true precursor of British liberty and British freedom in its noblest aspect. The highest liberty is spiritual liberty. It is a higher liberty than even British liberty. If to-day this passion for personal religious and spiritual liberty is the peculiar characteristic of the British Empire, and of the Northern nations of the world, it is largely owing to one man, and that one man an English Churchman, John Wycliffe. It was he who first flashed on the modern world the rays of the Bible. He was not only the first Englishman, but the first man, to recognize the truth and to promulgate the truth, that the freedom of the Church and the freedom of the nation had its fundamental not in the Magna Charta of the nobility of King John, but in that greater Magna Charta of the freedom of the Church and of the nation, that deed of grace and promise given by the Heavenly Father, God's Own inspired Word. It is this moral constitution written upon the hearts of the people of England which is,

as our great and good Queen Victoria said, the real secret of England's greatness. It is to this we owe our British love of freedom and our British submission to law, our English constitution, and our national love of truth. Wycliffe builded deeper than he knew when he worked as a loyalist for the spiritual liberty of the subject, and as a translator for the right of the English people to the Bible. The leaven which Wycliffe had inserted within the mass of English thought never ceased to ferment, and the religious liberty we enjoy at the present day may all be traced to him as the human source.

2nd. *Wycliffe's Influence upon the Present Teaching of the Church of England.*

The question of the effect of the career and teachings of John Wycliffe upon the present-day teaching of the Church of England is a very large one, for it opens up the very important question of the relation of Wycliffe to the Reformation movement. As far as detail is concerned, it is certain that some of the sociological and sacramental views of Wycliffe can in no measure be claimed as the teachings of the Church of England to-day, for Wycliffe in nowise attempted to compile a system of dogmatic theology, or to formulate a series of doctrinal articles. But with regard to the main principles assumed by Wycliffe, it is certain that his cardinal doctrinal positions are the cardinal and distinctive principles of the Church of England.

This may be asserted with regard to three important positions.

First and foremost of all, Wycliffe maintained, as the corner-stone of his doctrinal position, the supremacy of the authority of the Holy Scriptures. With him the infallible test of all doctrines was the Word of God. Nothing that anyone could teach, nothing that anyone could do, could be of equal authority with Holy Scripture. To this touchstone all human writings, human opinions, and human traditions, were to be unhesitatingly brought. The authority of Scripture infinitely surpasses the authority of any writings whatever. It is God's word, and therefore the highest authority. *De Veritate Sacrae Scripturae*, pp. 200-394. To hold the contrary is the most dangerous of heresies. Not only so. He took what was in those days the audacious and extraordinary position that the teachings of popes and prelates were not to be accepted as ex-cathedra statements of Church belief simply because they were the statements of popes and prelates to which, because of their authority, all men should bow. Men, that is, Christian men, Churchmen, the lay people, were to be established in God's law. They were to examine for themselves the faith, and to know the subject of belief. "Forasmuch as the Bible contains Christ, that is, all that is necessary for salvation, it is necessary for all men, not for priests alone. It alone is the supreme law that is to rule Church, State, and Christian life, without human

traditions and statutes. The Bible, according to Christ's will, is the foundation of all true life, the Magna Charta of the Church, the final standard of truth and error. The Bible is for each and all; every one is bound to study it. In the sense of being a lover of God's Word, every man ought to be a theologian." Ibid., pp. 370-378-382.

In other words, he promulgated as his private opinion what is now the authorized faith of the Church of England in the Sixth Article: "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." This is exactly what Wycliffe contended for; the doctrinal supremacy of the Scriptures, and the reasonable right of private judgment. The Bible, and the Bible alone, was to be the standard of doctrine.

In the next place, Wycliffe taught men "to trust wholly in Christ; to rely altogether on His sufferings; to beware of seeking to be justified in any other way than by His righteousness." "The performance of good works without Divine grace is worthless. Those who follow Christ become righteous through the participation of His righteousness, and will be saved." "Human nature is wholly at enmity with God; we cannot perform a good work unless it be properly His good work."

"We have no merit. His mercy prevents us so that we receive grace; and it followeth us so as to help us and keep us in grace."

"The merit of Christ is of itself sufficient to redeem every man from hell. Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ is sufficient for salvation." "There must be atonement made for sin, according to the righteousness of God. The Person to make this atonement must be God and man." "Christ died not for His own sins. He died for the sins that others had done." "If men believe in Christ, then the promises of life that God hath made shall be given by virtue of Christ to all men that make this the chief matter." "As a right looking on that adder of brass saved the people from the venom of serpents, so a right look by full belief on Christ saveth His people."

It is probable that Wycliffe did not hold with Luther's clearness, as both Melancthon and Dorner have hinted, the doctrine of justification by faith. Still, it cannot be doubted that he grasped the reality of salvation by the merit of Christ alone. He got hold of the fact rather than the dogma of justification by faith. And his teaching is practically identical with what is now the distinctive teaching of the tenth, eleventh, and thirteenth articles of the English Church.

"Men become righteous through the participation of Christ's righteousness," said Wycliffe.

"We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,"

is the distinctive teaching of the Church of England (Article XI.).

"Seek not to be justified in any other way than by His righteousness," said Wycliffe. "It is altogether a vain imagination that man can of his moral behaviour induce God to give him the grace of the Holy Spirit needful for conversion." "It is not good for us to trust in our merits, in our virtues, in our righteousness."

"We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our works or deservings," is the teaching of the Church (Article XI. of the Justification of Man).

"We cannot perform a good work unless it be properly His good work. We cannot so much as think a good thought unless Jesus send it," said Wycliffe.

"We have no power to do good works pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us when we have that good will," is the teaching of the Church (Article X.).

"Unbelievers, though they might perform works apparently good in their matter, still were not to be accounted righteous men," said Wycliffe.

"Works done before the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of His Spirit, are not pleasant to God . . . neither do they make men meet to receive

grace," is the teaching of the Church of England (Article XIII.).

The five Articles, from Article X. to Article XIV., are almost ipsissima verba of Wycliffe's writings; a brief summary of the teachings of Wycliffe on the way of salvation.

Then as to his teaching on the Church and the Sacrament there is scarcely an Article, from the nineteenth to the thirty-second of the Articles of the Church of England, which was not found substantially in the teaching of Wycliffe. His teaching, with regard to the nature of the Church, was directly opposed to the so-called Catholic Church teaching on the subject, and is similar to the distinctive (that is, distinctive from the so-called Roman Catholic teaching) Church teaching of the Church of England to-day. He declared that the Church was made up of the whole body of the faithful, that is, true believers, and that the clergy alone are not the Church. He repudiated the current idea that Holy Church meant merely prelates and priests, with monks and canons and friars. "Christian men, taught in God's law, call Holy Church *the congregation of just men*, for whom Jesus Christ shed His blood."

The visible Church of Christ, says the Church of England, is a congregation of faithful men.—Art. XIX. So there was also to Wycliffe, although he may not have used the precise language of our Church Article to-day, a Church visible and a Church invisible, membership in the former by no means implying

(as in the Romish system) membership in the latter. The Pope and Bishops, if "of the world," were no members of the holy Church. The True Church, the Real Church, or, as Hooker used to call it, the Church Mystical, consisted of the elect only, those who from eternity were predestinated to salvation. "Not every one who is *in* the Church is *of* the Church." In one word. Wycliffe deliberately opposed the idea that the Church means the Visible Catholic Church, or the organized communion of the Roman hierarchy, and clearly anticipated the teaching of the Bishop-reformers that the true Catholic Church is the blessed company of all faithful people in its mystical or invisible, and visible aspects. The authority of the Word was superior to that of the Church and Councils, as the Church of England distinctly (namely, in opposition to the position of the Church of Rome) teaches in Articles XX. and XXI. "The Church has fallen because she has abandoned the gospels and preferred the laws of the Pope. Although there should be a hundred popes, we should refuse to accept their deliverances in things pertaining to the faith, unless they were founded in Holy Scripture." It is almost the very language of Article XXI.

He taught that the doctrine of the Church (the so-called Roman Catholic Church), as to pardons, and saint worship, and image worship, and relic worship, was superstitious, and unwarranted by Scripture. The Church of England teaches the same (Article XXII.).

He taught that the Latin should not be invariably used in the public worship of the Church. The people did not understand it, and it was contrary to the Word of God. The Church of England teaches the same (Article XXIV.).

With regard to the sacraments, especially the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, while the teaching of Wycliffe was defective in some particulars, it is remarkable how similar it is in the main to the distinctive teaching of the Church of England. He held most clearly, as we have already shown, that the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation was a figment. "The consecrated bread was not Christ; it was a sign, an effectual sign of Christ." "Transubstantiation rests on no Scriptural grounds. The bread still continues bread." "Substantially it is bread; sacramentally it is the body of Christ. The body and blood of Christ are in the sacrament figuratively and spiritually." This was Wycliffe's language.

The language of the Articles is almost verbally the same. "The sacraments are effectual signs of grace." (Article XXV.).

"Transubstantiation (or the change of substance of bread and wine) in the Supper of the Lord cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but it is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions" (Article XXVIII.). "The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner." (Article XXVIII.)

Wycliffe condemned the system of sacramental adoration. "For where fynde ye that ever Christ, or any of His disciples, or apostles, taught any man to worshipec it." So Article XXVIII.: "The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped." And Article XXV.: "The sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon or to be carried about."

He taught that the thing needful in the reception of the Lord's Supper is not merely a vain formalism and a superstitious rite, but a communion with Christ according to the spiritual life. The very teaching of Article XXVIII. and Article XXIX.: "The mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith."

"The wicked and such as be void of a lively faith" "eat not the body of Christ."

In short, if Wycliffe did not teach in extenso, he taught in embryo nearly every *distinctive* doctrine now authoritatively set forth as the formulated teaching of the Church of England. In those great fundamental matters of faith, the Holy Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Resurrection, he held with the Creeds of the Catholic Church. So, in like manner, does the Church of England in the first five Articles; for the first five Articles do not therefore contain anything peculiarly distinctive of the teaching of the Church of England.

In connection with this phase of the question,

however, one thing must be clearly held in mind. The teachings of Wycliffe were, after all, mere private opinions. They were simply the unauthorized views of an individual. Not only so. In the view of the Church they were absolutely heretical opinions. The Church, that is, the Roman Church, declared them to be "false and erroneous conclusions, and most wicked and damnable heresies." They were distinctly and flatly opposed to the teaching of the Church. They were abhorred by the Church. They were condemned by the Church. Wycliffe was a Protestant. The Church to which he belonged was not Protestant, but Roman.

And further. It must be remembered that the modern, loosely-held idea that there were at that time a number of churches holding their independent doctrines, and that the Church of England was one of these, is an utterly unhistoric opinion. The Church that condemned Wycliffe, and from which Wycliffe differed, was the Holy Mother Church, that is, the Holy Church of Rome, which was known in England as the Catholic Church. There was in those days no known doctrine of the Church of England which was distinct from the doctrines of the Church of Rome. Every doctrine of the Church in England was the doctrine of the Church of Rome. There was no distinctive teaching of the Church of England as there is to-day. But now, those same views, those same teachings, for holding which men were once burned by the Church of England as a Church, are now the doctrine and the

teaching of the Church of England as a Church. The private opinions of a man have now become the teaching of the Church.

3rd. *The Reactionary Influence of the Life and Teaching and Work of John Wycliffe upon the Church of Rome.*

This is a subject that is sometimes forgotten. But it ought not to be overlooked. Wycliffe awakened not merely a national, but a continental, popular conscience. He sent the schoolmaster called Truth abroad to teach an awakening world. And more than that. He shouted into the ear of a recumbent giant, and compelled that giant to wake up and put his house in order. It was not Luther, it was Wycliffe who first disturbed the somniloquisms of the Papacy. It was not Luther, it was Wycliffe who first awakened the Papal Court to turn over a new leaf and mend its ways. It did not all come in his age. But the day soon came when even in the Roman Church a Pope Joan would be an impossibility, and an Alexander VI. an anachronism. The haughtiest despot of all the earth had to learn the bitter lesson that he must set a better example and stop his evil ways; and he had to learn it from an English priest. If the greatest Council ever convened by the Church of Rome assembled thirty years later in the City of Constance, with an estimated attendance of 5,000 delegates and 10,000 visitors, it was convened and did its work largely, if not solely, because an English

reformer had disturbed the Church and its ways. If the spirit of a Ximenes, a Savonarola, and later on a Quignoni, evoked reforming impulses in the very bosom of the Papacy, it was owing in large measure to John Wycliffe, an English Churchman. He was the voice; they were but Roman echoes.

4th. *Wycliffe's Influence upon the Modern Continental Nations.*

A modern biographer of Wycliffe, the Rev. J. C. Carrick, has traced in a most interesting manner the connection between the preaching and publishing work of Wycliffe and the Church of Scotland. It seems that in Wycliffe's day many Scottish young men of promise were attracted to Oxford and came within the reach of his influence. The mesmeric spell of his personality seems to have operated upon them, as upon all his followers. They returned to Scotland Wycliffite enthusiasts. His teachings were promulgated with incredible rapidity, and records remain to this day of statutes and laws put in operation to annihilate the arising Wycliffe heresy. It was by these men that the torch was handed on to the Scottish reformers. The path between Wycliffe and Knox can almost as clearly be traced as that between Wycliffe and our reformation. Wycliffe's New Testament was translated into the current Scotch language of the day, and so the light was lit that afterwards illumined that influential church. Knox

was spiritually the son of Wishart. Wishart was the son of that Bible which was brought by Wycliffe's Scotch disciples into the north country.

The Reformation in Bohemia, and the works of Hus and Jerome, of Prague, were simply echoes of the work of John Wycliffe. John Hus, or John of Husinec, the famous Churchman of Prague, Dean of the philosophical faculty, and Rector of its University, came into contact with the writings of Wycliffe through Jerome of Prague. He is said at first to have abhorred them intensely, and to have advised a student who possessed them to go and fling them into the river. But gradually truth triumphed over the prejudice of ignorance. Hus became an enthusiastic Wycliffite, and his intrepid advocacy of his doctrines overspread the land, inaugurated a national reformation, and precipitated such a panic in the Roman Church that the Council of Constance was convened, and the ecclesiastical world convulsed by the storm he raised. It is only natural that the spirit of national patriotism should have attributed to Hus, the national hero, and the national saint, a measure of originality which later researches have reluctantly deprived him of. But, as a matter of fact, as Professor Loserth and others have justly shown, the writings of Hus were largely a translation of the writings of Wycliffe, copied with the innocence of a child. His work on the Church, which was considered so powerful, and was so celebrated, was simply a meagre abridgment of Wycliffe's *de Ecclesia*. "What if the contempo-

raries of Hus, who represented the intellectual capacity of the Europe of that day assembled at Constance, had known the original Hus had drawn upon, instead of his feeble imitation!" It is hardly fair, however, to charge upon Wycliffe and Hus the dreary conflicts of the religious wars that ravaged Bohemia after the Council of Constance, and the barbarous wars of the Calixtines and Taborites. They may, with much more justice, be charged to the monstrous perfidy and cruelty of the Papal hierarchy. Rather, give to Hus and Wycliffe the credit of the purer faith of the United Brethren of Bohemia, and their episcopal succession through the Bishops of the Waldenses.

And as it was in Scotland and Bohemia, so, less directly, it was in Spain, in Italy, in Germany. When Cardinal Ximenes brought out the first Polyglot Bible, he was simply following the example of the English reformer in utilizing his instrument of ecclesiastical regeneration. When Savonarola in Italy hurled his fiery word-arrows against the Roman See, he was simply re-assuming the position and reiterating the protest of the old rector of Lutterworth. And as to the work of the Mystics of Germany, and the efforts of Gerson and John of Wesel, it was simply the spirit of John Wycliffe revived in another form. They were mere echoes restating in adapted language the words and ideas of the man who first emerged out of the darkness of the Middle Ages with the torch of truth.

As to the oft-disputed question of Wycliffe's influence upon Luther, it is unfortunate that the Germans, through partiality to their national reformer-hero, should have so earnestly repudiated it, for, as an able modern writer has shown, there is scarcely an idea, or an argument, used by Luther, with one doubtful exception, which is not to be found in the works of Wycliffe; and Germany, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, was honeycombed with Hussite Societies. There is, in Vienna, one of Wycliffe's manuscripts with the name Doctor Martinus Luter plainly inscribed upon it. Leland, who wrote about 1530, says that he saw in Germany quite a number of Wycliffe's writings in circulation. In fact, we may well summarize the marvellous influence of our great reformer by the words of Milton in his brilliant prose work, the *Areopagitica*: "Had it not been for the obstinate perverseness of our prelates against the divine and admirable spirit of Wycliffe to suppress him as a schismatic or innovator, perhaps neither the Bohemian Hus and Jerome—no, nor the names of Luther and Calvin—had ever been known, the glory of reforming all our neighbours had been completely ours."

To conclude.

What, after all, was the final secret of this man's career? What was the deepest root of this great banyan-life that has fastened its limbs in many a land, and still is stirring countless lives? What was

the key that opened to John Wycliffe a door of power such as few men ever possessed over their fellow men?

It was not merely scholarship, though he was by long odds the most distinguished English doctor of the schools, the Evangelic Doctor par excellence. A professor of Divinity, a master of Balliol, a brilliant lecturer, a famous preacher, a chaplain of the king, he was the outstanding English scholar of the day. The learned looked up to him, for he was head and shoulders above them all. But as far as the students and clergy of the land were concerned, he was as Mount Blanc to the hillsides around Chamonix. Knighton, one of the bitterest of his Roman opponents, said of Wycliffe: He was the most eminent Doctor in Theology of his day. In philosophy, his reputation was second to none, and in the learning of the schools he was without a peer. The University of Oxford, in its now famous testimonial, also declared that in logic, philosophy, and theology, he was without an equal. Lechler, ii., 318.

It was not merely his courage, though he was the Athanasius of his day. To defy a current of tradition that had flowed for centuries unwithstood; to stand alone, all alone, against Popes and Cardinals and prelates; this John Wycliffe did, and it proved the man of heroic mould. Wycliffe seemed ignorant of the very meaning of fear. Like Lord Lawrence he feared man so little because he feared God so much. Councils, Popes, doctors, judges; these things were nothing to him. He had a greater appeal than that to

Cæsar. He went back farther than the Primitive Church ; even to the voice of Christ and the Word of God.

It was something deeper than scholarship, and originality, and valour. The final secret of Wycliffe's power was this. He had a simple, personal faith in his Saviour. He loved Christ. He lived Christ. He walked humbly with his God. He was a good man. His life was a demonstration of the Invisible Realities. In a day when men of holy name were oftentimes most unholy, John Wycliffe was acknowledged to be the most holy of all men in his age. In a day when churchmen seemed to live only for advancement and earthly rewards, he sought neither wealth nor preferment, and preferred the path of privation.

Perhaps the most wonderful tribute ever paid to Wycliffe was that of one of his contemporaries, who said he was absolutely blameless in his conduct. There is good reason, also, to believe that when another man of his age, the poet Chaucer, drew his famous picture of the English parson, he was just painting a word-portrait of John Wycliffe.

"A good man was there of religion,
And was a poor parson of a town,
But rich he was of holy thought and work " ;

And when Chaucer goes on to say that though he was a learned man, a clerk, and preached the Gospel of Christ most truly, and devoutly taught his people,

patient, benign, and diligent, yet, after all, the most impressive thing about the man was that

“This noble example to his sheep he gave
That first he wrought and afterward he taught,
Out of the gospel he the wordës caught.
Christ’s lore, and His Apostles twelve
He taught, and first he followed it himself.”

he was, in all probability, just describing the good rector in the quiet little village in Leicestershire, who often might have been seen visiting the sick, telling Christ’s love to the dying, and cheering the poor in their hovel homes. Never, says a modern writer, does the great Doctor Wycliffe, first scholar of the day, and the keenest logician of Oxford, seem so truly great as when we trace his footsteps in the hovels of Lutterworth.

If John Wycliffe was as intensely beloved by those who knew him best, as he was maligned intensely by those who understood him not ; if with a singular intrepidity, and staunch perseverance, he pursued one single aim and purpose, the emancipation of his fellows from error and their establishment in truth ; if as a national Churchman he led a national, if not an international, moral revival ; if as a writer he helped largely to form the language of a world-influencing empire ; if by his immortal achievement, the translation of the Bible, he inaugurated a movement that to-day is swaying the nations of the world through four hundred of its languages ; if as an evangelist “he found an abundant reward in the

blessings of his countrymen of every rank and age, to whom he unfolded the words of eternal life"; if his whole life was "a call to others to stand fast, to quit themselves like men, and to be strong," a beacon that always shone, a trumpet that never gave an uncertain sound as it prepared men for the battle; if his notoriety as a scholar was altogether inferior to his personality as a Christian; it was because he had learned through the leading of the Holy Spirit and the promise of the Scriptures, to enthrone in his heart the Lord Jesus as his Saviour and Lord. "The Name of Jesus filleth those that love it with spiritual joy." "It gets a man a warmth of love. It lifts up the mind to heavenly melody. It chases away the watchful fiends." "Oh thou good Name. Oh thou sweet Name! Oh glorious Name! Oh heathful Name! Oh Name to be desired!" "I sought to love Jesus, and the more I grew perfect in his love, so much the sweeter His Name savoured to me." "Thou most sweet Lord, from henceforward pass not from me, dwell with me in Thy sweetness." "Oh thou most Holy Ghost, come unto me, draw me to Thee, inflame my heart with Thy love."

No English-speaking Christian should ever be ashamed of the man who could write such revealing words as that; the man who stands at the very summit of the eminence which has been climbed throughout the ages by English Churchmen—John Wycliffe.

CRANMER

An Historical Study

by the

Rev. Dyson Hague, M. A.

Rector Memorial Church, London, Ont.

Canon St. Paul's Cathedral, London, Ont.

Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Huron.

Lecturer in Liturgics, Wycliffe College, Toronto.

The Church Record S. S. Publications, Confederation Life Building,
TORONTO.

THIS is not a biography. It is an historical study. It is not, by any means, intended as a complete biographical statement. It is intended to be suggestive. It is an attempt to throw a fair light upon a much-slandered historical character, and to explain a much-misunderstood career. It is, in a measure, a vindication. In its preparation, I have used the standard English Histories, such as Macaulay, Froude, Green, and Aubrey ; the Roman Catholic historian, Lingard ; the Church historians, Collier, Burnet, Milman, Perry, Massingberd, Martineau, Cutts, Jennings, Hore, Wakeman, Geikie, Blunt, Innes, Southey, Fisher, Dixon, Overton, and Clark ; Dean Hook's Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury ; and above all, Foxe, Strype, and the invaluable editions of Cranmer's works, and the Original Letters, by the Parker Society.

D. H.

Cranmer.

Few historical characters have been more misrepresented than Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, from 1533 to 1556. Roman Catholic historians, from Lingard downwards, have almost uniformly traduced him. Anglican Catholics, from Wakeman upwards, have almost uniformly misjudged him. And a Protestant historian, who ought to have known better, has done more to prejudice English opinion against him than all the Roman and Neo-Catholic writers combined. It is Lord Macaulay who is chiefly responsible for the popular view of Cranmer. In his *History of England*, he has painted Archbishop Cranmer as a man unscrupulous in his dealings, zealous for nothing, a coward and a time-server in action, a placable enemy, and a lukewarm friend; and his characterization in the *Essay on Hallam's Constitutional History* of Cranmer as a merely supple, timid, interested courtier, has passed into almost universal opinion.

It can be certainly said that the idea in the average mind about Cranmer is, that while possessing many amiable and excellent qualities, he was in the main, if not a traitor and a hypocrite, at least a time-server without character, a Churchman without principle, a cowardly leader, timid, pliant, and vacillating, an arch-episcopal Mr. Anything, and a political Mr. Facing-both-ways. Froude, the English historian, has left it on record that Macaulay's unfairness

to Cranmer first suggested to him the project of writing history.

It is time that a reaction should set in, and that a juster opinion of this great English Churchman should prevail. As a matter of fact, Cranmer was a man born, as it were, out of due time. He had to fill a very trying, and oftentimes a very thankless, position, and even his detractors have reluctantly admitted that he played his part to the best of his ability under circumstances of almost incredible difficulty. A man of studious, retiring, and academic habits, he was suddenly thrust out into the hurly-burly of the most strenuous, ecclesiastical-national life. He was forced to play a part that was entirely distasteful to his temperament. Cranmer never was, never could have been, a great, big, bold, world-defying man like Luther. He was not a daring and outspoken truth-champion like Knox. He was not of adamant native strength, uncompromising in his dogmatic position, like Calvin. He was of less masterful and imperious mould. But manfully and earnestly, here a little and there a little, not without occasional trips and falls, he did what he could in the times in which God placed him, with the material God had built him of.

It is easy for us to sit on our velvet cushions of twentieth-century ease and criticise the courage of those who were sailing the ship in the storm-centre of those Reformation days. Perhaps if we lived a little nearer the times, we would echo the words

of a great historian of the Church: The name of Thomas Cranmer deserves to stand upon eternal record, having been the first Protestant Archbishop of this country, and the greatest instrument under God in the happy reformation of the Church of England, in whose piety, learning, wisdom, and conflict, and blood, the foundation of it was laid. He was a man of more excellent spirit than the ordinary run of men.

Archbishop Cranmer was born in 1487. His father was an English country gentleman. He was sent to college at an early age, and developed a remarkable talent for study. At Cambridge he was well known as a scholar of Jesus College, became a master of sophistry and the logic of the schools, and was distinguished by a habit for accurate and scientific observation which afterwards became his most salient characteristic as a scholar. *Vehemens observator erat.*

At that time the new wave of thought that was breaking over the religious world touched England. The publication of the Greek Testament by Erasmus gave an impetus to University life that was epoch-marking. The old Roman foundations in worship and doctrine were being shaken, and the world was waking out of the deep sleep of the Middle Ages. The thing that struck Erasmus on his visit to England was the number of young men who were taking up the study of the Bible. Cranmer became a diligent student of the Scriptures. The whole of

his influential life may be traced to this foundation and root; the earnest, personal, first-hand study of the Bible. It might be said of him, as Carlisle said long afterwards of Luther: "He gradually got himself founded as on the rock. No wonder he should venerate the Bible, which had brought this blessed help to him. He prized it as the Word of the Highest must be prized by such a man. He determined to hold by it, as through life and to death he firmly did."

In 1529 a chance observation caused him to leap into fame. The matter of the King's divorce from Queen Catharine was in discussion at a country house where he happened to be staying, and Cranmer remarked that the question ought to be decided and discussed by the authority of the Word of God, and might be done just as well in England, in the universities, as in Rome. The remark was carried to the king. It speedily brought Cranmer into favor with Henry VIII., and started him on a path of extraordinary Church influence. It did more than that. It fortified Cranmer in his position as an advocate of the right of private judgment with regard to Scripture and truth, as opposed to the claim of the Pope of Rome. It gave him a starting point of independence as a thinker and a theologian. And further; it signalized him as the man for the hour. The King and the nobility alike recognized him as a man who was prepared to stand as an Englishman, and as an English Churchman, against the overshadowing

prerogatives of the Papacy. The King was looking for just such a man. He found in Cranmer what he wanted.

In 1529 Cranmer was despatched as an ambassador to Rome, and bore himself well. It was a daring thing in those days to contend with the Pope. But, following the example of the great Apostle, he gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour, that the truth of the Gospel might continue with us. He contended firmly these points:

1st. That no one *jure divino* could or ought to marry his brother's wife.

2nd. That the Bishop of Rome by no means ought to dispose to the contrary.

In 1533, Cranmer, who had been Archdeacon of Taunton, King's Chaplain, Pope's Plenipotentiary General in England, was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury.

This was a great epoch in the history of the Church of England. Cranmer accepted the appointment with unfeigned reluctance. Not only did he feel, as he expressed it, very sorry to leave his study; he felt his great inability to such a promotion. And further: "He expressly told the King that he could accept it only on one condition; that it should come from him, and not from the Pope, inasmuch as the King, as the Supreme governor of the Church of England in causes ecclesiastical and temporal, had the full right and donation of all manner of bishoprics and benefices, and no foreign authority." The

King, after a good many talks on the subject, agreed that Cranmer might accept the Archbishopric, making his protestation to protect his conscience. This Cranmer did. "I indeed, bona fide, made my protestation that I did not acknowledge his authority any further than as it agreed with the express Word of God. And this my protestation I did cause to be enrolled." Cranmer Letters, Park. Soc. 223-224.

After receiving the eleven Bulls from the Pope, which he gave to the King, Cranmer was consecrated with the usual form and ceremony of the Roman Church. Later on when he received the pallium, he again asseverated that he took the oath under the same protestation. Cranmer has been doubly assailed for doing these things. The Romanists have taunted him for his want of principle as a Churchman. The Anglo-Catholics have taunted him for his time-serving subservience to Henry. It must be asserted, moreover, in all fairness, that throughout this period of his career, Cranmer honestly seems to have held as a conviction the right of the King's supremacy as opposed to the Pope's supremacy. To some Church minds it seems to be impossible that a Churchman could take such a position. But Cranmer certainly appears to have accepted it, and to have accepted it with conscientiousness. That is, he regarded the Pope's headship of a national Church as a usurpation, and seemed to honestly believe that the King, as head of the Nation, was, under Christ of course the Heavenly Head, the head of the national

Church. "Why," said Doctor Martin, in the famous trial at Oxford, September, 1555, before Brokes, "why, you made Henry the Eighth Supreme Head of the Church!" "Yes," said the Archbishop, "of all the people of England, as well ecclesiastical as temporal." "And not of the Church," said Martin. "No," said Cranmer, "for Christ is only Head of His Church, and of the faith and religion of the same. The King is head and governor of his people, which are the visible Church." With this postulate, it can be seen that Cranmer's character, essentially cautious and tardy in development, was evidencing a certain force of independence. From this time on, Cranmer's chief care was to advance God's cause in his high position. The thing that he lived for, his primary concern, was the reformation of the Church, in morals, and doctrine, and finally in worship. The stages through which he passed in his archepiscopate were, broadly speaking, three :

First.—The Political-antipapal.

Second.—The Protestant-doctrinal.

Third.—The Evangelical-liturgical.

The first stage through which Cranmer passed was the Antipapal. In the Parliament of 1533 he moved that the usurped power of the Pope was a mere tyranny; that it was against the law of God, according to the Divine Word. This was the national legislative complement of the renunciation of the supremacy of the Pope by the Convocations of York

and Canterbury in 1531. The abolishment of the foreign Papal power by Act of Parliament, and the voluntary separation of the Church of England as a particular or national Church, from the corporate unity of Rome, was largely the result of his singularly forceful advocacy. Convocation in 1532, petitioned the King in these memorable words:—Forasmuch as St. Paul willeth us *to withdraw* ourselves from such as walk disorderly, it may please the King's most noble Majesty to ordain that the obedience of him and his people *be withdrawn from the See of Rome*. And when Cranmer, later, was accused of schism, as not only himself *receding from the Catholic Church and See of Rome*, but also of moving the King and subjects of this realm to the same, he answered: "As touching *the receding*, that he well granted; but that receding or departing was only from the See of Rome, and had in it no matter of any schism." We have separated from that Church (the Church of Rome), said Bishop Jewel, in his *Apologia*, and have returned to the Primitive Church.

Reading through the lines of his after-convictions, we must surely give credit to Cranmer for honesty of purpose in this matter. It was not abject subservience to the imperious will of Henry. It was conviction born of Scripture, and fortified by reason. His article on the Catholic Church in the Ten Articles, of 1536, demonstrates this, evidently. Throughout all this initial stage of his reforming career, the character of a liberty-loving and Italian-

scorning Englishman comes strongly out. But there was something higher and deeper than that. There was in Cranmer, also, that love of freedom with which Christ makes us free, of which the Lord Jesus spoke when he said : If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed. And as the years passed on, this conviction not merely of the tyranny of the Papal authority, but of the evil and unscripturalness of the Papacy as an apostate ecclesiastical system, deepened and strengthened.

2ND. CRANMER AS A PROTESTANT REFORMER.

The second stage through which Cranmer passed was the Protestant-doctrinal. His progress in the first part of this stage of his career was gradual, and his action correspondingly cautious. But every step shows progress. Cranmer's first action in his career as a Protestant reformer was the most important of all. In 1534 he pressed in Convocation for a translation of the Bible, that the Scripture should be translated into the vulgar tongue by some honest and learned men. It was a significant motion. It showed his master-bias. He regarded the Bible even then with a peculiar affection, and throughout his career he was the unswerving champion of an open Bible. He worked, and worked long and patiently, for his final object ; the English Bible to be read in all the English Churches, and all the Bible to be put in the hands of all the English people. It took years, but at last it came. In 1538-39 the great English Bible, now popularly known as Cran-

mer's Bible, was set up by Royal Command in every church. It was a great act, and it created no small sensation. For it was done, as one historian of the Church put it, to the confusion of the Romanists, the exultation of the Reformers and the rejoicing of Archbishop Cranmer. Not only so. In spite of the antipathy of the Romanists, who called it the mother of all heresy and the father of schism, and did all in their power to prevent its being read, Cranmer worked for a further concession, and not only secured the Bible for the Church, but procured leave for the people to buy Bibles and keep them in their own houses.

Cranmer then proceeded to a very great work indeed as far as its effect on the future of England's Church history is concerned; the systematized recasting of the Church's doctrine. In 1536 the Ten Articles came out. They were largely due to Cranmer. His speech in Convocation on that occasion showed that he had already grasped in embryo the very kernel and essence of the principles of evangelical religion. While the Ten Articles are, of course, not so clear in their doctrinal purity as the present Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, they exhibit a remarkable advance towards the reformed doctrine, and may be said to be the high-water mark of the principles of the Reformation before the days of Edward VI. In another way, too, they were epoch-marking. They were the first declaration of the doctrinal independence of the Church of England. They

flung out the banner of England's national Church in the assertion of its right to act independently of Rome. The very opposition they evoked shows the independence of Cranmer, and his determination to set forth what he believed to be truth. Cranmer's hand is also plainly evident in the book that was set forth a little later; the Bishop's Book, or Institution, of 1537, a kind of composite Protestant—Popish, Catholic—Evangelical manual. It was simply an evidence of the tangled theological sentiment of the day. The Article on the Catholic Church, which seems to have been Cranmer's, was a remarkable piece of work, for it proves that as far back as 1537 Cranmer had practically arrived at the teaching of our Article 19. It sets forth in unmistakable language the initial concept of the impossibility of the Church of Rome being the Catholic Church, and of the unity of the Catholic Church being a spiritual unity. It distinguishes between the Catholic Church visible and the Catholic Church invisible, and largely teaches the present doctrine of the Church of England upon the subject of the Church.

In fact, we may trace in these early doctrinal formularies of 1536 the rudimentary workings of the master mind which in later years was the inspiring influence of the Articles which have become the formulated teaching of the Church of England: the 39 Articles.

During this period a double process of development was in evolution in Cranmer.

On the one hand there was discernible an increasing antipathy towards the Roman Catholic system. This was more especially against the superstitions and falsities of its worship, though it was conjoined with an antipathy to the Papacy as the representative of spiritual tyranny and ecclesiastic corruption. On the other hand there was a growing sympathy with the continental reformers. Cranmer was gradually, perhaps even timidly, stretching out the hand of fellowship towards the Reformers on the Continent. His interest in them had been first awakened through his visit as chaplain of the English Embassy to Nuremburg, in 1532. The fact of his having married his second wife, as a result of this, a niece of the Nuremburg liturgiologist, Osiander, would doubtless tend to cement the ties already formed. It was largely owing to his influence that a deputation of Lutheran divines came over to England, in 1538. The English reforming Churchmen, and even Henry himself, were feeling that they were really engaged in the same great work, notwithstanding differences of detail, and that a friendly conference would tend to draw them closer. The 13 Articles which were published were an expression of the harmony of faith and doctrine between the Reformers in the Church of England and their Lutheran brethren.

This visit, however, unfortunately seems to have failed in its purpose. Instead of establishing the concord, it broke the concord, and the Romish party

took advantage of some premature and perhaps impolitic expressions on the part of the Lutheran embassy to twist the mind of the king.

From that time to the end of the reign of Henry VIII. there was a decided anti-Protestant reaction, and Cranmer's position became one of extremest difficulty. Cromwell fell. Gardiner became the man of the hour. Gardiner, the Bishop of Winchester, was a clever man. Wily, crafty, insinuating, of loose morals, a trained diplomatist, a master of intrigue; he was the unwearying foe of the principles of the Reformation. As the result of his influence on the King, The Six Articles, a set of Roman dogmas of the most definite type, including transubstantiation, private masses, clerical celibacy and auricular confession, were introduced in 1539, as the formulated doctrine of the Church of England, and the laws of heresy were put in operation. Cranmer showed his independence and courage, however, even at this juncture by doing all in his power to prevent the adoption of those execrable penal clauses with regard to the execution of heretics. "The Archbishop did adventurously oppose, standing himself, as it were, post alone against the whole Parliament." Later on he stood out against the Romish manual known as The King's Book, or the Necessary Erudition of a Christian Man. And to the end of the career of the dogmatic and increasingly imperious King, Cranmer kept quietly but consistently working for the principles of the Reformation. At times it

looked as if he did very little. His inaction on occasions appears open to unquestionable criticism. But on the whole he seems to have done what he could. He certainly kept the Bible for the people. It was owing to Cranmer that the Bible was maintained in the Church to the end of Henry VIII.'s reign, untouched by any dishonoring hand. No one can ever estimate the effect upon the nation of that silent but potent force, the seed of the Word planted in every church in England, and in the homes of many of England's people.

It was largely owing to Cranmer also that the Apostolic lever of power was once more revived in England's Church, the practise of preaching. Gifted men were permitted to freely preach the Gospel. And to encourage the clergy in this novel work, a book of Homilies was drawn up, mainly by Cranmer in obedience to a resolution of Convocation in 1542. Gardiner imprisoned them pretty well, as Mr. Tomlinson has shown in his valuable work on the Prayer Book, Articles, and Homilies, but still the principle was established which later on in Edward's days became a feature of the reformed Church of England. But above all, as we shall presently show, Cranmer was working silently and energetically as an ecclesiastical popularist for the re-establishment of the rights of the people of the land to participate personally and intelligently in the worship of the Church. In 1544, three years almost before the great Tudor's death, he was the means of giving to

England's people the Litany in English. It was a great act. It marked an epoch in England's church history. It was the inauguration of a great church principle, *church* prayer, not private prayer, but *church* prayer, public prayer, in the people's mother tongue. It did not supersede, of course, the ecclesiastical use of Latin as the language of English church worship. That did not come till five years later. But it undermined one of the first ecclesiastical principles of Rome, and prepared the way for the extinction of the ecclesiastical use of Latin.

THE EVANGELICAL LITURGICAL.

The third stage through which Cranmer passed might be summarized in the words the Evangelico-liturgical. It was the period in which he attained to the fullest clearness in Scriptural and doctrinal enlightenment, and his final position in church teaching and worship. During this part of his career, Cranmer's development as an advocate of the reformed doctrine and as a liturgical compiler is of special interest. At times his progress was slow, and his caution marked. But however gradual his advance along the path of the new learning, it was deliberately and uniformly in the one direction. The moulding factors during the latter years of his Archbishopric were :

First. The influence of an illumined study of the Holy Scriptures. His growing clearness of insight into doctrinal truth was primarily due to his careful and continuous study of God's Holy Word by the light

of God's Holy Spirit. While it is not exactly clear that Cranmer came within the stream of influence of the so-called Cambridge band, the centre of which was that influential, though comparatively unknown reformer, Thomas Bilney, it is certain that the same influences that operated upon Bilney and Latimer and Barnes and Coverdale, the Holy Spirit and the Holy Scriptures, were operating upon his mind, and that he was throughout these years, in consequence, reaching after deeper things than mere ethical and ecclesiastical reform. Cranmer, as Strype put it, was a great Scripturist.

The second and by no means an indifferent influence, was the companionship and sympathy of Bishop Ridley. Strong, scholarly, scriptural, Nicholas Ridley exercised no small influence upon Archbishop Cranmer, whose chaplain he was, and whose theological researches in the Scriptures and the Fathers, incited by a treatise of Bertram or John Scotus Erigena, strongly impressed Cranmer's receptive mind. "I grant," he said in that famous scene in St. Mary's Church, Oxford, on 12th September, 1555, when he was cited to appear before the Bishop of Gloucester as subdelegate of the Pope, "I grant that then I believed otherwise than I do now, and so I did until my Lord of London, Dr. Ridley, did confer with me, and by sundry persuasion and authorities of Doctors drew me quite from my opinion." Ridley became Cranmer's right-hand man. In fact, we might alter the proverbial saying and say: Latimer leaned

to Cranmer, Cranmer leaned to Ridley, and Ridley and Cranmer and Latimer all leaned to the Word of God.

The third influence, and in the latter days more particularly, was that of certain scholarly men who came from the Continent as representatives of the most modern reformed opinion, to reside by Cranmer's invitation in England. Of these the leading men were Peter Martyr, an Italian, a man of singular erudition, and of strongly Protestant Evangelical sentiments, who was established in 1548 as Regius Divinity Professor of Divinity at Oxford. Another man was Martin Bucer, a strong Protestant Reformer, who was appointed as the Regius Professor of Divinity in Cambridge. "Bucer is with the Archbishop of Canterbury like another Scipio, and an inseparable companion," wrote Hooper to Bullinger, June, 1549. John A. Lasco, a Polish Reformer of noble lineage, also helped Cranmer into paths of truth, and exercised no small influence upon him. While it can not be fairly said that Cranmer agreed in every detail with the opinions of these foreign reformers, it must be admitted by the impartial that there was a general similarity in thinking, and an entire sympathy in action. Their eyes were all tending in the same direction, and they were all being led by the same guiding spirit, away from the falsities of mediævalism to the verities of the Scripture and the teaching of the Apostles.

Looking over his life as a theologian and

a Churchman, it may be said that Cranmer's career as a whole was one of steady spiritual evolution, divisible into three sections. Or, to put it into other words, his convictions passed through three fairly well defined stages.

During the early part of the reign of Henry VIII., he was a Roman Catholic in doctrine, as he was an Anglo-Roman Catholic in Communion, having been nurtured in the Roman doctrine, familiarized from childhood with the Roman ritual, and an expert in Roman law and procedure. He was appointed Archbishop of Canterbury by the head of the Roman Church, and consecrated according to the Pontifical of the Church of Rome. During the latter part of that time he could be described as a Roman with a decided leaning to Lutheranism. Cranmer then became a Lutheran, having abandoned completely the Roman doctrine of the priesthood and the sacrifice of the mass, and during the last five or six years of Henry's reign he may be described as a Lutheran with decided leanings towards the reformed position. During the first two or three years of Edward's reign his position was advancing more or less slowly and cautiously towards the reformed position, and by 1548-49 he had come over to what might be called the Bullinger view of the Sacraments, and what we would call the Reformed or Evangelical position. In a letter of Hooper to Bullinger, he says : "Now I hope Master Bullinger and Canterbury entertain the same opinions." On the last day

of December, 1548, a letter was written to Bullinger, describing the great debate on the Sacrament in Parliament, December 14th, 1548, in which it was said: "Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, contrary to general expectation, most openly, firmly and learnedly maintained your opinion concerning the Eucharist. The Truth never obtained a more brilliant victory among us. I perceive that it is all over with Lutheranism, now that those who were considered its principal and almost only supporters have altogether come over to our side." From that time on Cranmer's convictions were stereotyped. He held to his convictions to the last, holding the golden mean between an unscriptural Sacramentarianism on the one hand and an unscriptural Anti-sacramentarianism on the other, and defending his position with dignity, clearness, and determination. In all his appearances before his accusers at Oxford, he spoke bravely and boldly, as Dean Hook says, in his *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, without shrinking from the assertion of any truth he had already advanced.

It is impossible to give exact dates, but the following may be taken as an approximate summary of his successive positions:

Cir. 1525-38—Cranmer, a Roman, tending towards Lutheranism.

Cir. 1538-46—Cranmer, a Lutheran, tending towards the reformed doctrine.

Cir. 1547-53—Cranmer, an evangelical of the reformed school.

That this is proven by Cranmer's own words is evident from his statement in St. Mary's Church, Oxford, in 1555, during his cross-examination by Dr. Martin :

Martin :—When you condemned Lambert, the Sacramentary, what doctrine was taught by you ?

Cranmer :— I maintained *then* the Papists' doctrine.

Martin :—And how when King Henry died? Did you not translate Justus Jonas' book ?

Cranmer :—I did.

Martin :—Then you there defended another doctrine touching the Sacrament ? . . . Then from a Lutheran you became a Zwinglian, which is the vilest heresy of all, in the high mystery of the Sacrament ; and for the same heresy you did help to burn Lambert, the Sacramentary, which you *now* call the Catholic faith, and God's Word.

Cranmer :—I grant that *then* I believed otherwise than I do now. Cran. Lett. Park. Soc., 218.

It was during the latter stage of his career, in the years 1549-1552 (Edward VI. reign), that the *Magnum Opus* of Cranmer's career was produced ; the *Prayer Book* of the Church of England. No one disputes that in this work his was the guiding mind. He was not only the Chairman of the Compilation Committee, but the formative genius in its compilation. Cranmer was par excellence the compiler of the *Prayer Book*. Even in the compilation of the *Prayer Book*, the progressive character of his mind was

evident. The book was not formed suddenly, nor was the whole plan of it definitely evolved at one time. As far as its contents were concerned, it was a composite of the most ancient and the most recent material. It represented the materials of many ages, and the thoughts of many men. But as far as its form, and spirit, and object, and principle, was concerned it was practically new, and without a counterpart in the western Catholic world. It was the product of the Reformation. Yet, while this is the case, two things may be asserted.

In the first place the shape the Prayer Book finally assumed seems to have been the climax of a series of progressive ideas, or working plans, that passed through Cranmer's brain. His first idea probably was to have an expurgated Breviary to take the place of the old Roman Offices. That is, his first project was purification; to purify the old offices, and, by means of translation and purgation, rid them of some of their most objectionable mediæval features. This seems to have been followed by the idea of an abbreviated and adapted Breviary, and the reduction of the eight or nine offices, used mainly, if not wholly, by ecclesiastics, to two services for the use of the people. In a word, the rudimentary idea of popularization. For, when Cranmer started out on the path of liturgical reform, it may be safely asserted that his primary object was merely purgation and reform, and that even when he reached the second stage of adaptation and

translation, he did not contemplate a Church of England Prayer Book for the use of England's people in English. His idea was simply an adapted or Anglicanized form of the Roman or Breviary service. But gradually, in ways that men would call accidental, but which we must think Providential, there rose before the mind of Cranmer what surely must have been the dream of his life, the vision of a people's Prayer Book. Henceforth, his idea was to have one Prayer Book for the people of England; a single volume, not eight separate books; a single volume, not in Latin, but all in English; one book, all on scriptural lines, in an easily-handled volume, and all for the people.

The result of these visions, and dreams, and ambitions, and efforts, was that masterpiece of Cranmer's life, the Book of Common Prayer. In its first stage of publication, in 1549, even though it contained many elements of superstition, it was, with its democratic idea and popularized worship, distinctly a new thing in the then Catholic world. Yet, even at the date of its compilation, Cranmer had undoubtedly arrived, in a measure, at the views contained in the second. The first Prayer Book marks a mere transitional stage in the Reformation of the Church of England. For a very short time afterwards, in 1552, the second Prayer Book was introduced, containing the more matured and final views of Cranmer and Ridley upon the Sacrament, of Baptism and the Supper of the Lord, and purposely omitting the words

mass, altar, auricular confession, sundry genuflections and crossings, and prayers for the dead.

There is a second thing to be remembered in regard to Cranmer's views and their relation to the Prayer Book, and that is this: the final stage of Cranmer's views represent, in the main, the doctrines and ritual finally impressed upon the liturgy of the Church of England. In other words, the views, doctrines and opinions *which Cranmer held in 1552*, were in 1552 formally set forth in the second Prayer Book, and in the Articles, as the teaching of England's Church; and *in that form to this day* the true and real views and principles of the Church of England are stereotyped in the service and the teaching of the Articles of the Book of Common Prayer. An Oxford scholar has recently said: The whole outcome was, and is to this day, the expression of Cranmer's mind. The ultimate construction of the Church of England was shaped in accordance with Cranmer's ideas. That is true. And though this writer probably did not refer to this phase of it, it is mainly true with regard to doctrine. His mind, his ideas, became the master-force, the moulding-force, of the form of the worship and formulated teaching of the national Church. For what Cranmer did in 1552 was done permanently. With a few slight changes, changes largely of addition, enlargement, and enrichment, the whole of their revising work has been introduced permanently in the Prayer Book of the Church of England. Or, as it may be stated in other words: the

position which Cranmer and his associate compilers deliberately assumed in 1552, with regard to the salient teachings of the Church, has never been abandoned by the Church of England.

As far as the liturgical work of Cranmer goes, it must be a source of gratification to all Englishmen that one so steeped in Scriptural knowledge, and so gifted with the power of producing a stately and sonorous English, should have been selected as God's instrument for the compilation of a book which was to exercise so widely-spread influence as the Book of Common Prayer. If men speak of the beauties of the Prayer Book, and of its language as a well of English undefiled; if men speak of its power to mould a nation's spiritual character; of its power to steady and uplift the devotions of a world-wide Church; of its power to hold and attract and inspire Christians of every realm; it is largely owing to the patient toil and the Scriptural devotion of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury.

Before we pass to the latter part of his career there are two matters that should have a passing reference. The first is the position of Cranmer with regard to the confiscation of the endowments of the suppressed monasteries. The idea has obtained a wide circulation that Cranmer, if not the instigator of this movement, was at least in some measure responsible for the wholesale spoliation of these properties. The following facts, however, should be held in remembrance:—(1) That the suppression or

spoliation of the monasteries in the reign of King Henry VIII. was by no means the first suppression. (2) That they were most of them, if not all of them, suppressed by the Bulls of the Pope. (3) That that great Roman Catholic, Cardinal Wolsey, was the author of the suppression of a very large number, and derived enormous personal gains from their dissolution, living in quasi-royal splendor on the spoils of thirty or so monastic manors. (4) That the most ruthless destroyer of them all was an uncompromising papist, Henry VIII. (5) That Cranmer and Latimer pleaded most vigorously, as Strype has pointed out in his Memorials of Cranmer, i.-ix., for the retention of various monasteries as centres of Christian learning, for the employment of their revenues for the establishment of colleges and theological halls, and for the extension of the episcopate by the founding of new bishoprics. It was largely the Romish influence that prevented their utilization for collegiate and church extension purposes. The reformers even lost favor, as a modern historian has put it, by standing out against the sacrilege of their unconditional transfer to the King and his favourites. Another great historic writer has said: "No plunder of Church or Crown had touched the hands of Cranmer. No fibre of political intrigue, or crime or conspiracy, could be traced to the palace at Lambeth."

Cranmer's position with regard to the transfer of the crown to Lady Jane Grey has also been wantonly

assailed. It will be remembered that Edward VI., as his end drew near, was determined that his sister Mary, the daughter of Queen Catharine, should not be his successor, and as the marriages of the mothers of both Mary and Elizabeth had been illegalized, it seemed only natural that the young King should throw the force of his influence in the direction of a Protestant successor. The Council was pliant, with two exceptions. Hales refused to the last to give in, and Cranmer for a long while held out most firmly. When we consider the personal weight of the Royal will, it is remarkable that Cranmer took so strong a stand. However, he finally yielded. Probably he was wrong. But that he was inexcusable, is a very strong statement for any man to make. There was no doubt that the Sovereign, with the consent of Parliament, had power, according to current-day usage, to transfer the succession. Mary, Queen of Scots, was already excluded by the will of Henry VIII. If the Chief Justice, the leading legalist of the day, after deliberately examining and re-examining the arguments for and against the King's contention, had altered his opinion, it seems hard for any one to accuse the Archbishop of taking an inexcusably weak position, as some modern writers have done. "The judges," said Edward VI. to Cranmer, as he stood at the death-bed of the dying boy, "the judges have informed me that I may lawfully bequeath my Crown to the Lady Jane. I hope you will not stand out." Whether or not the others were involved by their

pledge in eternal disgrace, and perjured themselves, is a fair matter of debate. But it is certain the charges do not apply to Cranmer.

All the conspirators, save only he,
Did what they did through policy ;
He only, in a general, honest thought
Of common good for all, made one of them.

It probably would have been nobler for him to have stood out. But, after all, who, in these days, can judge ?

The Closing Days.

Edward VI. died July 6th, 1553.

After the death of Edward VI., Cranmer's lot was not a very happy one. The tragedy of Mary's reign is one of the mysteries of Providence. Yet out of the awful blight of that unhappy segment of England's history, have come some of the best things in our national life. The reign of Mary meant ecclesiastically and theologically the re-establishing for a few years of the Roman Catholic religion in England. In 1554, England was received back into union with Rome. The nation, through its representatives, declared itself regretful and repentant for *its schism*, humbly besought absolution, and asked to be received *once more into unity* with the See of Rome. They were absolved then by the Papal Legate for all heresy and schism and received again into unity with the Holy Roman Church. Before long the fires were blazing and some of England's best and holiest were dying at the stake, not for treason, not for sedition, but because they endured to the end in

holding that doctrine of the Communion which is now taught in the 28th and 30th Articles of the Church of England.

The conduct of Cranmer throughout Mary's reign, with one brief and sad exception, is of the highest. While his friends on every side were flying from the country Cranmer refused to flee. His resolution was noble. "The post which I hold and the parts I have taken require me to make a stand for the truths of Holy Scripture." With this and like sayings, he refused to desert his post. Later on when a scurrilous slander was circulated to the effect that he had celebrated or authorized the celebration of the Mass in Canterbury, he wrote a most dignified and courageous rejoinder. Latimer himself could not have written in more dauntless strain. "I have been well exercised these twenty years to bear evil reports and lies," he said, "and have borne all things quietly, but untrue reports to the hindrance of God's truths are in no wise to be tolerated." He then went on to say that the Communion Service of the Church of England was conformable to the order of Christ and His Apostles, whereas the Mass in many things is not founded on Christ's Apostles or the Primitive Church, but is manifestly contrary to the same.

Cranmer was, not long after, despatched as a prisoner to the Tower, where he held pleasant and heart-inspiring conferences with his episcopal brothers in bonds, Bishop Ridley and Bishop Latimer. They read the New Testament over together, for they

were all confined in one chamber in the Tower, "with great delectation and peaceful study." From there, in April, 1554, they were taken to Oxford, when the last disputations on the subject of the Sacraments were held, and Cranmer bore himself throughout with marked dignity and calmness, as a scholar and a champion of the Truth.

The scene of his first examination was a notable one. The leading churchmen of the day had flocked to Oxford, and delegates from every part of the kingdom thronged in St. Mary's Church, where the thirty-three Commissioners in their scarlet robes and academicals were awaiting the arbitrament. Three Articles were submitted to him, and most firmly, and with a dignity that won the admiration of many, they were repudiated by the Archbishop. At this, his first defence, Cranmer stood alone, "calm, collected, unmoved," as he did also at his second. A short while after, he underwent another examination, and a few days later Cranmer, with Latimer and Ridley, again stood before the Commissioners for their final pronouncement. The three Articles that were to determine their standing or falling were submitted to them. They were asked whether they would maintain, or whether they would deny, the three following propositions :—

1st. In the Sacrament of the altar, by virtue of the divine word uttered by the priest, the natural body of Christ, conceived of the Virgin Mary, is

really present under the species of bread and wine, and also His natural blood.

2nd. After consecration the substance of bread and wine no longer remaineth, neither any other substance, save only the substance of Christ, God and Man.

3rd. In the Mass there is a life-giving propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living as well as of the dead.

The Bishops were asked whether they said Yes or No. One by one each of them repudiated and denied for the last time the Roman dogma. The prolocutor with dramatic tensity urged them with a pleading appeal to reconsider this final decision. Deliberately, solemnly, and decisively, the three Bishops answered: "We are not minded to turn." Then and there the sentence of heresy was pronounced upon them. And though many months elapsed, it was for heresy, the heresy of denying the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and maintaining the present-day doctrine of the Church of England, as set forth in the services and in the Articles, that Thomas Cranmer, Hugh Latimer, and Nicholas Ridley were burnt at the stake near Baliol College, Oxford. "We are not minded to turn!" These are splendid words. They deserve to be held in the memory of all English Churchmen.

The saddest passage of Cranmer's life came shortly before his end. In what seems to have been a time of moral and spiritual enfeeblement, one of those crises to which we are all liable, of intense depression

of spirit, he was entrapped by the wily envoys of Rome, and induced by two of their most able strategists, Garcina and Sydall, to sign a series of recantations. It matters little how many he signed, or how far their genuineness can be established. The undeniable fact is that he recanted, and that plainly against his conscience. But his fall, though profound, was transient, and as men rise on stepping stones of their dead selves to higher things, Cranmer rose from that dismal depth to a height of esteem from which he never can be removed. His agony of remorse, his deep and real repentance, his longing to atone in some measure for the sin that stained his soul; these things can never be forgotten. Of all the dramatic passages of England's history, none approaches or surpasses the scene of Cranmer's recantation of his recantation in the University church, and the nobility of his death amid the flames on that foul and rainy day in Oxford, March 21st, 1556. Historian after historian has depicted it. Our great modern poet Tennyson has immortalized it in his drama of Queen Mary.

Howard.—Did he die bravely? Tell me that, or leave all else untold.

Peters.—My Lord, he died most bravely!

Seldom, as we have said before, has a man been so pitilessly treated for one act of weakness. No character in the pages of history, perhaps, has been so ruthlessly denounced for a single error. One modern historian tells us that for that one recanting act, the

brand of the craven is upon him, and the flames of Oxford have not erased it. He says that because of his failure of an hour, forgiveness is denied him for the ages.

But is this fair? Really, is it fair and just?

A man should be judged by his life, and not by his failure under one singular and peculiar circumstance. Why should we judge Cranmer's life any more than we judge another man only by his faults, still less by only one fault. "We make too much of faults. The details of the business hide the real centre of it. Faults? The greatest of faults, I should say, is to be conscious of none. Poor human nature! Is not a man's walking, in truth, always that: 'a succession of falls.' In this wild element of a Life he has to struggle onwards; now fallen, deep abased; and ever, with tears, repentance, with bleeding heart, he has to rise again, struggle again still onwards. That his struggle be a faithful, unconquerable one; that is the question of questions."

Well said, Thomas Carlyle. We must judge a man's whole life, not a single hour of weakness. We must judge Cranmer's life as we judge Peter's. Like Peter, he denied; like Peter, he wept, and that bitterly; like Peter, he confessed, and that bravely; like Peter, he braved the world with such power that multitudes were convinced. If he was timid constitutionally; if he was inclined to hesitate and falter; then all the more honor to him that he did what he did.

Of all the martyrs at the stake, no martyr ever displayed such physical courage as Thomas Cranmer, Metropolitan and Primate of all England. And if he recanted once, he only did after all what two of the other English martyrs did, men of the highest courage. With that one brief exception, it can be truly said of Cranmer; he never went back; he never receded; he never played the traitor. He was one of those—

Who rowing hard against the stream,
Saw distant gates of Eden gleam,
And did not dream it was a dream.

To conclude and epitomize :—

Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Metropolitan and Primate, was unquestionably the master spirit of the Reformation of the Church of England. He was not as strong a man as Cromwell, as clever a man as Erasmus, as eloquent a man as Latimer, or as bold a man as Luther. But in many ways he was a great man, and he was the man of the day. If unendowed with more brilliant faculties, he had at least the divine gift of common-sense, and the divine grace of patience. He knew when to be silent, and he knew when to speak. He has been freely called a coward. Historian after historian has accused him of absence of principle. They assert that his character was abject and yielding. They taunt him with his silence when as a brave man he should have spoken, and with submission when as a true man he should have opposed.

There may be another explanation.

There were times when boldness would have been madness, and opposition folly. A general may retreat, and still be brave. And no man seems to have mastered better than Cranmer the great secret of statesmanship, the power to wait patiently on time; to be quiet when it would be madness to speak; to wait when it would be folly to push forward. He has been unfairly accused of not opposing the Six Articles Bill because he was an inconsistent coward. But he was no coward then, if Burnet can be trusted, who says he opposed the King with much resolution and boldness. And afterwards he was no coward, for when all brave men in England were afraid to open their lips, he alone dared to plead for Anne, venturing as far as was possible with such a king as Henry VIII. Nor was he a coward when, not long after, he stood up, almost alone, against the angry Lords and pleaded like a man for Crumwell. Nor did he look like a craven when, a few years later, he stood Athanasius contra mundum in the Legislature against the Bloody Statute. (See Geikie, 349.)

Dean Hook, who has not presented Cranmer, by any means, in the fairest light, says that his conduct in November, 1553, "as compared with that of Crumwell, and even that of Wolsey, is worthy of all admiration. He bravely refused to fly when flight was possible; and that though life was dear to him, there was not in him that abject cowardice which we lament in a man so really great as

“Wolsey, or as one who acted so important a part of
“life as Crumwell.”

It has been thought that he was a time-serving knave because he did not stand by Lambert, or because he more than once gave way to the King. But at the time of Lambert's death he was at least a Consubstantiationist; and, as to giving in to the King, there were times, as we all know, when it would have been infatuation not to have done so. The times were hard; as Bishop Burnet quaintly said, very ticklish. The King was hard. The questions of action were almost maddening at times. It is easy for men in these days to criticise; but a poor and shallow thing it is to condemn a man in a situation like his. For long weeks and months together, Cranmer could simply do nothing. And, like a wise man, he did not try. He saw that it would be of no use. And then, at other times, he saw an opening. At once he seized it, worked like a man, and made the most of it.

“To grasp the skirts of happy chance,
And breast the blows of circumstance.”

And so through all the dreary years till Edward's day, Cranmer fought and wrought almost alone. He could not do much. But he did what he could. It was a sore struggle. He stood practically alone. He had no friend for support, and the malice of the Popish party was incredible.

Throughout the reign of Edward, Cranmer's character was consistent, and he was most courageous. And if in that reign cosmos emerged from chaos, and

the vague and flitting dreams of the Reformers were formally materialized on the reconstruction of the Church's doctrine and worship, it was owing to the gentle but firm influence of the man, who however accused of pliability and inconsistency, still steadily held on. In Mary's reign, as we have seen, the Simon became a Peter, and the man who by nature was endowed with a gentle, tolerant, conciliatory disposition, to say nothing of the disadvantages and disabilities of a storm-tossed age, emerged triumphantly in the final act of his life.

"Life may be given in many ways,
And loyalty to truth be sealed
As bravely in the closet as the field.
But then to stand beside her,
When craven churls deride her
To front a lie in arms and not to yield.
This shows, methinks, God's plan,
And measure of a stalwart man ;
Limbed like the old heroic breeds,
Who stands self-poised on manhood's solid earth.

Such was he our Martyr-Chief.

I praise him not ; it were too late ;
And some innate weakness there must be
In him who condescends to victory
Such as the Present gives, and cannot wait :
He knew to bide his time ;
And can his fame abide,
Still patient in his simple faith sublime.
Till the wise years decide."

What after all may be taken as the heart and secret of this influential life. What was the cause

final of his work and efforts as a Churchman and as a man?

What was it that led the Archbishop of Canterbury from the time of his consecration to prosecute with almost an undeviable consistency the cause of ecclesiastical reform, and to pursue it with whatever transient phases of halting and hesitation, to its final goal, the reformation of the Church of England as a particular or national church? What was it that inspired him with what became the supreme aim and purpose of his life, to restore once more to the people of God's Church in its simplicity and scripturalness, the worship that through the de-formation of the ages had become traditional, superstitious, and unintelligible; to wrest the monopoly of Church worship from monastics and priests and choir and give it back once more to the priesthood of the laity; an object surely worthy of a life, and of a death? What was it that led Cranmer with such undeviating firmness to labour for the transformation of the Mass into the simple Communion Service of the Church of England; to overturn that which for a thousand years had woven itself into the nation's ecclesiastical life as the supreme and highest act of worship, and to substitute for it the Supper of the Lord on the Lord's Table, as a memorial of the Lord's death? What was it that led him with such singular determination and perseverance to labor for the circulation of the Holy Scriptures as the inspired source of doctrine, and the inspired guide of life? What was it that

led him, a devout and simple-hearted child of the Romish faith, a sincere and true-hearted believer in the teachings of Rome, to repudiate with insistent energy not only the supremacy of the Pope, but the whole body of Roman teaching, as a system which falsified the truth of God and overwhelmed men with Christless ignorance? That conviction, that change, that patient resolve, all sprang from one source, and are explained by one thing. Thomas Cranmer was a man whose heart-life was changed by the power of God's spirit operating through God's Word. That, as he once simply and solemnly stated it in his own language, was the secret of all.

Writing in answer to one of his critics on one occasion, to explain the change that had come over him, he uttered words that I have sometimes thought deserve to be written in letters of gold. They are these :

" I confess of myself that 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 ; being brought up from youth in them and noursled (nursed) therein, for lack of good instruction from my youth, the outrageous floods of Papistical errors at that time overflowing the world. For the which, and other mine offences in youth, I do daily pray unto God for mercy and pardon, saying, ' Good Lord, remember not mine

ignorances and offences of my youth.' But after it had pleased God to show unto me, by his Holy Word, a more perfect knowledge of His Son Jesus Christ, from time to time, as I grew in knowledge of Him, by little and little I put away my former ignorance. And as God of His mercy gave me light, so through His grace I opened my eyes to receive it, and did not wilfully repugn unto God and remain in darkness."—Cranmer. On the Lord's Supper. Park. Soc. 374.

That, in a nutshell, is the secret of the Reformation of the Church of England.

The re-formation of the Church of England was not due to convocations, or Kings, or Parliaments. It was due to the spiritual enlightenment of certain great English Churchmen. The Church was reformed because the reformers were converted, and the conversion of the reformers was effected by the same forces that inaugurated the primitive Church; the Spirit of God through the Word of God. This, then, was the secret of Cranmer's life-work. God had showed him Jesus Christ. God had been pleased to reveal His own Son to Cranmer by means of His Holy Word. It was because Cranmer grew in knowledge of Jesus Christ as his own personal Saviour, and Teacher, and Lord, that he shed little by little the remnants of his early ignorances, doctrinal and ritual. That was the reason that he, like Paul, preached the faith that once he destroyed. That was the reason that, though by nature timid, he became so brave and took a daring

stand. "I will never consent to the Bishop of Rome," he said, "for then should I give myself to the Devil." "I cannot, with conscience," he again asserted, "obey the Pope." "Although the Bishop of Rome, whom they call Pope, beareth the room of Christ on earth, and hath power of God, yet by that power and authority he has not become unsinnable." It was this that made him stand alone facing the angry crowd at Oxford, undaunted and unmoved as they shouted *Vicit Veritas*, and refuse his obeisance with quiet dignity to the representative of the Pope, while he bowed to the representatives of England's Court. It was this that led him at last to the stake at Oxford. For it must never be forgotten that the man who died at Oxford, as Archbishop of Canterbury and Primate of England's Church, died there because he refused to believe in the real the corporal presence of Christ's flesh and blood in the Sacrament of the Supper of the Lord. Did he, or did he not, believe in the corporal presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the consecrated elements of Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper; that was the question. Repudiating that, he died. The Archbishop of England's Church was burned at the stake because he refused to accept the Communion teaching of the Church of Rome. It was that too that was the secret explanation of much of the misjudgment and nearly all of the abuse that has fallen to the lot of Thomas Cranmer.

What, then, are the verdicts of individual judges

with regard to a career like this? "Truth is the daughter of time," said old Bishop Fox in 1537, "and time is the mother of truth, and whatsoever is besieged of Truth cannot long continue; and upon whose side Truth doth stand, that ought not to be thought transitory, or that it will ever fall."

"My Lords," said the Duke of Argyle in a memorable speech in 1885, upon the political situation, "the social reforms of this last century have not been mainly due to the Liberal party. They have been mainly due to the influence, character, and perseverance of one man, Lord Shaftesbury." "That," said Lord Salisbury, in endorsing this eloquent tribute, "that is, I believe, a very true representation of the facts."

So, slightly altering this, we may say: The ecclesiastical reforms of the Church of England in the sixteenth century were not mainly due to a political party, or even to the King; they were due mainly to the influence, character, and perseverance of one man, Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury. If the Church of England to-day is peculiarly democratic in its character and in its worship; if the language of its liturgy is the mother tongue of England's people, and the salient feature of its worship the right of participation of the people in all its services; if its offices from beginning to end are saturated with Scripture and expressed in Scripture; if its calm, and dignified, and beautiful devotion is at once spiritual in expression and edifying in effect; if its doctrines

are based upon the purest teachings of the Holy Bible, and in conformity with the purest ideals of the Apostles of Jesus Christ; if not only England's Church but English Christians have had secured to them an open Bible in the Church; it is, in the main, because of the earnest purpose and rare devotion of that scholar and statesman, that accomplished liturgist and dying martyr, Thomas Cranmer.

THE HOLY COMMUNION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

PART I.—AN HISTORICAL STUDY.

PART II.—AN EXPOSITION.

BY

DYSON HAGUE, M.A.

Rector of the Church of the Epiphany, Toronto, Canada;
Lecturer in Liturgics and Ecclesiology, Wycliffe College;
Formerly Canon of St. Paul's Cathedral, London, Ontario, and
Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Huron.

With a Preface by

The Right Rev. E. A. KNOX, D.D.,
Sometime Bishop of Manchester.

LONDON :
THE CHURCH BOOK ROOM,
—82, VICTORIA STREET, S.W.1.—

PREFACE

THE great value of this book is due to the force with which the author expounds the doctrinal significance of our service of Holy Communion as contrasted with the Roman Catholic Mass. The importance of insisting on this difference at the present moment cannot be exaggerated. It is from the services and ritual of his Church that the ordinary layman forms his conception of doctrine. I speak of the ordinary layman: not of the careful and diligent Bible student: nor of the comparatively small proportion of laity who study theological works. Theology and doctrine reach the ordinary worshipper through forms of worship. Wycliffe's teaching remained the possession of a small minority, until Cranmer presented it—with developments no doubt, and variations—in the form of the Book of Common Prayer. Cyril Lucaris, Patriarch of Constantinople in the beginning of the 17th century, held and taught Calvinistic doctrine, but he conformed to the Liturgy of the Eastern Church and his teaching perished with him. Tractarian tenets never made any way in England until they were translated into ritualistic imitations of Rome. It is in this fact that the great importance of Prayer Book revision is to be found to-day. If the Church officially sanctions forms of worship which convey to the ordinary layman doctrines which he cannot distinguish from the Mass, if these doctrines come to him, not as extravagances of individualistic cranks, but as official Church teaching, it will be useless to say that Prayer Book revision did not affect doctrine. It will not be the meticulous distinctions of theologians that will reach the public mind: not these, but the great and broad difference between the offering of a Sacrifice and the administration of a Sacrament.

It has been truly said that "it is the heart that makes the theologian." Canon Hague's book will be found

to be no dry bones of metaphysical doctrine, but a book that comes from the heart and speaks to the heart. It is, in fact, a popular work, although based on a wide study of doctrinal literature. It is, of course, the misfortune of controversy that it is directed against error, which is, almost always, an exaggeration of a truth, exaggerated until it has ceased to be true. Canon Hague, in his disproof of what may be called the Levitical Priesthood, and Levitical doctrine of the Eucharist, has not thought it necessary to enlarge upon the *whole* doctrine of the Eucharist—its relation to the sacrifice of the Cross, or the various non-Levitical sacrifices, which it involves—sacrifices of almsgiving, of praise and thanksgiving, or the free-will offering of ourselves to God. Indeed in so short a work there was no room for a full exposition of all that our Blessed Lord left to us, when He instituted this holy rite. Canon Hague has restricted himself mainly to one point, and has enforced it with vigour and convincing reasoning. His book should be of special value at this critical moment in the history of our Church.

E. A. KNOX,

Bishop.

SHORTLANDS.

FOREWORD

IN view of the efforts now being made to revive the use of the word "Mass" as a definition of the Holy Communion in the Church of England, and of the statements made that "the Mass simply stands for the service that is celebrated in the Church of England," and that "when the Bishop of London celebrates the Holy Communion in St. Paul's Cathedral and the Bishop of Rome says Mass in St. Peter's in Rome, they are both doing identically the same thing." It is well for English Churchmen to recall the teaching of our Church in the 15th Homily referred to in Article XXXV: "But, before all other things, this we must be sure of specially, that this Supper be in such wise done and ministered as our Lord and Saviour did, and commanded to be done, as His holy Apostles used it We must then take heed, lest, of the memory, it be made a Sacrifice. . . . What hath been the cause of this gross idolatry, but the ignorance hereof? What hath been the cause of this mummish massing, but the ignorance hereof? Let us, therefore, so travail to understand the Lord's Supper, that we be no cause of the decay of God's worship, of no idolatry, of no dumb massing." (*Homilies and Canons*, S.P.C.K., pp. 474-475.)

Some years ago a leading English writer penned a sentence worthy of being pondered by all thoughtful Churchmen to-day: "It is possible without forsaking Protestantism, to indulge in certain Romish practices which, whether they are wise or foolish as parts of that great religious institution *to which they properly belong*, are childish and grotesque when observed by the adherents of a spiritual system of an altogether different type and genius." (*Dale on Hebrews*, p. 279.)

These words seem to express precisely the real problem of the Holy Communion in the present crisis of the Church of England. The ritual accessories, the bowings and crossings and censings and vestments of an elaborate "Eucharist," "properly belong," as far as the order of the Service goes, to the Mass of the Roman Catholic and Eastern Churches. *It is all there!* It is *taught there!* It is *provided for* in Rubrics! The ritual arrangements, and vestments, and postures *are authorized and prescribed parts* of those services. But in the Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper or the Holy Communion in the Church of England there is no such provision. *It is not there.* It is not there by prescription or inference. And the object of this brief work is to show how, in the course of history, the original Lord's Supper became the Mass of the Roman Catholic Church; and how, by a series of events, providential and wonderful, the Mass of the Anglo-Roman Church before the Reformation became the Lord's Supper or the Holy Communion of the Church of England; and to explain the real meaning of the Communion Service as it is found in our Prayer Book to-day.

The study is divided into two parts :—

- I.—Historical : How did the Lord's Supper become the Roman Catholic Mass and how did the Roman Catholic Mass become the Holy Communion or Lord's Supper of the Church of England ?
- II.—Expository : What is the real significance of the Church of England Communion Service viewed as a whole and studied in the light of the aims and intentions of those who compiled and revised it ?

THE HOLY COMMUNION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

PART I.—AN HISTORICAL STUDY.

THE storm centre of the Church of England at the time of the Reformation was, as all Churchmen know, that service which is called the Mass. For centuries before the Reformation the Mass was practically the only service attended every week by the laity of the Church of England. And yet the first doubts that crept into the minds of the men who were being illumined by the light of the Holy Spirit through the Holy Scripture were doubts with regard to the scripturalness and validity of the Service to which they were most accustomed.

Strype, in his "Memorials of Archbishop Cranmer," states that almost the last thing King Henry VIII. was concerned in was that the Archbishop "pen a form for the alteration of the Mass into a Communion" (1-198). Whether Strype's statement is correct or not, and it has been questioned, there can be no doubt that it contains in a nutshell a summary of the greatest doctrinal and liturgical epoch in the history of the Church of England.

Within three years from the death of Henry VIII. the Mass disappeared, and the Lord's Supper became for the Church of England, the Holy Communion. And from that day to this throughout the Empire millions and millions of devout and earnest souls in every quarter of the world have received the "holy mysteries," as "pledges of his love," in the form that is provided in the Prayer Book, by The Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion.

Two
QUESTIONS. Now there are two questions of profound interest to all Anglican churchmen. The first is this. *How was it*, in the first place, in the early history of the Church, *that the Lord's Supper ever became the Mass?* By what strange and devious steps did that simple service instituted by the Saviour in the Upper Room become transformed into a service of so entirely different a character? The second is: *How was it that the Mass became again the Lord's Supper?* How was it that that service which, for practically a thousand years, had reigned supreme in the Church of England as the Roman Mass disappeared, and the Lord's Supper was re-established in its place as the Holy Communion in every Church in England.

The study presents many difficulties. It is a study that covers eras of Church History that are beyond all others involved in obscurity. It involves developments of doctrine and ritual that are incapable of exact historical, chronological and theological definition. It presents also many involved questions of interpretation into which it would be impossible for us to enter. In fact, our present object is rather to present the subject in a broader outline, so that the reader may see and grasp clearly certain great phases of development in regard to the history of the Holy Communion and, through a review of these, see how ideas that were entirely alien to the original ideal worked like a leaven till the whole was leavened.

Suppose we take two dates. For the sake of illustration, let us take 50 A.D. and 1000 A.D. Exercise, for a moment, the historic imagination and think of the different aspects of the Holy Communion, doctrinally

and ceremonially, in those two periods. In the one there is a simple Supper. It is marked by the distinguishing features of communion, confederation, commemoration. It is in the evening. There is no fasting. It is a brotherhood feast. There is no ritual ; no priest, no altar, no sacrifice. In the other, there is a Sacrifice ; in the centre is an Altar, with its ritual splendour, and its sacrificial priest. Its object is, in effect, the repetition of the Sacrifice of Calvary, and there is the profound belief that the Bread, after the Invocation of the Holy Ghost by the priest, has become the Body of Christ and is offered as a Real Sacrifice to God by a priest before adoring worshippers. Or, to take another instance. Contrast the Mass Service in use in the English Church in the year 1547, with the service called the Order of the Administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion, in use in the English Church in 1552. The one, in 1547, was the Sarum Use, or the Service of the Church of Rome in England ; identical, save for a few minor details with that now celebrated in every Church of Rome. The other, in 1552, was the Communion Service identical in almost every respect, save for a sentence or two and a few non-essential rubrical additions, with the Order of the Holy Communion in our Prayer Book to-day. It will be seen almost at a glance what is meant by this great transformation.

Now let us glance at the historical development of the Lord's Supper from the very beginning, that we may learn what it was originally. Professor Kennett, the Cambridge Professor of Hebrew, recently writing on the subject of the Last Supper, said very significantly, " it is somewhat strange that the Institution of the Holy Communion as it is recorded in the New

Testament is, in general, comparatively ignored." It is indeed strange. And it is surely the duty of every intelligent Christian to make the New Testament record the starting point and regulating standard of all earnest study. Without that the whole subject will be confused in the mazes of ecclesiastical misinterpretation. We shall see that the service, in the course of its evolution or devolution has passed through three great stages.

1.—*Institution* : The service, as instituted by our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and as continued by the Church in the days of the Apostles, was the Lord's Supper. It was called by St. Paul the Lord's Supper, I. Cor. xi., 20, and (possibly) the Communion, I. Cor. x, 16, and sometimes the Breaking of Bread, Acts ii, 42 ; xx, 7. It was not the Mass either in name, or form, or substance, or doctrine, or ritual.

2.—*Substitution* : During the sub-apostolic, primitive, and post-Nicene eras, say from 150 to 500 A.D., the ordinance underwent a subtle and definite transformation. By the fourth or fifth century it was changed, in more or less rudimentary fashion, into that form of service which afterwards became in its full development the Mass of medievalism and the Roman Church. It was called the Mass as early as 380 A.D. It was the Mass, and, in its essentials, identical with the Mass Service that was the supreme service in the English Church for many centuries before the Reformation.

3.—*Restitution* : During the course of many years of definite preparation a movement was growing in

England which resulted within the brief space of five years, 1548-1552, in :

- (1) The complete abandonment of the Mass ;
- (2) The complete substitution for it of the restored service of the Lord's Supper.

After being used for one thousand years, if not more, the Mass was displaced in the Church of England, and the Lord's Supper again took its place as the Communion Service of the Church of England according to God's Word. As Cranmer said, the Communion which was secured for the Church of England was conformable to the order which our Saviour Christ did both observe and command to be observed, and which His Apostles and His Primitive Church used many years. (Strype's Cranmer, i., 437-438.) The claim of the Church of England now is : our Communion Service was the *restoration* of the service of the Lord's Supper according to the order of Christ and His Apostles.

Our first object then will be to trace these steps of transition ; to note some of the master minds who were the prime movers thereof ; and to suggest some of the more salient reasons for the various stages of progression and retrogression.

I.—THE INSTITUTION.

Now let us, to start from the right
THE starting point, open the pages of the New
STARTING Testament in order that we may see
POINT. exactly what the institution of the Lord's
Supper was in its original form. Let
us, with the open Gospel in our mind, approach in

imagination the door of the Upper Chamber on the eve of the first Good Friday and see the Saviour and His disciples gathered together for the last time at the Passover Feast and for the first time in His own sacred Communion Service. What do we see? We see these men gathered together in a sacred fellowship. They participate in a fraternal feast. They join together in a fellowship, as brothers loyal to death to their Saviour-Lord and Master, who is abrogating and displacing the Hebrew Passover and inaugurating a New Feast, as a continuous Memorial, from age to age, till He return, of His death as their Substitute, their Sin-Bearer, and their Sacrifice.

The record of the Lord's Supper is
THE contained: (1) In Matthew xxvi., 26-30 ;
ORIGINAL (2) In Mark xiv., 22-26 ; (3) in Luke xxii.,
RECORD. 19-20 ; (4) in I. Cor. xi., 23-26. The
account of St. Paul was probably the
first that was committed to writing, and it must be
remembered that the Apostle distinctly states that
he received it neither by tradition nor by apostolic
narration. He got it straight from the Lord Himself.
The "*from the Lord*" in I. Cor. xi., 23, is emphatic.
From these four accounts carefully read we gather
these things :

- (1) That, as far as *the name* is concerned, its name was pre-eminently the Lord's Supper (I. Cor. xi., 20).
- (2) *The object* of the service was Communion, (I. Cor. x., 16). The service itself is perhaps not described by that name ; but Communion, from the Pauline teaching, was unquestionably one of its chief characteristics.

- (3) *The thing* on which or at which it was partaken was a table. It is specifically designated as *the Lord's Table* (I. Cor. x., 21). The word used was the ordinary word in those days for a table at which people used to eat at a meal or feast.
- (4) *The elements* were bread and wine. These were taken, and broken, and poured out, and distributed, and eaten and drunk, with thanksgiving and praise to God (Matt. xxvi., 26, Mark xiv., 22, Luke xxii., 19, I. Cor. xi., 23).
- (5) As far as *the Lord Himself*, the Master of the Feast, is concerned, the prominent elements of the service were blessing, thanksgiving, instruction, and distribution.
- (6) As far as *the Disciples* were concerned : participation, commemoration, and, after His ascension, proclamation of the Lord's death till His return.

To summarize. The first Lord's Supper was in the evening. It was not taken fasting. That is explicit. Matt. xxvi., 26 :—"As they were eating Jesus took bread." It is clear that the disciples were not in a fasting condition that night, nor is there any evidence in the New Testament for any such practice, much less any injunction of it, as fasting Communion. The disciples gathered at a table which is denominated the Table of the Lord ; not at an altar (I. Cor. x., 21). There was no trace of anything like altar sacrifice, nor of any offering by a vested priest upon an altar. Further, in instituting His Supper, our Lord took bread, *not a lamb*. Nor is there any trace of anything like

adoration (or altar-worship). Nor of the bread not being bread, or of its being turned into something else than bread.* Nor is there indication in any shape whatever of any altar ritual either as regards vestment, or posture, or gesture.

In view of later developments it is a matter of no small interest for us to know that the Early Church determined to carry out as fully as possible the Lord's injunction to do what was done at the Last Supper. The Apostles and disciples met each Sunday evening and re-enacted, so far as was possible, the whole of the Last Supper. There was no lamb eaten because the type represented by the lamb was fulfilled, and as the use of unleavened bread was only the accidental effect of the Last Supper having fallen on the days of Unleavened Bread it was not continued. But all the faithful of the neighbourhood assembled, the richer members of the community supplied provisions, and the Master's Last Supper was, with the necessary

* The phrase "This is my body" means, "represents my body." There is neither in the teaching of our Lord nor in the attitude of His Apostles anything that could in any way countenance the idea of any change of any kind whatsoever in the bread. The word "is" does not and cannot mean "becomes." It is well known that the Paschal formula pronounced by the Head of the Feast as he broke the bread was "This is the bread of affliction which our fathers ate when they came out of Egypt." The very thought of the bread that the father held in his hand being transformed into or becoming the original bread of affliction would be foreign to Hebrew thinking. If the words "This is my body" refer to identification of substance, either by way of consubstantiation or transubstantiation, then the same must be true of the cup, for the very same word is used: "This cup is the new testament in my blood" (Luke xx., 20). It is clearly metaphorical language, a simile of representation. Just as we say "This is a pound" when, as far as substance is concerned, it is merely a piece of paper; or "This is my father," "This is my mother," as we look at a portrait. (See *Jacobs Ecc. Pol. of the N.T.*, Ch. vii., pp. 296-314.)

changes, re-enacted. Towards the end of the meal, at the same time in it that the Lord had instituted His Memorial, bread and wine were placed before the presiding presbyter and solemnly blessed by him as the symbols of the Body and Blood of their departed Lord, and partaken by all in solemn silence as a memorial of Him. Then the meal continued, and at the end of it, thanksgiving for the whole was offered and psalms or hymns were sung.

This was the form of the Administration of the Holy Communion down to apparently the year 110 A.D., when, owing to the prohibition, by Trajan's orders, of evening meetings, the celebration of the Holy Communion was transferred to the forenoon and the meal to mid-day.—(Meyrick's "Scriptural and Catholic Truth and Worship," p. 22.)

THE
OBJECT

As far as the purpose of the Institution was concerned, it is obvious that the Lord's Supper, as recorded in the New Testament, was primarily a witness to and a remembrance and announcement of the Lord's atoning death. (I. Cor. xi., 24-25). It was to be an everlasting memorial of Him as the Crucified; and a perpetual witness to Him as the Coming Lord (I. Cor., xi., 26). In one word. The New Testament survey in its entirety presents to the careful reader the picture of a Supper or a Memorial Feast, in which the chief elements are Commemoration, Confederation, Communion, and Annunciation. It was instituted to enable the Lord's children, in the interval between His Ascension and His Second Advent, to remember His Death, in a communion-covenant-feast, and thus announce or set forth and proclaim

His atoning death *until* His coming again.* The whole matter is finely and fairly summarized in the theological statement of our Church Catechism in the question: "Why was the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper ordained?" The answer is remarkable. It stands like a crystal monument to the clearness of our Church's Sacramental teaching. It does not say with the Church of Rome, "For the continual *re-offering*, or *repetition* or *re-presentation* of the offering of the death of Christ." No! But "For the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, and of the benefits we receive thereby." In the Communion Service, and especially in the Exhortations, there is that Scriptural balance of truth, with its emphasis of the two great features, Commemoration and Communion, that so pre-eminently characterise our Church's position.

II.—THE SUBSTITUTION.

As we go down the pathway of history
THE we see that, little by little, the Church
FIRST departed from the original idea of the
DEPARTURES. Lord's Supper as a Communion. Little
by little, there was developed another
ideal of the service. In its initial stages it was simple
enough. Then, step by step of subtle and almost
unconscious, unintentional digression, the Lord's Supper

* The words "Ye do shew the Lord's death" have been the subject of much controversy. The word in the Greek is "katangellete." It means literally to announce or to set forth good news, or any proclamation of joyous or solemn meaning. To katangelize His Death is, therefore, to announce evangelically, or publicly set forth, its glorious meaning. It is generally admitted by scholars that the word cannot mean to exhibit before God; much less to plead or present or represent, before God, Christ's death. (See *A Sacrament of Our Redemption*, by Griffith Thomas, and especially pages 23-26.)

gradually became that complex service of strange and suggestive ceremonial that attained its climax in the Roman Mass. The line of development was in one definite direction. Century after century, the streams of tendency converged to one end ; to make the Eucharist the central and the supreme service of the Christian Church. As far as the laity were concerned, it was practically from a very early date the only service attended by the generality of worshippers. From the fourth century onward, if not earlier, the Communion Service, known then largely as the Eucharist, became the sun and centre of Christian worship. It had the supreme place of honour. The other services became altogether subsidiary and secondary.

As time went by, the central part of this central service became the offering of sacrifice. The idea of communion was slowly but surely receding into distance. An entirely new theory was absorbing the mind of Christendom. Within three, or certainly four, centuries from the death of Christ the idea of a Communion Supper, which was primary and fundamental in the Lord's institution, became subsidiary, and non-essential ; and the idea of sacrifice, which was utterly wanting in the original service, became primary, fundamental, and supreme.

<p>HOW DID THE CHANGE COME ABOUT ?</p>	<p>The natural question is therefore : How did it all come about ? How was it possible in such a brief period of the Church's history for such a transformation to take place ?</p>
--	---

It arose apparently in a very simple way. It started from very small and apparently harmless beginnings.

For instance, it was customary from a fairly early date to separate the baptized and non-baptized Christians, and then to dismiss the latter before the Holy Communion. For probably very simple reasons also, it became customary to shut and guard the doors. And so the idea grew that there was a certain mystery attached to the Lord's Supper, an idea that tended to develop with great rapidity in an age accustomed to exaggerate the mystic.

During the second and third centuries this idea took deeper root on account of the gradually developed theory of the mystical connection between the bread and wine and the Body and Blood of Christ. Without any caution of spiritual explanation, the symbolic expressions of John vi., 53-56, with regard to eating His flesh and drinking His blood, which our Lord most specifically said were *not* to be taken with literalism (John vi., 63—"It is the spirit that quickeneth: *the flesh profiteth nothing*: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life," that is, understood spiritually, they are life) were applied by writer after writer to the Lord's Supper in terms of almost mechanical materialism. Irenaeus says that the bread, in the Communion Service, when it receives the Invocation of God, or the Word of God, is no longer bread but the Eucharist, and that when the mingled cup and the made bread receive the Word of God they become the Eucharist of the body and blood of Christ, and consist of two elements, an earthly, plus a heavenly! Irenaeus may have used the terms innocently enough. But one can see peering in, and lurking dimly, and looming up vaguely, dangerous and strange expressions. We may charitably say: They are only hints! They are only suggestions! Yes. Possibly. But they unquestion-

ably show the growth of the view that the elements in the Communion are made to be, by the Invocation or the Epiclesis in the consecration act, *something that they were not before*. They seem to disclose *the roots* of a doctrine which before long, in the mystic language of Cyril, and the unambiguous language of Cyprian and Ambrose, became something which approached the transubstantiation theory of the Medieval Church.

Along with this more mystical development was another of perhaps far deeper DANGEROUS and more dangerous tendency. It was THEORY. really the secret of all the departure. It was found almost as far back as the days of Clement of Rome. It was this : That the Jewish system of priest and sacrifice in some subtle way, mystic or spiritual, was to furnish patterns for the Christian Church to follow. Of that idea, in the New Testament, it can be confidently stated there is not a trace. A study of the Gospels and Epistles fails to reveal a single trace of the institution of any priestly or sacerdotal ministry. St. Paul used ten different names to describe the Christian ministry, but the one name he never gave is the word "priest." There is no trace in Scripture of any sacerdotal sacrifice as an element of the Lord's Supper. As Farrar said : "There is not one syllable in the New Testament to sanction it, and everything to exclude it."

The duties and privileges of the Christian Ministry are clearly set forth in Ephesians iv., 11-15 (R.V.), "And He gave some to be apostles and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, unto the work of ministering unto the building-up of the body of Christ" ("ye

For instance, it was customary from a fairly early date to separate the baptized and non-baptized Christians, and then to dismiss the latter before the Holy Communion. For probably very simple reasons also, it became customary to shut and guard the doors. And so the idea grew that there was a certain mystery attached to the Lord's Supper, an idea that tended to develop with great rapidity in an age accustomed to exaggerate the mystic.

During the second and third centuries this idea took deeper root on account of the gradually developed theory of the mystical connection between the bread and wine and the Body and Blood of Christ. Without any caution of spiritual explanation, the symbolic expressions of John vi., 53-56, with regard to eating His flesh and drinking His blood, which our Lord most specifically said were *not* to be taken with literalism (John vi., 63—"It is the spirit that quickeneth: *the flesh profiteth nothing*: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life," that is, understood spiritually, they are life) were applied by writer after writer to the Lord's Supper in terms of almost mechanical materialism. Irenaeus says that the bread, in the Communion Service, when it receives the Invocation of God, or the Word of God, is no longer bread but the Eucharist, and that when the mingled cup and the made bread receive the Word of God they become the Eucharist of the body and blood of Christ, and consist of two elements, an earthly, plus a heavenly! Irenaeus may have used the terms innocently enough. But one can see peering in, and lurking dimly, and looming up vaguely, dangerous and strange expressions. We may charitably say: They are only hints! They are only suggestions! Yes. Possibly. But they unquestion-

ably show the growth of the view that the elements in the Communion are made to be, by the Invocation or the Epiclesis in the consecration act, *something that they were not before*. They seem to disclose *the roots* of a doctrine which before long, in the mystic language of Cyril, and the unambiguous language of Cyprian and Ambrose, became something which approached the transubstantiation theory of the Medieval Church.

Along with this more mystical development was another of perhaps far deeper DANGEROUS and more dangerous tendency. It was THEORY. really the secret of all the departure. It was found almost as far back as the days of Clement of Rome. It was this : That the Jewish system of priest and sacrifice in some subtle way, mystic or spiritual, was to furnish patterns for the Christian Church to follow. Of that idea, in the New Testament, it can be confidently stated there is not a trace. A study of the Gospels and Epistles fails to reveal a single trace of the institution of any priestly or sacerdotal ministry. St. Paul used ten different names to describe the Christian ministry, but the one name he never gave is the word "priest." There is no trace in Scripture of any sacerdotal sacrifice as an element of the Lord's Supper. As Farrar said : "There is not one syllable in the New Testament to sanction it, and everything to exclude it."

The duties and privileges of the Christian Ministry are clearly set forth in Ephesians iv., 11-15 (R.V.), "And He gave some to be apostles and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, unto the work of ministering unto the building-up of the body of Christ" ("ye

are the Body of Christ ") till we all attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ ; that we may be no longer children, tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, in craftiness, after the wiles of error ; but speaking truth in love, may grow up in all things into Him, which is the head, even Christ." The only sacrifice demanded of Christians is the sacrifice of themselves. " I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which is your reasonable service " (Rom. xii., 1).

But from the middle of the second century that idea grew and spread with extraordinary rapidity and in proportion as it grew the ministry became the clergy, or a kind of separated class. Then the clergy became the priesthood, a sacerdotal order. The idea of sacrifice logically followed. When once the theory took root that the presbyter was a sacerdos, a sacrificing priest, it was only natural that he should have somewhat to offer (Heb. viii., 3-4)* And so it came to pass that the

* In that very remarkable work *The Priesthood of the New Covenant*, Mr. Werner H. K. Soames shows that the Epistle to the Hebrews finally destroys the argument of any analogy between the New Testament presbyter and the Old Testament priest. " No comparison is ever drawn in Scripture between the priests of the Old Covenant and the priests of the New, but between the MANY priests of the Old Covenant and THE PRIEST of the New." " The Old Covenant priesthood and the New Covenant priesthood are often compared, but the comparison almost always points out this fundamental *difference* between them, that, whereas the OLD Covenant " priesthood " consisted of MANY priests, the NEW Covenant " priesthood " consists of ONE great priest ONLY." " At the celebration and eating of the Paschal Supper no Levitical priest (sacerdos) was present (*i.e.*, one was not required), or was present at the institution of the Lord's Supper. The HEAD of the family used to preside and officiate."

Eucharist as a service became more and more regarded in the light of a sacrifice. At first, of course, it was only a "spiritual sacrifice." It was only a "symbolical sacrifice." But still it was a sacrifice.*

How the changes came to pass will
THE probably never exactly be traced. But
CARDINAL there can be no doubt that from that
ERROR. time on the oblations of the Old Testament, unbloody and commemorative, were seized upon as the prophetic foreshadowing of a new oblation in the New Testament, and that the Lord's Supper was actually deemed to be a *re*-presentation and a *re*-enactment of the awful Sacrifice of the Son of God on Calvary's Cross. The bread and wine which were originally the gifts of the people, offered to the priest, for the Lord's Supper, were now to be offered by the priest, for the people, in the Lord's Supper! The consecration prayer has become the prayer of sacrifice! The bread has become by the Invocation, the Body of Christ. It was the oblation offered to God of the Sacrifice of Christ. "The passion of Christ (that is, the sacrificial suffering) is what we offer to God,"

* It has been frequently asserted that the sacrificial terms used by St. Paul in Rom. xv. and xvi., where he speaks of himself as the minister of Jesus Christ doing the sacrificial work of God's Gospel, that the offering of the Gentiles may be acceptable, and of the consecration and service of Christians as sacrifice (Rom. xii., 1, and Phil. ii., 17), and of the offering of the sacrifice of praise (the Greek word used being that which is the basis of the liturgical expression "anaphora"), distinctly teach and authorize the idea of the sacrifice of the altar in Christian worship and the office of sacrificer in the Christian priest. But it must be evident that there is not the slightest hint in the Rom. xv.-xvi. passage of anything like sacerdotal teaching and that the whole expression is used metaphorically as it is in Rom. xii., 1. Never does the Apostle or any New Testament writer hint at the Holy Communion as a sacrifice, a sacrificial offering, nor is there the slightest trace of anything like altar worship or the suggestion that the minister is a sacrificing priest.

said Cyprian. "The Eucharist is the holy and awful Sacrifice, the Sacrifice of propitiation," said Cyril of Jerusalem. "We offer Christ the sacrifice for our sins, while we propitiate the living God on behalf of the living and the dead." "You see the Lord sacrificed and lying before you and the priest standing over the sacrifice and praying," said Chrysostom.

But the student of history will, of CYPRIAN, course, remember that the name of THE PRIME Cyprian, the famous Bishop of Carthage, SACER- about 250 A.D., is the name that really DOTALIST. marks the water-shed of Church history.

Cyprian was, essentially, the sacerdotalist of the Neo-Catholic of the third century. He was the pioneer, the daring pioneer, of Christian priesthood. He rushed in where even his master, the great Tertullian, feared to tread. He boldly transferred into the domain of Christianity the theories and terms of Judaism. To him the Communion Table is *the Altar*. The Lord's Supper is *the Sacrifice*. The bread is the *Host*. The elements are *offered* upon the altar. The Christian minister is no longer a mere presbyter; he is the priest, the sacerdos. The twentieth century sacerdotalist, Roman or Anglican, can find almost everything he wants in Cyprian, except the Papal Supremacy. He declared that the bishop, the summus sacerdos, sits in the sacerdotal chair; that he makes priests by the will of God; that priestly authority and power comes from the bishop, the successor of Peter. Priestly unity takes its source from Rome; the priest assists at the altar of God; the priest offers in the Church a full and true sacrifice. The priest functions in the very place of Christ. (*Sacerdos vice Christi vere fungitur.*) These and a hundred like expressions abound in his writings.

We can see by this time that the Church had departed very far indeed from the simplicity which is in Christ ("I fear," said St. Paul, "lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ.—II. Cor. xi., 3), and that the plain teaching of Scripture ("We are sanctified through the offering of the Body of Christ once for all"—Heb. x., 10), and that "there is no more offering for sin" (Heb. x., 14) was ignored and forgotten.

THE GREAT CHANGE. After Cyprian's day a very decided change came over the spirit of the Church in doctrine and ritual. The progress was extraordinary. It amounted almost to an apostasy. At that time and during the centuries that followed, with astonishing rapidity, every possible element of ritual splendour and pagan superstition crept into the Eucharistic service. It was after the Council of Nicea, A.D. 325, that the alteration of the Church's position as to doctrine and ritual became so manifest. The reign of Constantine the Great was the danger era. It was then that the elements of pagan idolatry, holy water, candles, the adoration of relics and the Cross, and other practices of heathenism, swept into the Church. Ideals of pagan origin were adopted with a greediness that seemed like the working of that strange delusion that made men believe a lie, because they received not the love of the truth. The current of Church opinion was running like a flood in a false direction. And its cause was without doubt the fusion of the world and the Church. It was the temporal exaltation of the Church that led to the appalling apostasy from the primitive simplicity of spiritual life and doctrinal view.

From that time on, the Eucharist became more and more conspicuously ceremonial. It displaced all other services. It was invested with every element of ritual magnificence. The rites and ceremonies prescribed at every point of the service by the most minute and exacting rubrics increased as the centuries went on, but even in the Liturgy which is supposed to be the most ancient extant, dating probably from the latter part of the fourth century, the service begins with injunctions to the High Priest and Priest to put on a splendid vestment, to make the sign of the Cross, and to perform various actions, destined within a very short time to become almost as elaborate and complicated as the Roman Service now is. The student of one of these ancient Liturgies, Eastern or Western, will be amazed at the imposing grandeur of their ceremonial, and the apparent importance that gradually became attached to the smallest ritual. It is hard to judge, but it almost looks as if the influence of worldly imitation, the seductive glamour of heathen rites and the pagan splendours of temple worship, were perhaps innocently, perhaps thoughtlessly, adapted by the leaders of the early Church as adding an emphasis of grandeur to the service which they held to be the offering of the body of God.

FURTHER
DEPARTURES. And then other things came in. The service became more and more crowded with intercessory supplications, largely on account of the martyrs' anniversaries. Then this habit of commemorating the beloved dead by oblations led to the development in the service of intercessions *for* the dead. This, in turn, was followed by the development of intercessions *to* the dead, and the service was elaborated by all sorts of memorials and inter-

cessions to the saints. Then there followed with swift and perilous effect the thoughtless practice of linking the efficacy of intercessions for the dead with the offering by the priest in the Eucharistic service. It came to be believed that in some way the offering of the sacrifice prevailed for the curtailment of the sufferings of those who were in Purgatory. Along with this developed the idea that the Eucharistic offering in some mysterious way atoned for their sins : a doctrine held with incredible tenacity and which rapidly spread. Oblations for the dead became universal, and soon were developed into celebrations of masses for the souls of the departed. This doctrine seems to have been of Western rather than of Eastern origin, and received its crowning development in Cæsarius of Arles and Gregory the Great. The oblationes pro defunctis are now called Masses for their souls and it was soon believed that the sufferings of the souls in purgatory might be alleviated and shortened through the offering of Masses. In fact, the Mass offering soon became the favourite instrument for the accomplishment of many and successful undertakings. The abuse of the after-development of the sacrifices of Masses and the danger of its teaching is clearly pointed out in Article XXXI.

Thus, there grew up and spread as a universal tenet the idea that it was sufficient for the sacrificing priest alone to communicate, and that the sacrifice he offered on the altar was of efficacy for the remission of the sins both of the living and the dead. As early as the fifth century it was considered sufficient to be present at the Church during Communion, and Chrysostom lamented that there was no one to communicate with the priest. Thus, the substance of the Lord's Supper was changed. The transubstantiation was complete. The simple

Supper of the Lord has become a spectacular ceremony ; the Communion feast has become a rite of magnificence ; the remembrance of the sacrifice of the Body and Blood has become a *re*-presentation of the sacrifice, which Scripture tells us can never be repeated. " And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifice, which can never take away sins ; But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever, sat down on the right hand of God ;—For by *one* offering he hath perfected *for ever* them that are sanctified.—And their sins and iniquities will I remember no more. Now where remission of these is *there is no more offering for sin.*" Hebrews x., 8-18. In the Great Mystery-Drama, the Incarnation and the Crucifixion were re-enacted before the wondering gaze of the worshipping multitudes, and the very Life of the Son of God Himself was given under the transmuted elements of bread and wine.

The service had become the Mass. As
AND SO far back as the days of Ambrose we
CAME THE pass the final milestone and enter into
MASS. a new era. Writing in the year 384
to a friend, Ambrose, who was then the
Bishop of Milan, said incidentally, without a thought of doctrinal or historical reference, that he had begun to celebrate the Mass in his Church. It is not necessary to quote extracts from Ambrose's writings to show that his views were similar to those of Cyprian and Cyril, and that to him the centre of the whole service was the offering of the Sacrifice, after the Epiclesis or Invocation (the prayer that the Holy Ghost may make the bread Christ's Body, and the wine Christ's Blood). In one word, to him, the priest, the altar, and the offering of the Sacrifice, with prayers to the

dead, were the essential features of the service. But for the student of history, the point is that we have come to what is at once a terminal point and a starting point in the Church's history. What was known in the New Testament as the Lord's Supper is now known in the Christian Church as the Mass.

There are few things less understood than the Primitive Liturgies. It may be said that average Churchmen, even highly educated and widely-read English Churchmen, have often only the vaguest ideas, and often even the most erroneous ideas, with regard to these so-called Primitive Liturgies. For these two things ought to be clearly understood :

- (1) They are not, in the proper sense, Primitive ;
- (2) Though they are called Liturgies, they should be called Mass Services.

They certainly were not primitive because there is scarcely a trace of them before the fourth century, and perhaps the fifth. It is a well known historical fact that the Apostles left no trace of anything like a form for the celebration of the Lord's Supper, or indeed any liturgical form whatsoever that can be regarded historically as authentic.*

* See Srawley, *The Early History of the Liturgy*, Introduction, pp. xiii.-xiv., who says that the attempt to trace, in any existing liturgical forms, an Apostolic Liturgy, is doomed to failure. On page 118 he quotes a remarkable passage from Basil, that great father of the Church, Metropolitan Bishop of Cappadocia, master administrator, preacher, theologian, liturgiologist. In his work on the Holy Spirit, Basil, who is speaking of unwritten tradition and of the fact that none of the words of the Invocation at the consecration had been left, goes on to say, in the most naïve way (375), that they were not satisfied in their day with the simple words of the Apostle or the Gospel, but they had received from *unwritten tradition* (the *agraphic didaschale*), *other words as having great force*.

Nor were they Liturgies. That is, in the ordinary sense of the word as we English Church people speak of our Prayer Book as a Liturgy. The Primitive Liturgies were really the early forms of celebrating the Mass. When they came in, our idea of the Communion and the Lord's Supper had disappeared from the Church, and the simpler and fuller idea of Church Service that we now associate with the word Liturgy had vanished also.

The most remarkable thing about these so-called Primitive Liturgies was that they sprang up simultaneously in various parts of the world; in Africa, in Asia, that is Eastern Asia, and in Europe, that is Southern and South-Eastern Europe, *after* the sacerdotal and sacrificial ideas of the Holy Communion had fully developed in the Church. They came into being as the ritual exponents of the sacerdotal theories. The sacerdotal theories ante-dated the Liturgies. They appeared as the first fruit and the ripe fruits of the fifth century sacerdotalism. This point must be clearly grasped.

Another remarkable thing is that the persons whose names they bear were not their authors. The so-called Clementine Liturgy was not the work of Clement at all. It is absolutely fictitious, and probably the work of the pseudo-Ignatius, a most unscrupulous forger. There is not the slightest proof that the so-called Liturgy of St. James had any connection whatsoever with the first Bishop of Jerusalem. It is a fraud-liturgy interpolated out of the so-called Liturgy of Constantinople. It had no more right to be called the Liturgy of St. James than the Sarum had to be called the Liturgy of St. Swithin or St. Dunstan.

THEIR But the extraordinary thing is that
BRANCHES. while there are differences in detail,
trivial varieties of order and sequence
and form, their broad features are the same. That
is in general structure, in general ritual, and, above all,
in actual object, spirit and doctrine, all the so-called
Primitive Liturgies are one and identical. The great
divisions were :

- (1) The Asian : The Syrian, the great Liturgies
of St. James, St. Basil, the Clementine, the
Armenian, the Nestorian.
- (2) The African : The Liturgies of St. Mark, the
Alexandrian, and the Coptic.
- (3) The East European : St. Chrysostom and the
Liturgy of Constantinople.
- (4) The West European : The Roman, then the
Milanese (Ambrosian), the Mozarabic (the
curious term applied to the old Spanish Liturgy),
the so-called Gallican, and the traditional
Liturgies of the British and Celtic Churches.

The Gallican and Ancient British Liturgies seem to
have disappeared by the seventh or eighth century,
and were swept into that great absorbent, the Mass
Service of the Roman Church.

Now what the reader has to remember is that the
essence of all these so-called Liturgies was the cele-
bration of the Mass, with all its prostrations, kissings,
censings, bowings, processions, vestings, crossings, and
elevations. Their substance was a teaching of the
Eucharist that was practically the doctrine of transub-
stantiation, though it was not formally so termed till
many centuries later. That is, when the Primitive
Liturgies sprang full-fledged into the arena of the

Church in the fifth century they were all so nearly alike, *not because* they proceeded from one common apostolic form, *but because* they were all formulated in an age when one common idea was held throughout the world with regard to the Eucharist.

We must repeat here, for emphasis, though it is a deeply fixed tenet of Roman writers, and widely received, that the service as celebrated in the Roman Church was of apostolic antiquity and handed by St. Peter himself to the Roman Church, *there is not the slightest trace of any form for the service of the Holy Communion composed by any of the apostles, or any trace of such a form being handed down to any so-called successor of the apostles.* Nor is there the slightest ground for supposing that any, even the earliest, of the so-called Primitive Liturgies is in any respect a legitimate development of the apostles' unwritten tradition.

The earliest form of what we might call consecration or setting apart the bread and wine as a memorial of Christ's death is to be found in the Didache, or "The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," written probably at the end of the first century. We find that the Lord's Supper still formed a part of the evening social meal of the Christian believer. In consecrating (or setting apart) the bread and wine for the sacred purpose of commemorating the death of their Lord, the following form was used: First, concerning the cup, "We give thanks to Thee, our Father, for the holy vine of David, Thy servant (or Child), which Thou hast made known to us by Jesus, Thy Servant (or Child). To Thee be the glory for ever." And concerning the broken bread, "We give thanks to Thee, our Father, for the life and knowledge which Thou madest known

unto us through Jesus Thy Child. To Thee be the glory for ever. As this bread which we break was once scattered over the hills and gathered together it became one, so may Thy Church be gathered from the ends of the earth into Thy kingdom for Thine is the glory and the power through Jesus Christ for ever " (Didache, ch. ix.).

The Primitive Liturgies represent a terrible falling away from the glory and beauty of the original ideal. Pomp had displaced purity ; tradition had displaced Scripture ; ceremony and superstition had displaced the simplicity of Christ. They all had one common origin ; the natural sacerdotalism of the human heart, and the natural ceremonialism of the sacerdotal mind. With every desire to recognise the fervour of the more spiritually-minded of the Fathers, and their wish to express, with appropriate dignity, the grandeur of the Communion Service, one cannot but realize that one of the strongest elements in the building up of the structure of the Primitive Liturgy was a loss of the words, a love of the world, and a desire to adopt its fascinating ceremonies ; the very thing that the early Christians were warned against by St. Paul, St. John, and St. Jude. (Acts xx., 29-30, II. Tim. i., 15, II. Tim. iii., 13, Jude iv., 16, Rev. ii., 4-20, iii., 1-14-17.)

THEIR
RITUAL. All the Liturgies, Asian, African, European, Roman and Gallican, were divided alike into two great sections :

1. The first was the part that came before the offering of the sacrifice, called the Pre-Anaphora.
2. The second was the offering of the sacrifice itself, the Anaphora.

They all had, with one or two possible exceptions, the same practice and doctrines. The prominent features,

were the Mass and movings of the priest and acolytes ; the incense, bowings and genuflections ; the mixing of the water and wine, and prayers for the dead ; the invocation of the Spirit to change the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ. And, as the years passed on, these were more and more marked in the sacrificial vestments, the lighted tapers, the censings of the altar, the invocation of the saints. They all taught as the essential doctrine, the re-offering of the Sacrifice of Calvary by the priest on the altar, that the offering of the sacrifice was efficacious for the living and the dead.

If words have any meaning and if Holy Scripture, as the Church of England so firmly teaches in the 6th Article, is to be the sole arbiter of all that a Christian is to believe, one is compelled to the conclusion that the whole service was the performance of a service the Lord Jesus Christ did *not* ordain, in a way in which His Apostles could *not* have approved, and for a purpose which He and they did *not* intend. If the New Testament account of the Lord's institution of the Last Supper in the Gospels and the 11th Chapter of I. Corinthians is to be the guide, then the Mass Service of the Primitive Liturgies and of the Roman and Eastern Churches to-day is not only corrupt but dangerous, not only blasphemous but idolatrous. (See the last Post-Communion Rubric and Articles XXVIII and XXXI.) Surely St. Paul and St. Peter would have marvelled if they had seen the Lord's Supper celebrated according to the Syriac or the Ambrosian Liturgies ! surely they would have stood aghast as they saw the sacrificing priest enter in all the pomp of his vestments, preceded by deacons with lighted tapers and censers, with the Holy Mother of God and all the saints for intercessors, standing before the altar with incense

vessels and ceremonial genuflections! surely they would have been bewildered to hear him intercede with the Holy Mother of God, to ask the Lord to receive their supplications and present their petitions through the intercession of the Holy Mother of God the Immaculate, to confess his own and the people's sins before God and God's Holy Mother and all the saints, and to inform the Almighty that he is now about to offer the awful and bloodless sacrifice? And truly the man must be strangely constituted who would believe that James, "the apostle and brother of the Lord," had ever seen the Eucharist celebrated according to the Liturgy which bore his name!

We come now to the more practical question of the relation of all this to the
THE HOLY question of the relation of all this to the
COMMUNION primitive expressions of our own Com-
IN THE OLD munion Services in England. It is practi-
BRITISH cally impossible to say what form the
CHURCH. Communion Service took in the Ancient
 British Church. In the very earliest
 stages—say 100-200 A.D.—it is possible that it was
 identical with the Service of the ancient Church in Rome
 before the Primitive Liturgies came into existence. But
 what that was nobody knows. It may have been
 similar to the service described by Justin Martyr, with
 its Bible readings and congregational prayers and extem-
 pore thanksgivings by the leader, and the distribution
 of the consecrated bread and wine to the people.* (See

* Maskell's exact words are: "We shall probably never know what was the primitive liturgy of the Churches of Britain—observed, perhaps, in parts of the Island for many centuries—before the arrival of St. Augustine. It is almost certain that every copy of it which could be identified has been long ago destroyed." Maskell assumes, one would greatly desire to know upon what historical or literary ground, that there was a Primitive Liturgy of the Churches of Britain. But "it is surely best to avow ignorance where nothing is known."

Maskell's Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England, XLVIII-LI.) But later—from say, 200-400 A.D.—the accepted theory is that it followed the Celtic and British Uses, or possibly the Gallican. Here again, as a matter of fact, what the so-called Celtic and British Uses were is not now known, nor how far they were identical with the Gallican. Indeed, what the Gallican Mass really was, nobody exactly knows. (See Hammond's *Liturgies, Eastern and Western*, pp. 285-363.) The remains of the Gallican Liturgy are in Latin, though the first rudimentary Eucharistic Services, if they were from Ephesus, might have been in Greek, but there seems to be a strong probability that the Gallican Liturgy itself, and probably also the Celtic Liturgy, of which there are no remains, was in Latin, as the residence of so many Roman citizens and troops in England made Latin in a measure the language of the country, and almost certainly the ecclesiastical tongue. The service was possibly simpler than the Clementine, and far less complex than the Medieval Roman or Sarum. But the centre of it was the altar, the offering of the host by the priest, and the doctrine of a localized presence, and a sacrificial efficacy that was universal in the Western Catholic Church of the day. (The reader will find in Duchesne's "*Origin and Evolution of Christian Worship*," an interesting attempt to reconstruct a Mass Service according to the Gallican Use. The imagination, as one would expect in a French Roman Catholic, plays an important part, and he throws a halo of glory around the service. But the heart of it is the Roman Mass. There are the same ornaments of the altar and of the priest, the oblation, the sacrificium, the offertorium, the Pax, the Epiclesis, the honour given to the consecrated body and blood. On the other hand, one sees

also the elements of simpler prayer and simpler ritual, of congregational participation, and the host given into their hands, not put in their mouths; indications, all of them, of an earlier and more scriptural worship.)

But when we reach the age of Augustine,
THE 597 A.D., we touch more solid ground.
ENGLISH Whatever the Mass Service was in Rome,
CHURCH that he introduced into England. And
ROMANIZED. a century later, from Theodore's day
onward, the Holy Communion was no
longer administered according to the simpler order
of the Celtic or Gallican Church, but throughout all
the Church of England the sacrifice of the Mass was
offered by the priest after the Roman fashion of the
day. If what is called the Gallican Liturgy was ever
used in England, and if as many have maintained
there are strong proofs of the identity of what are
called the Old British Liturgies with the Gallican,
this Gallican Liturgy disappeared completely soon
after the Primacy of Theodore, 680 A.D. (See the
writer's "Church of England Before the Reformation,"
pp. 38-61.)

The various Anglo-Saxon services, that is, the Mass
Services of the Church in England during the Anglo-
Saxon and Danish historic period, were simply localized
varieties of the Roman Mass. And later on what
were called the Diocesan Uses, and are referred to
in the Prayer Book Preface as the Salisbury, Hereford,
Bangor, York and Lincoln Uses, were nothing more
than Diocesan forms of the Roman Mass and other
Roman Catholic services.

Remember then, that for century after
THE MASS century, in every church in every diocese
IN THE in England, the people of England
MEDIEVAL assembled Sunday by Sunday to witness
CHURCH OF the celebration of the sacrifice of the
ENGLAND. Mass by the priest, vested in the chasuble,
and going through those multitudinous
ceremonies which are now the essence of that Service.*

III.—THE RESTITUTION.

And then came the great awakening. At last, after many centuries, England's day came, and England's man. For centuries Englishmen had been restless under the advancing aggressiveness of Rome. The sense of British independence, the love of truth, the British craving for constitutional liberty, for century after century found expression in a growing resistance to the Papal demands. But now the Protestantism of England is to take another form. It is about to receive the rising beams of evangelical light. The people who had long groped in darkness were beginning to feel that it *was* darkness. And then God raised up the man who brought to them the light.

* One who has not been present at the Roman Mass, say in a Church in Quebec or Ireland or Italy, cannot really comprehend the multiplicity and complexity of its ceremonial. It is the first thing that strikes one who visits for the first time. It should be known that the priest who goes through the Mass has to observe nearly 500 ceremonies. He must remember 400 rubrics or rules. At the Mass, he signs himself with the sign of the Cross 16 times; turns 6 times, kisses the altar 8 times, strikes his breast 10 times, kneels down 10 times, bows his head 21 times, folds his hands 24 times, signs the altar with the sign of the Cross 31 times, uncovers the chalice 10 times, presses the altar 29 times, folds his hands in prayer 36 times. The priest who celebrates the Mass has hundreds of things to do, of which he cannot omit one without sin. (See *Wright's Service of the Mass*, R.T.S., p. 68.)

The translation of the Bible by John WYCLIFFE's Wycliffe, in 1382, may be taken as the BIBLE AND starting point of the Reformation.

CON- Through that man and by that act, God
CLUSIONS. said to England: Let there be light;
and there was light. The opening of
the eyes of that great English Churchman by the Holy
Spirit through the Holy Bible resulted in three great
things:

First, his conviction that the whole fabric of the Papal system was erroneous, if not anti-Christian. Again and again he declared that the Papacy was Anti-Christ, and its fabric based on falsity.

Second, that the Bible, as the Word of God, was the exclusive touchstone of truth. By that all was to stand or fall. It alone was the supreme law, the final standard by which all doctrine was to be tested.

And third, that the doctrine, which was then the very heart of the Roman system and teaching, the doctrine of transubstantiation, with all that it involved of priestly power and altar sacrifice, was not true. He took his stand on Scripture and on common sense. As a thinker, he declared that it was unphilosophical to say the bread, after consecration, was no longer bread. It was not reasonable to believe that the body of Christ would descend into the host in every church where the priest consecrated. He taunted the priest on his presuming to make his Maker, and declared "nothing is more repulsive than that any priest, in celebrating, daily makes or consecrates the Body of Christ. For our God is not a recent God" ("De Eucharistia," c. 1, p. 16). "Thou then that

art an earthly man by what reason mayest thou saye that thou makest thy Maker " (Wycket vi.).

It was a tremendous conclusion for any man to arrive at in that age. But God was his Arbiter, and the Word of God his authority. Wycliffe most clearly saw and most daringly declared that the imposing super-structure of the Roman system of doctrine and worship was built on a quagmire of tradition, superstition, and cunningly devised fables.

A STRANGE But a fact of strange interest should
FACT. be noted here. It does not appear that Wycliffe ever attacked, from the destructive and Protestant standpoint, the various features of the Roman ritual. He does not appear to have discerned, as the Anglican reformers two centuries later did, the falsity and idolatry of the Mass Service as a whole. The time for that, in the providence of God, was apparently not yet ripe.

THE Now let us pass on through two cen-
REFORM- turies of English ecclesiastical history
ATION. into the era of the Reformation. The world was waking from the deep sleep of the Middle Ages. The thoughts of men were widening through science, art, discovery, and above all, through the epoch-making miracle of the day, the printing press. The publication of the Bible had the effect of a spiritual earthquake. Professor Froude, in lecturing upon Erasmus, described the astonishing effect produced by his edition of the Greek New Testament upon the reading world of the day. The laity woke to find that the things that they and their fathers had fondly believed in were a mythology of lies. The

dominating religion of the day was seen to be a sham. "There is no religion in it save forms," said Erasmus, in a burst of honest indignation, "religion is nothing but ritual."

At first Cranmer and the other reforming Bishops had no idea apparently of anything being wrong. As children, and throughout their boyhood, they were taken to the Mass. They had never seen or known anything else. They accepted the Service and its teaching as a matter of course. They believed as every one else did, that when the priest pronounced the words of consecration, the natural body of Christ conceived of the Virgin Mary, was present there upon the altar, and that none of the substance of the bread any longer remained but only the substance of Christ, God and Man. They believed that every Sunday morning in the Mass Service there was a life-giving propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living as well as for the sins of the dead, and the very fact of its having the unquestioned veneration of eleven or twelve centuries would incline them to believe that it was ordained of God.

But little by little their eyes were CRANMER'S opened. Perhaps no single passage in OPENING the literature of the time throws such a EYES. revealing light upon the secret source of the history of the Church of England, for three and a half centuries, as that little biographical reference of Cranmer in his work on the Lord's Supper. It was a kind of confession; a frank unveiling of his soul. He was talking of his past. "But this I confess of myself, 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 ; being brought up from my youth in them." And then he said these words that are worthy of being printed in letters of gold.

" But after it had pleased God to show unto me, by His holy word, a more perfect knowledge of His Son Jesus Christ, from time to time, as I grew in knowledge of him, by little and little I put away my former ignorance. . . . And as God of His mercy gave me light, so through his grace I opened mine eyes to receive it, and did not wilfully repugn unto God and remain in darkness." (Cranmer on " The Lord's Supper," Park. Soc., p. 374.)

THE FIRST The first thing apparently that they
GAIN. awoke to was that it was not right to
 have all their services in Latin, a language
which the people could not follow. They determined
to fight for a service in English. And that was what they
got, though in bits, first of all.

And then there came the strong conviction that as the early disciples, both clergy and laity, in the Primitive Church, had received the wine as well as the bread, the laity were wronged of their just right and inheritance in the Last Will and dying Testament of their Lord and Saviour, by being deprived of it. They determined to restore the Sacrament in both kinds. That is, they resolved to have a service that would provide for the administration of the consecrated wine in a cup or chalice to all the people who desired to communicate. An extraordinary innovation in England, for a Church that even in 1548, had the Roman Mass in its entirety, and in Latin.

And then, gradually, probably very gradually, there came the deep conviction that somehow or other *the whole thing was wrong*. It seems almost incredible when we think of it. But at last the great conviction came that that service so magnificent, so spectacular, redolent with the associations of a thousand years, gorgeous in its ancient ceremonial, and enthroned in its high seat of honour throughout Christendom as the sun and centre of all Christian worship, was nevertheless an invention and ordinance of man. *It was false*. The very body of it was false.

Here are some of the Reformers' very
THE words. One of the noblest of the Anglican
BISHOPS' Bishops said, "I utterly detest and abhor
WORDS. the Mass; it is stuffed with so many
absurdities, errors, and superstitions. It
is a very masking and mockery of the true Supper of
the Lord. It has so bewitched the minds of the simple
people that they have been brought from the true
worship of God unto pernicious idolatry." Another
of them said: "The very marrow-bones of the Mass
are altogether detestable. The only way to mend it
is to abolish it for ever." And the greatest Anglican
of them all, Cranmer, the most scholarly and in many
ways, the most conservative, said: "The greatest
blasphemy and injury that can be against Christ, and
yet universally used through the Popish kingdom, is
this: that the priests make their Mass a sacrifice
propitiatory, to remit the sins as well of themselves as
of other, both quick and dead, to whom they list to
apply the same. Thus, the papistical priests have taken
upon them to be Christ's successors, and to make such
an oblation and sacrifice as never creature made but
Christ alone, neither he made the same *any more times*

than once, and that was by His Death upon the Cross." (Cranmer on "The Lord's Supper," Park. Soc., 345); These words may sound strangely harsh. Yet on the living pages of the Prayer Book to-day, in Articles XXII., XXVIII. and XXXI., we have language just as passionate, just as stern.

And so it came to pass that the Lost
THE Supper was found. Lost? Yes. Some-
LOST where between 158 A.D. and 450 A.D., the
SUPPER. precious gift bequeathed by Christ to
His Church, known as the Lord's Supper,
was lost, and buried for over a thousand years beneath
the superstition, false doctrine, and misleading ritual
of the Roman Mass. Found? Yes. After many
gropings on the part of England's Church leaders and
many guidings by God's gracious Spirit, precept upon
precept, line upon line, here a little and there a little,
the Lost Supper was found, and in 1548, 1549, 1552,
restored to England's Church once more. For it must
be remembered that in that marvellous period of recon-
struction their life determination was to recover from the
wreckage of the ages the long-buried elements of Scrip-
tural truth. Gradually they were led to see that the very
idea of the Holy Communion had been buried in the
accumulation of centuries of superstition, tradition and
error. The very name had disappeared. "Tush,"
said a Bishop who was angrily opposing the new teaching
of the reformers, in the famous story told by Latimer,
"What do ye call the Lord's Supper? *What new term*
is that?" ("Latimer's Sermons," Park. Soc., p. 121.)

Gradually the Reformers came to see that in the
Mass of the Church of Rome the idea of sacrifice was
primary, supreme, indispensable; and that the idea

of Communion was secondary, subsidiary and even optional. "It cannot be called Communion," said one of the Bishop-reformers, "for there need not be communicants." *In the institution of the service by our blessed Saviour, the idea of communion was primary, supreme, and indispensable.* The idea of sacrifice, in the Roman sacerdotal sense, was not even secondary or subsidiary. *It was non-existent.* In spite, therefore, of incredible difficulties and in the face of the whole Roman world, they determined to depart from a thousand years of "Catholic usage" and to revert to Scripture and Apostolic teaching, restoring to England's Church, in all its original elements, the institution of the Lord's Supper or the Holy Communion.

The first effort was made in March, THE ORDER 1548, when what was called "The Order OF THE of the Communion" was issued. It COMMUNION, was a most remarkable achievement for 1548. that day. In its origin it seems to have been a kind of after-thought. One of the first provisions of that remarkable First Parliament of Edward VI., when the Church and the nation leaped into the arena of liberty as it were, in a day, was the enactment of the Administration of the Sacrament in Both Kinds. England's astonished Churchmen, cleric and lay alike, heard for the first time that they were to receive the wine at the Mass as well as the Wafer. It was well enough to pass an Act like that in the House of Parliament, but it was a very different matter to carry it out in the Parish Church. The practical question was, "How is it to be done?" Not a trace of such an action, much less the way to perform it, was found in the Roman Mass, and, as the bulk of the English priests were Roman to the core, it was evident

that "either for lack of knowledge, or want of a good will," they would not be very keen to make the experiment. The passing of the Act, therefore, necessitated the appointment of a commission, or, as we would call it nowadays, a committee, to draw up an Order that the legal requirement might be carried into effect. The State authorized the administration of the Cup to the laity. But the Church had no form of service. The State, therefore, had to provide the Church with a service. And this was done by the appointment of a Prayer Book Committee in 1548.

The Committee met at Windsor for the reformation of the service of the Church, and there during the winter of 1548 they produced what was called the Communion Book or, as it is generally termed now, The Order of the Communion.

It must be remembered that this remarkable little Service, the first fruits of reforming Anglican originality, did not by any means displace the Mass. The Roman Mass was still to be celebrated in every church of the Church of England according to the use of Sarum, Hereford, Bangor, York, or Lincoln. But after the spectacular rites and ceremonies of the Mass in Latin had been performed, and the priest himself had received the consecrated Wafer, he was now ordered to prepare, bless and consecrate as much as would serve the people in the biggest chalice, some fair and convenient cup or cups full of wine with some water put into it. He was then to turn to the people and say: "Dearly beloved in the Lord," "Ye coming to this Holy Communion, etc.," and "You that do truly and earnestly repent you of your sins"—the very words that are so familiar to all Church of England com-

municants to-day—and then continue in the words of the Confession, the Absolution, the Comfortable Words and the Prayer of Humble Access. Then he was to deliver to the kneeling people “the Sacrament of the Body of Christ.” And then (this was the innovation!) “the Sacrament of the Blood, giving every one to drink once, and no more”! It was a remarkable piece of work. It was the opening of a Great Door of Entrance. The Mass still held its place. But it was like a man standing in the sand against a rising tide. After centuries of privation the laity of the Church of England were once more privileged and encouraged to partake of the bread and the wine of the Sacred Feast as Christ ordained. In England’s Church the mutilated Sacrament is gone for ever. The Lord’s Supper, as far as the reception of both elements was concerned, is henceforth to be administered as Christ ordained it.

A few months later came out that THE FIRST significant book, the First Prayer Book PRAYER of 1549. In it the Mass of the Roman BOOK, 1549. Church in the Church of England was abandoned. It is true the word “Mass” still remained. The Service was entitled “The Supper of the Lord and the Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass.” But the essence and substance of the Mass Service was gone. Of course, as everybody knows, the service was, as it were, the halfway house from England’s pre-reformation Romanism to the reformed Anglicanism of to-day, and there were many things in it that were abolished later. There was for instance: the Altar, the Vestment or Chasuble, the Eastward Position, permissive Auricular Confession, the Mixed Chalice, Prayers for the Dead, the Invocation

of the Holy Spirit on the elements, and the Intercessory Ministry of the Angels; and, noticeably, the clear teaching of the Real Presence, and the Wafer. But the whole service was in English. The spell of Popery was broken. The Latin Mass had disappeared. The Protestantism of England's Church was inaugurated. The first great step in the declaration of her doctrinal and liturgical independence was taken. As Cardinal Gasquet says: "The new book, that is, the Prayer Book of 1549, displaced the traditional Liturgy in England. From whatever point of view the new Liturgy be regarded, the First Prayer Book is without doubt one of the most momentous documents connected with the ecclesiastical history of England" (Gasquet, "Edward VI.," 182-233). It swept away ruthlessly the ancient and popular practices of religion, according to the Roman Catholic rite, and substituted ideals that were, to the Roman Catholic mind, strange, bare and novel.

But it was not until 1552 that the
THE restitution was complete. The Prayer
SECOND Book was carefully revised and all the
PRAYER semi-Romish features of the 1549 Prayer
BOOK, 1552. Book were eliminated. Unimpeded by
ecclesiastical or political obstructions,
spurred on by the earnest young King, the Bishop-Reformers gave to England what is, for all practical purposes the Communion Service of the Church as it is now celebrated week after week throughout the Empire. Their objective was achieved. The temporary interim which marked the ecclesiastical compromise of the First Prayer Book passed away. To-day the Prayer Book will be searched in vain for the words Altar, Auricular Confession, Chrism, Anointing, Reservation of the Sacrament, Prayers for the Dead, Invoca-

tion of Saints, and the various lingering elements of Romish doctrine and Romish ritual found in almost every service of that Book. The dreams that they dreamed, and the visions that they saw, found their realization in the *Second* Prayer Book, and their settlement in its final adoption as the Prayer Book of the Church of England in 1559 by Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity which is a legal part of every Prayer Book of the Church of England, as it is in every table copy of the Canadian Prayer Book. The old was cast away. As Cardinal Gasquet says, " With regard to the English (Prayer) Book, what it was in 1552 it practically remains to the present day. The position which was deliberately abandoned in 1549, and still further departed from in 1552, has never been recovered " (p. 307). As an Anglican, however, I would prefer rather to state it in this way: The position which was deliberately attained in the Prayer Book of 1552 has never since been abandoned by the Church of England.

The triumph of the 1552 Prayer Book is a matter that should receive a stronger emphasis. It is customary with many Churchmen to regard the 1552 Prayer Book as a discarded phase of Anglican liturgical history. But to one who goes into the matter with a careful study, *the triumph of the Prayer Book of 1552* seems almost incredible. If one would take, for instance, such a work as the " English Rite " by Brightman, and study the four-column tables of the Holy Communion, pp. 638 to 721, it is wonderful to find how the Sarum Mass has scarcely a vestige left. The 1549 Communion, as far as the so-called " Catholic " features are concerned, is nearly all gone. But, *with scarcely a vestige of alteration in column after column, the Communion Service of 1552 stands in the Prayer Book to-day as it was 370 years*

ago, the omission of the first half of the Words of Administration being rectified in 1559.

But here two points are worthy of notice. Little or nothing remained of the Sarum Mass. As there is considerable misconception on this point it is well for the student of Church teaching to remember this: the idea that our Communion Service is essentially, and for all practical purposes, the same as the Sarum Mass is utterly wrong. Canon Evan Daniel says, "if the reader compares our Communion Service with the Gallican Liturgy he will see that in all essential matters the mode of celebrating the Eucharist in the Ancient Gallican Church is identical with that of the Church of England to-day." ("On the Prayer Book," p. 10, 16th Ed.) As a matter of fact, in its spirit, its aim and intention, in its order and substance, especially in what is called its sequence, our Communion Service is essentially, substantially, and absolutely different. It has a completely different object. It is a *Communion Service*; not a service for the offering of the sacrifice by the vested priest upon the altar, as the Gallican Mass Service was. It has a completely different form. It is in English. The Mass Service, from the beginning, in England was in Latin. It is simple, spiritual, scriptural. It is the Communion Service of the Lord's Supper. The proof of this is very simple. Take your Prayer Book. Open it at the Communion Service. Count the various elements one by one: the four Rubrics, the Ten Commandments, the ten responses, the two Prayers for the King, and so on and so on, right to the end. You will find that there are about 75 parts in all. And of these, some 70 parts have *nothing whatever* corresponding to them in the Sarum Mass. They are purely

the work of the reformation era, they represent the genius of the Church of England, reformed and purified by the Spirit and Word of God. Then take "The Ordinary and Canon of the Mass according to Sarum," (Dodd's Translation), and go through its 150 to 200 parts and you will find that, with the exception of the opening Collect, the Gloria in Excelsis, the Sursum Corda, the Ter Sanctus, the Gospel and the Epistle, there is *absolutely nothing* in the service corresponding to the present Communion Service of the Church of England. And even with regard to those elements of the service that were in the old Sarum or in the Gallican Mass, if they were in the Gallican Mass, they are in a totally different position in our Communion Service. As to the Gospel and the Epistle, they would never be recognised, for they were placed in such an environment of weird ceremonial that no ordinary Anglican would ever know that it was the Gospel and Epistle that were being read.

Nor is there anything in our Communion Service that corresponds with the doctrinal and ritual objective of the so-called Primitive Liturgies. Here again the average Anglican encounters a surprise. But those who will throw aside prepossessions and the tradition of generations of second-hand reading and thinking and investigate the Clementine, the Syriac, the Coptic the Ethiopic or Armenian Liturgy, will find that from beginning to end, their tone and note and teaching is *utterly unknown* in our Church to-day. The sequence, as well as the substance, the ritual and doctrine, is absolutely different. Cranmer, in language that was proud in its indignation, said to his slanderers, "who abused his name and bruited abroad that he set up the Mass at Canterbury and that he (Cranmer) offered to

say Mass before the Queen's Highness (that is, Queen Mary) and at St. Paul's Church ' as for offering myself to say Mass before the Queen's Highness, or in any other place, I never did but I shall be ready to prove against all that the Communion Office (meaning the Second Prayer Book, 1552) is conformable to the order which our Saviour Christ *did* both observe and command to be observed, and which His Apostles and primitive Church used many years ; whereas, the Mass, in many things, not only hath no foundation of Christ, His Apostles, nor the primitive Church, but also is manifest contrary to the same ; and containeth many horrible blasphemies in it.' " (Strype, " Cranmer," 437-438.) It would be as absurd to say that Cranmer followed the ideal of the Ancient Eastern Liturgy, as to say that he took as his model the famous Sarum Office or that he grounded our Service upon it. No ! His whole being would have revolted with profound indignation against the idea of his looking to a service which he believed had not only no foundation in Christ or the Primitive Church, but was manifestly contrary to the same.

To conclude the whole matter. What

A they got we now have ; and what, by
 SUMMARY. the grace of God, they held, we, by the
 same grace, now hold. The Holy Communion Service that they secured and which is now to be found in every Prayer Book of the Church of England is a heritage, the beauty and worth of which ought to be more and more realized by English Churchmen, but it will be almost impossible for us to understand its essential value unless we endeavour to see the dream that they dreamed and the vision that they saw in the Spirit of God.

What they wanted above all things
WHAT was to get back the Lord's Supper. On
THEY that point they were very clear. No one
WANTED. can read the writings of Archbishop
Cranmer, Bishop Ridley and Bishop
Latimer without seeing that that was the objective of
all their labours. They wanted to get rid of the Mass.
And they did. They did not want an Anglican Mass.
They did not want a revived or a revised Gallican Liturgy.
They did not want a Sarum Mass purified. "I have
read the New Testament over seven times," said Bishop
Latimer, "and I cannot find the Mass in it."

They were determined to get back to the original. They
opened the New Testament. As they studied it, they
saw that the Lord's Supper was not instituted while the
disciples were fasting, *but as they were eating*; that
Jesus took bread—not a lamb slain in sacrifice—but
bread, about which there never was or ever could be
anything propitiatory; that this bread was not offered
on an altar or eaten before an altar, nor did it involve
the presence or action of a priest; that Christ broke
the bread and did not give an unbroken Wafer; that
the bread was bread after He gave it and was eaten by
all, not gazed at; that the elements were received, not
offered; and that *all* were expressly ordered to take
the wine as well as the bread.

And so, as they read and studied these
WHAT things deeply and more deeply in the
THEY Spirit, and laid that original simple Supper
SECURED. of the Saviour side by side with the specta-
cular performance, the theatrical presenta-
tion with mystic meanings and symbols and vestments
and ceremonial, the great drama performed by the priest
in the chancel before the gazing multitude, in the Latin

tongue, with ceremonies dark and dumb, their whole soul rose in a passionate revolt to think that Englishmen for so many centuries should have been cheated and defrauded by such a travesty and counterfeit, and that their God had been dishonoured by a service so destitute of Truth. No wonder then that when these great Churchmen secured for us once more the long lost Lord's Supper and brought back to England's Church the Holy Communion, Cranmer cried with a proud elation of spirit : " Thanks be to the Eternal God ! The manner of the Holy Communion which is now set forth within this realm of England is agreeable with the institution of Christ, with St. Paul, and the old primitive and apostolic church, with the right faith of the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross for our redemption, and with the true doctrine of our salvation, justification, and remission of all our sins, by that sacrifice." (Cranmer, " The Lord's Supper," p. 354, Park. Soc.)

But they not only wanted to get back the Lord's Supper. They wanted to construct the service on the exact lines of the original plan and purpose of the Lord as set forth in the four Gospels, and especially in the teaching of the 11th Chapter of 1st Corinthians.

Their first endeavour in 1548, in the pioneer service of the reign of Edward VI., was known as the Order of the Communion. It was just a little four-page tract in English, to be tacked on as an appendix to the Roman Mass, which was still to be said in its entirety in Latin. But this little Order of the Communion was a most extraordinary innovation, from the pre-Reformation standpoint, for considerably more than one-half of it was occupied with *matter which had for its object the preparation of the communicant*. It proves that Cranmer's master purpose, even as far back as

the year 1548, seems to have been the opening of the eyes of the Churchmen of England to the duty of receiving the Sacrament *worthily*, and that to receive worthily meant with true repentance, with earnest and living faith in Christ, and a heart that was divested of all hatred and unforgiving malice. You can see in the four exhortations *the legitimate consequence of a reversed idea of the Service itself*. If the main purpose of the worshipping body was merely to witness the offering of a sacrifice which was largely a priest's affair, a chancel affair, a choir affair, it is obvious that personal preparation was not so necessary. But if the object was the partaking of the Lord's Supper by a body of believers, intelligent, spiritually-minded, with personal faith (Article XXVIII.), as the Holy Communion, and if the Sacrament had a wholesome effect or operation only in such as worthily received it, that is, with true repentance and living faith, one can realize in a moment that the first necessity was to see that the heart and mind of the communicant was to be prepared along the lines of I. Cor. xi., 27-29, and that the Liturgy itself should embody some practical way of doing it. How thoroughly they carried out that resolve will be shown later.

A NEW SERVICE. In the next place, their object was to reproduce as far as possible, liturgically, the exact thing that our Lord intended in the original institution. Daringly to say of the sacred Service of the Church, that no innovating hand had dared to alter for over 1,200 years, that this is not and cannot be the model that we will follow; to say we must initiate an entirely different style, form and manner of service; that we must return to apostolic simplicity; indicated a fear-

lessness in the cause of truth that was only possible to men who believed that they were being led in every step by the guiding Spirit of God. "As for me," said Archbishop Cranmer, in words that deserve to be written in letters of fire on the hearts of every Anglican Churchman, "*I ground my belief upon God's Word, wherein can be no error*" (Cranmer on "The Lord's Supper," Park. Soc., p. 368). The whole of the initial part of the Mass Service, occupying say from thirty to forty minutes, was simply swept away. A new thing altogether—some say Lutheran, but many think purely Anglican—was introduced in the recitation of the Ten Commandments; as if they desired to carry through the first part of the service the Lighted Lamp of the Law of God searching each conscience. If here and there in the main body of the Service little fragments of the original Liturgies peer out, and certain elements that are found in the Roman Mass appear, it must be remembered, as that great Churchman, Hooker, said in his Ecclesiastical Polity (Book V., 12-6), that "we are not to forsake any true opinion because idolaters have maintained it; and where Rome follows reason and truth we fear not to follow the self-same steps." So we have the Lord's Prayer and the opening Sarum Collect; the Epistle and Gospel which came, of course, from the Church's very beginning; the *Sursum Corda* and the *Ter Sanctus*. But in our service all these are in a totally different setting and are entirely free from any thought of a descent of Christ upon the Altar. These things came to us *through* Rome; but they did not come *from* Rome. They came from the New Testament and the Apostolic Church. And it must also be remembered that in their connection, their intention, that is, in what the liturgical writers

technically call the sequence, they are absolutely different so far as their *place* and ritual and meaning goes from the Roman Service. As Cardinal Gasquet says in his remarkable work, "Edward the Sixth and the Book of Common Prayer," "the ancient ritual oblation, with the whole idea of which the idea of sacrifice was so intimately associated, was swept away, that venerated service that had 'remained unaltered during thirteen centuries,' " and *the reformers resolved that "it should henceforth be impossible to trace in the Communion Service of the Church of England any resemblance however innocuous to the ancient Mass"* (pp. 194, 196, 197, 291).

THE FINAL
SEPARATION. But it was in the Post-Communion Service that they sounded their final farewell to all that is Roman and from the standpoint of the Primitive Liturgy, "Catholic." That is, in the first three Rubrics they broke clean away from a thousand years of so-called Catholic practice and teaching and, so far from making the Communion the one supreme and indispensable service for the laity on every Lord's Day they actually made the Communion, for the ordinary parish church, a dispensable and optional service, provided that all parishioners communicate at least three times a year. The ideal was of course higher. With a clear eye, with a firm mind, knowing absolutely what they did, for they were men of the profoundest and strongest convictions, *they displaced of set purpose the celebration of the Holy Communion from its central place as the sacrificial offering, or, as it is called by many, the highest act of Christian worship*, by making it not as in Rome the indispensable service, but as it is in the Church of England to-day, a service that "*shall not be celebrated*

unless there be a convenient number of communicants." No clearer challenge to the so-called "Catholic" doctrine of the indispensability of the Eucharist as the supreme service could be imagined. And in the last Rubric they finally departed from the whole idea of the Medieval Roman teaching with regard to the service by declaring that "*no adoration* is intended or ought to be done to the Sacramental Bread or Wine ; that the Sacramental Bread and Wine *may not be adored* ; that were Idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians."

Now everybody knows that the centre of the Primitive Liturgy and of the Roman Mass was Sacerdotal Sacrifice. Adoration was its *logical* necessity. The true view of the Mass Service can only be gained by looking at it as a whole, as one great act of Eucharistic Sacrifice. (Gasquet, p. 197.)

Our Reformers, therefore, in their declaration, flung out the banner of our Church's defiance of Rome. The Anglican view of the Holy Communion is, that *it is not* as a whole an act of Eucharistic Sacrifice, but that *it is* the Lord's Supper. "To put the oblation of the priest in the stead of the oblation of Christ," said Cranmer, "to refuse the Sacrament of His Body and Blood ourselves as He ordained and trust to have remission of our sins by the sacrifice of the priest in the Mass, is not only to do injury to Christ but commit most detestable idolatry, for these be but false doctrines, feigned by wicked Popish priests who have corrupted the most holy Supper of the Lord and turned it into manifest idolatry. For as much then," Cranmer went on to say, "as in such masses is manifest wickedness and idolatry . . . 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."

For this they dared not only to live but to die. In these days when the Church in England is being almost rent in twain by men who are compassing sea and land for the re-establishment of the Mass in its seat of honour as the Eucharistic Sacrifice, *we must never forget that what our Church leaders really died for was the truth of the Lord's Supper as we now have it in our Communion Service.* We may well remember that great day in Oxford, in April, 1554, when Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer were solemnly asked for the last time whether they would still continue to believe in the teaching of our Church and our Communion Service, or whether they would accept the Roman dogma of transubstantiation and the Mass. Deliberately and decisively our great Martyr-Bishops answered with an unhesitating voice :

"WE ARE NOT MINDED TO TURN."

From that place they went to die, and were burned for refusing to accept the Mass teaching of the Church of Rome. But the heritage they bequeathed by their life and death to the Church of England was the Communion Service of the Church of England, the Lord's Supper.

PART II.—AN EXPOSITION.

The real significance of our Communion Service in the light of the original structure.

In studying the Communion Service, as a whole, it should be remembered at the outset that "it is a dictate of common sense that any examination of its origin and sources should be conducted with a primary regard to the circumstances in which, and the opinions of the persons by whom, it was produced. In a word it must be put in its proper historical setting, and illustrated from the writings of those who composed it . . . and not by the productions of those centuries, the doctrine and practice of which it was the avowed aim and intention of its authors to destroy." (Gasquet, p. 20, *cf.* Prot. of Prayer Book, pp. xxii-xxiii.)

It is a truism, of course, but a truism that needs to be repeated, that the Prayer Book as a whole, represents the spirit of a new Anglicanism. It stands for the completeness of the victory of the Reformation. A small but triumphant minority of Scripture-taught leaders were enabled, in the providence of God, to achieve the *re*-formation of the Church in doctrine and ritual. For it must be remembered that the Church of England was Ultramontane in allegiance, Roman in doctrine, Roman Catholic in Communion, and Romish in ritual. It was identified with Rome as the heart is identified with the body. Its central and conspicuous service was the Roman Mass, celebrated according to the Use of Sarum. And the Church of England emerged from that triumphant struggle with two books: the one, *the cause*, the other, the consequence of its *re*-formation—the people's Bible, translated, printed, published, and

put in every Church in the land ; and the people's Prayer Book, conceived and compiled, revised and completed, in the spirit of a spiritual and scriptural reconstruction.

The Prayer Book, therefore, stands for the new genius of the worship of the Church. Ecclesiastically, it represented the regaining of the devotional rights of the laity and the declaration of the independence of the Church of England. Doctrinally, it stood for the restoration of scriptural truth. Liturgically, it was the re-establishment of the principles of New Testament and apostolic worship. In one word, its supreme objective was the restoration of the reality of worship, and the re-vitalizing of the religion of the Church of a nation. It was the historic fulfilment, as far as England's Church was concerned, of the prophecy of the dry bones in Ezekiel's vision. (Ezek. xxxvii., 5-10.) The Church of England was a redeemed Church, redeemed from legalism and formalism, redeemed by truth, its redemption sealed by the blood of its martyrs.

The starting point of all our readings and thinking, therefore, is that the men who compiled the Communion Service were spirit-led men, and, above all things, clear in the vision of what they desired. They were men whose theological and doctrinal view-point had been changed. They knew exactly what they wanted and they determined to secure it in the Order of the Service of the Church. This, and this only, explains the Communion Service of the Church of England. It was not a meaningless conglomeration of Sarum, Lutheran, Primitive, and Reformed material. It was a distinct whole. It was the consummation of a definite liturgical plan. There is nothing like it in the Roman

Catholic or the Sarum Mass. In many ways, also, it differs distinctly from the Lutheran. It can only be understood when taken as a whole. It must be read in the light of the constructive genius of the Spirit-led and Spirit-taught compiler or compilers of the Service.

We will first of all make an analysis
THE of the component parts and view it in
THREE its three great sectional divisions.
DIVISIONS. The Communion Service is divided into
three great sections :

- (1) The Ante-Communion, as it is commonly called, which includes all the matter up to the end of the Prayer for the Church Militant.

The keynote of this section is *preparation* ; in searching the heart by the Word of God and prayer. It includes the four preliminary Rubrics, the Lord's Prayer and the Collect, the Ten Commandments, Collects, Epistle and Gospel, confession of faith, sermon and offertory and prayer ; the liturgical fulfilment of I. Cor. xi., 27-34. The whole of this part of the Service is the practical fulfilment of the Church requirements of repentance and faith, newness of life and love, as set forth in the Catechism and the Articles.

- (2) The Communion Proper, which begins with the Exhortations and the General Confession and goes down to the end of the Words of Administration.

The key-notes of this central section are approach and *participation*, in the spirit of deeper personal heart searching, worship, thanksgiving

and humility. It includes the Exhortation and thankful remembrance, Invitation, Confession and Absolution, the Consolatory Words, Entrance into the Holy of Holies, adoration and most humble pleading of unworthiness to receive the spiritual food—unworthiness removed by the Cross, confirmed and applied as by the Ten Commandments and consecrated Bread and Wine—with a climax, the Consecration Prayer and reception of the elements.

- (3) The Post-Communion, from “Our Father,” to the Benediction.

The key-note of this section is *parting* in the spirit of prayer and praise and peace after the sacrifice or oblation of the communicant, soul and body, and the final adoration of the Gloria in Excelsis.

Now the thing that strikes us is the
THE uniqueness of the opening of the Commu-
FIRST nion Service in the Church of England.
NOTE. It is a distinct break from the service of
the Mass. If our service of the Lord's

Supper forms, as a whole, a striking contrast to anything that had been found in the Church of England for a thousand years, of all parts of the service, the opening part, from the medieval standpoint, must certainly have had a surprise of novelty. The prominent feature at the beginning of the Anglican service is the extraordinary insistence on the principle that in order to get the blessing of the Service the heart must be right in the sight of God. From the beginning to the end of the service, the key-note of sincerity is emphasized in every possible way. The genius of the Church of England has always been practical. There is, throughout the

Prayer Book, a determination to exclude, as far as is possible, all formalism and unreality on the part of the worshipper. For it must be remembered that the highest object of the Reformation was the effort of awakened men to rid the Church of England not only of idolatry, but of the curse of hypocrisy. We modern Churchmen will probably never understand how deeply the hatred of the formality of the Mass Service was burnt into the minds of our Bishop-Reformers; or how strong was their resolve to make Reality the very essence of the restored Lord's Supper. And so the *opening part of the Service* seems to be carefully built upon the Apostolic basis of I. Cor. xi., 27-34. Any one familiar with the Roman Catholic Mass knows the elaborate preparation of the vesting of the priest and of the altar, the bowings, crossings and censings, the multiplied genuflections and kissings of the altar and all the actions that constitute the solemn and indispensable introduction to the preliminary service.

But an outsider who studied, for the first time, the Anglican Service, would be struck with the fact that the two longest preliminary rubrics have nothing whatever to do with either ritual or order or doctrine. They concern conduct. They are of a moral and personal character. The approach to the service is through the portal of the life. He would be struck with the fact that the main thing at the outset of the Communion Service, in the mind of the Church of England, is the anxiety for consistency of character and a regard for the moral state of the recipient. The quintessence of the Reformation lies here.

Now, as we proceed with the Service, we are struck with this continually. After the Lord's Prayer, the

service begins with a Collect that is one of the most heart-searching and comprehensive in the whole Prayer Book. It is an old Prayer, exquisitely translated by Cranmer. It voices the cry of the body of God's people for the cleansing of the very thoughts of the heart by the inspiration of God's Holy Spirit, that there may be a perfect love and a worthy exaltation of God's name. As the people remain on their knees, the most solemn demands of the Most High, as expressed in the Ten Commandments, are heard by their listening ears, and then each soul sends forth its cry for mercy and for Divine grace to keep this law, not only in the letter, but in the spirit, in the very heart, according to the teaching of Heb. viii., 10. From whatever source the Church of England got this inauguration section of the Holy Communion, whether from some Lutheran, or as has been conjectured, from one of our own Anglican Bishops, matters little. The point is that the Service starts with a searching of the hearts of the people by the Lamp of God's Law.

But more striking still, is the insertion
 THE FOUR in the very heart of the service of what are
 EXHORTA- called the four Exhortations. They are
 TIONS. entirely Anglican. Not only do they
 contain a significant exposition of the
 two-fold aspect of the Holy Communion, in language
 at once simple and sublime, but they will ever remain
 as a monument of the Church's resolve to clear the way
 to the Lord's Table. They are impregnated with the
 very spirit of I. Cor., xi., 27. They seem to say, in
 solemn tones ; This Communion Service is the solemn
 and strengthening sacrament of the Body and Blood
 of Christ. But it is so divine and comforting only to
 those who receive it worthily. There is great peril in

receiving it unworthily. Search, therefore, and examine your consciences. Come holy. Come clean. Be ready to forgive. If there is secret or open sin, repent, or else come not. Come with a quiet conscience. Come with a full trust in God. Come with living and steady faith. In the last exhortation, which is so familiar, is a feature of the Church of England that is very marked throughout the Prayer Book and is put in the forefront of the Communion Service. It is the use of the adverbs "truly" and "earnestly." It shows that the Church of England demands no more formal or verbal offerings of lip confession or lip homage. So great is the final demand that no one can approach the chancel at the Holy Communion who has not been asked to repent, *truly* and *earnestly*, to live in love, with the intention of leading a *new* life, and drawing near with faith.

It is evident then to the student of our Communion Service that the emphasis, as far as the communicant is concerned, is neither upon the ritual nor upon the doctrine, but, primarily and throughout, upon the *state of one's heart and life*. To this end the whole of the Ante-Communion Service seems directed. For after the Ten Commandments, there follows the teaching of God's Word in the Gospel and in the Epistle, nearly all of which, throughout the Church year, emphasize some great truth of doctrine and spiritual teaching, conjoined with and emphasized by some phase of Christian living. In the Canadian Prayer Book, the time-honoured responses are introduced by rubrics; "Here shall be sung or said, 'Glory be to thee, O Lord'; and the Gospel ended, the people shall in like manner sing or say, 'Thanks be unto thee, O Lord,'"—words which seem to express the rapture of the believer's heart as he listens, as it were, to the pronouncement of a message from the

Lord Himself. Then comes the confession of personal faith, the recitation of the Creed. It is a pity that this is not more thoroughly understood, for it is one of the most important things in the whole service. It is the demand both of Christ and His Apostles, Matt. x., 32, and Romans x., 10, for if with the heart man believeth, with the mouth confession is made ; for the Scripture saith, "whosoever believeth on Him shall not be ashamed." To this great end also is the hearing of God's Word in the preaching of the Gospel in the sermon and before the offertory, I. Cor. xvi., 1.

THE
OFFERTORY. It must be remembered that the Offertory, like the Sermon at this service, was an entirely new feature in the Church of England Prayer Book. The Offertory in the Roman Mass was a totally different thing. It was the offering, with most elaborate ritual, of the Wafer for the Immaculate Host, and the elevation and offering up, with crossings and bowings and censings, of the Chalice ; and the tinkling of the bell to tell the people the great offering of Calvary and its repeated sacrifice is about to commence. And then, the long and elaborate consecration prayers known as the "Canon."

This service of spectacular ritual, Archbishop Cranmer cut out and substituted for it, in the very heart of the Communion Service, that very practical method of evidencing our religion, the offering of our substance to the Lord, according to the letter of Exodus xxxv., 5-21, and the spirit of Heb. xiii., 15-16. And he enforced the right and the reason and the method and the measure of the people's giving, by a series of most wisely chosen texts from the Word of God on the subject. These money offerings of the people are then to be humbly

presented to the Lord, as oblations or devotions; and at the revision of 1662 then were directed to be placed upon the Holy Table.*

The climax of the Ante-Communion is THE CHURCH the Prayer for Christ's Church militant MILITANT here in earth. In the First Prayer Book, PRAYER. it was part of the great Consecration Prayer and contained a very distinct prayer for the departed, "We commend unto thy mercy, O Lord, all other thy servants which are departed from us with the sign of faith, and now do rest in the sleep of peace. Grant unto them, we beseech thee, thy mercy, etc." In the Prayer Book of 1552, this great prayer appeared with a new title, a new setting, a new form, and a new teaching. The very significant words were added, "Let us pray for the whole state of Christ's Church militant here *in earth*." The words "in earth" are emphatic and suggestive. They show that the prayer is to be used for the living, and for the living only. But while it deliberately excludes any praying for the faithful departed, it teaches us to thank

* The reader is here referred to that very able work of Bishop Dowden entitled *Further Studies in the Prayer Book*, pp. 193-196, in which he shows that "oblation" cannot mean the bread and wine, but simply money offerings. The Scotch Prayer Book Rubric of 1637 provides that one of the Churchwardens shall receive the devotions of the people in a basin and bring the basin, with the oblations therein. Oblations were always identified with money offerings. It is significant that the devotions, that is, the money offerings, when they are brought by the minister, are to be humbly *presented* and *placed* upon the Table, but the bread and wine are simply to be *placed*. The words "presented" and "offered up" are intentionally avoided. This is a very remarkable fact, when we consider that this rubric was inserted in the Prayer Book in 1662, in defiance of the desire of the Bishops that the word "presented" should be used of the offering of the bread and wine. It was done in order that there might be countenance given to the sacrificial idea of the Eucharist

God for them,* and to ask God that we may be partakers of His Heavenly kingdom with them. The prayers, as a whole, is one of marvellous comprehensiveness. It breathes the very heart of a glorious catholic prayer for all that do confess God's Holy Name, for all Christian kings, for all bishops and clergy, for all God's people, for all the troubled, with a thanksgiving for all who have departed this life in God's faith and fear. The succession of "all's" is remarkable. The more one studies its depth of meaning and far-reaching petitions, the more one thinks of what manner of men we Churchmen ought to be to send forth petitions that can sway the movements of empires, secure grace for a world-embracing Church, and bring down blessing upon the world of troubled and needy hearts, by the use of a prayer, so profound in its depth of meaning, so forceful in its tremendous reach, To repeat the words of such a mighty prayer as that for the Church Militant, in terms of a parrot-like formalism, seems almost like treachery. Only those who are living on the plane of a warm, sympathetic, victorious communion with God are fit to use so significant a masterpiece of intercession.

II.—THE COMMUNION PROPER.

As we approach the central part of the Service, the Communion Proper, we are again impressed with the fact of the extreme care that is taken to secure a body of believing participants.

THE
APPROACH. The spirit of earnestness and devotion becomes more tense. As guarding gates, the four Exhortations stand before the inner shrine of the reception of the Communion. They

* This was added in 1662.

are the Church's effort to translate into practical effect the teaching of Articles XXV and XXVIII: 'In such only as *worthily* receive the Sacraments have they have a wholesome effect or operation,' or, as it is in Article XXVIII, 'To such as *rightly, worthily, and with faith,* receive them.'

The Exhortations then stand as guards of the Church's fidelity to standard, as admitting to Communion only such as are worthy to receive the same. While in the second, they earnestly and lovingly plead for men to dethrone all feigned excuses and come to the Feast to which they are so lovingly called and bidden by God Himself, in the first, third and fourth, they say with solemn tones "Bewail your sinfulness. Be reconciled to your fellow men. Be ready to make restitution and satisfaction. Be ready to forgive. Repent truly. Have living faith. Receive with a true penitent heart." But what strikes us as most significant in these Exhortations is the way in which they set forth the central truth of Christianity, the very citadel of our religion; the Atonement. It is declared to be Christ's meritorious death and passion whereby alone we obtain remission of our sins. It is the sacrifice of His death. It is the redemption of the world by the death and passion of our Saviour Christ, both God and Man. And, throughout, the Lord's Supper is equally set forth in its two great aspects; remembrance and spiritual nourishment.

Passing from the words of exhortation,
THE the meekly kneeling Churchman is now
FIVE STEPS led from strength to strength through
UP. five successive stages of devotion, until
the climax of the actual reception of the
elements is reached. Here again the sequence of the

service is in exact accord with the demands of a truly spiritual and scriptural order. For, before there can be praise and lofty adoration, there must be the prostration of the soul in the pleading for forgiveness and the realization of the removal of the sin burden, through the assurance of personal forgiveness in the Absolution. Before the quieting and uplifting sense of peace, there must be the evangel of pardon. And so the Great Entrance in the Prayer Book Communion Service is, at the start, the soul's confession, the soul's acceptance and the soul's assurance of comfort and peace in order that there may be the opening of the lips in overflowing praise and adoration. Surely it was an inspiration that led Archbishop Cranmer, to see that the place of the *Ter Sanctus*, the *Sursum Corda* and the *Gloria in Excelsis* in the *Sarum Mass* was all wrong. Surely it was the leading of the Spirit of God that led him so carefully to order the various elements of our Communion Service that the great Eucharistic features of adoration should come *not before* but *after* the confessions of sin and the declarations of pardon. That was the reason, undoubtedly, why he removed the *Gloria in Excelsis* from its place in the Roman Catholic and Lutheran Communions to the very end of our service.

The first step, therefore, is *Penitence*.
 FIRST, It not only re-echoes the first demand of
 PENITENCE. the Gospel, through Christ and His
 Apostles (Mark i, 15; I. John, i, 8-9), but it seems to
 answer to the natural desire of the soul to lay aside, at
 the beautiful gate of the Temple of Communion, the
 soul burden of sin. The personal confession of sin is
 articulated in this wonderful General Confession, the
 language of which sometimes seems almost like an
 exaggeration. Its sentences are terrific in their earnest-

ness. Its cries are the *De Profundis* cries of souls burdened with a sense of the exceeding sinfulness of sin (Rom. vii, 13-18). We confess not only our sins but our manifold sins ; sins grievously committed, by thought, word and deed ; sins provoking most justly God's wrath and indignation. We confess that the burden of these sins of ours is intolerable, a word which seems to imply that no human heart can bear that which only can be carried by the Lamb of God (John i, 29 ; I. Peter ii, 24). In an age like this, inoculated with Russelism, Pseudo-Science, Theosophy and Unitarianism, these expressions of the nature of sin and God's right to be indignant and wrathful, evoke surprise or even disdain. But Churchmen to-day may well be grateful that Cranmer, in this very remarkable prayer has left for Churchmen for all time so wonderful an expression of the very secrets of the sin-convicted soul, in its desire for mercy and forgiveness and the longing for a newness of life, of service and God-pleasing.

SECOND, The second step is *Pardon*. The joyous
PARDON. consciousness of sin forgiven, the assurance
 of personal pardon, is now brought home
to the heart, through the words of a declaratory Absolution, most beautiful, most true. Here again, in this absolution, the constructive genius of Cranmer is marvellously manifest. The words are the words of Sarum and Cologne ; but the spirit is the spirit of truth and evangelical clarity. Its tones of purity and power fill the ear with a sweetness and a strength that prepare for the great *Sursum Corda* so soon to follow.

THIRD, The third step is that of *Peace*. There
PEACE. are few more beautiful sentences in the
 Prayer Book than those Scripture texts

that are known to all Churchmen as "The Comfortable Words." The heart that has just been assured of the Father's promised pardon is now confirmed in its faith by the previous promises of the Evangel of Christ. They are indeed "good words and comfortable" (Zech. i, 13), inspiring because inspired. Words intended, in the true sense of the word "comfort," to give power to the faint and strength to them that have no might. There are only four of them and they are, in their quaint English, possessed of a strange and uplifting pathos to modern ears. Cranmer probably got them from the Liturgy of his friend, the Prince Archbishop Hermann of Cologne, and the subsequent revisers, from his day to ours, have left them just as they were in the Cranmer version of the Great Bible, 1540. Archbishop Hermann's Reformed Lutheran Communion Office was of a moderate and conservative type, and gave many suggestions to Cranmer in his compilation of our Communion Service. A curious fact is that in the Cologne Communion Service, the Comfortable Words came *before* the Absolution and consist of John iii, 35-36, Acts x, 43, as well as the three last sentences in our Prayer Book. Why did Cranmer put the Comfortable Words *after* and not before the Absolution, and why did he add Matt. xi, 28? Probably because that wonderful verse of our Saviour seemed to comprehend everything, and because the consolation of the Gospel words were intended to come as a confirmation of the gracious assurance of the Absolution. Acts x, 43, was admirable *before* the Absolution and would not have been out of place after. But for some reason he left it out, and John iii, 35-36, also. (Jacobs' "Lutheran Movement, pp. 224-227; Dowden, "Further Studies," p. 59.)

FOURTH, The fourth step is *Praise*. The pardoned
PRAISE. and uplifted soul is now prepared for the
 great Eucharistic offering of praise and
thanksgiving. In the First Prayer Book the ethical
perception was faulty, because the *Sursum Corda*,
“Lift Up Your Hearts,” came *before* the sin was con-
fessed and forgiven. But with a deeper spiritual insight
Cranmer saw that the praise should come *after* the
realization of pardon. And so all this part of the service
was arranged in strict accordance with a progressive
spiritual discernment. The *Sursum Corda* is probably
the most ancient formula in the Communion Service.
It seems to have been used as far back as the time of
Tertullian. It is found in Cyprian’s Treatise on the
Lord’s Prayer. It is quoted by Cyril. The next words
are, “Let us give thanks unto the Lord ” and “It is
meet and right so to do,” etc. Augustine says, with
regard to the giving of thanks unto the Lord, “It is
meet, because He made us by His will. It is just,
because He redeemed us by His mercy. It is right,
because He gratuitously justified us.” It is wonderful
that through all the chances and changes of the historic
eras of the Church, these glorious words still survive as
the keynote of this section of the service, with their
inspiring sequel.

“Hearts up to heaven ! ”

“Up to the Lord we lift them ! ”

And most glorious of all, the congregation assembled
in the church on earth now unites with the church in
heaven, and rising into the heavenly places, in Christ
Jesus, associates itself with the angels and archangels
and all the company of heaven in a Magnificat of laud
and praise to God’s glorious name, joining in the Angelic

Trisagion (Isa. vi, 3; Rev. iv, 8.) Churchmen may well thank God for the beauty and splendour of the *Ter Sanctus* in its present form. Not only are the cumbrous expressions of the Sarum-Roman Mass omitted, but one of the most significant phrases connected with the doctrine of transubstantiation, "Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord," was with purpose, left out.* The five Proper Prefaces that introduce the "Therefore with Angels and Archangels" are further indications of the independence and originality of our English Prayer Book. Two of them are practically new, two others are almost new, and all give an entirely new tone of clearness and beauty to the whole teaching of the Preface.

The fifth and last step in the preparation

FIFTH, for the reception of the elements is the

A profession of unworthiness. This prayer PROFESSION is peculiar to our Prayer Book. It has no parallel in any primitive or medieval service. It was most probably composed by Cranmer himself. In the Scottish Liturgy it is called the Prayer of Humble Access. In its original form it represented the *semi*-enlightened mind of Cranmer, for after the words "Drink His Blood," there followed four words—"in these holy mysteries"—which unquestionably pointed to the doctrine of the Real Presence. It is a well known fact that Bishop Gardiner said that, because this prayer in the 1549 Prayer Book came *after* the Consecration Prayer, it was an act of

* The reader will remember that in the Roman Mass the bell is rung at the close of the *Ter Sanctus*—Holy, holy, holy—to call the attention of the people to the fact that the re-incarnation of the Lord through the act of transubstantiation is about to take place, and that they are about to adore the most awful and august presence of Jesus Christ under the sacramental veils.

adoration paid directly to the flesh of Christ then lying upon the altar. (Tomlinson's Prayer Book, Articles and Homilies, p. 32.) In the revision of 1552, therefore, Cranmer removed the words, "in these Holy mysteries," and changed the position of the Prayer, placing it *before* the Consecration. The Prayer, as a whole, has for its characteristic notes, humility and self-renunciation. It sounds a death knell to the spirit of Pharisaism. There is in it an absence of self-confidence and self-trust, that is the very spirit of Luke xviii, 13. It is an echo of Rom. x, 3, and Phil. iii, 9. In the spirit of the teaching of Articles XI and XIII, it abases the soul to the very dust, and compels every communicant at the moment of consecration to renounce absolutely, all trust in one's own righteousness. "We do not presume!" "We are not worthy!" "We do not trust in our own righteousness!"

The latter part of the prayer centres around the introductory word "so." There are two letters only, but of great suggestiveness. *So*-truly repentant; *So*-steadfastly strong in living faith; *So*-full of love; *So*-emptied of self; *So*-praising thee with the glory of the angels; *So* absolutely trusting in God's righteousness alone; *So* grant us, gracious Lord, to eat the flesh of Jesus and to drink His Blood.*

* For the meaning of "eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ," the reader is referred to John vi., 51-53-57, and the explanatory words of the Lord Himself in verse 63, "The flesh profiteth nothing, the words that I speak unto you, they are to be understood in a spiritual not carnal sense, *spirit*, and they are life, and the explanation of the Church's teaching in the third paragraph of Article XXVIII., and the explicit teaching of Article XXIX. As to the idea of our bodies being cleansed by Christ's Body and our souls washed through Christ's Blood (see the very remarkable appendix to Dowden's *Further Studies in the Prayer Book*, pp. 317-343, a most scholarly and suggestive study. See also the *Tutorial Prayer Book*, pp. 332-333.)

As we approach the Consecration Prayer,
THE we see that the reformers displayed
CENTRE remarkable courage in meeting a serious
PRAYER. difficulty. It was obvious that they
could not retain the prayer of the Roman
Canon. It was the very heart of the service. Yet
how could they touch words which had for centuries
been regarded with such awe. At no other point
would associations, prejudices and superstitions be
so vitally affected. If Cranmer and his fellow workers
had not been rooted and grounded in the Word of God,
and emboldened by the power of the Holy Ghost, they
could hardly have dared to depart so absolutely from
the inherited traditions of a thousand years.*

They wished to provide for the Church of England a
Consecration Prayer which would embody three great
essentials :

- (1) A statement of the truth of the atoning death
of Jesus Christ as our Substitute and our
Sacrifice.
- (2) A prayer that would embody the perfect truth
of the reception of the elements and, at the
same time, reject every possible phrase or
sentence that would in any wise countenance
the teaching of the objective presence of Christ
in the consecrated elements, or in any way

* Cranmer's own words deserve the deepest study. "The very body of the tree, or rather the roots of the weeds, is the Popish doctrine of transubstantiation, of the Real Presence of Christ's flesh and blood in the Sacrament of the Altar (as they call it), and of the Sacrifice and Oblation of Christ made by the priest for the salvation of the quick and the dead." See Cranmer on the Lord's Supper, Park. Soc., p. 6. See also the splendid dissertation upon this in Dimock's *Doctrine of the English Church Concerning the Eucharistic Presence*, p. 441.

seem to imply the sacrificial character of altar worship.

- (3) A statement, in the most absolutely simple and spiritual form, of the original institution of the Lord's Supper by our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

The work was not performed in its completeness at one stroke. In their first reforming effort, in 1548, there seems to be no evidence of their even having attempted anything like the introduction of a new consecration prayer form. In 1549, the Consecration Prayer certainly retained some of the features of the Roman Mass ; and it added the invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the elements. *It was not until 1552*, that they divested this portion of the service of every possible element of sacerdotal or sacrificial meaning. The thing that they then had as the end in sight, was to bring clearly before the eye of faith the atoning death of Jesus Christ, and at the same time to dispose of the error that the sacrifice of the death of Jesus Christ was to be continually *re-offered* upon the so-called altars of an earthly church.

The opening part of the Consecration Prayer, therefore, sets forth the great truth of the *finished* work of our atoning Saviour. With a strong emphasis the great prayer teaches that the Sacrifice of Jesus Christ was made on Calvary. It flings back the thought across the chasm of nearly nineteen centuries. It teaches as the explicit doctrine of the Anglican Church, that there was only One Oblation ; and that, the Oblation of HIMSELF ; *once* offered—once only. And, further, that this ONE Oblation of Himself ONCE offered was full, perfect, and *sufficient*. So perfect, so sufficient,

that no merit of saint or angel would ever be needed to supplement it. And, further, that it was so ample that it was sufficient for the sins of the whole world. (Heb. vii, 27 ; ix, 24-25 ; x, 10-12.) Nothing in the formulated language of theology more satisfactorily sets forth the New Testament doctrine of the propitiatory, substitutory, and vicarious aspects of the *completed* work of our Saviour on the Cross. Compare also the Catechism answer, " For the continual *remembrance* of the sacrifice of the death of Christ " ; *not* for the continual *repetition* of that sacrifice, as the Church of Rome teaches. (Read the words, Heb. ix, 24-28. " For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true ; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us : Nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others : For then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world ; but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself. And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment : So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many ; and unto them that look for Him shall He appear the second time without sin unto Salvation.")

Not only is there a remarkable avoidance of the sacrificial character of the altar offering, as it is called, but in this Consecration Prayer, as we now have it, there is a remarkable avoidance of one of the root errors both of the Primitive Liturgies and of the Roman Mass ; an error that has its echo in the Lutheran Communion Service, and also in the Scottish Liturgy and the Communion Service of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States ; that the Holy Spirit invoked by

the priest should *make* the elements Christ's Body and Blood, or else so bless and sanctify the bread and wine "that they may be unto us, or that they *may become* the Body and Blood of God's most dearly beloved Son." But in our Consecration Prayer, we have an entire change of thought; a change of teaching, by a change of wording. The prayer is now not for any blessing upon the creatures of *bread and wine*. There is no request that any change in any way whatsoever should come upon or over *them*. The prayer is now a prayer for the communicants, that *they* receiving God's creatures of bread and wine may be partakers of His most blessed Body and Blood,* that is, that they may receive by faith an interest in His Body and Blood, and personally experience by living faith the remission of sins and all other benefits of His atoning death. And so the very heart of the service is Christ Crucified; Christ Jesus Himself as the Lamb of God, the Sin-Bearer, the Sacrifice. It is wonderful how deeply the substitutionary and atoning work of Christ is inwrought into Christianity. It is the immovable centre; and in this wonderful prayer, the Church of England wonderfully sets forth what Dr. Forsyth has called "the centrality of the Cross." For, as often as we come to this part of the service, we do "shew forth His Death," at the Lord's Table in a perpetual memorial and communion, with the everlasting prospective onlook "till He come."

* The reader whose desires to have a full and fine explanation of the Saviour's words, "Except you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, yet have no life in you" should read that most masterly summary of Bishop Ryle in his *Expository Thoughts on the Gospels* (John i., 402). His view is that by flesh and blood our Lord meant the Sacrifice of His own Body for us, and that by "eating and drinking" He meant that communion and participation of the benefit of His sacrifice which faith, and faith only, conveys to the soul.

And now come the Words of Adminis-
THE WORDS tration. Again the genius of the English
TO THE reformers is seen. When they came to
COMMUNI- the administration of the sacred elements
CANTS. to the communicants, they were like
men in an almost unexplored region.
There was nothing to guide them in the one Reformation
Mass Service. They must have been in a kind of dilemma
for it had been the habit for centuries to put the Wafer
on to the tongue of the communicant, never to deliver
it into the hand. As to the wine, there had never been
any to speak of, in the service the Cup never having been
given to the laity. Bishop Dowden has pointed out
that the mass services of medieval England contained
no words for communicating the laity, either at or after
Mass, and the only words that were ever used being found
in a form for the Communion of the Sick—the Viaticum,
as it was called, being given with the form “The Body
of our Lord Jesus Christ keep your body and soul to
life eternal.” (Dowden, “Further Studies, pp. 235-319,
and Upton’s “Outlines of Prayer Book History,”
pp. 98-100.)

It was a happy inspiration, when the first compilers
of our Prayer Book resolved to introduce a more Scriptural
feature in our Church system, that the communicant
kneeling to receive the Sacrament should hear in his
ears a few suggestive words that would bring home to
his heart the very essence of the Communion. Their
historical genesis is of great interest.

They were first used in the Order of the Communion,
1548, with these words: “When the priest doth deliver
the Sacrament of the Body of Christ, he shall say to
every one these words: The Body of our Lord Jesus

Christ, which was given *for* thee (note not *to* thee), preserve thy body unto everlasting life." and, when delivering the Sacrament of the Blood: "The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed *for* thee, preserve *thy soul* unto everlasting life."

A year later, they conjoined the words in the delivery of both elements, "Preserve *thy body and soul* unto everlasting life." It was a happy innovation and undoubtedly the result of a quickened spiritual insight and a deeper study of the teaching of the New Testament (Upton's "Outlines of Prayer Book History," p. 102). In the year 1552, to bring home to each believing heart the personal appropriation of the death of Christ, they substituted the appealing and beautiful words, "Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, etc," and "Drink this in remembrance that Christ's Blood *was* shed for thee, etc." In 1559, both forms were combined so that we now have repeated at every administration throughout the year the words that have become endeared to every English Churchmen by a thousand sweet and tender associations.

Bishop Dowden raised the question, "Why were our reformers not content with the ancient formula and why did they insert the words, 'which was given for thee,' 'which was shed for thee'?" ("Further Studies," p. 235.) And he answered his question by showing that the words were used in the Lutheran formula and that they were considered of such vital importance, as to be principal parts of the Sacrament. The ministers were enjoined always to admonish the people with the greatest earnestness at every Communion to carefully ponder and lay to heart the words "which was given for you," "which was shed for you." And in Cranmer's Catechism of 1548, the same thing is

emphasised in a paragraph enlarging on the significance of the words, "given for *you*," "shed for *you*."

To the Communicants of the Church of England, they set forth the truth of the personal appropriation of the *benefits* of Christ's death by faith. They bring home the great teaching of our Church in Articles XXVIII and XXIX. They show that in the Sacrament we are to feed on Him (not on bread); in our heart (not in our mouth); by faith (not by mastication); with thanksgiving, in the Eucharist of the soul. (Heb. xiii, 15; Ephes. v, 20.)

Further, there is brought home to each heart, in the solemn moment of the reception of the Sacrament, the most profound of all Gospel truths—the great truth of the *finished* work of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ upon Calvary's Cross. For the words are not "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ which *IS* given for thee," but "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ which *WAS* given for thee." It is a very suggestive difference. If our reformers had inserted the phrase, "The Body which *IS* given for thee," or, "is being given," there would have been the danger of some, so *mis*-taking the phrase as to possibly construe it into meaning that it was a direct or indirect evidence of the fact that Christ's Body is given to God in sacrifice for us in the Communion. Cranmer had to face this and make his choice between, "*IS* given" and "*WAS* given." He made his choice deliberately. And so, in using the words, "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ which *WAS* given for thee," "The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ which *WAS* shed for thee," our reformers lifted into prominence the great truth of the redemption that was consummated *once for all*. (Heb. ix, 12-14-25-28; Heb. x, 1-2 and 10-14.) The

emphasis is not upon the presence of the *glorified* Body of our Saviour, which was never at any time given in sacrifice for us ; but upon that Body which WAS given for us in His death upon the Cross. As Bishop Moule has pointed out, in *English Church Teaching*, "The bread is the body regarded *as slain*. The wine is the blood regarded *as shed*. Literally, the body was given and blood shed eighteen centuries ago, once and forever. Literally, therefore, the body once given and the blood once shed, *cannot be going through this process now*. The Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death mean Christ Crucified. The thought is not an infusion of the glorified humanity. It is of saving union and communion with the Lamb of the Sacrifice." In other words, the Church of England places between the two parts of the Words of Administration a chasm of about 1890 years ; the first part emphasises the finished redemption of that Day ; the second, brings home to the believer in this day his personal interest in that finished redemption. The Body which *was* given—there ; then, Take and eat this—here, now !

III.—THE POST COMMUNION.

The conclusion of the Service deserves a careful study. It consists of five sections :

- (1) The Lord's Prayer.
- (2) The first alternative prayer, sometimes called the Prayer of Oblation.
- (3) The second alternative prayer, sometimes called the Prayer of Eucharist.
- (4) The Gloria in Excelsis.
- (5) The Benediction.

This is in most remarkable contrast to the Roman Service. Before the Reformation, the Mass ended with a complex and curious series of chalice rinsings, hand washings, ablutions of the chalice and paten, bowings and crossings, and other ceremonies. But the English Reformers, heart-sick possibly, with the irritating dark and dumb ceremonies, or following the concluding of some Primitive Liturgies, in the pioneer order of 1548, simply ended the service with this blessing :

“ The peace of God, which passeth all understanding, keep your hearts and minds, in the knowledge and love of God, and of His Son, Jesus Christ our Lord.”

A year later, was provided a Post-Communion series of texts of Scripture, twenty-two in number, and most beautiful in suggestion. It is not easy to understand why Cranmer struck them out in 1552. But, he did. And he put in their place the Lord's Prayer, and the two prayers that we now have, and, as the climax of all, the Gloria in Excelsis.

The Lord's Prayer forms a noble opening to the finale of the Communion SACRIFICE Office. But the subsequent prayer may PRAYER. be taken as an index of their intense desire to follow the guidance of the Holy Spirit, for it marks one of the most revolutionary features of the revision work of the 1552 revisers. In 1549, this prayer was intended to be a Prayer of Sacramental Oblation. It brought out, by its position and language, the idea of the pleading of the eucharistic sacrifice before God. But, by taking it away from the Prayer of Consecration, and inserting it in the Prayer Book after the Communion was over, our Prayer Book compilers intentionally removed any possibility of the sacrifice of praise and

thanksgiving being connected with the offering of the elements of bread and wine. By making it an optional and not an obligatory prayer, they absolutely destroyed its value from the standpoint of Roman Catholic teaching. But they brought out more clearly the Scriptural thought of the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving (Heb. xiii, 15), and the solemn dedication of *ourselves* as a living sacrifice (Rom. xii, 1). The humble and lowly petition with which it concludes is one of the sweetest and most solemn in the Prayer Book, "We be unworthy through our manifold sins to offer unto thee any sacrifice"*

The second alternative prayer is also
THE without any parallel in the Roman Mass
ALTERNATIVE Service and illustrates the development
PRAYER. of Cranmer's mind. In 1549, it contained
the words, "Thou hast vouchsafed to
feed us *in* these holy mysteries." But in 1552, by a deliberate change, slight but revealing, they avoided any possibility of the teaching of the Real Presence by the present wording of the Prayer. Cranmer's broad and catholic spirit is reflected in the now famous definition of the Mystical Body of Christ as "The blessed company of all faithful people," and the latter part of the prayer reveals the spirit of the Epistle to the Ephesians (Eph. ii, 10) in the beautiful wording of a

* The spiritual illumination of Cranmer, and the teaching of the Church of England, are well brought out by his distinction between Christ's sacrifice of Himself *for* us, and our sacrifice of ourselves *to* God by him. "Another kind of sacrifice there is which doth not reconcile us to God, but is made of (that is, by) them that he reconciled to God—sacrifices of laud, praise, and thanksgiving—ourselves and all that we had." (Cranmer on the Lord's Supper, Park. Soc., p. 346.) These words throw a great light upon the distinctive teaching of the Church of England in regard to sacrifice-offering.

prayer that is at once spiritual and practical and aptly comprehensive.

The Gloria in Excelsis. For many centuries this glorious hymn, originally called the Dawn Hymn or the Seraphic Hymn or the Hymn of the Angels (for it contained in its original form little more than the simple words of Luke ii, 14), was used in the service of the Mass. It was sung in Latin just before the Nicene Creed. In the First Prayer Book, 1549, it was placed in the forefront of the service, after the opening prayer, "Almighty God, unto whom all hearts are open." Why, then, was it transferred by one stroke of the pen, as it were, from the very beginning to the very end of the Communion Service? The most natural supposition is that, as they read the words of the Gospel, they were struck with the concluding text: "And, when they had sung an hymn, they went out" (Matt. xxvi, 30; Mark xiv, 26), and that they evidently desired to finish our service just as our Lord and His disciples finished their Communion Service. Anyway, there it stands in imitation of our Lord and Saviour, the eucharistic closing hymn.

It consists of three great sections and, like the Te Deum, is a hymn of praise, a profession of faith, and a litany of supplication, all in one. Beginning with an almost exuberant tone of praise, it passes at once into a strain of tender and wistful pleading for pity, combined with a glorious exaltation of the Lord Jesus Christ in the glory of His Deity and the beauty of His Humanity. He is hailed as the Only Begotten; the Lord God; the Lamb of God; the Son of the Father; the Remover of the world's sin; the Sitter at the right hand of God;

Mounting, as it were, from height to height, it reaches its marvellous climax in the solemn cadence of the thrice-repeated, all-excluding words: "Thou only! Thou only! Thou only!"

And so the Anglican Communion Service concludes. The soul lies low, self-emptied; shrunk into nothingness before the glory of God. The two finest notes of the Anglican liturgical system come out, at the end of the service, into fine relief: the sense of humiliation and unworthiness on the part of man, and the giving all the glory to God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. And then, not with the curt dismissal of the Church of Rome, but with the great Benediction, the communicants depart. As they pass out into daily life with their souls strengthened and refreshed the last words that linger in their ears are those of the peace of God which passes all understanding, and guards, as a sentinel, the heart and mind in the knowledge and love of God, and of the blessing of the Triune God ever abiding with each. (Phil. iv, 7.)

A FINAL
WORD. Once more the Church of England is at a parting of the ways. It almost looks as if, in England anyway, the war of the Reformation has to be fought over again. Once more the centre of the battle is the Communion Service. Once more, the roots of the Romish Real Presence doctrines are growing in the Lord's vineyard, and overspreading the ground with the old errors and superstitions. (Cranmer on "Lord's Supper." Park. Soc., Preface 6.)

In the reign of Edward, the reaction was from the Mass, and for the recovery of the Lord's Supper. To-day, in the Anglican Church, the reaction is from the Lord's

Supper for the recovery of the Mass. The reaction of to-day is an almost exact repetition and a reproduction of the successive steps in the movement of the first three centuries of the Sub-Apostolic age, and of the retrograde movement of the first century in the Church of England after the Reformation. The lines of primitive departure from the simplicity of the Lord's Supper find an exact historic parallel in the departures of the Caroline Catholic Anglicans, the Non-Jurors and Scottish Episcopal Laudians, and the Anglo-Catholics from Pusey's day to ours. These lines, in a word, were as follows :

1st.—An over-valuation of the Supper ; a tendency to exaggerate its importance as a service ; and to give to it a place that is certainly not assigned to it in the teaching of the Apostles. It is significant that the communion is mentioned in only five Books of the New Testament. In twenty-two of the Books there is no reference to it. In only one of the Epistles of St. Paul is it referred to, and in the writings of St. Peter, St. John, St. Jude and St. James it is not once mentioned. The silence of the Pastoral Epistles is of extraordinary significance. These letters to two Bishops haven't a suggestion with regard to its observance. much less to its ritual.

2nd.—To make it the highest act of Christian worship, to the exclusion of Morning and Evening Prayer, and to put into the background, if not to disregard, the reading of the Word and the preaching of the Gospel. (See " A Sacrament of Our Redemption," pp. 106-111.) In the Primitive Church, this tendency led, with awful rapidity, to the establish-

ment of the Mass Service of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, with its accompaniment of false and misleading teachings. The propaganda that is being carried on to-day for the restoration of the Altar and the re-establishment of the Mass in the Church of England, as the sun and centre of Anglican worship, is ecclesiastical history repeating itself, with its fearful errors and soul-destroying dangers.

3rd.—To administer it with an excess of ceremonial, multiplying the accessories of ritual, pageantry and regarding the service more and more with mysterious and obsequious veneration. (It is almost like the *epithumia tōn opthalmōn* of I. John, ii, 16.)

4th.—To see in the bread and wine after consecration, the mystic Body and Blood of Christ, through a process of consubstantiation or insubstantiation or transubstantiation. And, in consequence.

5th.—To *re*-plead the once-for-all offered sacrifice, and then to *re*-present it, and then, as a logical consequence, doctrinal and ritual, to *re*-offer it.

If Churchmen will only hold fast to their Prayer Book and take it as it stands in its true and usual and literal meaning, we shall be preserved from those curious and unhappy differences which have for so many centuries vexed the Church of Christ, and come, as Archbishop Sancroft pleaded, into closer union with our separated brethren, the Protestant dissenters. The writer is persuaded that nothing so tends to separate us from them as the sacerdotal and sacrificial errors with regard to the Lord's Supper, for, as Bishop Wordsworth said, "unity in error is not true unity." If, with opened eyes,

we stand upon the Bible, we will never either under-value or over-value the Holy Communion. Side by side with our great Bishop-reformers, with simple faith in the Bible and strong confidence in the Prayer Book, we will, as loyal Churchmen, avoid the term "Altar," abhor the term "Mass," and beware of the term "Eucharistic Sacrifice." As well call the Waterloo banquet, as one has said, a repetition of the Battle of Waterloo, as call the Holy Communion a repetition of Christ's sacrifice on Calvary's Cross. We will pray with Cranmer and his colleagues for opened eyes and growing perceptions of truth and error, and with stern resolves abandon all that would tend to falsify, and hold fast all that is spiritually true. To lay stress upon spiritual qualification ; to plead for living faith ; to demand supremely, heart love and genuine, sincere and absolute personal consecration ; this is the duty of the hour for the clergy. To see in the service an exhibition of the saving truth of the Gospel, the power of the precious blood, and the vicarious propitiation of our Crucified Lord for the sins of the whole world ; to realize what is, alas, so often obscured in the Communion Service of the Anglican Church, our unity and our union with our fellow communicants ; to search the heart, and come with living faith and loving heart ; this is the duty of the laity. Then we may truly feel that in our beautiful service, every promise of the Lord, every intention of His Word, every blessing of His presence, will surely be fulfilled to all, both clergy and laity, who, coming humbly, truly, earnestly, meekly, receive the elements, with simple and sincere faith. And so coming and so receiving, the faithful communicant can depart saying, "O, my God, thou art true. O, my soul, thou art happy."

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

“THE PROTESTANTISM OF THE PRAYER BOOK.”

New Impression. 1/- net.

“This volume is a brief but exhaustive account of the true principles on which the English Book of Common Prayer was finally compiled, when the Reformation of our Church was completed, and the Second Book of King Edward substituted for the First Book. Those principles were carefully retained in the Prayer Book of Queen Elizabeth’s reign and were finally preserved unaltered in the last revision of 1661. Even at that date, immediately after the unhappy Savoy Conference, Archbishop Sheldon and his assistant revisers did not attempt to bring back into our Liturgy the questionable things which found a place in King Edward’s First Prayer Book, and were purposely cast out from King Edward’s Second Book. The true principles of the English Prayer Book, whatever some interpreters may please to say, are Protestant and Evangelical, and of this abundant evidence is supplied in this volume.” (*Note from Preface.*)

THE CHURCH BOOK ROOM.

82, VICTORIA STREET,

:: LONDON, S.W. 1. ::

