

EXPOSITION

'We are thus taught by the Saviour, and also by the Apostle Paul, that this bread and this wine, which is placed upon the altar, are placed for a figure or memorial of the Lord's Death, so that it may recall to present memory that which was done in the past, and that we may be reminded of His Passion; by it also are we made partakers of the Divine gift by which we are freed from death. Knowing that when we shall come to the vision of Christ we shall no more have need of such outward means, by which we may be reminded of that which divine goodness endured for us. For beholding Him face to face we shall not be influenced by the outward admonition of temporal things, but by the contemplation of the thing itself (*ipsius veritatis*) we shall perceive in what way we ought to give thanks to the Author of our salvation.'—*The Book of Bertram*, Monk of Corbie, A.D. 840, on The Body and Blood of the Lord (*De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*), c. 100, translated by Archdeacon Taylor.

He who would know the principle upon which the Communion Office of the Church of England was built up by Cranmer can see it 'writ large' in this extract from the work whose reproduction at the period of the Reformation led Ridley, and through him Cranmer, back to Scriptural truth.

Title.

1549. The Supper of the Lord, and the Holy Communion, commonly called The Mass.

1552. The Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion.

Commonly called **The Mass**: cf. 'Commonly called the Creed of St. Athanasius,' 'Those five commonly called Sacraments' (Art. XXV), 'the Sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said,' etc. (Art. XXI). The adverb 'commonly' stamps the usage as popular but inaccurate and undesirable; cf. 'The Presentation of Christ in the Temple, commonly called The Purification of Saint Mary the Virgin,' a new title given in 1662 to justify the special observance of the Day, consonant with the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel.

The name 'Mass' is generally derived from the words of dismissal: *Ite, missa est*.* It had been retained in the 'Order of Communion' of 1548, and 'time of High Mass' is found in the Royal Preface to the Homilies in 1547 and 1548, but it was changed to 'the Celebration of the Holy Communion' in the 1549 Edn. It appears only here in the 1549 B.C.P., and was finally discarded in 1552.

Bishop Tonstal at the great Parliamentary Debate on the Lord's Supper in December, 1548, began the disputation by objecting to the abandonment of the term 'Mass,' see Tomlinson's Tract, containing a verbatim reprint, *Tracts on Ritual*, vol. ii.

The **Lord's Supper** is a name derived from 1 Cor. xi. 20. The title prevailed in very early days, e.g., Hippolytus, 220; Dionysius the Great, 254; cf. Scudamore, *Not. Euch.*, p. 5.† Though a very common name in the Middle Ages (Frere, *l. c.*), its manifest incongruity with the practice of non-communicating presence at a sacrifice, and that early in the day, had practically abolished its use in the West.‡ "I chanced in our communication to name the Lord's Supper. 'Tush,' saith the bishop, 'What do ye call the Lord's Supper? What new term is that?'" (*Latimer's Sermons*, p. 121, P.S.). Following a Jesuit of the close of the fifteenth century, Roman divines and others now try to dissociate the term as used by St. Paul from the Holy Communion; but no answer is or can be given to the fact that St. Paul goes on immediately to describe the Holy Communion, and has not a word to say about the Agapè: this latter may certainly have accompanied the Holy Communion at Corinth—probably did do so—but it is not the matter concerning which St. Paul writes. Nor is it easy to see on what ground any feast save the Holy Communion could be called 'the Lord's Supper.'

Holy Communion is taken from 1 Cor. x. 16, 17, which teaches the common partaking of Christ, and therefore fellowship with one another. This is the distinctive Reformation title, bringing out, by its implication of fellow-partaking, the contrast between the original rite, now restored, and the Mass-Sacrifice.

Other names have been and are in use; 'Breaking of bread' Acts ii. 42; xx. 7; 'Eucharist,' an early and appropriate title, though not Scriptural. It is a strange irony that this title should

* I.e.: 'Go, the (congregation) is dismissed.' Others suppose that *missa* is a late corruption of *missio*, 'dismissal.'

† Frere says (*New History of the B.C.P.*, Edn. 1910, p. 438, ft. nt.) that 'it does not appear that 1 Cor. xi. 20 was interpreted absolutely of the Eucharist before the end of the fourth century.' This seems to be wrong.

‡ In Hermann's *Deliberatio* (1535) the name was restored; see Dowden, *Further Studies*, p. 56.

have become chiefly, though not exclusively, the property of those whose tendency is to subordinate the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving to the idea of a sin-offering. The words of 1 Cor. xiv. 16:—'Else when thou shalt bless with the spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say Amen at thy 'giving of thanks,' seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest?—have been cited as Scriptural authority for applying the name 'Eucharist' to the Holy Communion.* But there is not one word to indicate that St. Paul refers here to Holy Communion; the two preceding verses refer to prayer and praise, this to blessing and thanksgiving, the latter as general as the former in application; and the whole chapter deals with mysterious utterances, which, far from being necessary parts of worship, were ordered to be controlled as liable to disturb public worship. The nemesis of this kind of exegesis, which attempts to attach a later technical meaning to a word originally as general as our 'thanksgiving,' is its being carried to such an extremity as the limitation of the word in 1 Tim. ii. 1:—'I exhort, therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and Eucharists, be made for all men.' At the original institution our Lord 'said grace' over the bread and wine, εὐλογήσας, Matt. xxvi. 26; Mark xiv. 22; cf. 1 Cor. x. 16; εὐχαριστήσας, Matt. xxvi. 27; Mark xiv. 23; Luke xxii. 19; 1 Cor. xi. 24; this use of the word, apart from the indiscriminate use of two Greek words, is decisive against its technical association with the whole rite. The early transition from the general meaning of thanksgiving to the special application of the word to the Holy Communion may be seen in the Didachè, § 9; Ignat. *ad Smyrn.*, 7, 8. Justin's *Apology* (i. 67), however, conclusively proves that the word was not thus restricted generally in 140.

Sacrament is not, strictly speaking, a name of Holy Communion, though often used as such. It meant in classical Latin (1) the sum of money deposited by the parties to a suit, called 'a sacred thing,' either because a pledge against perjury and injustice, or because deposited in a temple, and to be used, if forfeited, for sacred things: (2) the suit itself: (3) the military recruit's preliminary pledge: (4) the military oath generally. In post-Augustan Latin it had already become common for any solemn oath or obligation, in which sense it is used in Pliny's famous letter to Trajan, containing the Bithynian Christians' description of their public worship:

* Palmer, *Orig. Lit.*, vol. ii. pp. 114 ff: Frere, p. 30, ft. nt. (2), p. 432, ft. nt. (1), 'probably not in the technical sense,' and p. 435, without any such qualification. This curious inconsistency of the latter writer is itself sufficient answer.

'They asserted that this was the sum-total of their fault or error, that they were wont, on a fixed day, to assemble before daylight, and sing (*dicere*) a hymn in turn to Christ as God; and to bind themselves by an oath (*sacramento*), not to a crime of any sort, but not to commit thefts or adulteries, not to deny their faith, not to repudiate a trust: these things completed, it was their custom to disperse, and to reassemble to take food, in common, however, and innocently: and even that they had abandoned since my edict forbidding clubs by your mandate.'

Here the word has obviously its ordinary meaning of a sacred pledge.* Another meaning was conferred upon the word in ecclesiastical Latin, some idea of which may be gained by its use in the Vulgate to translate the Greek μυστήριον, 'secret,' (not 'an intellectual puzzle,' as the modern use of the word 'mystery' suggests); cf. Tobit, xii. 7, 'it is good to keep a king's secret (LXX μυστήριον, Vulg. *sacramentum*), but to reveal clearly the works of God': Eph. v. 32, of the symbolic meaning of marriage: 1 Tim. iii. 16, 'great is the mystery of godliness (Vulg. *sacramentum pietatis*), God was manifest in the flesh,' etc.: Rev. i. 20: 'the mystery of the seven stars.'† From such passages as this last it is easy to see how the modern idea of 'transcending intelligence' attached to the word 'mystery,' a fruitful cause of mischief in interpreting Patristic references to Holy Communion, as well as Holy Scripture. However, it is quite another error which has accompanied the use of the word 'Sacrament,' due to its ambiguity. Anciently used, like its

* Bishop Beveridge's suggestion, that the word is here used of the Holy Communion, though 'the following words seem to show that the Eucharistic Service was in the evening' (Robertson, *History*, i. 18, Note a), might pass unnoticed were it not that Harold Browne (Art. XXV) claims that 'it is generally supposed that its application in this passage was to the Supper of the Lord,' and refers to Waterland's *Eucharist* c. i. Frere (Procter and Frere, 432, n. 1) makes the same claim, saying 'the word was probably misunderstood by Pliny, and may have been technically employed. It is probable enough that he [Pliny] used the very word which he had heard from them [the Bithynian Christians], and that they used it in the Christian and technical sense, however Pliny may have understood it.' Pliny's conjectural use of the actual word used by the Christians, and his conjectural misunderstanding, and consequent conjectural mistranslation of their word—for presumably the Bithynians did not use Latin terms in A.D. 112—constitute slender support for a claim styled 'probable.' It is more truly probable that the desire to find earlier evidence of the separation of the Holy Communion from the Evening Agapè, and another reason for it than that expressly contained in the letter itself, viz., Trajan's mandate against clubs, is responsible for the perpetuation of this suggestion. It is unfortunate that Harold Browne's quotation stops short of the reference to the re-assembling for food. Robertson (*l. c.*) supposes that the baptismal vow may probably be intended; Tertullian (*Apol.* 2) gives it no sacramental signification of any kind.

† *Mysterium* is also sometimes employed in the Vulgate; cf. Eph. vi. 19; 'mystery of the Gospel,' *mysterium evangelii*.

Greek theological equivalent, for anything connected with revelation (e.g. Cyprian's reference to many sacraments in the Lord's Prayer), it very gradually acquired a technical meaning in Augustine's time: *signa, cum ad res divinas pertinent, sacramenta appellantur*, Ep. 138. He applies the word to O.T. symbols, e.g., manna, as well as to Baptism and Holy Communion, but regards these two as the N.T. sacraments, *De doctrina Christiana*, iii. 9: cf. *Epistle* 54, where, however, is added *et si quid aliud in Scripturis Canonicis commendatur*: 'and anything else, if any, which is commended in the Canonical Scriptures.' Lombard fixed upon the symbolical number seven, in the twelfth century; the Reformers returned from this arbitrary use of the word to the more reasonable one suggested by Augustine, limiting it more definitely, however, to the two rites instituted by Christ. A further ambiguity, productive of many misconceptions, is the double use of the word, both to signify the rite as a whole, including the outward visible sign and the inward invisible grace, and also for the former alone. Sometimes even the outward visible sign is not wholly included in the word, the consecrated bread and wine, to the exclusion of the distribution and partaking thereof, being called 'the Sacrament.' Many a reference to the whole rite, in the Fathers, in the Reformers' writings, and in B.C.P., is reasonable and intelligible as applied to the Sacrament as a whole, which would be unjustifiable if used of the outward alone. It is interesting to note that in the expression 'pledges of his love,' there is a return to the classical meaning of the word 'Sacrament,' a pledge given by God to us, however, not by us to Him.*

I. ANTE-COMMUNION.

Rubric giving notice of intention to communicate, 1549.

1549. Overnight, or else in the morning afore the beginning of Matins, or immediately after.

* Other expressions, as 'offering' (*προσφορά*), 'sacrifice' (*θυσία*), are given as early names of the rite in Frere (*l. c.*); but, if accurately, their technical meaning is abandoned for a spiritual one. For example the passage cited but not quoted by him for the use of 'Sacrifice,' and 'Commemoration, Memorial,' Justin, *Dial.* 117, is: 'Now that prayers and giving of thanks, when offered by worthy men, are the only perfect and well-pleasing sacrifices to God, I also admit. For such alone Christians have undertaken to do, and in the remembrance made by their food, both solid and liquid, in which the suffering of the Son of God which he endured is brought to remembrance.' The passage cited in support of 'Oblation' (*προσφορά*, a word frequent in the N.T. for a sacrificial offering, but never used of Holy Communion) is Clem., *Ep. Cor.*, 40, where, far from being a 'name' for Holy Communion, the word is not used in the singular at all; and the whole passage refers expressly to *Jewish sacrifices*, 'high-priest,' 'Levites,' and 'Jerusalem' being named to define the reference.

1552. 'Matins' altered to 'Morning Prayer.'

1662. At least sometime the day before.

This alteration was a concession to the request of the Presbyterians at the Savoy Conference.

Rubric warning notorious evil-livers, 1549; unimportant verbal changes 1552 and 1662.

Rubric warning those at variance, 1549; order to report to Ordinary added 1662.

The Ordinary is the judge authorized to take cognisance of causes, i.e. in this case the Bishop of the Diocese, from whom appeal lies to the Archbishop, and from him to the King in Council. Seeing that Canon Law is abrogated by desuetude, and that this form of exercising 'the Canon' has certainly not been used for some time, the Ordinary cannot fulfil this rubric. The abandonment of attempts to enforce uniformity has made it unlikely that an open or notorious evil-liver would come to the Lord's Table, though it is to be feared that those at variance may do so, in spite of warnings. A recent attempt to interpret 'evil-liver' in a sense not recognized by Statute Law, and to refuse the bread and wine to one who had married his deceased wife's sister, was condemned on appeal to Law by the rejected communicant.

Rubric defining place of Table and position of Priest, 1552.

1549. A rubric stood here, regulating the vesture of the officiant, and of his assistants, if any (see p. 79), concluding, 'Then shall the Clerks sing in English for the Office, or Introit * (as they call it), a Psalm appointed for that day. The Priest standing humbly afore the midst of the Altar, shall say the Lord's Prayer, with this Collect.'

1552. The Table, having at the Communion-time a fair white linen cloth upon it, shall stand in the body of the Church, or in the Chancel, where Morning Prayer and Evening Prayer be appointed to be said. And the Priest standing at the North side of the Table, shall say the Lord's Prayer with this Collect following.

S.L. The Holy Table having at the Communion-time a Carpet, and a fair white linen cloth upon it, with other decent furniture, meet for the high mysteries there to be celebrated, shall stand at the uppermost part of the Chancel

* The 'Introit as they call it' was a reminiscence of the mediæval 'approach to the Altar,' and was removed in 1552. It has been of late re-introduced under cover of the growth of the use of hymns.

or Church, where the Presbyter standing at the North side or end thereof, etc.

1662. As in 1552, with 'the people kneeling' added.

(1) The Meaning of 'Table.'

In 1549 the word 'table' was introduced three times, 'God's Board' twice, 'altar' being also retained. But though the word was retained, the altars themselves began to disappear as early as February of that same year, and an Order in Council, dated November 23, 1550, bade every bishop 'pluck down the altars,' and prescribed a 'table' instead, stating that 'the form of a table shall more move the simple from the superstitious opinions of the popish Mass, unto the right use of the Lord's Supper. For the use of an altar is to make sacrifice upon it; the use of a table is for men to eat upon.' Accordingly, in 1552, the word 'altar' disappeared from the B.C.P., and was not restored at the revision of 1662, though the abortive Canon of 1640, attempting to enforce the altar-wise position of the Table, claimed a legitimate use of the word as applied to the Lord's Table: 'We declare that this situation of the Holy Table doth not imply that it is, or ought to be esteemed a true and proper Altar, whereon Christ is again really sacrificed, but it is and may be called an Altar by us, in that sense in which the Primitive Church called it an Altar, and no other.' The word has persisted in popular language, especially in regard to the Marriage Service, where a sense of humour might have killed the inaccuracy; and the occasional Coronation Offices, which cannot be taken to govern the doctrine and usage of the Church of England, have been used for an introduction of the word. The word is unscriptural, unhistorical, and misleading:—

(a) In the O.T. the prescribed altars were two, the brazen altar of sacrifice, and the golden altar of incense. Earth and unhewn stone were the only materials permitted, though the casings were directed to be of brass and gold for the two altars of the Tabernacle. To carve the stone was to pollute the altar, and to add steps was an insult to God (Exod. xx. 24–26). An altar may be sometimes called a table, cf. Ezek. xli. 22, and Mal. i. 7; but a table cannot conversely be called an altar.

In the N.T. the altar of sacrifice finds its typical significance fulfilled in the Cross, the golden altar has its counterpart in the Presence of God where our High-Priest ever liveth to make intercession for us. The two altars are both mentioned in Revelation, where they are in heaven, save indeed that the measured temple, altar, and them that worship therein (xi. 1), are once figuratively applied to the Church Militant. In all

the word is used twenty-three times, and always of the two O.T. altars, save once of Abraham's altar, and once of the Cross perhaps. This last reference, Heb. xiii. 10, 'we have an altar,' may very well refer to the Israelitish Altar of Sacrifice, for the 'we,' which is unemphatic, would mean Israelites in a letter written by a Jew to Jews. If the 'we' means 'we Christians,' even so the writer does not say that we have 'altars' in our churches, much less that the Table of the Lord is an altar. As a matter of fact the typical altar was *outside* the building, symbolizing by its position that not until sacrifice had been offered could any one venture to enter the Tabernacle or Temple. In one place (1 Cor. x. 18–21), St. Paul uses the word 'altar' of the Jewish sacrifices, in connexion with the Lord's Supper, and carefully avoids using the word of the Christian rite, substituting for it the word 'table.'

(b) In the primitive church Ignatius and Polycarp use the word fancifully enough (see p. 224), but most early writers avoided the dangerous word, Minucius Felix stating roundly that Christians have no altars. So late as Ambrose, the figurative use of the word is clear: 'our altar is not visible but invisible' (*Ep. ad Heb.* viii). It was not until the eleventh century that the wooden tables were replaced in England by stone altars, though the growth of the idea of a sacrifice for sin in the Lord's Supper had long tended to make the table an altar. The brief account of the Reformers' action already given demonstrates the importance which they attached to the avoidance of both the word and the thing.

(c) The re-introduction of the word is to be deprecated as inevitably leading to unscriptural ideas of the Holy Communion, with which, indeed, the word is associated by the majority of those who use it with any meaning at all. The highest Court of Appeal stated in 1857 that 'the Reformers considered the Holy Communion not as a Sacrifice but as a feast to be celebrated at the Lord's Table,' and declared stone structures to be illegal.

The use of the singular, 'the Table' in B.C.P. sufficiently shows that side-tables, 'Credence-Tables,' were not contemplated by the compilers or revisers, but the use of such was not condemned when the case was brought into court. The meaning of the term 'credence' is not known, but the tables are used for the elements before they are placed on the Lord's Table. Such side-tables seem to have been unknown before the seventeenth century (see Micklethwaite, *Ornaments of the Rubric*, p. 40.

(2) Place of Table.

1549. No order was made, the Altar-wise position being

retained (though some altars disappeared that same year), and the Communicants being gathered in the 'Quire,' from which non-communicants were excluded.

1552. The Table was to be placed in the Nave or the Chancel, for the convenience of worshippers, that the Priest's words might be audible and his actions visible.

1559. Elizabeth's injunction ordered the Table to be placed 'where the Altar stood,' except at Communion, when it was to be 'so placed in good sort within the Chancel, as whereby the minister may be more conveniently heard . . . and the communicants also more conveniently, and in more number communicate'; the Table was afterwards 'to be placed where it stood before.'

An old synopsis of 'Varieties in the service,' of 1565, describes the absence of a uniform placing of the Table in those days:—

'The Table standeth in the body of the Church in some places, in others it standeth in the Chancel. In some places the Table standeth Altarlike distant from the wall a yard, in some other in the midst of the chancel north and south.'

1566. The Advertisements in one place specified 'the East wall over the said Table,' but did not deal directly with these varieties.

1640. A Canon, framed to enforce the altar-like position, spoke of it as adopted 'in most Cathedrals, and some Parochial Churches,' and as not being any longer under 'just suspicion of Popish superstition or innovation.' It also ordered the railing in of the Table, to prevent the irreverent way in which it had been misused, namely for hats, and even as a seat.

1662. Attempts to enforce this Canon on the lines of the Scottish B.C.P. of 1637 were frustrated, the liberty of the 1552 Rubric being still retained.

Within a short time from the Restoration the moving of the Table for the Communion seems to have died away; the custom of erecting pews in Churches had already made the placing of the Table in the body of the Church difficult, if not impossible, while the almost invariable addition of rails made any moving of the Table a practice scarcely to be carried out with the quiet reverence desirable at the Lord's Supper. The absence of screens, too, made moving unnecessary.*

* For very full details, with illustrations, see Tomlinson, *Tracts on Ritual*, Nos. 88, 164, 180 and 203, from which the above notes have been freely borrowed

(3) Position of Priest.

1549. Standing humbly afore the midst of the Altar.

1552. Standing at the North side of the Table.

S.L. Standing at the North side or end thereof.

1662. Standing at the North side of the Table; and (in the Rubric before the Consecration) 'when the Priest, standing before the Table, hath so ordered the Bread and Wine, that he may with the more readiness and decency break the Bread before the people, and take the Cup into his hands,' etc.

The position 'afore the midst of the Altar' represented the mediæval position of a sacrificing priest; in earlier days the officiant had often stood behind the Table, facing the people. Before 1552, the Eastward Position (as it is called) had been very generally abandoned, and the North side position was apparently chosen to obtain uniformity wherever the Table stood, against the East Wall or in the body of the Church. Of course it had no meaning in itself, save as a visible protest against the Mass position, which commenced at the South and ended 'afore the midst of the Altar.'

The 1552 ordinance was unchanged in 1662, the new rubric before Consecration providing for such cases as that of Bishop Wren, who defended himself from the accusation of having once adopted the sacrificer's position by alleging that his littleness of stature made it impossible for him readily and decently to reach the bread and wine from the North side.

In spite of the plain facts of history, and the obvious concurrence with these facts of the 'North side or end' of S.L., efforts to recover the sacrificial position of the Priest at Holy Communion were crowned with considerable success in 1890, when the then Archbishop of Canterbury decided that the Eastward Position is legal, so that the 'afore the midst' of 1549, and the 'North side' of 1552, are to be considered synonymous. Yet the highest Court of Appeal had stated in the Purchas Judgment: 'North side means that side which looks towards the north'; and, in the Ridsdale Judgment: 'It is the duty of the minister to stand at the side of the Table which, supposing the church to be built in the ordinary westward position, would be next the north, whether the side be a longer or shorter side of the table . . . it is accurate, both in scientific and in ordinary language, to say that a quadrilateral table has four sides.'

The history of the theory which seems to have determined the Lambeth Judgment of 1890 is important as showing that that theory is novel.

- (a) The North side is the North-West Corner; suggested in a journal called *The Ecclesiastic*.
- (b) The whole front is divided into five sections, viz. N. and S. Corners, the Midst, and, between the Corners and the Midst, the N. and S. sides; theory of F. G. Lee, *Directorium Anglicanum*, 1865.
- (c) The front is divided into three sections, North side Middle, and South side; theory of Blunt and Freeman.
- (d) The front is divided into two sides, North and South, by an imaginary line; theory of Littledale.
- (e) There is now no 'North side,' the rubric only referring to the Table as placed East and West in the Body of the Church, so that, being oblong, its North side was identical with its front when placed Altar-wise. This is the theory of Walton and Scudamore, who, so early as 1866, pointed out the absurdity of their predecessors' attempts to reconcile the Eastward Position with the words 'North side.'

Is their own any better?

- (i) It assumes a distinction between 'side' and 'end' which was unknown to Laud and Wren when the S. L. was drawn up, in 1637, with the words 'side or end.'
- (ii) It assumes that all Tables were oblong, which they certainly were not.
- (iii) It assumes that when moved from the East End to the Chancel or body of the Church, the Tables were always placed East and West, of which assumption there is no proof.
- (iv) It assumes either that all Tables were always moved for the Communion in 1662—an obvious contradiction of facts—or that the rubrical direction for the priest was of only partial application, viz., to those in Churches where the Tables were so moved—an assumption of which there is no evidence.*

In conclusion, it should be noted that the Eastward Position should be avoided on the following grounds:—

(1) Now, as at the Reformation, its significance is the sacrificial idea conveyed thereby.

* For the whole subject, including full historical investigation of the Lambeth Judgment, see Tomlinson, *Tracts on Ritual*, l. c., also 195, and *Lambeth Judgment Examined*, in vol. ii.

(2) The Lambeth Judgment itself recognizes the necessity of the manual acts being visible, a practical impossibility with the Eastward Position.

(3) The posture is inconsistent with the whole genius of the B.C.P. which sets the ministry forth as ministering to a congregation, not as acting for them in any sacerdotal capacity.

Lord's Prayer, 1549; printed here 1662, cf. S.L.; Sar. Miss. in Priest's Preparation.

The omission of any direction to the people to join in the Lord's Prayer is probably the reason for the prevalence of the custom of the Priest's saying it alone, though it may also be that its having formed part of the private preparation of the Priest in the Missal aided the practice. Whatever the cause, the custom is inconsistent with the 1662 Rubric before the Lord's Prayer in Morning Prayer directing the people to repeat it with the Priest, 'both here, and wheresoever else it is used in Divine Service.' Some have imagined that 'Divine Service' applies only to Morning and Evening Prayer, with, perhaps, the Litany; but this theory will not hold with the use of the phrase in two 1662 Rubrics in the Communion Service, that for giving notices, and that directing the disposal of the collection. Others (e.g. Blunt) suggest that the wording of the Morning Prayer Rubric (Cosin's) was an oversight, which is hardly serious. Strictly the Lord's Prayer should be repeated by the people, and the 'Amen' is so printed that unless they do so, they take no audible part in the Prayer.*

Collect for Purity, 1549; Sar. Miss. in Priest's Preparation; Leofric; Alcuin.

The Latin has been partly improved by the English Translation, but partly impaired: *Deus, cui omne cor patet, et omnis voluntas loquitur et quem nullum latet secretum; purifica per infusionem Sancti Spiritus cogitationes cordis nostri; ut te perfecte diligere et digne laudare mereamur. Per Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen.*

Literally translated: 'God, to whom every heart is open and every wish speaks, and from whom no secret lies hid; purify by the impouring of the Holy Spirit the thoughts of our heart; that we may deserve† to perfectly love and worthily praise thee. Through Christ our Lord, Amen.' 'All desires known' is a

* See Dowden, *Further Studies*, pp. 82–88.

† The verb *mereor* had become very general in its significance, often meaning little more than 'obtain.' But its very frequent use in Latin Collects is at least ambiguous, especially when the tendency of human nature to substitute merit for grace is taken into consideration.

somewhat poor equivalent for the original, lit. 'to whom every wish speaks'; on the other hand, the idea of 'merit,' in the word *mereamur*, is gladly missed.*

Rubric concerning the Commandments, 1552; enlarged 1662.

1552. Then shall the Priest rehearse distinctly all the X. Commandments, and the people kneeling shall, after every Commandment, ask God's mercy for their transgressions of the same, after this sort.

1662. Then shall the Priest, turning to the people, rehearse distinctly all the TEN COMMANDMENTS; and the people, still kneeling, shall, after every Commandment, ask God mercy for their transgression thereof for the time past, and grace to keep the same for the time to come, as followeth.

The addition, 'turning to the people', was a partial concession to the Puritans' demand at the Savoy Conference.

In 1549 Auricular Confession † was still recognized (though not enforced) with its examination of the sinner. In 1552 for this method of examination, liable to so many and grievous corruptions, was substituted the reading of the Decalogue, with a special petition after the reading of each Commandment. Palmer finds some precedent for both the reading and the petition in the custom of reading the last Six Commandments in Lent, with a prayer at the close: 'Pity me, O Lord, since I am weak, heal me, O Lord.' But the petition is obviously formed by adding to the familiar words of the Lesser Litany, used in the Communion Office here in 1549, a special request for power to keep each Commandment. Cranmer had many precedents for this departure. The Frankfort *Church Order* of 1530 introduced the Decalogue just before the Exhortation warning against unworthy reception; the *Christly Order* for Bremen (1534) directed an exposition of the Ten Commandments after the Sermon in the Mass; Bugenhagen's *Church Order* for Pomerania (1535) prescribed them to be sung as an alternative use in the Mass; the Norheim *Church Order* (1539) contained the Decalogue; the *Order* for Calenberg and Göttingen introduced it just before Confession in the Mass. Moreover Luther's metrical version (1524), each verse being followed by 'Lord have mercy,' was translated into English by Coverdale, with the response. These possible sources render it quite needless to trace Cranmer's work to Pullain's service for refugees at Glastonbury (with Frere and Daniel), in which the Decalogue was sung

* For the variation of the Service here in 1549, which more nearly followed the order in Sar. Miss., see analysis, p. 282.

† See p. 321.

at Morning Prayer, in two separated parts, especially as this service only appeared in 1551, barely, if at all, in time to suggest anything to the Revisers of the 1552 B.C.P. The prayer in Pullain's Service: 'deign to write (thy law) in our hearts by thy Spirit': is similar to the response to the tenth Commandment, and may possibly have suggested it, but so scriptural a figure need not be traced to anything but knowledge of the Bible.*

The present Scottish B.C.P. allows the use of the Lord's summary of the Commandments (Matt. xxii. 37-39), with a petition similar to that after the tenth; the American B.C.P. gives a similar relaxation when the Commandments have been read in full once in a day. The Non-Jurors' B.C.P. of 1718 was the first to substitute this summary.

S.L. (1637) added after 'transgression': 'either according to the letter, or to the mystical importance of the said Commandment,' a valuable distinction taught by the Sermon on the Mount, but capable of clearer expression. It did not make any reference to 'the time to come,' cf. 1552 B.C.P., possibly because that is plainly included in the petitions themselves. Frere states that the word 'mystical' has special reference to the Fourth Commandment, a statement which agrees with the authoritative desecration of the Lord's Day at that period; but 'mystical' is rather too euphemistic a description of the Laudian practice.

Commandments, 1552.

The version of the Great Bible was not changed for A.V. in 1662, as in most other cases; the same version is used in the Catechism, where, however in 1549, the Commandments were abbreviated.

Rubric concerning Collects for the King, 1549.

1549. Then shall follow the Collect of the day, with one of these two Collects following, for the King.

1552 added:—the Priest standing up, and saying: Let us Pray.

1662. Then shall follow one of these two Collects for the King, the Priest standing as before, and saying: Let us pray.

The mention of the Collect for the Day first, in 1549 and 1552, is a reminiscence of the Missal, where 'memorials,' i.e. various Collects, were read after the Collect for the Day, and before the Epistle. The Rubric regulating the use of the six collects at the end of the Communion Office was altered in 1552 to permit of their being used not only when there was no Com-

* See Dowden, *Further Studies*, pp. 167 ff.

munion, as in 1549, but also at the Communion, and other Services. It has been suggested that the intention was that they should be used here (Palmer), but without any evidence in support of a theory which conflicts with the next Rubric: 'immediately after the Collect the Priest shall read the Epistle.'

Collects for the King, 1549.

1662. 'Church' for 'congregation' in the first Collect.

St. Paul's injunction (1 Tim. ii. 1, 2) to remember Kings and all that are in authority first in our prayers, was very literally carried out in the Middle Ages, Kings sometimes bargaining for Masses to be said in return for benefits.* The changes in regard to the authority exercised by Kings seem to call for some recognition in B.C.P., which still retains the language suitable to the times of Absolute Monarchy. However, these Collects are more free from such unsuitable phrases than some others, though the second is markedly preferable to the first, as not pronouncing the King to be God's chosen servant (which reads queerly of a Charles II or James II), and as praying more definitely for grace for the King to fulfil his high office, instead of, as in the former of the two, for grace for his subjects to obey him. Yet the turbulence of 1548, under a boy-king, may well have made the latter a more pressing need than the former. As Bishop Dowden points out, the successive changes in political life call for suitable petitions, and rebuke that strange spirit of worship of the antique which opposes such improvements on the ground that the present forms are old.

Rubric concerning Collect, Epistle and Gospel, 1549; altered 1552 and 1662.

1549. The Collects ended, the Priest, or he that is appointed, shall read the Epistle in a place assigned for the purpose, saying The Epistle of Saint Paul written in the — chapter of — to the —. The Minister then shall read the Epistle. Immediately after the Epistle ended, the Priest, or one appointed to read the Gospel, shall say, The holy Gospel written in the — chapter of —. The Clerks and people shall answer, *Glory be to Thee, O Lord.* The Priest or Deacon then shall read the Gospel. After the Gospel ended, the Priest shall begin.

1552. Immediately after the Collects, the Priest shall read the Epistle beginning thus: The Epistle written in the — chapter of —. And the Epistle ended, he shall say the Gospel beginning thus: The Gospel written in

* See Dowden, *Workmanship of the Prayer Book*, 2nd Edn., p. xxii.

the — chapter of —. And the Epistle and Gospel being ended, shall be said the Creed.

S.L. Immediately after the Collects, the Presbyter shall read the Epistle, saying thus: The Epistle written in the — Chapter of — at the — verse. And when he hath done, he shall say: Here endeth the Epistle. And the Epistle ended, the Gospel shall be read, the Presbyter saying: The holy Gospel is written in the — Chapter of — at the — Verse. And then the people all standing up shall say: *Glory be to thee, O Lord.* At the end of the Gospel, the Presbyter shall say: So endeth the holy Gospel. And the people shall answer: *Thanks be to thee, O Lord.* And the Epistle and Gospel being ended, shall be said or sung this Creed, all still reverently standing up.

1662. Then shall be said the Collect of the Day. And immediately after the Collect the Priest shall read the Epistle, saying, The Epistle [or, The portion of Scripture appointed for the Epistle] is written in the — chapter of — beginning at the — verse. And the Epistle ended, he shall say, Here endeth the Epistle. Then shall he read the Gospel (the people all standing up) saying, The holy Gospel is written in the — chapter of — beginning at the — verse. And the Gospel ended, shall be sung or said the Creed following, the people still standing, as before.

With the excision, in 1549 (note the words: 'immediately after the Epistle ended'), of much ceremonial in introducing the Gospel, there also took place the custom of naming the places from which the Epistle and Gospel are taken. After the division of the Bible into verses, which first appeared in the Genevan Version (1557–60), the exact verse was also announced, both in S. L. and in 1662. According to Frere (*Sarum Customs*) the practice of making some such announcement, of course in Latin, obtained in the Middle Ages. The German Church Orders, e.g. Brunswick, 1528, prescribed this practice; cf. also Brandenburg-Nuremberg Order, 1533.

In the Missal, the Epistles taken from most of St. Paul's writings commenced with the word *Fratres*; from his Pastoral Epistles with *Charissime*; from the other Epistles with *Charissimi*. The Gospel began with *in illo tempore*, as also did 'Epistles' taken from the Acts and historical books of the O.T.; selections from the Prophets had *Haec dicit Dominus* prefixed.

The direction to the people to say: 'Glory be to thee, O Lord': after the announcement of the Gospel, was omitted in 1552, and not re-inserted in 1662, though the S.L. had

restored it, and added: 'Thanks be to thee, O God': after the reading. Either the 1549 or the S.L. practice is very general now, but neither has sanction in B.C.P.

In 1662 the incongruity of saying: 'The Epistle written in the—Chapter' of a book which is not an Epistle was removed.*

Incense. In 1549 the words 'immediately after the Epistle ended,' prefacing the announcement of the Gospel, marked an important divergence from Sar. Miss., which introduced the Gospel with elaborate ceremonial, including profuse employment of incense. In view of the re-introduction of the use of Incense, the following conclusive proofs of its unscriptural, unprimitive and unreformed nature are valuable.

(a) In the O.T. incense was used under stringent regulations as to material, method, and place, Aaron's sons suffering death for disregard of those laws. The offering of incense was confined to the priesthood, the type of Christ's priesthood, and took place out of sight of the worshippers.

In the N.T. Zacharias was offering incense in his turn as priest, when the birth of John was foretold to him. There is no other mention of incense in the N.T. except in Revelation, where it is always used of a heavenly ritual. In regard to the words of Mal. i. 11, 'in every place incense shall be offered unto my name' (A.V.), it is to be borne in mind that the words 'shall be' are not in the original, and that R.V. substitutes 'is,' which makes a literal interpretation impossible. The N.T. writers know nothing of any literal fulfilment of this passage. Indeed, the ingredients of the incense so carefully prescribed in the Pentateuch are no longer known, their place being taken by a mixture of spices, pitch, and burnt sugar, in the Church of Rome.

(b) The early church knew nothing of incense as an accessory to public worship. Its use is disclaimed by all who mention it from Justin Martyr to St. Augustine. Scudamore holds its ritual use to have commenced somewhere in the sixth century, or possibly in the fifth. The meaning of it was plainly prayer in Holy Scripture; its early use in churches seems to have been quite different, namely, as a fumigatory, under the impression

* The arrangement of the Gospels on Palm Sunday and Good Friday, so as to follow the Second Lessons at Morning Prayer on those days, indicates the intention that Holy Communion should follow Morning Prayer. The B.C.P. lays no stress upon the hour of Holy Communion, which, as in the early Church, must be dictated by convenience (see p. 218 and p. 225) God's own example in subordinating times and seasons to weightier matters in regard to the Passover, should here be the communicant's guide; the ministerial obligation is to provide for the spiritual needs of all believers.

prevailing to a very late date, that to disguise the odour of anything unhealthy was to cure it. This notion lingers in the Roman explanation of the use: 'that all spirits of diseases, and all spirits of infirmity, and the ensnaring emissaries of the enemy smelling its odour may flee away' (*Pontif. Rom.* Part II). It is now variously interpreted as symbolical of zeal, virtue, and prayer.

(c) Nothing was more strongly repudiated at the Reformation than the use of incense, which, even before the Reformation, was far from general. Grindal ordered the destruction of censers as 'relics and monuments of superstition and idolatry'; the Homily *On Peril of Idolatry* is very strong: 'Let us honour . . . none but Him, not in lighting of candles, burning of incense, etc., for all these be abominations before God.' The Ecclesiastical Courts, as well as the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, have pronounced the ritual use of Incense in the Church of England to be illegal.

Lights. Edward VI's Injunction of 1547, ordering 'no offering or setting of lights or candles, tapers or images of wax to be set afore any image or picture, but only two lights upon the high altar, before the sacrament,' has become famous as the historical ground for the re-introduction of lights at Holy Communion. Edward's order was only a repetition of that of Henry VIII, in 1541, and at the date of the re-enactment, July 31, 1547, no change of doctrine had been attempted. With the enactment of the 1549 B.C.P. these Injunctions were ordered to be no longer read, Ridley and Hooper expressly forbidding the lights to be placed upon the Lord's Table. Queen Elizabeth, apparently for state purposes, had two candles burning before a crucifix in her own chapel, but the crucifix was broken and the candles were no longer lighted when they had served their turn in mystifying the foreign ambassadors. Moreover, they were not lights before the Sacrament. Bishops Grindal and Horn, in 1567, stated that 'the Church of England has entirely given up the use of a foreign tongue, breathings, exorcisms, oil, spittle, clay, lighted tapers, and other things of that kind which by prescription of the laws are never to be restored.'

The general history of the use of lights in Christian service may be summarized as follows:—

(a) In the N.T. lights are once mentioned, when they were used to give light (Acts xx. 7, 8). It could never occur to a Christian Jew to attempt to copy the seven-branched candlestick (lampstand) of the Temple, the Light of which was fulfilled in the Person of Christ, the Light of the World, the oil supplied in the gift of the Holy Spirit, and the sevenfold candlestick

itself in the various light-bearing branches of the one Church (Rev. i.).

(b) Tertullian (192), Lactantius (303), and others derided the heathen custom of using lights in the daytime; and Jerome only furnished a half-hearted defence of the practice, adopted by *some* in his day, of lighting tapers by day in honour of martyrs, crediting them with 'a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge.' Such careless toleration of customs admittedly heathen in origin has been a fruitful cause of doctrinal perversion in every age of the Church's history. Jerome also reports that at the reading of the Gospel lights were lit at noon in the East to signify the light-giving of the Word. This practice spread to Spain by the seventh century, the lights, after use, being set at first on the floor, later upon the Altar. This seems to have been the origin of altar-lights as distinct from the two lights before the Sacrament.

(c) In 787, the second Council of Nicæa decreed that incense and lights might be offered to images of Christ and the Saints, to the Cross, to the Book of the Gospel, etc., defending themselves on the perilous ground that 'the honour which is paid to the image passes on to that which the image represents.'

(d) By 1215, when at the Fourth Lateran Council Pope Innocent III decreed the doctrine of Transubstantiation, the 'Host' had become the chief representation of Christ. Accordingly, then, for the first time, the two lights were ordered to be set burning upon the altar. Cardinal Langton, in 1222, promulgated the order in England, directing that 'two candles, or at least one together with the lamp' (i.e. the lamp before the reserved host), should be burning at Mass, and that the laity must kneel to the Body of the Lord as to their 'Creator and Redeemer.'

The two lights on the Lord's Table are therefore historically inseparable from the mediæval doctrines which were repudiated at the Reformation.

Creed, 1549, Sar. Miss.

Before the Reformation the laity, who did not know the Nicene Creed, were bidden to say the Apostles' Creed to themselves, while the priests recited the Nicene.

Since Hort's *Dissertation*, in 1876, it has been generally admitted that this Creed, commonly called the Nicene Creed, or more fully Niceno-Constantinopolitan, from the theory that the additions therein to the Nicene Creed of 325 were made at the Council of Constantinople in 381, appears in Epiphanius about seven years before that Council. Epiphanius came from the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, and the Catechetical Lectures of

Cyril of Jerusalem contain material which, put together, composes the Creed practically as it is now known. The Acts of the Council of Constantinople are not extant, but, from the Creed being called *Constantinopolitanum*, it is conjectured that it was there propounded by Cyril and received as orthodox. In 451, the Council of Chalcedon recited it as the Creed of the 150 Fathers at Constantinople.*

The qualitative difference between the Nicene and Apostles' Creeds is that the latter is the development of a formula for baptism, the former is a document primarily drawn up, at Nicæa, as a test of episcopal orthodoxy, and provided with an Anathema, the first to appear in the history of the Church. But the form of both Creeds is identical, emphasizing in turn the three Persons of the Trinity.

Strangely enough, the use of this (or any) Creed at Holy Communion originated in the protest of the Monophysite Patriarch of Antioch, Peter the Fuller (476-488), against the Chalcedonian definition of the faith. The custom spread rapidly in the East, and by 600 it was adopted in Spain, by 800 in Gaul. It was in Spain, at the Council of Toledo, 589, that the famous clause 'and the Son' was first added to 'proceedeth from the Father,' a clause which still divides the Eastern and Western Churches.† Only in 1014, under Pope Benedict VIII, was the Creed introduced into the Roman use.

A literal translation of the Greek Creed is appended, the portions not in the original Nicene Creed, of 325, being bracketed:—

¹ We believe in one God Father Almighty,
Maker of heaven and earth,
of all things both visible and invisible:
And in one Lord Jesus Christ,
the Son of God the only-begotten,

* See Turner, *History and Use of Creeds*, etc., pp. 41 ff.

† The Westerns were certainly in the wrong in making the unauthorized addition, as the Pope very plainly showed by refusing, in 809, to sanction the Gallic form with the added words. He had two silver shields made and inscribed with the original Greek and the Latin Version, excluding that addition. Not till 1064 did the final rupture between the Eastern and Western Churches take place, and then through resentment against papal aggrandizement rather than from any doctrinal differences. As regards the clause in dispute, in the words of Holy Scripture only 'Procession from the Father' is mentioned (John xv. 26), the Lord referring to Himself in the same verse as 'sending' the Holy Spirit, Who, however, is called the Spirit of Christ Jesus elsewhere in N.T. Doubtless a fear of derogating from the perfect equality of the Son with the Father dictated the desire to add 'and the Son': but taking into account the Son's own words, and our profound ignorance of what heavenly reality 'proceeding from' connotes, the addition may be regretted on every ground.

(Who was ² begotten of ³ the Father before all the ages),
⁴ Light ⁵ out of Light,
⁶ Very God out of Very God,
 Begotten not made,
 Of one substance with the Father,
 Through ⁷ Whom all things were made;
 Who for us men and for our Salvation came down out of heaven
 And was made flesh (of the Holy Spirit and Mary the Virgin)
 And was made man,
 (And was crucified on our behalf under Pontius Pilate) and suffered
 and was buried,
 And rose up on the third day according to the Scriptures,
 And went up into heaven,
 (And is sitting on the right hand of the Father.)
 And is to come again with glory to judge living and dead,
⁸ (Of Whose kingdom there shall be no end :)
 And in the Holy Spirit (the Lord the ⁹ Life-maker,
 (Who proceedeth from the Father,¹⁰)
 (Who with Father and Son is together worshipped and together
 glorified,)
 (Who spake through the prophets ;)
¹¹ In one ¹² holy Catholic and Apostolic Church :)
 (We acknowledge one baptism unto the remission of sins :)
 (We look for uprising of dead,)
 (And life of the coming age.) Amen.

- ¹ The Greek is plural throughout, the Latin singular.
² The Latin has *natum*, 'born'; the English here follows the Greek.
³ 'His' in the English Version is not an improvement.
⁴ 'God of God' is a later addition to the original Creed; it is sufficiently expressed in the next clause but one.
⁵ 'Out of,' Greek *ék*, Latin *de*, is given instead of the ambiguous 'of' of the English Version. A comma at 'God,' 'Light,' 'Very God,' would remove the ambiguity:—'God, of God; Light, of Light,' etc.
⁶ 'Very,' i.e. genuine.
⁷ 'Whom,' i.e. the Son.
⁸ This Clause was omitted in 1549; Dowden sees here, and in Note 2, proof that Cranmer used more than the Latin form, see *Workmanship*, pp. 104–108.
⁹ 'The Lord and Giver of Life' is ambiguous in an English Version; the omission of 'and' as in the original, and a comma at 'Lord' would be an improvement: 'the Lord, the Giver of life.'
¹⁰ Here came the Spanish addition: 'and the Son.'
¹¹ The omission of 'in' before 'Church' in the English Version is due directly to Cranmer, indirectly to the authority of Augustine, who laid it down that 'to believe in' is only properly applicable to the three Persons of the Holy Trinity. Cranmer's own translation of the Apostles' Creed, of 1538 or 1542, has: 'I believe in the Holy Ghost; And that there is an holy Catholic Church.'
¹² 'Holy' is omitted in the English Version, according to the critical opinions of the Reformation period. Later investigation has shown that 'holy' was in the original.

Rubric respecting Notices, 1552; enlarged and placed before Sermon, 1662.
 1552. After such Sermon, Homily, or Exhortation, the Curate

shall declare unto the people whether there be any holy days or fasting days the week following: (the remainder of the Rubric deals with the Offertory, which immediately followed the Notices in 1552).

1662. Then the Curate shall declare unto the people what Holy-days, or Fasting days, are in the week following to be observed. And then also (if occasion be) shall notice be given of the Communion; the banns of Matrimony published, and Briefs, Citations and Excommunications read. And nothing shall be proclaimed or published in the Church, during the time of Divine Service, but by the Minister: nor by him any thing, but what is prescribed in the Rules of this Book, or enjoined by the King, or by the Ordinary of the place.

Though the Rubric demands notice of communion to be given *before* the Sermon, the Exhortation to be used in giving such notice is printed *after* the Prayer for the Church Militant.

The order to publish banns of Matrimony in this place does not appear in modern books, being revoked by the Act 4 George IV, c. 76, specifying the time as immediately after the Second Lesson, at which place an earlier Act, 26 George II, c. 33, had already ordered their publication at Evening Prayer, when there was no Morning Service. This point, otherwise of no importance whatever, has been raised frequently since a custom has arisen of relegating Morning Prayer to such insignificance that practically banns cannot be 'published,' though they may be 'read,' in that Service, there being no 'public' to hear them.*

Briefs are letters authorizing the collection of money; Citations are summons to appear before any authority; Excommunications are public expulsions from the Church, or suspensions from its privileges.

In regard to the final sentence, defining Notices, a wise latitude of interpretation is allowed, in accordance with the wide development of modern Church life; yet it may fairly be questioned whether the multiplication of such announcements does not defeat the object by exceeding the number which the worshippers can remember. Abuse of the latitude allowed, by announcements being made little in accord with Church work, deserves no defence.

Rubric prescribing Sermon or Homily, 1549; altered 1552 and 1662.

* Frere, ignoring the second Act altogether, maintains that the 1662 position is the only 'proper place' for the publication of Banns (p. 479).

1549. After the Creed ended, shall follow the Sermon or Homily, or some portion of one of the Homilies, as they shall be hereafter divided : (the remainder of the Rubric deals with the First Exhortation).

1552. After the Creed, if there be no Sermon, shall follow one of the Homilies already set forth, or hereafter to be set forth by common Authority.

1662. Then (i.e. after the Notices) shall follow the Sermon, or one of the Homilies already set forth, or hereafter to be set forth, by Authority.

Next to the use of the English language in Divine Service, the enforcement of preaching was the greatest practical—as distinct from doctrinal—mark of the Reformation. Sermons had been preached before, but they had no place in the Missal, the drama of the Mass being sufficient preaching from the point of view of the Roman Church.

Unfortunately, the number of clergy capable of preaching was ludicrously small, and Homilies were published to remedy the lack due to their ignorance and inexperience of public proclamation of the Gospel. The first book, the only one referred to in the 1549 Rubric, consisted of 12 sermons, by various hands, partly, but probably not wholly, compiled in 1543, their publication being delayed, by the reaction of the last years of Henry VIII, until 1547, at which date some seem to have been written. The notice forecasting further similar sermons has been dealt with above (p. 275). The Second Book, with 21 Homilies, the titles of which are enumerated in Article XXXV (see p. 569), was published in 1563, with the exception of the last, on Rebellion, which was incorporated in the Second Book in 1571.

The Authority of the Homilies is described in Art. XXXV : they 'contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times.' Their chief, or only, use of late has been to illustrate the Reformers' doctrine, an use expressly authorized in the case of the Homily of Justification, the third of the first Book, in Art. XI.*

The promise to subdivide the Homilies, in 1549, was fulfilled, in Grafton's edition, 1549; in 1552 no provision for reading portions was made. The retention of the phrase, sug-

* Some interesting and important changes have taken place in the Homilies, of which a good account is given in Tomlinson's *Prayer Book, Articles, and Homilies*, cc. ix., x. The alteration of 'High Mass' to 'the Holy Communion' in the 1549 Preface to the first book, is instructive, as are also Queen Elizabeth's alterations made in the teeth of Convocation, whereon arguments have been founded by that school of thought to whom lay efforts to expound doctrine are peculiarly abhorrent.

gesting the possible publication of more Homilies, has borne no fruit.

With the revival of preaching, the provision for the Sermon in B.C.P., viz. only in the Communion Service, (save for such special services as Matrimony), had long been insufficient, when the Act of Uniformity Amendment Act, of 1872, permitted sermons to be preached after any authorized Service, or without any service at all if preceded by a Collect or the Bidding Prayer, with or without the Lord's Prayer. The 'Bidding Prayer' is, according to Frere, p. 255, connected with an authorized pre-Reformation custom of interpolating in the Mass a form of vernacular prayer called the Bidding of the Bedes, a recital of the subjects of prayer. Under Henry VIII and Edward VI amended forms were issued, also under Elizabeth, when praise, instead of prayer, for the dead was inculcated. The form now in use at the Universities, Inns of Court, etc., is practically that of the Canons of 1604, and is generally employed before sermons when there is no other form of Service. The custom of prefacing the sermon with a prayer is derived from this source, even extempore prayer being in some sort countenanced by the variability of the Bidding Prayer. There is no warrant beyond that of undisturbed custom for prefacing the sermon with the Invocation : 'In the Name of the Father,' etc. : or for closing with the familiar ascription, the formality of which not infrequently grates upon the spiritual sensibilities of both preacher and congregation.

The direction to the Sponsors, in the Baptismal Office, to 'call upon them (the children) to hear Sermons,' coupled with the fact that there is no other provision for a Sermon save in this place, has been claimed as sanction or even direction for 'Children's Eucharists,' on the ground that the presence of children is commanded at this point in the Service, and that there is no direction at any place to withdraw. This contention ignores the fact that when the direction in the Baptismal Office was inserted, there was also a clause in the Exhortation to the Negligent, strongly condemning non-communicating attendance, and demanding the withdrawal of those who did not intend to communicate. The absence of any express Rubric directing the withdrawal of non-communicants, both before and after the 1662 revision, is atoned for by the exclusive references to communicants in the Rubric preceding the Third Exhortation, added in 1662, when the clause in the Exhortation to the Negligent was omitted as unnecessary, no non-communicants remaining. The real reason for Children's Eucharists, as for all other non-communicating attendance, is that benefits are supposed to accrue from

participation in a sacrifice, at which Christ is present in, with, or under, the bread and wine. Neither the dogmas, nor the practices founded on them, are supported by the B.C.P.

Rubric regarding the Offertory Sentences, 1549; altered 1552. made separate Rubric 1662.

1549. Then shall follow for the Offertory one or more of these Sentences of holy scripture, to be sung while the people do offer; or else one of them to be said by the minister, immediately afore the offering.

1552. (Part of Notices Rubric) . . . and earnestly exhort them to remember the poor, saying one or more of these sentences following, as he thinketh most convenient by his discretion.

1662. Then shall the Priest return to the Lord's Table, and begin the Offertory, saying one or more . . . etc., as in 1552.

The prominent place given to a collection of money for the poor in the service for the Holy Communion was a novelty in England in 1549. In the mediæval Church 'oblations' indeed were often made at Mass by pious persons to the Priest, and on 'offering days' (generally four times a year) the Mass-penny had to be paid, but that the ordinary rule should be that a collection for the poor was to form the normal order on every Sunday and holy day was quite a new thing. It had, however, been adopted some years earlier in Germany, as we see from many of the German Church Orders.*

From these words will be seen the great difference between the word *Offertorium*, as used in the Missal, and 'Offertory,' as used in the B.C.P. The latter word was dropped in 1552, but restored in 1662, when it could no longer be confounded with the offering of the bread and wine.† The elements, in B.C.P., are not 'offered,' but 'set' (1549) or 'placed' (1662) on the Table (see p. 313). The omission, in 1662, of the words 'earnestly exhort them to remember the poor' was partly, at least, suggested by the objection of the Puritans to the fact that four of the sentences refer to offerings to the ministry and not to the poor.

Offertory Sentences, 1549.

There has been no change here since 1549, even the version

* Dowden, *Further Studies*, p. 175.

† The refusal to recognize this distinction is common in a certain class of B.C.P. Manuals, and invalidates all their tables of comparison of the Mass and English Service Books. For example, Frere, p. 469, uses the one word to describe the Offertory of the Sarum Use, and those of 1549 and 1552, in which latter the very word is wanting.

of the Great Bible being retained. The Puritans at the Savoy Conference objected to them, on the grounds that two were apocryphal, and (as already noted) that four were calculated to excite generosity rather to the ministry than to the poor. They also desired the offertory to be wholly removed to the close, or near the close, of the service. However, they remain untouched, constituting a clear testimony to the greatness of the change of the Offertory from the days when, instead of incitements to charitable self-denial, was sung (in Latin): 'To thee, O Lord, have I lifted up my soul, my God, in thee do I trust, let me not be put to shame,' etc. In no case is the return to primitive precedents more marked.

In S.L. considerable changes were made, five new sentences being introduced, having no direct bearing upon charitable gifts, one of them expressly dealing with sacrificial oblations; these had to be taken from O.T. There were several omissions, and one addition from N.T.

Rubric regarding the Collection of the Offerings, 1549; altered 1552 and 1662.

1549. Where there be Clerks, they shall sing one or many of the sentences above written, according to the length and shortness of the time that the people be offering.

In the meantime, while the Clerks do sing the Offertory, so many as are disposed shall offer to the poor men's box every one according to his ability and charitable mind. And at the offering days appointed, every man and woman shall pay to the Curate the due and accustomed offerings.

In another Rubric at the end of the 1549 Office will be found: 'the Parishioners of every Parish shall offer every Sunday, at the time of the Offertory, the just value and price of the holy loaf (with all such money and other things as were wont to be offered with the same), to the use of their Pastors and Curates.'

1552. Then shall the Churchwardens, or some other by them appointed, gather the devotion of the people, and put the same into the poor men's box: and upon the offering days appointed, etc. . . . after which done, the Priest shall say, (Let us pray for the whole estate of Christ's Church Militant here in Earth).

S.L. While the Presbyter distinctly pronounceth some or all of these sentences for the offertory, the Deacon or (if no such be present) one of the Churchwardens shall receive the devotions of the people there present in a bason provided for that purpose. And when all have

offered, he shall reverently bring the said bason with the oblations therein, and deliver it to the Presbyter, who shall humbly present it before the Lord, and set it upon the holy Table.

1662. Whilst these sentences are in reading, the Deacons, Churchwardens, or other fit person appointed for that purpose, shall receive the Alms for the poor, and other devotions of the people, in a decent basin, to be provided by the Parish for that purpose; and reverently bring it to the Priest, who shall humbly present and place it upon the holy Table.

The following changes are noteworthy:—

1549. Alms are put into the poor men's box; dues, including the 'price of the holy loaf' are paid to the Curate.

1552. Alms ('devotion') are collected and put into the poor men's box; dues ('price of the holy loaf' omitted) are paid to the Curate.

S.L. 'Devotions' (also called 'oblations') are collected in a provided 'bason,' humbly presented 'before the Lord,' and 'set' upon the holy Table.

1662. Alms for the poor, and other devotions, are collected in a provided 'basin,' humbly presented, and placed upon the holy Table.

The omission, in 1662, of the payment of 'dues' at this place was urged by Cosin. The distinction between offerings for the Poor and offerings for the maintenance of the Ministry, though rightly enough made, especially after the Puritans had pointed out the recognition of both in the Offertory Sentences, was not one which demanded separate treatment in their reception; as the 1662 Rubric puts it, all are 'devotions' and as such, offerings to God. For the bearing of these alterations upon the word 'oblations' in the Prayer for the Church Militant, see notes *ad loc.* below.

Rubric ordering the placing of the bread and wine, 1662 (1549); no directions 1552.

1549. Then so many as shall be partakers of the holy Communion, shall tarry still in the quire, or in some convenient place nigh the quire, the men on the one side and the women on the other side. All other (that mind not to receive the said holy Communion) shall depart out of the quire, except the Ministers and Clerks. Then shall the Minister take so much Bread and Wine as shall suffice for the persons appointed to receive the holy Communion, laying the bread upon the corporas, or else in the paten,

or in some other comely thing, prepared for that purpose; And putting the wine into the Chalice, or else in some fair or convenient cup, prepared for that use, (if the Chalice will not serve) putting thereto a little pure and clean water: And setting both the bread and wine upon the Altar: Then the Priest shall say.

1552. No regulations.

S.L. And the Presbyter shall then offer up and place the bread and wine prepared for the Sacrament upon the Lord's Table, that it may be ready for that service. And then he shall say.

1662. And when there is a Communion, the Priest shall then place upon the Table so much Bread and Wine, as he shall think sufficient. After which done, the Priest shall say.

In the new Rubric of 1662 the following omissions are important:—

(a) The mixture of water with the wine.

In the Lambeth Judgment permission is given to use wine mixed with water, but not to mix them during the Service. So early as 1523 Luther had shown the inaccuracy of associating the 'mixed chalice' with the unmixed water and blood which flowed from Christ's side, and the German Orders contained no directions for mixing wine and water. Andrewes held it 'a matter not worth the standing on'; the Roman Church regards it as merely an ecclesiastical ordinance, neither essential nor divinely ordered.

(b) The words 'offer up and' before 'place.'

These words were definitely before the Revisers, both in S.L., and in the *Durham Book*, and were refused admission. However primitive it may be, the idea of offering the elements to God is not scriptural, and the use of a sacrificial term, besides the peril which experience both before and since 1662 has been shown to lurk therein, is far from reasonable in the case of bread and wine, all of which the 'offerers' will consume themselves, and where, therefore, neither death of a victim nor participation by God suggests 'sacrifice.' Our Lord thanked God for the loaf and the cup, and His example can be followed without using any such terms.

The 1549 direction for placing the people is dropped, another being added in 1662 before the Third Exhortation (see p. 323). The practice of dividing the sexes was not again ordered, being curiously subversive of the scriptural principle that 'in Christ Jesus there is neither male nor female.'

Prayer for Church Militant, 1552 (1549); last sentence added 1662.

The 1549 B.C.P., following more closely the arrangement of Sar. Miss., made the Prayer for the Church part of the Consecration Prayer (see Analysis, p. 283). In 1552 the long Prayer of 1549 was broken up, and the first part of it placed here, before the departure of the non-communicants.* The chief changes in the wording are:—

1549. Let us pray for the whole state of Christ's Church.

1552, } 'Militant here in earth': added.
1662. }

1549. To receive these our prayers.

1552. To accept our alms and to receive, etc.

1662. To accept our alms and oblations and to receive, etc.

1549. 'And especially we commend unto thy merciful goodness this congregation, which is here assembled in thy name, to celebrate the commemoration of the most glorious death of thy Son: And here we do give unto thee most high praise, and hearty thanks, for the wonderful grace and virtue, declared in all thy saints, from the beginning of the world: And chiefly in the glorious and most blessed virgin Mary, Mother of thy Son Jesu Christ our Lord and God, and in the holy Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, and Martyrs, whose examples (O Lord) and stedfastness in thy faith, and keeping thy holy commandments, grant us to follow. We commend unto thy mercy (O Lord) all other thy servants, which are departed hence from us, with the sign of faith, and now do rest in the sleep of peace: Grant unto them, we beseech thee, thy mercy and everlasting peace, and that at the day of the general resurrection, we and all they which be of the mystical body of thy Son, may altogether be set on his right hand,' etc. (as at close of last Burial Collect).

1552. All the foregoing omitted.

S.L. 'And we commend especially unto thy merciful goodness, the congregation which is here assembled in thy name to celebrate the commemoration of the most precious death and sacrifice of thy Son and our Saviour Jesus

* The 1549 Prayer, called the Canon in the Communion of the Sick, consisted of:—

(1) The Prayer for the Church, corresponding to the present Prayer for the Church Militant, placed immediately after the Offertory in 1552.

(2) The Prayer of Consecration, immediately preceding reception in 1552.

(3) The Prayer of Oblation, transferred, with the omission of reference to Oblation, to immediately after the Lord's Prayer in 1552, and made an alternative Prayer of Thanksgiving. The Lord's Prayer followed in 1549; in 1552 it was placed before the Thanksgiving, immediately after reception.

Christ. And we most humbly . . . adversity (as in 1552). And we also bless thy holy name for all those thy servants, who having finished their course in faith, do now rest from their labours. And we yield unto thee most high praise, and hearty thanks for the wonderful grace and virtue declared in all thy saints, who have been the choice vessels of thy grace, and the lights of the world in their several generations; most humbly beseeching thee, that we may have grace to follow the example of their stedfastness in thy faith, and obedience to thy holy commandments, that at the day of the general resurrection, we, and all they which are of the mystical body of thy Son, may be set on his right hand,' etc., as in 1549.

1662. Foregoing omitted, and praise in place of prayer, for the faithful departed, added: 'And we also bless thy holy Name for all thy servants departed this life in thy faith and fear: beseeching thee to give us grace so to follow their good examples, that with them we may be partakers of thy heavenly kingdom.'

In Sar. Miss. the prayer for the dead was separated from the prayers for Church, Pope, Bishop, King, and the living, by the Consecrating and Offering of the elements. Where not entirely original, the B.C.P. Prayer owes more to Hermann than to Sar. Miss. (Dowden, *Workmanship*, p. 28).

The above alterations speak for themselves, but two of the additions of 1662 demand special notice, viz., 'oblations,' and the commemoration of the faithful departed.

(1) Oblations.

The attempt to find in this word a re-introduction of the early but not scriptural practice of 'offering' the bread and wine to God, has received recent treatment at the hands of the late Bishop Dowden, from whose exhaustive examination of the subject (in *Further Studies in the Prayer Book*, pp. 176 ff.) the following decisive points are extracted—

(a) The word is to be used whether there is a Communion or not; this conclusively proves it did not mean the elements exclusively.

(b) There were those who desired to make an 'oblation' of the elements, and Cosin's suggestion for the rubric before this Prayer contained the words 'offer up and place,' as in S.L.; the words 'offer up and' were designedly rejected.

(c) The collection is to be 'reverently' brought to the Priest, and he is to 'humbly present and place' it; the bread and wine he is simply to 'place' upon the Table.

(d) In S.L. 'the said bason with the oblations therein' is the collection, 'oblations' being used as a more general term to describe money which, by a later rubric in S.L., was to be given half to the poor or for Church furniture, half to the Minister for his library.

(e) 'Oblations' meant money in the middle ages; * cases occurred where the priests refused to administer the 'host' till they were paid their 'oblation' by the communicant.

(f) Hooker, V. lxxiv. 4: 'Nothing therefore is more proper than to give the name of oblations to such payments [to the clergy] in token that we offer unto Him whatsoever His Ministers receive.'

(g) Edward's Injunctions of 1547 order 'a strong chest with a hole' for the parishioners' 'oblation and alms.'

(h) The omission of the mention of payment of dues in 1662 was made up for by mentioning not only 'alms' but also 'other devotions.' The 'other devotions' of the rubric are the 'oblations' of the prayer. Hence also the omission of the direction: 'and earnestly exhort them to remember the poor,' etc. Notice also the omission of 'given unto the poor' in the indented Rubric of 1662.

(i) The first mention of oblations coincided with the first mention of a ceremonial presentation of the collection.

(j) A special service of 1635, which does speak of offering the bread and wine, expressly uses the word 'oblations' of the money received at the reading of such sentences as are not chosen for alms. Bishop Andrewes had two basins, one for alms and another for offerings.

(k) Wren, one of the Revisers, used the words 'oblation' and 'prophora' of the collection.

(l) Cosin in 1668 twice used the actual phrase 'alms and oblations' of money; so Sancroft, 1686.

The source of the mistake in regard to the word is a popular writing of Bishop Patrick, so early as 1667, in which, in defiance of the above-given facts, he states that the oblations 'can signify nothing else' but the elements, 'an illustration' (says Dowden) 'of the caution with which even almost contemporary glosses are to be viewed.' The Non-jurors readily adopted the mistake, and Wheatley assisted in making it wide-spread. It still lives on as part of the attempt to read into the B.C.P. the very things carefully excluded at the various revisions: 'The interpretation of the additional word is somewhat doubtful, but it seems legitimate to refer it either to the elements, just set upon the altar, or else from a more strictly antiquarian

point of view, to the dues and offerings paid by the people to the clergy' (Frere, p. 482). This is characterized by Dowden as 'rather a lame conclusion.'

(2) Commemoration of the faithful departed.

In spite of Bucer's desire to retain some such remembrance, the Revisers of 1552 thought it safer to exclude anything which might be perverted into prayer for the dead. The danger in 1662 was not so pressing, and it was thought fit to add a carefully-worded clause to this Prayer. The 1549 B.C.P. retained both the distinction between 'Saints' and 'all other thy servants, which are departed hence from us, with the sign of faith'—a distinction which, if it existed in any sense, no human power could apply to individual cases;—and also the self-contradictory prayer for 'peace' for those who 'now do rest in peace,' a stultification which must accompany any attempt to make a definite, i.e. a real prayer, for those of whom it has been revealed that they are 'with Christ, which is far better.'

S.L. restored the distinction between 'saints' and other servants of God, but avoided the other pit-fall, only praying that we may so follow the stedfastness of the 'saints' that 'we and all they which are of the mystical body of thy Son, may be set on his right hand,' etc. This prayer is susceptible of a quite reasonable interpretation, but taking the words literally, it is a prayer for the dead, that they may be set on Christ's right hand.

In 1662 great care was taken to eradicate every possible mistake:—

(1) The prayer for peace was not restored.

(2) No distinction was made between 'saints' and the other faithful dead.

(3) Instead of 'we and they,' 'we with them' was made the subject of the sentence, just as in the 1552 revision of the 1549 Burial Service.*

(4) The Title 'Church Militant here in earth' was retained, after deliberation, effectually condemning attempts to find prayer for the faithful departed here, though such are still made.† The only scriptural prayer we can offer affecting the condition of the faithful dead is 'Thy Kingdom come,' and

* It is ominous that the Revision Committee of Canterbury Convocation Lower House has proposed altering the Burial Prayer by using 'and' instead of 'with.'

† Cf. Frere, p. 482: 'the thanksgiving and prayer for the faithful departed was added at this time (1661).'

that prayer must not be supposed to imply that their present condition is not one of happiness (Rev. vi. 10, 11).

Indented Rubric, 1552; enlarged 1662.

1552. If there be no alms given unto the poor, then shall the words of accepting our alms be left out unsaid.

1662. If there be no alms or oblations, then shall the words (of accepting our alms and oblations) be left out unsaid.

The meaning of 'oblations' has been given above (p. 315). The wording of the Rubric is obscure; the use of 'or' suggests that the whole phrase 'alms and oblations' is to be used, whether the collection be exclusively for the poor or for any other object. It will be noted how absolutely this wording conflicts with any idea of making the bread and wine an oblation.

Rubric ordering Announcement of Holy Communion, 1548 (1549); 1662.

An announcement is implied (though no directions are given) twice in the 1549 B.C.P.: once in the Exhortation to the negligent, adapted for ordinary announcement in 1662; and once in one of the concluding Rubrics, where arrangements for the provision of bread and wine are made according to houses, 'the which may be the better done, for that they know before when their course cometh, and may therefore dispose themselves to the worthy receiving of the Sacrament.' In 1552 there were no similar implicit regulations.

In the Order of Communion, 1548, a Rubric ordered announcement on 'the next Sunday or holy day, or at the least, one day before,' with the Exhortation ('or such like'), which was restored to the purpose of making announcement in 1662, but prescribed for 'negligent' in 1549. This Rubric is rarely obeyed now, though there is a custom in some churches of using the first sentence in announcing Holy Communion.

First Exhortation, 1548; enlarged for the negligent 1549; 'sometime said also,' 1552; adapted for announcing, and clause added from Exhortation to Communicants, 1662 (see pp. 270, 1).

1548 } 'On — next, I intend . . .'
1549 }

1552. This opening sentence wanting.

1662. Opening sentence restored, but shortened.

1548. 'Doth vouchsafe, in a Sacrament and Mystery, to give us his said body and blood spiritually: to feed and drink upon.

TABLE OF CHANGES OF ARRANGEMENT OF EXHORTATIONS.

1548	1549	1552	1662
1. <i>To give notice</i> place in Service not specified.	1. <i>To negligent</i> after Sermon.	2. <i>To negligent</i> after Prayer for Church Militant (B) included.	1. <i>To give notice</i> after Sermon (A) inserted.
		1. 'Sometime also at discretion.'	2. <i>To negligent</i> after Sermon (B) omitted.
3. <i>To communicants</i> after Priest's reception (A) at end.	3. <i>To communicants</i> at celebration (A) inserted.	3. <i>To communicants</i> at celebration (A) inserted.	3. <i>To communicants</i> at celebration (A) transferred to 1.
4. <i>Invitation</i> after 3.	4. <i>Invitation</i> after consecration.	4. <i>Invitation</i> after 3.	4. <i>Invitation</i> after 3.

(A)=paragraph 'Therefore if any of you be a blasphemer . . . body and soul.'

(B)=paragraph condemning non-communicating attendance. The Exhortations are all printed after Prayer for Church Militant in 1662, as in 1552, but the 1st and 2nd are ordered to be used after Sermon.

1549. 'Doth vouchsafe, in a Sacrament and Mystery, to give us his said body and blood to feed upon spiritually.'

1552. 'Hath given . . . to be our spiritual food and sustenance, as it is declared unto us, as well by God's Word, as by the holy sacraments of his blessed body and blood.'

1662. 'Hath given . . . to be our spiritual food and sustenance in that holy sacrament.'

1548. 'And if any man have done wrong,' etc.; this sentence wanting.

1549. 'For neither the absolution of the priest can any thing avail them, nor the receiving,' etc.

1552. 'For otherwise the receiving,' etc.

1662. 'For otherwise the receiving,' etc. (The next sentence of 1662 is taken from Exhortation to Communicants of 1548, 1549 and 1552.)

1548. } 'discreet and learned priest, taught in the law of God,
1549. } and confess and open his sin and grief *secretly*, that of us
(as of the Ministers of God and of the Church) he may
receive comfort and absolution . . .'

1552. 'discreet and learned Minister of God's word, and open
his grief . . . that by the ministry of God's word he may receive
comfort and the benefit of absolution . . .'

1662. As in 1552, with 'holy' before 'word,' 'comfort'
omitted.

In 1549 a concluding sentence tolerated 'auricular and
secret confession'; this toleration was omitted in 1552,
and not restored in S.L. or in 1662.

ANALYSIS.

- I. The meaning of the Sacrament :—
 1. Remembrance of the death of Christ.
 2. Thanksgiving for :
 - (1) The death of Christ.
 - (2) Sustenance in the Sacrament.
- II. Precaution against unworthy reception :—'Which being
so divine.'
Consideration of the dignity of the rite.
- III. Ways and means of preparation :—
 1. Self-examination by the Commandments.
 2. Confession of sins to God.
 3. Determination to amend.
 4. Restitution to the wronged.
 5. Forgiveness of offenders.
- IV. Warning against unworthy reception :—'Therefore if any.'
- V. Provision for extraordinary cases of disturbed consciences :
—'And because it is requisite.'
 1. Opening of grief to a minister of God's Word.
 2. Absolution and spiritual advice by ministry of the
Word.

Judas. The Reformers have followed St. Luke in giving
Judas a place not only in the last Passover, but in the Lord's
Supper itself. St. Matthew and St. Mark do not suggest Judas'
presence, but their narrative does not absolutely exclude it.
Edersheim (*Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*), with many
other commentators, believes Judas to have departed before the
institution; Godet (*Commentary on St. Luke's Gospel*) represents
another school of interpretation taking the opposite view. Tradi-
tion, as embodied in Leonardo da Vinci's picture, and in the
superstition in regard to sitting 13 at table, is inconclusive,
since all are agreed that Judas was present at part of the meal.

Open his grief. This direction has been made the ground
of a re-introduction of that 'auricular and secret' confession
which forms part of the Roman Sacrament of Penance, and was
still tolerated in 1549, but rejected in 1552.

The New Testament only attaches efficacy to confession of
sins before men in the case of sickness, James v. 14-16. There
Christians are bidden to confess sins* to other Christians, in
order that they may pray for the sinner's health. The ministry
is not empowered to receive such confessions, and that though
the 'elders' are mentioned (14) as those authorized to pray
over the sick man and anoint him. Such confession, therefore,
is not to a priest, not to obtain absolution, not to comprise an
exhaustive enumeration of sins, and not to be generally practised;
it was, moreover, voluntary, and not necessarily private.

Public voluntary confession was common in the early Church,
but not as a necessary part of confession to God, much less as
a substitute for it. Chrysostom deprecates confession to man :
'I entreat and beseech you to confess continually to God. For
I do not bring thee unto the theatre of thy fellow-servants, nor
do I compel thee to uncover thy sins to men.' † So Augustine :
'To what purpose do I confess my sins to men, as if they them-
selves could heal my distresses?—to a set of men inquisitive in
inquiring into the lives of others, but indolent in amending their
own. And how shall they, who know nothing of my heart but
by my confession, know whether I say true or not?' ‡

The following are the steps by which voluntary public con-
fession became compulsory secret confession to a priest :—

1. By 400 it had become the rule that those guilty of notorious
sins should confess publicly before admission to the Lord's Supper.

2. Between 440 and 461 Leo I. wrote to the Bishops of Campania
directing such confessions to be made to the priest instead of
before the congregation. This became universal by 600, fostered
by the growing belief that the priest was the representative,
not of the scandalized congregation, but of the injured God, and
therefore empowered to bestow absolution.

3. In 763 this kind of confession of greater offences was made
compulsory.

4. In 1215 the Lateran Council ordered private confession of
all sins to a priest at least once a year.

* A.V. 'faults,' but *ἀμαρτίας*, sins, is a better reading than *παραπτώματα*
fallings away.

† *De Incarnatione Dei*: Hom. v. 57.

‡ *Confessions*: x. 3. Yet Vernon Staley, *Catholic Religion*, p. 214,
cites Augustine as saying that sins are forgiven by baptism, prayer, and
penance.

5. In the sixteenth century the Council of Trent, Canon 6, anathematized those who denied the divine institution of sacramental confession, or its necessity for salvation, although Bellarmine, Maldonatus, and other Roman authorities declare that it was unknown to the early Church.*

The Reformers tried, in 1549, to retain the practice of secret confession as a voluntary aid to distressed sinners, but abandoned it altogether in 1552. The evils inseparable from the practice, acknowledged in Papal Bulls and Roman writers generally, are summed up in the words of Archbishop Magee: 'I denounce the system as an outrage on decency and common sense, as well as on God's Word. . . . I maintain that taking God's place without God's attributes, it is impossible, however prudent the priest may be, to avoid instilling vice by the Confessional.' † The revision of 1552 safeguarded the permission to receive any confession by the following provisions:—

1. It is only to be received in special cases of spiritual distress. This provision is carefully made both here and in the Visitation of the Sick.

2. It is to be entirely voluntary.

3. It is not ordered to be secret, the word 'secretly' was expunged in 1552.

4. It is not to be an exhaustive enumeration of sins, but the opening of grief.

5. It is to be made, not to a priest, but to a minister, whose qualifications are knowledge of God's Word, and discretion.

6. The relief, both of absolution and spiritual counsel, is to be found in God's Word and not in any ministerial function save the unfolding of the Word. No form of absolution is provided in this place, and that in the Office for the Visitation of the Sick is only to be used at the request of the sick man (since 1662: see p. 454). ‡

Rubric providing for the Negligent, 1549; placed before Second Exhortation 1552.

1549. First Exhortation, 'or like words,' to be used for the negligent.

* Vernon Staley, *Catholic Religion*, p. 214, says that the Sacrament of Penance was instituted by Christ, relying upon the commission given by Christ in John xx. 23. That the authority then given to remit and retain sins was not given to the ministry as such, but to the witnessing Church as a whole, and that it was not associated with any secret confession, is sufficient reply.

† *Auricular Confession in the Church of England*, quoted from *Anti-Ritualism*, p. 25.

‡ For 'Confession' see p. 95.

1552. 'at certain times,' Second to be used.

1662. Second to be used 'instead of the former,' when negligence seen.

Second Exhortation, 1552; one clause omitted 1662.

This Exhortation is possibly due to Bucer.

The two alterations in 1662 were:—

- (1) 1552. 'In the remembrance of his death.'
1662. 'In remembrance of the Sacrifice of his death.'
- S.L. 'In the remembrance of his death and sacrifice.'
- (2) The long clause condemning 'gazers and lookers on' was omitted in 1662, because, as Wren records, the custom of non-communicating attendance was quite unknown. It were to be wished that the Revisers had retained a sentence so valuable to check a possible recurrence of the evil.

ANALYSIS.

- I. Invitation in God's Name.
- II. Examination of Refusals:—'Ye know how grievous.'
 1. Heedlessness.
 2. Business.
 3. Personal unfitness.
- III. Scriptural condemnation of all excuses:—'They that refused.'
- IV. Official exhortation of the
 1. Minister, ready to do his part.
 2. Ambassador, inviting in Christ's name.
- V. Explanation of the rite and its implications:—'And as the Son of God.'
 1. The remembrance of the sacrifice of Christ.
 2. Neglect of such remembrance an injury * to
 - (1) God.
 - (2) Oneself.
 - (3) Brethren.
- VI. Remedy of neglect:—
 1. Thoughtful consideration by the negligent.
 2. Instant prayer by the minister.

II. COMMUNION.

Rubric directing that communicants be conveniently placed, 1662, (1549).

* The word 'injury' here, used in reference to God, retains something of the meaning of the Latin word, *injuria*, 'insult.'

1549. The 'quire' was prescribed as the place for the communicants, the sexes being separated, as in some of the German Orders.

1552. The moving of the Table rendered explicit directions unnecessary, but the words of the Fourth Exhortation 'draw near' ('with faith' was added in 1662) were often interpreted literally by the communicants, a custom which still lingers in some churches.

1662. The latter custom was regulated by the direction to conveniently place the Communicants, the duty of the Churchwardens.

Third Exhortation, 1548; * placed here 1549; clause transferred to First Exhortation 1662. (See p. 271.)

Important differences:—

1548. Because we make no difference of the Lord's body.

1549. Not considering the Lord's body.

1548. 'Judge therefore,' as in 1662, with clause 'If any man here' at the close.

1549. Before 'Judge therefore,' the clause at end of 1548 inserted.

1552. As in 1549.

1662. The clause transferred to First Exhortation.

1549. He hath left in those (there, 1548) holy Mysteries, as a pledge of his love, and a continual remembrance of the same, his own blessed body, and precious (om. 1548) blood, for us to feed upon spiritually to our endless comfort and consolation.

1552. He hath instituted and ordained holy mysteries, as
1662. pledges of his love, and for a continual remembrance of his death, to our great and endless comfort.

ANALYSIS.

I. The necessity of examination for worthy participation:—

1. Great benefit.

2. Great danger.

* In 1548, the Order of Communion followed the Priest's Communion: it consisted of the Third and Fourth Exhortations, the Confession, Absolution, Comfortable Words, Prayer of Humble Access, Administration and Blessing.

In 1549, being no longer used with the Latin Mass, it was incorporated into the English Communion Service, the First Exhortation following the Sermon and preceding the Offertory, the remainder, except the Blessing, following the Consecration, and the Blessing concluding the Service.

In 1552, it was rearranged as in 1662 B.C.P., save for variations in regard to use of the Third Exhortation, for which see special Table on p. 319.

II. The conditions of worthy participation:—'Judge therefore yourselves.'

1. Repentance.

2. Faith.

3. Amendment.

4. Loye.

5. Thankful remembrance of Christ's death shown in:—

a. Submission.

b. Service.

'We eat and drink our own damnation.' This passage occurs in the same words in the 1548 *Order of Communion*, taken from 1 Cor. xi. 29, where A.V. uses also the word 'damnation,' R.V. 'judgment.' The later association of the word 'damnation' with final punishment has lent the word a severity which St. Paul did not intend, and which has accordingly acted as a deterrent in the case of many who would otherwise communicate. The American B.C.P. has cut the Gordian Knot by omitting the whole sentence containing the word: the Irish B.C.P., more wisely, has altered the word to 'judgment' (as the R.V. has done), and omitted the remainder of the sentence associating disease and death with God's wrath upon unworthy communicants. St. Paul definitely attributes sickness and death amongst the Corinthians to this cause (v. 30), so that the association is thoroughly scriptural. The sin of the Corinthians was that of selfish disregard of one another in the common meal, which proved their disregard of the solemnity attaching to the Sacrament of Unity. To partake of the sacred symbols of Christ's Body and Blood in such a spirit, was to display a carelessness amounting to contempt, in regard to the Body and Blood of Christ, given and shed for their redemption. Moreover, they failed to discern the 'Body,' the oneness of believers in Christ. St. Paul warned them (v. 31) that if they did not 'discern' themselves, they would be judged of God, the play upon the two Greek words, *diakrino* and *krino*, being impossible to reproduce in English. The substitution of 'judgment' for 'damnation,' without any other alteration or omission, would sufficiently meet any difficulty. It may be that now as of old God does visit those who belittle His Sacrament of Redemption with temporal afflictions.

Rubric preceding the Invitation, 1549 (1548); placed here 1552.

1549. Here the Priest shall turn him toward those that come to the holy Communion, and shall say.

1552. Then shall the Priest say to them that come to receive the holy Communion.

The Eastward Position was abandoned in 1552, so that the direction to 'turn' became unnecessary.

The 'Here' of 1549 was at the close of the long prayer including Consecration; the 'Then' of 1552 was at the close of the Third Exhortation, as in 1662.

In 1548 a Rubric here bade the Priest pause to see if any would withdraw in response to the Exhortation to self-examination.

Fourth Exhortation (Invitation), 1548 ; placed here 1552.

Two alterations were made in 1662 : 'Draw near with faith' for 'Draw near,' which had been literally interpreted by many ; and the omission of the words 'before this congregation here gathered together in his holy name,' after 'make your humble confession to Almighty God.' In 1548 and 1549, 'and to his holy Church' was read for 'before this congregation.' This latter change is easily understood, but the omission in 1662 is not so clear. Frere (p. 485) attributes it to the fact that non-communicants were now absent, but the remainder might be more accurately called a 'congregation gathered in God's Name' than the mixed congregation.*

Rubric regulating the Confession, 1548.

1548, 1549, 1552. 'Either by one of them, or else by one of the Ministers, or by the Priest himself.'

S.L. 'by the Presbyter himself, or the Deacon.'

1662. 'by one of the Ministers.'

This alteration was a concession to the Presbyterian request at the Savoy Conference.

Confession, 1548 ; Herm. Con.

This Prayer has no counterpart in Sar. Miss., with which indeed it was ordered to be used in 1548. The single phrase 'thought, word, and deed,' occurs in the Mutual Confession of the Priest and his assistants early in the Mass Service, in which the Confession was to 'God, blessed Mary, all the saints and you,' and the prayer was not directly addressed to God, but to

* Frere, l. c., states that 'the rubrics which precede and follow still contemplate the presence of others not communicating,' because both rubrics mention those 'that come to receive the holy Communion.' If this precarious reasoning be adopted, the further conclusion is emphatically to be drawn, viz., that the others present have no part or lot in the matter. But the Rubric before the Absolution simply says 'the people,' so also in the Administration and Lord's Prayer Rubrics, while the 'Humble Access' Rubric repeats the phrase used here. No distinctive stress, therefore, must be laid upon that phrase.

'holy Mary, all the Saints and you, to pray for me.' The whole prayer has many correspondences with the form in Herm. Con., in which much of this part of the 1548 Order is to be found.

Rubric regarding the Absolution, 1548 ; called 'Absolution' 1662.

'Or the Bishop (being present)' added 1552.

Absolution, 1548 ; altered 1549 ; (Sar. Miss.)

1548. 'Our blessed Lord, who hath left power to his Church to absolve penitent sinners from their sins, and to restore to the grace of the heavenly Father such as truly believe in Christ . . .'

1549. As in 1662.

The latter part of this Absolution is derived from the Absolution of the Priest by the Ministers in Sar. Miss. : *Misereatur vestri omnipotens Deus, et dimittat vobis omnia peccata vestra ; liberet vos ab omni malo, conservet et confirmet in bono, et ad vitam perducat æternam* : literally, 'Almighty God have mercy upon you, and put away from you all your sins : free you from all evil, keep and strengthen (you) in good, and lead you unto life eternal.'

In Herm. Con. the Absolution is declaratory, not, as here, precatory ; the Reformers omitted all reference to the power to absolve, which is retained in Herm. Con.

Comfortable Words, 1548.

In Herm. Con. five such passages, including the four of B.C.P. save the first, Matt. xi. 28, which is found 'in the preliminary discourse on the Lord's supper in Hermann's work,' with John iii. 35, Acts x. 43, were placed between the Confession and Absolution, one of them only to be read, with the preface, 'Hear the Gospel.' This position was valuable as leading the penitent to expect absolution ; the B.C.P. position confirms faith by justifying the precatory absolution just offered. The German Editions of Herm. Con., slightly earlier than the Latin, had : 'Hear the Gospel-comfort,' obviously the source of the phrase 'Comfortable words.'

The 1548 version of the passages has been slightly altered :—
1662. 'Are' for 'be heavy laden' : 'will' for 'shall refresh' : 'everlasting life' for 'life everlasting.'

1548. 'Worthy . . . to be embraced and received' ; 'embraced and' omitted 1549.

1548. 'He it is that obtained grace for our sins,' altered to 'and he is the propitiation for our sins' in 1549.

S.L. adopted the A.V. The Revisers retained the independent translation of 1548.

