

Catena patrum.--no. Iv. Testimony of Writers in the Later English Church to the Eucharistic Sacrifice

by J.H. Newman

The sermon discusses the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice and its corruption by the Romanist Church, highlighting the importance of understanding the true nature of the sacrifice and its significance in the early Church.

Scripture: Proverbs 4:25, 1 Corinthians 16:13, Ephesians 4:14, 2 Timothy 1:13, Jude 1:3

Topics: "Eucharistic Sacrifice", "Church Reformation"

Description

Edward Bouverie Pusey preaches about the challenges faced by the Church in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, particularly during the time of Queen Elizabeth, in navigating the complexities of the Reformation. He highlights the struggles of the reformers, such as Cranmer, in attempting to unite the discordant elements of Protestantism into one Episcopal body, leading to vacillation and confusion. Pusey emphasizes the importance of preserving the true doctrine amidst the turbulent times, acknowledging the difficulties faced by those who sought to uphold the faith while combating both Roman Catholic corruptions and Protestant innovations. He underscores the need for a calm and steady adherence to the principles of the Church Catholic, despite the challenges and temptations to compromise.

Transcript

Catena Patrum. No. IV.

[By Edward Bouverie Pusey]

THE general character and object of these Catenae is the same: viz. to exhibit the practical working of the system and peculiar temper and principles of our Church upon the minds of the more faithful of her sons, whether acting upon them through the channel of reflection or learning, or through the deference of a single-hearted simplicity. The extent and character of this influence will, however, necessarily vary, according to the nature of the several doctrines, and the degree in which they enter into that system. Doctrines, for instance, are impressed more or less prominently, and in different ways, in her Creeds, or her Prayers, or her Catechism, or her selection of Holy Scripture: some definitely and tangibly, some conveyed in a general tone, which runs throughout, and which may be called the *hōqV*, or spirit of the

Church: some again have been retained by oral tradition, and maintained by her uniform spirit of deference to the early Church, whose hallowed lamp she carries on, and whose handmaid she is. Such, for instance, is her view of the spiritual benefits of absolution and confirmation, or the spiritual gifts in ordination, which are assumed to be great and real, where these ordinances are duly and worthily received; but what they are, is not dogmatically enunciated, being presupposed as already known, through the successive teaching of her Ministers. So in other points, wherein they, who at the time had the deposit of her faith committed to them, were persuaded to withdraw from common use, or to leave hut slight indications of, doctrine, which had recently and might again be abused. This might, by a sort of analogy, as far as relates to the object, be called the "disciplina arcani" of the Anglican Church; only, it was so far a hazardous experiment, in that no provision was made (as in the antient Church) for authoritatively inculcating upon those fit to receive it, the doctrine thus withheld from the unworthy or uninstructed. It was left to tradition, but that tradition was not guarded. One must, also, herein not speak of the wisdom or foresight of individuals, but of the good Providence of God, controlling and guiding the genius of the Church. "Not through our merit but His mercy; not through our foresight but His Providence; not through our own arm but His right hand and His arm were we rescued and delivered." Yet since He "saw some good thing in us," He so directed our Church's reverence for the good old Fathers of the primitive Church" as not indeed to exempt us from "suffering loss" but still with safety of our "lives" as a Church. For "loss" He has ordained all to suffer, who in any way tamper, whether by adding to or taking away from, the Apostolic deposit of sound words; yet since we had in most things been faithful, He chastened us only, and gave us not over unto death.

Of this latter kind--a doctrine, namely, which our Church retains, but one of the most withdrawn from sight, lest it should, at one time, perchance have been misapplied or profaned, is the doctrine of a Sacrifice in the Blessed Eucharist. It is not here intended to speak disparagingly of those of the revisers of our Liturgy, who furthered or consented to the suppression of doctrine visible in the 2d book of Edward VI. They listened or yielded to foreign advisers, who had their minds fixed solely on the "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits," which the Church of Rome had connected with the true doctrine, and who had themselves lost it.

Happy, if while guarding against the errors of Rome, they had escaped the opposite danger of fomenting profane indifference or unbelief, which have left their own homes desolate! And the revisers of our own Liturgy, in the latter part of the reign of Edward VI, would have acted with greater wisdom and a firmer faith, had they continued to retain the explicit statements of the Catholic doctrine, and sought other means of averting its abuse, or left the correction to Almighty God, who gave that doctrine.

Nor can one doubt that if they could have foreseen, whither this half-suppression of true doctrine would lead, they would have guarded in some other way against any temporary danger which might arise from the association of past errors therewith. There is evidence, as will appear hereafter, that those of the revisers, who were most yielding, themselves held, and were prepared to maintain, the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice; one cannot indeed suppose that they felt altogether, even as men might, its great value and privilege: they had been engaged in controverting errors connected with a high view of sacred doctrine; and such errors cannot be controverted without great peril to the delicacy of our own faith, and our refined and affectionate apprehension of it; the office of assault makes the mind rough and rude, and associates jarring thoughts with the doctrine thus approached, (so that the Spirit of love cannot dwell there,) and, again, it almost forces the mind to speak familiarly on high mysteries, thereby injuring the reverence by which they must be apprehended.

Then also, the very notion of disguising the expression of any doctrine implies a diminished estimation of it; the debating about it, preparing for it, at last, the overt act of doing it, are so many acts of forfeiture. For he that hath not, from him shall be taken away even that he hath." Whoso watches not jealously over the deposit committed to him shall lose it. Still the revisers in question had the doctrine, and wished, in their way, to keep it, and so would be grieved to find that their mode of acting had nearly forfeited it to the Church.

But, further, no doctrine can be lost, or injured singly. We may not indeed maintain any doctrine, or rest its principal importance, upon its connection with or bearings upon some other doctrine, lest we arrogate too much to ourselves, and lose sight of the intrinsic value of the doctrine, which we presume to make thus dependent on another; still it is allowable to point out any additional evils, which departure from that doctrine may have. We know not then how great may be the loss of the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice in itself; undoubtedly much greater than they are aware of, who, while in the flesh, think it the greatest; the loss of this, as a devotional act, may be an unspeakable evil to the whole Church, and intercept much of the favour of the FATHER from us, and of the fulness of His blessings in His SON.

And so, on the other hand, we may perhaps look upon the "chain of witnesses" here adduced, not only as having attested and perpetuated the truth, but also, each in their generation (with a multitude of others whom they represent, and who more or less consciously and distinctly performed the same act of devotion and held the same truth) obtaining a measure of favour of GOD for His Church here by pleading thus the merits of their LORD. But apart from this, the highest and most mysterious part of the subject, it may be noticed as a fact, that the way wherein the doctrine of the Communication of the Body and Blood of CHRIST in the Holy Eucharist has been received, has always been proportioned to this of the "commemorative sacrifice."

Both were held in high and awful honour in the Primitive Church, both perverted in the later Church of Rome, both depreciated by Ultra-Protestants; and among ourselves, the reverence felt towards the one Mystery has been generally heightened or depressed, according to the several degrees in which the other was received; and not these only, but (since every portion of our faith is indissolubly although invisibly linked with every other portion,) other truths also which people do not readily suspect.

It was easy for those, free from the errors of Rome, to see that her doctrine of the sacrifice interfered with that of the one Sacrifice on the Cross; but many overlooked that the belief in that Sacrifice might then only be altogether sound, when the Eucharistic Sacrifice was also revered.

It may be well, however, in these days, before going further, to state briefly what that doctrine is, and what the Romanist corruption of it. The doctrine then of the early Church was this; that "in the Eucharist, an oblation or sacrifice was made by the Church to GOD, under the form of His creatures of bread and wine, according to our Blessed LORD'S holy institution, in memory of His Cross and Passion;" and this they believed to be the "pure offering" or sacrifice which the Prophet Malachi foretold that the Gentiles should offer; and that it was enjoined by our LORD in the words "Do this for a memorial of Me;" that it was alluded to when our LORD or St.

Paul speak of a Christian "altar" (St. Matt. v. 23. Heb. xiii. 10.), and was typified by the Passover, which was both a sacrifice and a feast upon a sacrifice. For the first passover had been a vicarious sacrifice, the appointed means of saving life, when the first-born of the Egyptians were slain; and like all other vicarious sacrifices, it shadowed out that of our LORD on the Cross; the subsequent Passovers were sacrifices,

commemorative of that first sacrifice, and so typical of the Eucharist, as commemorating and shewing forth our LORD'S sacrifice on the Cross.

Not that they reasoned so, but they knew it to be thus, because they had been taught it, and incidentally mentioned these circumstances, which people would now call evidence or grounds and reasons. This commemorative oblation or sacrifice they doubted not to be acceptable to God, who had appointed it; and so to be also a means of bringing down GOD'S favour upon the whole Church. And, if we were to analyze their feelings in our way, how should it be otherwise, when they presented to the ALMIGHTY FATHER the symbols and memorials of the meritorious Death and Passion of His Only Begotten and Well-beloved SON, and besought Him by that precious sacrifice to look graciously upon the Church which He had purchased with His own blood--offering the memorials of that same sacrifice which He, our great High-Priest, made once for all, and now being entered within the veil, unceasingly presents before the FATHER, and the representation of which He has commanded us to make?

It is, then, to use our technical phraseology, "a commemorative, impetratory sacrifice," which is all one with saying that it is well-pleasing to GOD; for what is well-pleasing to Him, how should it not bring down blessings upon us? They preferred to speak of it in language which, while it guarded against the errors of their days, the confusion with the sacrifices of Jew or Pagan, expressed their reverence for the memorials of their SAVIOUR'S Body and Blood, and named it "the awful and unbloody sacrifice," or the like, as men would, with a sense of the unfathomable mystery of GOD'S goodness connected therewith.

This pleading of our SAVIOUR'S merits, by a sacrifice instituted by Himself, was (they doubted not) regarded graciously by GOD, for the remission of sins; as indeed our LORD had said, "This is My Blood which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins." The Eucharist then, according to them, consisted of two parts, a "commemorative sacrifice" and a "Communion" or Communication; the former obtaining remission of sins for the Church; the Communion "the strengthening and refreshing of the soul," although, inasmuch as it united the believer with CHRIST, it indirectly conveyed remission of sins too.

The Communion was (to use a modern phrase) the feast upon the sacrifice thus offered. They first offered to GOD His gifts, in commemoration of that His inestimable gift, and placed them upon His altar here, to be received and presented on the Heavenly Altar by Him, our High-Priest; and then, trusted to receive them back, conveying to them the life-giving Body and Blood. As being, moreover, appointed by their LORD, they believed that the continual oblation of this sacrifice (like the daily sacrifice appointed in the elder Church) was a benefit to the whole Church, independently and over and above the benefit to the individual communicants--that the sacrifices in each branch of the Christian Church were mutually of benefit to every other branch, each to all and all to each: and so also this common interest in the sacrifice of the memorials of their SAVIOUR'S Passion was one visible, yea, and (since GOD for its sake diffused unseen and inestimable blessings through the whole mystical body of His SON) an invisible spiritual bond of the Communion of Saints throughout the whole Body.

"There is one JESUS CHRIST," says St. Ignatius, "who is above all: haste ye then all together, as to one Temple of GOD, as to one Altar, as to one CHRIST JESUS, who came forth from One FATHER, and is in One, and to One returned." [Ep. ad Magnes. Â§. 7] Lastly, since they knew not of our chill separation between those who, being dead in CHRIST, live to CHRIST and with CHRIST, and those who are yet in the flesh, they felt assured that this sacrifice offered by the Church on earth, for the whole Church, conveyed to that portion of the Church, which had passed into the unseen world, such benefits of CHRIST'S death as (their conflicts over, and they in rest) were still applicable to them.

For their state, although higher far and purified, was yet necessarily imperfect, since the consummation of all things was not yet; and so they thought, was capable of increased spiritual joys, and fuller disclosures of the Beatific Vision. At all events, it had ever been the received practice of every branch of the Church Catholic, then to remember the "dead in CHRIST," and so whatever might become of their own individual surmises as to the mode, or extent of its efficacy, they comforted themselves, that being according to the will of GOD, it must in some way be of benefit to them.

The merits of CHRIST'S death it is, which still keeps in subsistence a sinful world, and retains GOD'S love for the Church; it is in His Son, that the whole Church, notwithstanding her manifold deficiencies and unfaithfulnesses, is still acceptable to Him, and, "in the unity of the Church" and so in CHRIST, all the several members of the one Body: and they who sleep in CHRIST, are in CHRIST. Why then should we take upon ourselves to say that they, who are His members, as well as we, have no interest in this, which is offered as a memorial for all? or why should men think it an unhappiness or imperfection, that they should obtain additional joys and satisfactions thereby?

The Romish Church corrupted and marred the Apostolic doctrine in two ways. 1st. By the error of transubstantiation. 2nd. By that of purgatory. And in both there occurs that peculiar corruption of the administrators of the Romish Church, that they countenance so much more of profitable error, than in their abstract system they acknowledge. Thus by combining the doctrine of Transubstantiation with that of the Sacrifice in the Eucharist, the laity were persuaded that not only a commemorative sacrifice, but that CHRIST Himself was again offered; as indeed one of their own writers confesses; "It is true, and impossible to deny, that many theologians of the Romish Church took occasion of the name of sacrifice given to the Eucharist, to tell us of a fresh immolation and death; to attach to it an efficacy of its own [i. e. independent of the one meritorious Sacrifice on the Cross], and an independent merit; to make us place therein a confidence which cannot but be superstitious, whenever it refers not to the Sacrifice of the Cross." [Courayer, R ponse au P.

Le Quien, c. xvii. p. 469. Even the excellent Nicole frequently repeats: "The sacrifice of the Mass is the same as that of the Cross; it is substantially the same sacrifice, because it is the same Victim, the same JESUS CHRIST who offers to His FATHER the same Body and Blood upon our altars, as He offered in Calvary." Esprit de M. Nicole, p. 533. M. Nicole a little softens this, but still keeps the main position, "that the sacrifices on the Cross and the Altar were the same, because it is the same JESUS CHRIST who offers Himself in the one as in the other."

These writers make the Sacrifice both the same and distinct; through Transubstantiation, the same, and yet, in act, distinct. But for the doctrine of Transubstantiation, Nicole might have a right meaning.] These false notions, in themselves, aggrandized the character of the priesthood, and as such, it was part of the unhappy policy of Rome to countenance them; and while (to take the mildest view) she narrowly observed the erroneous tendencies which were almost unavoidably mixed up in the minds of individuals with the reformed doctrine, she had no sense for her own; she thought no deeds cruel which would remove the motes that threatened to darken her sister's eye, but perceived not the beam in her own.

While repressing even by the shedding of blood the slightest approximation to the Reformed doctrine, she rebuked not errors which entrenched on the authority of our LORD. Joined, however, with the doctrine of purgatory, the sacrifice of the Mass gained for them another accession of power, the extent whereof, and of the abuses therewith connected, is not now easily appreciated. For the souls of almost all, if not all, who passed out of this life, were supposed to go into purgatory; its pains were regarded as intolerable, equal,

except in duration, to those of Hell.

From these torments the sacrifice of the Mass came to be practically regarded as the only means of deliverance. For when it was believed that CHRIST was "truly and indeed, in respect of His very Body and Blood, offered up to His FATHER under the form of bread and wine, in the daily sacrifice of the Church," [Harding ap. Jewel, Reply, c. xvii. init.] nothing else, however abstractedly it might be allowed to be of use, could in comparison be of any moment. [One illustration of the practical combination of these doctrines may suffice, viz. the way in which even Sir Thomas More writes in a practical and popular work.

A book, namely, "the Supplication of Beggars," had been put out, complaining that the charity destined for their relief had been turned aside to pay the priests for saying masses. Against this, Sir Thomas More, "Counsellor to our Sovereign Lord the King, and Chancellor of his duchy of Lancaster," wrote "The Supplication of Soules against the Supplication of Beggars." It thus begins; "In most piteous wise continually calleth and crieth upon your devout charity and most tender pity, for help, comfort, and relief, your late acquaintance, kindred, spouses, companions, play-fellows, and friends, and now your humble and unacquainted and half-forgotten suppliants, poor prisoners of GOD, the silly souls in purgatory, here abiding and enduring the grievous pains and hot cleansing fire, that fretteth and burneth out the rust and filthy spots of our sin, till the mercy of ALMIGHTY GOD, the rather by your good and charitable means, vouchsafe to deliver us hence.

From whence, if ye marvel why we more now molest and trouble you with our writing than ever we were wont before, it may like you to wit and understand, that hitherto, tho' we have been with many folk much forgotten of negligence, yet hath always good folk remembered us, and we have been recommended unto GOD, and eased and holpen, and relieved, both by the priests' prayers, of good virtuous people, and specially by the daily masses, and other ghostly suffrages of priests, religious, and folk of holy Church.

But now sith that of late, there are sprung up certain seditious persons, which not only travail and labour to destroy them by whom we be much holpen, but also to sow and set forth such a pestilent opinion against our self, as once received and believed among the people, must need take from us the relief and comfort that ever should come to us by the charitable alms, prayers, and good works of the world; ye may take it for no wonder, tho' we silly souls that have long lien and cried so far from you, that we seldom break your sleep, do now, in this our great fear of our utter loss for ever of your loving remembrance and relief, not yet importunately bereave you of your rest with crying at your ears, at unseasonable time, when ye would (which we do never) repose yourself and take ease," &c. (Works p. 288).

In p. 316 they speak of the "pains which will else hold them here with us in fire and torments intolerable, only God knoweth how long."] The corruptions, occasions of avarice, superstition, and profaneness thence ensuing, exceed all bounds. Even the Council of Trent was obliged to address itself to the remedy of them. [In the decree on Purgatory.] The connection then of the doctrine of the sacrifice with the two errors of Transubstantiation and Purgatory, at the Reformation, was of much moment; and of these, the fundamental error was that of Transubstantiation.

"St. Cyprian saith," says Bishop Jewell to Harding, [Defence of Apology, P. 2. c. 5. v. fin. p. 140.] we offer our LORD'S cup mixed with wine. But he saith not as you say, 'we offer up the Son of God substantially and really unto the FATHER.' "Take away only this blasphemy, wherewith you have deceived the world, and then talk of mingling the cup and of the sacrifice while ye list." "Do ye take away from the Mass your Trasubstantiation," says Bishop Andrews [Respons. ad Card.

Bellarmino. c. 8.] to Cardinal Bellarmine, "and we shall not long have any question about the sacrifice." "This kind of oblation," [the Romish] "standeth upon Transubstantiation, his cousin-german," says Bishop Ridley, [Brief declaration of the Lord's Supper p. 16.] "and they do both grow upon one ground." And at the beginning of his book, [Ibid. p. 6.] "As in a man diseased in divers parts, commonly the original cause of such divers diseases, which is spreading abroad in the body, do come from one chief member,--even so all five points aforesaid do chiefly hang upon this one question: What is the matter of the sacrament?

Whether is it the natural substance of bread, or the natural substance of CHRIST'S own body?--For if it be CHRIST'S own natural body, born of the Virgin,--then assuredly they must needs grant Transubstantiation, that is, a change of the substance of bread into the substance of CHRIST'S body. Then also they must needs grant the carnal and corporal presence of CHRIST'S body. Then must the sacrament be adored with the honour due to CHRIST Himself, for the unity of the two natures in one person. Then if the priest do offer the Sacrament, he doth offer indeed CHRIST Himself." And again [Ibid p. 17.], "Transubstantiation is the very foundation, whereon all their erroneous doctrine doth stand."

How then did those who revised our Liturgy separate the true doctrine from the false? The doctrine of Purgatory was entirely connected with the private masses, i. e. such as the priest celebrated alone, when there was the sacrifice, but no communion; for these, as being said especially for the deceased, were more costly, and it was profitable to multiply them. ["These monstrous things (that the Mass is a sacrifice for the remission of sins, and that it is applied by the priest to them for whom he saith or singeth, &c.) were never seen or known of the old and primitive Church, nor was there not then in one church many masses every day; but there were then no daily private masses, where every priest received alone, like as until this day there is none in the Greek churches but one common-mass in a day. Nor the holy fathers of the old Church would not have suffered such ungodly and wicked abuses of the Lord's Supper. But these private masses sprung up of late years, partly through the ignorance and superstition of unlearned monks and friars, which knew not what a sacrifice was, but made of the mass a sacrifice propitiatory, to remit both sin and the pain due for the same; but chiefly they spring of lucre and gain, when priests found the means to sell masses to the people; which caused masses so to increase, that every day was sold an infinite number," &c.--Cranmer, Defence of the Catholic Doctrine, &c. b. 5. c. 16.] These our Church laid aside, as contrary to primitive practice; and therewith a main blow was struck at the belief that the sacrifice of the Eucharist benefited souls in purgatory; for the rite, with which this error was associated, was gone. Transubstantiation (as is well known) was not expressed or implied in any of the Liturgies used anywhere in the Church, down to this very period; on the contrary, the very Church of Rome preserved, as a witness against her, her ancient Liturgy in this respect uncorrupted. The Canon of the Mass, or the ancient, peculiar service of the Communion, is, as is well known, thus far wholly pure and catholic, although some other prayers, incidentally blended with it, are not always so.

The revisers of our Liturgy, however, anxious to remove all occasion of stumbling, in the very first instance went further than this. They dropped all which spoke of any benefit of this commemorative sacrifice; they retained the act, as a duty, but omitted all mention of its privileges. Again, they retained the practice of the Church Universal, to "commend to the mercy of GOD all His servants which are departed hence from us, with the sign of faith, and now do rest in the sleep of peace;" but they transposed this prayer, placing it before the oblation, perhaps for fear that it should give any countenance to the Romish error, "that CHRIST was offered for the quick and dead;" and they confined the verbal act of the sacrifice to the single prayer which followed after the consecration. Then also they introduced the mention of another sacrifice, comprehended in that sacrifice, as the "sacrifice of ourselves, our souls and bodies,"--not to lower the

character of that commemorative sacrifice, but still to remove men's wrong conceptions of it, as if the sacrifice were something quite independent of the faith and devotion of those who offered it, in like way as the communication of the Body and Blood of our LORD is indeed independent of any intention of the priest.

The form of words which accompanied the oblation, was as follows. After the prayer "for the whole state of Christ's Church," there followed a prayer as well of consecration as of oblation, of which part was subsequently omitted, part retained as the prayer of the consecration, part placed after the actual communion. The prayer began, "O GOD, heavenly Father, which of Thy tender mercy," &c. to "His coming again," hear us, "O merciful Father, we beseech Thee, and with Thy Holy Spirit and Word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these Thy gifts, and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of Thy most Dearly Beloved SON, JESUS CHRIST, who in the same night," &c. to "in remembrance of Me." "Wherefore, O LORD, and heavenly Father, according to the institution of Thy Dearly Beloved SON, our Saviour JESUS CHRIST, we Thy humble servants do celebrate, and make here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, the memorial which Thy SON hath willed us to make; having in remembrance His blessed Passion, mighty Resurrection, and glorious Ascension, rendering unto Thee most hearty thanks, for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same, entirely desiring Thy fatherly goodness, mercifully to accept this our Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," &c. to "sacrifice unto Thee;" "humbly beseeching Thee, that whosoever shall be partakers of this holy Communion, may worthily receive the most precious Body and Blood of Thy Son JESUS CHRIST, and be filled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction, and made one body with Thy Son JESUS CHRIST, that He may dwell in them and they in Him. And although we be unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto Thee any sacrifice; yet we beseech Thee to accept this our bounden duty and service, and command these our prayers and supplications by the ministry of Thy holy Angels to be brought up into Thy holy Tabernacle before the sight of Thy Divine Majesty; not weighing our merits, but," &c.

In the subsequent part of the service, as an additional safeguard, is added (in a brief address now omitted,) a Confession, which bears the character of antiquity. "CHRIST our Paschal Lamb is offered up for us, once for all, when He bare our sins on His Body upon the Cross, for He is the only LAMB of GOD, that taketh away the sins of the world; wherefore, let us keep a joyful feast with the LORD."

The remainder of the Service differed not from our present; save that possibly the doctrine of the connection of the actual participation of our LORD in the Communion, with the reception of the Holy Elements, was more distinctly enounced in the prayer, "We do not presume," &c.--in that they prayed that they might "drink His blood in these holy Mysteries;" and again, in the thanksgiving after the Communion (now in consequence of these changes universally omitted,) in like manner, "for that Thou hast vouchsafed to feed us [in these holy Mysteries] with the spiritual food," &c. "and hast assured us [duly receiving the same] of Thy favour and goodness towards us," instead of "for that Thou dost vouchsafe to feed us, which have duly received these holy Mysteries, with," &c.

Such was the modified form in which the doctrine was expressed; so that one should rather question whether the revisers had not already gone further than they need, and if so, further than they ought, in altering the ancient liturgy of the Church. For, of course, it would be a maxim that, especially in high doctrines, which we do but dimly see, as little change should be made as possible, lest we inadvertently part with that, whose value we do not at the time appreciate. The false doctrine was that ordinary persuasion that "in the Mass, the Priest did offer CHRIST for the quick and dead." The danger to be apprehended, lest it should interfere with "that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction made by

the one oblation of CHRIST upon the cross, for all the sins of the whole world." Of this, in the revised liturgy, there was not the remotest trace. It would be difficult to imagine what ground of exception could be taken against what remained, unless one had known whence those exceptions came. There is not the slightest intimation that the English Church dreaded any practical evils from the revised form,--as indeed how should they, when every expression which could, in the remotest way, favour the Romish corruption, was removed? On the contrary, the Act which enforced it "gave offence (only) we are told, [Heylyn, Hist of the Ref. p. 66.] to the Romish party; not that "they could except against it, in regard either of the manner or matter of (which they acknowledged to be consonant to the ancient forms,) but because it was communicated to the people in the "Vulgar Tongue." The general feelings of the Lay portion of the Church might, in those days, be tolerably estimated by those expressed in the two Houses of Parliament; and these [ap. Strype, Eccl. Mem. of Edw. 6, b. 1. c. 11. p. 86. fol.] "gave to the king most hearty and lowly thanks for it, and for his godly travail, in collecting and gathering together the said Archbishop, Bishops, and learned men, and for the godly prayers, orders, rites and ceremonies in the said book; and considered the honour of GOD, and the great goodness which, by the grace of GOD, would ensue upon it; and finally, concluded the book such, that it would give occasion to every honest man most willingly to embrace it." It was also not only confirmed by the two Houses, but "the more material points were disputed and debated in the Convocation, by men of both parties, and might further have been discussed, so long as any Popish Divine had anything reasonably to say." [Dr. G. Abbot against Hill, p. 104. ap. Strype, ib. p. 87. "The religion--drawn out of the fountains of the word of GOD, and from the purest oracles of the primitive Church, was, for the ordinary exercise thereof, collected into the book of Common Prayer, by the pains and labour of many learned men, and of mature judgment." Id. Ib.]

Indeed, persons of the most different views agree in praising the wonderful wisdom of these first revisers of our Common Prayer Book; and, at the time, it was unhesitatingly affirmed to have been done "by aid of the Holy Ghost;" without Whom so blessed a work could not have been accomplished. There seems, then, to have been good hope that all the Romanist Laity would have continued to conform to it, inasmuch as in the Upper House only four of the Laity protested against it. [Strype, ib. p. 86.]

This hope, however, of retaining the Romanist Laity within our Communion, was soon dissipated. The feelings of the Church do not appear to have been altered. When some Bishops had been induced, by the representations of Calvin and the rest, to open the question about the "words used at the giving of the elements, and the different manner of administering the holy sacrament," the lower House of Convocation, to whom the matter was proposed, put off the question until the succeeding session, nor does it appear that they ever acceded to the plan. [Heylyn, p. 107.]

The objections came entirely from without. When this, our genuine English Liturgy, was framed, one foreign reformer only, of any note, (P. Martyr) had arrived in England; Æ Lasco, whose influence was subsequently most pernicious, and Bucer, came not until the Liturgy was completed. But the kindness wherewith England has made itself the refuge of the oppressed, was in this case also abused. Immediately after the completion of the Liturgy, we find the poor Archbishop unhappily surrounded by foreigners, who had in their own countries rejected Episcopacy, some, the doctrines of the Sacraments also, and left their own countries because they went beyond the foreign reformation. Others were generally unsound.

Of these, the highly-gifted B. Ochinus died an apostate to a low Socinianism; a Lasco, a Polish emigrant nobleman, carried even further than their author, the anti-sacramental doctrines of Calvin. [See Scriptural views of Holy Baptism (Tracts) Note M. p. 245 seq. The following account is from Strype, principally his

"Cranmer," b. 2, c. 22.] Yet he was highly trusted by Cranmer, was, although a Preacher only, invested with a sort of Episcopal authority over the several congregations of foreigners, Germans, Italians, and French, and perhaps Spanish, settled in or near London; and so much wealth was, out of a dissolved Church, settled upon him, that he was enabled to become a patron to all foreigners who should resort thither. [He had become a preacher to a Protestant congregation at Embden, Strype, 1. c.] His having fled from his own country, his position in London, reputation for learning, and strictness of life, gave him considerable influence; and in those unsettled days, the existence of a regular form of doctrine, worship, and government different from that of the Church, was calculated in unstable minds to produce a like desire of novelty. A Lasco himself was of an active, meddling temper; he took upon himself to interfere in the question of episcopal habits, (which was indeed a question between the spirit of the English Church and Geneva,) and from the Arians in his own country also, ultimately from Geneva, had brought in the custom of sitting at the Holy Eucharist, and the antipathy to the scriptural and primitive name of "Altar." [It is characteristic that Peter Martyr, although he accepted a Canonry in our Church, boasts that he never would wear the surplice. Epist. ej. ap. Heylyn, p. 92.]

With these and the like men Cranmer was surrounded; and paid much deference to them, as a man of no decision is wont to do to those who are bent upon carrying a point. It was probably a fruit of this influence, that there came out from the Council in 1550 an ill-omened letter, signed by seven laymen, but by one Bishop only (Ely) besides the Archbishop, commanding the altars to be taken down, and tables to be placed in their room. [A Swiss Reformer, resident at Oxford, informed Bullinger, in Nov. 1548, that Cranmer had been brought to sounder views of the Lord's Supper by John Æ Lasco!" Jenkyns's pref. to Cranmer's Works, p. lxxix.] Some of the reasons assigned [Heylyn, p. 96, 97.] are the more remarkable, in that the good ground of Christian antiquity was necessarily abandoned, and arguments are drawn from the partial silence of Holy Scripture; in that "it is not to be found that any of the Apostles did ever use an altar in the ministration;"--the selfsame argument by which the name of the Blessed "Trinity" is proscribed by the Socinian, and the blessing of Infant-baptism by the Anabaptist. It was forgotten that as little is it said that they ever used a table; that in the first three centuries the name "table" but once occurs, that of altar, as sanctioned by Holy Scripture, is the ordinary title. [Johnson, Unbloody Sacrifice, p. 308.] The edict, however, was executed;" the people flew upon the spoil," jewels, hangings, plate, candlesticks, were transferred from the temple of GOD to the houses, tables, or persons of the rich; and sacrilege was an ill augury of what should follow.

The change in doctrine was now actually introduced, and recommended by the authority of Bishop Hooper, who had unhappily, during Henry VIII's reign, taken refuge in Zurich, and become acquainted with Bullinger a friend of Zuingli. [Heylyn, p. 90. The interest which Calvin took in Hooper's success, is instructive. During the demur about the "habits," Calvin wrote to the Protector "to give him a helping hand." Ep. Calv. ap. Heylyn, p. 91] Of the change itself, the less need be said, since the whole doctrine of the Eucharist was then altered. The service indeed was rendered inconsistent; for some of the antient doctrine was retained, although all the alterations went one way, to introduce the Zuinglian view of a simple commemoration for the Catholic doctrine of actual communion. It suffices to characterize and condemn this change, that words, some whereof were ever used by the whole Church, "The Body of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life," were expunged, and instead thereof was invented and substituted the mere exhortation, "Take and eat this, in remembrance," &c.

But it is instructive to observe how this change of doctrine affected (as it must) the value felt for the Holy Eucharist, as appears incidentally in the two liturgies of Edward VI. In the first, we find it said,

"In Cathedral churches or other places, where there is daily Communion, it shall be sufficient to read this exhortation, once in a month. And in parish churches, upon the week-days, it may be left unsaid. And if, upon the Sunday or holy day, the people be negligent to come to the Communion, then shall the Priest earnestly exhort his parishioners, to dispose themselves to the receiving of the holy Communion more diligently."

And, "If in the sermon or homily, the people be not exhorted to the worthy receiving of the holy Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Saviour CHRIST; then shall the curate give this exhortation to those that be minded to receive the same, "Dearly beloved in the Lord, ye that mind, &c." and

"When the holy Communion is celebrated on the week-day, then may be omitted the Gloria in excelsis, the creed, the homily, [The Communion was then thought of more moment than the sermon.] and the exhortation."

Another regulation implied that it might very probably be celebrated every Wednesday and Friday, and other days; and it is provided that "the priest on the week-day shall forbear to celebrate the Communion, except he have some that will communicate with him;" and provision was made (as far as might be) "that the Minister, having always some to communicate with him, may accordingly celebrate so high and holy Mysteries with all the suffrages and due order appointed for the same."

In the second book, all these notices and this urgent desire of frequent Communion disappear; we find only, "there shall follow this exhortation at certain times, when the curate shall see the people negligent to come to the holy Communion" [the 2d exhortation, now in use, only altered].

Daily communion was altogether dropped; it is implied only that there may be communion on holy days; and that in Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, there should be weekly communion; but, on the other hand, it is provided that "there shall be no celebration of the Lord's supper," not as before, "unless there be some," but "except there be a good number to communicate with the priest, according to his discretion," (a regulation for which now has been substituted, "a convenient number,") as also another still retained, "if there be not above twenty persons in the parish of discretion to receive the Communion; yet there shall be no Communion, except four (or three at the least) communicate with the priest." They were more anxious to rescue the priest from communicating with a few, than the flock from rare communions or losing them well-nigh altogether.

And thus the devout (as is ever the case in these changes) were sacrificed to the undevout; and we have followed out this reformation, thus brought about through the agency of foreign reformers, and have brought down our celebrations of the Communion from weekly to monthly, or quarterly, or three times in the year; (whereby those of our people who can receive it oftenest, receive it only so often as our Church, even in those bad times, thought necessary, at the very least, to retain the spiritual health of any member of CHRIST'S body, and the most cannot receive it even on all these rare occasions;) and we have dropped the Communions of Holy Days, and should oftentimes not think it worth while to administer it (in church) to three or four communicants, and have lost (for the most part) the very sense and feeling, that more frequent communion would be a blessing. It makes, in truth, a man's "eyes gush out with water," to see in these notices, how the glory of our church, the days of her youth, and her first love are departed: and to think what she might have been, had she stood in the old paths. "The virgin daughter of my people

is broken with a great breach, with a very grievous blow."

On the accession of Q. Elizabeth, the worst alteration, that of the words used at the delivery of the holy elements, was modified, so as to restore the old doctrine of a real Communion, for those who were willing to receive it; and with regard to her doctrine of the Sacrifice, the restoration of the Communion table to the place which the altar had formerly occupied, shewed that the Church recognized the doctrine, which some of her heads had before shrunk from avowing in the presence of the foreign reformers, and their disciples.

These restorations were, however, inadequate to replace men's minds in their former state; the confession of the true doctrine had been once half suppressed, and was now not more than half avowed: and it seems annexed as a penalty to all unfaithfulness in guarding the deposit committed to us, that we cannot replace things as they were. The snow which descends from Heaven, cannot, if once polluted, recover its former purity. The purity which God gave, He can restore; yet He does not so to any Church, for any half-efforts, nor unless it be "zealous and repent." (Rev. iii. 19.)

Men's minds also had received a severe shock through the profanations which had been carried on in the name of this second reformation; in taking away the tares, they had uprooted the wheat also; in endeavouring, with a rude hand, to eradicate Romish misbelief, they went hard to introduce unbelief; they had effectually effaced the association between the altar and the Romish sacrifice, but they had loosened men's reverence altogether. "When their table was constituted, (was the well-merited mockery of a Romanist divine) they could never be contented with placing the same, now East, now North; now one way, now another: until it pleased GOD of His goodness to place it quite out of the Church:" "this difference and diversity, (says Heylyn very truly) "although in circumstance only, might draw contempt upon the Sacrament itself, and give great scandal unto many moderate and well-meaning men." [White, Bp. of Lincoln ap.

Heylyn, p. 107. Heylyn quotes other mockery, which is very instructive as to the mischief which was done by these vacillations: "The like did Western (Prolocutor of Convocation, 1 Queen Mary) in a disputation held with Latimer, telling him, with reproach and contempt enough, that the Protestants having turned their table, were like a company of apes, that knew not which way to turn their tails; looking one day East, and another day West; one this way, and another that way, as their fancies led them.

Thus, finally, one Miles Hubbard, in a book called 'The Display of Protestants,' doth report the business, 'How long were they learning to set their tables to minister the Communion upon? First, they placed it aloft, where the High Altar stood; then must it be removed from the wall, that one might go between; the ministers being in contention, whither part to turn their faces, either toward the West, the North, or South; some would stand Westward, some Northward, some Southward.'"] Then followed the scenes of plunder, each labouring to outdo the other; the king issuing a Commission to restrain the "plundering of the Churches," and to recover what had been stolen, in order--to appropriate it to himself; and this Commission, with all intended expedition, was left behind in the race of sacrilege, and powerful private plunderers, or secret thieves, had got much of the treasure into their own hands, and could not be discovered, or would not disgorge it: "Insomuch that many private men's parlours were hung with altar cloths; their tables and beds covered with copes instead of carpets and coverlids; and many made carousing cups of the sacred chalices, as once Belshazzar celebrated his drunken feast in the sanctified vessels of the temple.

It was a sorry house, and not worth the naming, which had not somewhat of this furniture in it, though it were only a fair large cushion made of a cope or altar cloth, to adorn their windows, or make their chairs appear to have somewhat in them of a chair of state. Yet how contemptible were these trappings in comparison of those vast sums of money, which were made of jewels, plate, and cloth of tyssue, either conveyed beyond the seas, or sold at home, and good lands purchased with the money; nothing the more blessed to the posterity of them that bought them, for being purchased with the consecrated treasures of so many temples."--"Thou that abhorrest idols, dost THOU commit sacrilege?" [Heylyn, p. 134.]

One would gladly have turned from these sickening scenes, whereby and by the like, religion was, for the time, made "a gainful occupation," (1 Tim. vi. 5) and GOD'S holy name was blasphemed; bad men supplanting one another, and Bishops scarcely lifting up one warning voice against the sacrilege, but submitting to enforce it; (so that the days of Q. Mary come as a relief, wherein those of our reformation suffered, not sinned) but that through the profaneness which these acts entailed, they must have had much effect in changing religious doctrine, and preventing its restoration. [Ridley, although we have no doubt unwillingly, as Bishop of London, enforced the mandate addressed to him, for pulling down the altars, which was accompanied with so much profaneness and sacrilege. (Heylyn, p. 90, seq.) Day, Bp. of Chichester, was deposed for not pulling down the altars in his diocese. (Strype, Cranmer, b. 2, c. 20.) A specimen of what then passed in men's minds is the report of the times (whether true or mistaken, matters not) "what Cheke told him (P. Martyr) did not a little refresh him, viz. That if they themselves (the Revisers of the Liturgy) would not change what ought to be changed, the king would do it himself; and when they came to a Parliament, the king would interpose His Majesty's own authority." Strype, Cranmer, b. 2, c. 18.]

[Ridley (it appears from his Life, p. 325) issued an injunction for the setting up of Tables in the Churches throughout his Diocese, and taking down of Altars, before the order in council, and probably obtained that order in consequence of the "great opposition and censure" this injunction met with, as "contrary to the present order of Common Prayer, and the King's proceedings." It is stated also in the "Letter from the Council," (as far as this may be taken as any authority, and not rather as asserting what they wished,) that "the Altars within the more part of the Churches were" already "taken down." It appears too that Ridley, though using the common-place ultra-Protestant statements, persuaded himself that he was acting in conformity to "primitive practice." He argued that "Christ instituted His last Supper at a Table and not upon an Altar. Nor did either the Apostles or the Primitive Church, as we read of, ever use an Altar in the Ministration of the Communion. Therefore a Table, as more agreeing with Christ's institution and primitive practice, is rather to be used than an Altar." The fact stated is indeed wholly untrue, arising, as it appears, from the confusion of the titles *quasiasthrion* and *bwmoV*. (See Mede and Johnson, &c.) On which ground the Archbishop of Canterbury and Bishop of Ely "urged against Day, Bishop of Chichester, before the Council," (when he refused to comply with its order,) "that 'twas clear by Origen against Celsus, that the Christians had no Altars when this Father lived." Though "they owned at the same time that the Lord's Table was called an Altar by ancient writers." (Collier.) Origen, and other early Christians, allowed that they had no Altars whereon to offer bloody Sacrifices, as the Jews and Heathens; but continually, and indeed uniformly, spoke among themselves of their having an Altar and a Sacrifice, as the Archbishop of Canterbury and Bishop of Ely admitted. It may be recollected also, in excuse, that the Catholic doctrine of the "Communion" was obscured, or nearly effaced, by the corrupt practice of Masses without Communion, and Ridley may have thought the Altars, as they then existed, were an impediment to its restoration, and hoped that the new "God's board" might also be considered as an "Altar," (though not in the Romish sense,) as, in the true Catholic view, the Altar is also the Table of the Lord. By taking an active part, however, with the more violent, though smaller, ultra-Protestant party, Ridley unhappily gave much

occasion for immediate profaneness, and for the ultimate suspension of doctrine, which he still held. So narrow is the path of Catholic Truth, and so much danger is there in disturbing any truth, which men hold, or the way in which they hold it, or any rites or forms, in connection wherewith it has been handed down, as also in using such a wayward and ungoverned instrument as popular feeling, in things holy.]

After these scenes of rapid legislation and confusion, decree following decree, spoliation upon spoliation, liturgy upon liturgy, (men's minds unsettled by the frequent changes, by the consultations with men of a different reformation, and by the state's violent interference and lawless deeds) a large body of our clergy fled abroad, mistrusted by the Lutherans on account of their consultations with Lasco, and settling in the birth-place of the unsoundest part of the reformation, Zurich, Geneva, and other cities connected with them.

Here such as were left (Ridley, the great upholder of Catholic truth, having received his martyr's crown) divided into two parties; only, as is ordinarily the case, evil principles are more rapidly developed than good, and so we find what was subsequently the Puritan party most developed, and engaged in turbulent, ambitious, schismatic measures. They also had the Zuingli-Calvinist reformation close at hand, to which they joined themselves without scruple, and so they were already arrived at the first stage of that Reformation, opposed to the Church, but not as yet opposed to the Scriptures; the other was gradually recovering from the influences, under which it had been brought during the reign of Edward VI; but we find this difference, that, while the principles of the Puritans or Nonconformists were already developed, that of the genius of the English Church did not unfold itself altogether, until some years afterwards, in the seventeenth century, and then was again cast out. At the accession of Queen Elizabeth, they either did not see their way clearly (as was natural) or "the sons of Zeruah were too hard for them;" the body of the English Church, not having been infected with foreign notions, was yet sound, and desired no foreign inventions; but when an innovating party is decided, and the sound party engaged on the defensive only, the innovators will ever have the advantage, and the quiet body of the Church is sacrificed. Concessions, involving the sacrifice of principle, are made, if only to avoid the imputation of obstinacy or stiffness in refusing. As an instance, some idea there was of restoring (as the Queen herself wished) the genuine English service book (Edward VI's first book): how this was prevented, we know not; the Church generally desired it: perhaps the hope of conciliating those who afterwards overturned our Church and nation, prevailed; mediating measures were adopted; and the Church lost the distinct and tranquil enunciation of doctrine, which was the best and only antidote to further evil.

The amalgamating measures of Queen Elizabeth's divines produced just their natural effect, viz. an amalgamation of doctrine; of which, however, unhappily, the lower doctrine naturally dragged down the higher (since men will always in the end subside into the lower of two views proposed to them), and was, from its own nature, the more conspicuous.

Should this sketch to any appear distressing, let him rather contemplate the immense fermentation, which was likely to arise in the endeavour to separate off the impurities of the Church of Rome; the influence which, in any such troubled times, bad men and bad passions must naturally obtain; and instead of wondering that the lees did not settle down until the next century, rather let him thank GOD (and he has abundant reason to thank Him) that, while He allowed them to float up and down in the vast ferment, He did not yet permit them to spoil the "good wine," but has "kept it until now." Even our Articles, as well as our Liturgy and Catechism (blessed be His Holy Name), were preserved free from the errors into which the foreign Reformers fell, and expressed the truth fully on all points necessary to salvation, and, in the case in question, though maimed, and not with the simple unreservedness of primitive days, still, sufficiently to

preserve the agreement with the primitive Church. Besides, she not only did not exclude, but directed her true sons to, the teaching of the Church Catholic; she did not form a system of faith, which should exclude whatever lay beyond it, but only secured (as far as she could) certain prominent points, on which error had existed. But these, as a particular church, she laid down only in dependence upon, and subordination to, not to supersede the Church Catholic.

Cranmer himself shared, in a great degree, the difficulty which men of those days must have had, in arriving at any definite or ascertained results at all: one who has been even compelled to part with a portion of his belief, has shaken the hold of the remainder: and even though the needle should be endued with a power, not its own, to fix at last on the centre where it should rest, yet, should it have been necessary once violently to shake it, it will not be until after much vehement vibration to the right and to the left, that it will at last tremblingly fix itself.

It is not in the midst of conflict, while men are struggling for their footing and for life, that we are to expect a calm survey of the nature of the ground whereon they stand. All the Reformers (as was to be expected) vacillated, English and foreign (save, perhaps, Ridley, who was most imbued with the doctrines of the early Church, and had therein a firm resting place); and they who ventured to systematize most, as Calvin, went most astray; others, as Luther, in whatever proportion they did so.

Their province was, to clear the building of its untempered mortar; it was to be the task of others to point the edges, which, in this rough handling, were of necessity injured, and to restore the fair harmony and finish of the goodly building. It is difficult, at any time, to oppose even an error broadly, without impairing some neighbouring truth out of which it was corrupted, or to which it is akin; this has been miserably evidenced again and again in individual controversy with heretics; the insulated defender of truth against heresy, himself steps on the other side beyond the Catholic verities, and becomes a heretic: every error, almost, in these latter divided times, is the depository of some kindred truth, and rough censures of what is untrue fail not to include what is true also; thus, in refuting men who depreciated the ordained sacraments, men, in their turn, came to depreciate or deny unquestionable (although mis-stated) Divine agency, and explain GOD'S miraculous workings in the conversion of a single soul, or the refreshing of His Church, by mere secondary causes: on the other hand, in correcting false notions of the Sacraments, they lost the true; in refuting Transsubstantiation, they fell short of the truth of the real mystical, spiritual presence of CHRIST in the Eucharist; the mind, intent upon the one side of removing injurious error, misses or forgets to establish, or does not discriminate, the positive truth.

The Divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries had different offices; in the sixteenth, we are to look for strong broad statements of truths, which had been obscured by Popery, but often without the modifications which they require and receive from other portions of the Gospel; in the seventeenth, we have the calmer, deeper statements of men, to whom God had given peace from the first conflict, yet suffered not their arms to rust, having "left" certain of "the nations to prove Israel by them, even as many of Israel as had not known the wars of Canaan" (Judges iii. 1).

Yet their office was to maintain, not to win, and so was a calmer duty; and they, however exercised by troubles, still breathed freely amid the "arva serena," which their fathers had won with their own blood. They had not to rise and take possession of the land, while

"blood and fire ran in mingled stream," [Christian Year.]

but "to keep the watch of the LORD by His holy temple and by the altar, every man with his weapon in his hand." (2 Chron. xxiii.) There is then no occasion to institute any comparison between the relative value of these several "vessels meet for the Master's use" in the House of GOD; between those who here first laboured, and those who, when these were at rest, entered into their labours. Each had their several offices, and were severally qualified for them; and they only risk disparaging the Reformers of the sixteenth century who would look to them for that which was not their office, viz. a well-proportioned and equable exhibition of the several parts of the Catholic faith, which was, in the appointed order of things, rather reserved for the seventeenth.

It was, then, natural that Cranmer should vacillate, and that, the more as to the doctrine of the Eucharist, since he had arrived at the Catholic views, through the aid of Ridley, and contrary perhaps to his own bias. We blame him then not for this, rather should one abstain from rudely blaming those, who vacillated most, and even for a while, or altogether, returned to Rome. It was not necessarily for interest that men so vacillated; the excesses of many foreign Protestants must needs have startled many of the gentler sort, who yet wished to be freed from the grosser corruptions of Rome, as they do at this day: and if Cranmer, pledged as he was, could recant, and retracted not, while there was yet hope, one need not impute worse motives than undue fear of man to others. GOD, for His own name's sake, rescued His servant Cranmer, and gave him the crown of martyrdom; Jewel's recantation was blotted out only by bitter tears, and a life of fasting and humiliation: why then ascribe sordid motives to others, who, halting between two opinions, were dissatisfied perhaps both with the corruptions of Rome and those of the Reformation under Edward VI., and so took part with neither, but held a middle course, leaning first on the one side, then on the other? Such persons are not to be hastily blamed: unless indeed they put themselves in the office of leaders of the LORD'S host, for which they are not fitted; to the people, it was wont to be proclaimed in the wars of the Lord, "What man is fearful and faint hearted? let him go and return unto his house!" (Deut. xx. 8.) Stirring times must be times of fear.

What, however, is to be blamed in Cranmer, is that one, from his own yieldingness unfitted for the task, should have undertaken so mighty a work as that of uniting the discordant elements of Protestantism in one Episcopal body. A splendid conception truly; but not to be encompassed by such an instrument! No great principles put forward; private and discordant opinions not repressed by an appeal to the agreement of Catholic antiquity, which had been the Anglican touchstone in Romish controversy; the peculiar advantages of the Anglican reformation abandoned; and instead thereof, a mere attempt at comprehension by the use of vague and indistinct terms, "which might be taken in a larger acceptation," but which, as Melanchthon saw, were but a source of increased contention to posterity. [Cranmer wished to unite the reformations of England, Germany, France, Geneva, and Zurich, i. e. the Fathers, Luther, Beza, Calvin, and Zuingli, in one.

Melanchthon approved Cranmer's plan generally, "to publish a true and clear confession of the whole body of Christian doctrine, according to the judgment of learned men, whose names should be subscribed thereto. He thought this confession should be much of the nature of their confession at Augsburg; only that some few points in controversy might be in plainer words delivered, than was in that" (Ep. 66. L. 1. ap. Strype Cranmer, b 3. c. 24). This last admission is the more remarkable, in that it was the policy of his followers in Germany to render that Confession more ambiguous, so that it might comprehend persons yet more at variance with one another, instead of guiding them in one way.

They went on, veiling differences of opinion under ambiguity of expression, until it proved their destruction. As people came to look upon Articles as a test, instead of a guide, they first sacrificed their primary use as

"a confession of faith," and then dreaded their effects, for the very purpose to which they had turned them, and wished to relax them and make them more indefinite (thus destroying their use in teaching), for fear that, as tests, they should be too restricted.

P. Martyr agreed with Melanchthon, but on the opposite, the Zuinglian, side; so that here, for this plan of union, there were already two opposed parties, wishing their own views to be fully and precisely expressed. This was impossible; but Bucer and Cranmer took a line equally impracticable, to conciliate parties by "using more dark and ambiguous forms of speech, that might be taken in a larger acceptance" (Strype, *ib.* p. 408). This was in 1548. Edward VIth's Articles (1552) which seem to have been carried through by the Archbishop in connection with the State, in conjunction perhaps with some selected Commission, but which were never submitted to the Church at large (Strype's Cranmer, 11, 27, 34.

Heylyn, p. 121)--these Articles are a fruit of this policy, and have two faces, one to be presented to those abroad, who could not as yet come up to the high doctrine; the other to be followed out at home, with reference to the teaching of the Church Catholic. Unhappily, but as was natural, they have been too often followed out into Zuinglianism, which they were intended to bring over to the Church. (On this negotiation with Melanchthon and Calvin, see Strype's Cranmer, b. 3, c. 24 and 25.

Of Calvin's strong interference with our reformation, Heylyn speaks, p. 80, 107.)] Cranmer thus aggravated the difficulties of his own waveringness; and entailed upon himself trials, which God had not annexed to his office, fell into a snare and brought the elements of confusion into our Church. As also he began the design, not in unison with the Church, but in concert with foreigners or the state alone, so it seems to have continued it single-handed; the body of the clergy do not appear even to have been consulted about it; the other Commissioners were (although nothing is known certainly) very probably joined in

Source: <https://sermonindex.net/speakers/jh-newman/catena-patrumno-iv-testimony-of-writers-in-the-later-english-church-to-the-eucha/>

Grow in Your Walk with Christ

Listen and read messages that will stir your heart for Christ and point you to deeper repentance and devotion.

- 50,000+ Sermons from speakers past and present
- 3,900+ Classic Christian Books freely readable online
- 1,200+ Bible Translations and Commentaries
- Over 450k forum posts — Join our vibrant online Christian forum

www.sermonindex.net