

Papers of the American Society of Church History

<http://journals.cambridge.org/PCH>

Additional services for ***Papers of the American Society of Church History***:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

The Vicissitudes of the Doctrine of the Lord's Supper in the English Church: A Study in Dogmatic History

James William Richard

Papers of the American Society of Church History / Volume 3 / January 1891,
pp 167 - 182

DOI: 10.1017/S1079902800000322, Published online: 21 September 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S1079902800000322

How to cite this article:

James William Richard (1891). The Vicissitudes of the Doctrine of the Lord's Supper in the English Church: A Study in Dogmatic History. *Papers of the American Society of Church History*, 3, pp 167-182
doi:10.1017/S1079902800000322

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

THE VICISSITUDES OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE
LORD'S SUPPER IN THE ENGLISH CHURCH:
A STUDY IN DOGMATIC HISTORY.

THE VICISSITUDES OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER IN THE ENGLISH CHURCH: A STUDY IN DOGMATIC HISTORY.

BY REV. JAMES WILLIAM RICHARD, D.D.,
Professor of Homiletics, Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.

When in the year 1534 Clement VII. decided against Henry VIII., King of England, in the matter of his divorce with Catharine of Aragon, and the spiritual corporations had resolved that the Roman pontiff had no more authority in the kingdom of England than any other foreign bishop, a royal edict abolished the usurped dominion of the Pope. This edict was succeeded in November of the same year by the Act of Supremacy, which reads as follows: "That the Kyng our Sovereign Lorde his heires and successours Kynges of this Realme shal be takyn accepted and reputed the onely supreme heed in erthe of the Church of England callyd Anglicana Ecclesia." By this act of Parliament the English Church ceased to be popish, but did not cease to be Romish. The worship was that of Mediæval Catholicism, mainly according to the Sarum Use; the theology was that of Thomas Aquinas, in which Henry himself had been well instructed. But the "new learning" had entered the realm. Grocyn and Colet had brought Greek from Italy. Groups of young scholars had gathered round the universities, and were protected and encouraged even by the Primate. Erasmus had taught at Cambridge. Luther's books had been read and proscribed, and proscribed and read. Tyndal's New Testament had "caused a boy that driveth the plough to know more of the Scripture" than many of the mitred ecclesiastics of the day. Cranmer had spent a year and a half in Ger-

many, part of the time in consultation with the Saxon Reformers, and part in the house of Osiander at Nuremberg, at the very time that the latter, with the coöperation of Brentz, was preparing the great Brandenburg-Nuremberg Kirchenordnung, the most influential and widely used Lutheran service of the sixteenth century. Barnes and Fox and Heath spent the winter of 1535-6 in Germany, much of the time at Wittenberg, where Melanchthon and other Wittenbergers, in company with the English envoys, elaborated a "Repetition and Exegesis of the Augsburg Confession," as a basis of the proposed union between Henry VIII. and the German princes. This "Repetition and Exegesis" was carried home by the English envoys in May or June, 1536.¹ The article of the Lord's Supper, as given by Seckendorf,² is as follows: *Constanter credimus et docemus, quod in Sacramento Corporis et Sanguinis Domini, vere, substantialiter et realiter adsint corpus et sanguis Christi, sub speciebus panis et vini, et quod sub iisdem speciebus vere et corporealiter exhibeantur et distribuantur omnibus illis qui sacramentum accipiant.* That is, rendered into old English:

"We constantly believe and teach that in the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, the body and blood of Christ are verily, substantially, and really present under the forms of bread and wine, and under the same forms verily and corporeally are exhibited and distributed to all them which receive the Sacrament."

This "Repetition and Exegesis," being the doctrinal response of the Saxon theologians to the English envoys, was undoubtedly presented by them to their royal master, who at this time was earnestly seeking alliance with the Reformation princes of the continent, and whom the envoys had declared "by the grace of God to be united with the confederated princes and states both in Christian doctrine and in the confession of it."³ On the ninth of June of this same year, and thus very shortly after the return of the en-

¹ The envoys were dismissed by the Prince Elector, April 24, 1536. *Corpus Reformatorum*, iii., p. ix.

² iii., p. III, 112.

³ *Corpus Ref.*, ii., p. 1034. Also Seckendorf, iii., p. 111.

voys,¹ Convocation assembled, and Henry sent forth "Articles devised by the Kinges Highnes Majestie, to stablysh Christen Quietness and Unitie Amonge us, and to avoyde contentious opinions, which Articles be also approved by the Consent and Determination of the hole Clergie of this Realme." These are the famous Ten Articles, the first doctrinal standard of the English Church. Burnet, Froude, and Green declare that Henry is the author of these Articles. Hardwick divides the authorship between Convocation and the King. That they are formed in large part on Lutheran models, is shown by even slight examination and comparison. But whether these models were the Augsburg Confession and the Apology, then just translated by Taverner under order of Cromwell, or the "Repetition and Exegesis," elaborated at Wittenberg and "reported at home by the envoys" (Seckendorf, iii., p. 111), cannot now be certainly shown, as only two articles of the latter document are known to be in print. The latter supposition is rendered highly probable by the fact that the "Repetition and Exegesis" had just been brought from Wittenberg, and by the close correspondence of the article on the Lord's Supper, given above, to the fourth of the English Articles, which reads as follows: "As touching the sacrament of the altar, we will that all bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach our people committed by us unto their spiritual charge, that they ought and must constantly believe, that under the form and figure of bread and wine, which we there presently do see and perceive by outward senses, is verily, substantially, and really contained and comprehended the very self-same body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which was born of the Virgin Mary, and suffered upon the cross for our redemption; and that under the same form and figure of bread and wine the very self-same body and blood of Christ is corporeally, really, and in the very substance exhibited, distributed, and received unto and of all them which receive the said sacrament."²

¹ Fox was present in Convocation.

² Lloyd's reprint (1825) of Bertholet's (1536) edition.

Here the "constantly believe" is a literal translation of the *constanter credimus* in the "Repetition and Exegesis." "Under the form and figure of bread and wine," is a literal translation, with very slight expansion, of the *sub speciebus panis et vini* of the "Repetition and Exegesis." The "verily, substantially, and really," correspond even in their order of consecution to the *vere, substantialiter, et realiter* of the Wittenberg document. The clause, "and that under the same form and figure of bread and wine, the very self-same body and blood of Christ is corporeally, really, and in the very substance exhibited, distributed, and received unto and of all them which receive the said sacrament," is a literal translation, with only slight expansion, of the second clause of the "Repetition and Exegesis." At least the correspondence is so marked verbally, and in arrangement of words, and in sentiment, as to make it morally certain that the Wittenberg document was closely followed. Passing lightly by the words "same form and figure of bread and wine," and "corporeally, really," we notice particularly that the word "exhibited," which in old English means, "make a presentation of,"¹ is a transfer in an English form of the Latin *exhibeantur*, which Luther² used again and again to state his doctrine of the *presentation* of the body and blood of Christ to the communicant; which Melancthon used in the Apology in explanation of the tenth article of the Confession, in the *Loci* of the second era, and in the Wittenberg Concord, which was signed by the theologians of Saxony and Upper Germany. It also appears three times in the Saxon Visitation Articles of 1592, and, more than any other word, was used by the Lutheran dogmatists to set forth their doctrine of the Lord's Supper. "Distributed" also is a transfer rather than a translation of the Latin *distribuantur*, which is employed in the Augsburg Confession, and which Taverner and the translator of the "Harmony of the Confessions" render "distributed," but which later translators of the Augustana render "communicated." And the words, "unto and of all them which re-

¹ See Century Dictionary *sub voce*.

² DeWette, iv., p. 216.

ceive the said sacrament," follow, with very slight exception, the *omnibus illis qui sacramentum accipiant*, which have their own antecedents in the *his qui sacramentum accipiunt* of the Apology.

If now we read the English Article in the light of the "Repetition and Exegesis," and in the light of the representations of the King made in Germany by the envoys, and in the light of the statement of Burnet¹ that in all points that were material, except communion under both kinds, worship in a known tongue, and the marriage of clergy, the King "had set up the doctrine of the Augsburg Confession," we will have no difficulty in ascertaining the accredited faith of the English Church at this time touching the doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

The Article must be regarded as a full abandonment of the doctrine of Transubstantiation. (*a*) It does not use the word, nor does it use any word which indicates a change of the substance of the bread and wine. (*b*) In the words, "under the form and figure of bread and wine" we recognize the very phraseology coined by the Lutherans to indicate and affirm the presence of bread and wine in the Supper, for form and figure of bread and wine were not intended to mean form and figure of these substances in the abstract, but form and figure of bread and wine which are known in connection with the substances of bread and wine, or, as Melancthon had put it in the Apology, "the visible things—to wit, bread and wine." And as the English Article itself says: "Which we there presently do see and perceive by the outward senses."

That is, in abandoning the Roman Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation, the English Church in her head and representative members did nevertheless formally accept in her first standard of faith a true, real, and corporeal presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist. The terms used are, in almost every instance, peculiar to the Lutheran faith, and as, on the one hand, they bar out the doctrine of Transubstantiation, so, on the other, do they

¹ *Hist. Ref.*, i., p. 187, Bohn's edition.

exclude the Zwinglian view. A Calvinistic view is not yet known in England.

We pass now to the Bishops' Book, or "The Institution of a Christian Man" (1537), which, however, was never authorized as a standard of faith. But as it was signed by two archbishops, nineteen bishops, eight archdeacons, and seventeen professors of theology and law, it may be held to exhibit the faith of the English Church. The Article of the Lord's Supper is identical with that on the same subject in the Ten Articles. But what is remarkable here is the fact that the name of Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, which is not attached to the Ten Articles, is subscribed to the *Institution*. Perhaps this is accounted for by the fact that the Ten Articles include only *three* sacraments, while the *Institution* embraces *seven*.

But now a reaction comes. The Lutheran theologians had refused to sanction Henry's divorce, and the latter arrests all further negotiations with the confederated princes and their representatives. The commissioners sent over from Germany in the year 1538, in company with three bishops and four doctors nominated by the King, compiled the Thirteen Articles,¹ which were intended to cover the positive doctrines required for a basis of alliance. The seventh article, *De Eucharistia*, is, word for word, identical with the corresponding article in the "Repetition and Exegesis," except that in the second clause it substitutes *realiter* for *corporealiter*, and adds *sive bonis sive malis*, which tends to emphasize the Lutheran doctrine still more distinctly.

But when the German commissioners insist on the abolition of the chief abuses, viz., communion under one kind, the sacrifice of the mass, the celibacy of the clergy, Henry refuses all further negotiations. In August of this year, the German commissioners, just before leaving London, address a very earnest letter to the King, in which they discuss these three points and set forth the Lutheran position. Henry replies just as earnestly in defence of the old Roman

¹ Found in Hardwick, "Hist. of Arts," Appendix ii., and in Cox's "Cranmer," ii., p. 472.

Catholic view.¹ It is manifest from Henry's letter, either that he had never in *reality* abandoned his Thomist views, and had not "joined with the confederated princes and states in Christian doctrine and the confession of it," as represented by the English envoys; or that in his resentment of the refusal to approve his divorce, he returns to the view in which he had been educated. The advocates of the "old learning" have now gained the ascendancy at court, and by the special aid of the King, are able to carry in the Southern Convocation and in Parliament "The Bloody Statute of the Six Articles," "the whip withe sixe stinges," "resolved by the Convocation the old popish way," enacted by Parliament under the title: "An act for abolishing diversities of opinions." The first and second articles as given by Cox in his (Parker Soc.) edition of Cranmer's works (vol. ii., p. 168, n.), read as follows:

I. "That in the sacrament of the altar, after the consecration, there remains no substance of bread and wine, but under these forms the natural body and blood of Christ were present."

II. "That communion in both kinds was not necessary to salvation to all persons by the law of God; but that both the flesh and blood of Christ were together in each of the kinds."

"The Parliament thanked the King for the pains he had taken in these articles, and enacted that if any after the 12th of July did speak, preach, or write against the first article, they were to be judged heretics, and to be burnt without any abjuration, and to forfeit their real and personal estates to the King." (Burnet, i., p. 190.) Burnet further says: "This act was received by all that secretly favored popery with great joy."—p. 191.

Thus the legal and authorized faith of the English Church² on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper is now Transubstantiation, and its logical sequence, the communion under one kind, and such it remains until after Henry's death.

¹ Originals in Burnet, Addenda cxxxviii. *et seq.*

² It is proper to state that Cranmer and other bishops strenuously opposed the passage of "The Bloody Statute," and voted against it in the presence of the King.—Burnet, i., p. 190; and Cox's "Cranmer," ii., p. 168, n.

This doctrine is elaborated in the revision of "The Institution of a Christian Man," which appeared in 1543 under the title: "A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man," commonly called the King's Book. Its article on the Lord's Supper contains the following: "In this most high sacrament of the altar, the creatures which be taken to the use thereof, as bread and wine, do not remain still in their own substance, but by virtue of Christ's word in the consecration be changed and turned to the very substance of the body and blood of our Saviour Jesu Christ. So that although there appear the form of bread and wine, after the consecration, as did before, and to the outward senses nothing seemeth to be changed, yet must we, forsaking and renouncing the persuasion of our senses, in this behalf, give our assent only to faith, and to the plain word of Christ, which affirmeth, that substance there offered, exhibited, and received, to be the very precious body and blood of our Lord, as it is plainly written by the evangelists, and also by St. Paul."¹

Edward VI. came to the throne, January 28, 1547. His uncle, Lord Hertford, whom the late king had placed at the head of the regency, first expelled from the regency all the advocates of the "old learning," and then seized the royal power with the title of Protector. His decidedly Protestant predilections gave Cranmer opportunity to carry into effect his plans of reform. November 22d he procured an act for receiving the sacrament in both kinds, and shortly afterwards obtained an act repealing "The Bloody Statute of the Six Articles." The next year steps were taken for converting the Mass into a Communion. At this time Cranmer is thoroughly Lutheran in his entire theological system. This is clearly proved by his translation of Jonas' Catechism.² Green says: "Cranmer had drifted into a purely Protestant position, and his open break with the older system followed quickly on Hertford's rise to power."³ The Geneva influence had not yet been felt in England.

¹ Lloyd's "Formularies of Faith," pp. 262, 263.

² Brown's "Exposition of XXXIX. Articles," Introduction, p. II.

³ "Hist. English People," p. 364.

The Order of the Communion appeared, March 8, 1548. It must be interpreted in the light of Cranmer's now well-known doctrinal position. The Prayer to be said just before the administration is: "Grant us, therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his blood, in these holy Mysteries, that we may continually dwell in him, and he in us, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body, and our souls washed through his most precious blood," which is followed by this Rubric: "Then shall the Priest rise, . . . and when he doth deliver the sacrament of the body of Christ he shall say to every one these words following:

"The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body unto everlasting life.

"And the Priest, delivering the sacrament of the blood, and giving every one to drink once and no more, shall say:

"The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy soul to everlasting life."¹

All this remains unchanged in The Book of Common Prayer of the next year, except that in the words of administration in each kind, we have: "Preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life."

With these words of administration we may compare some Lutheran formulæ. Those in the great Brandenburg-Nuremberg, which was in course of preparation while Cranmer sojourned in Osiander's house, are: "Take and eat. This is the body of Christ, which was given for thee." "Take and drink. This is the blood of the New Testament, which was shed for thy sins." The Swabian Hall (1543): "The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, preserve thee unto everlasting life." "The blood of our Lord Christ, be a washing away of all thy sins." The Cologne Reformation, which is known to have influenced the English book in various ways, has these words: "Take and eat unto thy salvation the body of Christ, which was given for thee." "Take and drink unto thy salvation the blood of the New Testament, which was shed for thy sins." The correspondence between these Lutheran forms

¹ Liturgies of Edward VI. (Parker Soc. ed.), pp. 7, 8.

and the English is too close to be accounted accidental. Special attention may be called to the words "given for thee," "shed for thee," which do not appear in the Mediæval Mass, but which already in Luther's "Babylonish Captivity of the Church" were held to be the chief thing. Hence reading these English formulæ in the light of these manifest correspondences with the Lutheran formulæ, and by the light of other well-known facts, we can hardly help interpreting them as intended to set forth the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper. And this position is confirmed by the prayer of thanksgiving, which is closely conformed to that in the Brandenburg-Nuremberg liturgy.¹

But now another change takes place. A strong pressure has been exerted from Geneva.² The First Prayer Book had passed into the house of Lords, December 9, 1548, and received the final sanction of the legislature,³ January 15, 1549. But on the 14th of December, 1548, Cranmer, during a public discussion in London, abandoned his former view of the Eucharist.⁴ Henceforth he holds the Calvinistic view. This is clearly shown in the Answer to Bishop Gardiner. In the very Preface to the edition of 1551, he denies the corporeal presence "in the outward visible signs," and declares: "My meaning is that the force, the grace, the virtue and benefit of Christ's body that was crucified for us, and of his blood that was shed for us, be really and effectually present with all them that duly receive the sacrament. But this I understand of his spiritual presence. . . . Nor no more truly is he corporeally or really present in the due ministration of the Lord's Supper, than he is in the due ministration of baptism."⁵

¹ Compare Richard Hilles' letter to Bullinger, March 4th, 1549: "We have an uniform celebration of the Eucharist throughout the whole kingdom, but after the manner of the Nuremberg churches, and some of those of Saxony; for they do not yet feel inclined to adopt your rites respecting the administration of the sacraments."—Original Letters, 1537–1558, p. 266, Parker Society.

² See Original Letters in Parker Society's publications.

³ Burnet, i., 358.

⁴ Schaff, "Creeds," i., 601.

⁵ Cranmer's Works, Preface (Parker Society).

This needs neither explanation nor comment. It reflects clearly the influence of Geneva and Zurich. Hence we need not be surprised to find a changed view of the Lord's Supper in the Second Prayer Book of 1552. The words of administration are so changed as to avoid mention of taking the body and blood of Christ. "When the minister delivers the bread, he shall say :

"Take and eat this, in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith, with thanksgiving."

"And the minister that delivers the cup, shall say :

"Drink this in remembrance that Christ's blood was shed for thee, and be thankful." ¹

English writers and others have regarded this as savoring of a tendency to Zwinglianism, and as "implying that the reformers believed in no real spiritual reception of Christ's body in the Eucharist, but only in a remembrance of His death and passion" ²; which is confirmed by the so-called Black Rubric,³ which is interpreted as aimed alike against the Catholic and the Lutheran view. In explanation of the order to kneel at the communion the rubric says :

"Lest yet the same kneeling might be thought or taken otherwise, we do declare that it is not meant thereby that adoration is done, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread or wine there bodily received, or to any real and essential presence there being of Christ's natural flesh and blood. For as concerning the sacramental bread and wine, they remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored, for that were Idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians. And as concerning the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ, they are in heaven and not here. For it is against the truth of Christ's natural body to be in more places than in one at one time."

And this receives further confirmation from the "Short Catechism" set forth by royal authority the next year (1553) :

¹ Liturgies of Edward VI. (Parker Soc.), p. 279.

² Brown's "Exposition of XXXIX Articles," p. 712.

³ Liturgies of Edward VI. (Parker Soc.), p. 283.

"*Master.* What declareth and betokeneth the Supper unto us, which we solemnly use in the remembrance of the Lord ?

"*Scholar.* The Supper (as I have shown a little before) is a certain thankful remembrance of the death of Christ : forasmuch as the bread representeth his body, betrayed to be crucified for us ; the wine standeth in stead and place of his blood plenteously shed for us. And even as by bread and wine our natural bodies are sustained and nourished : so by the body, that is the flesh and blood of Christ, the soul is fed through faith, and quickened to the heavenly and godly life." ¹

It can hardly be claimed that these statements measure up to the doctrinal standards of Calvinism, as expressed in Calvin's Catechism and in some of his confessional writings.

The same view in general of the Lord's Supper is set forth in the twenty-ninth of the Forty-two Articles of the year 1553. It declares that "the body of Christ cannot be present at one time in many and diverse places," and that "a faithful man ought not either to believe or openly to confess the real and bodily presence (as they term it) of Christ's flesh and blood in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper." ²

Hence a Zwinglian, or at least a weakened Calvinistic view, is the faith of the English Church in the matter of the Lord's Supper at the time of the death of Edward VI.

During the reign of Bloody Mary the Second Prayer Book was superseded, and the Mass was restored. The Forty-two Articles remained uncanceled, but inoperative. When Elizabeth came to the throne the restoration of Protestantism was slowly and cautiously made. The Eleven Articles of Religion "set forth by the order of both archbishops metropolitans and the rest of the bishops for the uniformity of doctrine," mark a transition back towards a position more conservative than that which existed at the time of Edward's death. The seventh article acknowledges the English Book of Common Prayer to be "agreeable to the Scripture and

¹ Liturgies of Edward VI., p. 517.

² Hardwick, "Hist. Arts.," Appendix, III.

catholic and apostolic and most for the advancing of God's glory." The ninth and tenth articles simply reject the Romish view of the Eucharist. But the Third Prayer Book, ordered into use June 24, 1559, combined the words of administration of both the Edwardine books. These formulæ leave the matter in doubt, since they, as well as the prayers, might be strained into a Lutheran meaning. We must fall back upon contemporaneous documents and explanatory writings. The twenty-eighth of the Thirty-nine Articles omits the clause about the location of the body of Christ in heaven. This manifestly points in the direction of a Lutheran conservatism. But the article makes no mention of the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist, and declares: "The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner, and the means whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper, is faith." This, by making *faith* the *means* of reception, gives finally a Calvinistic turn to the article. It also throws light back upon the Prayer Book, and fully justifies the late Dr. Krauth in speaking "of Calvinism in particular changes in the Book of Common Prayer, and, most of all, in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper."¹ All of which is confirmed by the correspondence of Jewel, who was the final reviser of the Thirty-nine Articles. Passing by numerous letters to the other Zurichers, we quote from several written to Peter Martyr. In one, dated April 28, 1559, he says: "We have presented to the Queen all the articles of our religion and doctrine, and not in the smallest point have we differed from the Zurich confession."²

In another, dated November 6, 1560, he writes: "That volatile Ubiquitarian doctrine cannot by any means gain a footing among us." Again, February 7, 1562, he writes: "As to matters of doctrine, we have pared every thing away to the very quick, and do not differ from your doctrine by a nail's breadth; for, as to the Ubiquitarian theory,

¹ "Conservative Reformation," Preface, p. 9.

² Jewel's Works, I, p. 207 (Parker Society edition).

there is no danger in this country.”¹ These uncomplimentary references to the Lutheran doctrine reveal the position of the final reviser of the Thirty-nine Articles, and therefore the meaning of the twenty-eighth article. Moreover, in the Apology, which has almost the authority of a public standard, Jewel says: “We eat him [Christ] by faith, by understanding, by the spirit.” “In celebrating these mysteries, the people are to good purpose exhorted, before they come to receive the holy communion, to lift up their hearts, and to direct their minds to heavenward; because he is there, by whom we must be full, fed, and live.” This clearly enough locates the body of Christ in heaven.

That the whole English Church was now committed to this view of the Supper is further shown by Nowell's Catechism, prepared in 1562, approved by a committee of the Upper House, March 3, 1563, and allowed by Convocation in 1570. It is, therefore, a standard of faith.

“*M.* Sith we be in the earth, and Christ's body in heaven, how can that be that thou sayest?” viz., that believers are partakers of Christ's body and blood in the Sacrament.

“*S.* We must lift our souls and hearts from earth, and raise them up by faith to heaven, where Christ is.

“*M.* Sayest thou then the mean to receive the body and blood of Christ standeth upon faith?

“*S.* Yea. For when we believe that Christ died to deliver us from death, and that he rose again to procure us life, we are partakers of the redemption purchased by his death, and of his life, and all other his good things.”²

Here we bring our study to a close. The Articles and the Liturgy, which were composed and revised contemporaneously, are standards of authority as regards the doctrines of the English Church. Any obscurities which may be found in them must be explained from contemporaneous events, and from the writings of their chief composers and revisers. Following this method of examination and interpretation,

¹ Zurich Letters, 1558-1579, pp. 92, 100; Jewel's Works, Apology, p. 64.

² Parker Society's edition, p. 213.

the conclusion reached is that the English Church finally settled down into the doctrine of a real spiritual presence of Christ in the Supper, and that faith is the instrument by which the communicant is made partaker of the body and blood of Christ, who as to his human nature is located in heaven.

However much this final conclusion may oppose the preferences and prejudices of the writer, it nevertheless seems to be the conclusion required by the facts. In the English Church, as in every other, the expounders of the standards have not always expressed themselves alike. But Bishop Brown thinks "they have agreed, as Hooker says, that 'Christ is *personally* present; albeit a part of Christ be *corporeally* absent'; that 'the fruit of the Eucharist is the participation of the Body and Blood of Christ'—but that 'the real presence of Christ's most blessed Body and Blood is not to be sought for in the Sacrament (*i. e.*, in the elements), but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament,'" which differs from the Lutheran view, with which the English Church began her reformatory career, chiefly in this, that according to that view the *whole* theanthropic Christ is really and truly present in the Sacrament (*in, cum, sub pane et vino*), and is presented "to all them who receive the Sacrament."

Looking back now over what we have written, we find that the English Church passed through the following vicissitudes in her doctrine of the Lord's Supper between the years 1536 and 1571—the latter year being the date of the final revision and correction of the Articles by Convocation: (a) In forsaking Transubstantiation she expressed her faith in the Lutheran conception and in language drawn from Lutheran models. (b) She then returned in the Six Articles to Transubstantiation. (c) Her next change was to the adoption of the Lutheran view, drawing again largely from Lutheran sources, principally from Hermann's "Consultation." (d) Subjected to strong pressure from Geneva and to a somewhat radical Protestant sentiment at home, she changes again, and now expresses herself according to a Zwinglian concep-

¹ Brown's "Exposition of Arts.," p. 715. Hooker's "Eccl. Pol.," v., xlii.

tion, or at least in an attenuated Calvinistic view. (e) Passing by the Marian episode we find her finally settling down to a Calvinistic doctrine of the Lord's Supper, which turns away very far from the Zwinglian view of a bare remembrance, and approximates very closely to the Lutheran doctrine, but which cannot be identified with it, in that, according to the one doctrine the communion takes place in heaven, according to the other the communion takes place here on earth ; according to the one the communion takes place by means of faith, according to the other the communion takes place through the visible elements. They both agree in this, that without faith it is impossible to receive any salutary fruit from the Sacrament.