

**THE ENGLISH LITURGIES OF  
1549 AND 1661 COMPARED  
WITH EACH OTHER AND  
THE ANCIENT LITURGIES**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649229888

The English liturgies of 1549 and 1661 compared with each other and the ancient liturgies by  
John Edward Field

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.  
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

[www.triestepublishing.com](http://www.triestepublishing.com)

**JOHN EDWARD FIELD**

**THE ENGLISH LITURGIES OF  
1549 AND 1661 COMPARED  
WITH EACH OTHER AND  
THE ANCIENT LITURGIES**



THE ENGLISH LITURGIES OF  
1549 AND 1661

THE  
ENGLISH LITURGIES  
OF 1549 AND 1661

COMPARED WITH EACH OTHER AND  
WITH THE ANCIENT LITURGIES

BY  
JOHN EDWARD FIELD, M.A.  
*Vicar of Benson*



LONDON  
SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING  
CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE  
NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

1920

By the Rev. J. E. FIELD, M.A.

---

THE LORD'S PRAYER IN THE SERVICES OF THE CHURCH. 1s. 9d. net.

ST. BERIN, THE APOSTLE OF WESSEX.  
The History, Legends, and Traditions of  
the Beginning of the West-Saxon Church.  
3s. 6d. net.

---

LONDON : S.P.C.K.

45207117✓

## PREFACE

THE liturgy of 1549 was for the most part a genuine attempt to reproduce in an English form the essential features of the ancient Latin service of the Holy Eucharist. It was superseded in 1552 by another in which its various parts were rearranged and its language was considerably altered with a view to giving greater prominence to the reception of Holy Communion by the worshippers, as distinguished from the offering of eucharistic worship; and in all its main features this is the service which we still retain. But on two occasions it was set aside for a few years, first in favour of the Latin Missal during the reign of Mary and afterwards in favour of the Puritan Directory under the Commonwealth; and on each occasion when it was brought back into use, first in 1559 after the accession of Elizabeth and secondly in 1661 after the restoration of Charles II., it underwent revisions in which some of the features of the ancient service were restored.

The purpose of the present treatise is first to compare together the short-lived rite of 1549 and that of 1661 as we now have it; and in order that the force of the alterations may be rightly understood it is necessary to indicate when and how they were introduced in the successive revisions. Besides this, the two rites are examined in relation to the general body of liturgies of the ancient churches, and more especially to the use of Sarum which was the immediate precursor of the rite of 1549 and the principal source from which its substance was derived. But this purpose cannot be adequately carried out without an attempt to trace upward the lines of the general liturgical order which all the churches have handed down, and to connect this with the original Institution of the Holy Eucharist by our Lord Himself as it is recorded in Holy Scripture. For when the various liturgies of antiquity are brought side by side there



appears in the great majority of them a very close correspondence; and where there is any considerable divergence the alterations commonly betray themselves; so that we are able to arrive at a clear view of the primitive form of liturgy which all the churches of Christendom accepted.

This comparison will show that when the services of 1549 and 1661 are judged by the standard that has been described each of them has points of agreement with it which the other lacks, and each has marked points of variation from it, so that it may reasonably be questioned whether either one of the two is distinctly to be preferred to the other. These points will appear in various details of greater or less importance. As prominent examples of such divergence from the normal standard it may be noted beforehand that the service of 1549 is seriously defective in having no verbal oblation of the elements and is greatly disfigured by the intrusion of the confession and absolution between the consecration and the reception of communion; while on the other hand the service of 1661 lacks the very important memorial oblation of the Sacrifice of Christ and is marred by an unfortunate dislocation of the ancient order of its component parts. In further illustration of these points it may be added that both the Scottish and the American churches, in revising the Prayer-book, have made a still larger restoration of ancient features; for the Scottish book is practically that of 1549, retaining indeed the misplaced penitential passage, but in other respects brought into closer conformity with the order of the early liturgies; while the American book is that of 1661, with its several parts still dislocated, but having the memorial oblation restored.

The substance of the two English liturgies remains essentially the same, and any doctrinal significance that may seem to be involved in the changes made at the successive revisions will be found to be merely superficial. That aspect of the subject is therefore passed over in these pages without serious discussion. But it may be well to notice a plausible argument which has been alleged as showing that the doctrine of the commemorative sacrifice embodied in all ancient liturgies is excluded in that of 1549. It has been urged that since Archbishop Cranmer was the chief compiler of this, and since in his published works he avowedly rejects that doctrine, therefore it cannot be the doctrine of the liturgy.<sup>1</sup> The argument is plainly

<sup>1</sup> Gasquet, *Edward VI. and the Book of Common Prayer*, 209.

fallacious; for it is obvious that the meaning of a document is not necessarily to be defined by reference to the private opinions of the compiler. The true test lies in the question of the sense in which the Church of England received this liturgy; and it contains nothing in which those who used it would find any violent break with the general eucharistic teaching of the Latin rite which they had used previously, though they would find some novelties and several omissions.

It may be convenient to add some notes upon the plan which has been adopted in the present work. It has not seemed necessary to indicate the slight verbal differences in the various editions of the book of 1549. Several editions are enumerated and the differences are indicated in the reprint issued by the Parker Society.<sup>2</sup> Nor would any useful purpose be served by following the archaic spelling of the original book. This is therefore modernised as in the above-named reprint and in others that have appeared in recent years. Several attempts have been made to exhibit the liturgies in parallel columns; but as the order of their several parts differs widely, and hence the proportion of blank pages on one side or the other becomes very large, the arrangement can hardly be considered successful in showing the liturgies side by side. Canon Brightman in his monumental work *The English Rite* has adopted an admirable system of reference numbers showing where the parallel passage is to be found. It is hoped that in the present work the purpose will be sufficiently served by merely setting the headings of the various passages in parallel columns.

The notes on the service of 1661 indicate all the details in which the text differs from that of 1549, with the exception of such as are merely verbal (as "we are" for "we be") or are otherwise unimportant. It would be superfluous to insert the text of the liturgy from the present Prayer-book.

The custom of the Prayer-book has been followed in the use of ordinary type for personal pronouns relating to the Deity; and for the sake of consistency the same usage is adopted in translations from the liturgies of other languages. Elsewhere it has been thought best to observe the modern custom of using a capital initial letter for those pronouns.

In translating passages from the Latin it has frequently been found useful to emphasise a detail by giving a bald and strictly

<sup>2</sup> *The Two Liturgies . . . in the Reign of King Edward VI.*, ed. Jos. Ketley, Cambridge, 1844.

literal version instead of following a more euphonious rendering which the English rite may supply.

In the notes in which the two English liturgies are compared with the various ancient rites it may perhaps be felt that a superabundance of detail has been collected and that it would have been sufficient to notice only the more important points. But it has seemed desirable to cover the ground in a more exhaustive survey and to illustrate as far as possible the numerous divergences of form and order in the various liturgies, since they have the effect of throwing out into stronger prominence the essential unity of the universal eucharistic rite.