



PROTESTANTISM
OF THE
PRAYER BOOK.

DYSON HAGUE.

McMASTER UNIVERSITY LIBRARY



3 9005 0300 4018 6

STORAGE



**McMASTER
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY**

THE PROTESTANTISM
OF THE
PRAYER BOOK.

THE PROTESTANTISM
OF THE
PRAYER BOOK

BY
THE REV. DYSON HAGUE, M.A.,
RECTOR OF ST. PAUL'S CHURCH,
HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA.

WITH
A P R E F A C E

BY
THE RIGHT REV. JOHN CHARLES RYLE, D.D.
LORD BISHOP OF LIVERPOOL.

THIRD EDITION, REVISED AND ENLARGED.

"The Church of England since the abolishing of Popery."—CANON XXX.

"I shall freely set forth that which undoubtedly I am persuaded to be the truth of God's Word,—call me a Protestant who will, I care not."—BISHOP RIDLEY.

Church Association,
14, BUCKINGHAM STREET, STRAND, LONDON, W.C.
DRYSDALE & CO., MONTREAL.

LONDON:
G. NORMAN AND SON, PRINTERS, HART STREET,
COVENT GARDEN.

It is surprising to find how many Churchmen are unaware of the true principles of the Church of England, and the true position of the Book of Common Prayer.

They are so accustomed to the fallacy that a Church which professes its belief in the Holy Catholic Church cannot possibly be Protestant, that they generally dismiss the subject without examination.

But the word Protestant is not contradictory to Catholic but to Popish or Romanist, and this work is sent forth in the earnest and confident hope that it will strengthen and confirm all true churchmen in their love for the grand old Catholic and Apostolic Church of England.

I desire here to acknowledge with gratitude my indebtedness to Mr. J. T. Tomlinson, who has, with the greatest kindness, given time and labour to revising the proof sheets, and verifying quotations and authorities.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
PREFACE BY THE BISHOP OF LIVERPOOL 	ix
INTRODUCTORY 	xi
The Protestant Church of England and the anti-Protestant reaction,	
CHAPTER I.—A PRELIMINARY ARGUMENT 	I
The age in which the Prayer Book was compiled, the men who compiled it, and the influences moulding them.	
CHAPTER II.—THREE GENERAL PROTESTANT CHARACTERISTICS 	22
It is Common Prayer; it is in the language of the people; it is scriptural.	
CHAPTER III.—MORNING AND EVENING PRAYER AND LITANY	34
The Protestant features of the Prayers and Rubrics; the noteworthy changes in the Litany.	
CHAPTER IV.—THE COMMUNION SERVICE 	46
Not the Mass, nor the semi-Protestant service of 1549. The Sarum Mass; Pusey's Views.	
CHAPTER V.—THE BAPTISMAL OFFICE 	66
Not Romish; not superstitious. The Roman doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration not taught in the Church of England.	
CHAPTER VI.—THE OCCASIONAL SERVICES 	93
Significant changes in the direction of Protestantism in all these services.	

CHAPTER VII.—THE ABSOLUTION DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND	113
Differences between it and the Roman doctrine.	
CHAPTER VIII.—AURICULAR CONFESSION	127
Not the doctrine of the Church of England: the teaching of the Roman Church.	
CHAPTER IX.—THE ORDINAL	141
The good rule of the Reformers. Vindication of the form "Receive the Holy Ghost."	
CHAPTER X.—RECAPITULATION AND CONCLUSION	161
Our Protestant Prayer Book.	
APPENDIX—THE CANON OF THE MASS	177
THE EASTWARD POSITION	187
THE SO-CALLED ORNAMENTS RUBRIC	201
THE MIXING OF WINE AND WATER	223
DR. PUSEY ON THE "REAL PRESENCE"	226
THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS	231
BISHOP WILBERFORCE AND DR. PUSEY ON PRIVATE CONFESSION	232
APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION	237
INDEX	257

PREFACE.

THE volume entitled "The Protestantism of the Prayer Book," originally published in Canada, requires no recommendation from me. It can afford to stand on its own feet, and to be judged by its own merits. Nevertheless, having been requested by the author to add a few prefatory words to the edition about to be published in England, I have much pleasure in complying with his request.

The volume now in the reader's hands is a brief but exhaustive account of the true principles on which the English Book of Common Prayer was finally compiled, when the Reformation of our Church was completed, and the Second Book of King Edward substituted for the First Book. Those principles were carefully retained in the Prayer Book of Queen Elizabeth's reign and were finally preserved unaltered in the last revision of 1661. Even at that date, immediately after the unhappy Savoy Conference, Archbishop Sheldon and his assistant revisers did not attempt to bring back into our Liturgy the questionable things which found a place in King Edward's First Prayer Book, and

were purposely cast out from King Edward's Second Book. The true principles of the English Prayer Book, whatever some interpreters may please to say, are Protestant and Evangelical, and of this abundant evidence is supplied in this volume.

The ignorance of many English Churchmen in this day about the true principles of their own Church, is something deplorable. Very little is taught about the subject in most public schools, from the highest grade down to the lowest. Very few, it may be feared, have ever read or studied our noble Confession of Faith, the Thirty-nine Articles. The result of this widely-spread ignorance may be seen in the growth of Romish doctrines and ritual within our pale.

The Rev. Dyson Hague's book, which I have much pleasure in recommending, appears to me eminently calculated to lessen the ignorance to which I have referred, if Churchmen will read it. I heartily wish it an extensive circulation.

J. C. LIVERPOOL.

PALACE, LIVERPOOL,

September, 1893.

INTRODUCTORY.

THE title of this work explains its object.

It is to demonstrate the essential Protestantism of the Book of Common Prayer, and to give to loyal Churchmen a series of reasons for their honest attachment to the Church of England. The word Protestant is a term of which no Churchman should be ashamed; and he who sneers at her Protestantism, may well be suspected of disloyalty to the Church. No one can read the history of the Reformation without recognizing the fact that the Church of England is nothing if not Protestant. Not only her Articles, but all the services of the Prayer Book were drawn up by Protestants in the true sense, and intended for the establishment of Protestantism. While we rejoice in the Catholicity of the Church of England, and recognize with gladness the fact that she is a true branch of the one holy Catholic Church, which she herself has defined to be "the blessed company of all faithful people," we also know that her very being is essentially and continuously a living protest against the falsities of Rome, and not only that, but against all forms of error, practical and doctrinal, Unitarian, Socinian, Pelagian, Arian.

The Church of England is Protestant, not merely in that she presents a powerful disclaimer both in her Articles and Liturgy against the perversions of Popery, but Protestant equally in her standing protest against other forms of error, which, by negation or subtraction, have perverted the truth. It is, however, in the former sense, which is the common understanding of the term Popery or Romanism, that is, in the sense of protest against Roman corruptions in doctrine, and

Romish trivialities in ritual, that the word Protestant is mainly employed in this work.

No one can question the Protestantism of the Church in the days of the Reformation, and for the next one hundred and thirty years. To abhor all Popery as sin; to detest the Pope as the incarnation of falsity; to regard with distrust the priests of the Roman Church; to dread, like poison, the name of the Jesuit, were unfailing characteristics of all sound Churchmen.

At certain periods this spirit waxed stronger, and the Church of England was not only Protestant, it was ultra-Protestant.

In the days of the Reformation, and those immediately succeeding, the language of Reformers and representative divines, the statements of authoritative documents, and the common employment of expressive terms, set forth this ultra-Protestantism with the strongest proofs; and Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Hooper, and Jewel, all speak of Rome as the seat of Satan, Babylon, or the whore of Babylon, and the Pope as the Antichrist, or the man of sin. The Homilies on the Peril of Idolatry, on Repentance, and for Whitsunday, exhibit the same detestation of Rome; and as to the use of expressive terms, it is a matter of notoriety that no Churchman scrupled to employ the words Romish, Papal, Popery, and Papist. In fact, the words Popery and Papist were almost uniformly used in reference to Romanists and the Church of Rome.

In the days of William and Mary, and for many years subsequently, the attitude of English Churchmen was unchanged. The revolution of 1688, which put them on the throne, was essentially a Protestant revolution. William of Orange sailed to England because a Popish king had attempted to subjugate the kingdom to the thralldom of Popery. He was acknowledged sovereign by the Estates

because England's Church was a Protestant Church, and England was a Protestant kingdom. This it was also that produced the strong denunciation of that doctrine and position that princes deprived by the Pope, or on authority of the See of Rome, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, as impious, heretical, and damnable; that no foreign prince, person, or prelate, hath or ought to have any jurisdiction, supremacy, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm; and that every person who is or shall be reconciled to the Church of Rome, or shall hold communion with the See or Church of Rome, shall be for ever incapable to inherit, possess, or enjoy the crown,—statutes which, it is almost needless to remind English Churchmen, have never been repealed. In those days pride in the Church of England, as a Protestant Church, was almost universal. It was confined to no one party or school of thought.

Coming down to a later period, we find that, even at the beginning of this century, the staunch old High Churchmen abhorred the Pope as the man of sin, and regarded Popery as the nation's irreconcilable foe. The late Professor J. A. Froude, in a recent interesting article on the Oxford movement, tells how his father, a rector of the old-fashioned High Church type, trained his boys up in the idea that the Pope was Antichrist, and the Reformers worthy of all honour. The Church was Protestant through and through, and the use of the word Protestant in popular connection with the Church of England was as common as the word Catholic in connection with the Church of Rome.

And naturally.

For the very name given to the Church of England in the statutes of the realm is that of the *Protestant Episcopal* Church; Protestant is the proper adjective by which her Archbishops and Bishops are described; and the religion held and taught by her is the Protestant religion. In the great constitutional

enactment of Queen Anne's reign, 1706, by which England and Scotland were united, it was stipulated that there should be no "alteration of the worship, discipline, and government of the Church of this Kingdom (the Church of England) as now by law established." And that there might be no mistake as to the true nature of the religion of the Church of England it is declared to be "the true Protestant religion," and Her Majesty with the advice and consent of Parliament "doth hereby *establish and confirm the said true Protestant Religion*, and the Worship, Government, and Discipline of this Church *to continue without any alteration* to the people of this land in all succeeding generations. (See Miller's "Guide to Ecclesiastical Law." Shaw, 5th Edit., p. 78.) In the legislative enactment which secured the union of England and Ireland in 1800, the fifth article declares "that the Churches of England and Ireland, as now by law established, be united in one *Protestant Episcopal Church*," and in the twenty-fourth section of the Catholic Emancipation Act of 1829, the Church of England is called the "*Protestant Episcopal Church*."

And, to give an equally conclusive instance, the act for the establishment of the coronation oath provides that the Sovereign of the Realm shall be solemnly asked by the Archbishop or Bishop at the time of the coronation: "Will you to the utmost of your power maintain the laws of God, the true profession of the Gospel, and the *Protestant Reformed Religion* established by law?" and shall answer "All this I promise to do."

We see then that Protestantism was so universally and so unquestionably the foremost characteristic of the Church of England that not only in popular language, but in the careful and stereotyped phraseology of the laws of the Realm, the Church of England is known as the Protestant Church, and the religion of the Established Church as the Protestant

religion. *Just as the Church of Rome is described both in popular and technical language by the two most descriptive adjectives Roman and Catholic, so the Church of England is described by those two adjectives which express her distinguishing and essential features, Protestant and Episcopal.* As a further illustration of this it may be also pointed out that a great branch of the Church of England, once a daughter, now a sister, a Church identical with her, in all but a few minor details, in doctrine, orders, and discipline, and always considered as a branch of the Anglican Church, the Episcopal Church in the United States, bears as a Church the title of Protestant. The Church which is, to all intents and purposes, the Church of England in the United States, has been and to-day is the *Protestant Episcopal Church* of the United States. Surely these facts are sufficient to account for the universal connection of the adjective Protestant with the Church of England.

About fifty years ago, more or less, a change, however, began to creep over the spirit of the English Church. Very quietly, very gradually, but very surely, the bitterness of the anti-Roman feeling, the "Protestant prejudice," as Newman termed it, began to wear away. The word catholic, which was formerly, and, we confess, in an entirely unwarranted manner, exclusively arrogated by the Romanists, began to be applied to certain Churchmen. The doctrines of the Church of Rome, which were formerly held in such honest abhorrence, began to be respected, admired, and even publicly proclaimed, in the Church of England. The words Popery, Papist, and Papacy, began to be gently laid aside as oppressive, abusive, and unreasonable. The practices of the Church of Rome, which were formerly abhorred, and by the Church at the Reformation completely cast aside, began to be stealthily advocated, and soon openly performed. A retrograde movement was taking place, and doctrines,

practices, words, and habits, conduced to habituate members of the Church of England to the forms of Romanism, and to conciliate them to what they once detested. Now, things have come to such a pass that men, still claiming loyalty to the Church of England, have not hesitated to disavow the term Protestant,* and boldly to glory in the inculcation of doctrines Roman in everything but the name, and the advocacy of all those trivialities of Ritualism which are the glory of Romanism, and were so earnestly opposed by our Reformers†; incense, altar lights, eucharistic vestments, alb, amice, maniple, chasuble, dalmatic, tunic, mixed chalice, Eastward position, wafer bread, genuflections, and crossings, adoration of the host on the ringing of the consecration bell, fasting communion, canonical hours, prayers for the dead, ablutions, auricular confession; extreme unction, a practice which the author of "The Congregation in Church" audaciously declares to be still perfectly valid in the Church of England; celebrations for the dead; the reserved sacrament; chrism and trine immersion; and other practices and ceremonials too numerous to mention.

Nor is there any question as to the tendency of these things, nor the end which they are designed to effect.

* I would refer the reader to a book which has obtained a large circulation, entitled "The Congregation in Church."

† Grindal, Archbishop of York, in his Injunctions to the Laity (about 1571), enjoined: "That the churchwardens and minister shall see that all *Mass books, manuals, vestments, albes, tunicles, stoles, censers, crosses, candlesticks, holy water stocks, images*, and all other relics and monuments of superstition and idolatry, be utterly defaced, broken, and destroyed." "That no month-minds, or yearly commemorations of the dead, nor any other superstitious ceremonies, be observed or used, which tend either to the maintenance of prayer for the dead, or of the Popish purgatory."—*Remains of Archbishop Grindal, Park. Soc.*, p. 136.

The true tendency of the practices of Ritualism, and the inculcation of Tractarian doctrine, is to make the doctrine and practice of the Church of England as like as possible to that of the Roman; in other words, to gradually unprotestantize the Church of England, and slowly but surely to assimilate it to Rome. The end to be finally effected is not merely the parallel development of the Church of England on so-called Catholic lines, but its fusion with the Church of Rome. The consummation devoutly wished by the Tractarian party, and daily prayed for by their leader, was declared by him, in the closing pages of the "Eirenicon,"* to be the restoration of intercommunion between the Eastern, Roman, and Anglican Churches; an assimilation which, it need hardly be repeated, would be confusion, not fusion; separation, not union; false doctrine, heresy, and schism.

Such are the plain facts, admitted by men of widely different schools of thought. Bishop Wilberforce and Bishop Coxe join hands with Bishop Ryle in protest against a party whose object is to Romanize the Church of England; to make the Church of England a mere appendage of the Roman usurpation, and destroy her catholicity; to undo the work of the Reformation and of the Church's martyred bishops; and to go down on servile knees to those who slew them, begging Protestant Churchmen to receive again a yoke of bondage and corruption. A party, too, whose *doctrinal* Romanism—I repeat, whose *doctrinal* Romanism—is by no means removed though it is cleverly disguised by continuous and loud-voiced protests against the Pope as a temporal despot, and the lately promulgated dogmas of the Papal Infallibility and the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin.

It is because of this change in the spirit of a party in the Church of England that I have endeavoured to emphasise

the fact of the Protestantism of the Prayer Book. Whither we are drifting, none can tell ; but as long as the Book of Common Prayer remains unchanged, the Church can never be Romanized. Its prayers, its services, its Articles, are the bulwarks of her Protestantism, and only by dislocation, distortion, and defiance can Popish practices find toleration in her. The strongest protest against the retrograde movement now in progress in the Church of England is not from the pen of this or that individual Churchman, but from the Prayer Book itself. It protests by its utterance. It protests by its silence. It protests by its amendments. It protests by its contrasts. Every false Romish doctrine, every novel Romish practice, stealthily introduced or openly advocated, receives either the protest of its written contradiction, or the equally forcible protest of its silent repudiation. Is it the practice of adoring the Eucharist? The Prayer Book expressly repudiates it. Is it the doctrine of extreme unction? The Prayer Book says nothing about it. Is it the doctrine of purgatory? The Prayer Book lifts up its voice of denunciation. Is it prayers for the departed dead? The Prayer Book is as silent as the graves in which their bodies lie. Is it the fatal dogma of transubstantiation? The Prayer Book explicitly rejects it. Is it the practice of the confessional? There is absolutely no provision for it whatever.

In short, a careful study of the various changes in the Prayer Book's chequered history, from its first stages in King Edward's reign to its present position, has led me to the deliberate conclusion that the Prayer Book is a Protestant work with no uncertain sound ; and that if English Churchmen will only remain true to their Book of Common Prayer, the ambitions of Romanists and Romanizers will never be realized.

The Prayer Book itself is the great stumbling-block in the way of the Romanizers.

It affords them so little countenance for their practices ; its doctrinal baldness from the falsely so-called Catholic standpoint is disappointing to a degree. The whole tendency and end of their doctrine and practice is one well-defined and boldly declared process of approximation to Rome. The tendency and aim of the Prayer Book has been from the outset, with almost uniform steadiness, retrogression from Rome.

The first practice generally to be introduced by the aspirants of this party is the elevation of the elements in the administration of the Eucharist. The first practice to be forbidden in the liturgical reformation of the Church of England was this same elevation of the chalice in the act of consecration. The crucial doctrines to be taught with more or less boldness, as occasions permit, are the doctrines of sacramental absolution, auricular confession, sacramental justification, and the sacrificial character (I mean in the Roman sense) of the Supper of the Lord. The doctrines to be clearly impugned, both by the silence and the clearness of the Prayer Book, are these same doctrines. In the First Prayer Book of 1549, they obtain but slight countenance ; and the subsequent revisions show that they were thoroughly disallowed.

If the doctrines of the Reformers in the reigns of Edward VI. and Elizabeth had been the doctrines of Pusey and the Tractarian party, the Prayer Book *would never have been cast in its present form.* This is an unquestionable fact ; and it is a thought of cardinal importance for English Churchmen. Let them grasp it, and hold it fast. If the doctrines of the Reformers in the reigns of Edward and Elizabeth had been the doctrines of Pusey and the Tractarian party, our Prayer Book would never have been cast in its present form. It is silent where, from their standpoint, it should be most expressive ; it is found wanting where, had they compiled it, it would have been most explicit.

The *bona fide* tendencies of the Romanizing party in the Church of England have been declared by a well-known Churchman, the late Bishop Wilberforce, to be four :—

First, the renewal of a system of auricular confession.

Second, of sacramental absolution.

Third, of the sacrificial character of the Lord's Supper.

Fourth, of the denial of justification by faith.

These, in reality, are the inward and dangerous doctrines of which the ritualistic innovations before mentioned are but the ominous outward and visible signs. These are but the separate links in a chain which always has but one design: *the binding of the Church* in that "Catholic" unity which must be the unity of Rome. But each of these pernicious links is shown, by the progressive stages of the Prayer Book, to have been cast aside; and the practices now so clamorously advocated as indispensable to the illustration of some falsely-called "Catholic" principle, and intrinsically harmless, are proved, by the contrasts offered by the various stages of the Prayer Book's history, to have been considered by the Church as positively dangerous.

My object, therefore, has been to show the striking difference between the intentions and productions of men who are actuated by Romish, and men who are actuated by Protestant, principles.

The aims of the one are to fabricate a liturgical system the soul of which is priestcraft, and the body a complex symbolical ceremonialism. The aims of the other are to produce a Liturgy at once scriptural, simple, and spiritual, with everything to promote devotion and godliness, and everything removed that would tend to superstition and false doctrine. The greater part of this treatise, therefore, is based upon the argument of contrast; contrast, primarily, between the teachings and the practices of the Roman Church and our own, and contrast, next, between the Prayer

Book, as it now stands, and the First Prayer Book put forth in the reign of Edward VI. ; and my endeavour shall be so to illustrate these differences by the statement of widely-ignored facts, and, I fear, widely unknown quotations, from the original Books themselves, that each man shall judge for himself whether these things are so.* If we find that certain practices authorized, and certain doctrines taught, in this semi-reformed Prayer Book of 1549 have been carefully removed in subsequent revisions, and are not to be found in the Prayer Book to-day, we may certainly gather from this fact that they were deemed either unnecessary or dangerous. *The things that were left out were left out for a reason ; and what has been expressly left out by the Church, it is not for irresponsible individuals to bring in.* Whatever biassed divines may decide, the common sense of Englishmen will sustain the judgment that the Prayer Book in its revisions abolished, and intended to abolish, what it did not retain. If we know, moreover, that this Prayer Book of 1549 is now obsolete, and, however valuable in many respects, is now no longer possessed of any doctrinal or rubrical validity, we may understand how unfair it is to plead its statements as a justification for ritualistic or doctrinal innovations in the Church of to-day. As well might one explain the doctrines of the Church set forth in the Thirty-nine Articles by the Articles of the reign of King Henry VIII. If, moreover, we discover that these changes are not merely accidental, nor changes of convenience, but the conscientious alterations of spiritually enlightened Reformers ; and that these remarkable indications of spiritual enlightenment are not confined to the Second Prayer Book of King Edward's reign, but are the substance of the Prayer Book

* The Prayer Books of 1549 and 1552 are to be found in the Parker Society Library.

as Churchmen now have it, we shall be the more determined to resist every endeavour to undo a work so carefully performed, and to hold fast a prize secured by martyr-blood.

In this endeavour, also, to set forth the more especially Protestant features of the Prayer Book, I shall not only proceed upon the principle that omission and alteration are practical prohibition, and an index of the teaching of the Church, but also upon the fundamental, the most indispensable, principle, that the true guide to the interpretation of the Book of Common Prayer, as it now stands, is not falsely so-called Catholic usage, and Catholic doctrine, but the teaching and rationale of the Reformation in its more perfect development, and of the age that followed, not the age that preceded it. Jewel and Hooker are more trustworthy exponents of Church Doctrine and ritual than either Pusey, or Sadler, or Staley, or Walker. It must be remembered that a book which is the product of certain men, and of a certain age, must be interpreted in the light of that age, and in honest accordance with the known views of its compilers.* Few, very few, real Churchmen, I am sure, will agree with Newman's conclusion in his famous Tract 90, that we have no duties towards the compilers, and that their views and interpretations of the formularies of the Church must, in no way, be a standard for us. To know the men, and to understand the tendency of the age, is a *sine qua non* for the right understanding of the Prayer Book. As the late Bishop of Winchester, Dr. Harold Browne, in his introduction to

* "The fundamental principle of interpretation of all worship, sacred or profane, is that words are to be understood in their historical sense; that is, in the sense in which it can be historically proved that they were used by their authors, and intended to be understood by those to whom they were addressed."—*Hodge, Theology*, vol. i., p. 376. See also Goode on Baptism, pp. 101-2, note.

the Articles, says: "If Ridley and Cranmer were the chief compilers both of the Prayer Book and of the Articles, although the Church is in no degree bound by their private opinions, yet, when there is a difficulty in understanding a clause either in the Articles or the Liturgy . . . it cannot *but be desirable to elucidate such difficulties by appealing* to the writings, and otherwise expressed opinions of these two Reformers." To ignore the fact that the tendency of the Reformation was away from, not towards, Romanism and undue ceremonialism, and to repudiate the views of the Reformers, is not only illogical and unfair, but misleading and deceptive. And the views of the Reformers which are to be our guide are not the views which they held in their earlier days, an error sometimes made by the Romanizing party,* but the views which they held after they became, by their own confession, enlightened by God's Spirit. This personal spiritual enlightenment is at once the explanation of their abandonment, as in the case of Cranmer, of the doctrines of the "Real" Presence, the sacrifice of the Mass, purgatory, and of the doctrinal significance of the careful changes they introduced in the Prayer Book.

Such is the object, endeavour, and purpose, of this work. Not merely to awaken, in its high and spiritual sense, that

* I have seen quotations made *ex. gr.* from the earlier writings of Cranmer and Ridley in proof of the doctrine of auricular confession, but these are no guide whatever to their later views. Churchmen should take care to see that any quotations from the Reformers are from a period not earlier than 1552.

I may state here, once for all, that I use the word Romanizer only in regard to those who advocate those practices and doctrines which, in Bishop Wilberforce's opinion, indicate a *bona fide* tendency to Rome, and that I distinctly repudiate as most unjust, and un-Christ-like, the branding of every so-called "High" Churchman as a Romanizer.

decaying spirit of antagonism to Rome, and to withstand that pseudo-charity which, in these perilous times, regards with complacency the Church's deformation; but to arouse Churchmen to defend from everything that is mediæval, Romish, false, a Liturgy that represents, in its reformed purity, the spirit of scriptural, apostolic, and primitive religion. Not to stir up strife, and perpetuate unreasonable and passionate antagonisms; but to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the Church in the spirit of truth and love. There is an antagonism to Popery which is merely founded on bitterness, ignorance, and hatred of individuals; but with such I plainly say I have no sympathy whatever. I believe that in all our contests with false teaching, and all opposition to erroneous teachers, our protests should be so permeated with the spirit of love that it should be manifest that our opposition is inspired by principle, not by contentiousness; and is directed against errors, not against men. Nothing is more calculated to injure the cause of Protestantism than the unloving, unsympathetic, intolerant spirit of some Protestants. If we do not love Christ and His truth, we have no reason or cause to protest. If we do love Christ and His truth, our protests can only be made in love.

May God the Holy Spirit, without whom nothing is strong, nothing holy, enable us to understand what is His truth, and add His blessing to what, with entire dependence on His strength and countenance, has been written herein.

CHAPTER I.

A PRELIMINARY ARGUMENT.

FEW books are the object of as much misapprehension and misinterpretation as the Prayer Book of the Church of England. Distorted by many within, and abused by many without, it has been for generations largely misunderstood, and, as Simeon said years ago, its blemishes alone are seen by multitudes, and its excellencies are altogether forgotten. Even Churchmen have been influenced by the aversion that is to be found in those outside the Anglican communion, and have sometimes, perhaps unconsciously, caught the contagion of prejudice. The accretions of abuse that have accumulated upon it, have often, to their eyes, obscured its real character, and led them tamely to accept the humiliating position, that it is not worth preserving, and is incapable of defence.

And in nothing is the Prayer Book more misunderstood than in its attitude towards Romanism. It is a subject, indeed, that seems to be rarely faced, and still more rarely appreciated. The soundness of our Book of Common Prayer, from the Protestant standpoint, is something vague and dubious to the minds of many Churchmen. They are convinced that the Articles are sound, and Popery will find small countenance in them, but as to the Prayer Book being Protestant, Protestant essentially, and Protestant as a whole, that is a different matter. They are so accustomed to hear of Popery and lingering Romanism in connection with it; so ready to accept carelessly the ignorant calumny of the Church of England having "a Popish Liturgy";

and so reluctant to study the true facts with regard to their Prayer Book, that its Protestantism seems hardly capable of vindication. I confess that, to a certain degree, I have shared this misapprehension, partly owing to the audacity with which the Romanising school have perverted its statements, and partly to the indifference which has permitted their interpretations to pass unchallenged, and to be considered the true teaching of the Church. A deeper study of the facts connected with the Prayer Book has entirely removed that prejudice, a prejudice which I now see was founded chiefly on ignorance and magnified by timidity, and my hope is that a careful study of the following pages, and an intelligent consideration of the arguments contained therein, will lead the reader to the conclusion that, in spite of the misapprehensions of many without, and the misrepresentations of many within, the Prayer Book is truly, and essentially, Protestant. Truly—that is, in its fair and honest interpretation; essentially—that is, as a whole, and in its real character.

At the outset, its Protestantism will be evident, as a matter of extreme probability, if we consider the age in which it was compiled, the men who compiled it, and the influences that surrounded them.

For many centuries previous to the Reformation, the Church of England, while independent, to a certain degree, of the supremacy of the Pope, and asserting its autonomy as a national Church, was, nevertheless, in doctrine and discipline, entirely Romish. Founded, in all probability, in apostolic days, and, perhaps, even by apostolic men, the Church in England became tainted by the same doctrinal and practical corruptions that, within eight or ten centuries, had leavened the rest of the Catholic Church of Christ. The very controversies in the early part of the seventh century, between the lingering representatives of our early

British Church and the Roman contingent, are an infallible indication of the Church's spiritual degeneracy. Even then, the Church of England, despite its apostolic origin, was weak, erring, spiritually ignorant, superstitious, and corrupt.

It was still the Church of Christ, but, like the Church in Galatia, it had been turned back to the feeble and beggarly elements of ceremonial religionism. As the ages passed on it fell back still more. Planted a noble vine, wholly a right seed, it turned, as it were, into the degenerate branches of a strange vine. Degeneracy deepened into still greater degeneracy; ignorance increased, until throughout England the most repelling elements of Popery were everywhere discernible. The most superstitious practices prevailed. The most misleading and unscriptural doctrines were proclaimed. The most inconsistent and ignorant of men were found in the ranks of the clergy. The dogma of transubstantiation was as fervently taught in London as in Rome. The worship of Mary and the saints was as blindly and continually practised in England as in Italy. Friars swarmed in the shires of England, as in the streets of Paris, or the country parts of Germany. Monasteries and nunneries abounded throughout the kingdom. Masses were continually being said in every church. The roadsides abounded with crosses, crucifixes, and temporary elevated chapels for prayers. The highways were filled with pilgrims travelling to favourite shrines to kiss some fabled bone of St. Peter, or watch the vial that contained drops of the blood of Christ. Of the images and idols, there was no end. Their name was legion. As Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury, tersely remarked: "Every county was full of chapels, every chapel was full of miracles, and every miracle full of lies." The whole country was deluged with the evidences of Popery. The people were ignorant, superstitious, and untaught. The churches were, in many cases, little more

than the temples of idols. The clergy were often blind leaders of the blind, and frequently, alas, licentious and debased. By the fatal decree of Hildebrand, Rome compelled them to remain unmarried, with the then inevitable consequences, immorality and debauchery. "Darkness covered the land, and gross darkness the people." And remember, this was the Church of England, not merely the Church of Rome in England, but the Church of England. It was the national Church—the Church of England, and the Church in England. As far as doctrine, practice, and worship was concerned, the religion of England was practical Popery. The Church of England had become thoroughly Romish.

And here let me, once and for all, emphasise a point of the utmost importance. *I am not now speaking of political Popery, but of doctrinal Popery.* There is a political Protestantism, and there is a doctrinal Protestantism, and I would earnestly caution the reader to be on his guard lest he confound these two things, and to remember that a Churchman and a Church may protest most forcibly against the Pope's usurping temporal power, and yet hold the great body of Romish teaching, and be what would now be called Roman Catholic. As early as the seventh century, there is an authenticated instance of the resistance of the Church of England to Agatho, the then Pope of Rome. But even earlier than this, there is undoubted evidence that the Church of England, then the organized Church of the nation, was in doctrine and discipline virtually Romish, and for centuries before the Reformation she was entirely Romish in doctrine. She was Romish in doctrine, teaching all the doctrines repudiated in Articles XIII., XIV., XXII., XXIV., XXV., XXVIII., XXX., XXXI., and XXXII.; and though she had her peculiar uses and forms, substantially at unity with the rest of the then Catholic Church in worship. As far as

doctrine is concerned, it may be truly said, as Professor J. J. Blunt, the historian of the Reformation, has put it, that "the Roman Catholic religion prevailed in England." * And it is only ignorance, wilful or casuistical, that makes modern Churchmen deny it. Let the reader, therefore, in order to be thoroughly fortified against misleading argumentation, keep clearly in mind that throughout the history of the pre-Reformation English Church these two things are unquestionable facts—

On the one hand, that ever and anon throughout many centuries in matters of political and ecclesiastical jurisdiction, the Church of England made endeavours to assert her independence of Rome.

On the other hand, that the Church of England, in all matters pertaining to ritual, practice, and doctrine, was practically identical with Rome.

There is a determined effort now made in certain quarters of the Church to make it appear that the pre-Reformation Church of England and the Church of Rome were two entirely different things, that the practices of the English Church were not the practices of the Roman Church, her ritual not the Roman ritual, her doctrines not the Roman doctrines, and that therefore the pre-Reformation Church of

* The employment of the word Roman Catholic by Churchmen is unfortunate. It is a term that is misleading, because unmeaning. The Roman Church, especially since the Council of Trent and the publication of the Vatican Decrees, cannot in any true sense be called *Catholic*. Not only does the Roman usurpation rob the true Catholic Church of Christ of her honourable name, but, as Dean Jackson declares, "adherence to the visible Church of Rome doth induce a *separation* from the Holy Catholic Church," or as the Church still more strongly states in the Homily for Whitsunday, "If it be possible to be where the true Church is *not*, then it is at Rome."

England should be more and more referred to as a doctrinal and liturgical guide for the Church of England to-day.

The reasoning by which this position is maintained is entirely delusory. It is disingenuous, deceptive, unfair. It is based upon apparent truth, while it conveys logical evasions, and misrepresentation. As Butler, in his "*Ecclesiastical History*," has truly remarked: "The effort of some English historians to show that the Church of England (as far as doctrine, discipline, and morals, that is) never came under complete subjection to the Papacy can be made to seem plausible only by an argument which keeps in the background the most obvious facts, and makes prominent the protests and resistances which were made to the extortions and the tyranny of the Papacy." (*Ecccl. Hist.*, II. p. 363.) The obvious facts are, of course, the innumerable elements of Church doctrine and practice which entirely identified the Church of England with the erring Church of Rome; the monastic system, celibacy of the clergy, transubstantiation, denying the cup to the laity, auricular confession indispensable to the reception of the Eucharist, purgatory, worshipping of images, &c. Romish doctrine does not merely mean the extremities of Roman doctrine, the Papal Infallibility, and the Immaculate Conception. It means the whole of that soul-destroying system which found its culmination in apostate Latin Christianity, and apostate Greek Christianity, in the mass and the mass-priest. Nor does Popery merely mean recognition of the Papal supremacy, or allegiance to the Pope's temporal authority, for, in its true and doctrinal acceptation, there can be Popery without the Pope; in the Anglican and Oriental Churches, as well as in the Roman.

When I say, then, that the religion of England was practical Popery, I desire it to be clearly understood that I am not unmindful of the repeated instances of resistance,

on the part of the Church of England, to the territorial and ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome. Occasional assertions of insular ecclesiastical independence were not necessarily inconsistent with doctrinal identity. The haughty spirit of defiance to the Italian despot which stirred in prelates like Robert Grosstête, Bishop of Lincoln, and Stephen Langton, of Magna Charta fame, and led protesting sovereigns like Edward I. and Edward III. and their protesting parliaments to pass anti-papal statutes and breathe defiance to the Pope, was not Protestantism in the modern sense of the term, nor had it the slightest doctrinal significance. Strictly speaking, these protests were not protests of the Church at all, but of individuals or of the legislative bodies; but even if they can for the sake of convenience—inasmuch as they were to an extent national—be called protests of the Church against the Pope, there was not the remotest idea of their involving any protest against Popery. And, therefore, again I say, to all practical intents and purposes, the Church of England was doctrinally one with the Church of Rome, tainted with her taints, corrupt with her corruptions, sinking with her just as deeply as she sank.*

When, therefore, in the good providence of God, John

* If any of my readers imagine that I am stating this point too strongly, let them read the fifteenth chapter of Bishop Ryle's *Principles for Churchmen*, "The Lessons of English Church History." In this he says: "It is no exaggeration to say that, for three centuries before the Reformation, Christianity in England seems to have been buried under a mass of superstition, priestcraft, and immorality." "There was an utter famine of vital Christianity in the land." "Practically, the religion of most Englishmen was Mary worship, saint worship, and slavery to priests." (pp. 358-360.) Of course it is a fact. No one can deny this but those who *will* persist in blinding their eyes to the plain facts of history.

Wycliffe, the first real Protestant in the Church of England, emerged from the darkness with the torch of Truth, and lighted that lamp which blazed forth with full radiance some two centuries later, it may easily be imagined how deep was the abhorrence with which he and his spiritual successors regarded the detestable enormities of Rome. As step by step the eyes of England's Reformers were enlightened, and the Spirit of God drew from off their eyes the veil that obscured the falsities of their mighty foe, the hatred with which they regarded her was conscientious and deadly. At first, separation from the Catholic body was a thing which was never contemplated by Henry VIII. and the nation. Their only desire was emancipation from the abominated thralldom of the Pope. It was not the desire of either the clergy or the nation, as a whole, to sever themselves from the unity of the Holy Catholic Church visible, nor, at first, to alter even to the length of one jot or tittle one article of the Catholic religion, as represented by Rome. They wished only to demonstrate the ability of England to administer her own affairs, without the interference of any foreign prince.

Henry VIII. never was a Protestant in the modern or evangelical sense of the word, nor did he to his dying day intend any serious doctrinal reformation. In doctrine, he was an ardent Romanist. The highest idea of reformation that he ever conceived was of reformation *in* the Church, not reformation *of* the Church. Even with regard to reformations *in* the Church, that is, reformation in the way of abuses and morals, they were conducted only in so far as they made no interference with Popery. Henry VIII. never intended a reformation of the Church in doctrine; he simply, through caprice, severed himself and the Church from the temporal headship of the Pope.

Now, the chief feature of the reformation of the Church of England was reformation in doctrine. The affair of

renouncing the allegiance of the Pope, though in God's providence a step of great importance, was not the greatest matter, for the English Church was never very strong in that at any time. The imputation, therefore, that the reformation of the Church of England was the work of King Henry VIII. is an ignorant calumny. The assertion of certain Romanists* that Henry VIII. was founder of the Church of England, or that Henry VIII. brought about the reformation of the Church of England, is utterly false. It is ludicrous; it is absurd. "Our King has destroyed the Pope, but not Popery."† He did everything in his power almost to hinder it, thwart it, stop it, and nothing was further from his thoughts. He was a thorough Romanist, a most bigoted Papist, and violently opposed to the doctrines of Protestantism. If Henry VIII. had had his way, the Church of England would never have been the reformed and Protestant Church that she is to-day, for, as Bishop Hooper sagaciously remarked, "The king cast out the Pope, not Popery." Neither the king, nor Wolsey, nor Warham, ever dreamed that the defiance of the Papal decree would involve separation from the doctrines of and unity with the visible Catholic Church.

Gradually, however, by the good hand of the God of all grace, the work of reformation proceeded, until by the dissemination of the Truth, through the reading of God's pure Word and the enlightenment of the eyes of the Reformers by the Spirit of Truth, that abhorrence of Popish tyranny was succeeded by an abhorrence of Popish *doctrine* equally deep-seated and deadly. Marvellous it is to witness how this work advanced in the teeth of what was apparently irresistible opposition.‡ Marvellous, too, is it to notice how

* The American Cardinal Gibbons, *e.g.* in his "Faith of our Fathers."

† Park. Soc., Orig. Lett., p. 36. Cranmer on Lord's Supper, p. 6.

‡ "The impious mass, the most shameful celibacy of the clergy, the invocation of saints, auricular confession, superstitious

an illumination almost preternatural directed and upheld the leaders in this great cause. Theirs was no blind hatred, or unreasoning malice. Not at all. It was the strong, deep-seated conviction of men who were taught by the Word of God, upheld by His power, and led onward by paths opened in His providence; and when the time was fully come, when the day appointed by God from eternity arrived, that stately fabric of falsehood, so long an incubus on our loved fatherland, fell, and fell, we believe, for ever; and great was the fall of it. "Cecidit Babylon! cecidit Babylon! civitas illa magna! cecidit Babylon!"

Now let the reader carefully remember this.

It was from the contest of these days that the Prayer Book issued forth. It was in the furnace of opposition to Romish doctrine and by the fires of Romish persecution that it was tried and purged and refined. It was by the men who

abstinence from meats, and purgatory, were never before held by the people in greater esteem than at the present moment."—*Orig. Lett.*, p. 36.

"The public celebration of the Lord's Supper is very far from the order and institution of our Lord. Although it is administered in both kinds, yet in some places the supper is celebrated three times a day. Where they used heretofore to celebrate in the morning the *mass* of the Apostles, they have now the *communion* of the Apostles; where they had the *mass* of the Blessed Virgin, they now have the *communion* which they call the *communion* of the Virgin; where they had the principal, or high mass, they now have, as they call it, the high communion. They still retain their vestments and the candles before the altars; in the churches they always chant the *hours* and other hymns relating to the Lord's Supper, but in our own language. And that Popery may not be lost, the mass-priests, although they are compelled to discontinue the use of the Latin language, yet most carefully observe the same tone and manner of chanting to which they were heretofore accustomed in the Papacy. God knows to what perils and anxieties we are exposed by reason of men of this kind."—*Bp. Hooper in Orig. Lett., Park. Soc.*, p. 72.

afterwards laid down their lives rather "than consent to the wicked Popery of the Bishop of Rome" that it was compiled, and, in many parts, composed. It was in an age when the hatred of Popery, rather than the Papacy, was undying, conscientious, and disinterested, that it was begun, continued, and brought to a consummation. Never, perhaps, did hatred of the abominations of the Papacy and the doctrines of Popery run so high in England as it did in the days of the Reformers, and never, perhaps, did hatred of the Papacy, and clear, conscientious detestation of Rome's soul-destroying teachings, run so high in individual men as it did in the minds of the men who compiled the Book of Common Prayer.

Cranmer: He accounted the Pope as very Antichrist, and the foe of the cause of God. His opposition extended not merely to the Pope as a usurping prelate, but to the Papacy, as a system which falsified the Word of God, and overwhelmed men in the darkness of Christless ignorance. "As for the Pope, I refuse him as Christ's enemy and Antichrist, with all his false doctrine." "It is not the person of the Bishop of Rome, which usurpeth the name of Pope, that is so much to be detested, but *the very Papacy* and the See of Rome, which hath by their laws suppressed Christ . . . and this is the chief thing to be detested in that See, that it hath brought the professors of Christ into such ignorance of Christ."—*Cranmer's Works*, Park. Soc., I., p. 28, and II., p. 322.

Ridley: He, too, accounted and boldly declared the Pope to be Antichrist, the beast of Babylon, the whore of Babylon, which hath bewitched almost the whole world. "I perceive," said he, "the greatest part of Christianity to be infected with the poison of the See of Rome." "For the godly articles of unity in religion, these thieves place in the stead of them the Pope's laws and decrees, lying legends, feigned fables and miracles, to delude and abuse. Thus the

robbery and theft is not only committed, nay, sacrilege and wicked spoil of heavenly things, but also instead of the same is brought in and placed the abominable desolation of . . . the Babylonish beast" . . . "By the abomination of Babylon I understand all the whole trade of *the Romish religion*, under the name and title of Christ, which is contrary to the only rule of all true religion, that is, God's Word . . . There are not only all these abominations which are come into the Church of England, but also an innumerable rabble of abominations, as Popish pardons, pilgrimages, Romish purgatory, Romish masses, &c., with a thousand more . . . and when I consider all these things, wherein standeth the substance of the Romish religion, it may be evident and easy to perceive that these two ways, these two religions, the one of Christ, the other of the Romish See, in these latter days are as far distant, the one from the other, as light and darkness, good and evil, Christ and Belial."—*Ridley's Works, Park. Soc.*, p. 53-57.

Latimer: He, likewise, denounced with a Pauline fervour the falsities of Rome as the tokens of Antichrist. "Let the Papists go with their long faith. Be you contended with the short faith of the saints, which is revealed to us in the Word of God written. Adieu to all Popish fantasies! The Fathers have both herbs and weeds, and Papists commonly gather the weeds and leave the herbs: *Ibid.*, p. 114. Learn to abhor the most detestable and dangerous poison of the Papists, which go about to thrust Christ out of His office. Learn, I say, to leave all Papistry, and to stick only to the Word of God, which teacheth that Christ is not only a judge, but a justifier, a giver of salvation, and a taker away of sin. He purchased our salvation through His painful death, and we receive the same through believing in Him, as St. Paul teacheth us, saying, 'Freely ye are justified through faith.' In these words of St. Paul all merits and

estimation of works are excluded and clean taken away. For if it were for our works' sake, then it were not freely, but St. Paul saith freely. Whether will you now believe, St. Paul or the Papists?"—*Conferences, Ridley's Works, and Latimer's Remains* pp. 1-74.

Hooper: He was of all men most fervid in his exposure of the falsities of Popery, and clear in his views of evangelical truth. "I believe and confess that the popish mass is the invention and ordinance of man, a sacrifice of Antichrist, and a forsaking of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, that is to say, of his death and passion; and that it is a stinking and infected sepulchre, which hideth and covereth the merit of the blood of Christ; and therefore ought the mass to be abolished, and the holy Supper of the Lord to be restored and set in his perfection again."—*Hooper's Later Writings, Park. Soc.*, p. 32.

"The See of Rome is not only a tyranny and pestilence of body and soul, but the nest of all abomination. God give him grace and all his successors to leave their abomination, and to come into the light of God's Word!"

"The very properties of Antichrist, I mean of Christ's great and principal enemy, is so openly known to all men, that are not blinded with the smoke of Rome, that they know him to be the beast that John describeth in the Apocalypse."—*Hooper's Early Writings*, pp. 23, 24.

"That wicked and pestilent See and Chair of Rome, which is indeed the very whore of Babylon that St. John describeth in the Revelation of Jesus Christ."—*Hooper's Later Writings*, p. 554.

Now, we are not speaking here of the correctness of their interpretation of Scripture in identifying the [Pope of Rome with the Antichrist of St. Paul and St. John. That is not the point. What we want to emphasise is that the men who used such language as this were the instruments chosen by God for the compilation of the formularies and liturgy of

the Church of England. Men whose opposition to Romish error was as far removed from uncharitable bigotry as the opposition of St. Paul to St. Peter at Antioch. Men living in an age when the long oppressions of the spiritual despot of Christendom had awakened a spirit of resistance and defiance akin to that which stirred the breasts of the Jews of old against brutal and tyrannical Rome. Is it probable, then, that a book which was to be almost entirely the work of these men's hands would bear the taints of Popery, or that they would be parties to the perpetuation of a Liturgy that would stereotype the very doctrines that they hated? Is it possible that they would compile a Prayer Book which would contain that doctrine of Transubstantiation which they regarded as idolatrous, or set forth the system of ceremonial sacerdotal religion which they so abhorred? Common sense would at once answer, It is impossible.

Not only the men, and the times, but the very influences that were at work upon the Reformers were all of them set in the strongest possible degree in a Protestant direction. While it cannot be declared with exactitude how far the influence of Bucer and Martyr extended in the revision of the First Prayer Book, it is certain that these master minds moulded in no small measure the Reformers in the changes introduced by them in the Second Book of Edward VI., which is substantially the Prayer Book as we now possess it. Both Bucer and Martyr were Protestants of the soundest type. Enthusiastic for the truth, they hated Popery as they hated sin; and keen to discern all Romish blemishes, they faithfully and clearly exposed what they considered to be blots in the Liturgy lately compiled. The consequence was that the Prayer Book was so thoroughly purged on its second revision that Martyr, in a letter written to Bullinger on June 14th, 1552, declared that "all things are removed from it which could nourish superstition." * Everything thus goes

to show how strongly improbable it is that the Prayer Book should retain the elements of Popery. The briefest consideration of the men, the times, the influences, will prove that such things would not willingly have been countenanced. If it had proceeded from others, they would have died rather than support it; much less would they have allowed it to go forth from themselves.

But, it will be objected perhaps by some, the men were not free in the matter. Had their own will been the standard, unquestionably the book would have been free from blots. But they had a Popish king, a Popish clergy, and a Popish people to deal with, and were in consequence compelled to retain many Popish elements to conciliate the minds of the people.

This objection has small basis in fact. The First Book of Edward VI., the Prayer Book of 1549, though, as contrasted with the Sarum and Roman services, "a very godly order, and agreeable to the Word of God and the primitive Church," contained, as will be afterwards shown, many elements calculated to engender superstition. While Protestant in the main and on the whole, the blemishes of a lingering Romanism were visible throughout. The light had begun to break, but the minds of the Reformers were not yet wholly emancipated from the errors of Rome. The glorious light of the Spirit had not yet fully enlightened their intellects and hearts. Doubtless it was God's good purpose that it should not. So sudden a change as the present Liturgy would have been as bewildering as the noonday glare to partially opened eyes. God's ways are

* This is a most important letter, and should be mastered by the student of Church History. It will be found in the appendix to Goode's "Baptism." Also in "Bradford's Letters," Parker Society, p. 403; and in Gorham's "Reformation Gleanings," p. 280.

wonderful. The new wine of the Reformation must not go into the old bottle of the Roman Church, nor must it go even into the new bottle of the Reformed Church of England without preparation and caution. A messenger must prepare the way for the Gospel. A preparatory step must be taken. That messenger and that preparatory step was the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. Tinged as it was with superstition, stained as it was with the remnants of Popery, it yet opened the minds of the people, and paved the way for its Protestant successor. It was not perfect—what thing of man's creation ever was—and yet it did its work. It filled the gap. It bridged the way between Popery and Protestantism. Compared with what came after, it was Romish; but compared with what went before, it was nobly evangelical and Protestant. In fact, when we consider the age, the First Prayer Book of Edward can only be regarded as a marvel.

When we consider that for nearly five hundred years the elements of apostolic Christianity had been dead, and buried under a mass of superstition and formalism, and that evangelical doctrine was almost unknown, and worship in the vulgar tongue a thing unheard of, and see that they had practically to create a new form of worship altogether, the work they performed seems truly miraculous.

It was pioneer work of a kind that had never been performed before.

The marvel, therefore, is not that it had so many blemishes, but that it had so few; not that it was so tainted with Romish error, but that it was so amazingly Protestant.*

Meanwhile, in the good providence of God, the way was being opened for further reformation. Without let or hindrance from king or clergy, nay, rather, with the highest

* See Tomlinson's "Great Parliamentary Debate of 1548." Shaw & Co. 6d.

authority in the land urging them peremptorily to remove the blemishes and cast out the faults, the Reformers, now more enlightened than ever by the Spirit of God, proceeded to perfect their work. Spurred on by the king,* and aided by the wise counsels of holy men, they removed the errors, filled in the gaps, added new features, and renovated the whole. The result was a Prayer Book purged from Popery, and sound, comprehensive, scriptural; a book, moreover, which both for its Protestantism and scripturalness did more to establish the Reformation in England than any other instrumentality whatsoever, the Bible alone excepted. For this reason, the Prayer Book broke the spell of Popery, by supplanting the unintelligible Mass with a service which all could understand. It destroyed the arrogant claims of the priesthood, by letting all men worship in a service of common prayer. It abolished tradition and lying fables, by bringing the people the pure Word of God. Churchmen may well thank God for the influence of the Prayer Book in establishing the Reformation, and stamping on the Church its Protestant character.

A still more subtle objection has to be confronted here. It is this. That this Prayer Book is *not now* the Prayer Book of the Church. The Second Prayer Book of Edward's reign, the Book of 1552, it is said, marked but a departed phase in the evolution of the liturgy, and is possessed of little interest for us to-day.† Now this objection is a very subtle one, and exceedingly dangerous, and it is one that is made a great deal of by those who seek to alter the position of the Church of England. The more the Second Prayer Book of

* Orig. Letters, Parker Soc., p. 580.

† "By it (the Second Prayer Book) a new character was given for the moment to the Church of England."—*Perry, Reformation in England*,

Edward can be vilified, and slandered as a Puritanical and Calvinistic abortion without any value as a Church Liturgy, an unauthoritative and obsolete production of a few Protestant extremists, the more likely are churchmen to regard it with suspicion, and consider it as having nothing to do with the Prayer Book as we now have it.

It is important, therefore, for churchmen to thoroughly understand that for all practical intents and purposes *this Second Prayer Book of Edward VI. is substantially our own Book of Common Prayer.*

If the good providence of God was marked in the beginnings of the Prayer Book, still more is it discernible in its continuance. Since the days of Edward VI. many and crucial have been the crises through which the Church has passed. In those days of trial and crises, the Prayer Book of the Church was naturally the subject of alteration and revision. But though many changes have been made, those changes, with one or two exceptions, have never in the slightest degree been of a retrograde character, and the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI. remains to-day, for all practical purposes, the Prayer Book of the Church of England. Let Churchmen thoughtfully and thankfully consider this fact. Subjected to the scrutiny of a thousand different minds, at the mercy of kings and convocations who could have introduced the most disastrous changes, in the hands of men whose doctrinal bias would naturally have led them to revert to such a Prayer Book as that of 1549, it seemed nevertheless, as if by some invisible power, they were restrained from altering anything that really affected in any serious degree the fundamental Protestantism of the Prayer Book.

Men who believed, heart and soul, in the communion table as an "altar," were in some strange way restrained from the re-introduction of that term. Men who believed, heart and soul, in the absolving power of the priesthood, were

restrained from inserting such a slight alteration as the permission in the First Prayer Book which authorises auricular confession. Men who believed most conscientiously in the Lord's Supper as a 'sacrifice' were kept from inserting that term in any such manner as to countenance the Romish teaching thereon. Men who believed in the practice of celebrating the Holy Communion with a wafer were restrained, as by an invisible hand, from inserting a sentence which would have even allowed its alternative use. Men who detested the phraseology of the "black rubric" were, as if by the influence of some mighty hand, held back from altering it in any serious degree, or from preventing its reinsertion in the Prayer Book. In fact, after a careful and earnest study of the various stages through which the Prayer Book has passed, I make this deliberate statement: *that as far as the great body of doctrine and practice is concerned, the Prayer Book of to-day is essentially the Second Prayer Book of the reign of Edward VI.* Or, in other words, that all the subsequent changes which the Prayer Book has undergone in the various stages through which it has since passed have never tended, in the slightest degree, to bring the Church of England back to Romanism, or even to the half-way house of the First Prayer Book of Edward VI.*

I make this statement with the greatest emphasis, because of the practice of not a few of the members of an extreme party in the Church to minimize the value of this book, which was *par excellence* the Prayer Book of the Reformation. They refer to it as a book possessed of only the briefest shadow of authority, and a short-lived existence. They allude to it as being *interesting*, inasmuch as it was the product of the opposition of the extremer school of Reformers, led by the impracticable Hooper, and the

* See Goode's "Baptism," pp. 480-482. Cardwell's *Conferences*, pp. 391, 392. "Great Parliamentary Debate," p. 21.

foreigners, Alasco, Martyr, and Bucer, to the semi-reformed First Prayer Book of Edward VI. The result is that multitudes of Churchmen of a more moderate school, are accustomed to think of this Second Book of Edward VI. as a phase of the Prayer Book with which we have no concern, a phase which marks only the temporary triumph of an extreme and most uncompromising reforming school, whereas the plain matter of fact is, that with a few unimportant exceptions, such as the reinsertion of the words "The Body of Our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. The Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ," &c., in the delivery of the elements to the communicants, all those significant and intentional changes of doctrine and ceremonial introduced by the Reformers in the latter Prayer Book of Edward VI.'s reign have *never* been renounced by the Church of England. Revision there has been; additions there have been; but retrogression to mediævalism—never.

The word "altar"; auricular and secret confession to the priest; the anointing and chrism; the reservation of the Sacrament; prayers for the dead; invocation of saints, &c., &c., may be searched for in vain in our present Prayer Book, as they will be searched for in vain in the Second Prayer Book of Edward.* However distasteful the fact may be, it *is* a fact, that, in the good providence of God, there has been no material reversion either in phraseology or in practice to the phraseology and practices that obtained in the Prayer Book which marks the initial stage in the reformation of the Church of England.†

* For a fuller list of these discarded Romish practices, see p. 163.

† Canon Perry in his work on the Reformation (in spite of its inconsistency with page 93) frankly admits that the Prayer Book re-established in the reign of Elizabeth was practically the *Second*

At the outset, therefore, it is well for us to grasp the fact, that the men by whom, the times in which, and the influences through which the Prayer Book was compiled, were all of an unquestionably Protestant character. If we do not understand this, we shall fail to interpret it aright. If we do understand it, we shall more readily perceive, and more clearly comprehend the reason for those Protestant features which meet us on every page, and the explanation of those intentional omissions and alterations which so clearly indicate the steady progress made by the Reformers in the Protestantizing of the Church of England.

Prayer Book of Edward VI., and not the First Prayer Book of 1549. He says, page 158:—"The revisers held to the Second Book of King Edward rather than to the First, and as far as can be ascertained (for the subject is involved in obscurity) the book left their hands with only three alterations, viz. . an addition of certain lessons to be used on Sundays; an amended form of the Litany; the bringing back of the words to be used to communicants of the First Book in union with those of the Second. These, it seems, were intended by the revisers to be the only alterations made in the Second Book of King Edward when it was presented to Parliament."

And in a remarkable paper read at the Birmingham Church Congress, by Dr. Child, the same thing is asserted and proved by a series of facts which are historically incontrovertible.

"The first question for us is, What did Elizabeth and her advisers actually establish? And the second is, How did they establish it? They actually established, or rather re-established, the Protestantism of Edward VI.'s time, and the Protestantism of Edward VI.'s time differed in nothing whatever but a few external ceremonies, which the men who established it themselves considered to be of no importance, from what was shortly afterwards called Puritanism. Thus we find that what Elizabeth really established was Protestantism of the Edwardian type, and that the machinery by which she established it was that of the state, not that of the Church."

CHAPTER II.

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS.

THE key to the Prayer Book, considered as a whole, is the theology of England's Bishop-Reformers. Enter into their sentiments, and an understanding of the doctrinal difficulties is [at once arrived at. Realize their doctrinal position, and the interpretation of ritual directions is at once made simple. No fountain sendeth forth from the same place both sweet water and bitter, nor does a Protestant Reformer lend his hand to the compilation of a Romish Liturgy. Such is the position assumed in the previous chapter, and the argument from probability and improbability is one that may at the commencement legitimately arrest the attention of every student of the Book of Common Prayer. But however valuable as a piece of circumstantial and complementary evidence, the acknowledged Protestantism of Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, is not sufficient to establish the soundness of the Prayer Book as we possess it. To prove this we must proceed to the Book itself, and examine it, both broadly as a whole, and minutely in its particular parts. In this chapter, therefore, it is proposed to glance at some of the more general features.

Now, if we take up the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England, and examine it first of all not particularly, but as a whole, we shall find that it presents three prominent characteristics, and that each of these stamps it with an unmistakable Protestantism.

It is in the language of the people. It is common or congregational prayer. It is wholly Scriptural.

(1) To begin with, it is in the vulgar tongue, or the

language of the people. This of itself is an invaluable boon, and a sign which proclaims most distinctly its emancipation from Popery. Such a thing would never have emanated from Rome, nor have been tolerated by Romanizers. Rome hates the thought of it. Her device has ever been to blind the minds of the people by the use of an awe-inspiring religious language, as an instrument for the preservation of mystery, and the perpetuation of the priestly power. When the Reformers laid down the majestic principle proclaimed in Article XXIV., "it is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God, and the custom of the primitive Church, to have public prayer in the Church, or to minister the Sacraments in a tongue not understood of the people," it is difficult for us to understand how revolutionary was the declaration from the Roman standpoint, or how finally and completely it demolished the Popish fabric.

Rome had practically said for generations: The language of Rome is the language of religion, and the language of religion is the only proper language for worship; therefore, the people must have it, whether they understand it or not. Obey the Holy Mother, the Church. "Living languages, continually changing, are more suited to convey doctrines which are subject to frequent alteration. But the Catholic Church prefers old unchangeable languages because she is herself unchangeable. The Church speaks Latin because she is apostolic, unchanging, and catholic. Obey the Church."

"No," said the Reformers, in acts if not in words, "St. Paul declared that it was better to speak five words with understanding than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue." If it should be objected that this referred to preaching, not to praying, the answer is clear. "If the preaching availeth nothing, being spoken in a language which the people understandeth not, how should any other service

avail them, being spoken in the same language? And yet, that St. Paul meant not only of preaching, it appeareth plainly by his own words. For he speaketh by name expressly of praying, singing, lauding, and thanking of God, and of all other things which the priests say in the churches, whereunto the people say, Amen, which they used not in preaching, but in other divine service; that whether the priests rehearse the wonderful works of God, or give thanks unto God, or make open profession of their faith, or humble confession of their sins; that then all the people, understanding what the priests say, might give their minds and voices with them and say, Amen, that is to say, allow what the priests say; that the rehearsal of God's universal works and benefits, the giving of thanks, the profession of faith, the confession of sins, and the requests and petitions of the priests and the people, might ascend up into the ears of God all together, and be as a sweet savour, odour, and incense in his nose."—*Cranmer's Works, Park. Soc.*, p. 450.

To-day an unknown tongue is compulsory the Papal world over. Whatever else is said in the vulgar tongue, I have read the mass must be in Latin. But from the day that the Church of England authorised her people to worship God in their own tongue, Popery received a death-blow in England, and Protestantism a life-giving inspiration. The publication of the Holy Scriptures in language understood by the people was doubtless the chief instrument employed by God for the destruction of the Popish stronghold. But in England, at any rate, the Prayer Book was a factor in this reformation work, second only in importance to the Bible itself. Superstition and false doctrine had so ingrained themselves into the national religious life, through the ecclesiastical use in worship of the Latin tongue, that the only possible method, humanly speaking, of ever breaking the spell was by the annihilation of this enslaving medium. This was most

effectually accomplished by the publication of the liturgy in English. The fact, then, of the Prayer Book being in the vulgar tongue is one of the first and strongest proofs of its freedom from Popery.

(2) Not only is the Prayer Book in the vulgar tongue, but it offers a form of *common* Prayer. It is to be participated in jointly by minister and people.

For generations the only part to be taken by the people was that of looking on. They were, on the whole, mere spectators of a religious performance. Far away in the chancel, and before the altar, the priest bowed and turned and prostrated himself, muttering mysterious things in an unknown tongue. The choir chanted and sung, doubtless with grace, and sometimes with unction, but also in a language understood by few. And the people all looked on. Religion was mystery. A mystery to the people, a mystery to the performers, a mystery even to the priests, and the priests loved to have it so.

Now all is changed. No longer "a sacrificing priest" like those of Rome, but a minister or presbyter (for short, called priest), the clergyman only leads the devotions of the people. No longer an ignorant and untaught rabble, the people join intelligently in an intelligible act of worship. People and minister unite together. The worship of the Church is not a priestly performance afar off in the choir, but a glorious communion of young and old, people and minister, in prayer and praise to God. The humblest peasant, the meanest child, uses the same devotions as the most learned layman or most exalted prelate. How distinct are the injunctions to bring everything within the understanding of the people. Nothing is to be mysterious or exclusive. "At the beginning of morning and evening prayer the minister shall read, with a loud voice the sentences," &c. "Then the minister shall kneel and say the Lord's Prayer

with an audible voice." "Then shall he read distinctly, with an audible voice, the first lesson," &c. This rubric is really a most decisively Protestant work, a distinct and ever eloquent protest against the superstitions and priestly falsities of Rome. It is a distinct protest, too, against the assumptions of the Romanizer. No man-made sacrificing priest is to intervene between the people and their God in the offering of devotion. The priest is to lead, not engross, the worship of the people. In the language of the late learned Bishop of Durham, while the Christian minister is the representative of man to God, of the congregation primarily, of the individual indirectly, as a member of the congregation, the minister's function is *representative* without being *vicarial*. He is a priest as the mouthpiece, the delegate, of a priestly race. His acts are not his own, but the acts of the congregation.

The Church of England, to my mind, is unique in this, not in that she recognized the right of the people to participate in the public worship of God, but in that she alone practically has made this participation an accomplished fact. She looks for the co-operation of all the people in all her services. She desires all, not only to have a part, but to have a great part. The first prayer used morning and evening in the Church of England is prefaced by the emphatic declaration. "A general confession, to be said *of the whole congregation after the minister.*" Even when prayers are said by the voice of the minister alone, it is distinctly understood that all the words, thoughts, and phrases, are simply the intelligent utterance of the people, who, at the end of *every* prayer, shall answer, "Amen"—the Church here following precisely the example of the Church Apostolic, I. Cor. xiv. 16. When the minister kneels and says the Lord's Prayer, the people also shall kneel and repeat it with him. When he, in the lesser Litany, prays a short

ejaculatory prayer by himself, then shall the people respond by another. When he utters the first part of the "Glory be to the Father," then shall the right of the people to participate in the worship be recognized by their responding audibly, "As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be." In the Psalms, the people stand up, and read each alternate verse; and in the case of the Creeds, it is enjoined that they shall be sung or said by the minister *and* the people.

The Litany is another wonderful example of a form of supplication in which the priesthood of the people is practically recognized, in making them all draw near to the Throne of Grace, with liberty to speak out before God. Even in the reading of the Commandments, contrary to natural expectations, the congregational rights of the worshippers are secured, and there, as in every part of the service, the people take their part audibly and intelligently. Thus throughout the whole service this idea is distinctly emphasized, that the worship of God's people in His Church is the united offering of devotion. "Ye shall be named the priests of the Lord," Isa. lxi. 6. "Ye are a royal priesthood," I. Peter ii. 9. "He hath made us to be priests unto God," Rev. i. 6. Every prayer is the common prayer of priest and people; of the holy priesthood, the people; and their representative and mouthpiece, the priest.

And herein the Church is found to be on the lines of Scripture and the primitive Church. Our Lord expressly laid down a form of common prayer when He gave, for the use of His disciples, that incomparable petition, the Lord's Prayer. In itself it is a Liturgy in epitome, and carries with it our blessed Lord's *imprimatur* as an authority for using a form of prayer. More than that, it carries with it the highest authority in heaven or earth for using united and common prayer. It was His will that they should all pray together. Not that St. Peter should lead in prayer and allow

the others to follow as well as they could the extempore effusions of his imagination; or that St. John should pray instead of them all, and they, in silence, adopt as well as possible his language and thoughts, making them their own in the progress of the supplication; but that they should all use in common, as a united mouthpiece, voicing forth in unison, as common property, the one petition in the same words. "After this manner therefore pray ye: 'Our Father,' " &c.

In the Acts of the Apostles, wherein is recorded the procedure of the primitive and apostolic Church, it is to be noted that not only once, but often, expressions are made use of which lead us to conclude that prayer was offered up unitedly by the whole people in common. Compare verses fourteen and twenty-four of the first chapter. It is not said in the latter verse that St. Peter or St. John alone uttered this sentence, but that they all did. The phrase used in the Revised Version of the forty-second verse of the second chapter, "they continued steadfastly in the prayers," points to a united and common form of supplication. The twenty-fourth verse of the fourth chapter reveals to us, as through an open window, the body of the primitive Church all together lifting up their voices in one common form of praise and petition, just as we do in the Church service in the Litany, or the Ter Sanctus. In the sixth and eighth chapters, common or united prayer is again hinted at, and when, in the twentieth chapter, St. Paul prayed, he prayed with them all. Whether or not they prayed audibly with him, it is more than probable that, in accordance with the practice of the apostolic Church, they would at least audibly respond, Amen, at the conclusion of the petitions.

In fact, the whole question of liturgical *versus* extempore prayer lies just here. The question is not whether one man can express his thoughts better in a written form, or in

extempore utterance ; or whether a man may or may not please God and the people better by uttering informally the burning petitions of the moment, or from a carefully prepared manuscript. The real question is, whether the people have the right, as God's priesthood, to participate constantly and practically in the worship of God in His house ? And further, whether the people, as God's priesthood, can be said to participate practically and really in common worship and common prayer when they relegate to one man the duty of framing prayers which must of necessity, in great measure, be the reflection of his own views and of his own thoughts ? The Church of England, in following the example of her Lord and His apostles and bringing back, at the Reformation, the early practice of common and united worship, has distinctly asserted that, as far as she is concerned, that only can be said to be common prayer and common worship, when not merely priest or minister speak audibly in prayer, but when, in every part of the service, all the priesthood of God join audibly in unison of heart and voice. It is a travesty upon the service of the Church of England when few or none but the minister and the choir participate in the service. It may be the method of the various Protestant religious bodies, or of Rome, but it is not the method of the Church of England. The teaching and practice of the Church of England is the union of minister and people in a form of common prayer. This participation of the people in the worship of the Church is an anti-Roman note that is worthy of all emphasis. It is the second distinct bulwark and guarantee of the Protestantism of the Prayer Book.

(3) Next, and by no means least, the Protestantism of the Prayer Book is guaranteed by its complete scripturalness. Where the Word of God has free course and is glorified, Popery dies by a natural death. In the Book of Common

Prayer the Word of God is glorified. So completely is it saturated with the Word of God that there is scarcely one sentence which has not for its foundation and vindication some text of Holy Scripture. By far the greater part of all the prayers, petitions, and responses, are in the words of Scripture. The Canticles are all, with one or two exceptions, portions of Holy Writ. More than two-thirds of the Prayer Book, the Psalms, and the Epistles and Gospels, are literal transcripts of God's Word. In fact, for one who has never carefully considered this matter, it is simply startling to find how richly permeated with Scripture is every part of the Prayer Book. The Rev. H. Bailey, in his "Liturgy Compared with the Bible," takes the sentences of the Prayer Book one by one, from the "Dearly Beloved Brethren" of the Morning Service to the last word of the Thirty-ninth Article, and shows by a simple collation of texts that there is for every sentence in the Prayer Book either exact scriptural language, or else apparent authorization from similar texts of Scripture. In addition to this, it must be remembered that the whole tendency of the Liturgy is to exalt the inspired Word of God. Its Lessons, its Psalms, its Canticles, its Gospels and Epistles, all combine to bring God's Holy Word into great prominence in the hearing of the people. We question, indeed, whether any human composition could, without any straining or purposed effort, compress with as much discretion, and in so short a compass, so full and varied a presentation of the Scriptures as is to be found in the order for morning and evening prayer. It begins with Scripture. It ends with Scripture. It exalts Scripture. It is based on Scripture. It is Scripture, Scripture, Scripture, from beginning to end.

As to the mere portions of Scripture which are appointed to be read daily, to say nothing of those portions of God's inspired Word which are appointed as "hymns and spiritual

songs," it is wonderful what richness and fitness there is in the Church's daily provision for her children. As far as I am aware, among the various Protestant religious communions outside the Church of England, it is not customary to have more than four portions of God's Word read on Sunday, two in the morning, and two in the evening, chosen probably at random, or at the caprice of the minister. In the Church of England, six portions of God's Word is the very lowest possible number, eleven is the average, while sometimes as many as eighteen passages of God's inspired Word are read, not including those four portions of the Bible which are sung in the morning and evening services. If those are reckoned also, fifteen portions of God's Holy Word is the ordinary provision of the Church of England for her people. In other words, *every person who attends the Sunday or daily services of the Church of England hears, or reads, fifteen passages out of the Bible.* Surely this fact, if there were no other, would be sufficient to guarantee the thorough soundness and Protestantism of the Book. The pure Word of God is ever hateful to Rome. She knows its fatal power. She hates its life-giving energy. She knows that priestcraft and papistry totter when it has free course. But Protestants love the Word of God. It is to them the Word of Life, the instrument of regeneration, making wise to salvation. It is the charter of their spiritual liberties, the eternal bulwark of their spiritual life. Therefore the Reformers exalted the Scriptures. Therefore they declared that "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the Faith." (*Art. VI.*) That "the three Creeds ought thoroughly to be received and believed, for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture." (*Art. VIII.*) That "it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is

contrary to God's Word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the Church be a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ, yet as it ought not to decree anything against the same, so besides the same ought it not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of salvation." (*Art. XX.*) That "things ordained by General Councils as necessary to salvation have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scripture." (*Art. XXI.*) That "the Romish doctrine concerning purgatory, pardons, worshipping and adoration of images, &c., is a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God." (*Art. XXII.*) That "transubstantiation in the Supper of the Lord cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture." (*Art. XXIII.*) Therefore they saw to it, in the compilation of the Liturgy, that nothing should be found therein which was not grounded on the Word of God, and took care that the Liturgy should be but a candlestick for the exaltation of the light. Therefore they secured to the Church a human composition so richly saturated with Scripture that it stands in its matchless beauty second only to the Word of God. "For they so ordered the matter that all the whole Bible (or the greatest part thereof) should be read over once every year, intending thereby that the clergy, and especially such as were ministers in the congregation, should (by often reading, and meditation in, God's Word) be stirred up to godliness themselves, and be more able to exhort others by wholesome doctrine, and to confute them that were adversaries of the truth; and further, that the people (by daily hearing of Holy Scripture read in the church) might continually profit more and more in the knowledge of God, and be more inflamed with the love of His true religion." (*Preface to the Prayer Book.*)

If the Church of England is sound upon any point, she is sound upon this cardinal doctrine of the position and value of Holy Scripture. If the Prayer Book is sound upon one point more than another, it is upon the supreme and exclusive value of the inspired Word of God. As has been tersely remarked, if you were to take out of the Prayer Book of the Church of England everything that is Scripture, or a paraphrase of Scripture, you would have little left but the covers. Not merely the spirit, but the body would be departed also.

By each of these characteristics separately, and by all of them as a whole, the Protestantism of the Prayer Book is most surely vindicated. Each of them is of the utmost importance, and contributed in large measure to securing the Protestantism of the Church and the nation. When together, they present a most solid front, a very bulwark of defiance, to the Romish practices. While Rome performs her service in a language "not understood of the people," and in a manner that practically excludes the people from common worship and common prayer, and in phraseology in great measure utterly anti-scriptural, the Reformed and Protestant Church of England, on the contrary, glories in a form of prayer which is in the people's language, within the people's reach, and permeated with the pure and soul-saving Word of God.

CHAPTER III.

MORNING AND EVENING PRAYER AND LITANY.

I PROPOSE to consider in this chapter those details of the Prayer Book which are comprised under the order for Morning and for Evening prayer, concluding with a brief survey of the Litany. It is not my object to point out the rationale of this order, nor to bring into prominence its spiritual appropriateness, nor its beauties of diction. As in the former chapter, and throughout the work, the aim will be to emphasize those niceties of rubrical direction, and textual expression, which prove, more strikingly than careful arguments, the anti-Romish intentions of the compilers. If the Book of Common Prayer is capable of vindication from a Protestant standpoint, it must stand the scrutiny of particular analysis. Each sentence must be subjected to examination, and tested even to the position of the words themselves. Such a scrutiny, I am persuaded, the book will stand, and the examination of each particular feature will confirm the unmistakable Protestantism of the whole. To proceed, then, to the order for morning prayer.

The service begins, of course, with Scripture. First of all, the people are brought into the very presence of God by contact with His infallible Word, as the minister reads, with a loud voice, one or more sentences of Scripture;* the Prayer Book thus declaring, by its first act, the supremacy of the sacred Scriptures, and the responsibility of the individual soul

* In Archbishop Grindal's Injunctions to the laity it is ordered: "That the minister shall stand with *his face to the people* when he readeth morning and evening prayer."—*Park. Soc.* p. 132.

to God. Then follows that simple and scriptural exhortation in which the people are summoned, before the Throne of Grace to confess their sin, not to any human mediator or confessor-priest, but to God the Almighty, the Judge of all. Precious on account of its intrinsic fitness and beauty, this exhortation should in itself be held dear, as an eloquent protest against two of the most fundamental falsities of Rome: private or auricular confession, and priestly absolution. It is impossible to conceive that such an exhortation could be found within the compass of a Romanist or a Romanizing Liturgy. The very simplicity of the language of appeal, and the statement of the four chief purposes for which we assemble in church, above all, the terms employed to express the end of confession, are proofs of its truly Protestant character. A Romanist, or even Romanizing, Liturgy would infallibly have substituted for the words, "to the end that we may obtain forgiveness of the same, by His infinite goodness and mercy," some such expression as that we may, in the sacrament of penance, by the absolution of the priest, obtain forgiveness of the same, or words to that effect.

Led, then, by the minister, the whole congregation approach the Presence of God in words at once scriptural, suitable, beautiful, meekly confessing their sins; the Prayer Book teaching, in this initial supplication, two most important truths: the right of each individual to go to God *directly and at once*, and the necessity of constant personal acknowledgment of sin. This general confession demolishes most completely the figment of a mediating priesthood. At once, without let or hindrance, or intermediate step to priest, or saint, or virgin, each individual soul draws nigh to God, with the voice of pleading, "Almighty and most merciful Father;" and, at the same time, his identity with his fellow-worshippers is emphasised by the use of the plural number. But it is to God, at once and directly, he goes. In the very

forefront of the Prayer Book, as a proclamation to all of its character, this confession is established as one of the bulwarks of its Protestantism. It strikes, at the beginning, a deadly blow at Rome's doctrine of secret confession, by uniting the congregation in a public confession, and proclaims, as with audible voice, the great anti-Roman dogma of Holy Scripture, "There is but one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus."

Following this is the absolution or remission of sins, to be pronounced by the priest alone, standing; the people still kneeling. In this, the priest pronounces and declares the absolution and remission of the sins of God's people who truly repent and unfeignedly believe. Let it be clearly understood that in this the priest does not absolve. As God's minister and ambassador, he declares the sweet message of pardon. He pronounces the glad message of peace. He assures the people of God that, if they truly repent and unfeignedly believe God's Holy Gospel, they are pardoned. "Almighty God—*He* pardoneth and absolveth all them that truly repent," &c. There should be no doubt of it, for as St. John said in writing, so the minister declares in slightly different words, "Your sins are forgiven you, for His name's sake." In the language of Dr. Lightfoot, the late Bishop of Durham: "The Christian minister is God's ambassador to men; he is charged with the ministry of reconciliation: he unfolds the will of Heaven; he declares, in God's name, the terms on which pardon is offered; and he pronounces, in God's name, the absolution of the penitent. This last mentioned function has been thought to invest the ministry with a distinctly sacerdotal character. Yet it is very closely connected with the magisterial and pastoral duties of the office, and is only priestly in the same sense in which they are priestly. As empowered to declare the conditions of God's grace, he is also empowered to proclaim the con-

sequences of their acceptance. But throughout his office is representative, and not vicarial. He does not interfere between God and man in such a way that direct communion with God is suspended, on the one hand, or that his own mediation becomes indispensable, on the other." (*Bp. Lightfoot on Epistle to Philippi*, p. 265.) So far, in fact, from indicating any remnant of Popery, this absolution is of the very essence of Protestantism, and, as long as it remains intact, will maintain the Protestantism of the Prayer Book. It is the very antipodes of a Papist absolution. The absolution of Rome, as we shall afterwards show, is the *judicial and indispensable* act of an absolving human priesthood. This absolution is a declaration, a promise, an evangel, an exhortation to prayer. It sets forth in the ears of the people the gladdest message that ever greeted man, the gospel of the free grace of God, the long-suffering and pardoning mercy of God; the certainty of this forgiveness as declared by His ministers, to whom the power and commandment to declare this message has been entrusted; and finally, the necessity of imploring the God who alone can save, and quicken, and renew, to grant true repentance and His Holy Spirit.

This last character, of itself, completely frees it from the imputation of Romanism, and vindicates its scripturalness and simplicity. Instead of a Popish absolution it is an exhortation to earnest prayer, founded on the authoritative demonstration of God's mercy, according to His unfailing promises; for the rubric that immediately follows seems to show that the Church considers it to be a kind of prayer. *The people shall answer here and at the end of all other prayers, Amen.* It is unfair, and untruthful, to distort this into a plea for lingering Romanism. The very distastefulness of this absolution to that section of the Anglo-Catholic school who will be contented with nothing short of a reversion to the First Prayer Book of Edward VI.

is in itself a proof of its stubborn Protestantism. One of the prominent leaders in that movement, the Rev. Dr. Littledale, in a letter to the Royal Commission on Ritual, quoted by Butler,* pleads for an omission of the General Confession and the Absolution. The latter, which he calls the quasi-absolution (note the expression—the *quasi*-absolution), he considers worthless, and a Puritan innovation of 1552, quite contrary to the true theory of Catholic worship. In fact, the party whose avowed object is the extirpation of Protestant opinions within or in the Church of England, finds no impediment to the accomplishment of their sinister designs more obstinate and impregnable than the unmistakable anti-Romanism of the Revised Prayer Book of 1552. This period in our Church history indicates the high standard of the Protestantism of the Church. It was at this period that the Confession and Absolution were added to the Prayer Book, both of them in the very words almost of similar services in other Protestant liturgies, and, by the goodness of our Lord, they remain as they were originally inserted to this day.

Though apparently a trivial circumstance and unworthy of particular notice, this fact of the time and the circumstances of the addition of the Confession and Absolution is, in reality, a very important one. This Absolution, which many to-day, through a misunderstanding of its evangelical purport, imagine to be a vestige of priestcraft, unworthy a place in a Protestant liturgy, was inserted, and almost certainly composed, by the men whose Protestantism brought them to the martyr fires at Smithfield. They knew full well what they were doing. They certainly had no idea of cringing to Rome, or admitting avenues to Romish teaching. Doubtless they understood only too well the tendencies and

* Butler, "History of the Book of Common Prayer," p. 83.

dangers of a mediating and sacrificing and absolving Romish priesthood, and in making the priest or minister the pronouncer of the message of absolution, and God the giver of absolution, they took the safe and blessed *via media* of Holy Scripture. As has been pointed out by a modern writer on the Prayer Book, the very doctrine of the Church of England propounded in our Absolution has been made the subject of a special anathema by the Church of Rome in the language of the Tridentine Canon: "If anyone shall say that the sacramental absolution of the priest is not a *judicial* act, but a bare *ministerial* act of pronouncing and declaring (*pronuntiandi et declarandi*) to the person confessing that his sins are pardoned, provided only he believes himself to be absolved, let him be accursed."

Now whatever learned theologians may decide after their disputes as to the form of absolution, whether it be a judicial act or merely a declaratory utterance, the common people, comparing the words of this Roman canon with the words of the Prayer Book absolution, can only come to one conclusion. It is certain that, according to the Prayer Book of the Church of England, the ministers here have the power and commandment to *declare and pronounce* the absolution and remission of sins, and that what they declare and pronounce with regard to the absolution and remission of sins is that He, God, pardoneth and absolveth "all them that truly repent and unfeignedly believe His holy Gospel." It is equally certain that the Romish doctrine is the opposite of this, for, according to the teaching of the Church of Rome in the canon of the Council of Trent, he is to be accursed who says that the absolution is a *bare ministerial act of pronouncing and declaring*. Therefore, whatever it is, it is clear that the absolution of the Church of England Prayer Book is not Romish, for it is, in so many express words, anathematized by Rome.

After the Absolution follows the Lord's Prayer, not to be muttered inaudibly by the priest alone, but to be said with a clear voice by the people, too. And from this section of the service to the recital of the Creed, with the exception of the *Te Deum*, or *Benedicite*, nothing is said or sung that is not in the very words of Holy Scripture. At least, one-half of the morning service is thus occupied in repeating or listening to the Word of God. The Lord's Prayer is taken from the sixth chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel, from the ninth to the sixteenth verse. The Versicles which follow are taken from the fifty-first and fortieth Psalms. The Gloria from the twenty-seventh verse of the sixteenth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, and other parts of Scripture. The *Venite* is the ninety-fifth Psalm. The Psalms for the day which follow, being read by the people and minister alternately, are taken from the old Bible version of Tyndale and Coverdale. They average five a-day, to be read through altogether in the course of a month. Then come the Lessons, one taken from the Old and one from the New Testament; and after that another sacred hymn, a choice being allowed between the song of Zacharias in the first chapter of St. Luke's Gospel, from verse sixty-eight to seventy-nine, generally known as the *Benedictus*, or the *Jubilate*, that is, the one hundredth Psalm.

We may mention here, in passing, that the rubric concerning the reading of the lessons has a most decidedly Protestant ring. In order to fully appreciate this we must once more remember that Rome was ever averse to the pure Word of God, and that in the English Church before the Reformation, when Roman practices everywhere prevailed, the Word of God was persistently kept from the people. It was read in an unknown tongue, and was utterly unintelligible to all but the scholarly. It was read, moreover, only in fragments here and there. It was, above all, so

covered over with fiction, and fables, and lying tales of man's invention, that spiritual benefit was nigh impossible. And to-day the practice of Rome remains unchanged. The Word of God is read in fragments, mixed with human fictions (see the Roman Breviary), and in a language that to the common people is incomprehensible.

The Reformers, knowing this, boldly reverted to scriptural usage. In the first place, they raised the standard of revolt against Rome, by ordaining that in our Church the Scriptures should be read in the language understood by the people. In the next place, by decreeing that they should be read distinctly with an audible voice, the reader to so stand and turn as to be best heard by all present. In the third place, by declaring that nothing is ordained to be read but the very pure Word of God. The difficulties they had to contend with, in introducing so revolutionary a change, are somewhat humorously alluded to in the Preface to the Prayer Book. The simple chapters of the Bible, they tell us, were interspersed with "stories and legends, with multitude of responds, and verses, and vain repetitions." The service was rendered in Latin to the people, which they understood not, so that they "heard with their ears only, and their heart, spirit, and mind, were not edified." And, worst of all, the number and hardness of the rules, and the manifold changings of the service, was the cause, that to turn the Book "was so hard and intricate a matter, that many times there was more business to find out what should be read, than to read it when it was found out." (*Preface concerning the Service of the Church*, p. 5.) Instead of all this, thanks to their wisdom, and energy, and perspicuity, we have now an order for the reading of the Holy Scripture, which is at once commodious, easy, profitable, and pure. Our Reformers have, in fact, so ordered the matter, in the good providence of God, that all the whole Bible, or the greatest part thereof, is read over once every year, to the

end that the clergy should, by often reading and meditating in God's Word, be stirred up to godliness themselves, and be more able to exhort others to wholesome doctrine, and to confute them that are adversaries to the Truth.

Herein, members of the Church of England have a rich heritage, for which they can never cease to be thankful. Not merely have they the Word of God read in the hearing of the people, but there is, in the order of the hearing, such a marvellous sagacity of choice and selection, in the arrangement of the reading of the lessons, that nearly the whole Word of God, in its breadth, fitness, order, and connectedness, is read in the hearing of the people. With others, the people may be largely left to the caprice of the minister, who may give them a short Psalm, or a favourite passage from Isaiah, or St. John's Gospel, and never necessarily—there may of course be exceptions—the fulness of the Word of God. But in the Church of England it cannot be so. By the wise arrangement of the authorities of the Church, where there is daily service, the whole of the New Testament, with the exception of a few chapters in the Revelation, is read through twice in the year, and the greater part of the Old Testament is read once. Truly, if any people should be grounded and rooted in the Truth, it is the people who have, in the readings of Holy Scripture provided in the Church, such ample opportunities for increasing in the knowledge of God.

With regard to the rest of the service, the Versicles, the Collects, the Litany, the Occasional Prayers, and General Thanksgiving, they not only offer, in a compact and suitable form, the most varied and incessant breathings of the prayerful soul, but they are couched in language so purely scriptural, so beautifully simple, and so deeply spiritual, that it is difficult to conceive how a human compilation could more entirely answer all the natural and the constant necessities of the devotional spirit. Protestant and Anti-Romish, they are

to the core. *Whatever there was in any ancient collect, Liturgy, or Litany, that savoured of Romish or other error, was carefully omitted. Everything that related to the merit of our good works, to the intercession of the Virgin or the saints, all prayers for the dead, and to the dead, everything that alluded to the intercession of the angels, everything, in short, that even faintly countenanced the falsities and superstitions of Rome, was as scrupulously removed from our Prayer Book, as the leaven was removed from the houses of the Israelites before the Feast of the Passover.* On the other hand, whatever there was in these ancient manuals that was pure, scriptural, and spiritual, was wisely and carefully retained. Many of the most exquisite prayers in our Liturgy were inserted by our Reformers, and all of them breathe the most fervent and evangelical spirit.

As to the *Litany*, it is not only a wonderfully comprehensive and satisfying service of prayer, a very model of intercessory worship, it is also a striking monument of the Protestantism of our Liturgy. The various stages through which it has passed, from its original form in the Roman service, to its form as now used in the Prayer Book, are trustworthy indexes of the various transition periods of our Church. *In its Romish form*, it need hardly be said, the Litany was full of error. There were in it no less than sixty-two petitions to angels and archangels, men and women, dead and alive. Invocations for intercession were addressed, not only to Mary, Holy Mother of God, to Michael and Gabriel, to angels and archangels, to all the holy order of blessed spirits, patriarchs, prophets, and apostles, to martyrs and evangelists, innocents and confessors, but also to St. Laurence, St. Vincent, St. Cosmas, and St. Damian, and to all the holy priests and Levites, all the holy widows, and hermits. Kneeling upon their knees, the congregation would listen for the most part in ignorance and

superstition, while there rolled forth in an unknown tongue, from the lips of the priest and the choir, such petitions as these—

“ Sancta Maria, Ora pro nobis,”

“ Sancte Abel, Ora pro nobis,”

“ Omnes sancti Dei, Orate pro nobis,”—

petitions, it need scarcely be added, as unedifying to the Church, as they were unintelligible to the suppliants.

The year 1544 marks the second stage of the Litany. It is a year worthy to be held in grateful remembrance from generation to generation of Protestant Englishmen; for in that year, 1544, thanks, under God, to the untiring vigilance of Archbishop Cranmer, *prayers were used for the first time in the English tongue.* “ Hitherto, the people had understood no part of such prayers and suffrages as were used to be said or sung,” but now, by royal mandate, it is enjoined that certain prayers and suffrages are to be said in the language of the people.*

It was certainly a most momentous innovation; it was, in fact, a national revolution. It gave a new character to the Church and the nation. It broke the spell of Popery; it inaugurated the Protestantism of England; it was the first great step in the Protestantizing of England's Church. Simply, and quietly, yet most effectually, it brought back again to primitive usage the forms of public devotion, and the religious sentiment of the people. The English Litany now introduced by authority, though substantially differing from the Roman in that it was in the English tongue and contained much new matter, was marred by many unscriptural features. While the numerous petitions to the monks and hermits, and other saints of the Roman Canon, were omitted, petitions still remained to Mary and the angels.

* See p. 563 of the “ Private Prayers, Elizabeth,” published by the Parker Society. Compare Cranmer's “ Remains,” p. 412.

“ St. Mary, Mother of God, pray for us.”

“ All holy angels and archangels, and all holy orders of blessed spirits, pray for us.”

“ All holy patriarchs, and prophets, apostles, martyrs, confessors, and virgins, and all the blessed company of Heaven, pray for us.”

However, on the whole, it was a worthy monument of Cranmer's evangelical zeal, and of the ripening Protestantism of the English Church.

The reign of Edward VI. witnessed the Litany issuing forth from its final revision as pure gold refined in the furnace. Not only were all the invocations to saints and angels finally and summarily disposed of; not only was the petition, “ by the intercession of thy saints turn from us all those evils that we most righteously have deserved,” omitted from the Collect at the end; not only were numerous petitions, breathing the most fervent spirit of evangelical truth, inserted; but the whole was remodelled and adjusted to meet the ever varying and perpetual needs of the hungering and thirsting spiritual mind. The most devout and loyal Christian can find nothing in it that, being weighed in the balance of scriptural truth, will be found faulty or wanting.

Why, then, perchance some one will ask, was that grand old petition omitted, “ From the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome, and all his detestable enormities, Good Lord, deliver us ”? For the simple reason, in truth, that it was no longer necessary. Finally and wholly, the Church of England had been delivered from Rome's accursed thralldom. The declaration of the Royal supremacy had as completely demolished Rome's political despotism, as the establishment of the Reformed religion had abolished her spiritual despotism. What need, then, for the free man to pray that he might be freed from a yoke which he no longer wore, and from a chain which God's grace had snapped asunder?

CHAPTER IV.

THE COMMUNION SERVICE.

SO far, in the examination of the Prayer Book, it is hardly possible that anything could be found to offend. The most decided Protestant could discover nothing to irritate or offend the anti-Romish prejudice. All is scriptural, apostolical, and consonant with the spirit of the truth as it is in Jesus. Purity, spirituality, and simplicity, have characterized every feature of the service. Now, however, we come to a section of the Prayer Book where, in the general opinion, the lines of Protestantism begin to grow fainter. The main body of the Liturgy will stand a vigorous scrutiny, but it is otherwise, some allege, with the sacramental and occasional services. It is in these, that is in the communion, baptismal, and other services, that stumbling blocks, and stones of offence, in the shape of lingering elements of Romishness, are discovered by the zealous and critical Churchman.

Before entering into a fuller consideration of these services, let me once more appeal to the argument from probability and improbability, by pointing out one noteworthy fact, a fact which, in itself, will speak eloquently in defence of these portions of the Prayer Book. It is this; that while in the previous portions of the Prayer Book a great part is taken from the services and practices of the early Church, many of which services were used in the mediæval Roman Church, *in this part* of the Prayer Book, the services were compiled under the presiding genius of the Reformation, and adopted in many parts from the works of the continental Reformers.

That is, the very parts which are supposed generally to

savour of Romanism, are taken from Protestant sources, while the very parts that are so entirely unobjectionable to the ordinary Protestant mind, such as the Versicles, Creeds, *Te Deum*, and many of the Collects, are taken from ancient sources, and were largely used by Romanists. It is well, then, to remember that these services—communion, baptismal, and ordination—were composed, compiled, and supervised, in the most Protestant age, and by the most Protestant men, and were in identity with, or similarity to, the most Protestant views that the world has ever known.

A comparison of our communion service, with the Sarum, or Roman services, will speedily make this point clear. What our communion service is, as compared with the Roman Mass, is known to all who may have ever witnessed that ceremony in a Roman church. The strange and unintelligible mutterings, the incessant crossings and genuflections, the kissings of altar and paten, the uplifting of the host, the prostration of the people, the lighting of the candles, the burning of incense, the changing of vestments, the tinkling of the bell,—all these things remind one more of the performance of some ceremony of heathenism, than the administration of the Lord's supper to His believing people. As Bishop Bull once said: "If the blessed apostles were alive, and present at the celebration of the Mass in the Roman Church, they would be amazed, and wonder what the meaning of it was; sure, I am, they would never own it to be that same ordinance which they left to the Churches."

If any one, moreover, thinks that our communion office is taken from the model of the English Church before the Reformation, let him peruse the communion service according to the use of Sarum.* So far from finding any trace of the scriptural dignity, and unobjectionable simplicity, of our

* See Appendix. On the Sarum Mass.

communion service, he will discover, at every turn, anti-scriptural, and Romanistic expressions ; the words, "mass," "holy host," "immaculate host," "sacrifice," "altar," "incense"; childish and superstitious observances, such as kissing the altar and cup, removing the candles, censuring the altar, changing of vestments, bowings and crossings most numerous, censuring the choir, and bowing to the host; unscriptural and objectionable practices; prayers for the dead, prayers to the saints, ablutions of the fingers, adoration of the host. The whole service, in fact, is stuffed with vain repetitions, senseless ceremonies, unscriptural doctrines, pernicious practices, and, to complete its worthlessness, it is in Latin.

Let me briefly give an idea of these. At the time of the offering of the sacrifice of the Mass, the priest is directed to place the bread upon the altar, before the chalice, to kiss the paten, and then to cover it. This ended, he is to cense the sacrifice with the censer, making the sign of the cross, three times—beyond the chalice, and in a circle on each side of the chalice and sacrifice, then the space between himself and the altar. Then he is to be censed himself, then to kiss the Book of the Gospels. Then the choir is to be censed by the acolyte, and the priest is to wash his hands. Then he is to kiss the altar, then to cross himself. Then to consecrate the host and chalice, with more bowings and kissings, and signings of the cross. Then, after many more like ceremonies, he is to receive the body and blood, which, being done, his hands are rinsed, and his face is signed with the sign of the cross. In short, from the beginning to the end, there is scarcely a single feature which can be claimed as analogous to our Protestant service. It is simply the Romish Mass, in all its superstitious and unscriptural repulsiveness.

Not only is our present service as far removed from this, as the order of the communion in the "Catholic Apostolic"

or Irvingite Church, is from the simplicity of the administration of the Lord's Supper in the average Presbyterian Kirk, but, even as compared with the Order of the Communion of 1548, the first step towards reformation in the Church of England, it stands forth, by contrast, as mid-day from twilight or early dawn.

The Order of the Communion, drawn up chiefly by Cranmer, and enjoined to be used by royal proclamation, was a Communion Service *in English*, added after the Priest's own communion, up to which point in the service the Latin Mass continued "without any varying" throughout "the second year of K. Edward VI." It countenanced auricular confession; enjoined many superstitious practices and ceremonials; employed constantly the word "altar"; and, of course, recognised the doctrine of transubstantiation. At the same time, it was a wonderful step in the right direction, and a perfectly marvellous defiance of Popish practices, considering the circumstances of the period. It forbade the elevation of the elements, by a rubric at the end of the service, discouraging thereby the superstitious adoration of the host which was then customary. "If it doth so chance, that the wine, hallowed and consecrate, doth not suffice or be enough for them that do take the communion, the priest, after the first cup or chalice be emptied, may go again to the altar, and reverently and devoutly prepare and consecrate another . . . and *without any levation or lifting up*"—the first ritualistic practice to be forbidden in the reformation of the Church of England.* It enjoined the priest to give an address to the people on the benefits of communion, thus reviving the apostolic order of preaching,

* Archbishop Grindal, "Injunctions to the Clergy," *Park. Soc.*, p. 124: "4. Item, That at all times, when ye minister the holy sacraments, and upon Sundays and other holy days, when ye say the Common

which Rome so laboured to suppress. It provided that the laity should receive both the wine and the bread; a practice so revolutionary and so contrary to Roman usage, that it was the most audacious defiance of Rome as yet attempted in England. Superstitious, imperfect, blemished, as it was, we may thank God for the significant Protestantism of this harbinger of our Liturgy.

In 1549, the whole Prayer Book, in English, came forth, and the Communion Service in it was arranged very much like that in our present Prayer Book. There were, however, various terms employed, and various practices sanctioned, in this First Book of Edward, which were intentionally avoided and omitted in the revised Prayer Book of Edward of 1552, which is, as must again and again be emphasised, substantially the Prayer Book as we now have it. I have said, intentionally, for there can be no doubt, that Cranmer and Ridley, the chief agents in the work of revision, with growing spiritual enlightenment, were determined to eradicate from the services of the Church of England everything that could nourish superstition or countenance Popery. That the omissions they made, and the changes they introduced, were the result, neither of chance, oversight, or caprice, but

Prayer and other divine service in your parish churches and chapels, and likewise at all marriages and burials, ye shall, when ye minister, wear a clean and decent surplice with large sleeves; and shall minister the Holy Communion in no chalice nor any profane cup or glass, but in a Communion cup of silver, and with a cover of silver, appointed also for the ministration of the Communion-bread. Ye shall not deliver the Communion-bread unto the people into their mouths, but into their hands; nor shall use at the ministration of the Communion any gestures, rites, or ceremonies not appointed by the Book of Common Prayer, as crossing or breathing over the sacramental bread and wine, *nor any shewing or lifting up of the same to the people*, to be by them worshipped and adored, nor any such like."

were the careful, judicious, and designed alterations of men who clearly understood how even minute expressions and outward gestures may be produced as intentional endorsements of doctrinal teaching, will be seen from a comparison of the service, as issued in 1549, with that to be found in our reformed and perfected service. The following differences deserve careful and grateful consideration.

First. In the Prayer Book of 1549, the title of the Communion Service was as follows :—

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

In the Second Prayer Book, the words “commonly called the Mass” were omitted, this simple change removing from the popular mind all connection of our Communion Service with that of the Roman Mass. A decided Protestant mark.

Second. In the Prayer Book of 1549, the word “altar” is frequently used.

“The priest, standing humbly afore the midst of the *altar*, shall say the Lord’s prayer.”

“Then the priest, turning him to the *altar*, shall say.”

It was also termed, “God’s board,” but *altar* is the word more frequently used.

Now, the word “altar” is entirely expunged, and the word “table” is substituted throughout. The “table,” “the Lord’s table,” “the holy table,” are the words intentionally and exclusively employed ; the word “altar,” never ! * A decided Protestant mark.

Third. In the Prayer Book of 1549, the last of the opening rubrics was :—

“The Priest standing humbly afore the midst of the altar shall say the Lord’s prayer with this collect.”

In the Second Prayer Book this most important rubric

* See pp. 60, 61.

appeared in place of it, and is to-day the last of the rubrics at the beginning of the Communion Service.

"The table having at the Communion time a fair white linen cloth upon it, shall stand *in the Body of the church*, or in the chancel, where morning prayer *and evening prayer* be appointed to be said. And the priest standing at the north side of the table, shall say the Lord's Prayer, with this collect following."*

This rubric was expressly intended to prevent the Romish error of localizing the Divine Presence, and the altarward system of worship and service. With the table standing "in the body of the church," the altarward system of worship is impossible.

Yet this position is authorized by the Church.

With the table standing *in the chancel*, altarward worship is almost equally difficult.

Yet this is *the only* alternative permitted by the Church.

The common use, viz. an altar-like table *fixed* at the end of the chancel, is authorized neither by the rubrics, nor by the doctrinal system of the Church of England;† and though use may make a thing common, it can never legalize, for nothing can legalize but law.

This rubric, suggesting and implying a movable table, not a fixed altar as in the Church of Rome, is a most decided Protestant mark.

Fourth. In the First Book of Edward, 1549, the vestments enjoined for use were a white alb, plain, with a "Vestment" or cope, or else albs with tunicles: vestments similar to those

* See Appendix. The Eastward Position.

† "It was a table indeed, so standing as men might stand round about it, and *not against a wall as your Popish altars stand.*" (See Fulke's "Defence," *Park. Soc.*, p. 517—a masterly treatise of one of the greatest of Church of England divines.)

in use in the Roman Church. In the Second Book of Edward, 1552, and now, with the exception of Cathedrals and Collegiate churches, the vestment authorized for both priest and deacon is, "a surplice only." Another decided Protestant mark.*

Fifth. In the Prayer Book of 1549, the mixing of wine and water was enjoined. Now it is wine alone, the mixing being purposely omitted, and therefore prohibited. Another Protestant mark.†

Sixth. In the First Prayer Book of Edward, the doctrine of the "Real" Presence (in the Romish sense) was countenanced, and most objectionable expressions were employed. For instance, in the Exhortations which the curate is enjoined to give to the people, he says, "He hath left *in* those holy mysteries, as a pledge of His love, and a continual remembrance of the same, His own blessed Body and precious Blood, for us to feed upon spiritually." In the prayer of consecration, which in the First Book came before the "You that do truly repent," &c., he prays that the "Bread and Wine may be unto us the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son, Jesus Christ." Both in the prayer of humble access, and in the prayer after the communion, the words are used, "to eat the flesh of Thy Son, and to drink His Blood, *in* these holy mysteries," and, "that Thou hast vouchsafed to feed us *in* these holy mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of Thy Son." In the revised Prayer Book, as we now have it, all these expressions are carefully avoided, the only approach to them being the unobjectionable thanksgiving to God for giving Christ to be our spiritual food in the believing use of the sacrament. While not

* See Appendix. The so-called Ornaments Rubric, p. 201.

† See Appendix on Mixing of wine and water, p. 223.

actually teaching, in so many words, the doctrine of the "Real" Presence, these expressions hinted in that direction, and were capable of being distorted into a direct support of that doctrine. The Reformers, therefore, carefully removed them, not by accident, or in ignorance, but because they thoroughly understood their work.* Another decided Protestant mark.

Seventh. In the First Prayer Book the rubric ordered that the bread used at the communion should be of a uniform kind, an unleavened, round piece of bread, like the Roman wafer, only a little larger, and "without any manner of print," and that this should be broken, and part of it put into the communicant's *mouth* by the Priest.

In the Second Prayer Book, as in our own, the rubric provided, "*to take away superstition*," that is, of course, superstition connected with the offering of the Mass and transubstantiation; that bread "such as is usual to be eaten at the table with other meats" † be used; and the direction with regard to the Priest putting the Sacrament of Christ's Body into the mouth was omitted.

Both these changes were significant changes in the Protestant direction, inasmuch as they were intended to

* See Appendix. Dr. Pusey on the Real Presence, p. 226.

† "At the revision of the Prayer Book, in 1661, the following addition was proposed to the rubric at the end of the Communion Service:—

"'Though wafer bread, pure and without any figure set upon it, shall not be forbidden, especially in such churches where it hath been accustomed.'"

This proposal, though apparently adopted at one stage of the revision, since it appears in both Cosin's "Durham book" and in the Bodleian ("Sancroft's") fair copy, was struck out and rejected by Convocation. See Parker's "History of the Revision of the Prayer Book," p. 232.

draw the mind away from customs associated with the Romish Mass, and to emphasize the Scriptural usage in the receiving of the communion. The Rubric of 1552 enjoined the Priest to deliver (the elements) to the people *in* their hands. The Rubric in the Prayer Book now is even more emphatic: "*into* their hands." * Another decided Protestant mark.

Eighth. In the First Book of Edward, prayers were made for the dead: "We commend unto Thy mercy, O Lord, all other Thy servants, which are departed hence from us with the sign of faith, and now do rest in the sleep of peace; grant unto them, we beseech Thee, Thy mercy and everlasting peace." (*Prayer before Consecration.*) In the revision, they were carefully omitted, and are not now to be found in the Prayer Book. Another decided Protestant mark.

Ninth. The prayer of oblation, as it has been called, now substantially the prayer which follows the Lord's Prayer, after the consumption of the elements, "O Lord and heavenly Father, accept this our sacrifice of praise," &c., was then *before* the partaking of the elements. This, by many semi-Romanists, as it is by the Romanizers now, was construed into a sanction of the idea of the communion being a sacrifice. Now, it is put into a position where no such meaning can possibly be forced out of it. Wheatly, in his work on the Prayer Book, complains that this prayer was "half laid aside, and the rest thrown into an improper place, as being enjoined to be said after the people have communicated; whereas, it was always the practice of the primitive Christians to use it during the act of consecration. For the holy eucharist was, from the very first institution, esteemed, and received as a proper sacrifice, and solemnly

* See note on p. 50. See also very important note, Zurich Letters, Parker Soc., p. 179.

offered to God upon the altar, before it was received and partaken of by the communicants. In conformity, whereunto, it was Bishop Overall's practice to use the first prayer in the post-communion office, between the consecration and the administering, even when it was otherwise ordered by the public Liturgy." Whatever may be thought of the utterly anti-rubrical and law-defying action of Bishop Overall,* it is certain that the Reformers knew what they were doing in placing the prayer where they did. They did it intentionally, and their purpose evidently was to discountenance everything that could lend any possible aid to the grossly sacerdotal doctrine of the sacrifice of the altar. The position of this prayer, then, is another decided Protestant mark.

Tenth. And, above all, most decided Protestant mark, there was inserted that rubric at the end of the service, which, as it has ever been a humiliation, and thorn in the flesh to all Romanizers and pseudo-Romanists in our Church, has been to all loyal Churchmen a cause for continuous thankfulness, as the sturdy bulwark against all Romanism and Popery, open or concealed. This post-communion rubric, called sometimes "the black rubric," was inserted in 1552, and though slightly altered it still stands as an irresistible protest against the doctrine of the corporal presence, and effectually demolishes the theory and practice of adoration of the eucharist. "Whereas it is ordained in this Office for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, that the Communicants should receive the same kneeling; (which Order is well meant, for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ therein given to all worthy Receivers, and

* Since the above was written it has been pointed out to me that we have no real evidence that Bishop Overall (who died sixty-seven years before Wheatly was born) was guilty of this practice, and that Wheatly was probably mistaken in making this statement.

for the avoiding of such profanation, and disorder in the Holy Communion, as might otherwise ensue :) yet, lest the same kneeling should, by any persons, either out of ignorance, and infirmity, or out of malice and obstinacy, be misconstrued, and depraved: It is hereby declared, that thereby no Adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental bread or wine, there bodily received, or unto any Corporal presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood. For the sacramental bread and wine 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 the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural body, to be at one time in more places, than one."

In fact, anyone who goes carefully through the Second Book of Edward, comparing it with the First Book, sentence by sentence, and word by word, cannot fail to see that every sentence and expression that afforded, in the Reformers' opinion, the slightest colour to the lingering elements of Romanism, have been firmly and intentionally expunged. Not only the above-mentioned alterations and additions, but rubrics against the reservation of the elements, and solitary communion, confirm this, and show with what minuteness of care all the avenues to a possibly returning Romanism were entirely and for ever closed up.

To sum up:

There is, in the Communion Service of the Church of England, a distinct repudiation, first, of the whole conception, form, and purpose, of the Romish Mass. The term is never employed. The elements are administered in both kinds. There is not the slightest analogy between them. The Mass is, from beginning to end, based upon the assumptions of sacerdotalism. It is a ritualistic ceremony, to be performed

by the priest, and to be witnessed by the people.* The administration of the Lord's Supper, according to the rites of the Church of England, is essentially and simply a communion. The central object in the Mass is the visible offering upon the altar, by the priest, of the sacrifice of Christ's Body. The central object in our service is Christ seen and fed upon by faith. The central idea of the Mass is sacrifice for the living and the dead. The central idea of the English service is communion of the living with their Lord. In the Mass, the people gather to see; in the Communion the people come to commune. In the Mass, the worshippers gather before an altar to adore a priest-made deity. In the Communion, believers gather around the table of the Lord, "in remembrance of his meritorious cross and passion whereby alone" (that is, by which cross and passion alone), "we obtain remission of our sins, and are made partakers of the Kingdom of Heaven." The object and end of worship in the Roman system is the eucharistic sacrifice. In the English Church there is a distinct provision of the rubrics which shows that an administration of the Holy Communion is *not necessarily* a part of the morning service, and another *which actually forbids* the celebration of the Holy Communion unless there be a certain number to communicate with the priest.† Were the "Catholic" theory of worship the Church theory, such things would be impossible. In fact, the altarward system of worship is as

* "For who knoweth not that *the very outward work of saying or seeing of Mass is taken for a great God's service?* Who knoweth not that the outward work of the Mass is and hath been applied for the remission of sins of the quick and the dead?"

"Christ ordained this supper to be a *taking* matter. 'Take, eat,' saith He: but the Mass is a *looking* matter, 'Peep, see, look, stoop down before,' &c."—*Bradford, Letters, &c., Park. Soc.*, pp. 313-315.

† See Hutchinson's Works, Parker Soc., p. 227-8.

completely destroyed by the third post-communion rubric requiring three persons at least (beside the priest) to receive, in order to make a communion *possible*, as it is by the fourth ante-communion rubric, which orders the table to stand in the body of the church, or in the chancel.

And any Romanist will say so too.

There is, in the Communion Service of the Church of England, a distinct repudiation, secondly, of the expression, and notion of an "altar." The altar is the inseparable adjunct of the Roman service. In the Protestant Church of England it has no place. The reasons given by Ridley and adopted by the Privy Council in their Orders in Council sent to each of the bishops "why the Lord's board should rather be after the form of a table than of an altar," are worthy of all consideration.*

* "What thinkest thou, is it more meet to receive the supper of the Lord at a table, or rather at an altar? *Son*: At a table. *Father*: Why so? *Son*: For our Saviour Christ did both institute this holy supper at a table, and the apostles of Christ also did receive it at a table. And what can be more perfect than that which Christ and his apostles have done? All the primitive Church also received the supper of the Lord at a table. And St. Paul, speaking of the Lord's Supper, maketh mention not of an altar, but of a table. 'Ye cannot be partakers,' saith he, 'of the Lord's table, and of the devil's table also.' Tables for the ministration of the Lord's Supper continued in the Church of Christ almost three hundred years after Christ universally, and in some places longer, as histories make mention, so that the use of altars is but a new invention, and brought in, as some write, by Pope Sixtus, the second of that name.

"Moreover, an altar hath relation to a sacrifice. And altars in the old law were built and set up at the commandments of God, to offer sacrifice upon them. But all those sacrifices do now cease (for they were but 'shadows of good things to come'); therefore the altars ought to cease with them. Christ alone is our altar, our sacrifice, and our priest. Our altar is in heaven. Our altar

First reason. "The form of a table shall more move the simple from the superstitious opinions of the Popish Mass unto the right use of the Lord's Supper. For the use of an altar is to make sacrifice upon it; the use of a table is to serve for men to eat upon. Now, when we come to the Lord's board, what do we come for? To sacrifice Christ again, and to crucify Him again? or to feed upon Him that was once only crucified and offered up for us? If we come to feed upon Him, spiritually to eat His Body, and spiritually to drink His Blood, which is the true use of the Lord's Supper, then no man can deny but the form of a table is more meet for the Lord's board than the form of an altar."

Second reason. Though the Prayer Book makes mention of an altar (he speaks here of the First Book of Edward, in which, as I showed above, the term "altar" was used), it did not prescribe any form thereof. How much more forcible is this reason now, when the word "altar" has been purposely rejected. So that we may now alter the words, and say with perfect truth—Whereas the Book of Common Prayer "maketh *no* mention of an altar," therefore, it is not lawful to employ a term which that Book abolished.

Third reason. "The Popish opinion of the Mass was that it might not be celebrated but upon an altar, or a super altar." To abolish this superstitious opinion, it is more meet to have the form of a table.

Fourth reason. "The form of an altar was ordained for the sacrifices of the Law. But now both the Law and the sacrifices thereof do cease; wherefore, the form of the altar used in the Law ought to cease withall."

Fifth reason. "Christ did institute the sacrament of his

is not made of stone, but of flesh and blood; of whom the apostle writeth thus:—'We have an altar, whereof it is not lawful for them to eat which serve in the tabernacle.'"—*Becon, Catechism, Park. Soc., p. 297.*

Body and Blood at his last supper at a table, and not at an altar, as it appeareth manifestly by the three evangelists. And also, it is not read that any of the Apostles, or the primitive Church did ever use any altar in ministration of the Holy Communion. Wherefore, seeing the form of a table is more agreeable with Christ's institution, and with the usage of the Apostles and the primitive Church, therefore, the form of a table is rather to be used than the form of an altar." (*Cranmer's Works, Park. Soc.*, p. 524.) The whole argumentation is in flat contradiction of those who, desirous of returning to Catholic usages, will persist in styling the table an "altar." The word "table" is more scriptural, more convenient, and more in accordance with primitive usage. The word "altar," on the contrary, is anti-scriptural, Romish, and tends to assimilate the holy communion to the Popish Mass. And what is more to the point with many, *the word table is the right Church of England word. It is the Church expression, and therefore to be used by the good churchman.*

The language of the Prayer Book is most emphatic. In the First Book, to use the term "altar" was necessary and legitimate. It was the term used in the Prayer Book. Afterwards, the expression was taken away, and that completely. To use it still, after such purposed removal, is evidently a contravention of the spirit and letter of the Prayer Book. If any further testimony is needed, it may be added that the eighty-second Canon puts an end to all controversy on this point. This Canon is entitled. "A decent communion-table in every Church." "Whereas we have no doubt, but that in all churches within the realm of England, convenient and decent tables are provided and placed for the celebration of the Holy Communion, we appoint, that the same tables shall, from time to time, be kept and repaired in sufficient and seemly manner, and

covered, in time of divine service, with a carpet of silk or other decent stuff, thought meet by the ordinary of the place, if any question be made of it, and with a fair linen cloth at the time of the ministration, as becometh that table, and so stand, save when the said Holy Communion is to be administered." But why quarrel about a name? Can there really be any serious ground for controversy in the use of a mere term? Certainly there can. Names represent things, and terms signify doctrines. Their danger lies in the ideas they convey. A sacrificing priest and an altar generally and naturally go together; a sacrificing priest and a *table*,—never.* Therefore, the Reformers abolished the term, and to-day there is no such thing as an altar in the Church of England.†

There is, in the Communion Service of the Church of England, a distinct repudiation, thirdly, of the whole idea of "sacrifice," that is, in the sense of its being a re-enactment of the offering of Christ on Calvary. Not only is there not the slightest allusion to this in the service, the catechism, the rubrics, the articles, but the very terms employed, "the Lord's Supper," "the Holy Communion," are totally subversive of the idea of sacrifice. Not only so, but Art. XXXI., "Of the one oblation of Christ *finished* upon the cross," made once for all,—Latin *semel*, that is, once only—never to be repeated, condemns the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the priest did offer Christ

* "They know right well that these three, priest, sacrifice and altar are dependents, and consequent one of another, so that they cannot be separated."—*Martin in Fulke's Defence, Park. Soc.*, p. 240.

† To refer to Heb. xiii.-10, "we have an altar," is not only unfair, for the point is about the Prayer Book expression, but a dishonest begging of the question, for it has yet to be proved that the Lord's table is referred to. But assuming that it is, it certainly is not the Romish altar for material sacrifices, as the context shows.

for the quick and the dead, as *blasphemous* fables and dangerous deceits. Not only that, but the Homily on the worthy receiving of the sacrament, bids us "beware, lest it (that is *the Holy Communion*), *be made a sacrifice*."*

To speak, therefore, of the post-communion prayer as the "offering of the sacrifice," is certainly an utter distortion of the plain teaching of the Prayer Book. And while the expression, "eucharistic sacrifice," is capable of a scriptural

* "Therefore did not Christ at His last supper institute any external propitiatory sacrifice of His body and blood, but a sacrament, joined with the spiritual sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, which sacrament being administered by the ministers thereto appointed, the sacrifice is common to the whole Church of the faithful, who are all spiritual priests to offer up spiritual sacrifices." —*Fulke Defence, Park. Soc.*, p. 241.

"Whereas they say, that it is the same sacrifice which Christ offered on the cross, but unbloodily—wherein they seem to deny transubstantiation, for else I trow it must needs be bloody—I would thus reason with them. Inasmuch as Christ's sacrifice on the cross was the only perfect and all-sufficient propitiatory sacrifice 'for the sins of the world,' as they confess, this could not be the same, because it was done before that upon the cross. Or else the full perfect sacrifice was then in the supper finished, and so Christ's death is in vain, and a foolish thing."

"Whereas they call this sacrifice of the Mass, the principal mean to apply the benefit of Christ's death to the quick and dead, I would gladly have them to shew, where and of whom they learned it. Sure I am, they learned it not of Christ. For when He sent His disciples abroad to apply unto men the benefit of His death, He bade them not Mass it, but preach the Gospel, as the mean by the which God had appointed believers to be saved.

"Away therefore with their abominable doctrine, that the sacrifice of the Mass is the principal means to apply Christ's death to the quick and dead; wherein all men may see that they lie boldly. For, as the Word of God in the ministry pertaineth not to the dead (for who will be so mad as to go and preach on dead men's graves, that the dead men may hear?), so likewise do not the sacraments." —*Bradford, Letters, Park. Soc.*, pp. 285, 287, 289. See also Hutchinson's Works, Parker Soc., p. 46.

interpretation, the way in which it is often employed by Churchmen is entirely in contradiction to the whole spirit of the words of the Communion Service and the real teaching of the Church.*

So much, then, for the anti-Romanism, and explicit Protestantism, of the Communion Service in the Church of England. From first to last no element remains which is capable of suspicion. All is clear, and true, and pure. But let it not be thought that these negative elements are all that we have to be grateful for. These Protestant elements, subjects as they are for devout and continuous gratitude on the part of every Churchman, are almost insignificant as compared with the fulness of the scriptural and spiritual beauties of the service. Solemnity, simplicity, practical fitness, all are wonderfully and throughout combined. The exhortations, so heart-rending and real; the confession, so fitted to the contrite heart; the absolution and the sentences, so full of consolation; the following prayers, so scriptural and pure; the Lord's prayer, and thanksgiving, so natural and significant; and the final ascription of praise to God—what could be more edifying and precious? To the devout soul, everything combines to bring one into the very presence of God, to see the Saviour face to face, and to feed upon Him, in the heart, by faith, with thanksgiving—

“ Here, O my Lord, I see Thee face to face ;

Here faith can touch and handle things unseen ;

Here do I grasp with firmer hand Thy grace,

And all my weariness upon Thee lean.

Here do I feed upon the bread of God ;

Here drink with Thee the royal wine of Heaven ;

Here do I lay aside each earthly load ;

Here taste afresh the calm of sin forgiven.”

See in the Original Letters relative to the English Reforma-

* See Note in the Appendix, Sacrifice of the Mass, p. 231.

tion, published by the Parker Society, that remarkable letter, page 47, of Bishop Hooper to Bucer, in which he repudiates the idea of the sacraments being "bare signs," and sets forth in its fulness the true sacramental doctrine of the Church of England expounded in Articles XXV., XXVII., and XXVIII.

The student is also referred to that exhaustive work upon the subject, published by the Church of England Book Society, entitled "Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church concerning the Eucharistic Presence."

CHAPTER V.

THE BAPTISMAL SERVICE.

NO portion of the Prayer Book has afforded more difficulty to multitudes of Churchmen than the service we are now to consider: the order for the ministration of baptism to infants. Volumes have been written upon every possible side, and the most learned of divines have engaged in its interpretation. It is vain, then, to imagine that a final solution of this vexed question of infant baptism in general, and our form for infant baptism in particular, a solution, that is, that will be decisive and satisfactory for all men, can be found at once and without difficulty. As to infant baptism as a divine ordinance and a scriptural truth, the more one studies God's Holy Word, the more one is convinced that it is the purpose of God; yet, its proof and demonstration requires a line of evidence as broad and as difficult as that which establishes the divinity of the Son of God. It is a line of argument dealing largely in circumstantial elements of evidence, insufficient and weak in themselves, but together contributing to establish the doctrine upon an immovable foundation.

So with regard to the soundness of our baptismal service. The demonstration of its Protestantism or Popery is not to be found in the explanation of a sentence which has generated volumes of controversy; for if the words "this child is now regenerate" prove the Popery of the Prayer Book, the words in I. Peter iii. 21, "baptism doth also now save us," prove the Popery of the Bible. The service must be regarded as a whole; the significance of all its parts

be carefully weighed; and its contrasts from Roman and Romish baptismal offices be examined in all their importance. If this is done, though every difficulty may not be dispelled, the conviction will be established of the soundness of this service from a Protestant standpoint, and a line of argument constructed sufficient to destroy the allegation that the baptismal service is still tainted with Popery.

I propose, therefore, in this chapter, to give a descriptive sketch of the Romish baptismal service, in order that an idea may be gained of the scriptural contrast offered by our own; to dwell then upon some of the superstitious features of the first Protestant, though not thoroughly reformed, Book of Common Prayer; and then to briefly notice the interpretation of vexed sentences in the service.

The various accretions of superstition and ceremonialism which gradually overgrew the apostolic rite of Holy Baptism, culminated finally in a double evil. On the one hand the service became elaborately ritualistic, on the other doctrinally corrupt. Outwardly the service was overladen with a series of ritualistic performances that altogether obscured its real significance, and the spiritual import of the sacrament was lost amidst a display of semi-heathenish rites. Along with this outward deformation of the ordinance grew that doctrinal corruption which increasingly attributed a direct influence on the human soul to the purely material parts of the sacraments, and culminated in the theory, "*ex opere operato*." That is, the theory that the work of the Holy Spirit in the sacrament is always and surely carried out by the performance of the rite itself apart altogether from any antecedent or accompanying faith in the recipients, or worshippers, or any elective decree of God. To understand, therefore, how thoroughly our service is purged from the elements of superstition, we must consider in the first place the form of the baptismal service in its purely Romish phase,

and then in its semi-reformed aspect; and in the next place the circumstances and facts that demonstrate its deliverance from the pernicious *ex opere operato* theory of Rome.

In order that the reader may have some idea of what this service was in mediæval days, and what it is to-day in the Church of Rome, and thus form a judgment for himself, I purpose to give, as briefly as is consistent with clearness, a description of the Roman form as taken from the Roman ritual at present in use in America.*

I believe that very few Protestant Churchmen have the least conception of the utter unscripturalness of the Roman baptismal office. After reading it we can only marvel at the grossness of the superstitions from which, by God's grace, our Church has been delivered.

The baptismal service in the Church of Rome—after an elaborate rubric prescribing the preparation of the vessels of holy oil, and salt, and water, the bombacium, the two stoles to be worn, one white the other violet, the vessel for washing the priest's hands, the white vestments for the child, the wax candle to be delivered to the baptized, and the careful repetition of the acts and words to each individual—opens with a short direction to the priest as to the disposition of the children, and the nature of the vestments to be worn, and a short question to the godfather—"What dost thou seek of the Church of God?" The answer being given, the priest is then directed to breathe or blow softly upon the face of the infant, at the same time saying, "Depart from him, unclean spirit, and give place to the Holy Ghost, the Paraclete." After that the priest makes with his thumb the sign of the cross on the infant's brow and breast, with the exclamation, "Receive the sign of the cross," followed by

* The translation is from a publication of the Roman ritual by Piet, of Baltimore, U.S.

two prayers, the first for the enlightenment, and deliverance from Satan, of those to be baptized. Then a solemn ceremony follows, the blessing of the salt; a strange performance to the Protestant.

Putting some salt into a small vessel, the priest repeats a form of benediction. "I exorcise thee, creature of salt, in the name of God the Father, Omnipotent,"—here he makes the sign of the cross—"and in the charity of Jesus Christ our Lord"—the sign of the cross again—"and in the power of the Holy Spirit"—the cross again. "I exorcise thee, through God the living"—the sign of the cross again—"through God the true"—again the sign of the cross—"through God the Holy"—crossing again—"through God"—another crossing—"who has procreated thee for the protection of the human race, and has ordained thee to be a healthful sacrament to the routing of the enemy. We therefore pray Thee, Lord our Father, that Thou wilt, in sanctifying, sanctify this creature of salt, and in blessing it, bless it so that it may become to all who receive a perfect remedy, remaining in them, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen."

The priest then places a small portion of the salt, thus blessed, in the mouth of the child, repeating at the same time these words: "Receive the salt of wisdom; may it be to thee a propitiation to life eternal." A prayer follows, in which God is implored to grant that the one who has now tasted for the first time the consecrated salt may be fed with heavenly food.

It might seem to some that the precautions taken so far with regard to the unclean spirits have been sufficiently elaborate to secure their abolition, if exorcisms and crossings were sufficient for the purpose. But apparently they have not been, for here the priest utters another formula with three more signings of the cross for the expulsion of the unclean spirit, which is still addressed as remaining, not-

withstanding the careful ensufflation and adjuration at the commencement of the service. "I exorcise thee, unclean spirit, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost,"—three crossings—"so that thou mayest depart from this servant of God. For He Himself commands thee, thou damned and cursed one, who walked upon the sea, and stretched the right hand to the sinking Peter. Therefore, cursed devil, recognize thy sentence, and give honour to the living God, give honour to Jesus Christ His Son, and to the Holy Ghost, and withdraw from this servant of God, because God and our Lord Jesus Christ have been pleased to call this person to Himself, and His holy grace, and the font of baptism." Then, with a final adjuration, he signs the infant's brow with the sign of the cross, calling to the unclean spirit as he does it, "And, do thou, cursed devil, never dare to violate this sign of the holy cross which we put upon his brow." After what one would suppose to be the final disposition of the devil, the priest now turns and says, "Oremus, let us pray." The prayer that follows is beautiful and touching: "I entreat Thee, Holy Lord, omnipotent Father, eternal God, in Thy eternal and most righteous compassion for this Thy servant, that Thou wilt deign to illuminate him with the light of Thy knowledge; wash him and sanctify him; give to him true understanding, so that he, being made worthy of the grace of Thy baptism, may hold steadfast hope, right counsel, and holy doctrine, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

But the simplicity and purity are of short duration, for another ceremony immediately follows. The priest lifts the lower end of his stole, and places it over the infant's head, and introduces him into the Church, saying as he does so: "Enter into the temple of God, so that thou mayest have part with Christ in eternal life. Amen."

So far there has been but small approach apparently to

the act of baptism, and the reader may well wonder how many more unscriptural ceremonies are to be performed before the administration of the sacrament itself. There have been numbers of crossings, adjurations, and exorcisms of the devil, but small mention of baptism, or the qualifications for the rite. Now, however, it seems to be in prospect, for the priest, proceeding to the font, recites in a loud voice, in Latin of course,—everything in the service, it is to be noted, is performed in the Latin tongue—“*Credo in Deum*” (I believe in God, the Father Almighty), and after it the *Pater noster* (the Lord’s Prayer). But here the scriptural and spiritual element abruptly vanishes again and another exorcism is introduced. From the wording of it, it seems to be specially addressed to the intelligence of the unclean spirits who have inhabited the body of the infant to be baptized. Already, as we have seen, there have been two very explicit and persuasive adjurations addressed to the evil ones, but in order that there may be no possible mistake, and that no evil spirit should consider himself as not included in the number of those expelled, the priest lifts up his voice in the following address: “I exorcise thee, every unclean spirit, in the name of the Father omnipotent, of Jesus Christ His Son, our Lord and Judge, and in the power of the Holy Ghost,”—three signs of the cross are made with the names—“that thou withdraw from this, God’s workmanship, which our Lord has deigned to call to His holy temple, that he may be a temple of the living God, and the Holy Spirit may dwell in him, through the same Christ our Lord. Amen.” Surely after such multiplied imprecations the spirit of evil will withdraw; but, as we shall presently see, there is another exorcism still.

The ceremonies hitherto have been somewhat multiplied and superstitious, but both as regards number and superstition they are outdone by what follows. The priest,

now putting his finger into his mouth, covers it with saliva, and taking it out touches the ears and nose of the infant. As he touches the right ear he pronounces the words, "Ephphatha, that is, be opened." Then he touches the left ear, saying the same words. After that he touches the nose with the saliva-covered finger, saying as he does so : "For a sweet-smelling savour. Do thou, moreover, devil, flee away, for the judgment of God shall draw nigh." A question is now addressed to those to be baptized by the priest, the answer being made by the sponsor.

"Q. Dost thou renounce Satan ? A. I do renounce him.

Q. And all his works ? A. I do renounce them.

Q. And all his pomps ? A. I do renounce them."

Another ceremony follows, viz. the anointing with oil. The priest, having dipped his thumb in the consecrated oil, that is, into the oil that has been blessed, and exorcised, and sanctified for the faithful, anoints the infant on the breast and between the shoulders, in the form of the cross, saying as he does so : "I anoint thee with the oil of salvation in Christ Jesu our Lord, that thou mayest have eternal life." Immediately after this there is another ceremony, the change of stole. The violet-coloured one is laid aside, and a white one substituted. Then another catechising : "Dost thou believe in God the Father . . . Jesus Christ His Son . . . the Holy Spirit ?" &c. Answer : "I do believe." "Dost thou desire to be baptized ?" "I do."

At last the baptismal ceremony itself has arrived, and like everything else in the service it is unique. The sponsor, taking the infant in his arms, holds him before the priest. The priest takes in a vessel a quantity of consecrated water, and holding it over the infant pours it upon him. "N. I baptize thee in the name of the Father,"—here he pours water upon him, and signs him with the sign of the cross—"and of the Son,"—here again he pours the water and signs

the sign of the cross—"and of the Holy Ghost,"—repeating the same process again. This being finished the holy oil is again brought, and the priest, putting his thumb into the oil, anoints the infant on the top of the head, in the form of the cross, repeating the words: "Almighty God, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who has regenerated thee by water and the Holy Spirit, and has given to thee remission of all thy sins,"—here the anointing in the form of the cross is performed—"Himself anoint thee with the chrism of salvation in the same Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen." The priest: "Peace be with thee." Answer: "And with thy spirit."

All is not yet over.

Three more ceremonies remain to be yet performed. First, the production of a piece of cotton wool, the bombacium, or something similar, and the careful wiping of the thumb of the priest, and the oil-anointed forehead. Next, there is brought forth a snow-white robe called the chrisom, which is put upon the infant in token of his spotless innocency through the laver of regeneration. "Receive," says the priest, "this white vestment, which mayest thou bear unspotted before the judgment seat of our Lord Jesus Christ, that thou mayest have eternal life." And, last of all, the ceremony of the candle. A lighted candle or taper is put by the priest into the hand of the infant or sponsor, and the words are repeated: "Receive this burning light, and keep thy baptism without blame. Keep the commandments of God, so that when the Lord shall come to the wedding, thou mayest meet Him with all the saints in the celestial palace, and have eternal life, and live for ever and ever. Amen." With the words, "Go in peace," and, "The Lord be with thee," the baptismal ceremony has come to an end!

Such is the administration of the sacrament of baptism according to the usage of the Church of Rome. And such,

there can be no doubt, was substantially the form in use in the pre-Reformation English Church ! *

But what a medley of strange performances.

What a confusion of vain and curious superstitions.

How little there is that is really scriptural, pure and good.

How overladen with "blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits," the original simplicity of the baptismal rite.

How utterly the man-devised ceremonies have obscured the reality of the apostolic ordinance. The exorcisms, the crossings, the changing of vestments, the tapers, and salt, and oil.

How aghast would St. Peter have stood if asked to perform such a ceremony !

How bewildered, were he told it was the apostolic rite of Christian baptism !

True, there is the baptism with water in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Encrusted

* Let the reader carefully peruse the following words taken from the famous catechism by Thomas Becon, Chaplain to Archbishop Cranmer, and Prebendary of St. Paul's :—

Father.—My child, what thinkest thou of those ceremonies which are used in the Pope's Church at the ministration of baptism, as salt, oil, cream, spittle, candle, hallowed font, holy water, crossing of the child, chrism, conjuring the devil out of the child, laying the child down upon the ground before the high altar, while the priest read the gospel against the falling sickness, and such like ? Dost thou think that these things are necessary unto the administration of baptism ?

Son.—I think them neither necessary nor commendable. For they are but the idle inventions of the most idle Papists, thrust into the Church without the authority of God's Word, not garnishing but rather obscuring the dignity of holy baptism. St. John the Baptist, Christ and His Apostles, and the ancient primitive Church knew no such beggarly ceremonies ; neither doth the Word of God make any mention of them. The more simply and the more

as it is with superstitions the apostolic formula still remains intact, but it is so buried under the rubbish of ritualism that it can scarcely be recognized. Surely if by Popery is meant identity with, or assimilation to, this form of the Church of Rome, the service of the Church of England is unquestionably Protestant. The only thing that the Church of England has in common with the Church of Rome in the baptismal service is *the only thing in the whole Roman office that is purely scriptural*, the baptismal formula. As to the rites, and ceremonies, and man-devised ritualisms of the Roman form, the contrast presented by the simplicity of the Anglican service is simply remarkable.

Let us now proceed to a comparison that is still more instructive as a proof of the desire of our Reformers to purge from the Prayer Book all the elements of Popery: the comparison of the baptismal service as it now stands in the Prayer Book, with the service as it existed in the First Prayer Book of 1549.

agreeably to the institution of Christ the sacraments are ministered, the more doth it please God. In the Acts of the Apostles we read that Philip baptized the eunuch, chamberlain to the Queen Candace. This eunuch did confess Jesus Christ to be the Son of God, which is the sign of our faith, and desired baptism; Philip, at the next water they came unto, washed him "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." *Here was neither hallowed font, nor holy water, salt, oil, cream, spittle, candle, or any other point of Popistry*; and yet I am sure that no man will deny, but that the manner of baptizing which Philip used here was both good and perfect. And to say truth, it were better that these Popish ceremonies were rooted out of the Church, than that they should be suffered to continue: for they have been and yet are the occasion of much superstition and false belief."—*Becon's Works, Parh. Soc.*, p. 207.

See also Foxe's "Book of Martyrs," Book xi., p. 807, Seymour's Edit., Carter Bros., New York; Tyndale's "Answer to More," p. 20; Archbishop Grindal's "Remains," p. 124.

Protestant on the whole, as this First Prayer Book was, it was tainted by some questionable and many unscriptural and dangerous features. There were still two or three elements of ritualism authorized, which were calculated to perpetuate and promote erroneous teaching; and, in addition to these semi-Romish practices, expressions which fostered unscriptural doctrine.

It was so, as we saw, in the Communion Office, and the reader will perceive it was also the case in the baptismal service. The fact of *two or three of these changes being comparatively trivial only emphasizes the argument of this work* that the changes effected in our Prayer Book were the result of a scrupulous desire to remove everything that would seem to countenance the lingering elements of Romanism.

(1) In the opening prayer, to begin with, there was the sentence which some might have been led to interpret in such a way as to countenance the Romish doctrine of mechanical or *ex opere operato* regeneration "that by this wholesome laver of regeneration whatsoever sin is in them may be washed away."

(2) Then there was the rubric immediately after the opening prayer enjoining the priest to make a cross "upon the child's forehead and breast, saying as he did so: 'Receive the sign of the cross both in thy forehead and breast,' " &c. This ceremony of the signing the forehead and the breast with the sign of the cross is not to be confounded with the sign of the cross at the time of baptism. It is a different ceremony.

(3) Then there was a form for casting out the devil, the priest being enjoined to look upon the children and say: "I command thee, unclean spirit, in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, that thou come out and depart from these infants, whom our Lord Jesus Christ hath vouchsafed to call to His holy baptism, to be

made members of His Body, and of His holy congregation. Therefore, thou cursed spirit, remember thy sentence, remember thy judgment, remember the day to be at hand wherein thou shalt burn in fire everlasting, prepared for thee and thy angels, and presume not hereafter to exercise any tyranny towards these infants, whom Christ hath bought with His precious blood, and by this His holy baptism calleth to be of His flock."

(4) Then there was the ceremony of the chrisom, or the putting a white robe on the child, with the prayer:—"Take this white vesture for a token of the innocency which, by God's grace, in this holy Sacrament of Baptism, is given to thee"; and

(5) After that there was still another ceremony, the anointing with oil, and the accompanying prayer: "Almighty God . . . vouchsafe to anoint thee with the unction of His holy spirit."

The rest of the service is practically the same as that found in the Prayer Book to-day, the contrast, therefore, between it and the former services revealing the magnitude of the work that the Reformers had imposed upon them.

It was, indeed, a work of no little difficulty to bring back the simplicity of primitive truth from the accretions of mediævalism, and to tear aside the excrescences without injuring the body. Clearly, it was impossible to bring in perfection in a moment at first trial. But they did the work, and bravely and well was it done. With the exception of the things above referred to, the whole service was solemn, scriptural, edifying and impressive. But still it was imperfect, and as they advanced in knowledge they determined to root out everything that savoured of superstition, and present to the Church a Prayer Book without Romish blot or blemish. This they did, as God permitted, and accordingly we find that there is in the baptismal service of the Prayer Book, as

we now possess it, a remarkable advance in the following particulars:—

In the first place they rearranged the whole service with the most admirable judgment, adjusting the various parts with great wisdom, so as to emphasize the necessity of faith and prayer beforehand, and the spiritual responsibility of those who bring the children to be baptized.

In the next place they omitted the words, “that by this wholesome laver of regeneration, whatsoever sin is in them may be washed clean away,” and left out entirely the Romish form of exorcism, by which the priest is directed to say: “I command thee, unclean spirit, that thou come out, . . . therefore, cursed spirit, remember thy judgment, remember thy sentence, and presume not hereafter to exercise any tyranny towards these infants,” &c.

Both of these things, which were omitted in the Second Prayer Book, are not to be found in our baptismal service to-day, which is, as we have often to repeat, substantially the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI.

In the third place they altered the form of Baptism, and omitted also the ceremony of the chrisom. In the First Book the priest is directed to dip the child in the water thrice. First dipping the right side; second the left side; the third time dipping the face toward the font. Then after the baptism he was directed to put upon the child its white vestment, the chrisom, to be returned at the purification of the mother. All of these alterations are distinct proofs of the advancing Protestantism of our Reformers.* Each of them is a distinct advance upon the First Book of Edward, which was only partially liberated from the elements of superstition, in the direction of unmistakable evangelical

* See the remarkable letter in the Zurich Letters, Parker Soc., p. 178.

purity. And we repeat, the very fact that some of these things removed are in themselves quite unobjectionable, and were expunged only on account of their offending the weak consciences of the spiritually enlightened, gives additional proof of the sturdy Protestantism of the revision. So much for the form of the baptismal service, and the evidence in favour of its Protestantism from a ceremonial standpoint. Nothing could be more simple, or further removed from Popery. There is absolutely not one element of ritualism in the whole service to which reasonable exception can be taken.

Having dwelt sufficiently upon the outward form, let us proceed now to the doctrinal expressions of the service. Though it is hardly within the purpose of this work to offer explanations upon controverted points of theology, it may not be out of place to dwell for a little space upon those expressions which have, to so many Protestant minds, offered most serious difficulty, the words, "seeing that this child is regenerate," &c.

But the reader must distinctly understand that the difficulty of these words and the Popery of these words are two entirely different things. Difficult they are; Popish they are not. They are found in a service compiled by men flatly opposed to Popery, and if any interpretation can be given to them but the Roman, it must be given. They are words, moreover, which are found elsewhere in ultra-Protestant formularies, and employed by men of most Protestant prejudices. They are precisely similar, for instance, to those employed by one whom no one ever suspected of Popish proclivities, John Calvin, in his catechism; * and they may be employed by any who really believe in the power of God to receive as His own disciples the little infants.

They are, moreover, words similar to those which are

* See Mozley on the Baptismal Controversy, Part ii., Chap. vii.

used by most ultra-Evangelicals to illustrate the baptismal blessing.

In a book lately written by the Rev. Andrew Murray, a well-known Presbyterian minister, entitled "The Children for Christ," it is said: "Not only are the children when grown up, but even from the birth, to be partakers of the covenant." "The promise is not held in abeyance to wait for the child's faith, but is given to the father's faith in the assurance that the child's faith will follow." "The promise of God is no empty word, though our unbelief may make it of none effect. In His purpose the water and the spirit are inseparably united; 'What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder'; let not a parent's unbelief rest content with the water without the spirit," pp. 36-42, 290. And throughout the whole of this excellent work similar reasoning is to be found. The expressions, therefore, of our baptismal service can no more be adduced in themselves as indications of the lingering Romanism of the Prayer Book, than the expressions employed by John Calvin and Mr. Murray could be brought forward as proofs of the Popish tendency of their works. Certain it is that in the baptismal service of the Church of England the Roman doctrine of baptismal regeneration is not taught. In proof of this four facts may be adduced.

The first fact is this:—

That after the baptismal service was completed it was eulogized by Peter Martyr, one of the most uncompromising Protestants of the Reformation age, a man summoned by Archbishop Cranmer to aid in the work of reforming the Church of England, and declared by Archbishop Parker to be one "who had sustained constant labours in the defence of evangelical truth against the Papists." This eulogy is possessed of more than ordinary importance, for it occurs in one of the most important publications bearing upon the

baptismal controversy, viz. a letter of this Peter Martyr, Regius Divinity Professor in Oxford in 1552, preserved in the archives of the ecclesiastical library in Zurich and edited by Goode, written to his friend Bullinger *just after the completion of the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI.* In this letter, speaking of the Prayer Book as then published, Martyr states: "For all things are removed from it which could nourish superstition." Then, almost immediately afterwards, he mentions as one of the doctrines, like that of the real presence, which would bring with it superstitions, the doctrine that grace is invariably conferred in the sacraments, that is, the Romish doctrine of baptismal regeneration. Since, therefore, in Martyr's opinion the doctrine that grace is invariably conferred by the sacraments brings with it superstitions, and Martyr testified that all things are removed from the Prayer Book that could nourish superstitions, it is certain that in the mind of those who were identified with Martyr's views, viz. the Reformers, the doctrine of the invariable spiritual regeneration of infants in baptism (the Tractarian doctrine of baptismal regeneration) is *not* the teaching of the Book of Common Prayer. It is, moreover, most significant, as pointed out by Goode, that the leading Reformers held the evangelical view with Peter Martyr, as opposed to the Romish, and that when the Articles were afterwards published to abolish controversy and determine the true teaching of the Church of England, the phraseology of the Article on baptism was the phraseology of Peter Martyr, and the views of the sacrament the views of the party with which he was connected, and not the views of the Romish party, and this is, in unaltered language, the doctrine of the Church of England to-day.

The second fact is this:—

That among all the controversies raised by the early Puritans about the baptismal services, *none was ever raised*

about the doctrine of regeneration as taught in it. This fact, which is pointed out by Goode in his work on Baptism, though apparently insignificant, and not generally known, is, to the careful observer, most important. These men were, as everybody is aware, the most uncompromising, and often the most unreasonable, opponents of everything that savoured of Papistry. Beneath their searching scrutiny a mole-hill of Churchiness was magnified into a mountain of Romanism. They would have destroyed even the very formulas and materials of Rome, not because they were wrong, but because they were Roman. Yet these men, amidst all their objections, never so much as raised a whisper against the expressions of the baptismal service, or ever dreamed of exhibiting the words, "this child is regenerate," as a proof of lingering Romanism.

The third fact is this:—

The difference between the Articles of the Church of England in 1536, the Church's first effort in the way of doctrinal reform, and the Articles of 1553, in their treatment of the doctrine of baptism. The difference is remarkable, and makes it clear that the Reformers intended to discard the Romish doctrine of baptismal regeneration. Indeed, no stronger proof of the soundness and legitimacy, from a Church standpoint, of the position of those who deny the Tractarian doctrine of baptismal regeneration can be offered than a comparison of the Articles of 1536 and our present Articles, Homilies, and Catechism. We have presented in these Articles of 1536 the spectacle of a Church trying to rid itself of Romanism, yet ignorant of evangelical truth. The very fact of their publication, even at such a date, speaks volumes for their Protestantism, for the "*Roma locuta est, causa finita est*" doctrine was just as true then as now, and ten times more practical. But of course they are full of Romish errors, and many doctrines afterwards discarded are there plainly set forth.

In the Article on baptism, the doctrine of baptismal regeneration is clearly taught, and were it the doctrinal standard of to-day the position of Pusey and the Tractarian school would be demonstrated and established beyond cavil. It begins by asserting that people must of necessity believe all those things which hath, by the whole consent of the Church, been always approved, received, and used in the sacrament of baptism; that it was instituted by Christ, &c.; that it is offered unto all men, as well as to infants such as have the use of reason, that by baptism they shall have remission of sins, and the grace and favour of God, according to the saying of Christ: Whosoever believeth and is baptized shall be saved; and continues by arguing at great length, that the promise of grace and everlasting life (which promise is adjoined to this sacrament of baptism) pertaineth not only unto such as have the use of reason, but also to infants, innocents, and children; and that they ought, therefore, and must needs be baptized; and that by the sacrament of baptism they do also obtain remission of their sins, the grace and favour of God, and be made thereby the very sons and children of God; that infants must needs be christened because they be born in original sin, which sin must needs be remitted, which cannot be done but by the sacrament of baptism, whereby they receive the Holy Ghost, which exerciseth His grace and efficacy in them, and cleanseth and purifieth them from sin by His most secret virtue and operation." And much more to the same effect.

The contrast to the present teaching of the Church in the twenty-seventh Article is remarkable.

In the Article of 1536 baptism is declared to be the bestower of the Holy Ghost, and this in the most unqualified terms. It is Rome's "*ex opere operato*" theory most clearly. In our Article baptism is said to be the sign and seal of regeneration, and the qualifying expressions are carefully

added: "And in such only as worthily receive the same they have a wholesome effect or operation." "They that receive baptism rightly," &c.

In the First Book of Articles the baptism of infants and their sacramental remission of sins and regeneration occupies an extremely prominent part and place. In the Article of to-day instead of this there is the qualified statement that the baptism of young infants is, in anywise, to be retained as most agreeable with the institution of Christ. This fact may at first sight appear trivial, but to the careful observer it is profoundly significant, and throws strong light on the interpretation of the baptismal service.

The fourth fact is this:—

That throughout the whole of the Prayer Book expressions are found which clearly prove that the Church frames the language of many of her services upon what is commonly called the principle of charitable assumption. The services are drawn up upon the supposition of faith in those who are addressed by them; in other words, that the participants in the Church services are in reality what they are declared to be. Without this principle many of the expressions in the Catechism, the Collects, the Burial Service, and other offices, cannot be understood. If then it is a fact that this principle obtains throughout the Prayer Book, there is no reason why it should not be found in the baptismal service; and it is evident then that the Reformers, holding as they did strong Calvinistic doctrines with regard to the salvation of the elect, and the perpetuity of faith in them, could not compile formularies which taught the very Romish doctrines they were drawn up to protest against and destroy. Believing as they did that infants may be spiritually regenerate, and believing most certainly that all infants are not spiritually regenerate, and therefore could not be spiritually regenerated in baptism, it is clear that the language of the service, "this

child is regenerate," was intended to bear an hypothetical interpretation. This seems borne out by the fact that in the very prayer in which the priest gives God thanks for the regeneration of the infant, he almost immediately afterwards prays that "finally, with the residue of God's holy Church, he may be an inheritor of God's everlasting kingdom," which proves that from the standpoint of the Reformation age, the statement about regeneration was generic and presumptive, not a positive judgment with regard to each particular infant. The teaching of the catechism that infants are bound to perform the promises made by their sureties when they come to age, a statement that is in flat opposition to the Romish doctrine of invariable spiritual regeneration, and is honoured by a special anathema against it from the Church of Rome in the Council of Trent,* also bears out the principle of hypothetical explanation.

In fact it seems from a consideration of the known views of the Reformers, and the literal statements of the Articles and Services, that on the one hand the teaching of the Church is plainly this, that the blessing of newness of life and spiritual regeneration is possible alike to adult and infant. As Samuel was the child of God from infancy, and John the Baptist filled with the Holy Ghost from his mother's womb, so is it possible for God now to settle on even new-born infants the fulness of His grace. Since, therefore, it is as impossible for the Church to discern which are not to be recipients of this blessing as to discern which are, she charitably uses the only language that is scripturally possible in connection with baptism. On the other hand, while the

* See Bungener's "*History of the Council of Trent*," p. 29. The fourteenth Anathema on Baptism anathematizes those who maintain that persons baptized in infancy should, when then come of age, be asked whether they are willing to ratify the promise made in their name.

regeneration in the highest sense, though possible, is in many case in adults and in all cases in infants the charitable language of faith and "expectative" hope, a relative change has always taken place.

All children brought into a covenant state of grace by baptism, as the Jews of old by circumcision, and all adults likewise who have professed their faith, are relatively, that is as far as covenant privilege, and responsibility goes, and as far as a dispensation of grace is concerned, "members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of Heaven." But as all circumcised were not circumcised in heart, Romans ii. 28-29, so all baptized are not necessarily without need of conversion because baptized with water, Acts viii. 21-23. It is perfectly right, therefore, to address those as unregenerate, that is in the spiritual sense, from the pulpit, who are without any signs of spiritual life, even though they have been publicly pronounced regenerate at the font.

Could not the expressions of the Church of England baptismal service have been applied to Simon Magus on his baptism? Certainly they could. And yet, notwithstanding, there can be no doubt that St. Peter was justified in addressing him as one who had still need of a change of heart and newness of life. "Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter; for thy heart is not right in the sight of God." Numberless quotations from the greatest and most authoritative teachers of the Church of England could be collected to prove that this view, as opposed to the Romish doctrine of baptismal regeneration, has been the commonly accepted interpretation of the language of the Prayer Book in the baptismal service.* It is a fact that the principle of hypo-

* I would heartily commend to my fellow Churchmen the work of Dean Goode on Baptism. The argument is somewhat involved and lengthy, but when once mastered it convinces the reader that

thetical interpretation was evidently intended by the Church to obtain in the case of the Collects, the Catechism, and the Burial Service. It is also a fact that a great number of most learned, pious, and representative Churchmen have united to declare that the principle of the prayer in these general cases is the principle of interpretation that must be applied to the words, "this child is regenerate," in the baptismal service.

It is evident, therefore, to thoughtful minds that hasty expressions of opinion as to the Romanism of this service are entirely inconsiderate. They are too frequently the utterances of ignorant and prejudiced men whose judgment is crude, and knowledge shallow ; men who consider it a blemish that anything should be found in the service which needs an explanation. Such persons forget apparently that the whole of the Word of God abounds with expressions which require most careful investigation and studied explanation, and that no expressions, perhaps, of the Prayer Book with regard to baptism are more difficult of correct explanation than the expressions in the Word of God. See Rom. vi., Col. ii. 12, I. Peter iii. 21, Acts xxii. 16. The language of the Prayer Book Service is certainly no stronger than that of the New Testament.

In fact, enlarging Origen's sagacious remark, as quoted by Butler in his *Analogy*, that he who believes the Scripture to have proceeded from Him who is the author of nature, may well expect to find the same sort of difficulties in it as are found in the constitution of nature ; we may say also : he who finds difficulties in those very Scriptures which were given by the Holy Ghost for the illumination of mankind, may expect more difficulties in compilations which, however

the Romish doctrine of baptismal regeneration never was, and never can be, with the Prayer Book untampered with, the doctrine of the Church of England.

beautiful and complete, were still drawn up by the hands of fallible men.

One thing, however, we confidently affirm to the student of the Prayer Book: difficulties he will find, but Popery never.

Before concluding the chapter there are two matters in the service which call for brief notice, as they have been a stumbling block to many.

First.—The expression in the prayer immediately before the baptism: “Sanctify this water to the mystical washing away of sin.” The meaning of it is clear. It is a simple petition that the water to be employed for the sacred act of baptism may be set apart for this symbolic purpose, and separated from common uses. That there is nothing Romish or superstitious in this is evident to any one who compares it with the elaborate formula for the benediction of the baptismal water according to the Roman Catholic ritual, and also remembers that the Presbyterian Church of Scotland in one of its manuals for the direction of its ministers enjoins that in the ordinance of baptism prayer is to be made “for sanctifying the water to this spiritual use.”

Second.—The sign of the cross on the forehead of the baptized. This was from the very first a stumbling block to some—see the rubric at the end of the service, “To take away all scruple concerning the use of the sign of the cross,”—and is a source of difficulty to many to-day. That, however, it is no proof of the Popery of the Prayer Book, but rather the very contrary, is clear from a consideration of the thirtieth Canon, to which the attention of all those who demur to the practice is directed. The Canon is entitled: “The lawful use of the cross in baptism explained.” Beginning with an expression of regret that this ceremony should still be a matter of scruple to many, it proceeds to show that the sign of the cross in baptism was one of

the usages of the primitive Church, whereby Christians acknowledged, in the face both of heathens and Jews, that they were not ashamed to acknowledge Him for their Saviour who died for them upon the cross, and that their children, also dedicated by that badge to His service, should not be ashamed of the faith of the Crucified. In process of time, however, the sign of the cross was greatly abused in the Church of Rome, "especially after that corruption of Popery had once possessed it." "But the abuse of a thing doth not take away the lawful use of it," and it was not the purpose of the Church of England to forsake and reject those ceremonies which neither endamage the Church of God nor offend the minds of sober men. It has therefore been retained, both by the judgment and practice of those reverend Fathers and great Divines in the days of King Edward VI., "because the use of this sign in baptism was ever accompanied here by such sufficient cautions and exceptions against all Popish superstition and error, as in the like cases are either fit or convenient."*

Two things in this Canon are especially worthy of careful consideration. The declaration that this ceremony of the signing of the cross in baptism, the only place in which its use is sanctioned by the Church of England, is among the

* It is not, therefore, to be inferred that the Church of England authorizes or permits the sign of the cross, on any other occasions, as for instance in bowing at the altar, or on entering or leaving church. No rubric is to be found in the Prayer Book authorizing any such practices.

In Archbishop Grindal's Injunctions to the laity it is ordered "That no person or persons whatsoever shall resort to any Popish priest for shrift or auricular confession in Lent, or at any other time; nor shall worship any cross or any image or picture upon the same, nor give any reverence thereunto, nor superstitiously shall make upon themselves the sign of the cross when they first enter into any church to pray."—*Grindal's Remains, Park. Soc.*, p. 140.

things which are "of themselves indifferent," and is to be retained not because it is in itself of the nature of an essential, but because it has been deemed fit and right in the judgment of the Church to observe it. The Canon declares: "The Church of England, since the abolishing of Popery, hath ever held and taught, and so doth hold and teach still, that the sign of the cross used in baptism is no part of the substance of the sacrament." And above all, the clear, strong, unambiguous statements with regard to the Protestantism of our Church, and the corruption of Popery.

As I have remarked before, whatever others may think, there are many who cannot view without apprehension the change that has come over the spirit and thought of many Anglican Churchmen within the last fifty years. Not only has the stubbornness and intensity of "the Protestant prejudice" passed away, but a reactionary sentiment of kindliness and amity has set in with overwhelming force. The Church of Rome to many has ceased to be a foe. She who was denounced is now spoken of softly and gently. That which was abhorred is now introduced into favour. Rome the adulterous, revelling in her shame, has suddenly become—not that she has changed one whit her character—the virtuous and pure. The harlot is to be received again as a true wife or sister, her iniquities still unrepented of, her foul deeds the same. The strong names by which she was called are forgotten. "Popery" and "Papist" are as slanderous terms of reproach. No Anglican sighing for union with Rome would ever dream of using terms so offensive. If protests are made, and denunciations employed, they are against her political and ecclesiastical usurpations, not against her deadly and soul-destroying doctrines. But the Church of England, in her Canons, has no such scruples, nor does the pseudo-charity of some of her members find any support in the formularies of the Church. If Anglo-

Catholics of the nineteenth century are ashamed of her Protestantism, she is not. If Tractators and Ritualists speak lovingly of Rome, she does not. Four times in this Canon is her language unmistakable in its sterling Protestant ring :

“ After that corruption of Popery had once possessed the Church of Rome.”

“ All Popish superstition and error.”

“ The Church of England, since the abolishing of Popery, hath ever taught and held.”

“ The use of the sign of the cross being thus purged from all Popish superstition and error.”

Popish and Popery were very definite things, and are so still. And they are very definitely repudiated and denounced by the Church of England. The extreme caution taken by the Church to guard against all elements of Popery, and the scrupulous care she has exercised, as the Canon declares, to vindicate the reasonableness and purity of even the slightest matter that might be deemed to savour of her superstitions, demonstrate most forcibly the soundness of her principles as a Protestant Church.

So much for the baptismal service. The nature of the case has demanded that I should dwell more largely upon its negative characteristics from a Protestant and anti-Roman standpoint, rather than upon its Catholic and scriptural characteristics. But as I remarked with regard to the communion service, so I would say with regard to the baptismal: Its fulness and scripturalness, its purity and solemnity, its heart-searching and touching spirituality, are matters for which Churchmen must ever be thankful. And I think that all who rightly understand its meaning will willingly endorse the sentence of one of the noblest of our age, a Churchman whom none could accuse of proclivity to Popery on the one side, or to Dissent on the other, the late

Lord Shaftesbury, on the baptismal service of the Church of England : " It is a lovely and solemn ceremony, heavenly in its purport, and almost so in its composition. May God in His mercy grant, that as the child was this day signed with the cross, so he may never be ashamed to confess and to fight for a crucified Saviour." (*Life*, I., p. 235.) It is an utterance worthy of the man. It is the utterance, not of a narrow-eyed, mote-seeking critic, but of a genuine man, a prayerful father, a devout Churchman, a sincere Christian.

CHAPTER VI.

THE OCCASIONAL SERVICES.

WE now pass from the major services of the Prayer Book to the consideration of those services like the confirmation, marriage, burial and other, which are in less frequent use, and are generally comprehended under the generic term, the Occasional Services. Though of comparatively minor importance the reader's attention is specially requested to them, for these services present in a very unmistakable manner the intention and position of the Prayer Book as it at present stands. While there still remains in the service for the visitation of the sick a rubric and a sentence which seem to countenance one of the most seductive errors of Popery, of which more hereafter, on the whole it can be honestly said of these occasional offices, that they have had all things removed from them which savoured of Romanism and were calculated to nourish superstition.

No little spiritual discernment and practical sagacity was required to remove from the partially reformed services the remnants of mediævalism. It was a most delicate and difficult work ; but in every case it was performed with thoroughness, and from each service there was removed some lingering sign of either needless ritualism or doctrinal corruption. From the confirmation service was taken the

signing of the sign of the cross. From the marriage service, the blessing of the ring. From the visitation of the sick, the anointing with oil and sign of the cross upon the forehead and breast. From the communion of the sick, the reservation of the elements and private celebration of the eucharist. From the burial service, the doctrine of purgatory and prayers for the dead.

Each of these changes is fraught with significance. They are not meaningless; they are intentional. They are not accidental; they are all in *one* direction. They all tend to one goal. They all declare the unmistakable Protestantism of the Reformers, and as all these changes are to be found not only in the Prayer Book of 1552, *but in our Prayer Book to-day*, the unmistakable Protestantism of our Church at present. Each of them is at once positive and negative. Negative, in that it is the discarding some useless or baneful shred of Popery. Positive, in that it is the putting on of the sound and scriptural garment of apostolic truth and practice. Though these changes in one service might seem trivial, when viewed as a whole they present an irresistible argument.

It is remarkable to notice how in every one of the above services there is a threefold gradation in the upward direction. The Roman or Sarum service marks the first grade, and it is invariably low, debased by the elements of superstition. The Prayer Book of 1549, the First Prayer Book of Edward, marks the second grade, and it is always higher and in the direction of Protestantism. The Second Prayer Book of Edward's reign, which is substantially the Prayer Book of to-day, marks the third and highest grade, the attainment of simplicity and Protestant purity.

Can any one believe that this uniform and invariable historical gradation is merely accidental? Can any one believe that this uniform tendency from Popery, and to

primitive purity, is meaningless? In one service alone such changes might be regarded as trivial and the result of accident. But when we see in each service the same careful progression, can we doubt the intention of the Reformers, or the importance of the changes as establishing the present standing of the Church? It seems impossible to escape the conviction that arises from a careful study of the changes simultaneously and uniformly made by the Reformers in all these services, that it was their deliberate intention to eradicate from the Prayer Book of the Church of England everything that would be calculated to perpetuate doctrinal corruptions, or nourish unnecessary ritualism. We shall proceed to exhibit the proof of this assertion by presenting each of these services in order for the reader's inspection.

Let the *Confirmation Service* be taken first.

According to the Roman use, and the use of the Anglican Church for some time prior to the Reformation, the rite of confirmation was to all practical purposes little more than a superstitious form. Little children of the age of seven and older were brought before the Bishop, who, having laid aside his mitre, prayed over them, and signed them with the sign of the cross. Resuming the mitre, the Bishop then touched with his thumb the holy oil, and signed the brow with the sign of the cross, saying in Latin: "I sign thee with the sign of the cross (the sign of the cross), and confirm thee with the chrism of salvation in the name of the Father, and of the Son (the sign of the cross), and of the Holy Ghost (the sign of the cross again). Amen." After various ceremonies and a prayer that the Holy Spirit may perfect the hearts of those whose brows were marked with the sacred chrism, and signed with the sign of the holy cross, the Bishop dismissed them with his blessing and the sign of the cross, thrice repeated. That the rite was overladen with abuses, and administered with a formalism that was superstitious in the extreme, is evident

from the scathing language of the Reformers in their references to it.*

And this was the rite of confirmation!

According to the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. the rite of confirmation appears under a totally different form. It assumes a reasonable and scriptural position; is

* "The first abuse in confirmation was, that it was done in a strange tongue, that no man might understand what was meant: then, that they received to confirmation such children, and so young, as were not able to make profession of their faith; so that the infant promised he knew not what; and the Bishop ratified and confirmed where there was nothing to be confirmed: he set to his seal where there was nothing to be sealed. These abuses were far unmeet for the Church of God.

"Besides these, there was great abuse in the manner of doing. For thus the Bishop said: *Consigno te signo crucis; et confirmo te chrismate salutis*: 'I sign thee with the sign of the cross, and confirm thee with the oil of salvation.' Thus they used to do: these were their words, 'with the oil of salvation.' They took not this of Christ, nor of His apostles, nor of the holy ancient fathers. It agreeth not with our Christian faith to give the power of salvation unto oil.

"More, they said he was no perfect Christian, that was not anointed by the Bishop with this holy oil. This was another abuse.

"Again, when they blessed or hallowed their oil, they used these words: *Fiat, Domine, hoc oleum, te benedicente, unctio spiritualis ad purificationem mentis et corporis*: 'O Lord, let this oil, by Thy blessing, be made a spiritual ointment, to purify both soul and body.' O Christ Jesu, where was Thy cross, where was Thy blood, and the price of Thy death and passion, when a drop of oil was of power to work remission of sins, to save and defend against all the darts of the wicked spirits, and to refresh both body and soul? Yet so were we taught, so were we led. I feign not these things: the words may be seen."—*Bishop Jewel, Works*, II., p. 1126.

See, also, Tyndale's "Answer to More," *Park. Soc.*, p. 72; Becon's Works, Vol. III., "Supplication," p. 234, *Park. Soc.*; Nowell's Catechism, p. 211; "Rogers on the Articles," pp. 253, 254.

administered to intelligent and scripturally instructed persons, who have come to the years of discretion ; and has little in common with the pre-Reformation rite but the name. Instead of a body of babes, or infants unable to speak, much less to give an account of their faith, as Nowell says, being presented to the Bishop for anointing, a body of intelligent youths and maidens and adults are presented, "agreeable with the usage of the Church in times past, whereby it was ordained that confirmation should be ministered to them that were of perfect age, that they being instructed in Christ's religion should openly profess their own faith, and promise to be obedient to the will of God."—*Rubric, First Book of Edward*, 1549. Instead of the anointing of the forehead and the thumb, the Bishop's hands, in accordance with the apostolic custom, were laid upon the head of the candidate, the sign of the cross was made, and the words were pronounced: "I sign thee with the sign of the cross, and lay my hand upon thee, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

In the Prayer Book of 1552, the third and perfect stage as far as its Protestantism is concerned, was attained. All the remaining elements of superstition were discarded, the crossing of the forehead was done away with, the sentence of the Bishop: "I sign thee with the sign of the cross, and lay my hand upon thee, in the name of the Father," &c., was obliterated for ever, and in place thereof was substituted the beautiful prayer: "Defend, O Lord, this thy child (or servant) with thy heavenly grace, that he may continue thine for ever," &c.

Not in ritual only, but in intention and scope the service was rendered more evangelical. The responsibility of the individual candidate was emphasised by the assumption of the vows, and the open acknowledgment of their decision for God, a matter that of itself constitutes a proof of radical

reform.* Thus the rite was gradually but entirely divested of the elements of superstition on the one hand, and on the other invested with the simplicity and reality of the apostolic form; and as in the Prayer Book of 1552 it remains to-day in its unadorned and scriptural beauty as a monument of the purity of our Reformers' work.

The Marriage Service.—Before the Reformation the marriage service was tainted with many unscriptural allusions and superstitious practices. The marriage was first of all performed at the church door, the priest being vested in surplice and white stole, with an attendant minister bearing the book, and the vessel of holy water; then after various crossings, prostrations and genuflections prayer was offered before "the altar"; the whole concluding with the sacrifice of the Mass. As in the Roman Catholic Church, so in the service of the pre-Reformation English Church, a most elaborate service was used for the blessing of the ring, which after being sprinkled with holy water and signed with the sign of the cross, was placed by the bridegroom upon the thumb, the forefinger, and the third finger successively, being finally left upon the fourth finger of the bride's left hand.

By the First Book of Edward nearly all the superstitious practices were omitted, and a service was introduced almost perfect in its purity and beauty. The rite was to be performed in the body of the church; the prostrations and blessing of the ring were discarded; and the service as a whole was simplified, and permeated with scriptural phraseology. There still remained, however, some Romish blemishes, the sign of the cross being made in the bene-

* It is hardly necessary to remind the reader here that confirmation according to the doctrine of the Church of England is *not* a sacrament. The language of Art. xxv. is explicit. See "Rogers on the Articles," p. 252. Prop. V., Art. xxv. "Confirmation is no sacrament."

dictions, an apocryphal allusion being used in the prayer after the Psalm: "As Thou didst send Thy angel Raphael to Thobie and Sara, the daughter of Raguel," and the word "altar" being twice employed.

In the Prayer Book of 1552 the minute care of the zealous and scrupulous Reformers is marked, first, by their intentional changing of the wording of the prayer, "O God of Abraham," from "As Thou didst send Thy angel Raphael to Thobie and Sara, the daughter of Raguel, to their great comfort" to "And as Thou didst send Thy blessing upon Abraham and Sarah to their great comfort, so," &c. Next, by their omission of the word "altar," and the substitution of the true Church of England expression, "the Lord's table," "the table." And, last of all, by the abolition of the sign of the cross. The very triviality of the changes, trivial, that is, as compared with the purity of the service as a whole, only proves the thoroughness of their intention to achieve perfection. The changes wrought in the Prayer Book of 1552 are, of course, the form of the Prayer Book of to-day.

The Visitation of the Sick.—In the service for the visitation of the sick, the three stages are equally perceptible. The changes achieved in the Prayer Book of 1552 are, of course, the form of the Prayer Book to-day. In the Roman and pre-Reformation Anglican services, this visitation service is marked, more than any other, by utterly unscriptural doctrines and superstitious practices. Prior to the Reformation, it was customary for the priest in the English Church to present to the eyes of the sick person, the crucifix, and then to sprinkle him and his bed with holy water. Then he had to make confession, and learn what penance to perform. The priests prayed that all their benedictions and sprinklings of holy water, all his own knockings of the breast, contritions, confessions, fasting, alms, vigils, prayers, pilgrimages, all his good works, all injuries borne for God's sake, the Saviour's passion, the Virgin's merits and the merits of the Saints, all

the prayers of the Catholic Church, might be effectual for the remission of his sins, the increase of his merits, and the obtaining of eternal rewards. Following this there was a direction for the sick person to kiss the crucifix, there were allusions to the granting of indulgences, there was the doctrine of extreme unction, and various superstitious practices connected therewith. There was a prayer, after the Roman fashion, for the soul at the time of departure. Above all, everything was in Latin, and, of course, generally unintelligible.

The progress made, even in the First Prayer Book, was most marked. The whole was put into a Protestant form. The crucifix was dispensed with. The unscriptural allusions to penance and merit were omitted. Extreme unction, in its superstitious Roman form, was abolished. The whole service was practically transformed.

And yet there remained some elements of danger, in the shape of doubtful expressions and practices; allusions to the Apocrypha, the countenancing of auricular confession, the anointing with oil, and the sign of the cross in the final rubric. "If the sick person desire to be anointed, the priest shall anoint him upon the forehead or breast only, making the sign of the cross, saying thus: 'As with visible oil thy body outwardly is anointed, so our Heavenly Father, Almighty God, grant, of His infinite goodness, that thy soul inwardly may be anointed with the Holy Ghost, who is the spirit of all strength, comfort and gladness,' " &c. In itself, the unction is a simple and scriptural practice, but in its abuse in those days it was most dangerous.

The service of 1552 marks another advance. All Apocryphal and unscriptural allusions are omitted. Anointing with oil, and the injunction to use the form of absolution there given, "*in all* private confessions," was removed, thus abolishing the practice of auricular confession from the Church of England.

It is worthy of note here that the Prayer Book of 1552 (vilified by certain party Churchmen as a Puritan and un-Catholic manual) is in this case *not even as Protestant as the Prayer Book of to-day*. For the service in our Prayer Book to-day, though practically identical with that in the Second Book of Edward, contains a sentence (inserted in 1662 in the rubric before the absolution), which is one of the most Protestant expressions in the Prayer Book. The words are (*if he humbly and heartily desire it*) a proviso of the utmost importance, for, as we shall subsequently show (Chap. VII. and Chap. VIII.), it subverts from the foundation the sacerdotal system of Rome.

Communion of the Sick.—In this service, according to the Roman use, all the superstitious features that mar the offering of the Mass are largely present. There is the doctrine of transubstantiation, and the adoration of the sacrament, the accompanying ceremonies, prostrations and genuflections, the holy water, and the confession of sins to the priest. When the sacrament is displayed, the priest exclaims: “Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world” (*Ecce Agnus Dei*), and, giving the sacrament to the sick one, adds: “Receive the viaticum of the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall guard thee from the wicked foe, and lead you to eternal life.”

In the First Book of Edward the change is remarkable. All superstitious elements are removed, doctrinal and ceremonial, while a rubric is inserted, which, for simplicity and scriptural purity, is almost unsurpassed in the Prayer Book. The rubric, that is, to the effect that even if a man does not receive the sacrament, and yet truly repents and steadfastly believes, he is a partaker of Christ.

There still remained, though, two directions which were liable to perversion into Romish error: the direction to the priest to *reserve* so much of the sacrament as shall serve the sick person, and the permission to celebrate in private, *solitary*

communion. With their usual care, fearing, not unreasonably, the consequences that might flow from this apparently harmless procedure, the Reformers, in the revision of 1552, wholly omitted this part of the rubric which sanctions the reservation of the sacrament, and provided, also, as a matter of necessity, that others beside the sick person should at the same time receive the communion. The intention, it need hardly be added, was to demonstrate authoritatively that the Church of England teaches that the communion is not a mere magical performance wherein priest and recipient alone are necessary, but a real communion of believers uniting together to remember the Lord's death till He come. The change to some may seem trivial; but in those days, as in these, the practice of reserving the elements, and of celebrating a solitary communion, was decidedly dangerous. While not necessarily Romish, it countenanced and tended to superstitious practices. *In our present Prayer Book both practices are likewise disallowed, and rubrics have been inserted which exclude all possibility of a return to them.* It may not be out of place here, in view of the persistent efforts that are being made by a certain party in the Church of England to undo the work of the Reformation, and to stealthily and openly introduce erroneous doctrines and unrubrical practices, to emphasize the point that these precautions were mainly made to prevent any possible return through tiny openings to Roman corruptions, especially Roman corruptions of doctrine in relation to the Holy Communion.

In fact, these two rubrics in the "Communion of the Sick," are, in themselves alone, one of the strongest, if not the strongest, Prayer Book bulwarks against Popery, and deserve a prominence which has not generally been accorded to them. The rubric before the service, requiring as a minimum number, that three, or at least two, besides the sick man, shall communicate, renders the private celebration of the Mass an impossibility in the English Church. It also

most effectually disposes of the Romish idea of the final reception of the Eucharist being indispensable to the soul's passage to Christ. *The rubric enjoining that the absence of other communicants is to be reckoned as a just impediment, preventing the administration of the Holy Communion, "if a man for lack of company to receive with him, or by any other just impediment, do not receive the sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood," most effectually reprobates, in the Church of England, the doctrine of the necessity of the sacrament as a kind of viaticum for the soul.* If it held this doctrine, it certainly could not teach that such a trivial matter as the absence of one or two others should be considered as a just impediment to the dying man's acceptance of the body and blood of Christ, and deny to him the Holy Communion, unless in the exceptional case of contagious disease.

The other rubric, after the service, declares that if the sick man repents and believes, &c., he doth eat and drink the body and blood of Christ, although he do not receive the sacrament with his mouth. In order to understand the full significance of this statement, the reader must compare it with Article 29.

ART. XXIX. "*Of the wicked which eat not the body of Christ in the Lord's Supper.* The wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as Saint Augustine saith) the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, yet *in no wise are they partakers of Christ*: but, rather, to their condemnation do eat and drink the sign, or sacrament, of so great a thing."

Rubric: Communion of the Sick.—"But if a man, either by reason of extremity of sickness, or for want of warning in due time to the Curate, or for lack of company to receive with him, or by any other just impediment, do not receive the sacrament of Christ's body and blood, the Curate shall

instruct him, that if he do truly repent him of his sins, and steadfastly believe that Jesus hath suffered death upon the cross for him, and shed His blood for his redemption, earnestly remembering the benefits he hath thereby, and giving Him hearty thanks therefor, he *doth eat and drink* the body and blood of our Saviour, Christ, profitably to his soul's health, although he do not receive the sacrament with his mouth."

Those without living faith, although they do partake of the sacrament, are not partakers of Christ. This is the teaching of the Article.

Those with living faith, although they do not partake of the sacrament, are partakers of Christ. This is the teaching of the Rubric.

Taken in conjunction, they conclusively prove that the Church of England does not hold the Romish "ex opere operato" theory of the sacraments. The reception of Christ lies not so much in the consecrated bread as in the consecrated heart. If the bread be consecrated, and the heart is not, there is no communion with Christ; and though the bread be not blessed, and the cup be not blessed, yet if, in the absence of the consecrated elements, the heart feed with faith on Christ, the Living Bread, there is the communion of the body and blood of Christ.

The Churching of Women.—The service for the thanksgiving of women after child-birth, or the churching of women, though of minor importance and devoid of doctrinal signification, presents also the same instructive gradation. In the Prayer Book of 1549, no such thing as allusions to the intercessions of the Virgin Mary, or sprinkling with holy water, as in the Roman and Sarum uses, is to be found. The service throughout is plain and simple; and in the perfection service of 1552, even the word "purification," and the offering of the infant's baptismal mantle, are done

away with. These changes only shew the carefulness of the intention of the revisers of our Prayer Book, and how resolved they were to eradicate from every part of the Liturgy the remnants of Romish teaching and symbolism.

The Burial Service.—In the burial service, the Protestant position of our Prayer Book is very marked indeed, and the progressive stages deserve the most careful consideration. In this service, let it be remembered, an easy opportunity is presented for reproducing many of the most unscriptural doctrines and superstitious practices of Rome. It is a service that deals almost wholly with the unseen world. Any departure, therefore, from the exact teaching of holy scripture, is sure to be followed by corrupt and misleading usages. We find this was accordingly the case in the pre-Reformation service of the English Church. False doctrine and vain ceremonial mingle, from beginning to end. A Mass is said for the soul of the departed. Prayers are offered for the pardon of his sins. The corpse is censed with incense. Three times the priest walks round the body, each time sprinkling it from the vessel of incense. Holy water is cast upon it. Requiem is made for his soul. The grave itself is sprinkled with holy water and covered with incense. Absolution is pronounced to the body as it descends into the grave. Earth is placed on it in the shape of a cross, and incense sprinkled on that. Requiem again are chanted, the service concluding with a final prayer for the soul of the departed.

The change from this service, with its traditionary superstitions, to the service of the First Prayer Book of Edward, is like passing from thick darkness to the light of early day. All is in English. The greater part of it is intelligible and scriptural. The formalities and varieties of ceremonialism are discarded. *There is no incense, no holy water, no requiem chanting, no signing of the cross, no offering of the Mass.*

At the same time, and who can wonder, there were blemishes.

One, especially, was most noticeable.

A great part of the service was drawn up as if intended for the dead, and not for the living. The prayers were prayers for the dead as well as for the living. The committal of the body to the grave was accompanied with a commendation of his soul to God by the priest. "Then the priest, casting earth upon the corpse, shall say, I commend thy soul to God the Father," &c. "We commend into Thy hands of mercy (most merciful Father) the soul of this our brother departed . . . that when the Judgment shall come, both this our brother and we may be found acceptable in Thy sight, and receive that blessing which Thy well-beloved Son shall then pronounce to all that love and fear Thee, saying," &c. And so again: "O Lord, with whom do live the spirits of them that be dead, and with whom the souls," &c. ". . . grant unto this, Thy servant, that the sins which he committed in this world be not imputed to him; but that he, escaping the gates of hell, may ever dwell in the region of light," &c. In fact, these prayers for the dead, and they were no doubt dangerous and indicative of graver erroneous doctrines, were the only real blot upon the reformed service of 1549.

In the service of 1552 all was achieved that was necessary to perfect the service, and in our Prayer Book as we have it everything is removed from this service that could countenance superstition.

In three respects the Protestantism of the Burial Service is remarkable.

First.—In that it totally omits all prayers for the dead. The omission is most noteworthy on account of the prayers in the first reformed Prayer Book, and the difficulty of avoiding the allusion to the dead. See in the prayer,

"Almighty God, with whom do live the spirits of them that depart hence in the Lord," &c., how carefully they now shun all approach to a prayer for the departed, and how skilfully the direction-current of the prayer is turned. Twice in the first book the soul of the departed is committed into the hands of God; once by the priest alone, and once by priest and people together in prayer; and three times united prayer is made on its behalf. All this is now abolished completely.*

Second.—In that it distinctly repudiates the Popish superstition of purgatory, according to which the souls of the departed rest in a condition of more or less misery until

* See Abp. Grindal as quoted above, p. xvi. note.

The following striking words of Archbishop Whitgift in his "Defence" effectually disposes of the paltry contention of certain modern party churchmen that the prayers he mentions in the Prayer Book sanction praying for the departed:—"You say that 'thereby prayer for the dead is maintained, as may partly be gathered out of some of the prayers, where we pray that "we, with this our brother, and other departed in the true faith of Thy holy name, &c."'" You know full well what our doctrine is concerning prayer for the dead, and you ought not thus boldly to utter a manifest untruth; for in so doing you do but bewray your sinister affection.

"In saying that these words gathered out of some of the prayers, 'that we, with this our brother, &c.,' *import prayer for the dead*, you do but quarrel: when you say that we, with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, may reign in thy Kingdom, do we pray for Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, or rather wish ourselves to be where they are?

"In like manner when we say, 'that we, with this our brother, and all other departed in the true faith of Thy holy name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss both in body and soul,' *we pray not for our brother, and other that be departed in the true faith, but we pray for ourselves*, 'that we may have our perfect consummation and bliss,' as we are sure those shall have which die in the true faith."—*Arch. Whitgift's Works, Park. Soc., iii., p. 364.*

they be purged and prepared for the presence of God. The Prayer Book clearly teaches here that the souls of the departed "are in joy and felicity," and distinctly discards the Popish falsity of a purgatorial flame.

Third.—In that it evidently intends the whole service for the living; not for the dead. The commendations and prayers for the dead are changed into prayers for the living who participate in the service. The prayer that he—the departed—"may be found acceptable in Thy sight, and hear the sweet words of Christ, 'Come, ye blessed children of My Father, receive the kingdom prepared for you,'" is changed into a prayer that the offerer of the prayer, and the bystanders, may be raised from the death of sin, and accepted at last by the Son of God. The Church of England thus emphasises, in the most solemn of her services, the truth that life is the only opportunity for conversion, and that prayers for the dead are worthless and unscriptural.

In this connection, another fact may be noticed. The remarkable freedom of the Burial Service from every trace of Romish and traditional error is no more significant than the precision with which the whole service adheres to the lines of Scripture. With openings on every hand in the direction of spurious teachings; with every facility, so to speak, for lapsing into error; it has nevertheless, in the good providence of God, been preserved in the straight path of simplicity, wisdom, true doctrine, and charity. If, on the one hand, it gives no countenance to the Popish superstition of purgatory, or the unscriptural practice of prayers for the dead, it offers as little countenance, on the other hand, to popular, though thoroughly erroneous, conceptions.

Too many, in starting back from the Scylla of Popish superstition, fall into the Charybdis of popular superstition; and in abhorring the doctrine of an intermediate state in purgatory, forget the doctrine of an intermediate state at

all. The popular idea of the state after death is an entrance into heaven that shuts out practically the very notion of the personal second coming of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, a judgment both for believers and the unfaithful according to their works, and the resurrection of the body. The great, overwhelming, and all-prominent doctrine emphasized by the Church in the Creeds, the Communion Service, the season of Advent, and so many of the prayers of our personal relation to our glorified Saviour, who is to come again in person, at whose coming "the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed," "who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation, that it may be conformed to the body of His glory," is, for all practical purposes, obscured, or destroyed, by the idea that, at death, the soul enters either into heaven or hell, and everything that concerns its felicity or misery is settled then, and there, and for ever.

Now, the Burial Service, by closely adhering to the very lines of Scripture, not only gives no countenance to such a heresy, but offers the most powerful antidote to it by holding forth the truth of the Word. It lifts the heart and mind throughout upwards and onwards, right on to Him "who is the resurrection and the life," and to the resurrection of the body, through Him, to glory. While it says very little about the intermediate state of the believer, what it does say is precisely similar to the very rare and brief allusions of Holy Writ. From the New Testament, we gather that the souls of departed believers are "with Christ," "at rest," and are in a state of happiness far transcending that of earth, and, as far as earth is concerned, are "asleep in Jesus." See Phil. i. 23; Rev. xiv. 13; Luke xvi. 22; xxiii. 43; and I. Thess. iv. 14. In the Burial Service, the only allusions to the intermediate state are these, and these only:

“The dead which die in the Lord are blessed, for they rest from their labours.”

“The souls of the faithful, after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, are in joy and felicity.”

“Christ hath taught us not to be sorry, as men without hope, for them that sleep in Him.”

“The soul of the departed has been taken by Almighty God to Himself.”

But the hope, the object of intelligent expectation, set prominently forth, and prayed for, is not a mere vague, indefinite, indiscriminate heaven, as multitudes superstitiously believe, but the second coming of the Lord Jesus Christ, “who shall change our vile body,” &c., Phil. iii. 21; the accomplishment of the number of His elect in this dispensation, according to Acts xv. 14; and the consummation of all in the kingdom of the glory of our blessed Redeemer.

As to the indiscriminate use of this service over the unbeliever and the believer alike, I need only add that it is a difficulty that, in my opinion, has been needlessly exaggerated. The service is only for those who are professedly believers. For the excommunicate and the unbaptized, it is expressly forbidden. It is for those who have been baptized in the name of the Lord, and have taken the solemn vows of His religion. It is not for those who, by open impiety or deliberate disobedience, have been expelled from the communion of the saints. If, even among those who are professedly the Lord's, there are brought for burial some whose lives seem to have been careless, it is nevertheless an act of most tremendous responsibility for any fallible man to pronounce himself so infallibly sure of the state of the deceased as to declare him shut out from the hope of the resurrection to life. The language of charitable presumption is nowhere less out of

place. At the same time, a stricter enforcement of discipline on the part of all branches of the Christian Church, and even a relaxation of the words of committal into such form as that employed in the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, or that found in our own Prayer Book for the burial of the dead at sea, would, in the opinion of many, be most desirable.

The Commination Service alone remains.—With regard to the Commination Service, whatever opinions men may have as to its usefulness, it certainly cannot be held amenable to the accusation of Popery. The ceremonial of the benediction of the ashes has been discarded, and all is simple, natural, and plain. Nor is it, as some men have carelessly asserted, a service for cursing our neighbours. No man curses any one. It were impious to do so in the face of the Master's prohibition, "Judge not, that ye be not judged." The minister simply reads out "the general sentences of *God's* cursing against impenitent sinners"—a very different thing—that the man that maketh any carved image, curseth father and mother, &c., is cursed; that is, the wrath of God abideth on him as long as he remains impenitent; and the people admit the righteousness and reality of that judgment by answering, Amen! As to the exhortation that follows, we question whether in the whole compass of the Prayer Book there is to be found an address more fervent, more scriptural, more touching in its pathos, more searching in its appeal, and one that is more calculated to arouse the impenitent, and lead unconverted souls to Christ. From first to last it breathes the spirit of the yearning Christ, and is wholly interpenetrated with the purity of evangelical fervour. Herein is nothing of priestly absolution, sacramental efficacy, or reception into the fold of the Church. There may be, and are, lost, unconverted, and unregenerate souls, and in pleading, simple tones, it exhorts the hearer to turn to God ere it be too late, to come for pardon and newness of

life, not to the priest, nor to the sacrament, but to Christ, the alone Advocate and Mediator.

Of course, in all these services, it must also be remembered that there are many changes in the direction of Protestantism which it is impossible to dwell upon at length.

For instance: In every place in each service in which the word "altar" is found in the First Prayer Book, the word Table, or the Lord's Table, is found in the Second Prayer Book, and, *of course*, in the Prayer Book to-day.* The directions in the First Prayer Book for changing the water in the font every month *once at least*, were omitted in the Prayer Book of 1552, and are not to be found in the Prayer Book to-day; the forms of prayer for the sanctification of the water were radically changed, and the sign of the cross done away with; all possible errors and superstitions with regard to "holy water" being thus removed, fresh water being now required by the Prayer Book at each administration of Baptism. The short service for the celebration of the Holy Communion when there is a burial of the dead in the Prayer Book of 1549 was removed in 1552, probably as affording possible countenance to the idea of the sacrifice for the dead, and is not found in the Prayer Book to-day, nor is there any provision for its celebration at a funeral. Small things as some may think them in themselves, they are valuable as affording additional evidence, and demonstrate, along with the foregoing indisputable testimonies, the thoroughgoing Protestantism of the Prayer Book as reformed in 1552, and at present established.

* In view of the fact mentioned (pp. 17-19), the reader is requested to carefully note the confirmations presented throughout this chapter to the statement that substantially and practically all the changes made in 1552 in accord with the spirit of reformation or evangelical churchmanship, remain to-day in the Book of Common Prayer, proving the unity of our present Prayer Book with that of 1552 rather than with that of 1549.

CHAPTER VII.

THE ABSOLUTION IN THE VISITATION OF THE SICK.

WE have now examined in detail the various features of those services which constitute the main body of the Book of Common Prayer. The only portions which still remain for consideration, as offering any serious difficulty to the Protestant Churchman, are the rubric with regard to confession in the visitation of the sick, the form of absolution, and the words employed by the bishop in the ordination service, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost." The material magnitude of these phrases is so inconsiderable that they might be eliminated from the Prayer Book, without reducing its size one quarter of a page; but as far as their doctrinal significance is concerned, they are of the utmost importance, inasmuch as they have been made the ground for the advocacy and introduction of some of the most pernicious of Romish teachings.

I do not for a moment pretend that I shall be able to remove all difficulties from sentences which involve some of the knottiest points in the Bible as well as in the Prayer Book; but I propose to offer a few arguments for consideration in proof that whatever the objections to those sentences may be, they do not and cannot teach the doctrine of Rome. The teaching of the Church of Rome with regard to absolution, confession, and ordination, is very definite, and very deadly, and any one who understands at all the connection of confession, absolution, and ordination, with the Roman theological system, will see at once, after a careful study of the position and method of the teaching of the Church of

England on these points, that it is essentially removed from that of Rome.

I would ask the reader in this chapter, therefore, to read the rubric which authorizes the confession to be made, and then carefully and dispassionately to investigate the form, conditions, and circumstances, of the absolution which is permitted.

The rubric reads as follows :

“ Here shall the sick person be moved to make a special confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter ; after which confession, the priest shall absolve him (if he humbly and heartily desire it) after this sort : Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to His Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him, of His great mercy forgive thee thine offences ; and by His authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.”

The question of auricular confession is of such importance that it deserves a chapter to itself, and therefore the subject of the absolution will be offered now for our exclusive consideration.

A form of absolution is used three times in our Prayer Book as it now stands. First, in the opening of Morning and Evening Prayer, after the General Confession. This absolution, as has been shown before, is manifestly declaratory. It is the simple pronunciation of the blessed Gospel message, that “ He pardoneth and absolveth all them that truly repent and unfeignedly believe His Holy Gospel.” Its very purity and scripturalness make it beautiful, and at the same time precious, to all Protestants, as a bulwark of the Faith once delivered to the saints. No one could distort it by any means into a support of the Roman dogma of absolution.

Second, in the Communion Service. This form is also one of remarkable pathos and beauty. "Almighty God our Heavenly Father, who of His great mercy hath promised forgiveness of sins to all them that with hearty repentance and true faith turn unto Him: have mercy upon you, pardon and deliver you from all your sins, confirm and strengthen you in all goodness, and bring you to everlasting life, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen." This, as any one can see in a moment, is simply a commendatory prayer, and could be offered, not merely by a bishop or minister of God, but by any devout follower of the Lord Jesus Christ. It carries in it nothing exclusively appertaining to the ministerial office, much less distinctively peculiar to sacerdotal authority. In the Order of the Communion which was published in 1548, the first authoritative Church service ever issued in English, the absolution was somewhat different:—

"Our blessed Lord, who *hath left power to His church to absolve* penitent sinners from their sins, and to restore to the grace of the Heavenly Father such as truly believe in Christ, have mercy upon you; pardon and deliver you from all your sins," &c., &c.

But for a good purpose the Reformers substituted, in the place of this form, those beautiful words of consolation above quoted, which are so familiar to all Church people as the absolution of the Communion office. These, then, are the two forms of absolution constantly employed in the Church of England. They are heard by millions every week, as the forms of absolution of the Church of England in common use, and they set forth, as often as they are pronounced, the striking fact, that the theory of doctrine with regard to absolution in the Church of England is totally removed from the system of the Church of Rome, and irreconcilable with it. They destroy the very foundations

of sacerdotalism, by not vesting in the priest the power to remit sins by the judicial act of absolution.

Third, the form in the service for the visitation of the sick, a form which so many suppose to be incapable of defence from the Protestant standpoint.

On the face of it, it certainly seems Romish.

Its position, following the exhortation to special confession; its form, so like the Roman; above all, the expression "I absolve thee," all point to Popery, pure and simple. That it is, however, far removed from the Popish absolution, a little reasoning and reflection will surely prove. In the first place, it is well to consider *who* it is that is said to forgive—"Our Lord Jesus Christ . . . of His great mercy, forgive thee thine offences." He it is alone who can lift the weighty load from the sinner's conscience. As the sin is against Him, so He must forgive. Not the priest, but the Lord Jesus is here distinctly declared to be the forgiver of sin. Having, then, made this declaration, and offered this prayer, the priest pronounces the sentence, "by His authority"—that is, by the authority of John xx. 23—"I absolve thee." If the former sentence were omitted, then we should be compelled to believe that a human priest was judicially pronouncing, as Christ's vicar in his sacerdotal character, a Divine sentence; but since that sentence is not omitted, but distinctly declares that Christ forgives, we may believe that this sentence of absolution, even though couched in the first person, the present tense, and the indicative mood, was not intended by the Reformers to carry with it any countenancing of the Roman doctrine.

The whole theological position of the Reformers justifies this assertion. Interpreted thus, it stands in conformity with the rest of the Prayer Book, and, though liable to abuse, it is not Popish. Interpreted otherwise, it is an unreasonable

and unintelligible blot, which the Reformers would never have tolerated, much less have themselves composed and inserted. *For the absolution, as it stands in the Prayer Book to-day, is precisely the same as the absolution in the Second Book of Edward VI.* There is not the slightest alteration of any kind whatever, save the substitution of the pronoun "who" for the more archaic "which." The Prayer Book of 1552 composed under the supervision of the most Protestant minds of the Reformation, and by the careful anti-Romish zeal of scripturally enlightened men, contained precisely the same formula for absolution, under almost the same conditions. It must not be supposed, therefore, that this is the production of the semi-Reform days of 1549, or an addition of any later era of sacerdotal reaction. It is not. It is the deliberate judgment of the fully enlightened Reformers, expressed in their carefully finished work of 1552. It was inserted, or rather retained, at a time when everything that savoured of Romishness was ruthlessly removed, and when the times so far from necessitating compromise were most favourable to root and branch dealing with the elements of Popery. The very fact that this form (as has been pointed out by Fausset in his work on the Prayer Book) was sanctioned by the sense of the continental Reformers and was retained in the Protestant confessions of Augsburg, Bohemia, and Saxony, and was, moreover, approved by John Calvin, simply proves that the form not only *may* have given to it, but *should* have given to it, an evangelical and non-Roman interpretation.

But the objection will, perhaps, be offered. The Roman form may be defended by precisely the same argument. In it the words "*Dominus noster Jesus Christus te absolvat*" stand before the judicial sentence of the priest, "*Et ego auctoritate ipsius te absolvo.*" If, then, in the Anglican, so in the Roman form of absolution, it is not the priest, but

the Lord that absolves. Not so. Though at first sight the words seem precisely similar, there are two points of difference which are worthy of emphasis. In the first place, there is a distinction made in the Anglican form between the forgiveness of the Lord and the absolution of the priest. The Lord Jesus Christ forgives; the priest exercises the ministerial function of absolution—the declaration, by an appointed authority, of the relaxation of God's penalty. In the Roman form it is, "Christ absolves thee . . . and I absolve thee." In the next place, the conditional repentance and belief in Christ is put prominently into position in the Anglican form. In the Roman form, it is entirely omitted. Only those who repent and believe in Him can be entitled to receive from His ministers the comfortable assurance of the forgiveness of their sins.

But there is another consideration that demonstrates strongly the fundamental difference between the two forms, and extracts from this resolution the sting of Popery. I do not say this consideration alters in any way the expressions of the form, or palliates the obnoxiousness of the absolution considered in itself. But it does establish the fact that there is such a difference between this absolution and the priestly absolution of the Roman Church, as to relieve the Prayer Book from the charge of Popery pure and simple. The consideration is this.

In the Church of Rome, confession and absolution are indispensable, and a positive necessity. It is the highest function of the priest to receive the one and impart the other. It is absolutely necessary, not only for ultimate salvation, but also for the reception of the eucharist, that the priest should pronounce this absolution, and that each member of the Church should duly receive it. It is the corner stone of the whole sacerdotal structure. Remove it, and the structure falls to the ground. If there is no confession, there is

no absolution ; if there is no absolution, there is no real acceptance and forgiveness. It is the *necessity* of the Roman act of absolution, therefore, which constitutes its evil.

Now, this fact is the strongest apology for the form of absolution in the Visitation of the Sick in the Church of England Prayer Book that can be offered. While the Roman form is uniformly employed and absolutely necessary, the Prayer Book form is never necessarily employed, and by millions is never used at all.* It occurs in an occasional service, but is never necessarily enjoined. With Rome, it is indispensable, and of the highest importance. Rome enjoins its use for every member of the Church before every Communion. The Church of England never absolutely enjoins it, and only permits it in the rarest of extreme instances. That the Church of England, therefore, attaches no such importance to priestly absolution, and denies *in toto* the Roman doctrine, is proved by the fact that this form of absolution is fettered with such limitations as to bring it practically into disuse.

(1) It occurs *only* in the service for the Visitation of the Sick.

(2) It not only occurs in this service alone, but this service, as has been pointed out, is *the only service in the Prayer Book which need not be employed by the minister, unless he so please*. The other services are imposed. This is optional. According to Canon 67, the minister, when he visits the sick, "shall instruct and comfort them according to the rules of the Communion, if he be no preacher ; or, if he be a preacher, *as he shall think most needful and convenient*."

* It is safe to say that there are to-day in the Church of England thousands of clergy who have not only never used it, but have never in all their lives heard it used by any clergyman of the Church of England ; and myriads upon myriads of the laity who have not only never heard it used, but have never even heard of any one who did.

And inasmuch as the Canons of 1603-1604 were passed by both Houses of Convocation, and received the assent of the Sovereign, as head of the Church, though never passed by Parliament, their authority is sufficient to justify the clergyman in making use in this service of any other form at his discretion. As a matter of fact the service is cumbrous, complicated and unfitted for modern uses, and has fallen into almost total disuse.

(3) It is only for the sick, and as the whole service goes to show, only the really seriously sick.

(4) It is only to be used in case the sick one feels his conscience troubled with any weighty matter. If he does not feel this—if his conscience is not troubled—if the matter be not weighty—then he is not to be moved to make a special confession.

(5) The absolution is only to be pronounced if—*if*—he humbly and heartily desire it. This limitation effectually demolishes the Popish character of the absolution, for absolution is an indispensable necessity, or it is nothing. It is impossible to conceive of Rome permitting her priests to limit their absolution to *such as humbly desire it*, or emasculating it of its authority by such man-devised “ifs!” By teaching here that this absolution is not indispensable, that it is not a necessity for every sinning son of the Church, the Church of England destroys its Romish character, and reduces it to an inoffensive formula. As has been well said, “The actual practice of the Church is utterly inconsistent with the notion that this absolution is a Divine sentence. If it were a Divine sentence, the Church would not have limited its use as above, nor allowed its total disuse, but would have taken care that every minister employed and every member received it.” In fact, when one takes into consideration the whole circumstances of this absolution—the chamber of sickness, the approach of death, the solemnity

of the surroundings, the unburdening of the conscience, the earnest desire for the assuring voice of God's minister; when one considers, moreover, that it occurs in a service but rarely employed, and indeed not necessarily even at any time; above all, when one considers that its use is entirely left, not merely to the option of the minister, but to the desire of the sick person, and that it is followed by as fervent and evangelical a prayer for pardon as is to be found within the compass of the Prayer Book—a prayer, moreover, that is utterly inconsistent with the supposition of the authoritative conveyal of priestly absolution—the most prejudiced mind must see how small a ground it affords for the accusation of undisguised Popery, and for the justification of the practices of the Romanizing school in the Church. Even though its presence may be regretted by many, candour must acknowledge that, as far as its practical effects are concerned, the defect is insignificant. I do not say that it is not a defect. In my opinion it is, because it offers to the Romanizing school a lever for the introduction of false teaching, by considering the sentence apart from its context, and without reference to the views of the compilers and the body of the Prayer Book, taken as a whole. To a school of men who are “haunted by no intellectual perplexities,” it is a matter of no consequence that there is absolutely no justification whatever for the employment of this formula in any other place, or under any circumstances other than those particularly specified in the foregoing rubrics; that to use it, for instance, in any other place than the house of the sick, or to any other person than one very sick, with a troubled conscience, at his humble and hearty desire, *is to act lawlessly as a minister of the Church of England*. So far, indeed, is it a defect; but in so far as honesty and obedience to truth and law remains in the Church, it is a defect which has, in the good providence of

God, been reduced by the limitations by which it is surrounded to its practical minimum.

As the question is one of great interest to Churchmen, I subjoin the views of two well-known authorities on the Book of Common Prayer, representing the two great schools of thought in the Church.

Wheatly supposes that this form of absolution seems only to respect the censures of the Church, and lays much stress upon the expressions of the Collect that immediately follows. "If," says he, "we look forward to the Collect immediately after to be used, it looks as if the Church did only intend the remission of ecclesiastical censures and bonds. For in that prayer the penitent is said still to most earnestly desire pardon and forgiveness, which surely there would be no occasion to do if he had been actually pardoned and forgiven by God, by virtue of the absolution pronounced before. Again, the priest offers a special request, that God would preserve and continue him in the unity of the Church; which seems to suppose that the foregoing absolution had been pronounced in order to restore him to its peace." He then goes on to show that the authority promised to St. Peter and the other apostles—Matt. xvi. 19; xviii. 18—was a power of admitting to or excluding from Church communion, for it is expressed by the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. "Binding and loosing signify the same things that we now express by excommunicating and absolving, and it is the opinion of some that the power committed to the apostles of remitting and retaining sins confers only a power of excommunicating and absolving, and consequently that no authority can be urged from hence for the applying of God's pardon to the conscience of a sinner, or for absolving him any otherwise than from the censures of the Church." That these words in St. John xx. 23, give no power to us, in the present state of the Church, to forgive

or remit sins in the name of God is clear to Wheatly from the fact that with the apostles this power was conjoined with the power of healing diseases. The power of forgiving sins "is only to be interpreted of an extraordinary power which accompanied the inflicting, or continuing, or removing diseases." In the primitive Church, this authority to pardon or forgive sins was never considered to appertain to the ministers of the Gospel, nor was such authority ever pretended to for a great many centuries after Christ. Absolution was always correlative with public discipline, and the relaxation of this discipline was accompanied with prayers after the optative form. Even when, as late as the twelfth century, the indicative form was introduced, it was made use of only to reconcile the penitent to the Church, while the deprecatory form was supposed to procure his pardon from God.

In applying the pardon of God to a sinner's conscience, the power of the priest is only ministerial, and therefore the form is precatory rather than peremptory. But in restoring a man to the peace of the Church, the minister exercises a judicial authority. It is evident, then, in Wheatly's opinion, that this absolution was not intended to countenance the unscriptural and demoralizing doctrine of the Roman Church, that the priests have a power invested in them to release a sinner from the wrath of God, &c., but rather to restore, under strong and narrowing limitations, the practice of the early Church with regard to discipline. He concludes this argument by a comparison of the rubric in the First Book of Edward VI., where these words occur: "After which confession, the priest shall absolve him after this form; and the same form of absolution shall be used in all private confessions." But in the Second Book: "Our Reformers, observing that persons might place too much confidence in it, and thinking that the bare pronouncing it over them

cleansed them from their inward pollution and guilt, and entirely remitted their sins before God, left out that rubric, and in the exhortation to the Communion altered the expression to show that the benefit of absolution (of absolution, I presume, from inward guilt) was not to be received by the pronouncing of any form, but by the due application and ministry of God's Holy Word. So that all the minister seems here empowered to transact, in order to quiet the conscience of a person that applies to him for advice, is only to judge by the outward signs whether his conversion be real and sincere ; and if, upon examination, it appears to be so, he is then to comfort him with an assurance that his sins are remitted, even in the Court of Heaven, and that he is restored to the grace and favour of Christ. But this he is to deliver, not absolutely, but conditionally ; that is, upon the presumption that his repentance is as sincere as he represents it."

Wheatly's theory is reasonable, and is worthy of consideration. His last argument especially is very strong ; in fact, it is this. If the Reformers, by their deliberate expurgation of the injunction to use this form in private confessions, and by their equally deliberate omission of the injunction in the Communion Service to come to the priest and confess that he may receive absolution, meant anything, they meant that confession and absolution were not necessary for the remission of their sins before God. Therefore they must have meant something else ; and it is reasonable to believe that it was left in this occasional and rarely-used service in accordance with the practice of the primitive Church in binding and loosing ecclesiastical discipline.

Hole, in his manual of the Book of Common Prayer, gives a somewhat similar explanation. I give his words without alteration :

*"The office of absolution: its nature.—*The first of the

three forms, by its manner of referring to its authority, understands that the minister's office, as conveyed by St. John xx. 23, is to declare the absolving grace of God, and assure the penitent of it. In the third absolution, therefore, since it is founded on the same authority, as itself more expressly declares, the minister must needs consider that he discharges an office of the same nature, and he must understand the words 'I absolve thee' as an equivalent form to 'I declare and pronounce unto thee God's absolving grace.'

"*The effects of the absolution.*—The first form, after declaring the pardon and absolution of those who truly repent, goes on to exhort us to pray for true repentance. It is followed also by the Lord's Prayer, which supplicates forgiveness. On the twenty-first and twenty-fourth Sundays after Trinity, notwithstanding that pardon and absolution have been already declared, both are prayed for in the Collect for the day. Absolution is also prayed for in the Communion; remission and forgiveness in the Litany; and on Ash Wednesday the second form is also succeeded, though not immediately, by the Lord's Prayer and its petition for pardon; while next to this again comes a prayer in which God is most humbly besought to grant remission of sins. In the case of the third absolution, the after prayer for pardon is more especially noticeable. The penitent has confessed with an express view to absolution; the precatory absolution, 'Our Lord absolve thee,' has succeeded; then the official sentence, 'I absolve thee'; and still there immediately follows a very full and most earnest supplication by the minister, that God would put away the sin of His servant who is still desiring pardon and forgiveness; and that God will continue him in the unity of the Church, and will not impute unto him his former sins. The penitent is not thus lulled into a false security, as though the

Church's absolution completed the remission, and took effect like a judge's sentence in court by the utterance of the words, or like the words which complete the act of baptism, or the act of marriage; he is not made to suppose that the official sentence settles his account with God. The office of a minister in absolution is to present, in the name of God, a remission of sins as a gift to the penitent, which he himself must take up, either then or thereafter, by his own personal and individual faith in Christ, and true repentance."

Substantially, his view is similar to Wheatly's on this point. Both agree that the succeeding prayer for pardon must be considered as an important factor in the determination of the precise import of this absolution form. Both agree that this form is not intended, like the Romish absolution, to take effect like a judge's sentence, or entirely remit the sins before God, by lulling the penitent into a false security.

CHAPTER VIII.

AURICULAR CONFESSION.

IN a book published in England, entitled, "A Catechism on the Church," by the Rev. C. S. Grueber, the following extraordinary sentences occur :

"Q.—What do you mean by absolution?"

"A.—The pardon or forgiveness of sin."

"Q.—By what special ordinance of Christ are sins committed after baptism to be pardoned?"

"A.—By the sacrament of absolution."

"Q.—Who is the minister of absolution?"

"A.—A priest."

"Q.—Do you mean that a priest can really absolve?"

"A.—Yes."

"Q.—What must precede the absolution of the penitent?"

"A.—Confession. Before absolution privately given, confession must be made to a priest privately."

"Q.—In what case does the Church of England order her ministers to 'move' people to private, or, as it is called, auricular confession?"

"A.—When they 'feel their conscience troubled with any weighty matter.'"

"Q.—What is 'weighty matter'?"

"A.—Mortal sin certainly is weighty; sins of omission or commission of any kind, that press upon the mind, are so, too; anything may be weighty that causes 'scruple or doubtfulness.'"

"Q.—At what times in particular does the Church so order?"

“A.—In the time of sickness, and before coming to the Holy Communion.”

Such is the unaltered language actually found in a work published by a clergyman of the Church of England for the instruction of the youth of the Church.*

Now, apart altogether from his unjustifiable use of the word “absolution,” his arbitrary and uncalled for assigning of a troubled conscience as a cause for confession, and his utterly false statement that the Church orders people to auricular confession before coming to the Holy Communion, it is manifestly unjust to talk of auricular confession being permissible in the Church of England, or to plead the rubric in the service for the Visitation of the Sick as affording any shadow of countenance for its observance.

What is auricular confession?

Auricular confession, as practised in the Church of Rome, is an express, contrite, but secret self-accusation to a duly authorized priest of at least all grievous sins committed after baptism, or of all the mortal sins committed since the last confession when absolution was received, in order to the reception of sacramental absolution. It involves accordingly three essentials:

(1) It is the *complete* confession of all one's sins of a grievous or *mortal* nature committed during one's life, if it is the first confession; or, if it is not, of all the mortal, not venial, sins committed since the last confession and absolution. This distinction between mortal and venial sins is a very important one in its bearing upon the doctrine of Roman confession. A mortal sin is one which “excludes a man altogether from the favour of God, because forbidden by Him under the penalty of eternal death.” Every mortal sin *ipso facto* excommunicates a man, deprives him of God's

* The book is published by G. J. Palmer, London.

favour, and quenches the Spirit within him. A venial sin is one of a lighter kind, and can be forgiven at once on the mere act of repentance and faith. A mortal sin can only (with such exceptions, for instance, as impossibility of access to a priest) be wiped out by confession and absolution. Auricular confession, therefore, is reserved for mortal sins alone, and without confession and absolution in ordinary cases, forgiveness is impossible. It is this fact, namely, that confession is required only of mortal sins, that renders the Roman doctrine so dangerous. On the one hand, it engenders in the penitent a diseased and morbid spiritual state, as he abjectly casts about in his mind for the terrible iniquity committed since the last confession, for nothing less than a mortal sin necessitates confession. On the other hand, it gives to an unscrupulous priest an opportunity to gratify a depraved imagination, by instituting an inquiry which will elucidate the committal of some deadly sin.

(2) It is the *secret* confession of one's sins into the ear of a priest. The act is to take place in private, between the soul and the priest.

(3) *It is necessary and indispensable.* It is indispensable to the reception of the sacrament of the eucharist, and it is positively enjoined, as one of the commandments of the Church, as necessary at least once a year. Take from it these two last characteristics, and the practice of confession will have lost its sting. If it is not secret, it will be deprived of its most odious feature. If it is not necessary, it has lost its power. The whole structure of Romanism would crumble without it, so wedded together are the doctrines of transubstantiation, priestly mediation, absolution and confession.

These are the elements, then, that make the practice of the confessional in the Church of Rome so abhorrent to all true lovers of God's truth. Confession in itself to a

brother Christian, especially to a man of God, duly authorized to be God's minister of comfort to troubled souls, is not only not repugnant to Holy Scripture, but is clearly enjoined therein. See St. James v. 15. It is the secrecy of the transaction, its connection with the dogma of mortal and venial sins, its necessity in order to priestly absolution and the reception of the eucharist, that makes it so entirely abominable. It is not the simple confession of brother-man to brother-man, or of man to minister, but all that the Roman practice involves.

Holding in mind, then, the real meaning of auricular confession, let us consider this rubric in the Visitation of the Sick: "Here shall the sick person be moved to make a special confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter."

In the first place, it occurs in a service which is only used on rare occasions, namely, in cases of severe illness, as the whole service manifestly proves.

It is a service, in the next place, for this point is so important that it demands repetition, which need not be used at all. It is the only service in the Prayer Book which is not enjoined as necessary, the only service which the minister may use, or may not use, according to his discretion. See Canon 67. As a notorious matter of fact, while no minister of the Church of England dare use any form of service other than that authorized in the Prayer Book in administering the Communion, marrying, burying, or baptizing, he does, in the visitation of the sick, use his own discretion as to what portion of the Bible he shall read, or what prayers he shall use, and comfort and instruct them as he may think most needful and convenient.

Further. Even in this optional and rarely necessary service, this rubric, which refers to the matter of confession, is so fettered with limitations that it completely destroys the

essentiality of auricular confession. The confession is to be made "if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter." If he doesn't feel the same, he need not. "If he feel his conscience troubled with any *weighty* matter." If his is only an ordinary life, stained by no particularly heinous offence or act of criminality, the requirement of confession is not insisted on. "Here shall the sick person be moved." It is to be a suggestion only, not the exercise of an indispensable sacerdotal act. Nothing could be further from the necessary and indispensable auricular confession of Popery than this strictly limited suggestion to the minister to advise the sick man, under these peculiar circumstances exclusively, to remove from his mind the weight of unconfessed guilt. This very fact of the reception or non-reception of absolution, and the opening or not opening of the conscience in confession, is the thing that clearly demonstrates the Protestantism of the service. The idea of Rome allowing the onus of responsibility to be thrown on the sick person, permitting him to say whether he will confess, or whether he will not confess; if he confesses, how much he will confess; and most startling of all, leaving it to him to determine whether or not absolution shall be given; the idea of such a thing is too absurd for any sane man to contemplate for a moment. The Roman system would crumble like a house on sand were the supposition even permitted!

In fact, this very rubric, in what some imagine to be the most Romanistic service in the Prayer Book, carries in it the very root-principle of all Protestantism: the wresting of power from the priest, and deposing him from the position of an absolving priest, carrying in his power life and death, to that of a minister of God's grace, whose ministerial power "shall" be exercised just as the penitent desires or not, upon the minister's suggestion. Were this a Roman

service, the words "if he humbly and heartily desire it" would be utterly impossible. God working through the Church; the Church working from God through the priest; the priest working as God, in the place of God, through the sacraments: this is the essence and entirety of Romanism. To vest the power of determining the administration of the absolution, *not in the priest, but in the laity*, is not only fundamentally to destroy the power of the priest and annihilate priestcraft, but to demolish the very idea of absolution in the Roman or sacerdotal sense.

Nothing, again, could be more removed from the secret transactions of the confessional boxes, according to the usages of the Church of Rome, than this open confession in the sick room, where others are present. Certainly the responses in the opening part of the Visitation seem to point to the participation of others in the service. Whatever it is, it is not the confessional box. Each of these points is sufficient to destroy the practice, and disprove the doctrine. Together, they present an irresistible argument.

But a stronger proof of the illegality and inadmissibility of auricular confession in the Church of England is offered by a comparison of the services in the Prayer Book when only half freed from Popish errors—the First Book of 1549—and as it now stands in its reformed and Protestant purity. In the Communion Service in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI., it is directed that after the Creed shall follow "the sermon or homily, or some portion of one of the homilies, as they shall be hereafter divided." In the second of these short exhortations, which is more particularly to be offered when the people seem negligent to come to the Communion, these words occur: "And if there be any of you whose conscience is troubled and grieved in anything, lacking comfort or counsel, let him come to me, or to some other discreet and learned priest, taught in the law of God,

that he may receive such ghostly counsel, advice, and comfort, that his conscience may be relieved, and that of us (as of the ministers of God, and of the Church) he may receive comfort and absolution to the satisfaction of his mind, and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness; requiring such as shall be satisfied with a general confession not to be offended with them that do use, to their further satisfying, *the auricular and secret confession to the priest*; nor those also which . . . particularly open their sins to the priest, to be offended with them that are satisfied with their humble confession to God, and the general confession to the Church." Now, in this exhortation three things are very noticeable.

(1) The word Priest is used throughout. Three times it is distinctly, and purposely employed with a significantly sacerdotal meaning.

(2) The practice of auricular confession is clearly defined, and unquestionably allowed. It was legal then in the Church of England.

(3) The absolution to be used is prescribed in the visitation of the sick where it is particularly stated that it "shall be used in all private confessions."

Now, compare with this the exhortation as it is found in our Prayer Book to-day. "Therefore, if there be any of you who cannot by this means (that is, by repentance and self-examination) quiet his own conscience herein, but requireth further comfort or counsel, let him come to me, or to some other discreet and learned minister of God's Word, and open his grief; that, *by the ministry of God's Holy Word*, he may receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice to the quieting of his conscience, and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness." The difference is as the difference of darkness and light. Instead of "to me, or to some other discreet and learned Priest," it is, "to me, or to some other discreet and learned minister of

God's Word," the contrast being intentionally marked because of the traditional and universal connection of the priest with the act of confession. *If the word priest is ever used in the Prayer Book as implying a distinctly sacerdotal office, it should be used here. But here, in this very place, it has been purposely omitted.* Instead of absolution from the priest, the benefit of absolution is to be obtained by the ministry of God's Holy Word; that is, by the application of the many great and precious promises of the Bible, by the minister unfolding to the penitent the declarations of the Word which may be applicable to him. But above all, the permission to use "the auricular and secret confession to the priest" is entirely left out, and by this purposed and most important omission, auricular confession is abolished completely from the Church of England.

That this was clearly the intention of the Church is shown, moreover, by another fact which demonstrates the matter beyond all dispute. In the service for the Visitation of the Sick in the First Prayer Book, these words occur after the examination of the sick man by the minister: "Here shall the sick person make a special confession, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter. After which confession, the Priest shall absolve him after this form; and the same form of absolution shall be used in all private confessions." The latter sentence permits the practice of auricular confessions, and makes provision for the manner of absolution. In the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI. this sentence was carefully omitted, and it has never been inserted since, so that there is now in the Church of England no authorization for the employment of any form of absolution in private confessions.

By two strong blows, the practice of auricular confession has been demolished.

The first blow was given by sweeping away from the

exhortation in the Communion Service the mention of auricular confession. The second blow by sweeping from the Visitation rubric any possible means of performing it. The omission of these words, "the same form of absolution shall be used in all private confessions," is really one of the most Protestant features in the Prayer Book, for it cuts out the very roots of one of the deadliest of Roman doctrines. These two facts are surely sufficient to establish the matter.

Finally, to banish all doubt as to the plain teaching of the Church of England with regard to auricular confession, I would quote these outspoken words from the Homily on Repentance. After proving confession of sin unto God to be one of the parts of repentance, and confession to brotherman also needful and necessary, according to the teaching of our blessed Lord and His apostle St. James, Matt. v. 23; Jas. v. 16, the Homily continues: "And whereas the adversaries (that is, the Papists) go about to wrast this place for to maintain their auricular confession withal, they are greatly deceived themselves, and do shamefully deceive others. For, if this text ought to be understood of auricular confession, then the priests are as much bound to confess themselves unto the lay people as the lay people are bound to confess unto them. And, if to pray is to absolve, then the laity by this place, hath as great authority to absolve the priests, as the priests have to absolve the laity. This did Johannes Scotus, otherwise called Duns, well perceive, who, upon this place, writeth on this manner: 'Neither doth it seem unto me that James did give this commandment, or that he did set it forth as being received of Christ. For, first and foremost, whence had he authority to bind the whole Church, since that he was only bishop of the church at Jerusalem? Except thou wilt say that the same church was, at the beginning, the head church, and that consequently that he was the head bishop, which

thing the See of Rome will never grant. The understanding of it then is, as in these words, 'confess your sins one to another,' a persuasion to humility, whereby he willeth us to confess ourselves generally unto our neighbours that we are sinners, according to this saying, 'If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.' And where that they do allege this saying of our Saviour Jesu Christ unto the leper to prove auricular confession to stand on God's Word, 'Go thy way, and show thyself unto the priest,' do they not see that the leper was cleansed from his leprosy afore he was by Christ sent unto the priest for to show himself unto him? By the same reason, we must be cleansed from our spiritual leprosy, I mean, our sins must be forgiven us afore that we come to confession. What need we, then, to tell forth our sins into the ear of the priest, since that they be already taken away? Therefore, holy Ambrose, in his second sermon on the one hundred and nineteenth Psalm, doth say full well, '*Go, show thyself unto the priest*; who is the true priest but He which is *the Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedec*?' Whereby this holy father doth understand that, both the priesthood and the law being changed, we ought to acknowledge none other priest for deliverance from our sins but our Saviour Jesus Christ, who, being our sovereign Bishop, doth with the sacrifice of His body and blood, offered once for ever on the altar of the cross, most effectually cleanse the spiritual leprosy, and wash away the sins of all those that, with true confession of the same, do flee unto Him. It is most evident and plain that this auricular confession hath not his warrant of God's Word, else it had not been lawful for Nectarius, Bishop of Constantinople, upon a just occasion to have put it down. For when anything ordained of God is by the lewdness of men abused, the abuse ought to be taken away and the thing itself suffered to remain. More-

over, these are St. Augustine's words: 'What have I to do with men that they should hear my confession, as though they were able to heal all my diseases? A curious sort of men to know another man's life, and slothful to correct or amend their own. Why do they seek to hear of me what I am, which will not hear of thee what they are? And how can they tell, when they hear by me of myself whether I tell the truth or not, since no mortal man knoweth what is in man, but the spirit of man which is in him?' Augustine would not have written thus if auricular confession had been used in his time. Being, therefore, not led with the conscience thereof, let us, with fear and trembling, and with a true contrite heart, use that kind of confession that God doth command in His Word; and then, doubtless, as He is faithful and righteous, He will forgive us our sins, and make us clean from all wickedness. I do not say but that, if any do find themselves troubled in conscience, they *may repair to their learned curate or pastor, or to some other godly learned man, and show the trouble and doubt of their conscience to them, that they may receive at their hand the comfortable salve of God's Word*; but it is against the true Christian liberty that any man should be bound to the numbering of his sins, as it hath been used heretofore in the time of blindness and ignorance."—*Homilies, S. P. C. K. ed.*, p. 575, *et seq.*

Of course, it must be remembered that the Homilies, though generally containing sound doctrine, are not to be considered as possessed of verbal authority, or as being in every sentence and particular statement doctrinally infallible. They are not. As far as some specific statements go, they are erroneous; and as far as their binding authority goes, they are subsidiary to the Articles. On the whole, they voice the sentiments of the Reformers and the teaching of the Church, and, as discourses, were admirably adapted to the times for which they were drawn up, by their forcible

exhibition of plain truths ; they show forth, too, most authoritatively, the mind of the Church of England with regard to the more serious errors of the Church of Rome ; and though not claiming particular infallibility for each utterance on the subject, they yet most strikingly declare that auricular confession in the Church of England is utterly inadmissible.* In the time of blindness and ignorance, it was in place. But now, by God's grace, we have been delivered from these things.

To sum up : The practice of auricular confession has no warrant in the Church of England. It is opposed at once to the Articles, the Homilies, the Canons, and the Rubrics of the Prayer Book. Those who plead that the rubric in the service for the Visitation of the Sick is a justification for the practice, are condemned by the rubric itself. Auricular confession is necessary, secret, and entire. This rubric enjoins a confession which is partial and peculiar, not entire ; in a house, and not in the confessional box ; before others, and not of necessity secretly ; optional, not indispensable ; in very, very rare cases, not for all. The Church of Rome makes auricular confession part of one of the sacraments necessary to salvation ; exacts it as indispensable to the reception of the eucharist ; excommunicates those who yearly neglect it ; imposes with it, by the priest's dictation, penance for satisfaction to God ; enforces secrecy from confessor and confessed ; demands an entire confession of every mortal sin of hidden thoughts and foul imaginings ; orders the priest, by suggestive questionings, to unfold the penitent's carnal desires ; begins this confessional work with children not yet in their teens ; teaches flatly that sins are forgiven by the priestly act ; requires the penitent to subject his whole soul to the will and dictation of the priest ; demands that painful and laborious works of satisfaction be performed at his word ; teaches that the penitent may satisfy Divine justice thus for

* See Bp. Jewel's Works, II., p. 1133.

his own sins; in short, makes the people in conscience, will, and thought, in matters spiritual and matters moral, the helpless bond-slaves of the priesthood, and the priesthood the dispensers of salvation. In direct antagonism to this, the Church of England, Article 25, denies that penance (which includes auricular confession) is a sacrament; not only does not exact auricular confession as a necessary pre-requisite to the eucharist, but never exacts it at all; does not excommunicate those who neglect it; requires no works of penance for satisfaction; does not demand, as Rome does, entire secrecy from confessor and confessed, and only in the case of voluntary confession is that confidence required, on the minister's part, which is reasonable and just; says nothing whatever of "mortal" sins; insists upon no revelation of sinful thoughts; authorizes no inquisitor-like search on the part of the minister, especially between a clergyman and the female members of the Church, for thoughts connected with immodesty and licentiousness; has absolutely no provision whatever for the bringing of children to confession; teaches that sins are not pardoned by the priestly act of absolution, without the hearty repentance and true faith of the penitent; never ascribes infallibility to mortal man, nor teaches slavish submission of soul to priest; and instead of teaching that satisfaction-works can be performed by one Christian for another, repudiates the doctrine as arrogancy and impiety (Articles 10, 13, and 14); teaching, in fine, as Latimer puts it, "as for satisfaction or absolution for our sins, there is none but in Christ; we cannot make amend for our sins but only by believing in Him which suffered for us; and herein standeth our absolution or remission of our sins, namely, when we believe in Him, and look to be saved through His death." *

* I am indebted for most of these contrasts to an able work on the history of the confessional by Bishop Hopkins, of Vermont.

In short, the confessional and Romish auricular confession are things blotted out by the Church of England at the time of the Reformation, and condemned by her absolutely. No one, save those specified in the Rubric and Communion Service, can be asked to confess; and if they do, the Church makes no provision whatever for the manner of their confession, or the method of absolution, save the application to the burdened conscience of the precious promises of God's Word. Therefore, it may, with all confidence, be declared, that the introduction of the teaching and practice of auricular confession into the Church of England is not only "fraught with peril to its existence as an establishment, and subversive of the principles of morality, social order, and civil and religious liberty," but also, in the very highest and truest sense, "alien to the doctrine, the principles, and the order of the Church."

CHAPTER IX.

THE ORDINAL.

ONE service still remains to be considered, the form and manner of ordering of priests, commonly known as the Ordination Service.

It is a service that most conspicuously attests the remarkable work of the Reformation, and illustrates the completeness of the victory achieved over the formalism and false doctrine of Rome. In no service was there such a perfect rebound from the vain ceremonial and dangerous doctrine of the Romish Service, and so thorough a return to the scriptural simplicity of the Apostolic Church; the Ordination Service being the only service of any importance in which no change of any importance was made in 1552 from the first reformed Ordinal of 1550.

The Ordination Service proper begins with the presentation of the candidates to the bishop, by whom a solemn exhortation is delivered, and a series of heart-searching queries addressed, to which suitable answers are given. After this, the congregation engage three times in prayer; once silently, once audibly, and once through the voice of the bishop. Then the bishop, with the priests (or presbyters) present, lay their hands severally upon the head of every one that receives the order of priesthood, the Church thus carrying out, with literal exactness, the apostolic practice in ordination, the conjunction of the hands of the presbytery with that of the bishop, the representative of the higher order, in the manual imposition. A comparison of the fourteenth verse of the fourth chapter of the first epistle to Timothy, "the gift that is in thee, given by prophecy,

with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery," and the sixth verse of the first chapter of the second epistle, "the gift of God which is in thee by the putting on of my hands," seems to prove that it was the mind of God, as expressed in His Holy Word, that the proper authorities for ordination, the representatives of the apostolic office, should have associated with them, in the act of ordaining, the members of the order of the presbytery, and accordingly this is done in the Church of England. While the hands are laid upon the heads of the candidates humbly beseeching upon their knees, the bishop says the words which convey the committal of the formal authority of the office to the minister: "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God, and of His holy sacraments; in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen." The words are mainly taken from Holy Scripture, being an almost literal transcript of the words of our blessed Lord in the twenty-third verse of the twentieth chapter of the Gospel according to St. John: "Receive ye the Holy Spirit. Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained."

Now, in considering this and other services in the Prayer Book, it is well to remember that while our Reformers were prompted by the convictions of a most decided Protestantism, they were by no means actuated by that unreasonable and fanatical spirit which rejects everything *in toto* that has ever been employed by Rome. Theirs was the most sagacious and profitable way of rejecting all that was bad, while retaining all that was good.

They rejected Popery, but retained Episcopacy. They

rejected the Mass, but retained the Lord's Supper. They rejected the Romish service, but retained the Liturgy.

In fact, their position is precisely put in the language of the great and judicious Hooker: "We condemn not all as unmeet the like whereunto have been either devised or used haply amongst idolaters. For why should conformity with them in matter of opinion be lawful when they think that which is true, if in action when they do that which is meet it be not lawful to be like unto them? Are we to forsake any true opinion because idolaters have maintained it? Nor to shun any requisite action only because we have, in the practice thereof, been prevented by idolaters? It is no impossible thing but that sometimes they may judge as rightly what is decent about such external affairs of God, as in greater things what is true. Not, therefore, whatsoever idolaters have thought or done, but let whatsoever they have either thought or done *idolatrously* be *so far forth* abhorred. For of that which is good, even in evil things, God is author." And again: "Touching our conformity with the Church of Rome, as also of the difference between some Reformed Churches and ours, that which generally hath been already answered may serve for answer to that exception which, in these two respects, they take particularly against the form of our common prayer. To say that in nothing they may be followed which are of the Church of Rome, were violent and extreme. Some things they do in that they are men; in that they are wise men and Christian men, some things; some things in that they are men misled and blinded with error. As far as they follow reason and truth, we fear not to follow the self-same steps wherein they have gone, and to be their followers. Where Rome keepeth that which is ancients and better, others whom we much more affect [that is, the Reformed Continental Churches] leaving it for newer and changing it for

worse ; we had rather follow the perfections of them we like not, than in defects resemble them whom we love.”—*Ecc. Pol.*, Book V., ch. 12, 28.

It is well also to remember, in our consideration of these difficult questions, that their age was one of amazing transitions. The whole of their surroundings, antecedents, and associations, were entirely different from ours. The only form of Christianity known to them for many years had been practically Romanism. The only services from which they could draw for models of ritual, or forms of service, were forms more or less identified with the usage of the Church for centuries. Accordingly, in drawing up many of the forms of prayer and services, they adopted the prudent plan of retaining all that was profitable and praiseworthy, and rejecting everything which, in their opinion, could nourish superstition, or lead the minds of the people back to Rome. “The compilers of the Liturgy examined all the service-books then in use. These they compared with the primitive Liturgies, and whatever they found in them consonant to the Holy Scriptures and the doctrine and worship of the primitive Church, they retained and improved ; but the modern corruptions and superstitious innovations of latter ages, they entirely discharged and rejected.”

The Ordination Service is one of the conspicuous examples of this. With the doubtful exception of one short sentence, it is interpenetrated with the spirit of evangelical fervour. The language employed, the forms used, the scriptural lessons, the addresses given, the questions asked, the prayers offered, the hymns sung, the acts performed, are remarkable alike for their fitness, scripturalness, dignity, and simplicity.

Its scripturalness is remarkable.

For every sentence, texts of Scripture can be found.

The addresses, especially to the candidates, are all accurately based upon the language of the pastoral and other epistles.

Its practicalness is remarkable.

Nothing is superfluous. Nothing defective. Nothing is left out that serves to promote the interests of the Church in the setting apart of her ministers for their sacred office. An opportunity is given to any who know good reasons why the candidate should not be ordained to come forth and stop the ordination; an obstructionist policy, perhaps, that might occasionally be employed to great advantage.

Its earnestness is remarkable.

How heart-searching are the appeals in the bishop's address! How subversive of all earthly ambitions and sinister designs! How comprehensive and penetrating the inquiries made! How impossible almost that any wolf in sheep's clothing could ever find entrance! How multiplied the precautions! Could prudence have erected any further safeguards? No one who has ever witnessed it, much less participated in it as a candidate for ordination, could remain insensible to its profitableness, its excellences, its grandeur.

But the thing that we desire specially to emphasise now is its Protestantism, and in order that the reader may perceive the fundamental differences between the doctrine and ritual of the Church of Rome and the Church of England in this matter, we design to show the nature and purpose of the Ordinal in the pre-Reformation English Church and in the Church of Rome to-day.

According to the teaching of the Church of Rome the essence and substance of the religion of Christ centres in the Priesthood, and the ordination of the Priest is of such indispensable importance that it is a sacrament of Christ Himself.

According to the teaching of Rome three things are essential to the nature of a sacrament :

- (1) The outward and visible sign.
- (2) The inward and spiritual grace.
- (3) Institution by Christ Himself.

The outward and visible sign is twofold ; the matter, the visible thing done or used, and the form, the sanctifying words.

In the sacrament of Holy Orders the matter and form are the things done, and the words said in the Roman Pontifical, and the inward and spiritual grace is the *sacrificial and sacerdotal character* conferred.

Accordingly, in the Roman form of ordination the whole ceremony is considered of supreme importance, and is conducted with the minutest attention to ritual and form.

First of all the Bishop celebrates the Mass vested in full Pontifical array, amice, alb, cincture, cross, dalmatic, maniple, stole, and chasuble, and the candidates bearing a folded chasuble on the left arm and holding in the right hand a candle and a cloth, advance toward his throne. After an address to the people on their right to be consulted with regard to the character of those to be admitted to the regimen of the altar, he addresses the candidates on the duties of a priest, " It is the duty of a priest to *offer sacrifice, to bless, to rule, to preach, and to baptize,*" and gives earnest exhortations to a godly and a holy life.

Then follows, after prayer, the ceremony of the laying on of hands. The mitred Bishop with the clergy present put their hands on the head of each one to be ordained *without saying any words at all* (*nihil dicens.*) After this he asks prayer for the ordained, and prays for the benediction of the Holy Spirit, and the infusion of sacerdotal grace.

The Bishop then crosses the stole over the breast, and

puts on him a chasuble (the principal vestment of the sacrificing priest) with the words: *Accipe vestem sacerdotalem*. Receive the sacerdotal vestment.

A prayer follows for the priest, in which it is implored that he may transform, by an immaculate benediction, the bread and wine *into the* Body and Blood of God's Son, after which the hands of the priest are anointed with oil.

Then at last comes the crowning ceremony of all, without which any ordination in the teaching of Rome is false and hollow, the tradition of the instruments, and the priest-making words. A chalice with wine and water, and a paten with an unconsecrated host, is given to the candidate by the Bishop, and the sealing words are said. "Receive power to *offer sacrifice to God* and to *celebrate Mass*, both for the living and for the dead, in the name of the Lord. Amen. *Accipe potestatem offerre sacrificium Deo, missasque celebrare, tam pro vivis, quam pro defunctis. In nomine Domini. Amen.*"

This then, according to the Church of Rome and the Use of Sarum, is the matter and form of a proper and valid ordination, the *res sacramenti* being the making of a priest, and the *signum* and *forma sacramenti* being the tradition of the instruments, the authoritative words and the accompanying ceremonies.*

Everything in the Roman service, the Roman tradition, and the Roman doctrine, combine to emphasize this one essential idea. This is the office and work of a priest:—to offer sacrifice to celebrate the Mass. to absolve the penitent.

The contrast between this service and the Ordinal of the Church of England is, as any one may perceive at a glance fundamental.

Not only is the form (the *signum sacramenti*) altogether

* Trent Catechism, Part ii. ch. 7, Q. 10.

at variance with the Roman tradition, but the whole ceremony from beginning to end is subversive of, and a protest against the Roman doctrine as to the purport of the service (the *res sacramenti*).

The words and the ceremonies are of a different kind. The purpose of the service is for a different object.

Accordingly we find in the First Ordinal of 1550 a total disregard first of all of all the Romish and sacerdotal ceremonial, and in the next place, a total denial of the Romish sacerdotal doctrine. In the Ordinal of 1550 a tradition of the instruments is retained, but it is not the "tradition of the instruments" of Rome.

"The Bishop shall deliver to every one of them THE BIBLE in the one hand, and the chalice and cup with the Bread in the other hand, and say, Take thou authority to preach the Word of God, and to minister the holy sacraments."

Here the Bible is given *first*, and the *first* authority given to the candidate by the Bishop is not that to sacrifice to God and to celebrate Masses for the living and dead, but *to preach the Word of God*; after that he is given authority to administer the sacraments. A study of the whole service will further impress the mind with the thought that the purport of it is the creation, not of a sacrificer, or a Mass priest; but of a gospel preaching, sacrament administering minister of Christ.

The Second Prayer Book (1552) marks an advance in the Protestant position of the Church which, it is well to remember, is the position of the Church to-day.

The Ordination Service is practically the same as that of 1550, but in accordance with the Church's intention to remove all things that could countenance superstition *one of the ceremonies* in the tradition of the instruments was omitted.

The Bible only is now delivered to the ordained.

The ceremony of delivering the chalice or cup with the bread was abolished, and *has been left out of the Prayer Book of the Church of England ever since.*

And it was left out purposely.

It was left out because the Church of Rome had associated the delivery of the instruments, of the paten and the chalice, with the constitution of a man as a sacrificing priest, and because some might perhaps be led to suppose that the minister of the Church of England was a sacrificing priest if at the time of his ordination he were given the chalice and the bread. Not only so, but by the Ordinal of the Church of England, a new meaning was given to the word priest, its meaning now being a minister of the Word. The office and work of a priest in the Church of Rome is to sacrifice at the Mass, and sacerdotally absolve the penitent. The office and work of a priest in the Church of England is to preach the Word, to administer the sacraments, and to give the benefit of absolution by the ministry of *the Word*. Perceive, then, the great and fundamental differences between the Anglican and Roman Ordination Services.

The Church of Rome in making her priests says nothing about preaching. The Church of England in making her priests says nothing about sacrificing.

The Church of Rome in her Ordinal distinctly makes a sacrificing priest, not a minister of the Word. The Church of England in her Ordinal makes a minister of the Word, not a sacrificing priest.

The Church of Rome delivers the chalice and the Host.

The Church of England delivers the Bible.

The Church of Rome teaches that Holy Orders is a sacrament, with outward sign, and inward grace.

The Church of England teaches that Holy Orders is *not a sacrament* of the gospel, and by denying this (*Art. 25*),

cuts up from the foundation, and destroys root and branch the whole doctrine of Rome.

In fine, one has only to read the Roman Pontifical and contrast the doctrines of the Church of England and the Church of Rome to perceive that it must be impossible for the Church of Rome to admit the validity of Anglican Orders, and that the Church of Rome, to be consistent, must declare that the clergy of the Church of England *are not priests in the Roman sense of the word.*

Two things are certain.

If there is such a thing as a sacrificing priest, and if proper form, express language, and specific intention, can make a man one, then the Church of Rome *does* make him such by its Ordination Service.

On the other hand, if a man by ordination is not made a sacrificing priest unless there is the specific intention, the proper ceremony, and the express language, then the Church of England *does not* make him such by its Ordination Service.

In Rome the intention is specific.

Its purpose is to make a minister, by a sacrament, a sacrificing priest.

The form likewise is unequivocal.

A sacerdotal vestment is put upon him, and an outward and visible symbolic ceremony is performed, the handing of the chalice and the paten with the Host.

The language is clear. Receive power to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate Masses.

In the Church of England all is different.

The idea of a sacrament is denied.

There is a total absence of the accessories of a sacrificing priest, the doctrine of which the Church of England denies. (*Art. 31.*) Nothing is said about sacrificing or the Mass, and express authority is given to preach the gospel.

If one should be asked to account for this remarkable

difference both in intention and form of the Anglican Ordinal, the answer is simple. The explanation of the profound difference lies here.

The whole of the Ordinal of the Church of England was fashioned by men whose views with regard to the nature and purpose of the ministry were totally different from those of the Church of Rome. What those views were may be fairly gathered from the words of a great representative churchman of the day, Bishop Jewel, who says in his treatise of the sacraments:—"Now are we to speak in the next place of the ministry of the Church, which some have called Holy Orders. Shall we account it a sacrament? there is no reason so to do. It is a heavenly office, a holy ministry or service."

"Here note, this ministry of the Church was not ordained to offer sacrifice for forgiveness of sins. Whosoever taketh that office upon him, he doth wrong and injury to the death and passion of Christ. He only 'is called of God an high priest after the order of Melchisedec.' He only 'by His own blood entered in once into the holy place, and obtained eternal redemption for us.' He only 'with one offering hath consecrated for ever them that are sanctified.' He only hath said, *Consummatum est*: 'It is finished.' The ransom or price for man's salvation, and for forgiveness of the sins of the world, is paid in Me, in My death upon the cross. Of Him alone, and only of Him, hath it been spoken: 'This is My well-beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.' And by Esay: 'With His stripes only we are healed.' It is He only 'which hath made of both one.' It is He only 'which did put out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us: He even took it out of the way, and fastened it upon the cross.' He alone is our High Priest, the Lamb of God, the Sacrifice for sins, the Altar, the Propitiation for sins, and Redeemer of the world. He only hath appeased the wrath

of God. He only appeareth in the sight of God, to make intercession for our sins. All others whatsoever, apostles, prophets, teachers, and pastors, are not in office to offer any propitiatory sacrifice, but are called to the ministry of the saints, to the edification of the body of Christ, and to the repairing of the Church of God.

"Thus much of the holy ministry of the Church, which standeth in the setting forth of the mystery of our salvation, both by the preaching of the Word of God, and by the due and reverend ministration of the sacraments. *The principal part of this office is to preach repentance; that so we may amend our lives, and be converted unto God.*"—*Jewel, Works, Park. Soc.*, pp. 1129-31.

It is certain that this view of the ministry was the view of the men who drew up our Ordinal, and holding this view of the sacred ministry, they framed the Ordinal accordingly, and, together with the altar and the Mass, they swept for ever away the sacrificing priest.*

There was, however, one form of words which the Reformers decided to retain, and that was the form :

"Receive the Holy Ghost, whose sins thou dost forgive they are forgiven," &c.

It is a form which has occasioned serious difficulty to many churchmen as apparently sanctioning the Romish view of the priesthood.

Historically, the form is one of comparatively recent origin, for, according to Roman Catholic authorities, it was unknown in the West for 1200 years, and was then only introduced to emphasize the bestowal of judicial power *in*

* The reader who cares to have further evidence of this is referred to the works of the Parker Society, especially "Calhill," p. 229; "Latimer's Remains," p. 255; "Ridley," pp. 111-112; "Tyndall's Doctrine," p. 256. "Bradford's Letters," p. 303.

foro interiore over the mystical body of Christ upon one who had already received the full power of the priesthood. Romanists seem to agree in asserting that for the purpose of making a real priest, that is a sacrificing priest, it is of no value, and that the words by themselves cannot be the form of the sacrament. Certainly the form is not used in the Roman Pontifical until near the end of the service, and the priest without these words is regarded as fully ordained to the sacerdotal office. For up to the time of the delivery of the instruments the candidates are spoken of as "*ordinandi*," after that they are "*ordinati sacerdotes*." It was probably on account of this, and in the belief that there was nothing in this form to nourish the superstition of the sacrificing priest, that the Reformers employed the words, and it is surely not a little remarkable that the only form of words in the Roman Ordinal which is said by her divines to be *not* essential, is the only form used in the English.

In the words themselves, there is and can be nothing objectionable. They are the very words of inspired Scripture; they proceed from the lips of the Infallible Priest, the Lord Jesus Christ. As far, therefore, as the words themselves are concerned, this is a difficulty of the Bible, not a Prayer Book difficulty. The responsibility of it must be thrown further back than the compilers of the Prayer Book of the Church of England. "If, then, our Lord and Saviour Himself have used the self-same form of words, and that in the self-same kind of action, although there be but the least show of probability, yea or any possibility that His meaning might be the same which ours is, it should teach sober and grave men not to be too venturous in condemning that of folly which is not impossible to have in it more profoundness of wisdom than flesh and blood should presume to control. Our Saviour, after His resurrection from the dead, gave His apostles their commission, saying, 'All power

is given Me in heaven and in earth; go, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them,' &c. In sum, 'as My Father sent Me, so send I you.' Whereunto St. John doth add farther that, having thus spoken, He breathed on them, and said, 'Receive the Holy Ghost. By which words He must of likelihood understand some gift of the Spirit—not miraculous power," which they did not then receive, but a holy and ghostly, that is, spiritual, "authority over the souls of men; authority, a part whereof consisteth in power to remit and retain sins: 'Receive the Holy Ghost: whose sins soever ye remit, they are remitted; whose sins ye retain, they are retained.' Whereas, therefore, the other Evangelists had set down that Christ did before His suffering promise to give His apostles the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and, being risen from the dead, did promise moreover at that time a miraculous power of the Holy Ghost, St. John addeth that He also invested them even then with the power of the Holy Ghost for castigation and relaxation of sin, wherein was fully accomplished that which the promise of the keys did import. Seeing, therefore, that the same power is now given (viz. ministerial power and authority), why should the same form of words expressing it be thought foolish? The cause why we breathe not as Christ did on them unto whom He imparted power is, for that neither Spirit nor spiritual authority may be thought to proceed from us, which are but delegates or assigns, to give men possession of His graces.'—*Hooker, Ecc. Pol.*, V., p. 77.

Similar language is found in Strype's "Life of Whitgift," where, in answer to an objection propounded by some, that the words, "Receive the Holy Ghost," imply that the bishop has authority to give the Holy Ghost, it was said: "The bishop did not take thereby upon him to give the Holy Ghost, but only instrumentaliter; even as the minister giveth baptism when he saith, 'I baptize thee in the name of the

Father, &c., whereby he doth not take upon him to be the author or giver of baptism, but the minister thereof only, as John the Baptist did. For Christ only is the Giver of the Holy Ghost. And of baptism John and others are the ministers of the sacrament and of the ceremony. The words are Christ's words, used in the admitting of the apostles to the ministry, and therefore used by us in the like action to signify that God, by our ministry and imposition of hands, as by the instruments, doth give His Holy Spirit to all such as are rightfully called to the ministry."—*Strype's Whitgift*, Vol. I., p. 258.

The difficulty, then, is not the use of the words themselves, but the propriety of their use on this occasion; and especially their conjunction with the words, "the office and work of a priest in the Church of God." Now, as we have shown, the Reformers never intended the words to bear the meaning that has been put upon them. To them the word priest meant nothing more than presbyter, being etymologically a contraction of that term; for, since Christ entered into heaven as our High Priest, the use of the word priest in the sense of sacerdotal mediator was impossible. In the Prayer Book throughout, the words priest and minister are used with such curious interchangeableness as to leave no other supposition than that they are practically synonymous. The "minister" reads with a loud voice; the "priest" pronounces the absolution; the "minister" says the Lord's Prayer; the "priest" (why the priest?) the Gloria; the "minister" reads the Creed and says, "Lord, have mercy upon us"; the next moment it is the "priest" using almost precisely the same form of words. So in the Communion office. Now it is "minister," now "priest," and from the usage of the terms it is impossible to make any distinction. The "priest" says the Ten Commandments, but the priest is in the same action called the "minister";

the "minister" giveth warning about the celebration of the Lord's Supper; the "priest" says the exhortation. The "priest" consecrates; the same person, the "minister," receives the Communion, and then delivers to the bishops, "priests," and deacons. The priest, the minister; the minister, the priest. A more remarkable case is the Baptismal Service, a service which has always been permitted to a deacon, where the words are, beyond all controversy, used as interchangeable terms. The same is the case in the Marriage Service,—where the word priest is used eight times, and the word minister thirteen times to describe the *same person*. The Visitation of the Sick, the Churching of Women, the Communion Services, and, above all, in the Burial Service. In the Burial Service the term minister is never used, the word Priest always, though, as everyone is aware, the Deacon, if not the layman, may validly perform the service. In fact, the terms are employed all through the Prayer Book so interchangeably as to bewilder anyone who would seek to explain their employment on any other ground than that of their practical convertibility. The word priest simply denotes the person who performs the sacred service at the time, and cannot refer to a sacerdotal as distinguished from a non-sacerdotal order, for it is used in certain places, as we have seen, to signify the officiating minister when he may be only a deacon. Whatever were the distinctions made by the Laudian divines, and introduced as far as they possibly could, it is certain that, from the standpoint of the Reformers, and in the Prayer Book, as they compiled it, the terms are interchangeable, and presbyter is the highest meaning to be attached to the word priest.

Two weighty authorities may be here adduced, the Second Book of Homilies, and the learned and judicious Hooker.

The Second Book of Homilies:—

In the first part of the Homily, on the worthy receiving of the sacrament, it is said that to acknowledge Christ as one's own personal Saviour, &c., is to make Christ one's own, &c. "Herein thou needest no other man's help, no other sacrifice or oblation, *no sacrificing-priest*, no mass, no means established by man's invention." If words prove anything, they prove that, in the interpretation of the Church of England, the "minister" or "priest" in the Holy Communion is no "sacrificing-priest."

Hooker :—

The view of this learned divine may fairly be received as the view of the Church in that age, from the standpoint of one whom all schools and parties delight to honour. His reasoning is conclusive as to the fact that the word priest, like presbyter, cannot convey any sacrificial meaning. "Touching the ministry of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the whole body of the Church being divided into laity and clergy, the clergy are either presbyters or deacons. I rather term the one sort presbyters than priests, because, in a matter of so small moment, I would not willingly offend their ears to whom the name of priesthood is odious, though without cause. For as things are distinguished one from another by true essential forms . . . so if they that first do impose names did always understand exactly the nature of that which they nominate, it may be that then by hearing the terms of vulgar speech, we should still be taught what the things themselves are." But, as he proceeds to show, words have so many different senses that it is difficult to determine the precise idea that is attached by each man to them in common use. Generally, however, names have regard to "that which is naturally most proper," or to "that which is sensibly most eminent in the thing signified," or, as is the case in the word priest, to the thing personified. In its proper ecclesiastical sense, a priest is one whose "mere

function or charge is the service of God." "Howbeit, because the most eminent part, both of heathenish and Jewish service, did consist in sacrifice, when learned men declare what the word Priest doth properly signify, according to the mind of the first imposer of that name, their ordinary scholies do well expound it to imply sacrifice. Seeing, then, that sacrifice is now no part of the Church ministry, how should the name of priesthood be thereunto rightly applied?" Because, he replies, "even as St. Paul applied the name flesh" to the substance of fishes, "although it be in nature another thing," so the Fathers of the Church called "the ministry of the Gospel priesthood in regard of that which the Gospel hath proportionable to ancient sacrifices, namely, the communion of the blessed body and blood of Christ, although it have properly now no sacrifice. As for the people, when they hear the name, it draweth no more their minds to any cogitation of sacrifice than the name of senator or alderman causeth them to think upon old age, or to imagine that every one so termed must needs be ancient."—*Hooker, Ecc. Pol.*, V., p. 78.

Hooker's reasoning here is most remarkable. The force of a name is entirely dependent on the thing that it represents. It is evil or good because of the idea that it embodies to the mind. Now, the word priest—which in itself is a perfectly harmless, nay, most scriptural, term, being etymologically a contraction of *Presbyter*—merely implies one whose function or duty is the service of God. But inasmuch as in the Roman Church the chief function of the priest is the offering of sacrifice, in that Church, and indeed largely, the term has set forth the idea of a sacrificer. But where there is no offering of sacrifice, the word priest cannot possibly denote the person of the sacrificer. Now, in the Church of England, there is no sacrifice. "Sacrifice is now no part of the Church ministry." "The Communion hath

properly no sacrifice." Therefore, the term priest cannot possibly denote "a sacrificing-priest." Most remarkable reasoning, truly. If for nothing else, remarkable for the proof it offers of the absolute difference between the views of those who now speak of "the great act of eucharistic sacrifice"—see Pusey's "Real Presence," p. 312—and the views of such a representative High Churchman of the Elizabethan age as Richard Hooker.

To proceed. If, then, it is proved that there is no such thing as a sacrificing-priest in the Church of England as reformed in the sixteenth century, the form, "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God," is stripped at once of a blemish that otherwise would be most damaging to the Protestantism of the Church. But with the Masses, and altar, and crucifixes, the Church of England abolished also the sacrificing-priest; or, as the Thirtieth Canon declares, the Church of England has abolished Popery. Therefore, it is conclusive that, whatsoever difficulty there may be experienced in the interpretation of this sentence, it was never intended to perpetuate Popery. Whether or not it be advisable to substitute another expression, is another question altogether. But that this form was neither drawn up by the willing slaves of Popery, nor intended for the perpetuation of Popery, nor could, without dislocation, be construed into an auxiliary of Popery, is evident from the meaning of the words, and the known views of the Reformers. Doubtless it has been made the justification for all the practices of priestcraft in the Church of England, and the fountain-source of all the assumptions of sacerdotalism by her clergy.* But offences come from the abuse of hard sayings

* See Appendix. The doctrine of Apostolical Succession in the Church of England, p. 237.

of the Scriptures as well as from the Prayer Book, and, in my opinion, men who would get their warrant for the particular practice of auricular confession from the very general and scriptural statements of the Ordination Service, would not be restrained, were those words obliterated, from introducing it upon the authority of their own private interpretation of our blessed Lord's words in the twenty-third verse of the twentieth chapter of St. John.

CHAPTER X.

RECAPITULATION AND CONCLUSION.

WE have now traced, chapter by chapter, the various details of the Prayer Book which establish, one by one, its Protestant character. It only remains for us, in this concluding chapter, to gather up in a brief summary the arguments brought forth, and present the several points in a general review.

We have seen, in the first place, that the Protestantism of the Prayer Book is established by several positive features, which exhibit very strongly its contrast to the Roman and pre-Reformation Anglican services. It is in the vulgar tongue; the Roman services were in an unknown tongue. It is common prayer; the ancient services, Roman and Sarum, were unintelligible to the people, and participated in almost exclusively by the learned. It is scriptural; the Romish Mass, and other services, were largely "fond things vainly invented" by the traditions of men. It is primitive, apostolic, catholic; the Romish Mass is mediæval, traditional, occidental, and novel. The difference between the Church of England Book of Common Prayer and the missal of the Church of Rome is absolute, essential, irreconcilable; the difference between midnight and mid-day.

Great, however, as are these positive contrasts presented by a comparison with services more purely Romish, they are still less suggestive than the contrasts (which we next pointed out) between the semi-reformed Prayer Book of 1549 and the Liturgies which preceded and succeeded it. These are, beyond all controversy, the most positive evidences of the anti-Romish and anti-Ritualistic character of the Liturgy, and present, in their number, a three-fold cord not easily broken.

(1) The vast and significant differences between the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. and the ancient services of the Church, such as the Sarum missal or the Roman Mass. The various services of the Anglican Church were Roman in all save the name; they were in an unknown tongue, crowded with idolatrous practices, and taught the idolatrous doctrines of transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the Mass. The Prayer Book of the year 1549 contrasted with this as the breaking of dawn with midnight. It was plain to every reader, simple to every worshipper, and scriptural throughout—compared, that is, with the earlier service books, for in itself, and compared with later revisions, it was disfigured by many blemishes, ritual and doctrinal. It was in this comparative sense, unquestionably, that the act authorizing the Second Book of Common Prayer spoke of the Book of 1549 as “a very godly order, agreeable to the Word of God and the primitive Church . . . and most profitable to the estate of this realm”· for certainly the differences were profound in every way.

(2) The still more significant differences, from a Protestant Church standpoint, between the First Prayer Book of Edward and the Prayer Book as it now stands and is used in every congregation of the Church of England throughout the world. In the First Book, the words “Mass,” “altar,” “auricular confession,” were employed, and the practices of mixing wine and water at the Eucharist, the use of the wafer, the invocation of the Holy Ghost on the elements, the prayer of oblation over the elements, prayers for the dead, reservation of the consecrated elements, and extreme unction, were either enjoined or permitted.* A careful perusal of our Book of Common Prayer will show that the

* Even Bp. Gardiner said that he could agree to the form of 1549, though he admits that, personally, he would have framed it otherwise. See Tomlinson's “Great Parliamentary Debate,” pp. 10-11.

following omissions and alterations are among the most noteworthy links in the chain of contrast :

The word mass is omitted.

The word altar is not to be found in the Prayer Book.

The mixing of wine and water is not mentioned, though most explicitly enjoined in the First Book.

The use of the wafer is done away with, and the rubric expressly ordains that "the bread be such as is usual to be eaten at the table with other meats."

The invocation of the Holy Ghost on the elements is not mentioned.

The allusion to the ministry of the angels in bearing up our prayers is omitted.

The direction that the communicants should receive the sacrament into their mouths from the *priest's hand* is not only left out, but a different direction is substituted.

The hymn enjoined to be sung at the time of the Communion, "O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world," &c., is purposely taken away, to prevent any appearance of adoration of the Eucharist.

The use of the chrism in the Baptismal Service is omitted.

The signing of the sign of the cross in the Marriage Service and in the consecration of water for baptism, is left out.

Prayers for the dead are swept entirely away.

The permission as to auricular confession is carefully omitted.

The reservation of the elements is completely discarded.

The service for the celebration of the Holy Communion when there is a burial of the dead is left out altogether.

The permission to use genuflections, and to cross oneself, is no longer to be found.

Each and all of these omissions prove the uncompromising character of the Prayer Book as it now stands. There is a significance in each of these changes that tells

of scrupulous and anxious care. They are the changes of men who were guided by God's Spirit to search out and expunge, not mere non-essential trifles and meaningless expressions, but phrases and practices which they knew only too well could be made not merely hinges, or handles, but very *doors* for the admission of floods of false doctrines and error. The expressions and practices most carefully omitted might possibly have been employed by unscrupulous men to justify the introduction of Romish doctrine. The expression "altar," leading, as it does, to the doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass; the injunctions as to "auricular confession," involving confession before Mass and priestly absolution; the reservation and seeming adoration of the elements; prayers for the dead and the implied doctrine of purgatory; extreme unction, and communions at burials, implying masses for the dead; these are the expressions, and practices, and doctrines, which, even in such a comparatively Protestant standard as the Prayer Book of 1549, gave opportunities for the introduction of Popery into a Protestant Church, and reversion to Rome without abandoning the Church of England. But these are the very things omitted by our Reformers, and the things that are to be searched for in vain in our Prayer Book to-day.

Our Reformers knew what they were about when they did these things; and when anti-Protestants and Romanizers, or, as Bishop Cleveland Coxe denominates them, "the Trentine party," clamour for a return to that discarded Liturgy, they are clamouring for that which would land us, not half way, but almost wholly into Popery. For, at that time, these expressions and practices were the lingering remains of a position which was being steadily and surely abandoned. The movement of the age and of the Church was forward, not backward; onward, not downward. *Now*, these expressions and practices would be the infallible

harbingers of a disastrous and renegade movement to Rome. They would show that we were going backward, not forward; downward, not upward; for it is certain that words which could be used without significance in 1549 could only be re-introduced in 1890 to the confusion and destruction of the Church now established by law as Protestant and reformed.

(3) The differences between the Prayer Book of to-day and some attempted editions. This is the third in the series of contrasts that throws strong light upon the present position of the Prayer Book: the contrast offered by a consideration of certain abortive Prayer Books, which were mainly identical with the Prayer Book of the Church, and yet contained many retrograde features. I mean the Prayer Books of the Non-jurors and the Scottish Episcopal Church. During the days of Laud, and afterwards, towards the close of the seventeenth century and the beginning of the eighteenth, the tide of Church doctrine and ritual set strongly in the misnamed "Catholic" direction; that is, in the direction of more elaborate ritual, and more strongly asserted sacerdotal doctrine; and out of this era of Church history, two Prayer Books issued.

The first, the Prayer Book for the Scottish Church.

This work owed its character to Archbishop Laud, who was one of the parties who assisted in its compilation. Though mainly similar to our own, there were various significant changes, especially in the Communion Office, and nearly all of these changes are of a retrograde character; that is, in the direction of the First Book of Edward VI.; of Ritualism in practice, and sacerdotalism in doctrine.*

The second, the Prayer Book of the Non-jurors who left the Church at the accession of William and Mary.

* See Cardwell's *Conferences*, p. 391.

Many of the Non-jurors made use of the First Prayer Book of Edward, but in 1718 they issued an office of their own, in which they revived the following obsolete ceremonies : the mixing of water with the wine ; prayers for the dead ; prayer for the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the elements ; the prayer of oblation ; trine immersion ; chrism ; and unction at the visitation of the sick.

Now, I say nothing as to the doctrinal opinions of these men, nor as to the Church views of those who to-day are doctrinally identified with them ; many of them were holy men, many of these are among the saintliest of God's servants. What I desire to emphasise is this, that the expressions, and rubrics, and practices, authorized by the Prayer Book of to-day are not the expressions and practices which the Non-jurors and Scotch Episcopalians deemed necessary for insertion in their respective Liturgies in order to set forth their views of Church doctrine and Church ritual. However valid and legitimate these views may be, it is certain that the expressions and ceremonies which are considered inseparable from the true exhibition of these same doctrines are not to be found in our Prayer Book as we now have it ; for, *if they were, the Non-jurors would have had no need to compile another.* It is a fact to be remembered with gratitude by Churchmen, that amidst the entanglements and conflicts of the seventeenth century, the Prayer Book was preserved undefiled. It passed forth from the contending factions and chaotic disturbances of that period as it did from the chaos of the century before, unsullied and pure. Though tossed about by many conflicts, and assailed by many foes, the Book of Common Prayer, in the good providence of God, has been preserved from any reversion, either in ceremonial or doctrine, to the standard of a more degenerate era in the history of our Church. It has come forth from innumerable struggles, enriched, but not degraded ;

amplified, but not deformed.* Thus each successive contrast demonstrates more effectually its present excellence, and shows that from the first tentative step in the direction of Protestantism in liturgical reform, the issue of the Order of the Communion in 1548, down to those last amendments of the final revision which gave us our Prayer Book as we have it to-day, the progress of alteration has been steadily away from Rome and Ritualism, and almost uniformly towards simplicity and Protestant purity. If Churchmen would know what they now have, let them more clearly understand what they once had. The contrast will make an impression upon the mind that can never be effaced.

In the face, then, of these facts, and considering the state of the Church as a whole, it seems to me that it is the wisdom of Protestant Churchmen to be content with the Prayer Book they have, and in the shape they have it. Tampering at present would not only be inexpedient and unnecessary, but it would be dangerous. We have in the Book of Common Prayer all that fair-minded Churchmen and conscientious Christians can demand: a Protestant and scriptural Prayer Book. Imperfect, confessedly, on some points; but the points are of such comparative unimportance that every liberal and thoughtful Protestant must infinitely prefer their retention to the possibility of the introduction of more serious errors. And it is certain that were any revision attempted, the tendency at present would be to introduce changes of a retrograde character.

Within the last thirty years, the leaven of a soi-disant Catholicism has spread through the ranks of the clergy with incredible rapidity, and to a most alarming degree. Doctrines that twenty-five or thirty years ago were regarded as infallible indications of a tendency to Rome are to-day held by thousands as the true, and, in fact, the only, teaching

* See Goode's "Baptism," pp. 480-2.

of the Church. Men who, thirty years ago, were denounced in most scathing language by bishops of most pronounced High Church opinions, are to-day the Gamaliels and Mentors of nearly all the clergy who hold these same views. To-day thousands in the Church of England openly scout the notion that the advocacy of the sacrificial character of the Lord's Supper, sacramental absolution, and auricular confession, indicates any real tendency to Rome. Thousands hold these doctrines most implicitly who deny that the effect of either their ritual or teachings is to lead any nearer to the Church of Rome; they even go to the length of saying that these men are the men who are the most successful and conscientious opponents of Romish teaching.

But thirty years ago it was not so.

The doctrines which to-day are held as *bonâ fide* doctrines of the Anglican Church were, in those days, taken to indicate a *bonâ fide* tendency to Rome. I suppose that the late Bishop Wilberforce may be taken as a representative exponent of the High Anglican school of theology: indeed, he himself claimed to be of the school of Andrewes, and other High Churchmen.

Let Bishop Wilberforce, then, be our witness.

In a letter written not thirty years ago, in his capacity as Bishop of Oxford, he gives his definition of what should be considered as *bonâ fide* Romanizing tendencies: "By *bonâ fide* Romanizing tendencies in the Church, I mean the revival of a system of auricular confession, sacramental absolution, the sacrificial character of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the denial of justification by faith," &c. (*Life of Bishop Wilberforce*, p. 195.*) Here we have four distinct marks or notes of the Romanizing system:

First, the revival of a system of auricular confession.

Second, of a system of sacramental absolution.

Third, of the sacrificial character of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

Fourth, the denial of justification by faith. That classification is eminently satisfactory. It is at once descriptive and comprehensive. Loyal Churchmen, the world over, would agree that each of these separately, and all together, are distinct evidences of a departure from the faith of the Church of England in the direction of Rome. Those four marks will stand.

But so steady and subtle has been the advance of these Tridentine, or so-called "Catholic" principles, that there are multitudes of clergy who are led to believe that there is no necessary connection between the holding of these doctrines and a tendency Rome-wards. *Now*, these doctrines are held to be essentially "Anglo"-Catholic, and the men who hold them are strong in the Church. The only dogmas the holding of which would indicate a Romish tendency would be the Immaculate Conception, Papal Infallibility, and the temporal headship of the Pope.

The fact is indisputable—the most extreme members of the party themselves do not deny it—eminent authorities in the Roman Church admit it—the tide is set in the current of High Anglican doctrine, and is rising fast; so fast that, in the event of any attempted authoritative revision of the Prayer Book, changes might be made that would be most disastrous. They would probably restore the word "altar," and thus get Prayer Book authority for using a word now largely though unlawfully employed. They would insert the word "sacrifice." They would doubtless expunge the post-Communion rubric. They would probably exchange the long-disused and doubtfully legal, if not thoroughly *illegal*, Ornaments Rubric for a law binding all the clergy.*

* See Appendix on the so-called Ornaments Rubric, p. 201.

They would, in fact, if their leaders and mouthpieces are qualified exponents of the views of their school, assimilate the Prayer Book, as far as possible, to the Prayer Book of the Scottish Episcopal Church; nay, the great majority, if the statement of the President of the English Church Union is correct, would be satisfied with nothing less than a return to the First Prayer Book of Edward VI., or, at least, liberty to perform its ceremonies, and employ its usages, without scruple of conscience, or defiance of ecclesiastical law. Nay, more. One of the organs of the "Catholic party," the *Church Review*, boldly declared lately: "The thing which English Catholics have in hand at present, and are likely to have in hand, as their principal work, for at least one generation to come, is the restoration of the altar, the re-establishment of the Mass in its seat of honour as the sun and centre of Christian worship. Till this great work has progressed much further than it has at present, it would be waste of time to emphasise too strongly doctrines of great importance, indeed, but of less importance than that of the Eucharistic sacrifice. But unless the Catholic revival is to come to an untimely end—a catastrophe which there is no reason faithlessly to anticipate—the future will see in our restored public worship unmistakable marks of the belief of the Christian Church in the efficacy of the intercessions poured forth by the blessed Mary, and all saints, at the Throne of Grace, and of our real communion (that is, mutual union) with them in the acts which we perform as members of the one body of Christ."

What, then, are the blemishes upon our Prayer Book that are of such tremendous consequence as to risk the almost certain introduction of deadlier and deeper stains? The question is not whether there are matters which might not rightly be altered, words which might not be expunged,

explanatory clauses which might not safely be added, for upon this I think all Churchmen are fairly agreed; but whether the risk depending on retaining them as they are is sufficient to counterbalance the risk of changing them for something else? We think it is. The errors are few, and the risk of retention is proportionately small, for the body of the Book, on the whole, is sound. But the risk of change is fearfully great. So widespread is the leaven of the Trentine party, traditionalism, and ceremonialism, that we can be sure that the number of changes which would be agreeable to the Protestant evangelical would be vastly outnumbered by changes which would make the Prayer Book of our Reformers agreeable to the Anglo-Catholics and Tractarians of to-day. "Let well alone" was the motto of one of England's greatest statesmen; and rather than imperil the Protestantism of our Prayer Book and Church by such a rash and dubious requisition as an authoritative revision, I would say: Let our Prayer Book stand as it is; the monument of the invincible Protestantism of our glorious Reformers; the most admirable and matchless of all standards of worship; the most scriptural of all formularies of public devotion; Churchly enough for the most conservative Churchman; evangelical enough for the most evangelical; and in its practical removal from all Popish superstitions, Protestant enough for the most ardent Protestant.

A few words in conclusion.

What end our blessed Lord has in view in permitting the present strifes and divisions in His Church, we do not know. Why He has allowed a party to gain such mischievous predominance within the last thirty or forty years, as to uproot much of the good effects of the glorious Reformation, we cannot understand. The external signs of abatement in the waters of the prevailing floods of Trentinism are, to human

eyes at least, entirely wanting. The evil is apparently gaining headway, and "the waters prevail and increase greatly on the earth." As in apostolic days the leaven of Pharisaism spread with such rapidity in the Galatian Churches, so, in these latter days of the Church, unsound men, with seductive doctrines, have waxed worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived. Everywhere in the Church conspirators are found, eager to wrest from the Church her charter of Protestantism, the Prayer Book, and bring her back once more to the days before the Reformation. It is, indeed, an incurable evil, and apt and expressive is the language of the learned Bishop of New York: "When I reflect on the Anglican Reformation; when I worship in the glorious Liturgy they rescued from an unknown tongue, and cleansed from innumerable defilements; when I compare our reformed Church with Holy Scripture and the purest ages of antiquity, I am amazed at these results; I wonder that, amid the passions and the conflicts of such an age, such a miracle should have been wrought by the hands of men. Then, when I see these benefactors of the world attesting in the flames their holy mission, and bequeathing their work to England, sealed and hallowed with their blood, I seem to dream when I think of an age like this, that has bred a puny race of men to mock their memory, and to go on servile knees to those who slew them, begging to receive back again the yoke of bondage and of corruption."

This is no dream, but an awful reality; and the questions on the lips of thousands of Churchmen to-day are: What shall we do? Whither are we tending? How much longer the darkness of night? Some men are bowing in almost hopeless grief, while others, weary at heart, are slinking from the battle, hopeless of a cause wherein so much seems lost.

Yet it does seem to me that, notwithstanding all these

things, it is cowardice and folly for Churchmen to lose heart. There is, indeed, danger and widespread retrogression ; there is indifference, intolerance, ignorance, and degeneracy ; *but hopelessness there should not be.* Where is our faith in Christ, His Church, and His truth ? How is it that we have no faith ? The times are dark, but there have been darker days than these before.

Who would ever have dreamed, in the beginning of the sixteenth century, that the Church of England was to be delivered from the thralldom of Papal rule and Romish doctrine, and that such an uncompromising and bigoted Romanist as Henry VIII. should have been chosen by God as the hand to strike the first blow of emancipation ? Had one, in the year 1520, asserted that Henry VIII. would be used as an instrument, even as an inferior instrument, for the conversion of the Romanized Church of England into a pure and scriptural and Protestant Church, he would justly have been counted mad.

Who could ever have dreamed, in the beginning of the reign of Edward VI., when both Church and State were in such perilous crisis, and the fierceness of tyrannical opposition to the Reformed opinions was already waxing strong, that, in His wonderful providence, God would so overrule the counsels of men as to enable Cranmer, and Ridley, and Latimer, and others, in the name of the Church, to introduce the Prayer Book in the tongue of the people ; to remove the altars and destroy Popish books of devotion ; to publish the Articles, the bulwark of our doctrinal Protestantism, and the charter of our freedom from doctrinal Popery ; to substitute the Bible for the missal, the Holy Communion for the Mass, and the Protestant minister for the Romish confessor and Mass-priest ; in short, in a period of time incredibly short, and by a series of movements so wonderfully effective as to transform the corrupted and tainted Church of England

into the Church of England apostolic, primitive, scriptural, Protestant? Truly, it seemed impossible. It was like the conversion of a man, cold, dead, hardened, to human eyesight hopelessly dead, yet by the regenerating power of God the Holy Spirit, a new creature, born again in Christ. The Church was converted. The old body, the old constitution, the old lineage, the old name; a new spirit, a new life, a new being!

Who would ever have dreamed, in the awful days of "Bloody Mary," when fifteen Protestant Bishops were turned out and sixteen Papists reinstated; when vestments and Mass-books, were dug up out of oblivion, and Romanism was sanctioned by the law of the land; when England's queen and bishops and Church were absolved from their heresy, and solemnly restored to the unity of the Pope; when fires were blazing with the bodies of Protestants, and Cranmer and Ridley and Latimer, the pillars of the reformed doctrine, were consumed in the flames, that Protestantism would ever again survive in the Church of England, and that our Prayer Book would once more be the standard of the Church? Who could ever have asserted, in those gloomy days, without inspiration, that God would make that same revolution the salvation of the Protestantism of the English Church, and that He would use the Popish Mary for the casting out of Popery, as He had before used the Popish Henry VIII. for the casting out of the Pope? Yet it was even so. O, the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God! How unspeakable are His judgments, and His ways past tracing out!

And who could ever have foreseen that, in that same wonderful providence, our Heavenly Father would so overrule the wills and counsels of fallible men that amidst all the changes and factions of fifteen generations, notwith-

standing the overthrow of the episcopate and the proscription of the Liturgy, on the one hand, and the predominance of men of high Catholic views, on the other, the essentials of Protestant Churchmanship would remain unchanged, and that He would give to us intact, in these latter days of the nineteenth century, a Prayer Book which, for all practical purposes, is as pure as when it issued from the fires of the Reformation?

Let the consideration of these things inspire us with hope. If we were in darker days, we might give way to fear; but now we are without excuse. We have much more to cheer us than the Reformers had. We have a Church that is sound, scriptural, practical; democratic, as well as episcopal; admirably fitted to the present day needs. We have a people, on the whole, loyal to Protestantism, and steadfast for the truth. We have a body of Church doctrine in our Articles which for soundness, scripturalness, and thoroughness, cannot be impugned. We have, as Protestant Churchmen, a title to loyalty which no others can urge, a claim to consistency which no others can put forth.

We have history on our side.

We have Scripture on our side.

We have the Prayer Book on our side.

We have the common sense of the great body of the laity on our side.

And though we may not have numbers, best of all, we have God on our side.

The cause of Protestantism is God's, and God will guard His cause.

We are struggling at once for the doctrine of the Church, and the truth of the Bible; we are contending for the faith once for all delivered to the saints, and bought for us by martyr blood.

For a time it is possible the issue may seem doubtful, and,

the battle lost, as the timid give up the contest, and the cowards surrender without a blow.

But that the Church of England, Protestant in her Reformation, Protestant in her history, Protestant in her doctrine, Protestant in her Canons, Protestant in the very essence of her national and ecclesiastical being, should ever be defiled by the caresses of Rome, is to the eye of faith impossible, *for as long as the Prayer Book remains unchanged, the Church of England cannot be Romanized.*

“For freedom did Christ set us free ; stand fast, therefore, and be not entangled again in a yoke of bondage.”

APPENDIX.

I.—CANON OF THE MASS. (CHAP. IV., p. 47.)

The Canon of the Mass, according to the use of Sarum. The following is taken from a translation by Mr. John T. Dodd, B.A., of Oxford.

The whole service was in Latin. The genuflections, prostrations, censings were substantially the same as in the Roman Church. In the midst was the priest, in his sacrificial vestments. Beside him were the deacon and subdeacon in their dalmatics, the incense-bearers, and the carriers of candles. With much ceremonial, the chalice and paten are placed on the altar, which is censed and kissed. The Ter Sanctus follows, and then, with clasped hands and uplifted eyes, he repeats the prayer, which really is the commencement of the Mass itself, p. 11 :

“Wherefore, O most merciful Father, we most humbly pray and beseech Thee, through Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord,

Here let him raise himself and kiss the altar on the right of the sacrifice.

that Thou wouldest vouchsafe to accept and bless these ✠ gifts (here he makes the sign of the cross, and at each place where this cross occurs), ✠ these presents, these ✠ holy, unspotted sacrifices,

When he has made the signs over the chalice, let him uplift his hands, saying :

which, in the first place, we offer unto Thee for Thy Holy Catholic Church, to which vouchsafe to grant peace ; to keep, unite, and govern, throughout the whole world, together with Thy servant, (N.) our Pope, and (N.) our bishop [that is, for his own bishop only], and (N.) our king [and they are mentioned by name], and for all the orthodox, and for all worshippers of the catholic and apostolic faith.

Here let him pray for the living.

Remember, O Lord, Thy servants, both men and women (M. and N.), and all here present, whose faith and devotion is known to Thee ; for whom we offer unto Thee, or who themselves offer unto Thee, this sacrifice of praise for themselves, and for all theirs, for the redemption of their own souls, for the hope of their salvation and safety, communicating with and honouring the memory, especially of the glorious ever-Virgin Mary, the mother of our Lord and God, Jesus Christ, and also of Thy blessed apostles and martyrs, Peter and Paul, Andrew, James, John, Thomas, James, Philip . . . Linus, Cletus, Clement, Sixtus, Cornelius, Cyprian, Lawrence, Grisogonus, John and Paul, Cosmas and Damian, and of all Thy Saints ; by whose merits and prayers, grant that we may, in all things, be defended by the aid of Thy protection ; through the same Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Here let the priest look at the host with great veneration.

We therefore beseech Thee, O Lord, graciously to accept this oblation of our service, and of Thy whole family ; dispose our days in Thy peace, and command us to be delivered from eternal damnation, and to be numbered in the flock of thine elect ; through Christ our Lord. Amen.

Here let him look at the host again, saying :

Which oblation do Thou, O Almighty God, we beseech Thee, vouchsafe to render in all respects, blessed ✠, approved ✠, effectual ✠, reasonable and acceptable, that it may be made unto us the body ✠, and the blood ✠, of Thy Son, our Lord Jesus Christ,

*Here let the priest raise his hands and join them together ;
and afterwards, let him wipe his fingers, and
elevate the host, saying :*

who, the day before He suffered, took bread in His holy and venerated hands, and with His eyes uplifted to heaven,

Here let him lift up his eyes.

to Thee, Almighty God, His Father,

Here let him bow and elevate a little, saying .

gave thanks, and blessed ✠, and brake,

Here let him touch the host, saying :

and gave to His disciples, saying : Take, eat ye all of this,
For this is My body.

*And these words ought to be pronounced with one breath
and utterance, and without any pause. After
these words, let him elevate it above his forehead,
that it may be seen by the people ; and let him
reverently place it before the chalice in the form
of a cross made by the same, and then let him
uncover the chalice and hold it between his hands,
not disjoining the thumb from the forefinger,
except when he makes the benedictions, saying :*

Likewise, after He had supped, taking also this pre-eminent chalice in His holy and venerable hands, also giving thanks,

Here let him bend, saying :

to Thee, He blessed ✠, and gave to His disciples, saying :
Take, and drink ye all of this,

Here let the priest elevate the chalice a little, saying :

for this is the cup of My blood, of the new and eternal testament, the mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you, and for many, for the remission of sins.

Let him elevate the chalice, saying :

As often as ye do these things, ye shall do them in remembrance of Me.

Here let him replace the chalice, and raise his arm in the form of a cross, with his fingers joined, until the words " of Thy gifts."

Wherefore, O Lord, we, Thy servants, and also Thy holy people, calling to mind the blessed passion of the same Christ, Thy Son, our Lord, and also His resurrection from the dead, and His glorious ascension into heaven, offer unto Thy excellent Majesty, of Thy gifts and presents, a pure ✠ host, a holy ✠ host, an immaculate ✠ host, a holy ✠ bread of life eternal, and chalice ✠ of everlasting salvation ; upon which vouchsafe to look with a propitious and serene countenance, and accept them as Thou didst vouchsafe to accept the gifts of Thy righteous servant, Abel, and the sacrifice of our patriarch, Abraham, and that which Thy High Priest Melchisedec offered unto Thee, a holy sacrifice, an immaculate victim.

Here let the priest say, with bowed body and clasped hands :

We humbly beseech Thee, Almighty God, command these to be borne by the hands of Thy holy angel to Thy altar on High, in the presence of Thy divine majesty, that all we

Here let him stand erect and kiss the altar on the right of the sacrifice.

who shall have received the holy body ✠ and blood ✠ of Thy Son from this participation of the altar

Here let him cross himself on the face.

may be fulfilled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction ✠ ; through the same, our Lord. Amen.

Here let him pray for the dead.

Remember also, O Lord, the souls of Thy servants, both men and women (N. and N.), who have gone before us with the sign of faith, and rest in the sleep of peace. We pray, O Lord, that to these, and to all that rest in Christ, Thou wouldst graciously grant a place of refreshment of light and peace ; through the same Christ, our Lord. Amen.

Here let him strike his breast once, saying :

And to us sinners, Thy servants, who trust in the multitude of Thy mercies, vouchsafe to grant some part and fellowship with Thy apostles and martyrs ; with John, Stephen, Matthias, Barnabas, Ignatius, Alexander, Marcellinus, Peter, Felicitas, Perpetua, Agatha, Lucia, Agnes, Cæcilia, Anastasia, and all Thy saints, into whose company do Thou admit us, we beseech Thee, not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences ; through Christ our Lord, by whom, O Lord, Thou dost always create all these good things ;

Here let the priest sign the chalice thrice, saying :

Thou dost sanctify ✠, quicken ✠, bless ✠, and bestow them upon us.

Here let the priest uncover the chalice and make the sign of the cross with the host five times : first, over the chalice, on either side ; secondly, level with it ;

thirdly, below it ; fourthly, as at first ; fifthly, before it.

Through Him, and with Him, and in Him, all honour and glory is to Thee, O God the Father Almighty †, in the unity of the Holy Ghost.

Here let the priest cross the chalice, and hold his hands over the altar, until the time when "Our Father" is said ; saying thus, for ever and ever.

Instructed by Thy saving precepts, and taught by Thy divine instruction, we are bold to say,

Here let the deacon take the paten and hold it aloft to the right of the priest, uncovered, until "mercifully grant." Here let the priest raise his hands, saying :

Our Father, &c. . . . and lead us not into temptation,

Let the choir answer :

But deliver us from evil,

The priest, privately :

Amen.

Deliver us, O Lord, we beseech Thee, from all evils, past, present, and future ; and by the intercession of the ever-glorious Virgin Mary, the mother of God, of Thy blessed apostles, Peter and Paul and Andrew, with all saints,

Here let the deacon give the paten to the priest, and kiss his hand, and let the priest kiss the paten ; then let him put it to his left eye, then to his right ; afterwards let him make the sign of the cross with the paten over his head, and then let him restore it to its own place, saying :

mercifully grant peace in our days, that, by the help of Thy mercy, we may be always free from sin, and secure from all trouble ;

Here let him uncover the chalice, and, bowing, take the body and place it in the hollow of the chalice; and holding it between his thumb and forefinger, let him break it into three portions while he says:

through the same, our Lord Jesus Christ, Thy Son (*second fraction*), who, as God, liveth and reigneth with Thee in the unity of the Holy Ghost,

Here let him hold the two portions in the left hand, and the third portion in the right hand, on the top of the chalice, thus saying in a loud voice.

for ever and ever. Amen.

The peace of the Lord ✠ be with you ✠ always. ✠

Let the choir answer .

And with Thy Spirit.

Then let the deacon and the sub-deacon approach the priest, both on his right, the deacon nearer, the sub-deacon further off, and say, privately .

O Lamb of God, &c. . . . grant us Thy peace.

Here, while making the sign of the cross, let him place the aforesaid third portion of the host in the sacrament of the blood, thus saying:

May the sacred mixture of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ become to me, and to all who receive it, salvation of mind and body, and a salutary preparation for the earning and laying hold of eternal life; through the same Christ, our Lord. Amen.

Before the pax is given [a small silver tablet to be kissed], let the priest say :

O Lord, Holy Father, Almighty, Eternal God, grant that I may so worthily receive this most holy body and blood of Thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ; that by this I may be

deemed fit [*merear*] to receive remission of all my sins, and to be filled with Thy Holy Spirit, and to possess Thy peace; for Thou art God, and there is none beside Thee, and Thy glorious kingdom remaineth for ever. Amen.

Here let the priest kiss the corporals on the right side, then on the top of the chalice, and afterwards the deacon, saying :

Peace be to thee, and to the Church.

Answer :

And with thy spirit.

Let the deacon on the right side of the priest receive the pax from him, and give it to the sub-deacon ; then let the deacon bring the pax to the choir-step, to the directors of the choir, and let them carry the pax to the choir, each to his own side, beginning from the elder. After the pax has been given, let the priest say the following prayers privately, before he communicates, holding the host with both hands :

O God the Father, fountain and source of all goodness, whose mercy willed that Thy only begotten Son should descend to this lower world for us, and should take upon Him flesh, which I, unworthy, hold here in my hands,

Here let the priest bow to the host, saying :

I adore Thee ; I glorify Thee ; with every power of my heart, I praise Thee ; and I pray that Thou wilt not leave us, Thy servants, but forgive us our sins, so far as we deserve to serve Thee, the only living and true God, with pure heart and chaste body ; through the same Christ, our Lord. Amen.

O Lord Jesu Christ, Son of the Living God, who, by the will of the Father, and the co-operation of the Holy Ghost,

hast, by Thy death, given light unto the world, deliver me from all mine iniquities, and from all evils, by this Thy most holy body and blood; and make me ever obedient unto Thy commandments, and grant that I may not be separated from Thee for ever, who, with God the Father, and the same Holy Ghost, livest and reignest God for ever and ever. Amen.

O Lord Jesu, let not the sacrament of Thy body and blood which I, though unworthy, receive, become judgment and condemnation unto me; but, through Thy mercy, may it be profitable for salvation of my body and soul. Amen.

Let him humbly say to the body, before he receives it :

Hail, evermore, most holy flesh of Christ,
Sweeter far to me than all beside.

May the body of our Lord Jesus Christ be to me, a sinner, the way and the life.

In the name ✝ of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

Here let him receive the body, after having made the sign of the cross with it before his mouth. Then to the blood, with great devotion, saying :

Hail evermore, celestial drink,
Sweeter far to me than all else beside.

May the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ be profitable to me, a sinner, for an eternal remedy unto everlasting life. Amen.

In the name ✝ of the Father.

Here let him receive the blood, and then let him bow and say, with devotion, the following prayer :

I give Thee thanks, O Lord, Holy Father, Almighty, Eternal God, who hast refreshed me by the most sacred body and blood of Thy Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, and

I pray that the sacrament of our salvation, which I, an unworthy sinner, have received, may not turn to my condemnation, according to my deserts, but may be available to the profit of my body and soul unto everlasting life. Amen.

When this has been said, let the priest go to the right side of the altar, with the chalice between his hands, his fingers joined as before; and let the sub-deacon approach and pour wine and water into the chalice; and let the priest wash his hands, lest any remnants of the body and blood be left either on his fingers or in the chalice. After the first ablution or pouring, this prayer is said:

Grant, O Lord, that we may receive with a pure mind that which we have taken with the mouth; and that from a temporal gift, it may be made to us an everlasting remedy.

Here let him wash his fingers in the hollow of the chalice, with wine poured in by the sub-deacon; and when it has been drunk, let this prayer follow:

Let this communion, O Lord, purge us from sin, and make us partakers from the heavenly healing.

After the reception of the ablutions, let the priest hold the chalice over [or rather place the chalice upon] the paten; so that, if anything remains therein, it may drip; and, afterwards, let him bend down and say:

We adore the sign of the cross, by which we have received the sacrament of salvation.

After the priest has washed his hands, and performed sundry other ceremonies, the people are dismissed, and the candle and incense-bearers, deacon, sub-deacon, and priest, retire in their vestments, after a reverence to the altar.

I have quoted this at some length in order that the reader may judge for himself whether there is anything in this service that can fairly be adduced as similar to the order of the Holy Communion in the Prayer Book of the Church of England. There are, indeed, a few analogous expressions and prayers ; but the point that I would emphasise is this : that the *substance, the essence, the intention, of the whole service is entirely different*. In short, this is the Mass, pure and simple ; as Latimer called it, altogether detestable. It is the making and adoring a priest-made god. The Lord's Supper, in the Church of England, is the Holy Communion, the simple and scriptural apostolic ordinance as our Lord ordained it. And, yet, some of the clergy of the Church of England have openly declared that this Sarum missal is the standard towards which the Church should work !

2.—THE EASTWARD POSITION. (CHAP. IV., p. 52.)

Is it right for the clergyman, at the celebration of the Holy Communion, to stand in the centre of the chancel space, with his face towards the table and his back to the people ; or, is it the intention of the Church of England that the clergyman should stand, during the Communion Service, on the north of the table, with his face towards the length of the table and his side to the people ?

In other words, is the Eastward position sanctioned by the Prayer Book ?

The question is of such grave importance that it is worth consideration, for with it is bound up the whole doctrinal position of the Church of England on one of the most vital of subjects. If the Church of England maintains the spuriously-called " Catholic " theory of Church teaching, that is, of a sacrificing priesthood and eucharistic worship, there can be no doubt that she must enjoin the Eastward position, for it is

inseparable from such theory. If the Church of England does not, in her standards and formularies, teach such doctrine, it is evident that she will, in her rubrics, guard against the introduction of any form and ceremonial that will tend to symbolically set it forth. It is, therefore, the duty of every Churchman to make diligent inquiry into the precise teaching of the Prayer Book on this matter.

Now, in the first or semi-reformed Prayer Book of the Church, the position of the Church was as clearly defined in one direction as it is now in another. In the First Book of 1549, the Eastward position *is most clearly enjoined*. There can be no doubt that it was the duty of every clergyman in the Church of England to assume the attitude universal in the Church of Rome, and to stand with his back to the people in the Communion Service. For here is the rubric :

“ The priest, standing humbly afore the midst of the altar, shall say the Lord’s Prayer, with this collect.”

Observe the words. They can have but one meaning. Even if there were no centuries of custom in the mediæval Church to guide, there could be no doubt that “standing humbly *afore the midst of the altar*,” meant standing before the middle of the altar, with face towards it, and back towards the congregation. If such a direction as this were to be found in the Prayer Book to-day, objectors to the Eastward position would not have an inch of argument to stand on.

When the Second Book appeared, there was doubtless much expectancy with regard to the nature of the alterations; and certainly, as far as this rubric was concerned, the difference was most striking. In two most important particulars, it was intentionally changed. In the first place,

there was added a rubric with regard to the appearance and disposition of the Communion Table, which purposely and wholly subverted the mischievous "Catholic" theory of eucharistic sacrifice and mediating priest.

"The table having at the communion time a fair white linen cloth upon it, shall stand in the body of the church, or in the chancel, &c."

No one could be so simple as to believe that the theory of "Catholic" worship could ever be carried out in a Church which authorized the Communion Table (not altar) to stand in the *body of the church* ! Where the altar is against the east wall as a fixture, and the priest is commanded to stand in the middle before it, all is clear ; but to perform the sacrificial service at a *table*, standing in the *body* of the church, is "confusion worse confounded."

And next, and, if possible, still more important, instead of the words, "the priest standing humbly afore the midst of the altar," there were substituted the words which to-day stand unaltered in the Prayer Book as the Church's direction to her officiating ministers at the communion :

"And the priest standing at the north side of the table, shall say the Lord's Prayer, with this collect."

The difference is complete. The one is Romish ; the other is Protestant. The first says, "afore" ; the other says, "at the north." The first says, "afore the midst" ; the other says, "at the north side." The first says, "afore the midst of the altar" ; the other says, "at the north side of the table." The distinction is thus radical and intentional. According to the teaching of the Prayer Book, there can be no other position taken by the clergyman than that of standing on the left-hand side (looking from the body of the church) of the table, with his side, not his back,

to the people. Any clergyman who assumes any other position is acting contrary to the clear direction of the rubric.

But perhaps it will be argued that the alleged distinction between the north *side* and the north *end* is a valid ground for the assumption of the Eastward position, and that inasmuch as the table is not a square, but an oblong, the clergyman who stands at the left-hand side of the front of the table, that is, the side facing the congregation, is standing in the rubrical position.

The argument is worthless.

It is not based upon any fair interpretation of the plain meaning of the text of the rubric, but has been fabricated in the very face of the rubric for the purpose of supporting a novel system of doctrine.

For there is no doubt, as matters of historical fact, that

(1) The tables, in the time of Edward VI., were sometimes square, not oblong; so that the word "side" could not possibly, even upon the recently invented argument, be confounded with the "end." No shape has ever been prescribed for the table by law, and a square table is just as legal as an oblong.

(2) Even where the tables were oblong, the distinction between the "side" and "end" was utterly unknown in the Church. The distinction is a purely seventeenth century fabrication. The word "side," at the time of the Reformation, was used to describe the ends of the altar; that is, the right and left-hand sides, as seen from the church.

(3) Both at the time of the Reformation, and at the time of later revisions in the reigns of James and Charles, the tables were often placed, *not* as they are now universally, across the chancel, with the longer side to the body of the church, but lengthwise, that is, with the longer sides parallel with the sides of the chancel; and few of the acts of

Archbishop Laud met with more bitter resistance than his attempts to alter the position of the Communion Tables and put them in a fixed position against the wall, in the place of the altar.

It was agreed at the Restoration, however, in spite of strong opposition, to leave in the rubric the old provision with regard to the table standing in the body of the church; and instead of inserting the words "north end," or "north part," to simply employ a term which would specifically designate the position required, and yet suit every position of the holy table. There can be no doubt that the minds of all Churchmen were unanimous upon this point, no matter what their private opinions, that the position of the officiating priest should be at the left side of the table, with his side, not his back, to the congregation, and that the rubric should be clear, so as to prevent the priest standing with his face to the altar, as is the manner in the Church of Rome. There can be no doubt, also, that what would now be called the "High Church" party would have preferred a rubric which would not have permitted the table to stand lengthwise, or in the body of the church; but for expediency's sake, the rubric was framed so as to permit this.

With tables lengthways *and* crossways, the need was felt for a word which would be applicable to both positions, and yet prevent the attitude of the Roman priest. The word "end" was certainly open to objection, for, if the table was placed lengthwise, there was, grammatically speaking, no end at all to the north; for every side is not an end, though, in a table, each end is a side. In that case, the north end did not exist. The word "part" was equally open to objection, as being somewhat vague, and as possibly, when the table was placed altarwise, giving an opening for the adoption of the Eastward position.

But there was a word which was at once specific and

comprehensive ; specific enough to define the precise position, and comprehensive enough to suit both positions of the table. That term was the "north side." It was inserted accordingly in the rubric, and to-day the order of the Church of England is so clear that no clergyman, who literally obeys the rubric of his Church, can adopt any other position than that of standing at the north side of the table, with his side to the people. With regard to the rubric immediately preceding the Prayer of Consecration, which might seem to warrant the assumption of another position, during that prayer at least, I will just quote the judgment of one whom "High" Churchmen certainly must regard as an authority—Wheatly, the author of the work on the Prayer Book. He says, pp. 296-297 :

"If it be asked whether the priest is to say this (the Consecration) prayer standing before the table, or at the north end of it, I answer, at the north end of it ; for, according to the rules of grammar, the participle *standing* must refer to the verb *ordered*, and not to the verb *say*. So that whilst the priest is *ordering the bread and wine*, he is to stand before the table ; but when he says the prayer, he is to stand so as *that he may, with the more readiness and decency, break the bread before the people*, which must be on the north side. For, if he stood before the table, his body would hinder the people from seeing ; so that he must not stand there : and consequently he must stand on the north side . . . In the Romish Church, indeed, they always stand *before* the altar during the time of consecration, in order to prevent the people from being eye-witnesses of their operation in working their pretended miracle ; and in the Greek Church they shut the chancel door . . . But our Church, that pretends no such miracle, enjoins, we see, the direct contrary to this, by ordering the priest *so to order the bread and wine that he may, with the more readiness and decency, break the*

bread before the people and take the cup into his hands." That is, directly before the consecration prayer, the priest is to leave the north-side and come before the table. Then he is to move the elements to the left or north-side; or, in other words, to "order" them. And then, in order "that he may, with the more readiness and decency, break the bread before the people," he is to assume again the position enjoined by the Prayer Book at the north of the table.

Interpreted in this way, the rubric is natural and easy. Interpreting otherwise, one must either overlook altogether the words "before the people," or give them an interpretation they were never intended to bear; or assume the Eastward position, and attempt the most awkward and almost ludicrous task of keeping the back to the people, and, at the same time, straining and twisting the arms and body, so as to make the manual acts visible to the people, or with still greater awkwardness and difficulty elevating the paten and cup above the head at arm's length.

The above was written before the Lambeth Judgment of November, 1890, which decided, after a prolonged delay, that it was not a contradiction of the rubric for a clergyman to assume the so-called Eastward position.

The Archbishop's Judgment was sustained on appeal.

To a very great number of English Churchmen the Lambeth Judgment has come in the form of an Eirenicon. It is regarded as a learned and large-hearted deliverance that must inevitably tend to satisfy all classes of Churchmen. The research and scholarship that it displays are declared to be simply enormous, and deeming themselves incapable of sitting in judgment on such a Judgment, they consider that

it is the duty of all reasonable Churchmen to accept it without question, and to rejoice over it with gratitude.

To a great number of others, the writer amongst them, the Judgment has caused a feeling of unutterable distress.

They feel that it is, as an ecclesiastical deliverance, without any parallel in the history of the Church of England since the Reformation, and that the very fact of its having been delivered, to say nothing of being sustained, marks a change in the ideas of English Churchmen with regard to ecclesiastical deliverances, and the interpretation of the Church's rubrics that is almost revolutionary. While they admit that the Judgment, as a whole or in particular, has not affected them, and, of course, did not attempt to cast the slightest question upon the legality of their practices, it has nevertheless introduced principles of interpretation which will, if carried to their rational conclusion, evacuate every rubric in the Prayer Book of any definite or positive meaning.

This, in the main, is their chief objection to the Judgment. But there are other and serious grounds of complaint. They complain that there is throughout the whole of the deliverance a series of evidences of what appears to be a desire on the part of the Court to view in the most favourable light the arguments on behalf of the practices complained of, and to disallow, or underrate the arguments against them, that savours more of the interested pleader than of the unbiassed judge.

They complain that in this case, the Court ignores in a most curious manner the fact that the word "side" in King Edward's day, and later, was used to denote what modern writers are pleased to call the "end," and bases its preliminary argument upon the ignoring of this fact; and then goes on to argue upon the supposition that the tables.

in the body of the church were always placed lengthwise (which was not the fact), and deduces conclusions that are good and sound save for the fact that they are based on a supposition that is contrary to the facts.

Even though "*some writers*" did make these terms convertible, it is difficult to understand why the Court should take the opinion of opponents of the Church because in that particular it happens to be on the defendants' side, and allow it to weigh against such good *Church* authorities as Cosin, Wren, Bennet, L'Estrange, and Nicholls.

They complain, moreover, that further on the Court makes use of a term that seems to ill-become the dignity and impartiality of the Judge—the word "*Puritan*." For what reason the Court should use this word, and speak of the difficulty of complying with a *Puritan rubric*, unless it was to somehow make the reader believe that the north-side position was the fad of a narrow-minded and unchurchly school, and thus stigmatize the position with an adjective that is so awful in its potentiality, it is hard to conceive.

It seemed hard that the Court should ignore, what they believe to be the incontrovertible fact, that the Priest standing at the north-side of the table is the same as the Priest standing at the north-end of the table, but it appeared still harder to have this followed by the use of such a defamatory term as *Puritan*.

They complain, moreover, that the reason given by the Court for the north-side rubric is one that is not only insufficient to account for its peculiarity, but is directly contrary to the uniform declaration of the great Church authorities of past centuries, and the almost universal teaching of Churchmen for a century and a half after the Reformation. If there be a fact in Church history that is a fact, it is this: that both High Churchmen and Low Churchmen were

unanimously of opinion that the reason, the only reason, for the enactment that the priest was to stand at the north-side of the table was *to avoid the Popish practice*, and to break away a Protestant people and a Protestant Church from the memory of the idolatrous Mass.

From Bishop Jewel, the great Church champion of the Reformation days, to Professor J. J. Blunt, in the latter part of our own century ; from High Churchmen of the stamp of Wheatly, to the lowest of Protestant Evangelicals, Church authorities unite in declaring that this was *the* intention of the rubric, and the language of the following writers may be taken as the voice of Church sentiment for centuries. A Church catechism published in 1674, which was declared to contain the opinions, among others, of such Churchmen as Andrewes, Pearsen, Nowell and Hooker, contained the following question and answer :—

Q. “Why doth the priest stand on the north-side of the table?”

A. To avoid *the Popish* superstition of standing towards the east.”

L'Estrange, in his “Alliance of Divine Offices,” 1659, says : “As for the priest's standing at the north-side of the table, this seemeth to avoid the fashion of the priest's standing with his face towards the east, as is *the Popish practice*.”

The Lambeth Court, however, says this was *not* the reason. The real reason was “that the Communion might be celebrated as near, as much among, and as familiarly with the congregation as possible,” nor does the Court vouchsafe to offer a single Church authority, or a single historical instance for the establishment of this position. The Court, indeed, was aware that some of the greatest of the Prayer Book authorities of the Church had unanimously declared that *the* reason of the north-side rubric was to make the

minister of the Church of England avoid the Romish position, and quotes Gauden, and Nicholls and L'Estrange, but it simply states *they were mistaken*. On what grounds, or for what reasons, or on what contemporaneous evidence, it does not allege, nor does it offer even the semblance of an argument. It simply repudiates the idea with scorn, and using almost the only vigorous language in the whole Judgment, it says "*their unhistorical idea of a protest against Rome* guided their judgments in favour of standing at the north-end." Surely English Churchmen who know anything of their Prayer Book, to say nothing of the history of the Reformation of the Church of England, can only receive with amazement the authoritative pronouncement that such a thing as "protest against Rome" must be kept away from the interpretation of the history of the formularies of the Church of England which were adopted in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and that such rubrics as the black rubric at the end of the Communion Office, and the 22nd, and 25th, and 28th, and 31st Articles of Religion, and the works of Latimer, and Cranmer, and Jewel, and Grindal, and Becon, are to be interpreted as having no reference whatsoever to the teaching and practice of the Church of Rome. Not only does the Court say that their idea of a rubric in the Church of England being framed as a protest against Rome was unhistorical, but it follows it by the assertion that "*their reasons are fallacious*," and the defences they set up "*erroneous*." Wherein their reasons were fallacious, or on what grounds their defences are *erroneous*, the Court again does not answer. These Churchmen lived in the times; their exposition has the strongest of all force, the force of contemporary exposition, and they were unanimous in giving as *the* reason for the north-side rubric the purposed avoidance of the Romish altar-ward position; yet the Court without the slightest allegation of counter-evidence, with an apparent

stet pro ratione voluntas brevity, declares a century or so of unanimous and authoritative Church opinion to be fallacious and erroneous.

They complain, in the next place, that the Court in stating that "the north-end became *the generally used* position and is beyond question *a true liturgical use* formed, not by enactment, but by use," not only contradicts the statements of former Church authorities but cuts away from the very root the principles of rubrical interpretation. For if the north-side (in the language of the Court, the north-end) is only *a true liturgical use*, where are Churchmen to look for the other liturgical positions, and where is the *enactment* or enactments that define them? The Prayer Book, the Canons, and the Articles have no enactment with regard to the other *true liturgical* positions. And as to the north-end position, that is, standing on the north of the table facing southwards, *not at the west-side*, either in the middle or any part of it, with back to the people, the position of every Churchman, high or low (with two admitted exceptions), to the end of the seventeenth century, even so high a Churchman as Heylin, says that the reason of the enactment in 1552 *was* "Where should the minister stand to discharge his duty? Not in the middle of the altar, *as was appointed* in the Liturgy of King Edward, *anno* 1549. That was disliked, and altered in the service book of 1552."—*Antidotum Lincolnense*, I.-56.

The unquestionable reason of the "use" seems only to be found in the "enactment"; in other words, the Prayer Book said north-side, and the clergy obeyed.

They complain, in the last place, that the Court should sustain its argument by the citation of a number of instances, more or less doubtful, from engravings of clergy celebrating the Holy Communion in a position other than on the north of the table facing southwards. In the first place, because

those, regarding the position of the book, are of no value whatsoever, the book in some cases being the Bible ; in the next place, because out of all the engravings mentioned only four show the officiating clergyman standing at any portion of the west-side of the table, and *of these not one* shows him standing altar-wards with his back to the people, and all of them have him so turning his body as to have his face to the people ; and in the third place, and chiefly, because a few pictures from a stray book here and there can hardly be considered to prove anything.* The action or the private opinion of an individual, or a few individuals, or perhaps, for aught we know, an irresponsible printer or engraver, in this or any age, has nothing whatever to do with the correctness of any particular ritual, and still less with the legality of the ritual of the Church. Not a single engraving, it is alleged has yet been found which shows a celebrant facing eastward with *his back to the people* during the Ante-Communion Service, but even if there were a dozen or fifty such it would prove nothing whatever with regard to the law of the Church. The reasoning of the Court seems to be that the legality of a practice or position is secured by the fact of somebody or other having practised or taken it, and somebody else having made an engraving of the same. It is certain that the semi-Popish celebrations of the Holy Communion in gorgeous chasuble, and altar-wards postures, represent, in the English Church to-day, to use the language of the Court, "no unknown manner of arrangement and celebrating" ; it is equally certain that these Romish eucharistic practices are "tolerated by persons of such character" as prelates and dignitaries of the Church.

* See Tomlinson's "Examination of the 'historical grounds' of the Lambeth Judgment." J. F. Shaw & Co. Also his "New Light on the Eastward Position."

It is impossible, therefore, if we are to follow the line of reasoning established by the Court, to avoid the conclusion that any Ritualistic practice whatsoever is *not illegal* and is "A" true liturgical use of the Church if it can only be shown that certain bishops or ministers of the Church have indulged in it, or that certain service books and manuals contained pictures in which it was represented.

Such, in brief, is their complaint as churchmen with regard to this most unsatisfactory deliverance. A plain positive enactment in good plain English—the north-side of the table is declared not to mean what it says, or, in fact, to mean anything in particular at all; a good plain reason, the unanimous reason of Churchmen of all sorts for generations—to avoid the Romish sacrificial position, is declared to be a fallacious, and erroneous and unhistorical idea; the departure from what was the universal practice of all English Churchmen, High Churchmen and Low Churchmen (with a couple of possible exceptions) up till the eighteenth century, is now declared to be "not illegal" because certain Churchmen about the year 1710 "introduced the whim of consecrating the Holy Eucharist with back turned to the people" along with the Romish doctrine of "the Holy Eucharist being a proper material sacrifice," and a few extreme Churchmen followed their example; and the belief of thousands and ten thousands of Church divines of all schools, and Churchmen of every kind for over three centuries, that the Eastward position was abolished by the Church of England to obliterate the Romish doctrine of the Mass sacrifice, and that adoption of the Eastward position was a sign of belief in the erroneous system of altar-wards worship is declared to be a mistake, because, in spite of the express statements of great Church writers, High and Low, and the traditions of the Church of England since the days of the Reformation, the Court declares that in its opinion none of

the positions assumed (meaning chiefly, of course, the Eastward or altar-wards position) "convey any intrinsic error, or erroneous shade of doctrine."

We may be wrong, but we think the day is coming which will show that the deliverance of the Lambeth Court of 1890, was not "the teaching of the English Church, but only the opinion of a school."

3.—THE SO-CALLED ORNAMENTS RUBRIC. (CHAP. IV.,
p. 53.)

This is perhaps the most difficult of all the difficulties in the Prayer Book, and I do not pretend for a moment to solve it completely. All that I can do is to endeavour to explain it as clearly as possible for the reader who cares to follow its rather involved history.

There it stands in the very forefront of the Prayer Book, as a direction before the order for morning and evening prayer.

"And here is to be noted, that such ornaments of the Church, and of the ministers thereof, at all times of their ministration, shall be retained and be in use as were in this Church of England, by the authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI."

On the surface there appears to be only one conclusion.

In the second year of the reign of King Edward VI., the ornaments of the minister, and of the Church were unquestionably of a Romish character, for there seems to be no manner of doubt as to the association of the wearing of the alb and chasuble with the Mass, and the use of these so-called sacrificial or specially eucharistic vestments was ordered or permitted by the First Prayer Book of Edward.

Every minister of the Church of England, therefore, who does not at all times of ministering wear vestments like those

worn by priests in the Roman Church, is acting illegally as a minister of the Church of England.

This is, I say, the first and most natural conclusion.

But at once a doubt arises in the mind of the thinking Churchman as to its being the true one, for if it be, then for about three hundred years *every minister in the Church of England* has acted illegally, and the extraordinary phenomenon is presented of all the ministers of a Church wearing a simple surplice when the Church of which they are the ministers prescribed for their use the cross-covered and richly ornamented vestments accustomed to be worn by the Roman priest.

It can be almost positively asserted that from the year 1552, when the Romish vestments passed out of use in the English Church, until the year 1853, when the Romish vestments were again seen worn in the Church of "St. Thomas (Becket) the Martyr," Oxford, the first church in England to use them, the custom of the clergy of the Church of England, since the Reformation, was to wear a simple white surplice as the distinctive garment of the minister in every parish church during the performance of Divine Service.

If this be the case, it is evident that the direction in this first part of the Prayer Book had been nullified by more authoritative directions ; or else that a different interpretation has to be taken of it than that which appears on the surface : for it stands to reason that if the vestments of the Church clergyman ought to be similar to those worn by the Roman clergy, an outcry against the universal custom would have been made generations ago.

What then is the explanation of this anomaly, or, in other words, what is the law of the Church of England respecting the vestments to be worn by its ministers.

To go back to the very beginning.

Before the Reformation it was the custom of the clergy

of the Church to wear a number of striking and highly ornamented articles of apparel, more or less symbolical and emblematic of the office of a sacrificing priest, the amice, the alb with ornamental embroidery called apparels, the girdle, and maniple, the chasuble (or else dalmatic or tunicle), varying in colour according to the ecclesiastical season. If any one had entered an English church in those days, he would have witnessed the performance of the Mass, with all its accompaniments of incense and crossings, and prostrations, by priests in richly ornamented and cross-covered vestments; but he would not have seen the Mass celebrated by a priest *in a surplice*, for the surplice only was *never permitted* to a priest celebrant.

When the First Prayer Book appeared, 1549, nothing whatever was said about the dress of the minister at all in the first part of the Book, the order beginning with the simple direction:

“The priest being in the Quire, shall begin with a loud voice the Lord’s Prayer.”

But in the Communion Office, entitled “The Supper of the Lord, and the Holy Communion commonly called the Mass,” after the three first rubrics which are still the first three in our Prayer Book, there came a direction as to what the priest should wear.

“The priest . . . shall put upon him the vesture appointed for that ministration, that is to say a *white* alb *plain*, with a vestment or cope,” and any priests or deacons helping were also to have corresponding vestures, “that is to say, albs with tunicles.”

This, then, was the first direction of the Church of England in the matter of vestments at the time of the Reformation, and though it was not completely, it was clearly in the

Protestant direction. For the reader must remember that the principal vestment of the priest in his ceremonial office as a sacrificing priest was *the chasuble*, and the principal vestment of the deacon at the celebration of Mass was the dalmatic or "tunicle," and that both of these were of high symbolical significance, and associated with the offering of the Sacrifice of the Mass.

But the cope, which was a thing shaped somewhat like a ladies' fur cape, though longer, and made of silk, was not a sacrificial vestment at all, while the alb was a kind of tight-fitting surplice worn generally by the choir and the sexton. When the alb was employed for eucharistic purposes, it had little square embroidered ornamentations in front and at the back to show *its sacrificial significance*, and was often coloured.

When, therefore, it was ordered in the rubric that the priest was to wear a white alb plain, it was evidently for the purpose of avoiding not only that excess of ornamentation that was so characteristic of Romish vestments, but also to get rid of a piece of ornamentation that was symbolically associated with the offering of the Mass. The permission to use a cope in place of the Vestment, and the injunction as to the alb being plain, all point to the fact that it was the mind of the Reformers, even at this early stage, to displace from their sacrificial use those more showy Romish dresses which had been associated with the offering of the Mass sacrifice, and to accustom the clergy to wear in their ministrations plainer and simpler vestments devoid of all priestly and sacrificial significance. Though "the vestment" be identified with the chasuble, there is no recognition of its necessity as a priestly garment, for the cope, a non-sacrificial dress, is permitted as an alternative; whereas if the Church held those high views of ritual and symbolism insisted on in the

Romish form, it would never have allowed the disuse of that garment.

So much for the First Prayer Book.

In the year 1552 the Second Prayer was put forth, and in place of our present ornaments rubric, these words were found :

“ And here is to be noted that the minister at the time of the Communion, and at all other times in his ministration, shall use neither alb, vestment, nor cope; but being Archbishop or Bishop, he shall have and wear a rochet; and being a priest or deacon he shall have and wear a surplice only.”

This Prayer Book was established by an Act of Uniformity and became law, and thus the use of the alb, vestment, and cope became illegal. In other words, the First Prayer Book was superseded by the Second, and the law of the Church henceforth was that the minister should at all times, and in all places, wear a surplice only, that is, that he should not wear an alb, a chasuble, or a cope, or any such thing.

Of course, every candid person must perceive that there was a reason for this alteration. The reason was obvious. The abrogated vestments had been connected with the Popish Mass, and they were forbidden because they were sacrificial garments, or gave a “distinctive” dress to the celebrant at the Eucharist. The surplice, on the other hand, was not a Mass vestment at all; nay, it was not a vestment in which Mass could be legally celebrated. And the Reformers selected the surplice as a protest against, and to avoid the superstition of the Mass.

After the accession of Queen Mary, and throughout her reign, both these Prayer Books were dead and buried, and all the vestments and ceremonies of the Romish Mass became

legalized in the Church of England, but in the first year of Queen Elizabeth's reign, the Second Prayer Book of Edward was restored, there being authorized only three slight changes to be made "therein," "and *none* other, or otherwise." In the twenty-fifth section of the Act of Uniformity, which legalized its restoration, there appeared these apparently plain words, which have since become famous; for they have occasioned perhaps more trouble in the Church than all the rest of the sentences in the Prayer Book put together:—

"Provided always, and be it enacted, that such ornaments of the Church and of the ministers thereof, shall be retained and be in use, as was, in this Church of England by authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI., until other order shall be therein taken by authority of the Queen's Majesty, with the advice of her Commissioners appointed and authorized under the great seal of England for causes ecclesiastical, or of the Metropolitan of this realm."

But when the Prayer Book of 1559 was itself *printed*, there appeared under the Order for morning and evening prayer the direction:—

"And here is to be noted that the minister at the time of the Communion, and at all other times in his ministration, shall use such ornaments in the Church as were in use by authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward VIth, *according to the Act of Parliament set in the beginning of this Book.*"

And this is the first appearance, and the first form of this so-called Ornaments Rubric.

If this form had never been altered, there never would have been any difficulty to speak of. For two reasons: In the first place it was not, in the strict sense of the word, a rubric at all, but only a professed summary of part of the

Act of Uniformity, made privately, and interpolated, without any authority whatsoever, as a rubric; while the Act to which it referred expressly stated that the direction was merely provisional "until other order should be taken;" and, as we shall presently see, other order was taken in the Injunctions and Advertisements of the Queen. In the second place, and this is most important, the whole force of the direction, or, as it is erroneously called, the rubric, depended for its legality on the *Act of Parliament* in the beginning of the Book, which by section 3 enacted the *Second Prayer Book* of Edward VI., enjoining the wearing of "a surplice only."

There seems to be no reason to doubt that this direction appeared in the Prayer Book from a simple desire to please the Queen, who liked to see the cope used in the Communion Service. Yet from the very first time it appeared it was regarded as a piece of waste paper, and, as a matter of fact, from that day to this, the vestments in question have been abolished from the Church.

And they were abolished, not from mere Puritanical caprice; they were abolished by law. In this very year 1559, the Commissioners referred to in the Act of Parliament set forth in the beginning of Elizabeth's Prayer Book framed and prepared a set of authoritative orders to the clergy in explanation and enforcement of the Act, to show them clearly what they were to wear and do as clergymen of the Church of England, and these orders were issued by the Queen in virtue of her supreme ecclesiastical authority as head of the State Church, and in accordance with the authority given her by the Act of Uniformity.

These orders were known as *the Queen's Injunctions*, and they dealt with the matter of the minister's vestments in language of most certain sound.

"Item, her Majesty being desirous to have the prelacy

and clergy of this realm to be had as well in outward reverence, as otherwise regarded for the worthiness of their ministries, thinking it necessary to have them known to the people in all places, and *assemblies*, BOTH IN THE CHURCH and without, and thereby to receive the honour and estimation due to the SPECIAL MESSENGERS AND MINISTERS OF ALMIGHTY GOD; willeth and commandeth that all Archbishops and Bishops, *and all* other that be called or admitted to Preaching or ministering the Sacraments . . . shall use and wear such seemly habits, garments, and such square caps, *as were most commonly and orderly received in the LATTER year of the reign of King Edward the Sixth.*" That is, the Queen's Injunctions now authoritatively declared that the clergyman who wore the vestments of King Edward's First Book, the "vestment," i.e. chasuble, the alb, the cope, and tunicle, was acting contrary to the law of the Church of England. That this was the clear meaning of the words, is manifest from the fact that all sacrificial vestments from that time went out of use, and were universally abolished from the Church.* This has become of late more apparent than ever, owing to a careful research which has established the fact, apparently not known at the time of the Ridsdale Judgment, that the 30th Injunction ordered *the surplice only*.

If it be alleged, however, that these Injunctions were only provisional, and to serve an ephemeral purpose, the answer to this is that they continued to be cited in Visitation Articles and other documents of authority down to the 18th century, and inasmuch as they were set forth by virtue of the Queen's authority given her by the Act of Uniformity they are possessed, in the opinion of many competent to decide, of the same legal force as that illustrious statute.

* See Zurich Letters, Parker Society, p. 142.

In the year 1566, there came forth another famous set of ecclesiastical regulations known as the Queen's Advertisements, which were compiled mainly by Archbishop Parker, and issued by the authority formally given to Her Majesty by the Uniformity Act. These Advertisements were issued by the Queen's directions, in the name of the Queen's Commissioners, and regarded universally as possessed of the same legal authority as the Injunctions, which were of the same legal force as the Act of Uniformity, and they were referred to as the binding law of the Church on vestments both by the Canons of 1571, and of 1604. The Advertisements expressly ordered that the minister, without any exceptions whatsoever in the case of parish churches, and at all services, should wear as the ecclesiastical garment the surplice. In cathedrals and college churches *only*, the cope was permitted (to the exclusion of chasubles and tunicles) in the ministration of the Holy Communion (the cope not having any sacrificial significance), and even in cathedrals and collegiate churches, at all other services, a surplice was to be worn.

In other words, the so-called Ornaments Rubric was clearly repealed, and vestments, albs, and tunicles were to be regarded not merely as unauthorized and illegal garments for any minister of the Church of England, but as things associated with Popish superstitions, and therefore to be destroyed.

If the old maxim, *contemporanea expositio fortissima est in lege*, be a rule of English law, there can be no doubt about the authority of the Advertisements, for the Archbishops and Bishops of the day were strong in their determination to utterly extirpate the use of vestments, as the visitation articles of Archbishop Parker, Archbishop Grindal, Archbishop Whitgift and Archbishop Piers abundantly prove. The "Vestment," alb and tunicle disappeared from the chancel, and were consumed in the flames. Even in

cathedrals, copes fell into disuse. The universal use of the Church vindicates the universal loyalty of the clergy to the law of the Church, for whatever may have been their own private predilections, they recognized the surplice as their only legal vestment, and considered the use of the chasuble and the alb (and the cope in parish churches) to be absolutely illegal.

The next authoritative documents to be considered are the Canons of 1603-1604, issued in the first year of King James I. These Canons set forth in the form of a series of articles the general laws of the Church with regard to the services, &c., and represent in a modernized and modified form the Acts, and Injunctions, and Articles of the two previous reigns, and especially the Canons of 1571 and 1597. They were authorized by the King, and passed by both convocations. They treat of the subject of the vestment three times.

The 24th Canon expressly provides that *according to the Advertisements published Anno 7 Eliz.* the principal minister, with Gospeller and Epistler "agreeably" (*i.e. en suite*), in all cathedral and collegiate churches at Holy Communion shall on certain great feasts wear a decent cope. Two things of great importance are here established. The authority of the Advertisements, which, as we have just seen, abolished the vestments of Edward VI.'s First Prayer Book, and the confinement of the use of the cope (a non-sacrificial and therefore inoffensive article) to cathedral and collegiate churches only. The fact, too, of the cope being ordered to be worn by the epistoler and gospeller shows conclusively that it was not considered as a vestment distinctive of the sacrificing priest.

The 25th Canon proceeds to confirm the law further by enacting :

"In the time of Divine Service and Prayers in all cathedral

and collegiate churches, when there is no Communion, it shall be sufficient to wear *surplices*." (And it adds that Deans, Canons and others, being graduates, shall wear their hoods.) Here again the law of the Church according to the Act of Uniformity is distinctly confirmed.

But these rules applied only to cathedral and collegiate churches. What were the great body of the clergy to wear in their parish churches?

Canon 58 put an end to all controversy.

"Every minister saying the public Prayers, or ministering the Sacraments, or other rites of the Church, shall wear a decent and comely surplice with sleeves, to be provided at the charge of the parish."

Thus, according to the Canons of the Church, the only vestment recognized as a legal garment to be worn by the clergyman of the Church of England is the surplice (with academical hood, and "tippet" or scarf). No other is even hinted at as possible or permitted. The only exception is the use of the cope in cathedrals and college churches. The use of the chasuble, alb, tunicle, is absolutely illegal.

A point of unassailable force in connection with these Canons was brought out in the Ridsdale Judgment, viz., that these Canons, enjoining the use of the surplice, &c., were by the convocations which passed them, considered to be entirely consistent with other Canons, such as the 14th, 16th, and 56th, which enjoined the strictest possible conformity with the orders, rites, and ceremonies, prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer, without addition, omission, or alteration. Now on the supposition that the *so-called* ornaments *rubric* was then possessed of statutory authority, these Canons could not possibly be reconciled with one another, and would be invalid in law because contrary to the statute.

On the supposition, however, of the Advertisements of

1566 being possessed of legal force, the Canons are quite consistent.

(One word may be inserted with regard to a contention that has been made by those who are anxious for the re-introduction of the disused vestments, that the mediæval Canons which were the law of the Church and the State during the reign of Henry VIII., and which authorized, of course, Popish usages and vestments, were in force in the second year of Edward VI., and thus the Canon Law itself authorizes their use still.

The contention is utterly futile.

For in the first place the statute of Henry VIII., which authorized these mediæval canons and constitutions, was itself invalidated *pro tanto*, if not by the first Act of Uniformity, most unquestionably by the subsequent Acts of Uniformity, and all the provisions of the older Canons thus abrogated; and in the second place the Canons of 1603-1604 were compilations from Acts and Injunctions of previous reigns, and by being accepted by the Church in convocation, and authorized by the sovereign, disannulled all former Canon Laws.)

We now come to the year 1662, and to the most puzzling part of the whole subject. As we have seen, up to this point there has been no question at all as to the law of the Church, or the usage of the clergy; for a hundred years, notwithstanding the so-called ornaments rubric of 1559—which was not a rubric at all, but only an inaccurate and unauthoritative paraphrase of the 25th section of Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity—the only vestment worn, and authorized to be worn in general use, was the surplice.

In the year 1662 the Prayer Book as we now have it appeared, revised and amended, and instead of the previous rubric:—

“And here is to be noted that the minister at the time

of the Communion, and at all other times in his ministration, shall use such ornaments in the Church as were in use by authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI., *according to the Act of Parliament set in the beginning of this Book,*"

there appeared with a slight but most crucial verbal alteration the present rubric :

"And here is to be noted, that such ornaments of the Church, and of the ministers thereof, at *all times of their ministration, shall be retained*, and be in use, as were in this Church of England, by the authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI."

The reader will perceive that there is an important difference in the two. In the first there was a reference to the Act of Parliament in the beginning of the Book, and this reference took away its sting, for by the high authority of that Act the ornaments of the *Second Prayer Book* were prescribed, and the surplice *only* authorized. In the present rubric this reference is not found, and the law of the Church in the year 1548-9, the year of the First Prayer Book, is apparently made the law once more, and every minister obliged to wear the semi-Popish vestments authorized in that imperfect stage of the Church's Reformation, viz., the chasuble, the alb, and tunicle.

But as it has been ably pointed out by some of the greatest of England's ecclesiastical jurists,* the Act of Uniformity which legalizes the Prayer Book of 1662, that is, Charles II.'s Act, did not *repeal* the former Act of Uniformity by Elizabeth, but left that Act in force.

That Act, as we have seen, overruled the particular enactment of the so-called ornaments rubric most effectually. Therefore, by retaining it, Charles II.'s Act of Uniformity

* See Six Privy Council Judgments, Brooke, pp. 180-181.

did the same. In other words, the effect of the Act of Uniformity of Charles II. was to leave the law in the same state *in which it had been up to that date.*

And up to that date the law was, the surplice only, and no dalmatic or any such thing.

This is further confirmed in the opinion of many by the introduction into the present rubric-direction of the words, "*shall be retained, and be in use.*"

Now of these things there can be no doubt. The Injunctions and Advertisements of Queen Elizabeth *did* supersede the use of the sacrificial vestments. They were put away. They were buried. It is positively certain that in no sense of the word could they be fairly said to be in use for almost a century previous to 1662. The universal abolition of these vestments is a provable fact of ecclesiastical history. They were as obsolete as one of the dead languages.

Now that which is not in existence cannot be "retained."

It can be revived. It can be restored. But in the strict usage of language it cannot be said to be retained. That only can be retained which is in actual existence and use.

The employment of the word *retained*, in the direction of 1662, therefore, has been considered as a plain indication of the fact that only those vestments were to be retained in use in the Church, which were in legal use in the Church *at that time, i.e., up to 1662.**

In fact, the whole question centres here.

Was it the intention of the legislature in 1662 to revive or restore the use of the abolished and obsolete sacrificial vestments by the slightly modified reintroduction of this ornaments rubric?

If it was, then it seems to be an extraordinary thing for a

* See Law Reports, Privy Council Appeals, vol. iii. p. 624. Also Appendix to Brooke's Six Privy Council Judgments, pp. 268-700.

legislature to imagine that a small and obscure sentence in the Prayer Book could override the very act of the legislature which gave itself validity; for, according to English law, any proviso in a law which renders the law or statute self-contradictory and self-destructive, is to be considered null and void, and possessed of no legal value whatsoever.

As we have seen, the law which concerned vestments had expressly been repealed, and *without some law of equal authority and validity* this deliberate legislation could not be cancelled and superseded.

The vestments of Edward's First Book had been laid aside, not by mere caprice, and through dislike. They had been abolished by *law*, even by legal enactments authorized by the Act of Uniformity, and equal in authority to it.

In the opinion of many eminent English Churchmen the rubric was intended to keep the law just as it was prior to 1662, and *to retain* in universal use for all ministers at all services what had been legally in use in the Church of England for the previous one hundred years, for it was distinctly declared in Convocation that it was not among "the material alterations" made at that time, but was "only verbal."*

During the previous one hundred years this rubric had been printed in the Prayer Book.

Did it during those years nullify the laws of Elizabeth, her Injunctions and Advertisements, or invalidate the directions of the Canons of 1603-1604? No.

There it stood all the time, inoperative and ineffective, till the year 1662 came, with its new Act, and new Prayer Book.

Did the modified rubric perform what the original rubric could not perform, viz. repeal the Advertisements and Injunctions, or, in other words, turn out the plain surplice and turn in the chasuble, tunicle, and alb? Did it repeal all

* See the list of "alterations" prefixed to the Prayer Book of 1636, used in Convocation and photographed by the Ritual Commission.

legislation from 1559 to 1662, and restore all former laws, however obsolete? No. Certainly it did not. For if the poor little rubric was inoperative, and ineffective, and invalidate during the reign of Elizabeth in its original form, it was equally so, if possible more so, in its modified form.

Nobody took any more notice of it afterwards than before. No clergyman ever dreamed of putting on the Mass vestments as a loyal clergyman of the Church of England. The clergy to a man at that time, and for two hundred years since that time, High and Low, one and all, acted upon that rubric as if it was so plainly worded as to legalize the continuance of the wearing of the simple surplice, and to perpetuate the obsolescence of the chasuble and alb.

The practice then of *the men who themselves made the change in the rubric* is of the utmost significance. Surely the men who made the change must have been the best ones to interpret its meaning, and their custom must have been its best exposition. If this be the case, the abolition of the Mass vestments, or rather the non-revival of them by the divines of 1662, and all the clergy of the Church of England, notwithstanding the high views of doctrine held by so many of them, is the best interpretation of the rubric that it is possible to have.

One of the strongest proofs of this is the fact which has been pointed out in Mr. Tomlinson's notes, pp. 22-23 of his edition* of the Ridsdale Judgment, that in the year 1690, that is, *twenty-eight* years after the last revision, Baxter testifies that the alb and tunicle are "things that we *see nobody use*." "We see, that *all* those that subscribe or consent to this, *yet use them not*."

The Bishops drew up the words of the rubric with great care; at least it is hardly credible that they recast an important part of the Prayer Book without the most careful

* Price 3d. J. F. Shaw & Co., 48, Paternoster Row.

consideration. They surely understood what they were doing, and understood what the words meant, *and this uniform practice shows that they did not mean that the obsolete Mass vestments were to be restored.* They never used them; they never asked anybody else to use them; they themselves wore the simple episcopal garments, and insisted on their clergy wearing the surplice only.

This is the great argument drawn from the "contemporaneous exposition" of universal usage.

It is an irresistible argument to jurists, for the usage was the usage of the very men who devised and drew up, and verbally formulated the law. This fact, too, has been pointed out as a circumstance of significance in the consideration of the question.* These alterations in the last form of the rubric were the result of certain objections made by the Puritans at the Savoy Conference to the rubric as it stood in the Prayer Book for so many years, that is, to the rubric of *Elizabeth's* Prayer Book.

Of course they would have liked the surplice left out altogether as a matter of necessity, but failing that, they made an effort, at any rate, to have the ornaments rubric difficulty cleared away entirely. So among the very first things that they took exception to was this direction in the order for morning and evening prayer.

According to Cardwell (Conf., pp. 314-351) their exception to the rubric was worded as follows:—

"Forasmuch as this rubric seemeth to bring back the cope, alb, &c., and other vestments forbidden by the Common Prayer Book, 5 and 6 Edward VI., and so our reasons alleged against ceremonies under our eighteenth general exception, we desire it may be wholly left out."

* Privy Council Appeals, vol. iii. p. 624.

The Bishops considered this proposition, and then gave a simple answer to this effect:

“For the reasons given in our answer” (to the general demand for the abolition of certain ceremonies), “*we think it fit that the rubric continue as it is.*”

That is, they distinctly gave the Puritans to understand that the rubric needed no alteration; and they gave this answer most certainly, not because they *desired to reintroduce* the disused vestments, *but because* they were thoroughly satisfied with the legality of the subsequent provisions which authorized the surplice only, and were persuaded that the surplice was a simple garment of an entirely inoffensive character.

Yet, strange to say, notwithstanding this plain answer, the bishops afterwards altered their opinion, and did not allow the rubric to continue as it was. They changed it; and from the wording of the rubric as it subsequently appeared, they changed it with a considerable degree of care.

Instead of permitting a distinction between the vestments to be worn at the Communion and at other times, they introduced the expression, *at ALL times of their ministration*, thus abolishing the distinction which had formerly obtained, and bringing the language of the rubric into conformity with the 58th Canon. These words themselves surely are sufficient to prove that their intention was not to authorize for *all services*, the alb and chasuble (or vestment) and cope and tunicle, for even in the First Prayer Book these vestments were prescribed exclusively for the Communion, and no man who associated some of them with eucharistic symbolism would have prescribed them generally for *all services*.

These, then, are the significant facts:

(1) That the Puritans objected to the rubric as it stood in the Prayer Book before that time.

(2) That the rubric was altered as the result of their objection.

(3) That the men who made the alteration made no attempt to revive the obsolete vestments, but on the other hand insisted on the use of the *surplice* only.

But then, after all, the stubborn question will assert itself again: Why, if this was the case, was the rubric ever left there at all?

Why all this ambiguity, and mystery, and elaboration of explanatory devices, when a simple stroke of the pen would have wiped away all controversy? Why, if the bishops just wanted the surplice, did they not simply say so? Why did they leave in the very front of the Prayer Book a clause which they might have seen would occasion endless discussion, and perplexity? Why indeed?

Not a few Churchmen have given up the attempt to answer this question, and have been satisfied to treat it as an insoluble conundrum, and say, "No one on earth can tell."

Others have answered it satisfactorily to themselves, by finding in this so-called ornaments rubric an authorization for a higher degree of ritual for all those who, from time to time, should desire to revert to the more elaborate eucharistic symbolism of the pre-Reformation Church, and revive the gorgeous vestments of the Mass. In other words, the Advertisements, the Injunctions, and the Canons are to be taken only as prescribing the very least degree of ritual, the minimum of plainness, and the ornaments rubric as prescribing the highest possible degree of ritual, the maximum of gorgeousness. But, as the most learned of English jurists have pointed out,* this theory, however agreeable to the ritualistic temperament, is hopelessly at variance with the facts of history, and the usage of the Church. There

* Brooke, p. 182.

is not the slightest evidence in the history of the Church to show that during the reigns of Elizabeth, James, and Charles, the surplice was permitted as a legally possible ritual minimum, while the gorgeous vestments were permitted also as a possible maximum. On the contrary, everything proves that the surplice was the *only* vestment permitted and *ordered*. It was to be one thing or the other. If it was to be a surplice at all times, then it was not to be a chasuble and alb at the Holy Communion, and *vice versâ*. It was not a permissive, it was a peremptory and compulsory statute. All the legislation of that day was characterized by this uncompromising exactitude. The acts were acts not of Biformity, but of Uniformity, and their object was not to tolerate maximums and minimums for differently thinking Churchmen, but to establish *uniformity* for all Churchmen.

And the crowning demonstration of this is the utter destruction of the Mass vestments, and the vigorous measures of the bishops taken to ensure the wearing of the surplice only. Strange that there should have been such annihilation and destruction if the bishops were aware that they were permissible vestments. Strange, too, that this fascinating explanation was unknown to the men who devised the rubric !

No. No.

The theory is utterly worthless, and is condemned most chiefly by the fact that it was left to the nineteenth-century ritualist to discover it.

Others have gone to the length of a literal interpretation of the face meaning of the rubric, contending that the only authorized vestments are those of the First Prayer Book, and that, in consequence, every clergyman who has for the past three hundred years administered the Holy Communion while wearing only a surplice has acted illegally.

The men who adopt this view are honest, but singular.

If they have an apparent sanction for this extraordinary view in an isolated sentence in the Prayer Book, they have a most practical refutation of it in the fact that *the whole body corporate* of the Church of England clergy, bishops, priests, and deacons, have for three hundred years been systematic violators of the law, and ninety-nine out of a hundred are so to-day; for if the rubric is the only law, then, to use the language of the Ridsdale Judgment, the use of the vestments is not merely authorized, it is *enjoined*. It would be a serious business to bring all the law-defying clergy to task if this is the case! But, seriously, there never has been an instance of the user of the surplice being considered a lawbreaker, nor has there ever been a recorded instance of such a prosecution.

*On the contrary, it has been decided by the highest court of the land, that any man who wears these vestments at the administration of the Holy Communion, is committing a legal offence against the Church of England.**

The law of the land, and the law of the Church is, that the surplice is the only lawful vestment for the clergyman at all times of his ministration.

To conclude.

The only satisfactory explanation to my mind is this:—

The rubric, so-called, is not to be regarded as a rubric at all, for rubric it never was, but simply as a kind of reference note to the Elizabethan Act of Uniformity which remains now as before the primary authority as to ornaments. In its original form, the rubric or quasi rubric, for it was an

* Privy Council Appeals, vol. iii., *Hebbert v. Purchas*, p. 626. "The Vestments complained of (chasubles, tunicles, and albs) have been considered prohibited, and declared illegal, and *are and must be considered, and so held now.*"

entirely unauthorized and imperfect article, referred the people to the great Statute of Uniformity, and in its final form its intention still was to retain the standard then existing, as provided for by the Act of Elizabeth.

That this explanation is the true one from the Church standpoint is proved by the fact that neither the inserters of it nor their antagonists ever regarded it as *a fresh enactment* determining the vestments of the clergy.

In fine: it is no more right to take an isolated sentence in the Prayer Book, and interpret it by itself, than it is to take an isolated passage in Holy Scripture and interpret it apart from the context.

And this has been the mistake of some modern English Churchmen.

They have taken a sentence, which of all other sentences in the Prayer Book should have been considered in its connection with the legislative enactments of the past, and considered it solely by itself as a rubric binding on all the clergy, forgetting entirely not only that this pseudo-rubrical direction has not, and never had, the authority of a rubric, but that the custom of the Church, the unquestionable interpretation of its framers, and the final decision of the highest authority have determined that it stands there only as a reference and testimony to that great series of Uniformity Enactments which, on the one hand, discarded and illegalized the chasuble, alb, and other sacrificial vestments, and on the other legalized, and exclusively legalized, the wearing of the surplice.

(The reader who cares to go into this subject for himself should read the official reports of the Privy Council in the Purchas and Ridsdale Judgments, and also the various learned treatises by Mr. J. T. Tomlinson, published by the Church Association.)

4.—THE MIXING OF WINE AND WATER. (CHAP. IV. p. 49.)

The decision of the Lincoln Judgment on this question is as follows :—

“The Court declares that the mixing of the wine in and as part of the service is against the law of the Church, but finds no ground for pronouncing the use of a cup mixed beforehand to be an ecclesiastical offence.”

Though the point is in some respects a trivial one, the way in which the Court arrived at the latter conclusion may be briefly referred to as a sample of its methods in dealing with these disputed questions.

The point the Court wanted to establish was that it is lawful *to use the mixed cup* in the Communion Service, though *not to mix it in* the service, and the difficulty the Court had to face was, that though in the Prayer Book of 1549 the mixing was enjoined, the Prayer Book now says nothing about it.

How, then, is the Court to do this?

First of all it goes to some trouble to show that the use of the mixed cup was a primitive, continuous, and all but universal practice in the Church; that Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and others mention the fact.

But of course, this is not sufficient, as the question is not what is or was the practice of any other church or churches, but what is the law of the Church of England.

The Church of England has omitted the practice altogether. But though the Church has thus plainly expressed itself, the Court is not without resource, and it proceeds by a rather involved line of demonstration to show that though the mixing was abolished from the service, it was not intended to abolish the *use* of the mixed cup.

How is this to be proved? It cannot be proved. What, then, does the Court say? It says that *probably* Cranmer

intended not to disapprove of the previous mixing. "There exists no presumption that the use of a mixed cup was intended to be discontinued."

Upon what grounds does the Court say this?

Upon this ground, that *apparently* Cranmer got many of his liturgical suggestions from "the usages of the Primitive Church," among which was the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom, and that as these had not the mixing in the service, though they presupposed a mixed cup, *therefore* it is *probable* that Cranmer did not intend to discontinue the use of the mixed cup.

But what is the ground for the probability of this negative presumption?

Simply a note written in his handwriting in one of Cranmer's unpublished folios not much later than 1544, to the effect that in the Eucharist water is to be mixed with wine.

In 1544! But, says the Court (it is believed) there is no after-trace of his having altered his opinion on the point.

The Court, it is to be presumed, has evidence of this, but on the other hand it must be remembered that Cranmer himself confessed many years after this that he was at that very time "in divers errors," and afterwards changed his opinion.

However. The Court then concludes:—

"*If*, however, for reasons of primitive antiquity he removed the mixing" (should not the Court have rather said, or at least have added, for reasons of a growing spiritual enlightenment, and the desire to remove from the Prayer Book everything which could nourish superstition), "it remains *probable* that for the same reason resting on the same early memorials of Christianity, he approved of the previous mixing"—

Truly the premisses are small, but the conclusion is enormous.

It is not even based on a probable fact.

It is based merely on the probability of a presumption. (A presumption that to many minds is more reasonably *improbable* than probable.) In other words, the Court lays down with all gravity as a basis for the deliverance of a most important ecclesiastical judgment, a mere presumption, a mere negative presumption, and then—upon the *probability* of this negative presumption, which the Court itself by no means ventures to positively support, but declares it is a mere opinion, a mere vague “it is believed”—the Court gravely proceeds to state that it is probable there is another probability, which doubly dubious probability is the ground for the Court deciding that the use of a cup mixed beforehand is no ecclesiastical offence.

Thus on the one side are these facts:—

(1) The cup in the Prayer Book of 1549 was mixed, and the administration of the cup mixed in the service was not only permitted but commanded. (2) This rubrical provision for mixing was put out of the Prayer Book. (3) This provision is not in the Prayer Book. (4) Nor was there put into the Prayer Book any permission (as might most naturally have been done in the post-communion rubrics) to use the mixed cup. (5) Nor is there any permission now.

On the other side are these facts and presumptions:

(1) The use of the mixed cup was customary in Eastern and Greek and other Churches, and was a primitive, continuous, and all but universal practice in the Church as the revisers of the Prayer Book knew. (2) It is a *presumption* that *if, as is probable*, Cranmer removed the mixing from the service for reasons of primitive antiquity, it is also *probable* that he approved of the previous mixing, for “*it is believed*” he did not *alter* his opinion after the year 1544.

The Court did not, for reasons of its own, discuss the proposition that Cranmer was not the only reviser of the

Prayer Book, and that a mere sentence in a mere unpublished volume of only *one* of these revisers, written many years before, was hardly a thing to have any stress laid upon it as indicating Cranmer's views, much less the views of the whole revising body at this later date; nor did it consider the apparently indisputable proposition that it does not necessarily follow that because an individual Archbishop may *perhaps* have had a certain private opinion which *presumably* led him in a general way to approve of a mixed cup being used in the Church, that the whole Church of England is therefore to take the same view, and act as if it were the Church's view when there is no rubrical direction on the subject.

However, the Court decided that what it presumed to believe was in all probability Cranmer's presumption, was a good basis for a judgment, and it pronounced accordingly; and it is to be hoped that all the clergy of the Church of England will remember that the decision of the Lambeth Court is:—"*That the mixing of the Wine in and as a part of the Service is against the law of the Church*"; and also remember that this and all the other deliverances of the Court do not in the slightest degree affect the unassailable lawfulness of the practices of the Protestant Churchman.

5.—DR. PUSEY ON THE "REAL PRESENCE." (CH. IV. p. 54.)

One of the chief works of the late Dr. Pusey, a work that has exercised no small influence in determining the views of modern Churchmen, is entitled, "The Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ the Doctrine of the English Church." The object of this work is to show that the Church of England teaches a real objective presence

of the body and blood of Christ in that sacrament. It is, of course, impossible, in the compass of so fragmentary a note, to give anything like an idea of the work ; but I will state, in a few brief words, four facts that most clearly show the contrast between the doctrine of Pusey and that of the Church of England.

First: Pusey says, p. 211, that "the Church of England teaches that we receive Christ, not spiritually only, but really." In the sense that Pusey means, the Church of England does not teach us this. The Church of England teaches us, in Article Twenty-eight, that "the body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper *only* (note, *only*) after an heavenly and spiritual manner." "*Only such* as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, are partakers of the body of Christ." "Faith is *the mean*" (*medium quo*), &c.

Second: Pusey denies that the Black Rubric opposes the doctrine of the Real Presence. But here, notwithstanding the ability with which his side of the case is presented, he comes into plain conflict with the teaching of the Church of England. "No adoration is intended unto *any* corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood." Pusey upholds a real objective presence; the Church of England denies that there is any corporal presence.

Pusey declares, justifying the practice of adoring the sacrament, p. 313, that the Church of England does not say, in the Twenty-fifth Article, that the practice of adoring our Lord as present in the holy eucharist "may not be done." The Church of England teaches, "no adoration is intended, or ought to be done." "The sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore *may* not be adored (for that were idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians)." — *Post-Communion Rubric*.

Third: Pusey, in a line of reasoning extraordinarily

involved, and, to my mind, entirely illogical, says that the teaching of the Church of England is that the wicked eat the body of Christ, pp. 240-311, compare especially pp. 307 and 257: "the wicked receive sacramentally the body of Christ." The Church of England does not teach this Article Twenty-nine: "Of the wicked which eat *not* the body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper. The wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, are in *nowise* partakers of Christ." Here are two syllogisms for those who, holding the non-Church doctrine of the "Real" Presence, believe that "good and bad people receive the same thing in the Holy Communion." The body of Christ is taken and eaten in the Supper *only* after an heavenly and spiritual manner. But "the wicked," or "bad people," are not heavenly and spiritual. Therefore they eat not the body of Christ. They cannot feed upon that precious body.

Again: "The mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith." But "the wicked," or "bad people," have no faith; that is, real faith, living faith, "a lively faith." Therefore, they eat not the body of Christ.

Pusey reasons all through upon the assumption that the words in the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel refer *only* and directly to the sacrament, a position that cannot be proved. On the contrary, the man who had much to do with compiling the service did not believe this, for the Papist, Dr. Smith, having employed an argument to which that of Dr. Pusey is very similar, in quoting John vi., in support of his view, Cranmer thus answers:—

"Whereunto I answer by his own reason: Can this promise be verified of sacramental bread? Was *that* given upon the cross for the life of the world? I marvel here not a little of Master Smith's either dulness or maliciousness, that cannot or will not see that Christ, in this chapter of St. John, spake *not of sacramental bread*, but of heavenly bread. So that He

spake of Himself wholly, saying : ‘ I am the Bread of Life. He that cometh to Me shall not hunger, and he that believeth on Me shall not thirst for ever.’ And neither spake He of common bread, nor yet of *sacramental* bread ; for neither of them was given upon the cross for the life of the world. And there can be nothing more manifest than that, in this sixth chapter of John, Christ spake not of the sacrament of His flesh, but of His very flesh ; and that as well for that the sacrament was not then instituted, as also that Christ said not in the future tense, ‘ the bread which I will give shall be My flesh,’ but in the present tense, ‘ the bread which I will give *is* My flesh,’ which sacramental bread was neither then His flesh, nor was then instituted for a sacrament, nor was after given to death for the life of the world.”—*Cran. Works, Park. Soc. I.*, p. 372.

Now, the correctness or the incorrectness of Cranmer’s exegesis here is not my point. What I want to emphasize is this, that it is entirely unwarrantable for Pusey to argue, in his reasoning, that the words in the Communion Service must refer only to John vi., and that John vi. refers only to the sacramental bread, when the man who mainly compiled the service itself declared distinctly, as his view, that Christ here spake not of sacramental bread.

Fourth : Pusey says, that the (*i.e.* his) doctrine of the “ Real ” Presence is the doctrine of the English Church.

But an emphatic contradiction to this statement is the fact noted on p. 53, namely, the careful removal, by Cranmer and his associate Reformers, of everything that would sanction even remotely this view, and the insertion of that tremendous stumbling-block to all Romanizers, the rubric against the adoration of “ any ” corporal presence. In fact, more than two years before the Prayer Book was revised, Archbishop Cranmer repudiated the doctrine of the “ Real ” Presence as a doctrine of the Church of

England. He is confuting Dr. Smith, the Papist controversialist, and said Smith no more understood P. Martyr's opinions than he understood "my book of the catechism, and therefore reporteth untruly of me, that I in that book did set forth the Real Presence of Christ's body in the sacrament. Unto which false report I have answered in my fourth book. But this, I confess of myself, that not long before I wrote the said catechism, *I was in that error of the Real Presence*, as I was many years past in divers *other* errors; as of transubstantiation, of the sacrifice propitiatory of the priests in the Mass, of pilgrimages, purgatory, pardons, and many other superstitions and errors that came from Rome; being brought up from my youth in them, and noursled therein, for lack of good instruction from my youth, the outrageous floods of papistical errors at that time overflowing the world. For the which, and other mine offences in youth, I do daily pray unto God for mercy and pardon, saying, 'Good Lord, remember not mine ignorances and offences of my youth.' But after it had pleased God to show unto me, by His Holy Word, a more perfect knowledge of His Son Jesus Christ, from time to time, as I grew in knowledge of Him, by little and little I put away my former ignorance. And as God of His mercy gave me light, so through His grace I opened mine eyes to receive it, and did not wilfully repugn unto God and remain in darkness. And I trust in God's mercy and pardon for my former errors, because I erred but of frailness and ignorance. And now I may say of myself, as St. Paul said: 'When I was like a babe or child in the knowledge of Christ, I spake like a child, and understood like a child; but now that I am come to man's estate, and growing in Christ, through His grace and mercy, I have put away that childishness.'"—*Cranmer's Works, Park. Soc., I., p. 374, also Orig. Letters.* p. 71.

Bishop Ridley, who was the instrument in God's hands of

leading Cranmer to the true view of the Lord's Supper, declared that when it is said "that with the receipt of the holy sacrament of the blessed body and blood of Christ is received of every one, good or bad, either life or death; it is not meant that they which are dead before God may hereby receive life; or that the living before God can hereby receive death. For as none is fit to receive natural food, whereby the natural life is nourished, except he be born and live before; so no man can feed (by the receipt of the holy sacrament) of the food of eternal life, except he be regenerated and born of God before; and on the other side, no man here receiveth damnation, who is not dead before."—*Ridley's Works, Park. Soc.*, p. 9.

6.—THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS. (CHAP. IV. p. 64.)

On p. 61 of the ever-famous Tract 90, Newman makes this audacious statement, which is also supported by Dr. Pusey, and to which many members of the Tractarian school seem to have lent their countenance: "The Articles are not written against the creed of the Roman Church, but against actual existing errors!" "Here the sacrifice of the mass is *not* spoken of . . . but the sacrifice of masses!" "The Article before us [Article Thirty-one] neither speaks against the Mass in itself, nor against its being (an offering though commemorative, 2nd Ed.) for the quick," &c. But if Newman and Pusey think that the sacrifice of the *mass* is to be received, while the sacrifices of masses are to be condemned, Ridley and Cranmer (the true exponents of Church teaching) did not:

"Now, alas, not only the Lord's commandment is broken . . . but there is set up a new blasphemous kind of sacrifice, to satisfy and pay the price of sins," &c.—*Ridley's Works*, p. 52.

"Prop. 3. In the Mass is the lively sacrifice of the Church available," &c. Ridley answers this doctrine—mark well, not the sacrifice of masses, but the sacrifice of the Mass: "I judge it may and ought most worthily to be counted wicked and blasphemous (the very word used in the Thirty-first Article) against the most precious blood of our Saviour, Christ" (p. 206-211). And again—this is very important—showing how they, the Romanists, "avoid" Scripture by subtle shifts . . . "By the distinction of the bloody and unbloody sacrifice, as though our unbloody sacrifice of the Church were any other than the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, than a commemoration, a showing forth, and a sacramental representation of that one only bloody Sacrifice, offered up once for all" (p. 211).

Cranmer also says, Works I., 374: "I was in divers errors," and amongst them he mentions "the sacrifice propitiatory of the priest in the Mass," not in the masses. So also the Homily for Whit Sunday: "Christ commended to His Church a Sacrament of His body and blood; they have changed it into a Sacrifice for the quick and the dead;" and the Homily concerning the sacrament: "We must then take heed, lest of the memory it be made a sacrifice."

7.—BISHOP WILBERFORCE AND DR. PUSEY ON PRIVATE CONFESSION.

To show that this view is not confined to any particular school of thought, I quote the opinion of one who may be fairly taken as a representative High Churchman, the late Bishop S. Wilberforce, whose views I learned for the first time after thus writing. Speaking on this subject of private confession, he says:—

"It is plain, first, that our Church never designed that the

ministers of God's words and sacraments should abdicate that which is amongst the most important functions of their office, the dealings, as ministers of God, with the consciences of men. Yet, on the other hand, it is equally clear that there is a broad distinction between her intention herein and that of the Church of Rome . . . The object of the Roman Church is to bring the conscience under the power of the priest, to make him the judge to whose sentence it should absolutely defer. The object of our Church is so to awaken, enlighten, and strengthen the conscience that, with the aid of Holy Scripture and the ordinary public ministrations of God's Word, it may rightly guide the individual soul.

"With these different objects in view, there is between the two systems far more than a mere difference in degree. Every part of the priest's private ministrations with consciences is affected by it. The one is always seeking to subdue, the other to emancipate, the individual conscience. And this difference of object has by degrees greatly affected the statement of doctrine, as well as the administration of discipline, in the two Communion.

"Thus, it is not merely that private confession is enjoined upon all in the Roman Communion, and only permitted in certain exceptional cases in ours, but that the spiritual aspect of the same act assumes a wholly different character in the two Communion. The teaching of the Church of Rome is that confession to a priest is a direct sacramental ordinance of the Church of Christ; and that, to be duly practised, it must be secret and complete, numbering all remembered sins. So made, it is to be followed by private absolution, which, it is held, conveys a special pardon for the sins so remembered and confessed; and then, consistently with this system of confession, she recommends that every soul should be permanently under the direction of some priest; that this spiritual director should habitually guide those who consult

him ; that the conscience should be committed to his keeping ; this is, in their view, the result to be aimed at . . . It is not difficult to see what must be the effect of such a system. It will lead to many great evils, and amongst them these : When confession to a man is thus enforced, or even encouraged, as a duty, instead of being allowed as a last permission, to which, under peculiar circumstances and as an extreme remedy, the stricken soul, unable to reassure itself, may have recourse, it will, with many, be used dishonestly. The habit of withholding the real and deepest sins, consistently with getting through confession, will soon be formed. On the other hand, those who strive to confess all will assuredly be led to weaken the spring of conscience by devolving that determination of what is right, which is its own solemn responsibility, to be discharged under the eye of God and by the light of His Word, to the decision of another for it. The confessor will take the place, first, of Christ, as the receiver of all the secrets of our guilt, and shame, and weakness ; and then of the conscience, as the judge, arbiter, and director of our lives.

“Now, in opposition to this system, the Church of England, in exact conformity, as we maintain, with the Word of God and the teaching and the practice of the primitive Church, allows private confession instead of enforcing it, and recommends it only under certain prescribed circumstances and conditions ; as a means of restoring health to a sick conscience, instead of treating the habit of confessing as the state of health. She treats it as wise men treat medical aids ; as blessed means of renovation, stored, by God’s mercy, for their need in times of sickness ; but still as not meant for, and not wholly compatible with, a settled habit of strong health ; and this difference of view is founded upon a great doctrinal difference as to the place which confession occupies in the new kingdom of Christ. The

Church of England does not treat it as a separate ordinance of Christ, endowed with a special sacramental grace of its own; but she regards it as a permitted 'opening of grief'; as a 'lightening' of a 'burden'; as in no way bringing any special pardon or absolution to the penitent over and above that which he might equally obtain by general confession to Almighty God, and public absolution in the congregation, but only as a spiritual confidence which might be entrusted to any brother Christian, but which it is most natural and best to commit to the physician of souls, as having more experience of such cases, and as being specially provided by God with grace for their treatment and relief."—*Wolverforce's Ordination Addresses*, pp. 112-115.

Quite opposed to this view, and to the teaching of the Church of England, are the views of Dr. Pusey, as expressed in his late work on confession, in which he takes the extraordinary position that the declaration in the First Prayer Book (an obsolete and now unauthorized manual) permitting auricular confession is a sufficient justification for its practice in the Church to-day, and the carefully circumscribed absolution in the Visitation of the Sick the formula to be employed in confessing those who are well. One rises from reading this argument of Pusey with the exclamation of Newman, "Truly, this man is haunted by no intellectual perplexities," and with the assertion of Bishop Cleveland Coxe, "Dr. Pusey is out of place in the Church of England." Filled with Romish theories, he casts about, as if in desperation, for any opening or place by which he can graft them on the Church of England. He asks that the Romanizing school "be free to do what we think, before God"; in other words, to propagate the Roman doctrine of confession and absolution because there were certain expressions in the now-abandoned Prayer Book of 1549 which permitted auricular confession. He declares, as his opinion, that the Church of England

commands her priests, in two of her offices, to hear confessions, a statement that is positively misleading, for the permission in the Communion exhortation has nothing to do with confession in the Romish sense that Pusey uses. He takes statements of divines like Usher, Jewel, and White, advocating the scriptural and evangelical theory of confession, as supporting his view, which is scarce distinguishable from the Roman. He quotes such men as Bishops Andrewes and Overall, and Dr. Peter Heylin, as if their views could be authoritative expositions of the teaching of the Church. He takes a quotation of Cranmer, written in the year 1540, to interpret his views in 1550 or 1552, though Cranmer himself acknowledged a change in his views. He quotes from Latimer's sermon on the third Sunday after Epiphany, "and sure it grieveth me much that such confessions are not kept in England," as if Latimer was supporting the Tractarian doctrine; but he omits to state that, in the very sentence before, the good bishop demolishes that very doctrine of priestly absolution which he (Pusey) advocates throughout:—

"Here our Papists make much ado with their auricular confession, proving the same by this place. For they say Christ sent this man unto the priest to fetch there his absolution; and, therefore, we must go also unto the priest, and, after confession, receive absolution of all our sins. But yet we must take heed, say they, that we forget nothing; for all those sins that are forgotten may not be forgiven. And so they bind the consciences of men, persuading them that when their sins were all numbered and confessed, it was well. And hereby they took clean away the passion of Christ. For they made this numbering of sins to be a merit; and so they came to all the secrets that were in men's hearts; so that emperor nor king could say or do, nor think anything in his heart, but they knew it; and so applied all the purposes and

intents of princes to their own commodities. And this was the fruit of their auricular confession." And then he adds, "But to speak of right and true confession," that for the grieved in conscience to go to a learned man and get comfort from him, of the Word of God, "I would to God it were kept in England, for it is a good thing."—*Latimer's Remains, Park. Soc.*, p. 180.

In short, the teaching of the Church of England in the language of the Prayer Book is, that the absolution of the burdened, in the cases specified in the Communion exhortation, is to be found from "the comfortable salve of God's Word," for the quieting of their consciences. "As for the absolution for our sins, there is none but in Christ," as Bishop Latimer truly declares. The teaching of Pusey is, that the burdened come, not for comfort merely, nor for advice, but for absolution, at the mouth of the absolving-priest. What wonder, then, that finding the deficiencies and silence of the Prayer Book so discouraging, he has resort to a semi-reformed formulary to substantiate his views; and failing to find any fair warrant in the Prayer Book, as it now stands, for his general auricular confession, he boldly flings the gauntlet of defiance at text-matter and rubrics by the audacious advocacy of lawlessness. "What I and others desire is that we should, both clergy and laity, be free to do what *we severally think (sic)* right before God."—*Pusey: Advice on Hearing Confessions*, Preface, p. 25.

8.—APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION.

Does the Church of England teach this doctrine?

To answer the question is somewhat difficult, for the reader must remember that there are two distinct theories

associated with this term, one of which the Church of England certainly teaches, the other of which she certainly does not.

The one doctrine or theory is this :—

That, according to reasonable inference from Holy Scripture, and the facts of primitive Church history, there were three orders in the ministry ; and as a matter of fact there has been a succession of carefully ordained episcopal ministers from the Apostles' times to the present.

That the ordaining power is properly exercised by bishops who represent, for example, Timothy and Titus, to whom, and not to mere presbyters, the ordaining function was committed.

That all ordinations performed by such bishops are valid and regular, and that ordinations by others are irregular.

That this, moreover, is a matter which concerns the form and ecclesiastical government of the Church, but is *not* to be considered as touching the very nature and essence of a Church.

It is, in short, the theory of the Historic Episcopate.

This theory or doctrine is the theory or doctrine of the Church of England. The Preface to the Ordinal, the Twenty-third and Thirty-sixth Articles, unquestionably teach it.

The other theory is altogether different, viz., that along with this historic episcopate, or the episcopal succession, and inseparable from it, there is a well-defined system or scheme of doctrine as essential to the Church as the body to the soul or the soul to the body.

This scheme of doctrine is :—

That apart from the episcopal succession there can be no valid ministry.

That all ministers not episcopally ordained are not really ordained.

That without this ordination no minister can administer valid sacraments.

That without valid sacraments no grace can be conveyed to the soul.

In the terse and emphatic language of Haddan, in his "Apostolical Succession": "This scheme of doctrine obviously is of one piece, and holds together as one complete and homogeneous view. . . . It means, in few words, without bishops no presbyters, without presbyters no legitimate certainty of sacraments, without sacraments no certain union with the Body of Christ, viz. His Church, without this no certain union with Christ, and without that union no salvation."

With regard to this clearly defined and logical scheme, we remark three things:

(1) *It is not to be found in the Articles*, which alone contain the true doctrine of the Church of England, nor in the Prayer Book. The Nineteenth Article declares the doctrine of the Church of England on the subject of the Church, and lays down the notes of the Church—the things that are essential to the very being of the Church.

But it says nothing whatever about the necessity of episcopal ordination to salvation.

It is silent about the idea of the grace of Orders, and those sacraments only being valid which are administered by the ministry of the episcopal succession.

The scheme of doctrine set forth by Pusey and Haddan, and now so widely known as "the" doctrine of the Apostolical Succession, is so bold, and clear, and essential to the very being of the Church, that it is as the keystone to the arch of their whole Church system.

It is not one of a series of notes of the Church, a note which might be inserted or omitted without much matter. It is not, nor could it be, *a* note at all. It is *the* note or

nothing. It is the one great, essential, and clearly indispensable note. Without it, the whole system of (falsely so-called) Catholic doctrine falls to the ground.

It is impossible, therefore, to believe that the Church of England, *if this were its doctrine*, could formulate an Article on the Church, and say nothing about it. As easily could one believe that the Nineteenth Article was written by the Pope of Rome, as believe that the Nineteenth Article was written by Churchmen who held the Haddan theory of Apostolical Succession.

The Twenty-third Article lends no support to this novel theory either. It states, in a very positive way, the necessity of ministerial ordination; and then, in an equally positive but very general way, that lawful ordination is ordination by men who have public authority given to them in the congregation. To extract "without bishops, no salvation," out of the Twenty-third Article is like getting the Papacy of the fifteenth century out of 1 Peter v.-3. As Dean Goode has pointed out, only a man ignorant of the history and theology of the Church of England could fail to admit that this Twenty-third Article was purposely so worded as *not to exclude* the ministry of the foreign non-episcopal Churches; and Bishop Burnet, also, in his "Exposition of the Articles," states that the general phrascology of the Article was designed "on purpose not to exclude them."

The Thirty-sixth Article is equally wanting in support to this novel doctrine. It is inclusive, not exclusive. That is, it declares the lawfulness of the ordination of its own ministers, but is silent about others. To make it prove all other ordinations invalid would be to make it prove too much, for it would then invalidate the ordination of all other episcopal Churches, Eastern and Western.

The Twenty-fifth Article distinctly states that Orders is not a sacrament, and the Thirty-fourth Article that ceremonies

can be changed, or ordained by the various particular churches, so that all things be done to edifying. These Articles joined together disprove completely this Romish theory of the Apostolic Succession.

So with the Preface to the Ordinal. It declared in its first form that the threefold order of the ministry and episcopal ordination should be continued in the Church of England; and since 1662 it has held that, for the purpose of continuing and reverently using and esteeming these orders *in the Church of England*, no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful bishop, priest, or deacon *in the Church of England*, unless he has, or has had, Episcopal ordination or consecration. See Bishop Fleetwood's "Judgment of the Church of England," pt. ii., p. 24. "They shall not exercise the functions of either Priest or Deacon, but this is *in the Church of England*." (The italics are the Bishop's.)

(2) It is not to be found in the writings of the great and representative exponents of Church doctrine.

If, as is natural, nothing is said about any scheme of doctrine in the Preface to the Ordinal (though the same cannot be said of the Articles, where the *argumentum e silentio* is unanswerable), it is only reasonable to look for the *systematic* and *dogmatic* exposition of this scheme in the writings of the great Church divines. Certainly, if this great doctrine is the *doctrine* of the Church of England—the *greatest* of all Church doctrines—the keystone to the arch of the Church-system—it will be elaborately outlined, and as clearly expounded by them as it is by Keble, Pusey, or Haddan. Yet we look for it in vain.

Not only do the leading Church divines ignore this idea of the connection of sacramental grace and salvation with an episcopally ordained ministry absolutely and purposely (for it is childish to say this theory was not a live question in their day, when the "without bishops, no salvation" dogma was

being for ever hurled at them by Roman controversialists), but they even deny that episcopal ordination is an essential note of the Church.

Jewel declared in his "Defence of the Apology" that there can be a true Church without bishops.

Whitgift declared that "form of Church government is not such a part of the essence and being of a Church, but that it may be the Church of Christ without this or that kind of government."

Hooker concludes his noted passage, in the fourteenth chapter of the seventh Book, with the words, "we are not simply without exception to urge a lineal descent of power from the Apostles by continued succession of bishops in every effectual ordination."

Bancroft stated that "where bishops could not be had ordination by presbyters must be esteemed lawful."

Bishop Hall, in another famous passage, asserted that "a distinction must be made expressly betwixt the being and the well-being of a Church," and "the lack of episcopacy is not to be regarded as the lack of the true essence of a Church."

Bishop Burnet, in the exposition above quoted, stated also that "the Body of the Church of England, for over half a century, did, notwithstanding these irregularities (that is, their not having bishops and being cut off from the episcopal succession), acknowledge the foreign Churches so constituted to be true Churches as to all the essentials of a Church."

Even so-called High Churchmen never dreamed of setting forth this novel scheme of Haddan as a doctrine of the Church of England. On the contrary, none of them seemed to deny the validity of non-episcopal orders.

Bishop Andrewes does not assert that a Church cannot stand without episcopacy. Archbishop Bramhall grants to non

episcopal Churches the *nature* and *essence* of true Churches. Dean Sutcliffe, a High Church divine, in his work on the "True Church of Jesus Christ" (1600), rejects the idea of the episcopal succession being a true note of the Church.

Bishop Cosin, in his famous letter to Cordel, printed in Goode's edition of "Jackson on the Church," denies *in toto* the necessity of episcopal ordination even for ministry in the Church of England; and Archbishop Wake, in 1719, declared that certain Church writers *were insane* who denied that the non-episcopal bodies had true and valid sacraments.

And so on, and so on. The reader is referred to Dean Goode's Divine Rule ii. 247-347, from which most of these references are taken, for further examples, but these are enough surely to convince even the most stubborn that this upstart theory of the Apostolical Succession was unknown to the representative divines of the Church for over two hundred years.

(3) It is disproved by the practice of the Church of England for many years.

Up to the time of the Restoration, it is a well-known fact, that ministers of Presbyterian churches were admitted as ministers of the Church of England *without reordination*. Bishop Cosin testifies that it was the practice of the bishops generally, and that many were admitted.* Bishop Fleetwood asserts that many ministers from Scotland, France, and the Low Countries were admitted into the Church of England ministry without reordination.† Bishop Hall and Bishop Burnet, and many others, testify, too, that where there was

* "Jackson on the Church." Goode's Edition, p. 231.

† Judgment of Church of England *re* Lay Baptism, 1712. Second Part, p. 24.

sticking at the admission of these ministers, it was not on account of their not being episcopally ordained, but on account of the requirements of the statutes of the realm.*

Now this fact most certainly proves two things.

1st. That the bishops of the Church of England admitted the validity of the ordination of non-episcopal ministers from the Anglican standpoint; and

2nd. That the bishops of the Church *did* not believe that the teaching of the Church of England connected the validity of the sacraments with the episcopal succession, and much less the grace of (episcopal) Orders with salvation, for they permitted these men to preach *and to administer the sacraments*.

The insertion of the words in the Preface to the Ordinal, 1662, about no one being accounted a "lawful" bishop or priest without episcopal consecration or ordination, stopped this practice, but they have nothing whatever to do with the doctrine.† The Nineteenth and Twenty-third Articles stand as they were.

We therefore conclude: that while the Church of England holds, and always has held, that doctrine of the Apostolical Succession which implies that episcopal ordination is the valid and regular method of ordination in the Church of England, and that Episcopal Succession is the historic inheritance of the Church, it does *not* hold, and never has

* Goode's "Divine Rule," ii., pp. 292-295.

† "She did not *condemn* all others not so ordained, nor *exclude* them from exercising the functions of Presbyters, even in the Church of England. The case is now somewhat altered; she now *excludes* them all; but she does not thereby *condemn* them."—*Fleetwood's Judgment*, pp. 24, 25. The italics are Bishop Fleetwood's in the original.

held, since reformed, that scheme of doctrine by some termed the “Church” doctrine of the Apostolic Succession, which implies that without bishops there are no presbyters, without bishops and presbyters there is no legitimate certainty of sacraments, without sacraments there is no certain union with the mystical Body of Christ that is, His Church—that without this there is no certain union with Christ, and without that union there is no salvation, a scheme of dogmatic teaching that is certainly complete and homogeneous, but of which every link (save the last) is unsound, every proposition (save the last) is undemonstrable, and not one of them (save the last) taught by the Church of England.

INDEX.

	PAGE
Absolution, at Morning Prayer .	36
Absolution, in Visitation of Sick	113
Advertisements of Queen Elizabeth, A.D. 1566	209
Altars abolished, A.D. 1550 .	59
Apostolical Succession	237
Auricular Confession	127
Auricular Confession, Wilberforce and Pusey on	232
Baptism of Infants	80
Baptism, Cross in	88
Baptism, promises of	80
Baptism, Office of, in First Prayer Book	76
Baptism Office expurgated	78
Baptismal Office approved by Martyr, 80, and Lord Shaftesbury	91
Baptism, Charitable hypothesis of	79
Burial Office	105
Canons of 1604	210
Canon of Mass	177
Chalice, the mixed	53, 223
Church of England Popish before the Reformation	2, 6
Churching of Women	104
Commination Service	111
Common Prayer, what ?	23
Communion, Holy, Office of	46
Communion, Holy, contrasted with Mass	58
Communion, Holy, temporary Order of, in 1548	49
Confirmation of children	95
Dead, burial of, 105 ; Prayers for	55, 106
Doctrine, the subject of the Reformation	4, 8, & Pref. xix
Eastward position, 187 ; Lambeth Judgment on	193
Episcopacy (see " Romish " and " Apostolical Succession ")	238
First Prayer Book of Edward VI. semi-reformed	15

First Prayer Book of Edward VI., changes from	51, 163
First Prayer Book of Edward VI., defects in .	50
First Prayer Book of Edward VI., now obsolete .	Pref. ix
High Churchmen, not to be confounded with Romanizers	Pref. xxiii
Henry VIII. never a Protestant .	8
Injunctions of Queen Elizabeth, June 24th, 1559	207
Intermediate State, the .	109
Lambeth Judgment, remarks on	193, 223
Litany, changes in .	43
Mass, Canon of (Sarum Use) .	177
Mass, Sacrifice of, and Article XXXI.	231
Marriage .	98
Mixed Chalice .	53, 223
Morning Prayer, analysis of	35
North side, reason for adopting .	188
Ordinal .	141
Ornaments Rubric, History and meaning of .	201
Prayer Book (see "First" and "Second" Prayer Books of Edward VI.)	
Prayers for the Dead (see Dead)	55, 106
"Protestant," meaning of .	Pref. xi
Pusey on re-union with Rome, xvi. ; on "Real" presence	226
Real " Presence	226
"Receive the Holy Ghost "	152
"Retain," meaning of	214
Revisions of Prayer Book	162
Romanizing, what?	168
Romish Ordination	146
Second Prayer Book of Edward VI.	20
Sick, Visitation of, 99 ; Communion of	101
Scriptural character of Prayer Book .	29
Table, why substituted for altar, 60 ; place of	190
Wafers discontinued	54
Vestments, illegal	202



SOME OF THE

Publications of the Church Association.

	PRICE POST FREE.	
	s.	d.
The Church Intelligencer. Annual Subscription	1	6
The "Legal History" of Canon Stubbs, by J. T. Tomlinson		7
The Great Parliamentary Debate in 1548 on the Lord's Supper, by J. T. Tomlinson		7
1st Volume of Tracts, 1 to 60	1	4½
2nd Volume of Tracts, 61 to 100	1	4½
3rd Volume of Tracts, 101 to 163	1	4½
4th Volume of Tracts, 164 to 199	1	3
Ditto, cloth each	1	10½
The "Word to the Wise" Series, small, tinted papers, suitable for letters per 100 assorted	1	2
The Church of England Almanack		1½
Ditto, cloth		6½
Guide to Ecclesiastical Law	1	2½
Guide to Church Services at Sea-side Resorts of England and Wales	1	1
Annual Report	1	2
The Protestantism of the Prayer Book	2	10½
The Misprinted Catechism of the Church of England		1

Church Association Publications—continued.

	PRICE POST FREE. <i>s.</i> <i>d.</i>
Additional Evidence respecting Ornaments { <i>Part 1</i> { <i>Part 2</i> Rubric { <i>Part 3</i> }	2
Advertisements of Queen Elizabeth	I
Queen Elizabeth's Crucifix: its Secret History and Real Meaning	I
Altar Lights: their History and Meaning	I
"Hearing Mass"; or, Non-Communicating At- tendance	I
Mixed Chalice.	I
"Spiritual Presence" as taught by Ritualists	I
Teaching of the Catechism as to the Lord's Supper	I
The threatened Revival of Canon Law	I
Reservation of the Host: a Reply to C.B.S.	I
The placing of the Lord's Table. <i>With illustrations</i>	1½
"Into their hands": a plea for toleration of the old way of "taking" the bread	I
"The Liturgy and the E.P." <i>With 15 of the oldest</i> <i>known representations of the Lord's Supper</i>	2½
"North Side of the Table"	2½
Sarum Mass compared with First Prayer Book	4½
The E.C.U. a Romanizing Confederacy	7
Canon Law. Reply to E.C.U. "Rejoinder"	I
Fasting Communion. Archd. Farrar	I
Sacerdotalism. Archd. Farrar	I
Undoing the Work of the Reformation. Archd. Farrar	I
Moving the Lord's Table. Counsel's opinion	6½
Regeneration and Baptism, by the Bishop of Liverpool.	I

Church Association Publications—continued.

	PRICE POST FREE. s. d.
Historical Grounds of the Lambeth Judgment, by J. T. Tomlinson	7½
Religious Education and the Kilburn Sisterhood .	1
The Kilburn Sisterhood	1
The Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament . .	1
The Church of England Working Men's Society .	1
Bishop of St. Alban's Fund	1½
Bishop of Bedford's Fund	1½
Tracts dealing with nearly every point of the Ritualistic controversy each	1
Bibles, at cost price.	
Complete Catalogue and sample Tracts	1½
The Catholic Doctrine of Eucharistic Sacrifice .	4½
Review of Knox Little, with Preface by Arch- deacon Farrar	7
The Priest on his Throne, and the Priests at their Altars: Dialogues on the Christian Sacrifice, by Miss Emily S. Holt	7
"New Light" on the "Eastward Position" . . .	1
Incense	1
Must we Confess?	1
Prayers for the Dead	1
The Teaching of the Ritualists not the Teaching of the Church of England	1
The Falsification of History	1
Hymns Ancient and Modern	1
Confession and Forgiveness of Sins	1
What Mean ye by this Service?	1
The Eastward Position	1

Church Association Publications—continued.

	PRICE POST FREE. s. d.
Peril of Idolatry and Superfluous Decking of Churches (Homily) .	I
Distinctive Vestments .	I
Wafer-Bread, Privy Council Judgment on	I
The Sacrificial Vestments,—Reasons Against	I
The Eastward Position,—Reasons Against .	I
The Church of England is Protestant. Historical Testimony .	I
Reasons for opposing Ritualism	I
What do we owe to the Reformation	1½
Church Armour .	I
The Gown in the Pulpit	I
The Ritualistic Conspiracy—The True History of	I
Dean Burgon's Letter to Canon Gregory	I
Secret Societies	I
Shall we go back to the Prayer Book of 1549?	I
The Secrets of Ritualism .	I
The Constitutional Settlement of Church and State	I
Non-communicating Attendance at Holy Com- munion	I
"The Priest and the Privy Council." Contains a reply to all the more usual misrepresentations of the Privy Council Judgments which are put forth from time to time by Ritualists	4½
Are Crucifixes in Churches Lawful? . . .	I
Ecclesiastical Prosecutions originated and advoca- ted by the English Church Union	I
What Ritualism is! No. 1	I
What Ritualism is! No. 2	I
The Candour of Lord Halifax	I

Church Association Publications—continued.

	PRICE POST FREE. s. d.
The Lord's Supper, or the Mass?	I
The New (?) Purgatory	I
Evening Communions	I
Modern Idolatry	I
Sisterhoods in the Church of England	I
Church Reform	1
Revival of Catholic Discipline	I
Temple Ritual and Christian Worship	1
"The Chancels shall remain," &c.	I
What is "Sacerdotalism"?	I
A Review of "The Catholic Religion. A Manual of Instruction for Members of the English Church".	I
Spiritual Equipment for Spiritual Work	I
Does Ritualism lead to Rome?	I
Parsonolatry; or, Why rise when Clergy and Choir enter the Church?	1
The Society of St. Osmund. Superstition and Idolatry. A Disloyal Confederacy Exposed.	I

Orders for any of the above may be addressed to

HENRY MILLER,

SECRETARY, CHURCH ASSOCIATION,

14, BUCKINGHAM STREET, STRAND,

LONDON, W.C.

London:
G. Horman and Son, Printers, Hart Street,
Covent Garden.

