

AN APPEAL

FROM THE TWENTIETH CENTURY TO THE
SIXTEENTH AND SEVENTEENTH CENTURIES

TRINITY COLLEGE LIBRARY



3 1761 02743150 1

F. MEYRICK



FROM THE LIBRARY OF
TRINITY COLLEGE TORONTO



AN APPEAL

From the Twentieth Century to the
Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries ;

or,

The Faith and Practice of the two first Centuries
of the Reformed Anglican Church.

BY

FREDERICK MEYRICK, M.A.,

Rector of Blickling and Non-residentiary Canon of Lincoln.

London :

DOVER STREET BOOK STORE,

8, DOVER STREET, PICCADILLY, W.

1905.

BX

5132

M4

100092

APR 25 1977

An Appeal from the Twentieth Century
to the Sixteenth and Seventeenth
Centuries.

LAST year I co-operated with the Dean of Canterbury in issuing an Appeal from the New to the True Catholics, in which it was my part to compare the ceremonies, practices, and doctrines now urged upon the Church of England on the score of their being Catholic usages, with the ceremonies, practices, and doctrines of the Church of the first 600 years; and this comparison showed that none of them could be rightly designated "Catholic," because they were not the common usage of the Church of those first 600 years.

In making our Appeal to the early centuries we did not for a moment forget that the highest Court of Appeal is Holy Scripture, the authority of which is unique and incontrovertible; nor did we dream of superseding the regulations of Statute and Canon law already binding on members of the Church of

❧ An Appeal from the Twentieth to the

England by a reference to the usages of the early Christians, which were not always consistent with themselves, are liable at this distance of time to misinterpretation, and are some of them unsuitable in the changed circumstances of the world.

My present purpose is to show that mediævalist demands can no more justify themselves by the authority of the Anglican Church of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries than by that of the primitive ages.

I. In respect to ceremonies, the "six points" on which Mediævalists insist are: Vestments, Eastward Position, Lights, Incense, Mixed Cup, Wafer Bread. What are the Anglican traditions respecting them?

1. Vestments.

The practice of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was as follows:—

(1) From 1500 to 1549. The Præ-Reformation vestments were in use, namely Alb, Amice, Girdle, Chasuble, Maniple, Stole.

(2) 1549-1552. Transitional period. The vestments used were the Alb, Chasuble, or Cope.

(3) 1552-1553. The Surplice.

(4) 1553-1559. Restoration of the Præ-Reformation vestments, namely, Alb, Amice, Girdle, Chasuble, Maniple, Stole.

Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. 50

(5) 1559-1566. Second Transitional Period. Restoration of the Alb, Chasuble, or Cope.

(6) 1566-1700. Restoration of the Surplice, as in 1552, with the occasional use of the Cope and of the Hood, to be worn by dignitaries at certain services.

This was the rule appointed in 1566 by the Advertisements of Elizabeth, to which legal sanction was given beforehand by the Act of Uniformity.

(7) 1604-1700. The Surplice, with the occasional use in Cathedrals of the Cope, and the Hood to be worn by all Graduates.

This is the law of the Church, as appointed by the Canons of 1604, "according," as stated in the Canons, "to the Advertisements published Anno 7, Eliz."

From 1700 to 1905 no further change has been made in the dress of the officiating clergy either by Statute or Canon law. The use of a Scarf, identified with the Stole, has grown up in the nineteenth century, with Episcopal encouragement, as a thing that no one would object to, but it does not rest on legal or Canonical authority, and would therefore have to be abandoned if demand to that effect were made.

In the Primitive Church the use of the Stole grew

❧ An Appeal from the Twentieth to the

up in the same spontaneous manner, in imitation, perhaps, of the dark border noticeable in representations of the earliest clerical dress.

That the regulations of 1566 and 1604 were not abrogated, but were confirmed, by the adoption as a rubric, in 1662, of a shortened form of the clause of Elizabeth's Uniformity Act, which authorized the changes made in 1566, is shown by contemporary practice, which was in no way affected by the admission (or retention) of the clause. This clause is now called the Ornaments Rubric, which appears to have been retained in 1662 because giving legal sanction to the Order (appointed in 1566, confirmed in 1604), which it was desired to maintain.

2. Eastward Position.

No alteration in the Præ-Reformation practice was ordered in 1549. The majority of the clergy therefore continued to use the Eastward position. But there were some who made objection to it as encouraging a false apprehension of the nature of the Eucharistic offering; they therefore stood, some on one side, some on another side of the Lord's Table. This want of uniformity was remedied in 1552 by the North side being appointed as the place where the clergyman should stand.

Bishop Cosin says: "There were so many exceptions taken and opposition made against that order

Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. 50

(some standing at the West side of the Altar, with their faces turned towards the people, others at the East, others at the South, and others at the North), that at last they agreed to set forth this rule in the fifth of King Edward, instead of the former set forth in the second year. The same that we have" (*Notes on Prayer Book*, genuine series).

No alteration has been made in this regulation, except that in 1662 the priest was ordered to stand in front of the Table to prepare the elements for consecration. The position at the North side was adopted, whether the Lord's Table stood in the Church or in the Chancel, and whether it was placed East and West or North and South, till about the middle of the nineteenth century.

The following instances will be sufficient to show the sentiments and the practice of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries:—

Latimer: "Where you should preach the benefit of Christ's death to the people, you speak to the wall" (*Remains*, 262).

Bishop Jewel (1564): "What Father or Doctor taught us . . . that the priest should hold the bread over his head and turn his back to the people" (Parker Soc. Ed., page 990).

Bishop Bullingham (1565) deprived the Provost of King's College, Cambridge, for ill-treating a Mr.

☞ An Appeal from the Twentieth to the

Woolward "because he would not execute the service at the Communion with his face towards the East and his back towards the congregation, according to the manner of the Mass" (*Lansdown MSS.*, VII., 53).

Heylin (1637): "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" (*Antid. Lincoln.*, I., 56).

L'Estrange (1659): "As for the priest standing at the North side of the Table, this seemeth to avoid the fashion of the priest standing with his face towards the East, as in the Popish practice" (*Alliance of Divine Offices*, 244).

T. Elborow (1663): "At the North side of the Table . . . that is, at the North end; in all quadrilateral and quadrangular figures, to speak according to the rules of art, every part is a side" (*Exposition of Prayer Book*, 97).

Archbishop Wake (1668): "Instead of reading the service aloud, would you have us turn our backs on the assembly and whisper they know not what?" (*Gibson's Preservative*, XII., 351).

Archbishop Temple: "There is no doubt that onwards from the date of the revision of 1662 (and initiated apparently by the revising bishops and

Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. 50

clergy themselves) the practice of consecrating at the North end of the Table was the generally unbroken custom of the Church of England for 180 years" (*Charge*).

Bishop Charles Wordsworth: "I consider, as my brother (the Bp. of Lincoln) does, that the Purchas Judgment, which, if I remember right, forbid *in toto* the Eastward Position is simply the true one. . . . It is certain that since the Reformation the use of the North end position has been in our Cathedrals universal" (*Letter to Beresford Hope*, 1874).

3 and 4. Incense and Lights. These may be used either as adjuncts to worship or as offerings in themselves. It has hardly been yet realized by English Churchmen that their use for the first purpose leads by a short path to their use for the second. We all know that the offering of incense was the sacrifice to the heathen gods demanded of the early martyrs; and the offering of lighted candles before the image of a saint is regarded as an act of worship of that saint. It was the offering of two candles in honour of St. Mary in the Church of Notre Dame des Victoires, and on the Altar of Notre Dame de Lourdes in the Church of the Gesù, on February 14th, 1870, in response to which, as an act of worship, St. Mary made her latest alleged appearance in France, to Estelle Faguette at Pellevoisin. *This* use of incense

— An Appeal from the Twentieth to the

and lights has been regarded since the Reformation as idolatrous, and in the Second Book of Homilies, composed in the sixteenth century, is forbidden and denounced. "What meaneth it that they, after the example of the Gentiles, idolaters, burn incense, offer up gold to images. . . . Is not this to worship images, so earnestly forbidden in God's Word?" "Let us honour and worship for religion's sake none but Him, and Him let us worship and honour as He will Himself, and hath declared by His Word that He will be honoured and worshipped, not in, nor by, images or idols, which He hath most straitly forbidden, neither in kneeling, lighting of candles, burning of incense, offering up of gifts unto images and idols, to believe that we shall please Him; for all these be abomination before God; but let us honour and worship God in spirit and in truth" (*Against Peril of Idolatry*, Part III).

As to the use of incense and lights as adjuncts to worship, incense was occasionally used for fumigation before the service began. It was so used, as recorded by Evelyn, at Whitehall Chapel in 1684; and stationary lights were used when needed for the purpose of giving light, and occasionally with a symbolical purpose. But the sentiments of the seventeenth century are expressed in the following extract from Bishop Andrewes: "To have frankin-

Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. 50

cense offerings, fasts and feasts, to have candles in them, and to carry them up and down, in every respect is heathenish, and Chemnitius in particular proveth this by a variety of authors. The placing of lights in Churches at some time is not altogether a heathenish ceremony, although it appears by Seneca the Gentiles had it. But their burning of tapers in their Churches at noonday is altogether a heathen custom, as Rhenanus well observes in his comment upon Tertullian" (*Discourse of Ceremonies*, Part III.).

Cosin was charged by Smart with using lights in extravagant numbers and with superstitious intent, but he easily refuted that accusation, as well as the others brought against him.

Smart, having charged Cosin with having on the night of the first Candlemas Day that he belonged to the Chapter "caused 300 wax candles to be set up and lighted in the Church at once, in honour of Our Lady, and placed three score of them upon and about the Altar," Cosin replied, on oath, before the House of Lords, that being treasurer for the Chapter, he was ordered by the Dean and Canons to provide sufficient numbers of wax lights for the service of the Choir in the winter, and that he did so; "yet upon the Communion Table they that used to light the candles never set more than two

❖ An Appeal from the Twentieth to the

fair candles, with a few small sizes near to them, which they put there of purpose that the people all about might have the better use of them for singing the Psalms and reading the Lessons out of the Bibles; but 200 was a greater number than they used all the Church over, either upon Candlemas night or any other" (*Life*, p. xxviii., Oxford, 1843).

5. Mixture of Wine. Water was ordered to be mixed with the wine in 1549, but the order was omitted in 1552. It has never been forbidden to add it before the service begins, and it is probable that some of the clergy in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries did so. The same thing is done, unobjectionably, by some of the clergy at the present time, especially if they think that the wine by itself is too strong (as the unmixed wine was thought to be in the primitive ages) or too sweet; but they did not, and they do not, mix it ceremonially in the Church as part of the Eucharistic service, in imitation of a mediæval practice of the Western Church, nor with any superstitious or even symbolical intention. Therefore, if the practice existed then, or if it exists now, it does not justify the introduction of a ceremony into the prescribed service of the Church.

6. Wafer Bread. The use of wafer bread not having been directly prohibited, was continued by

Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. 50

individuals in the sixteenth century, and was even enjoined by Elizabeth at the beginning of her reign, and it lingered on in occasional use at Westminster Abbey to the year 1643. But it was not the general practice of the Church, nor of any section of the Church. Gradually the use died out. Bishop Overton, of Lichfield, in 1584, ordered "that no other bread was to be used by the minister, nor to be provided for by the Churchwardens and parishioners, than the finest common bread," and in the seventeenth century the enquiry made by Archbishop Bancroft, and adopted by Laud, Andrewes, Neile, Curle, Lindsell, Williams, Wren and others, was, "whether the Churchwardens do provide against every Communion, with the advice of the minister, a sufficient quantity of fine white bread." The Convocation of 1640 appointed the enquiry to be made in the following form: "Is the bread provided for the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper of the best and purest white bread that may conveniently be gotten." These articles of enquiry imply the disuse of wafer bread. Laud, at his trial, June, 1644, stated: "For wafers I never either gave or received the Communion but in ordinary bread" (*Troubles*, IV., 251).

The first book of Edward ordered that the bread should be "unleavened as afore." After that time no specific rule was laid down either authorizing

• An Appeal from the Twentieth to the

or condemning unleavened bread, the rubric of 1552 appointing that "it shall suffice that it be such as is usually eaten," which was leavened. But the learned Anglican divines knew that the use of unleavened bread was not heard of in the Christian Church till the ninth century; they knew also that the use of separate wafers (still more unprimitive, having been introduced into the Western Church only in the eleventh century) destroyed the lesson of unity drawn by St. Paul from the one bread (1 Cor. x. 17), and lovingly dwelt upon by early writers.

Hence it appears that the mediæval *ceremonies* proposed to be introduced into the Church of England are not justified by an appeal to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, two of them, Vestments and Eastward Position, being prohibited both by Statute and Canon law; three of them, incense lights and ceremonial mixture of the wine, by omission and disuse, and the other, wafer bread, abrogated by the general and at length universal practice preferring common bread, which was at last commended by authority to the use of the clergy.

II. The mediæval *practices* proposed to be introduced are such as these: (1) Adoration of the Sacrament. (2) Elevation. (3) Non-communicating

Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. 50

Attendance. (4) Reservation. (5) Children's Eucharists. (6) High Celebration. (7) Excessively multiplied Eucharists. (8) Pictures and images in Churches.

1. The following Declaration against Adoration of the Elements, or of Christ in them, was added to the Prayer Book of 1552 by order of Council, and accepted by the Church authorities: "It is hereby declared that thereby (kneeling) no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental bread or wine, there bodily received, or unto any real and essential presence, there being, 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 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."

The Act of 1559, which revived the obligation of the Prayer Book of 1552, did not cover this Declaration, (which was regarded as an adjunct to the Prayer Book proper), and for that reason it could not appear in the Prayer Book of 1559, though not omitted for any theological reason. It was adopted as a rubric in the Prayer Book of 1662, and a verbal

— An Appeal from the Twentieth to the

change in the wording was made, "Corporal presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood" being substituted for "Real and essential presence, there being, of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood." No difference of doctrine was intended, or was made, by this change of diction, which was preferred lest the tenet of the "Real Presence" in the heart, as explained by Hooker, Wake, and other theologians, might seem to be condemned.

The following are examples of Anglican teaching in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries:—

Cranmer: "Now it is requisite to speak something of the manner and form of worshipping of Christ by those that receive this Sacrament, lest that in the stead of Christ Himself the Sacrament be worshipped. For as His humanity, joined to His divinity, is exalted to the right hand of His Father, is to be worshipped of all creatures in Heaven, earth, and under the earth; even so, if in the stead thereof we worship the signs and Sacraments, we commit as great idolatry as ever was or shall be to the world's end" (*Book of the Sacrament*).

Latimer: "If you deny unto them their corporal presence and transubstantiation, their fantastical adoration will by-and-by vanish away. Therefore be strong in denying such a presence, and then you

Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. 50

have won the field. Furthermore, in the First Supper, celebrated by Christ Himself, there is no mention made of adoration of the Elements" (*Conference with Ridley*).

Ridley: "Then that godly honour which is only due unto God the Creator, and may not be done unto the creature without idolatry and sacrilege, is not to be done unto the Holy Sacrament" (*Treatise on the Lord's Supper*).

Jewel: The fourth point in Bishop Jewel's famous sermon at St. Paul's Cross relates to the adoration of the Sacrament: "The old Doctors and Holy Fathers of the Church never make mention in any of their books of adoring or worshipping the Sacraments. . . . Christ's Body is in Heaven, thither therefore must we direct our hearts; there must we feed; there must we refresh ourselves; there must we worship." And again: "We condemn the Roman bishops who, without the authority of the Word of God or of the Holy Fathers, and without precedent, not only offer to the people the Eucharistic bread for divine worship, but also carry it about" (*Apology*).

Cosin: "In all which (the Anglican Service) there is not a word tending to the people's adoration of that bread and that cup, this being a late device of the new Roman Catholics, after they had brought

❧ An Appeal from the Twentieth to the

in their novelty of transubstantiation" (*Notes on the Prayer Book*).

Jeremy Taylor: "The commandment to worship God alone is so express, the distance between God and bread dedicated to the service of God is so vast, the danger of worshipping that which is not God, or of not worshipping that which is God, is so formidable, that it is infinitely to be presumed that if it had been intended that we should have worshipped the Holy Sacrament, the Holy Scripture would have called it God or Jesus Christ, or have bidden us in express terms to adore it" (*Real Presence*, XIII.).

"Do nothing which is like worshipping a mere creature, nothing which is like worshipping that which you are not sure it is God. And if you can believe the bread, when it is blessed by the priest, is God Almighty, you can, if you please, believe anything else. . . . If it be transubstantiated, and you are sure of it, then you may pray to it, and put your trust in it, and believe the holy bread to be co-eternal with the Father and with the Holy Ghost" (*Fifth Letter*).

I quote another passage or two (out of many) from Bishop Jeremy Taylor, because he was specially selected from among the English Divines by the English Church Union in their Manifesto of

Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. 50

1901 as justifying their teaching "that in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper the bread and wine, through the operation of the Holy Ghost, become in and by consecration verily and indeed the Body and Blood of Christ; and that Christ, present in the same most Holy Sacrament of the altar, under the form of bread and wine, is to be worshipped and adored."

With that statement the passages quoted above, and the following, may be compared.

"The same is the case in their worshipping of consecrated bread, in which if they be not deceived, all the reason and all the sense of all the men in the world are deceived; and if they be deceived, then it is certain they give divine worship to what they naturally eat and drink; and how great a provocation of God that is, they cannot but know by the whole analogy of the Old and New Testament, and even by natural reason itself, and all the dictates of religion which God has written in our hearts" (*Dissuasive*, II., i. 8).

"The same also is the case in their worshipping the consecrated bread and wine; of which how far they will be excused before God by their ignorant pretensions and suppositions we know not; but they hope to save themselves harmless by saying that they believe the bread to be their Saviour, and that

25 An Appeal from the Twentieth to the

if they did not believe so they would not do so. . . . We have too much cause to fear that the error is too gross to admit an excuse. . . . We do desire that God may find an excuse for it, and that they would not" (*Ibid.* I., iii. 12).

Bishop Beveridge: "The Sacramental bread and wine being vainly fancied to be changed into the very Body and Blood of Christ, it was presently conceived that something more than ordinary honour should be conferred upon it, yea, that it was not only to be eaten but laid up privately, yea, carried about publicly, lifted up and worshipped too, and that with the same worship which is due to the true and living God; and therefore have they appointed a certain holy day too, which they call *Corpus Christi* day, whereon the Sacramental bread might be annually carried about and religiously worshipped. Now we having proved that this bread is not the very Body of Christ, but bread still, after as well as before consecration, we have overthrown the very foundations of their gross superstition" (*Discourse on the XXXIX. Articles*).

2. Elevation. Latimer: "Neither Christ bade him (the priest) lift, neither are the people allowed to do those things" (*Conference with Ridley*).

Bishop Cosin: "Which rite neither we nor any of the reformed or Protestant Churches observe, but

Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. 50

in regard of the peril of idolatry have wholly omitted; besides it is but a novelty, as the Roman priests now use it, for in the ancient Fathers we do not read of any such custom" (*Notes on the Prayer Book*).

Bishop Bull: "The worst ceremony of all is the elevation of the Host, to be adored by the people as very Christ Himself under the appearance of bread, whole Christ, God, and Man, while they neglect the old *Sursum Corda*, the lifting up of their hearts to Heaven, where the whole Christ indeed is. A practice this is which nothing can excuse from the grossest idolatry but their gross stupidity, or rather infatuation, in thinking that a piece of bread can by any means whatsoever, or howsoever consecrated and blessed, become their very God and Saviour—a very sad excuse indeed" (*Corruptions of the Church of Rome*).

3. Non-communicating Attendance. Prayer Book of 1552, repeated in the Prayer Books of 1559, 1604, as well as 1637:

"Whereas ye offend God so sore in refusing this holy banquet, I admonish, exhort, and beseech you that to this unkindness ye will not add any more; which thing ye shall do, if ye *stand by as gazers and lookers on* them that do communicate, and be no partakers of the same yourselves. For what

— An Appeal from the Twentieth to the

thing can this be accounted else than a further contempt and unkindness unto God? Truly it is a great unthankfulness to say nay when ye are called; but the fault is *much greater* when men stand by, and yet will neither eat nor drink this Holy Communion with others. I pray you, what can this be else than but even to have the mysteries of Christ in derision? It is said unto all, 'Take ye and eat'; 'Take and drink ye all of this'; 'Do this in remembrance of Me.' With what face, then, and with what countenance, shall ye hear these words? What will this be else but a neglecting and despising and mocking of the Testament of Christ? Wherefore, rather than ye should do so, *depart you hence*, and give place to them that be godly disposed."

Articles, 1562: "The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon or to be carried about, but that we should duly use them; and in such only as worthily *receive* the same they have a wholesome effect or operation" (*Art. XXV.*).

Homilies, 1562: "Our loving Saviour hath ordained and established the remembrance of His great mercy, expressed in His Passion, in the institution of His Heavenly Supper, where everyone of us must be guests and not gazers; eaters and not lookers. To this His Commandment forceth us, saying, 'Do ye this'; 'Drink ye all of this.' To this His promise

Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. 50

enticeth, 'This is My Body which is given for you': 'This is My Blood which is shed for you.' So then, we must be ourselves partakers of this Table, and not beholders of others" (*On the Worthy Receiving of the Lord's Supper*).

Bishop Andrewes: "It is an Eucharistic sacrifice (a Thanksgiving or Peace-offering), and the law of that kind of sacrifice is this—that the offerer must partake of it, and he must partake of it by taking and eating, as the Saviour enjoined, for your 'partaking by praying' is modern and new-fangled, newer even than your private Masses" (*Resp. ad Bell.*, p. 250). "The law of a Peace-offering is, he that offers it must take his part of it, eat of it, or it doth him no good" (Serm. IV., *Of the Resurrection*). "I see not how we can avoid that the flesh of our Peace-offering must be eaten in this feast by us, or else we evacuate the offering utterly, and lose the fruit of it" (Serm. VII., *Of the Resurrection*).

Bishop Cosin: "After this (the Prayer for the Church Militant) those that are not about to communicate are dismissed" (*Notes on the Prayer Book*).

4 Reservation. The purpose of Reservation is twofold. (1) To form a local presence of Christ in a church, or in a procession, where He may be worshipped under the form of bread. This practice

❧ An Appeal from the Twentieth to the

depended upon the identification of the Sacrament with Christ. That doctrine having been rejected, the practice consequent upon it ceased, and did not exist in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Bishop Andrewes: "That carrying about of yours is against Christ's command, and Scripture nowhere favours it. It is contrary to the purpose of the institution. A sacrifice has to be consumed; a Sacrament to be taken and eaten, not laid up and carried about. Let that be done which Christ desired when He said, 'Do this,' and there will be nothing left for the priest to set out, or for the people to worship, in the pyx" (*Resp. ad Bell.*, p. 267).

Bishop Cosin: "Of the bread and wine which the priest consecrated for the Sacrament, if he be careful, as he ought to be, to consecrate no more than will suffice to be distributed unto the communicants, none will remain" (*Notes on the Prayer Book*).

(2) The other purpose for which Reservation has been desired is that of communicating the sick. There was no reservation for this purpose in the proper sense of the word; but the elements were occasionally taken direct from the service in the Church to the sick bed of a member of the congregation. The necessity for this practice and for any Reservation was superseded by the introduction of the Service for the Communion of the Sick in 1662,

Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. 50

which enabled the clergyman to administer the Holy Communion to the sick in a manner more reverential and impressive than heretofore.

5. Children's Eucharists. The purpose of this practice is to instil into the minds of children, while they are still plastic, the belief that Christ comes down from Heaven at the moment of consecration and enters into the bread and the cup. The doctrine not being entertained, the practice did not exist in the two centuries referred to.

6. High Celebration or High Mass. This practice has for its purpose the inculcation of the belief that the celebration of the Holy Communion is a sacrifice offered to God by the priest as an act of propitiation. The Church having at the Reformation changed the Mass into a Communion, could not, and did not, have the practice. In the modern Roman Church Mass and Communion are commonly different rites celebrated at different times.

7. Excessively multiplied Eucharists. The frequency with which we think that the Eucharist should be celebrated must depend on the view that we entertain as to its primary object. If we hold Remembrance to be the primary object, we shall not be anxious for very great frequency, counting it to be a sign of feeble faith and luke-warm love to require a special ceremony every day or two to

❧ An Appeal from the Twentieth to the

remind us of what our Master has done for us, or to put God in remembrance of it, as though its memory could be, in God's mind, evanescent. If we regard it as primarily a means of grace we shall not desire that it should be attended so frequently as to exclude a fitting preparation, without which it is not a means of grace at all. If we hold it to be primarily a sacrifice, its greater frequency may seem more reasonable. Now it is certain that the aspect in which it was looked at in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was that of its being primarily a Remembrance. We have only to open our Prayer Books at the Catechism or the Communion Service to see this. Consequently the excessive frequency with which Mass had been said (leading to Private Masses and Non-communicating Attendance) was discouraged.

Prayer Book of 1552. Rubrics: "There shall be no Communion except four, or three at the least, communicate with the priest." "And in Cathedrals and Collegiate Churches and Colleges, where there are many priests and deacons, they shall all receive the Communion with the priest every Sunday at the least, except they have a reasonable cause to the contrary." "And note that every parishioner shall communicate at least three times in the year, of which Easter to be one."

Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. 20

Advertisements (1566): "In Cathedral Churches and Colleges the Holy Communion shall be ministered upon the first or second Sunday of every month at the least."

Dean and Chapter of Canterbury, in a report to Abp. Parker, 1566: "The Holy Communion is administered ordinarily the first Sunday of every month through the year."

Archbishop Grindal (1571) orders that the Holy Communion shall be administered once a month at least in the Cathedral, and throughout the province, of York.

Of 37 Articles of Enquiry made in the reigns of Elizabeth and James I. at Visitations, issued by Overall, Davenant, Lindsell, Pearson, Duppa, Mountagu, and Bostock, seven ask if the Holy Communion is celebrated every month, and thirty make inquiry if it is so often celebrated that the parishioners may receive three times.

Bishop Andrewes had monthly administrations, and so had the Ferrars in their Religious House at Little Gidding in 1624. George Herbert says that it should be celebrated once a month, or at least five or six times in the year. Bishop Cosin represents monthly Communion as the practice of the Church in his day (*Reg. Ang. Rel.*).

Mr. Scudamore writes: "I do not suppose that

—s An Appeal from the Twentieth to the

celebrations were more frequent than once a month in many places, if indeed many came up to it, during the reigns of Elizabeth and James" (*Notitia*, 733).

Bishop Jeremy Taylor (1634) advised monthly Communion "besides the solemn and great festivals of the year" (Golden Grove).

Bishop Bull (1658) raised the celebrations of the Holy Communion in his parish to seven times a year. Archbishop Sancroft, in 1688, recommends administration to be once in every month.

6. Images or Pictures in Churches. Cranmer: "As it is forbidden to have any strange gods, so is it also forbidden to have an image of the true living God. And if any will say, that it is forbidden to make an image of God to the intent to worship it, but I do not worship it, nor have it for that intent, but only that it may stir me to the remembrance and knowledge of God: to this I answer, that God forbids the making of His image, lest this peril should follow, that thou shouldst worship it. Therefore thou dost offend, although thou dost not worship it, and that not only because thou doest it against God's Word and Commandment, but also because thou puttest thyself wilfully in very great peril and danger; especially seeing that of our corrupt nature we are most highly inclined to idolatry and superstition, as experience,

Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. 50

from time to time, hath taught us, even from the beginning of the world" (*Catechism*).

The crucifix, with two lights before it, set up in Elizabeth's private Chapel, is not to be here reckoned, because it was not done religiously, but was a political device for leading the Spanish Ambassador and the English Roman Catholics into a belief of the Queen's possible conversion.

Homilies of 1562: "As all things that be amiss have from a tolerable beginning grown worse and worse, till they at last became intolerable, so did this matter of images. First men used privately stories painted on tables, cloths, and walls. Afterwards gross and embossed images privately in their own houses. Then, afterwards, pictures first, and after them embossed images began to creep into Churches; learned and godly men ever speaking against them. Then by use it was openly maintained that they might be in Churches, but yet forbidden that they should be worshipped; of which opinion was Gregory. . . . But of Gregory's opinion, thinking that images might be suffered in Churches, so it were taught that they should not be worshipped, what ruin of religion and what mischief ensued to all Christendom, experience hath, to our great hurt and sorrow, proved." "We are not so superstitious or scrupulous that we do abhor either flowers

↪ An Appeal from the Twentieth to the

wrought in carpets, hangings, and other arras; neither do we condemn the arts of painting and image making, as wicked of themselves. But images placed publicly in temples cannot possibly be without danger of worshipping and idolatry; wherefore they are not publicly to be had or suffered in temples or churches." "The images of God, our Saviour Christ, the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Apostles, martyrs, and others of notable holiness, are of all other images most dangerous for the peril of idolatry, and therefore greatest heed to be taken that none of them be suffered to stand publicly in churches and temples" (*Against Peril of Idolatry*).

Bishop Cosin, being charged by his accuser, Smart, with having set up an image of Christ in Durham Cathedral, instead of defending such an act, explained that the image referred to was a "little portraiture on the top of Bishop Hatfield's tomb, about ten inches long, and hardly discernible to the eye what figure it was, for it stood 30 feet from the ground," and the tomb had been "set up in the Church, under a side-arch there, two hundred years before Dr. Cosin was born" (*Life*).

III. We have lastly to consider the mediæval *doctrines* which we are asked to admit, and to examine how far they may or may not be justified by the doctrines held in the Anglican Church during the

Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. 50

sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The doctrines in question are the Objective Presence of Christ *in the Elements* after Consecration; the Doctrine of the Mass; the Necessity of Fasting before Communion; the Necessity of Auricular Confession; Invocation or Worship of Saints and Angels; Seven Sacraments; the Primacy of the Pope over Christendom; Denial of the Rights of a National or Particular Church.

1. Objective Presence in the Elements (as distinct from in the Ordinance). Cranmer: "All that love and believe Christ Himself, let them not think that Christ is corporeally in the bread, but let them lift up their hearts unto Heaven and worship Him sitting there, at the right hand of His Father. In no wise let them worship Him as being corporeally in the bread; for He is not in it; neither spiritually as He is in man, nor corporeally as He is in Heaven; but only sacramentally as a thing may be said to be in the figure, whereby it is signified" (*Doctrine of the Sacrament*).

Latimer: "As for that which is feigned of many concerning the corporeal presence, I, for my part, take it but for a Papistical invention; and therefore I think it utterly to be rejected from among God's children that seek their Saviour in faith" (*Protestation*).

Ridley: "I plainly affirm and say that the natural

❧ An Appeal from the Twentieth to the

substance of bread and wine is the true material substance of the Holy Sacrament of the blessed Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ" (*On the Lord's Supper*).

Jewel: "Christ's purpose was not that wheaten bread should lose its nature and clothe itself in a sort of novel divinity, but rather that it should work a change in us. . . . For though we do not touch the Body of Christ with our teeth and jaws, yet by faith in our heart and spirit we hold Him, and hold Him close. For that is not a vain faith which embraces Christ, nor is that an ineffective apprehension when the soul and spirit and faith apprehend" (*Apology*).

Becon: "As sure as we take the bread and eat it with the mouth of the body and drink the wine, so verily and certainly, even at the same instant, with the mouth of our faith we receive the very Body and Blood of Christ, and there it as actually comforts and sustains the soul, as the bread and the wine nourish and comfort the heart and the outward man" (*Demands of Scripture*).

Jeremy Taylor: "Christ, as present by His human nature in the Sacrament, is a *non ens*; for it is not true; there is no such thing. He is present there by His divine power and His divine blessing and the fruits of His Body, the real effective consequents

Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. 80

of His Passion. But for any other presence it is *idolum*, it is nothing in the world. Adore Christ in Heaven, for the Heavens must contain Him till the time of the restitution of all things" (*Fifth Letter*).

"This Body, being carried from us into Heaven, cannot be touched or tasted by us on earth; but yet Christ left to us symbols and Sacraments of this natural Body; not to be, or to convey, that natural Body to us, but to do more and better for us, to convey all the blessings and graces procured for us by the breaking of that Body and the effusion of that Blood; which blessings, being spiritual, are therefore called "His Body" spiritually, because procured by that Body which died for us" (*Worthy Communicant*).

Beveridge: "Scripture and Fathers holding forth so clearly that whosoever worthily receives the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper doth certainly partake of the Body and Blood of Christ, the devil thence took occasion to draw men into an opinion that the bread which is used in that Sacrament is the very Body which was crucified upon the Cross, and the wine, after consecration, the very Blood that gushed out of His pierced side. The time when this opinion was first broached was in the days of Gregory III., Pope of Rome" (*Discourse*).

It need hardly be said that the theory proposed

↪ An Appeal from the Twentieth to the

of late, namely, that the bread and wine are, on their consecration, snatched up to Heaven, laid upon an altar, supposed to exist in Heaven, there identified with the existing Body of Christ, and thence retransferred to the altar at which the priest is officiating on earth, having now become a proper object of worship, was totally unknown to the divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

2. The Mass. Cranmer: "The priests make their Mass a service propitiatory to remit the sins as well of themselves as of others, both quick and dead, to whom they list to apply the same. Then under pretence of holiness the Papistical priests have taken upon them to be Christ's successors, and to make such an oblation and sacrifice as never creature made but Christ alone; neither He made the same any more times than once, and that was by His death upon the cross" (*Doctrine of the Sacrament*).

Ridley: "The Mass is a new, blasphemous kind of sacrifice, to satisfy and pay the price of sins, both of the dead and of the quick, to the great an intolerable contumely of Christ our Saviour, His Death and Passion, which was and is the only sufficient and everlasting and available sacrifice satisfactory for all the elect of God, from Adam the first, to the last that shall be born to the end of the world" (*Piteous Lamentation*).

Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. 50

Jewel: "True it is, the ministration of the Holy Communion is oftentimes by the old learned Fathers called a sacrifice, not for that they thought the priest had authority to sacrifice the Son of God, but for that therein we offer up unto God thanks and praises for the great sacrifice once made upon the Cross" (*Reply to Harding*).

Andrewes: "That a memory is there made of the sacrifice, we grant willingly; that your Christ made of bread is sacrificed there, we will never grant" (*Resp. ad Bell.*).

Cosin: "The word 'Mass,' as it is now used by the Papists for a true and proper sacrifice of Christ offered every time to God the Father for the living and the dead, is nowhere found among the Ancients. And for this reason the very word 'Mass' in its new, not in its ancient signification, is rejected by the English Church, which desired to abolish that wrong opinion about the sacrifice of the Mass" (*Notes*).

Bull: "The meaning of it (the Trent Creed) must necessarily be this, that in the Eucharist the very Body and Blood of Christ are again offered up to God as a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of men, which is an impious proposition, derogatory to the one full satisfaction of Christ, made by His death on the Cross, and contrary to express Scripture" (*Corruptions of the Church of Rome*).

— An Appeal from the Twentieth to the

3. The necessity of fasting before Communion. There were probably some in the seventeenth century, as in the twentieth century, who found themselves better prepared for the solemn rite of Communion after abstinence from food than they would have been without such bodily exercise. Such persons would, and would rightly, have used fasting. But they felt themselves under no compulsion to adopt a practice which they knew to be unapostolic, while the theory on which it is enforced at the present time, namely, that it is a profanity to place unconsecrated food in juxtaposition with the consecrated wafer in the stomach, if known at all, would have been rejected as a materialistic conception incompatible with the Church's doctrine of the Holy Communion.

4. In like manner there were, no doubt, individuals who thought it conducive to piety to make use occasionally of Confession. But, says Hooker: "That extreme and rigorous necessity of auricular and private confession which is at this day so mightily upheld by the Church of Rome we find not in the Fathers. It was not then the faith and doctrine of God's Church, as of the Papacy at present, (1) That the only remedy for sin after baptism is sacramental penitence; (2) that Confession in secret is an essential part thereof . . . No, no! these opinions

Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. 50

have youth in their countenance; antiquity knew them not; it never thought nor dreamed of them" (*Eccl. Pol.*, vi. 13).

So Bishop Bull: "It is absolutely necessary, the Church of Rome says, for a sinner to make an auricular confession to, and be absolved by, a priest, though God hath nowhere said so" (*Sermon*, i.).

5. Invocation and Saint Worship. Homilies, 1562: "It is plain by the infallible word of truth and life that in all our necessities we must flee unto God, direct our prayers unto Him, call upon His holy Name, desire help at His hands, and at none others. . . . We must call neither upon angel nor yet upon saint, but only and solely upon God." "That we should pray unto saints, neither have we any commandment in all the Scripture, nor yet example which we may safely follow. . . . Let us not therefore put our trust or confidence in the saints or martyrs that be dead. Let us not call upon them, nor desire help at their hands; but let us always lift up our hearts to God, in the Name of His dear Son Christ, for Whose sake as God hath promised to hear our prayer, so He will truly perform it. . . . Let us not therefore anything mistrust His goodness. Let us not fear to come before the throne of His mercy. Let us not seek the aid and help of saints, but let us come boldly ourselves,

23 An Appeal from the Twentieth to the

nothing doubting but God for Christ's sake, in Whom He is well pleased, will hear us without a spokesman, and will accomplish our desire in all such things as shall be agreeable to His most holy will" (*Homily concerning Prayer*).

Bishop Andrewes: " 'Come to Me,' says the Saviour—that is, according to Cardinal Bellarmine: 'Stay where you are, and send some go-between to Me; that is all that is wanted, though you don't come yourselves.' So, 'Come' means: 'Don't come, let others come.' . . . When you thus invoke the saints, you give them Christ's place; if you go to them, you put them in the place of Christ, for them to refresh you instead of Him. You take them as mediators with God, to obtain His pardon for you by their prayers" (*Resp. ad Bell.*).

Bishop Bull: "For the worship and invocation of saints deceased there is no ground or foundation in the Holy Scripture, no precept, no example. Nay, it is by evident consequence forbidden in the prohibition of the worship and invocation of angels (Col. ii. 18). Now if we must not pray to angels, then much less may we pray to saints" (*Corruptions of the Church of Rome*).

"We abominate the impious imposture of those who have translated the most humble and holy Virgin into an idol of pride and vanity, and repre-

Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. 56

sented her as a vainglorious and aspiring creature, like Lucifer (I tremble at the comparison), thirsting after Divine worship and honour, and seeking out superstitious men and women, whom she may oblige to her more especial service, and make them her perpetual votaries. For what greater affront than this could they have offered to her humility and sanctity?" (*Sermon* iv.).

Bishop Beveridge: "It is God Who is the only Person in the world that ought to be religiously worshipped; thence it plainly follows, that God is only to be prayed to; for invocation is the principal part of religious worship, insomuch that it is sometimes put for the whole. He alone may be worshipped that is to be called upon; and He alone may be called upon Who may be worshipped. And so he that may not be worshipped ought not to be called upon; and therefore seeing it is not lawful to worship the saints, it cannot be lawful to call upon them. . . . We say with the ancient council of Frankfort (*Can.* 42), 'That no saints should be either worshipped or invocated or prayed to by us'" (*Discourse*, p. 420).

6. Seven Sacraments. Articles, 1562: "There are two Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord. Those five commonly called Sacraments,

— An Appeal from the Twentieth to the

that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel" (*Article XXV.*).

Catechism, 1604: "How many Sacraments hath Christ ordained in His Church? Two only, as generally necessary to salvation: that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord."

Bishop Andrewes: "For more than a thousand years the number of Seven Sacraments was never heard of. How, then, can the belief in Seven Sacraments be Catholic, which means, always believed?" (*Resp. ad Bell.*, p. 72).

Bishop Cosin: "The Papal invention that there are neither more nor less than seven Sacraments properly so called, and that that must be held as part of the Catholic faith, was certainly unknown to the ancient Church and unheard of" (*Notes*).

Bishop Beveridge: "Whatsoever other things the Papists would obtrude upon us as Sacraments, it is certain that we find our Saviour solemnly instituting two, and but two, Sacraments in the New Testament—to wit, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. . . . And if we look into the Fathers, we shall find them, when speaking of the Sacraments of the New Testament, still mentioning neither fewer nor more than two, even Baptism and the Lord's Supper" (*Discourse*, p. 441).

Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. 50

7. The Pope the Primate of Christendom. Cambridge Declaration: In reply to the enquiry made by Henry VIII., as to the authority of the Pope in England, the University of Cambridge replied that "the Bishop of Rome hath no more authority and jurisdiction derived to him from God in this kingdom of England than any other foreign Bishop." This declaration was signed, among others, by Ridley, afterwards Bishop and martyr, who was at the time Senior Proctor.

Jewel: "There is, and can be, no one man to govern the whole, for Christ is always with His Church, and has no need of a man to take His place as Vicar, possessing his Lord's powers, and there can be no mortal man whose grasp of comprehension can embrace the universal Church, that is, every part of the world, still less order it rightly, and duly administer it. . . . Neither the Roman Bishop, nor any other mortal man can be head of the whole Church or universal Bishop, any more than he can be the bridegroom, or the light, or the salvation, or the life of the Church; for these are the privileges and titles of Christ alone, and they belong to Him and none other" (*Apology*).

Hooker: "Jesuits and Papists, hear ye me! Ought ye not to know that the Father hath given all power unto the Son, and hath made Him the

↻ An Appeal from the Twentieth to the

only Head over His Church, wherein He dwelleth as a Husbandman in the midst of His vineyard, manuring it with the sweat of His own brows, not letting it forth to others. . . . Neither will ever any Pope or Papist under the cope of Heaven be able to prove the Romish Bishop's usurped supremacy over all Churches by any one word of the covenant of salt, which is the Scriptures. For the children in our streets do now laugh them to scorn when they force 'Thou art Peter' to this purpose. . . . Jesus said not, 'The Pope is universal head of all the Churches'; but '*Tu es Petrus*,' 'Thou art Peter'" (*Sermon v.*, 15).

Andrewes: "Any primacy that Rome has came from the Fathers, not from Christ; and because Rome was the seat of the Emperor, not of Peter" (*Resp. ad Bell.*, 231).

Laud: "The Popes grew under the Emperors till they had overgrown them" (*Conference*, 25).

Jeremy Taylor: "From hence it must needs follow that by the law of Christ one Bishop is not superior to another" (*Duct. Dub.*, III., 4, 16).

Bull: "The universal pastorship or government of the Catholic Church was never claimed by any Bishop till towards the end of the sixth century" (*Corruptions*).

Beveridge: "And so the Bishop of Rome for a

Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. 30

while kept this nation in slavery, till at last his yoke grew so heavy that neither King nor people could endure it any longer" (*Discourse*).

Pearson: "The extravagant power of one chief Bishop has robbed all the other Prelates of their rights and absorbed them, has diminished the rightful authority of the ancient Canons by novel decretals, and has irremediably corrupted the wholesome discipline of the Church" (*Oration*).

8. Rights of National Churches. Act 24, Henry VIII., c. 12: "That part of the body politic called the Spirituality, now being usually called the English Church, always has been reputed, and also found, of that sort that both for knowledge, integrity, and sufficiency of number it hath been always thought, and is also at this time, sufficient and meet of itself, without the intermeddling of any exterior person or persons, to declare and determine all such doubts, and to administer all such offices and duties as to their rooms spiritual doth appertain."

Jewel: "We have reformed our Churches in a National Synod, as the Holy Fathers and our own ancestors have often done: we have shaken off the yoke and tyranny of the Roman Bishop, as it was our duty to do; for we were not bound in any way to him" (*Apology*).

Hooker: "The indisposition of the Church of

— An Appeal from the Twentieth to the

Rome to reform herself must be no stay unto us from performing our duty to God; even a desire of retaining conformity with them could be no excuse if we did not perform that duty. . . . With Rome we dare not communicate concerning sundry her gross and grievous abominations. . . ." (*Eccl. Pol.*, iii., 1-10).

Laud: "Is it, then, such a strange thing that a particular Church may reform itself, if the general will not? I had thought, and do so still, that in point of Reformation of either manners or doctrine, it is lawful for the Church since Christ to do as the Church before Christ did, and might do. Was it not lawful for Judah to reform herself when Israel would not join? To reform what is amiss in doctrine or manners is as lawful for a particular Church as it is to publish and promulgate anything that is Catholic. . . . I make no doubt but that as the universal Catholic Church would have reformed herself had she been in all parts free of the Roman yoke, so while she was, for the most, in western parts, under that yoke, the Church of Rome was, if not the only, yet the chief hindrance of reformation. And then, in this sense it is more than clear that if the Roman Church will neither reform nor suffer reformation, it is lawful for any other particular Church to reform itself so long as it does

Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. 30

it peaceably and orderly, and keeps itself to the foundation and free from sacrilege" (*Conference*, § 24).

Jeremy Taylor: "We cannot deserve blame who return to our ancient and first health by preferring a new cure before an old sore" (*Dissuasive*, i., I, 11).

Bishop Hall: "The voice of God our Father in His Scriptures, and (out of them) the voice of the Church our mother in her Articles, is that which must both guide and settle our resolutions; whatsoever is besides these is but either private or unnecessary and uncertain. Let us hate to think ourselves either wiser than the Church, or better than our superiors. . . . If the Roman Church will not be healed by us, let us not be infected by her; let us be no less jealous of her contagion than she is of our remedies. Hold fast that precious truth which hath been long taught you by faithful pastors, confirmed by clear evidences of Scriptures, evinced by sound reasons, sealed up by the blood of our blessed martyrs" (*The Old Religion*).

The conclusion to be drawn, after the above examination is, that neither the mediæval *doctrines* which we are asked to admit as tenable or obligatory, namely, the Objective Presence of Christ in the elements after consecration; the doctrine of the Mass; the necessity of fasting before

• An Appeal from the Twentieth to the

Communion ; the necessity of Auricular Confession ; Invocation or worship of saints and angels ; Seven Sacraments ; the Primacy of the Pope over Christendom ; Denial of the rights of a National or particular Church ; nor the mediæval *practices* pressed upon us, namely, Adoration of the Sacrament ; Elevation ; Non-communicating Attendance ; Reservation ; Children's Eucharists ; High Celebration ; Excessively multiplied Eucharists ; Pictures and Images in Churches ; nor the mediæval *ceremonies* which are being introduced without sanction, namely, Vestments ; Eastward Position ; Incense ; Lights ; Ceremonial Mixture of Cup ; Wafer Bread, are justified by an appeal to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries ; with this only and partial exception, that wafer bread was allowed and used by some of the clergy in the reign of Queen Elizabeth ; but it was gradually superseded by wheaten bread, "such as usually is eaten," so that Archbishop Laud never communicated except in leavened bread.

It may be allowed that, while all practices prohibited by authority are as inadmissible now as when they were first prohibited, and will continue to be inadmissible until the prohibition is as authoritatively withdrawn, practices not so prohibited are not proved to be necessarily inadmissible in the

Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. 50

twentieth century merely on the ground that they did not exist in the sixteenth or seventeenth century; for it may be right to adopt ceremonies and practices, though not doctrines, unknown to previous centuries, to meet the needs of the century in which we live. What is thereby proved is that they are not in accordance with Anglican traditions and Anglican use; and this creates a presumption against them in the mind of a loyal Anglican Churchman, which will direct his conduct until that presumption has been removed by very solid arguments on the other side, and those arguments must show that the practices in question do not involve or rest upon any principle alien to the character of the Anglican Church.

In like manner the proof already offered that the ceremonies, practices and doctrines above named do not derive sanction from the Church of the first six centuries, proves that they are not in accordance with Primitive traditions and use, and therefore that they do not deserve the name of "Catholic," and cannot properly be defended on the plea that they are Catholic doctrines and usages. They must be regarded as neither Primitive nor Anglican, but Mediæval, unknown to the Primitive, rejected by the Anglican Church.

Three Books

BY THE

REV. CANON F. MEYRICK, M.A.,

*Rector of Blickling, Non-Residential Canon of Lincoln, late Fellow
and Tutor of Trinity College, Oxford.*

1. Scriptural and Catholic Truth and Worship, or, The Faith and Worship of the Primitive, the Mediæval, and the Reformed Anglican Churches. *Cr. 8vo, Cloth, price 5/-*

RECORD.—"This is a remarkable and most valuable book. . . . Whoever will read this book will obtain a sound knowledge of the history of the Church. This book should be in the hands of everyone who desires an accurate and a historical comprehension of the great controversy now at issue in our Church, and we wish it the widest circulation and the most careful study."

ROCK.—"Admirably done. The present work is most timely in supplying a want long felt for such an accurate and illuminative sketch of the history of the Church of Christ. Canon Meyrick's book is a real boon, and at once convincing and deserving of confidence and respect. It will doubtless run through many editions—the more the better for England and its Church."

MANCHESTER COURIER.—"The book is so full of facts that it will need serious study and should prove exceedingly useful."

2. Old Anglicanism and Modern Ritualism. *Cr. 8vo, Cloth, price 5/-*

SPECTATOR.—"Of great interest and value. We commend it to the attention of our readers."

TIMES.—"Useful and well designed."

MANCHESTER COURIER.—"Extremely valuable."

3. Sunday Observance. A Plea and an Argument for the Old Fashioned English Sunday. *Cr. 8vo, Cloth, price 3/6*

CHURCHMAN.—"It will well repay careful perusal. Our experience is that many people who are anxious to defend or promote the observance of Sunday do not know where to go for facts and arguments; they will find here what they want."

LONDON :

SKEFFINGTON & SON, 34, SOUTHAMPTON STREET, STRAND, W.C.

BX

Meyrick, F.

5132

An appeal from the
twentieth century ...

.M4

100092

BX

5132

.M4

