

THE PROTESTANTISM

OF THE

PRAYER BOOK.



Mary E. Huskisson

THE PROTESTANTISM
OF THE
PRAYER BOOK

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

"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.

TORONTO:
THE J. E. BRYANT COMPANY (LIMITED).

1890.

BX5145

H3

Entered, according to the Act of the Parliament of Canada,
by THE J. E. BRYANT COMPANY (LIMITED), in the
Office of the Minister of Agriculture.


A BOUT three years ago I began writing in my daily journal some notes on the more Protestant features of the Prayer Book.

The study was somewhat new to me, and the more I pursued it, the more was I surprised and delighted to find so many clear proofs of the anti-Romanism of our beloved liturgy.

It has thus come to pass that what was at first material for a newspaper article only, has been enlarged to the proportions of a volume.

Convinced that there are many who are as unaware as I once was of these more essentially Protestant features, my earnest desire is that they may experience the same gratification as myself in their discovery, and I now send forth this plain statement of the true facts with regard to the teaching of the Book of Common Prayer, with a prayer that it may be a blessing to every one who reads it.

I dedicate it to those Churchmen who, because they love Christ and His truth, are not ashamed of the grand old name of Protestant.



CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTORY.....	IX
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 CHARACTER- ISTICS.....	17
It is Common Prayer; it is in the language of the people; it is scriptural.	
CHAPTER III.—MORNING AND EVENING PRAYER AND LITANY.	29
The Protestant features of the Prayers and Rubrics; the noteworthy changes in the Litany.	
CHAPTER IV.—THE COMMUNION SERVICE.....	41
Not the Mass, nor the semi-Protestant service of 1549. The Sarum Mass; Pusey's Views.	
CHAPTER V.—THE BAPTISMAL OFFICE.....	55
Not Romish; not superstitious. The Roman doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration not taught in the Church of England.	
CHAPTER VI.—THE OCCASIONAL SERVICES.....	78
Significant changes in the direction of Protestantism in all these services.	
CHAPTER VII.—THE ABSOLUTION DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.....	94
Differences between it and the Roman doctrine.	
CHAPTER VIII.—AURICULAR CONFESSION.....	107
Not the doctrine of the Church of England: the teaching of the Roman Church.	
CHAPTER IX.—THE ORDINAL.....	121
The good rule of the Reformers. Vindication of the form "Receive the Holy Ghost."	
CHAPTER X.—RECAPITULATION AND CONCLUSION.....	135
Let loyal Churchmen have faith in God.	
APPENDIX.....	15

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 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 sense of protest against Romanism, or Popery, 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, but she 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; Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, and Hooper, 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 perils of idolatry, on repentance, and for Whit Sunday, 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, that 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 sterling declarations 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 forever incapable to inherit, possess, or enjoy the crown. In those days, it is almost needless to remark, 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. A modern author, 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 honor. The Church was Protestant through and through.

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, eastern 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 "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. 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

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

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; heresy, not union.

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 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 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 section of the English Church that I have endeavored to emphasize 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 and distortion 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 eucharistic adoration? 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 boldness 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. 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 the revival of a system of auricular confession, sacramental absolution, the sacrificial character of the Lord's Supper, and the denial of justification by faith; and 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 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 advo-

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

In this endeavor, 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. 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. 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, in the case of Cranmer, of the doctrines of the Real Presence, the sacrifice of the mass and purgatory, and the doctrinal significance of the careful changes they introduced in the Prayer Book.

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

* I have seen quotations made from the earlier writings of Cranmer and Ridley in proof of the doctrine of auricular confession, eq., 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 Wiltforce'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.

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 to-day 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 prejudice from those without, and the distortions of the Trentine party 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. 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. As the ages passed on, it became still more so. 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 favorite 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." As far as doctrine, practice, and worship was concerned, the religion of England was practical Popery.

And here let me, once and for all, emphasize a point of the utmost importance. I am not now speaking of political, but of doctrinal Popery. 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. As far as doctrine is concerned, it may be truly said, as Blunt, the historian of the Reformation, has put it, that "the Roman Catholic religion prevailed in England."* Through out the history of the pre-Reformation English Church, these two things are most remarkable:

On the one hand, that the Church of England, in matters of political and ecclesiastical jurisdiction, was ever and anon, from time to time, asserting 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

*It is surprising to see that even such a Churchman as Blunt should employ the word Roman *Catholic*, a term that is utterly misleading and 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 honorable name, but, as Bishop 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."

ritual not the Roman ritual, her doctrines not the Roman doctrines, and that therefore the pre-Reformation Church of England must be more and more referred to as a doctrinal and liturgical guide.

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."—*Ecc. 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, etc. Nor does Romish doctrine 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. 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 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

*If any of my readers imagine that I am stating this point too strongly, let them read the 15th chapter of 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.

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 evangelical sense, 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 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. 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. See, for instance, the latter part of Note 2, Chapter 5. 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 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 forever, and great was the fall of it. "Cecidit Babylon! cecidit Babylon! civitas illa magna! cecidit Babylon!"

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 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"—*Cran. Works, Park. Soc.*, I., 28, and II., 322.

Ridley: He too accounted and boldly declared the Pope to be Antichrist, the beast of Babylon, the who.e 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, etc., 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 fervor the falsities of Rome as the tokens of Antichrist. "Let the Papists go with their long faith. Be you contented 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*, 1-74.

Now, these men 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, nay, is it possible, that a book which was to be almost entirely the work of these men's hands would bear the taints of Popery? That from these fiercely, and, to the last degree, anti-Popish days, a work should come forth all marred with Popish error? Common sense at once would 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. The objection has no 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 wonderful. The new wine of the Reformation must not go into the old bottle of the Roman Church, nor must it go into the new bottle of the Reformed Church of England without preparation and caution. A messenger must prepare the way. 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.

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 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. 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. It is impossible, as a matter of fact, to overestimate the influence of the Prayer Book in establishing the Reformation, and stamping on the Church its Protestant character.

But it will perhaps be objected by others, the Prayer Book of these Reformers is not now the Prayer Book of the Church. The Second Prayer Book of Edward's reign, the Book of 1552, marked but a departed phase in the evolution of the liturgy, and is possessed of little interest to us to-day.

This objection, too, is futile, for substantially this Prayer Book is our own Book of Common Prayer.

If the good providence of God was marked in the beginnings of the Prayer Book, still more so is it discernible in its continuance. Since the days of Edward the Sixth many and crucial have been the crises through which the Church has passed. In those days of trial and crises, naturally the Prayer Book of the Church was the subject of alteration and revision. But though many changes have been made, with one or two exceptions those changes 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 authorizes 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 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 it is the practice of not a few of the members of an extreme school of the Church to minimize the value of this book, which was 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 foreigners, Alasco, Martyr, and Bucer, to the semi-reformed Prayer Book of the first year of Edward VI. The result is that multitudes of Churchmen 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, all those significant and intentional changes 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—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, etc., etc., may be searched for in vain in our present Prayer Book. 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.

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 apparent blemishes which are found in this as in every other human work.

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 unfolded. 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, 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 my 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 request 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, 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 authorized 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 accom-

plished 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," etc. "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," etc. 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 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," Is. lxi. 6. "Ye are a royal priesthood," I. Peter, ii. 9. "He hath made us to be priests unto God," Heb. 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 effu-

sions 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," etc.

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, etc., 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. XXVIII.* 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 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 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 Everlasting Father;" and, at the same time, his identity with his fellow-worshippers is emphasized 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," etc. 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 the 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 consequences 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."—*Epistle to Phil.*, p. 267. 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 clearly shows that the Church considers it a prayer. 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 in his "History of the Book of Common Prayer," pleads for an omission of the General Confession and the Absolution. The latter, which he calls the quasi-absolution (note the expression), 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 dangers of a mediating and sacrificing and absolving Romish priesthood, and in making the priest or minister the herald 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."

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, 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," etc. 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 to pronounce and declare. 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 sixth to the ninth 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, and 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 to the Prayer Book*, 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 reading, 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 favorite 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 can not 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.

As 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 desires and needs of a devotional spirit. Protestant and Anti-Romish, they are to the core. Whatever there was in any ancient collect, liturgy, or litany, that savored 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 monks and widows, all the holy monks and hermits. Kneeling upon their knees, the congregation would listen 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 established the Protestantism of England. 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.

"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 the Sixth 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 King's 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 the greater 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 savor 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 are largely used by Romanists. It is well, then, to remember that these services—communion, baptismal, and ordination—were composed, and 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

* See Note 1.

the scriptural dignity, and unobjectionable simplicity, of our 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, incensing the altar, changing of vestments, bowings and crossings most numerous, incensing the choir, and bowing to the host; blasphemous and abominable 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 incense 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 incensed himself, then he is to kiss the Book of the Gospels. Then the choir is to be incensed by the acolyte, and the priest is to wash his hands. Then he is to kiss the altar, then to cross himself. Then he is to offer the offertory, with frequent crossings, and 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 not 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 partly in English, and partly in Latin. Though differing, absolutely and radically, from the Mass, which had been abolished before it was published, it countenanced auricular confession; enjoined many superstitious practices and ceremonials; employed constantly the word "altar"; and, worst of all, taught 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, demolishing thereby the superstitious adoration of the host. "If it doth so chance, that the wine, hallowed and consecrate, doth not suffice to 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 elevation 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, which Rome so labored 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 substantially the same as 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 emphasized, 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 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, and 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 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.

Second. In the First Book of Edward, 1549, the vestments enjoined for use were a white alb, plain, with a vestment or cope, or albs with tunicles; vestments similar to those in use in the Roman Church. In the Second Book of Edward, 1552, and now, with the exception of Cathedrals and College churches, the vestment authorized for both priest and deacon is, "a surplice only." Another decided Protestant mark.*

Third. 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.

Fourth. In the First Prayer Book of Edward, the doctrine of the Real Presence (in the Romish sense) was countenanced, and the most objectionable expressions were employed. For instance, in the exhortation 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," etc., 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

* See Appendix.

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

Fifth. In the First Book of Edward, prayers were made for the dead: "We commend unto Thy mercy, O Lord, all other of 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 for the Church Militant*. In the revision, they were carefully omitted, and are not now to be found in the Prayer Book. Another decided Protestant mark.

Sixth. The prayer of oblation, as it is called, now substantially the prayer which follows the Lord's Prayer, after the administration of the elements, was then before the partaking of the elements, and, in fact, before the whole of the service, beginning, "Ye that do truly repent you of your sins," etc. 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 is "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.

* See Note 2.

For the holy eucharist was, from the very first institution, esteemed, and received as a proper sacrifice, and solemnly 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 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.

Seventh. 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. It stands ever as an irresistible protest against the doctrine of the corporal presence, and effectually demolishes the theory and practice of eucharistic adoration. "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 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, any one 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 color to the lingering elements of Romanism, have been firmly and intentionally expunged. Not only the above mentioned alterations and additions, but rubrics against the use of wafer bread, the reservation of the elements, and single communion, confirm this, and shew with what minuteness of care all the avenues to a possibly returning Romanism were entirely and forever 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. The central idea of the English service is communion. In the one, the worshippers gather before an altar to adore a priest-made deity. In the other, 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."

There is, in the communion service of the Church of England, a distinct repudiation, secondly, of the expression, and notion of, the 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 Cranmer why the Lord's board should rather be after the form of a table than of an altar, are worthy of all consideration, as an index of the character of the presiding genius in the reformation of the Church of England:—

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 shewed above, the term "altar" is used), it does 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 Cranmer's 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 do cease; wherefore, the form of the altar used in the law ought to cease withal.

Fifth reason. "Christ did institute the sacrament of his 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 the 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 of Cranmer's 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. 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 said 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."—*Canon eighty-two*. 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 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 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

* See Note 4.

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.”

CHAPTER V.

THE BAPTISMAL SERVICE.

NO portion of the Prayer Book has afforded more material for controversy 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 Churchmen 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 destroyed, the conviction will be established of the soundness of this service from a Protestant standpoint, and a line of argument constructed sufficient to dispel the allegation that the baptismal service is still tainted with Popery. I propose, therefore, in this chapter, to give a slight 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 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. 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 two prayers, the first for the enlightenment, and deliverance from Satan, of those to be baptized. Another ceremony follows, the blessing of the salt, a strange performance to the Protestant.

Putting some salt into a small vessel, he 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

* The quotations are taken from a publication of the Roman ritual by Piet of Baltimore.

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 would seem to many 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, notwithstanding 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 honor to the living God, give honor 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 practices 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 occurs another exorcism. 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^A 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 enhanced 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, "Ephpheta, 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, 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.” Then another, the change of stole. The violet-colored 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?” etc. Answer: “I do believe.” “Dost thou desire to be baptized?” “I do.”

At last the baptismal ceremony itself has arrived, and like everything else 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 innocence 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, I suppose, substantially was the form in use in the pre-Reformation English Church! But what a medley of vain performances. What a confusion of empty and heathenish superstitions. How little 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 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.

Protestant on the whole, as this First Prayer Book was, it was tainted by many unscriptural and dangerous features. There were still not a few elements of ritualism authorized, which were calculated to perpetuate and promote erroneous teaching ; and, in addition to these semi-Romish practices, many expressions which fostered unscriptural doctrine. It was 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 as they advanced in knowledge, they determined to root out everything that savored 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 these three particulars.

In the first place there is to be found in the First Book a form of exorcism similar to the one in the Roman use. The priest is directed to look upon the children and say: "I command thee, unclean spirit, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, that thou come out and depart from these infants. . . . Therefore, thou cursed spirit, remember thy judgment, remember thy sentence . . . and presume not hereafter to exercise any tyranny towards these infants whom Christ hath bought with His precious blood." In the Second Book, *which is substantially the service of the present day*, this remnant of Romish superstition is entirely omitted, and in the Prayer Book to-day it is not to be found.

Secondly. 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. In the Second Book this is left out, and it is omitted from the Prayer Book as we possess it.

Thirdly. In the First Book after the baptism the ceremony of putting on the child a white vesture, called the chrisome, was enjoined. Now, this Romish practice is wholly omitted. Each of these alterations is a distinct proof of the decided 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 purity. The very fact, moreover, 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 favor 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," etc. 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 words similar to those which are used by most ultra-Evangelicals to illustrate the baptismal blessing.

In a book lately written by the Rev. Andrew Murray, who is, I believe, a Presbyterian minister, author of "Abide in Christ," "With Christ," and other works, it is said: "Not

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

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." And throughout the whole 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 labors 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 the

Sixth. 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.

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 Boulton in his exposition of the Articles, 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 reasonable, opponents

of everything that savored 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:—

That the difference between the earlier formularies of the Reformed Church of England, and its formularies to-day, is so striking that the intention of the Reformers in discarding the Roman doctrine of baptismal regeneration is no longer a matter of doubt. 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, though 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, etc.; 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, etc.; 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 favor 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," etc. In the First Book 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 honored 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 regeneration in the highest sense, though possible, is in many cases 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, "in anywise," in any case, in a sense, relatively, that is, as far as covenant privilege and responsibility goes, 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 baptized of the Spirit because

* See Bungener's History of the Council of Trent, p. xxix.

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 been applied to Simon Magus on his baptism? Certainly they could have. 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. Thou art in the gall of bitterness,—repent—." 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 hypothetical 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

* 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 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.

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 no expressions, perhaps, in the Word of God are more difficult of correct explanation than the expressions of the Prayer Book with regard to baptism. See Rom. vi, Col. ii. 12, I. Peter iii. 21, Acts xxii. 16. 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 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 holy purpose, and separated from common uses. That there is nothing Romish or superstitious in this is evident to any one who considers 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 the Sixth, "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 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 kindness 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 favor. 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 savor 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, 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. Of minor importance comparatively, 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 savored 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. 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. As soon as children were baptized, immediately after or as soon as possible, always at any rate while they were infants or little ones, they were brought to the Bishop to be confirmed. The Bishop anointed the thumb of the infant, and crossing its head with oil, said in Latin: "I sign thee with the sign of the cross, and confirm thee with the chrism of salvation, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost." And this was the rite of confirmation!

According to the First Prayer Book of Edward the Sixth the rite of confirmation appears under a totally different form. It assumes a reasonable and scriptural position; is 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 infants being presented to the Bishop for anointing, a body of intelligent children 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," etc., was obliterated forever, 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 forever," etc. 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 to-day it remains 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; then after various 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 trifling blemishes, the sign of the cross being made in the benedictions, 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 by their intentional omission of the allusion to the angel Raphael in the prayer, the expunging of the term "altar," and the abolition of the sign of the cross in the benedictions. 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 Visitation of the Sick. In the service for the visitation of the sick, the three stages are equally perceptible. 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 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 infinite goodness, that thy soul inwardly may be anointed with the Holy Ghost, who is the spirit of all strength, comfort and gladness,'" etc. 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 signing with the cross are done away with, and absolution is protected by the significant safeguard, "if he humbly and heartily desire it." Although, as I shall

afterward show, there still remains in this service a sentence which is capable of mischievous misconstruction, on the whole it presents one of the strongest illustrations of the onward progress of the Reformation in the Church.

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 sacraments, the accompanying ceremonies, prostrations and genuflections, the holy water, and the confession of sins to the priest.

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 error: the direction to the priest to reserve so much of the sacrament as shall serve the sick person, and the permission to celebrate private 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 purposely to prevent the celebration of the Mass in the sick chamber, and 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 receiving the elements, and of celebrating private communion, was decidedly dangerous. While not necessarily Romish, it countenanced and tended to superstitious practices. In our present services both practices are 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 Romish 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, 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, etc., 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.

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. Requiems are 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. Requiems 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," etc. "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," etc. And so again: "O Lord, with whom do live the spirits of them that be dead, and with whom the souls, etc.

. . . 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," etc. 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 now 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," etc., 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 his 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 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 emphasizes, 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 strait 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 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 forever.

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 xviii. 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 labors."

"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," etc., 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 American Church, in the opinion of many, would 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 neighbors. 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, etc., 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 fervor. 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 enumerate. For instance, the discarding of the word "altar" and the substitution of the Lord's Table, or the Table, in its place; the absence of allusion to the various vestments prescribed for the priest in the early services; the entire sweeping away, in short, of all the trivial and vain rubrical directions of these vitiated liturgies. Small things 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.

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.

The 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 pronouncement 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 true repentance and hearty 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.* 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."

* See Note 1.

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 would 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." That Book, 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 the precisely 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 judg-

ment of the fully enlightened Reformers, expressed in their carefully finished work of 1552. It is, moreover, a form which was sanctioned by the sense of the Continental Reformers, inasmuch as it has been retained in the Protestant confessions of Augsburg, Bohemia, and Saxony, and was approved by John Calvin. This fact, which has been pointed out by Fausset in his work on the Prayer Book, is worthy of consideration.

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 ergo 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 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 for millions may never be 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. The Church of England never absolutely enjoins it, and only rarely permits it. That the Church of England, therefore, attaches no such importance to priestly absolution, and denies *in toto* the Roman doctrine, is proven 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."*

(3) It is only for the sick, and 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—

* See Note 2.

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, candor 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.

Wheatley 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 Wheatley 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 Wheatley'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, etc., 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 favor 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."

Wheatley's theory is reasonable, and is worthy of consideration. His last argument especially is very strong: "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 Wheatley'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 favor 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 favor, and quenches the Spirit within him. A venial sin is

* The book is published by G. T. Palmer, London, England.

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 the unscrupulous priest an opportunity to gratify a depraved imagination, by instituting an enquiry 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 author-

ized 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 may, 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 shall 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 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 two things are very noticeable. First—That while auricular confession is not to be enforced upon the members of the Church of England, it is to be freely allowed to those who desire it. Second—That the confession so permitted is undoubtedly what is now generally known as auricular confession, involving secrecy; confession and absolution on the part of an authorized priest. The words confession, absolution, auricular, had, in those days, very definite meanings; and they mean, on the whole, precisely what they mean in the Roman Catholic usage to-day.

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 is 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 admits the use of private 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 swept away 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 to be one of the parts of repentance, and the chiefest confession, confession of sin unto God, and confession to brother-man, 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 upon 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 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 neighbors that we are sinners, according to this saying, 'If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.' And when they that 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 sent by Christ 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 unto the ear of a 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 forever 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 Jesu Christ, who, being our sovereign Bishop, doth with the sacrifice of His body and blood, offered once forever 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 been law 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. Moreover, these are St. Augustine's words: 'What have I to do with men that they should hear my confession, as though

hey 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 of me by 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, though 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 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, not only for his own sins, but for the

sins of another; 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 Twenty-five, denies that penance (which includes auricular confession) is a sacrament; not only does not exact auricular confession as a necessary prerequisite 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, of 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 perfect contrition 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 (Arts. 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 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 last objection remains to be considered: the form employed by the bishop in the ordination of priests, beginning, "Receive the Holy Ghost." The various preliminary services having been accomplished, and the candidate presented, a solemn exhortation is delivered by the bishop, 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 difficulties 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 more 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 practise 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) are leaving it for newer and changing it for worse; we had rather follow the perfections of them we like not, than in defects resemble those whom we love."—*Ecc. Pol., Book V.*

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 known form of Christianity to them for many years was what was 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 fervor. 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 enquiries 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 in the contemplation of what is regarded as a blemish and plague-spot, many entirely overlook its beauties. That spot is the sentence in the mouth of the bishop, "Receive the Holy Ghost," and its objectionableness lies in the fact that it is similar, in some degree, to the Roman form.

But, as we have shown, its similarity to the Roman form is nothing whatever in itself. The Church of England uses the Lord's Prayer exactly as do the Romanists; yet we have obtained that prayer, not from Rome, but from the very words of Holy Scripture. The question is not whether it is like or not like the Roman form; for, being like, it might be true, and, being unlike, it might be false; but whether it is scriptural, and true, and reasonable, and right. Unscriptural and superstitious as Rome is, the basis of many of its doctrines is true. The head of Rome is sick, and the heart is faint; but from the sole of the foot unto the head it is not all wounds, bruises, and putrefying sores; corruption within, and corruption without, and not a vestige of soundness. Its pollution consists in the way in which it has overladen what is true with what is false, or transformed what is true in itself into falsehood, by virtue of dislocation and misapplication. It has much truth, and we must not deny it. If we say that it is fundamentally corrupt, we must mean that as a whole; and substantially it is corrupt, not that every part, sentence, act, doctrine, is verbally, literally, essentially, of the Evil One.

But even from the standpoint of similarity to Rome, the Protestant Churchman has small grounds for apprehension

and cavil. Though resemblances in detail may be discovered, yet, as a whole, the Ordination Service of the Church of England differs from the Roman in method, aim, and intent, fundamentally and entirely. Whatever the English Church Ordination Service may be, it certainly is not Popish. In the Roman Church, three forms are used for the ordination of priests, two of which are essential, the third non-essential. The chief personage in the Romish ritual is the sacrificing-priest; the chief service he performs, the sacrifice of the altar. Accordingly, in a Roman Catholic ordination the thing foisted into greatest prominence is this, that, in the act of ordination, the candidate is about to be constituted a sacrificing-priest, with power to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate masses for the living and the dead. This is the fact, beyond all things emphasized, that a man is about to be made a sacrificing-priest.

Two ceremonies, therefore, form the essential features in a Roman ordination:

First: The hands of the kneeling candidates having been placed in the form of a cross, they are anointed by the bishop (Pontifex) with oil. As he anoints them, he prays this prayer: "Vouchsafe, O Lord, to consecrate and sanctify these hands by this anointing and our benediction. Amen." Then, as he makes the sign of the cross over the hands of each ordained, he continues: "That whatsoever they shall bless may be blessed, and whatsoever they shall consecrate may be consecrated and sanctified; in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen."

Second: The bishop hands to each one in succession a chalice, in which water is mixed with wine, and a paten, with the sacred host, saying the words: "Accipe protestatem offerre sacrificum Deo, missasque celebrare, tam pro vivis, quam pro defunctis. In nomine Domini, Amen." "Receive power to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate

masses for the living and the dead. In the name of the Lord, Amen." This ends the part of the service that pertains to the form of ordination, and the candidates are now ordained.

There is, I understand, a third form employed, "Receive thou the Holy Ghost," but its use is not regarded as essential, and it is not found in the Roman Pontifical, from which I have made the above extracts.

Evidently, then, the act of ordination to the priesthood in the Roman Church is an act which has for its chief end and purpose the solemn constitution of a sacrificing-priest and priestly mediator between God and man. The hands are hallowed because they are to be the media for the performance of such mysterious acts, and the authority of the ministry is to be chiefly exercised in offering sacrifice to God, and celebrating masses for the living and the dead. Therefore, it is clear that the Reformers, having in mind the precise meaning and tendency of the Romish form, at once determined, boldly and peremptorily, to discard those elements of the service which were nothing more or less than corruptions of Popery. As they had abolished the sacrificing-priest, as altars and masses were no more, those parts of the Ordination Service which were inseparable from these things were not only unnecessary, but harmful. Accordingly, they were swept away. And the fact that the very rites which conferred the supreme and distinguishing sacerdotal functions, the rites which made a man a priest, in the Roman sense, were thus purposely abolished by the Reformers, speaks volumes for itself.

Having swept away the things themselves, altars, masses, and sacrifice, and the form that authorized them, they considered it unwise to proceed further, and in the belief that there was nothing in the form to "nourish superstition," that the words were the very words of Christ

for a similar purpose, and employed by Him at a similar time, they substituted the form, "Receive the Holy Ghost," etc.

To proceed now to the consideration of the expressions used. "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained." 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 has 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 venturesome 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 unto Me in heaven and in earth; go, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them,' etc. In sum, 'as My Father sent Me, so send I you.' Whereupon St. John doth add further 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 the 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 ye 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 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, then, that the same power is now given (viz., ministerial power and authority), why should not 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., LXXVII.*

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,' etc., 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." For my own part, I am convinced that 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 Latin version of the Ordinal, the word uniformly used is *presbyterus*. 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, the Visitation of the Sick, the Churching

of Women, and the Communion Services. The terms are employed so interchangeably as to bewilder anyone who would seek to explain their employment on any other ground than that of their practical convertibility. 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 the Prayer Book, as they compiled it, the terms are interchangeable, and presbyterus 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, etc., is to make Christ one's own, etc. "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 honor. 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 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 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, "just as St. Paul applied the name flesh to the substance of fishes, in nature a different thing, so the Fathers of the Church called the ministry of the Gospel priesthood in regard to that which the Gospel hath proportionable to ancient sacrifices, namely, the communion of the blessed body and blood of the Lord Jesus 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 of old age, or to imagine that every one so termed must needs be ancient."—*Hooker, Ecc. Pol. V., LXXVIII.*

Hooker's reasoning here is most remarkable. The force of a name is entirely dependent on the thing that it repre-

sents. 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 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, 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 both 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 comparatively, in my opinion, that the language was employed in the act authorizing the Second Book of Common Prayer, which 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 after the elements, allusions to angels, prayers for the dead, reservation of the elements, and extreme unction, either were enjoined or permitted. A careful

perusal of our Book of Common Prayer will show that the following omissions and alterations are among the most noteworthy links in the chain of contrast:

The word mass; it is omitted.

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

The mixing of wine and water; it is no longer allowed.

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

The invocation of the Holy Ghost on the elements in the Holy Communion; it is not mentioned.

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

The direction that the communicants should receive the sacrament in their mouths from the *priest's* hand; it is carefully left out.

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

The introits before the Collects, Epistles, and Gospels; they are no longer in the Prayer Book.

The sign of the cross in the Marriage Service; it is left out.

Prayers for the dead; they are swept entirely away.

The permission as to auricular confession; it is carefully omitted.

The reservation of the elements; it is completely discarded.

The service for the celebration of the holy communion when there is a burial of the dead; it is left out altogether.

The permission to use genuflections and to cross oneself; it is not 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 are the expressions and practices which might possibly be 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" and the Romish doctrines of confession before mass and priestly absolution; the reservation of the elements and the doctrine of eucharistic adoration; prayers for the dead and the implied doctrine of purgatory; extreme unction and communions at burials, implying the doctrine of 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 in 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," clamor for a return to that discarded liturgy, they are clamoring for that which would land us, not half way, but almost wholly into Popery. For, *then*, these expressions and practices were the lingering remains of a past 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 in 1549 without significance 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 unquestionably owed something of 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. Many of the non-jurors made use of the First Prayer Book

of Edward, but in 1717 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; the 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 emphasize is this, that the expressions, and rubrics, and practices, now to be found in and 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 to 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 uniformly towards simplicity and Protestant purity. If Churchmen would know what they have now, let them more clearly understand what they had once. 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 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 *bona fide* doctrines of the Anglican Church were, in those days, taken to indicate a *bona 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 claimed himself to be of the school of Andrews, 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 *bona fide* Romanizing tendencies: "By *bona 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," etc.—*Life of Bishop Wilberforce*, p. 195. Here we have four distinct marks or notes of the Romanizing system. 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 essen-

tially Anglo-Catholic, and the men who hold them are strong in the Church. The only dogmas the holding of which would vindicate 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.” They would employ the word “sacrifice.” They would doubtless expunge the post-Communion rubric. They would probably exchange the long-disused and doubtfully legal Ornaments’ rubric for a law binding all the clergy. 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 defence 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 honor 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 emphasize 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 faithfully 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 Protestant 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." Alas! it 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? Strong 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 is not, and 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 the inspiration of madness, 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, notwithstanding 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?

In the face of all these things, what can we be but hopeful? 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, above all, a Prayer

Book upon which, thank God, we can stand as a rock; for as long as the Prayer Book remains unchanged, the Church of England cannot be Romanized. Therefore, let loyal Churchmen stand fast in the Lord. Let them not lose heart. Let them pray, without ceasing, for God's blessing on our Church. Dear Church! How beautiful she is, and lovable! We know that in struggling for her, and pleading for her, we are contending earnestly for the faith once for all delivered to the saints. We believe that it cannot be God's will that she should be defiled by the caresses of Rome. We know that the battle is not ours, but God's. In heart and soul, we are convinced that the desperate conflict now raging in the Church against ritualism and Romanization, on the one hand, and latitudinarianism and incipient agnosticism, on the other, is not the battle of Low Churchmen, or of High Churchmen, or of any set of Churchmen merely; it is God's own battle for His truth and Church. He is Light, not darkness. He is Truth, not error. He is Purity, not defilement. Therefore we are confident. Therefore we have faith. Therefore we are persuaded that so far and no farther will the proud waves come; and when God wills it, then they will be stayed. The predicted day has come, when the battle of the Reformation is being fought over again; but if God be for us, who can be against us?

Is it possible that the lamp lit by Ridley and Latimer is in danger of being extinguished through the timidity of Protestant Churchmen? God forbid!

Stand fast, therefore, brother Churchmen, in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage.

FINIS.



APPENDIX.

NOTES ON CHAPTER IV.

I.—CANON OF THE MASS.

The Canon of the Mass, according to the use of Sarum. The following is a translation of the chief part of the service, by John T. Dodd, B. A., of Oxford.

The whole service was in Latin. The genuflections, prostrations, incensings, 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 sub-deacon in their chasubles, the incense-bearers, and carriers of candles. With much ceremonial, the chalice and paten are placed on the altar, which is incensed 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 honoring 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, Cletys, Clement, Sixtus, Cornelius, Cyprian, Lawrence, Grisogonus, John and Paul, Cosmos 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 remembered in the flock of thine elect; through Christ our Lord. Amen.

Here let him look at the host again, saying:

Which relation 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 honor 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; thus saying, for ever and ever.

Being 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, etc. . . . 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 paction), 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 the deacon and the sub-deacon approach the priest, and they say, privately:

O Lamb of God, etc. . . . grant us Thy peace.

Here, having made the sign of the cross, let him place the aforesaid 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 is 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 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-steps, 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 the paten, that, if anything remains therein, it may drop; 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 reformed Church of England. There are, indeed, a few analogous expressions and prayers; but the point that I would emphasize 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.—DR. PUSEY ON THE "REAL PRESENCE."

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 the 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 means," etc.

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 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 (he reasons, *e.g.*, all through upon the assumption that the words in the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel refer *only* to the sacrament, a position which is not proved, and cannot be*), says that the teaching of the Church of England is that the wicked eat the body of Christ, pp. 240-311, compare especially p. 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 means 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.

Fourth: Pusey says, that the doctrine of the Real Presence is the doctrine of the English Church.

But the most emphatic contradiction almost to this statement is the fact that we have noted on p. 123, 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 the corporal presence. In fact, more than two years before the Prayer Book was revised and compiled in its present shape, Archbishop Cranmer repudiated in these very words the doctrine of the Real

* See Note 3.

Presence as the doctrine of the Church of England. He is confuting Dr. Smith, the Papist controversialist: "He, Smith, no more understood P. Martyr's opinions than he understood my book of the catechism, and therefore reporteth untruly of me, that I did in that book 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 laek of good instruction from my youth, the outrageous floods of papistical errors at that time overflowing the world. For the which, and other of mine offences in youth, I do daily pray 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 frailty 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., 374.*

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 in 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 no one is fit to receive natural food, whereby the natural life is nourished, except he is born and live before; so no man can feed (by the receipt of the holy sacrament) upon 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.*

3.—OPINION OF ARCHBISHOP CRANMER.

As this statement is of great importance, I would like to quote the view of the master-mind of the English Church Reformation on this point. 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 at either Master Smith’s dulness or maliciousness, that cannot or will not see that Christ, in this chapter of St. John, spake *not of sacramental*, 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 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., l., 372.*

Now, the correctness or the incorrectness of the 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 declares distinctly, as his view, that Christ here spake not of sacramental bread.

4.—CRANMER AND RIDLEY AS AGAINST NEWMAN AND PUSEY.

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 for the quick, etc. (an offering

though commemorative, 2nd Ed.) But if Newman and Pusey think that the sacrifice of the *mass* is to be received, while the sacrifice of masses is to be condemned, Ridley and Cranmer (the true exponents of Church teaching) did not :

“Now, alas, not only is the Lord’s commandment broken, but there is set up a new blasphemous kind of sacrifice, to satisfy and pay the price of sins,” etc., . . . “the mass,” (not merely masses).—*Ridley’s Works*, p. 52.

“Prop. 3. In the mass is the lively sacrifice of the Church available,” etc. 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 this, “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.”

5.—THE EASTWARD POSITION.

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 left hand 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 doctrine of sacrificing priesthood and eucharistic worship, there can be no doubt that she must enjoin the Eastward position, for it is inseparable from such theory and doctrine. 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 enquiry 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, in 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."

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 com-

manded 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. Rightly, there can be no other position, according to the teaching of the Prayer Book, 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, in many cases, 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 nineteenth century fabrication. The word "side," at the Reformation, 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 bring them against the wall, in the position 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 side," "north end," or "north part," to simply employ one term which would specifically designate the position required, and yet, at the same time, 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 question was 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." Not two words, the north side; but one word, the hyphenated 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 seems to warrant the assumption of another position, during this prayer at least, I will just quote the judgment of one whom "High" Churchmen certainly must regard as an authority—Wheatley, 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 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, they always stand *before* the altar during the consecration, in order to prevent the people from being eye-witnesses of 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 and take the cup into his hands, *before the people*."

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-side 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.

NOTES ON CHAPTER VII.

I.—THE ABSOLUTION.

The onward progress of the Reformation is peculiarly marked in the difference between the absolution in the Order of the Communion of 1548 and that in the Prayer Book of 1549. This obsolete Order of the Communion is a most interesting formulary, inasmuch as it was the pioneer in the great work of liturgical reformation. It was the first authoritative service ever issued in English, though much of it was still in Latin, a step in itself of unique importance. It was the first effective step to the demolition of the mass, inasmuch as it provided for the administration of the communion in two kinds, and forbade the elevation of the elements: "The priest may go again to the altar, and reverently and devoutly prepare and consecrate another . . . without any elevation or lifting up." The absolution in the Order of the Communion is as follows: "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 sins; confirm and strengthen you in all goodness; and bring you to everlasting life." It was not without purpose that the Reformers substituted for this form those beautiful words of consolation which have ever since been the authoritative form of absolution in the Communion Service. In the services which are daily and weekly used in the Church of England, the form of absolution is entirely unobjectionable. The only form to which even possible objection may be taken is one which may never be used by any, and by thousands is never used at all. The objectionable form is one which, if used ever, is used privately, and in the house. The only forms to which the ears of the people are accustomed in the public services of the Church are pure, simple, scriptural, evangelical.

2.—AUTHORITY OF THE CANONS OF 1603-4.

The authority of the Canons of 1603-1604 rests upon a double foundation. In the first place, they were passed by both Houses of Convocation; and in the next place, though never passed by Parliament, they received the assent of the sovereign, as head of the Church. Their authority, therefore, is sufficient to justify the clergyman in making use in this service of any other form at his discretion.

NOTES ON CHAPTER VIII.

I.—BISHOP WILBERFORCE 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 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 dealing, 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 Communions.

“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 Communions. 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, as 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.”—*Wilberforce’s Ordination Addresses*, pp. 112-115.

2.—DR. PUSEY ON PRIVATE CONFESSION.

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 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 the 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 are 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 Hevlin, as if their views could be quoted as 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 acknowledges 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 the 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 are all remembered and confessed, it is 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 minister and get comfort from him, with the Word of God, "I would to God it were kept in England, for it is a good thing."—*Park. Soc., Latimer's Remains, II., 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, 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 right before God."—*Pusey: Advice on Hearing Confessions, p. 25.*