



LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS

John Wordsworth
Aug 1898

Considerations on Public Worship and
on the Ministry of Penitence.



A LETTER

ADDRESSED

To the Clergy of the Diocese of Salisbury

BY

JOHN WORDSWORTH, D.D.,

Bishop of Salisbury,

TOGETHER WITH

A PASTORAL LETTER

TO THE

Laity of the Diocese.

ISSUED AFTER CONSULTATION WITH THE GREATER CHAPTER.

Second Thousand.

BROWN AND CO.

SALISBURY

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON

NEW YORK AND BOMBAY

1898.

In this second thousand a few misprints have been corrected and slight amendments made, and the statements as to Confession in the Roman Church in the *Pastoral* have been brought into more exact conformity with those in the *Considerations*, by adding the words "at least once a year" on p. 77 l. 2 from bottom; and substituting the words "though this order is largely infringed in practice" for "with certain exceptions in favour of certain privileged orders" on p. 78 l. 13.

J. S.

1 August, 1898.

CONTENTS OF THE LETTER.

	PAGE.
I. This Letter issued after consultation with the Chapter	5
II. Nature of the present Disquiet.—Origin of this Letter	6
III. A Bishop's Responsibility in regard to Public Worship	7
IV. Rules laid down on the use of Services	9
V. The Bishop's Authority a common Benefit	10
VI. A Bishop not likely to be too precise or arbitrary ...	11
VII. Principles of Public Worship. It must be distinctly <i>Christian</i>	12
VIII. Christian Worship essentially the Worship of the Blessed Trinity	13
IX. Of Prayer to our Lord Jesus Christ	14
X. Reasons for caution respecting the Worship of our Lord in the Sacrament	16
XI. What kind of Worship is proper to the time of Con- secration	18
XII. The points of Christ's manward attitude are the proper occasions for the special adoration of His Person ...	19
XIII. Evidence on special adoration at Communion time ...	21
XIV. Cautions as to pressing this practice into undue prominence	25
XV. In any case there must be the proper number of Com- municants to receive with the Priest	27
XVI. Reservation of the Sacrament for Worship not per- missible	28
XVII. Considerations on proposed Reservation for the Sick	29
XVIII. Recognition of God's Providence in the Loss of certain sacred things	30
XIX. Adoration of the Cross interferes with the proper use of Symbols	31
XX. A kind of Divine Worship paid by Romanists to the Cross. Confusion introduced by subtle Distinctions	32
XXI. Public Worship as <i>conformable to Holy Scripture</i> ...	33
XXII. Worship of the Saints tried by this Test. Official Prayers addressed to the Blessed Virgin Mary and the Saints	34

	PAGE.
XXIII. Further Devotions to the Blessed Virgin Mary permitted in the Roman Church	36
XXIV. Evidence of Scripture on this point. Our relation to Angels and Saints	37
XXV. All Christians are waiting for Judgment	38
XXVI. Impossibility of relative place being taken before the End	39
XXVII. Other Considerations. Uncertainty of the Evidence	40
XXVIII. Why Public Worship of the Saints is disallowed ...	41
XXIX. Why Private Worship of the Saints is disallowed ...	42
XXX. Public Worship must be <i>Worship of the Church of England</i>	43
XXXI. Application of the Principle	46
XXXII. On the <i>Ministry of Penitence</i> , especially in private	48
XXXIII. Evidence of Scripture on the subject	49
XXXIV. Sketch of ancient penitential Discipline. Gradual change to privacy	51
XXXV. The Lateran Canon and our own Discipline	55
XXXVI. What our practice ought to be	58
XXXVII. The outward sign of imposition of hands	58
XXXVIII. The form of words, first precatory, then indicative	59
XXXIX. Cautions as to the conduct of the Minister	62
XL. On <i>public prayer touching the faithful departed</i>	68
XLI. Concluding exhortation	69
APPENDIX. Counsels on some points of order and ritual where caution or explanation is necessary, viz. (1) Use of the <i>Te deum</i> ; (2) Publication of Banns; (3) Licenses after Divorec; (4) Special forms for Burial; (5) Preparation of the elements, especially of the chalice; (6) Attitude at the Epistle; (7) Responses at the Gospel; (8) "Drawing near"; (9) Attitude of the priest in communion; (10) Delivery of the chalice; (11) "Gloria in Excelsis"; (12) Reverent consumption of what remains after communion	70
PASTORAL LETTER ADDRESSED TO THE LAITY	73

CONSIDERATIONS ON PUBLIC WORSHIP AND THE MINISTRY OF PENITENCE.

To the Clergy of the Diocese of Salisbury.

I.—THIS LETTER ISSUED AFTER CONSULTATION WITH THE CHAPTER.

Brethren beloved in the Lord, it seems right that I should use the opportunity which the annual meeting of our Pentecostal Chapter has given me, to take counsel with my constitutional advisers, the Dean and Canons of our Cathedral Church, and, after so doing, to address the whole Diocese, on a subject which causes some disquiet around us. It was in this way, as you will remember, that I first addressed the Diocese some twelve and a half years ago; and I have always thankfully regarded that action as one which had the blessing of Almighty God. May He grant that the words which you now receive from me*, and those which you will communicate to our brethren who are in your spiritual charge, which are issued to you after such common counsel in Chapter, may have an equal blessing from God; and may He by the grace of His holy Spirit assist us all in the discharge of our common duty to worship Him in Spirit and in Truth!

While, however, I have followed generally the precedent just referred to, I have thought it well to separate what I have to say into two portions. To yourselves, my reverend brethren of the Clergy, I have in the first instance addressed the fuller "Considerations" on which the Pastoral Letter to the Laity is based. You are representatives with myself of

* This letter, in different stages of its composition, has been twice before the members of the Chapter (on Thursday 2 June and Friday 1 July), when advice was freely given thereon. But the Bishop alone is finally responsible for it.

the teaching office of the Church, and it is right that you should know, in some detail, the principles, and the evidence, and the grounds of reason and argument, by which the counsels which I have given are supported. I desire that you will be good enough to communicate my Pastoral Letter, attached to these "Considerations," to the Christian people of your own cures in whatever manner you think most expedient, either by reading it from the pulpit or by publishing it in some other way; and that, in so doing, you will give them what further insight you may think desirable into the matter contained in these "Considerations." I feel sure that I may, in every single case, rely upon your loyalty neither to add to or diminish from the weight of what has been here set down, but to let it speak for itself as a message from one who has by God's providence a very responsible duty to discharge.

II.—NATURE OF THE PRESENT DISQUIET.—ORIGIN OF THIS LETTER.

There is undoubtedly at the present time some serious disquiet as to innovations in the forms and accessories of public worship in the Church of England, especially in certain churches and in certain dioceses. There is further some rather indefinite searching of heart as regards the procedure of a few of our own clergy. This disquiet is not due to the action of the clergy alone, or to the conduct of persons all belonging to one section of the Church. A good many persons, both clergy and laity, have taken advantage of the profound objection which has been felt to ritual prosecutions on one side, and of the general sense that some greater liberty of public worship was needed on the other, to incline to a sort of Congregationalism. There has been a tendency to encourage local uses and customs, and to try experiments, in the hope that out of these varying forms might grow a greater spontaneity and force of religious life.

At the same time it has recently been felt that some of these experiments were straining the links of unity too severely. They seemed to embody more serious differences

in faith and principle than were compatible with united loyalty to the doctrine and discipline of the Church as received by this Church of England.

There has, therefore, been a general disposition, on the part of those who are troubled by liturgical and ritual disputes, to turn, as it is right they should do, towards the Bishops of the Church. Men desire to know that they are really giving serious attention to the subjects which are being debated. They wish also to be informed on what principles and in what manner the Bishops will think it right to act. Many, perhaps most, of those whose conduct has given rise to alarm, are anxious to be guided; and the clergy, especially, are mindful of their ordination vows and of the oaths and promises made by them to their Bishops, and desire that definite advice and, if necessary, command should be given them which they may in conscience follow.

Before expressing any judgment of my own as Bishop, either by way of warning or counsel, I think it right to explain that the impulse to write this letter comes to me from within, not from without. It expresses my conviction that, in the position in which God has placed me, I ought not to be silent under the circumstances just referred to, even though no complaints have reached me, as regards the conduct of public worship in this Diocese, either as to omissions from or additions to ordinary usage, which seem to require formal notice.

III.—A BISHOP'S RESPONSIBILITY AS REGARDS PUBLIC WORSHIP.

The office of a Bishop involves indeed a very solemn responsibility in respect to the regulation of public worship. Ever since the days when the Episcopate first generally emerged into prominence on the death of the Apostles, it has been viewed as a centre of unity, especially as regards the Sacraments and the tradition of doctrine. The first thought in particular is expressed in the teaching of S. Ignatius (circa A.D. 110), for instance in the phrases "one altar, one Bishop," "Let nothing be done without the Bishop." The second appears in the teaching of S. Irenæus (circa

A.D. 170), who ascribes to the Episcopate the "charisma veritatis" or spiritual gift of truth (*IIaer.* iv. 26, 2). Further the Bishop is, according to all Church order, the one immediate Pastor of the souls of all the faithful within his Diocese and jurisdiction. Nothing can be done officially in any Parish for which he is not directly or indirectly responsible. The doctrine of the Vatican Council of 1870 that the Pope has immediate Episcopal jurisdiction in every Diocese, and has therefore a right to communicate his pastoral counsels and decrees to the pastors and flocks of the whole Church, is not less subversive of the fundamental order and constitution of the Church, than his assumption of personal infallibility in faith and morals is dangerous to the truth of her doctrine. (See the Constitution *Pastor aeternus* cap. III. in *Décrets et Canons du Concile du Vatican* p. 146 foll. Paris 1871). Nor has any Metropolitan ordinary jurisdiction in the Diocese of any of his suffragans, or the right to address pastoral letters or to issue injunctions to the clergy and people of such a Diocese. Diocesan Bishops have, indeed, been relieved from a great burden of responsibility by the prescription of "one use" for the whole Church in the *Book of Common Prayer and of the Administration of the Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the Church of England*. But, outside formal prescriptions, their old "jus liturgicum" still remains, in the form unanimously set forth by the Bishops assembled at the Lambeth Conference of 1897. They have the "exclusive right" of putting forth or sanctioning additional services for use within their jurisdiction, and of adapting existing services to local circumstances, and also of directing or sanctioning additional prayers "subject to such limitations as may be imposed by provincial or other lawful authority, and provided that any such adaptation shall not affect the doctrinal teaching or value of the service or passage thus adapted" (*Lambeth Conference, Resolutions* 45, 46, S.P.C.K. 1897).

Further, a Bishop has rights and duties specially confided to him by the laws or customs of our own Church, in addition

to the general obedience guaranteed by the promises made in the ordination service and the oath of canonical obedience taken after it. He has, firstly, the delicate duty which is assigned to him in the Preface to the Prayer-Book, in the section *Concerning the Service of the Church*, to be the interpreter of any questions as to "the manner how to understand, do and execute the things contained" in that Book.

Secondly, he is, in the first instance, the "lawful authority" referred to in the solemn declaration made by all clergy to be licensed to the cure of souls or admitted to Benefices, who promise that "in public prayer and the administration of the Sacraments they will use the form in the said book prescribed and none other *except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority.*" Thirdly, he has the discretion to stay proceedings under the *Public Worship Regulation Act* of 1874, which is reserved to him under Section 9 of that Act.

It cannot therefore be denied that a Bishop still has a very serious burden to bear in these respects, especially in his own Diocese. I have taken pains to intimate this to all clergy admitted to cure of souls by the constant use, in giving them license or institution, of the old formula "Accipe curam meam ac tuam," "Receive my (spiritual) charge which is also thine."* It might be well for me to be more explicit and emphatic on this point, and particularly to explain the meaning of the phrase "lawful authority" in the solemn declaration, by addressing those newly ordained on the subject, or mentioning it to those who come from the outside into the Diocese.

IV.—RULE LAID DOWN ON THE USE OF SERVICES.

I must therefore lay down this general rule that no form of service may be used in public worship or open prayer in Church, or in any licensed building, other than those of the Book of Common Prayer, except it be directed, issued, sanctioned or allowed by myself; and that no adaptation of the services of that Book (except as provided in the *Schedule* to the *Act of Uniformity Amendment Act* of 1872) or prayers additional to

* Perhaps it should be rather "tuam et meam;" Gibson p. 807 n.

such services, may be used without the same sanction. I use the word *Schedule* with emphasis, because the "special" and "additional" services referred to in Sections 3 and 4 of that Act must both be "approved by the ordinary."

This is the general rule. It obviously is not intended to prohibit services authorised by my predecessors, either of their own motion or as being sanctioned by the Upper House of Convocation, at any rate when they have not specifically been withdrawn by me, or superseded by some other form. Nor is it intended to press hardly on clergy who have, perhaps for many years, used certain offices for guilds or parochial societies in Church, apart from public prayer. Nevertheless I think that such offices should be gradually all submitted to the same rule as others, although they need not necessarily be all of the same form everywhere.

With these reservations I desire to promulgate this rule and to bring it to the notice of all concerned. Any wilful and intentional infraction of it would be liable to be treated as a breach of the oath of canonical obedience.

In judging what should or should not be sanctioned I shall naturally consult some such Committee as that which the Chapter has recently appointed to deal with the Report on *Tables of Additional Psalms and Lessons* which has been drawn up in pursuance to a resolution of the Synod of Clergy held in November, 1897.

V.—THE BISHOP'S AUTHORITY A COMMON BENEFIT.

In addition to the special duties of a Bishop towards his Diocese, his position as a member of the Upper House of the Convocation of the Province, and of such bodies as the Lambeth Conference, gives him duties to the whole Province and to the whole Communion. He may also sometimes have to be the interpreter of that Communion to members of other religious bodies, as it has from time to time fallen to my own lot to be on the Continent of Europe and in the Levant. Unless he acts with authority inside his Diocese he can hardly advise with authority outside it.

A Bishop may therefore well ask those of the clergy and

people, who may be in favour of introducing or maintaining changes in the ritual or practice of public worship (whether it be by omission or addition, and whether in a puritan or a medieval direction, especially when those changes may be considered expressive of doctrine) to remember their duty to his office and their interest in maintaining its authority. It is important to the Church at large as a centre of unity. Everything that undermines this authority, or makes its even application difficult (and this is surely a very serious consideration), is injurious to the whole body. A Bishop need not plead for charity or consideration to be shown to himself (though such gentle thoughtfulness is in most cases abundantly visible), but he must ask loyal and reasonable men not to endanger the stability of the spiritual building under the shadow of which the congregation of Christ's Church comes together to meet their Lord.

VI.—A BISHOP NOT LIKELY TO BE TOO PRECISE OR
ARBITRARY.

A Bishop on the other hand, finding by experience the value of different types of character and opinion in a manner that probably no other one man is able to do, and considering the variety of circumstances and tempers of the people, the difference between town and country and between sparse and thickset populations and the like, and being conscious of the value of local traditions connected with the ministry and influence of godly men, and many other like points—will undoubtedly be careful not to act too precisely or arbitrarily. Any such action on his part would be resented by presbyters of all parties, and by the great mass of the laity, on whose respect and goodwill he depends for the working of the whole large system of Church Societies and Meetings for counsel, which are now happily practically essential to the existence of the Church as a body corporate. The days of autocratic Bishops are, I believe, passed. The position of an English Bishop is probably stronger in some respects than that of any other Bishop in any other country, but it depends, much more than it used to do, upon his reasonable action and

fulfilment of reasonable expectations. On all these grounds, then, I think you may trust your Bishops not to be unduly vexed about smaller matters nor to fall into the mistake of unduly vexing others. They must bear, and bear willingly, a certain considerable variety in the action of those to whom they have delegated a share in the ministry of the word and sacraments as well as of the cure and government of the souls of the people. They will be also anxious to act together with other Bishops of the Province and Communion. Personally I rejoice to reflect that I have not only the Synod of Clergy to look to in case of need, but meetings of the Greater Chapter of this Cathedral, twice a year, with whom I can take counsel on matters of theory and principle, as well as with the Archdeacons and Rural Deans who are my executive council for the administration of the Diocese. I rejoice too to think that there are men in the Diocese to whose judgment and knowledge any Bishop might be thankful to have the right to refer in regard to what is right or wrong in questions of public worship.

VII.—PRINCIPLES OF PUBLIC WORSHIP. IT MUST BE
DISTINCTLY CHRISTIAN.

So much by way of preliminary considerations. Let us now pass to principles of public worship and to illustrations drawn from present circumstances.

We are bound to act in this matter on principles, the first being that our ritual is the expression of the faith and life of Christianity. “*Lex supplicandi legem statuit credendi*” is a maxim which has been always acknowledged since it was uttered, and indeed was felt long before it was formulated.* It means, for us, that the expression of the Church’s belief

* The phrase appears to be taken, as Bp. Kingdon of Fredericton pointed out to me in 1888, from the Appendix to the letter of Pope Celestine to the Bishops of Provence, A.D. 431 (in Constant *Epist. Pont. Rom.* p. 1193, or Migne *P. L.* 50, p. 535 = ep. 21 § 12). The prayers (like those now used on Good Friday) are referred to as proving the belief of the Church on the question of grace, “*Ut legem credendi lex statuat supplicandi.*” See also my note in *Holy Communion* ed. 2 p. 93.

must be sought for in the Prayer-Book as well as in Creeds and other documents describing or limiting our doctrine.

We are joint guardians then of a *Christian ritual*. This sacred name reminds us of our duty both negatively and positively. Negatively it cuts off anything that is distinctly Pagan, or anything that is Jewish in the lower sense of abolished ceremonial. It cuts off anything inconsistent with the highest thought of the character of God, anything that militates against the highest ideal of human service. Almost all Christian thinkers see that bloody sacrifices or mutilations of the person are intolerable in the Church. But it requires some firmness of grasp to resist what is merely artificial, or ascetic for the sake of asceticism, or injurious to the full brightness and strength of the mind, heart and soul of man, and above all anything derogatory to the character of God.

This I trust you are all fully prepared to assist me in doing. You will discourage vain repetitions of prayers, use of charms, belief in indulgences, ascription of power to local shrines, images and relics, mechanical forms of penance and adoration and the like. These must not only be kept in check in our missions to the heathen, but in our own usages at home. The human heart is not weaned from superstition all at once, and it must carefully be guarded against slipping back into a second childhood.

VIII.—CHRISTIAN WORSHIP ESSENTIALLY THE WORSHIP OF THE BLESSED TRINITY.

Even more important than the negative sense of the word is its positive import. Worship to us is, above all things else, worship of the Blessed Trinity in Unity. If we wished to define Christian worship we should say it is the humble but joyous and confident approach of the Body of Christ, endued both in the whole and in part with the Holy Spirit, and led on by its unseen High Priest and Head, to the throne of God the Father.* This great name, "The Father," by itself implies the two other persons who with Him compose the ineffable Unity of the Godhead. Hence it is used by itself

* Cp. S. Basil *de Spiritu Sancto* vii. § 16.

to define the object of prayer. Thus our Lord in the sermon on the Mount teaches us "Thou when thou prayest . . . pray to thy Father which is in secret" (S. Matt. vi. 6), and in this sense He gives us His own prayer that follows. Similar to this are His precepts on prayer in other places of the Gospel, as in His discourse with the woman of Samaria (S. John iv. 21—24), and the many places where He touches on or uses the thought of prayer to the Father in His name (*ib.* xiv. 13, xv. 16, xvi. 23, and chap. xvii generally). Hence by far the largest proportion of ancient collects are addressed simply to God, through Jesus Christ our Lord (Cp. Origen *De Oratione* cap. 15). Hence also two important African Councils* went so far as to say that "in the service at the altar prayer should *always* be directed to the Father." So cautious were the first ages of the Church in regard to anything that might lead to a suspicion of polytheism or the worship of many Gods.

IX.—OF PRAYER TO OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST.

Nevertheless it is undoubtedly the Catholic doctrine that prayer may also be addressed to our Lord Jesus Christ.† This we gather from His own words at the feast when He healed the impotent man, implying that He is to receive the same worship that we give to God the Father, "who hath committed all judgment unto the Son, that all men should honour the Son even as they honour the Father" (S. John v. 22, 23). This He directly encourages, according to what I believe to be the true text, in one of His discourses after the Last Supper. For after declaring "Whatsoever ye shall ask in my name that will I do, that the Father may be glorified

* Hippo, A.D. 393, canon 21, and Carthage III., A.D. 397, canon 23. S. Augustine was present probably at both, certainly at the first, when as presbyter he delivered his discourse *de fide et symbolo* at the request of the assembled Bishops, which he afterwards embodied in his treatise known by that title (*Retract* i. 17).

† See Origen *contra Celsum* viii. 12, and Fulgentius Ruspensis *ad Monimum* ii. 5, the latter on sacrifice as offered to the Son in the Unity of the Trinity. Cp. also Bp. Pearson *on the Creed*, art. 2, "His only Son," side page 143. The texts quoted are not quoted, I think, either by Origen or Fulgentius, and the second is not quoted by Bp. Pearson. Fulgentius relies on Old Testament authorities.

in the Son," He proceeds, "If ye shall ask me anything in my name I will do it" (*ib.* xiv. 13, 14, R.V.). So again we have evidence of worship addressed to Christ in the Apocalypse. The Evangelist, in a vision, heard every created thing saying "Unto him that sitteth on the throne, and unto the Lamb, be the blessing and the honour and the glory and the dominion for ever and ever" (Rev. v. 13, R.V.). Simpler but equally striking acts of worship were those of S. Thomas, "My Lord and my God," which our Saviour clearly accepted as right, and of S. Stephen, in his dying prayer.

But the condition of prayer which our Lord lays down, "in my name," is evidently of extreme importance. If we ask what that name is, in so many words, we shall find an answer in the context. Our Lord, in His High-priestly prayer, teaches us in the solemn sentence "And this is life eternal that they may know Thee the only true God and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent" (S. John xvii. 3).^{*} The meaning of the name is not of course confined to the syllables "Jesus Christ;" but the use of His "name" implies a recollection of the unity of the Divine and Human Natures in the one Person. It is on this account that all ancient collects addressed to our Saviour have some concluding Trinitarian formula, such as "Who livest and reignest with the Father and the Holy Ghost" as our collects for the third Sunday in Advent and the first in Lent have, or at least some recognition of His Mediatorial position, as our collect for S. Stephen's Day has. Nor is it any real departure from this rule when we say in the *Te Deum* "Thou art the King of Glory, O Christ, Thou art the everlasting Son of the Father," or invoke Him as the "Lamb of God" (much as is done in the Apocalypse) in the *Gloria in Excelsis* and the *Litany*, both of which bear witness to the doctrine of the Trinity. The title "Lamb of God" clearly implies His relation to the Father, just as "Word of God" "Son of God" do. Hymns too have naturally a greater freedom than

^{*} I venture to differ somewhat from the Bishop (Westcott) of Durham in the interpretation of this verse, which appears to represent a very important revelation of our Lord's own direct teaching.

prayers ; and it was probably in Hymns that the practice of addressing our Saviour as God in worship first became prevalent. (See my *Holy Communion* pp. 61, 62, ed. 2, 1892.) The apostrophe of S. Thomas and the song of creation in the Apocalypse are indeed Hymns of praise rather than acts of prayer.

X. REASONS FOR CAUTION RESPECTING THE WORSHIP OF OUR LORD IN THE SACRAMENT.

But this worship becomes matter of more serious question when it is directed towards visible objects, especially in connection with the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, whether in the Communion office or outside it. Two considerations must clearly be attended to in discussing it, first the character of the sacramental signs, and secondly the general purpose of the sacrament as an act of worship.

In the first place, if we consider the character of the sacramental signs, we shall at once observe that they suggest and symbolize the Human rather than the Divine nature of our Lord. They have all the associations proper to the existence of a creature : they are in their natural condition not even elemental forces, but products of human foresight and labour. But the humanity of our Lord *by itself*, according to all Christian theology, is not a proper object of Divine worship. If it were, a fourth term would be added to the Blessed Trinity. It is by this rule that we criticise such developments as the cultus of the Sacred Heart. One reason then why we must be cautious about sacramental adoration is the fear lest it should degenerate into a like error. Again, the sacramental signs not only suggest the Humanity apart from Divinity, but the Humanity restricted by local and material conditions. This, I suppose, is why the Trent Catechism directs the clergy to warn the people that the Body of Christ is not in the Eucharist "as in a place" (ii. 4, 42). That this warning is not wholly successful is evident from the language habitually employed by many Romanists. To speak of our Lord as "the Divine prisoner of the Tabernacle" is surely to use very misleading and distressing language.

Secondly, we must consider the general purpose of the Sacrament as an act of Christian worship. We cannot express it more simply than by saying that it is a pleading before God the Father, on the part of the Church on earth, in union with her great High Priest and Head, of the atonement made by Him, with which she dares humbly to associate her own oblation of herself as His visible Body.* It is the appointed memorial (*ἀνάμνησις*) of the one offering of Christ. All English Churchmen agree that it is more than a "bare commemoration" of a historical event. It is as true now, as it was when S. John wrote,† and so it will be till the end of time, that our Saviour is "the Lamb of God," and "the propitiation for our sins." Because He lives we live also. And yet it is not a repetition of the Sacrifice of the Cross. All Christians, of every communion, agree to this. It is something then between the two; something mysterious, as to the exact definition of which we do not need, and, I think, ought not, too curiously to enquire. It is not certainly to our purpose to do so in this connection. What we have established is that, as an act of worship, the Eucharist is one in which the offering is presented by our Saviour, as the High Priest and Lamb of God, to the blessed Trinity; and that, so far as He is separable in thought from the blessed Trinity, He is the minister and also the subject of the heavenly sacrifice in which we join. In some mysterious way, to use the words of S. Cyprian (*Ep.* 63, 17), "The Passion of the Lord is the sacrifice which we offer;" or to use the words of Bishop Thomas Wilson's prayer, "Give me, when I commemorate the same sacrifice which Jesus Christ once offered, give me the same intentions that He had—to satisfy the justice of God, to acknowledge His mercies, and to pay all the debt which a creature owes to his Creator. None

* This is well brought out in a well-known Chapter of S. Augustine *on the City of God*, x. 20. He clearly considers the self-sacrifice of the Church as part of the act not as a mere appendage to it.

† See the *Apocalypse* v. 6 foll., 12, vii. 17, "The Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall be their shepherd and shall guide them unto fountains of waters of life" (R.V.) And 1 John ii. 2, where notice the verb *ἔσται*.

can do this effectually but Jesus Christ. Him therefore we present to God in this Holy Sacrament." (*Sac. Pr.* p. 160, A.C.L.). This is the general mind of the Church, and not less of the Church of England than of other Churches; but this is something different from, and in a certain degree inconsistent with, the separate adoration of our Saviour as almost the sole object of worship at the time of Consecration.

XI.—WHAT KIND OF WORSHIP IS PROPER TO THE TIME OF CONSECRATION.

It follows then from these two considerations that adoration of the Person of Christ, in this separate sense, must be very carefully guarded so as not to interfere with the general movement of our public worship. It must be entirely subsidiary, and must be protected from any appearance of leading to a superstitious attitude towards the sacramental signs. We have then to ask ourselves, Is the moment of the Consecration the suitable time for such subsidiary worship?

We try to "lift up our hearts" in this holy mystery; we ascend in heart and mind with our Saviour in His Godward attitude; we thankfully recognise that He carries our nature along with Him; we see Him pass through the throngs of upward-looking angels; we see as it were Justice and Love embracing on the throne of God. As a living writer, who is also a practised theologian, has well expressed the thought, we cry in adoration and penitence—

" Look, Father, look on His anointed Face,
And only look on us as found in Him :
Look not on our misusings of Thy grace,
Our prayers so languid, and our faith so dim :
For lo! between our sins and their reward
We set the Passion of thy Son our Lord."

Is this the proper moment to adore the sacramental signs of that Passion, though doubtless they are "no longer common bread but Eucharist"? Is this the moment to chain our ears to the sound of certain holy words and our eyes to certain spots of earth? Surely to do so is confusing

to the ordinary worshipper and in some degree interferes with the proper upward movement of our worship.

During the utterance of the prayer of consecration, or when it is over, there should be no ringing of a bell or sound of any kind, but a solemn and awful silence. Then should follow the Communion, and this is a season or part of the service during which it is fitting that when Christ turns to minister to us we should turn to adore Him. Suitable Hymns may be used, but should be used with care and moderation.

XII.—THE POINTS OF CHRIST'S MANWARD ATTITUDE ARE THE PROPER OCCASIONS FOR SPECIAL ADORATION OF HIS PERSON.

There are indeed several points in the service where such special adoration of His Person seems not only justifiable but eminently right. They may be called points of His *manward attitude*, when, instead of turning His face towards the throne of God, He rather turns towards His people. The first is when He speaks to us in the Gospel, which in the Greek Church is brought in solemnly at the "Little (*i.e.* lesser) Entrance." When the Gospel book is taken by the reader, and the place from which he is going to read is given out, is among ourselves the first occasion of this separate manward attitude of our Saviour.

The Church then salutes Him with the adoring recognition "Glory be to thee, O Lord," and, when His words are ended, she responds "Thanks be unto thee, O Lord, for this thy Holy Gospel," or with some such reverent address. It is a misfortune that the ignorant custom of kneeling during the Epistle has crept in in some churches, so as to destroy the full significance of this rite of standing at the Gospel. Kneeling is the posture of prayer, not of attentive listening, and to give greater honour to the Epistle than to the Gospel is a blunder of a serious kind, and injurious to the true reverence we owe our Saviour. As regards standing at the Gospel, Hooker well says "It sheweth a reverend regard to the Son of God above other messengers, although speaking as from God also. And against infidels, Jews, Arians, who derogate from the honour of Jesus Christ, such ceremonies

are most profitable" (*E.P.* v. 30, 4). The Church here recognises her Lord as the Word of God, and therefore adores Him in these short loving ejaculations, just as S. Thomas did when he said "My Lord and my God."

Another point in the service, where reverent recognition of our Lord's manward attitude is made by great part of the universal Church, is the inbringing of the gifts of bread and wine previous to consecration. This is the principal moment of adoration in the Eastern Church, and is therefore called "the Great Entrance." It would be well if more solemnity were used by ourselves at such a moment, at least when the gifts are placed on the Holy Table. It represents, so to say, our Lord's readiness to give Himself a sacrifice for us, the movement of His heart towards us. I find S. Ambrose referring to this as a very solemn moment.*

Another point, peculiar to our own service, where we continue still kneeling after the absolution, but with a somewhat different purpose, namely, to adore the Person of Christ, is that of the *Comfortable Words*. The words of S. Paul and S. John that follow, speaking directly of Him, are naturally received in the same posture.

And again, after the commemoration and representation of the Sacrifice has been made, when our Lord turns to us, as the Minister of the true tabernacle, to give us His body and His blood, we kneel in reverence to His person to receive so great a gift. This is what is usually understood as Eucharistic adoration, by writers of our Communion, and it is truly the supreme part of it. But it is likely to be somewhat misunderstood, if viewed apart from these other points, as if it stood absolutely alone in the ordinance.

That it is an attitude of adoration is clear from the rubric, generally called the black rubric, which defines and explains it. The object of that rubric is not to deny that we adore the Person of Christ, as separate in thought from the blessed

* *Enarr. in Psalm xxxviii.* § 25, "Videmus nunc per imaginem bona et tenemus imaginis bona. Vidimus Principem sacerdotum ad nos venientem, vidimus et audivimus offerentem pro nobis sanguinem suum: sequimur ut possumus sacerdotes ut offeramus pro populo sacrificium," etc.

Trinity, but to explain that we do not offer adoration "unto the Sacramental Bread and Wine there bodily received, or unto any Corporal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood." That we ought before receiving to adore the Person of Christ, who so lovingly ministers to us so wonderful a gift, whether by kneeling, or, as the ancient Church did, by humbly standing and bowing the head, is surely not a thing to be questioned. As Hooker well says on this point, "Coming as receivers of inestimable grace at the hands of God, what doth better beseem our bodies at that hour than to be sensible witnesses of minds unfeignedly humbled?" (*E.P.* v. 68, 4).

XIII.—EVIDENCE ON SPECIAL ADORATION AT COMMUNION TIME.

That this is the thought too of the Liturgy at present in use in the orthodox Eastern Church seems to me certain. Nothing can be clearer than the passage of the Byzantine Liturgy, based largely on "S. Basil's," which occurs some time after the recitation of our Lord's words and the Invocation of the Holy Spirit which follows them, and just before the Communion:—"Hear us, O Lord Jesus Christ, our God, out of thy holy dwelling-place, and from the throne of the Glory of thy Kingdom, and come and sanctify us; Thou that sittest above with the Father, and here unseen art present with us; and vouchsafe with thy mighty hand to make us partakers of thy spotless Body and precious Blood and all the people through us."

It is, I think, through some such underlying thought as this, that we must explain, not only the words of the Eastern Fathers, but those of Westerns, like S. Ambrose and S. Augustine,* who are often quoted as justifying adoration

* The passages of S. Ambrose *de Spiritu Sancto* iii. 11, § 78, 79, and of S. Augustine *Enarr. in Psalmum* xeviii. § 9 (=Ps. xcix. 5) are closely connected. S. Ambrose comments on the verse, "Adorate scabellum pedum eius," and suggests that the "footstool" is "earth" and that it is to be understood of "the flesh of Christ, which even to-day we adore in the mysteries, and which the Apostles, as we said above, adored in the Lord Jesus." S. Augustine accepts this curious gloss without mentioning his authority. It is however doubly inaccurate, since the footstool is clearly not "earth" but "the ark of the

directed towards the sacramental signs. This is clearly, at any rate, the meaning of Bishop Beveridge when he writes in his tract on *Frequent Communion* (*Works* A.C.L. viii. p. 607), where he is explaining the act of kneeling at reception, "How can I, by faith, behold my Saviour *coming to me and offering to me* His own Body and Blood and not fall down and worship Him? How can I, by faith, lay hold upon the pardon of my sins, as there sealed and delivered to me, and receive it any otherwise than upon my knees?" No doubt he and others do not always sharply distinguish between the Lord, as the minister of the communion, and His Body and Blood, which He gives us in communion. They are so truly *His* Body and *His* Blood that our reverential thoughts about Him cannot be dissociated from them. But what I desire to point out, as regards our English theologians, is that they are thinking of the duty of worship *at the time of Communion*, not as the Church of Rome does during the consecration. This is the principle brought out in the late Archbishop of Canterbury's judgment (to which I was a party as an

covenant," and the Hebrew is rightly rendered "worship at or towards his footstool." What influence this misrendering may have had on practice is not of course easy to calculate. S. Augustine however (as Mr. Freeman remarks) "connects the 'adoration' of which he speaks with the prospect of *reception*; and may the rather on that account be understood in accordance with the Liturgies as above explained" (*Principles, Int. to pt. 2, p. 184*). His words are "Nemo illam carnem manducet nisi prius adoraverit." These and other passages are best considered as using adoration in the sense of strong reverence. For S. Augustine of course considers the "flesh of Christ" as something distinct from the person of Christ. For he writes in reference to the words that follow in the Psalm ("For he is holy"), "Who is holy?" to which he answers, "*He in whose honour ye adore the footstool of His feet.*" According to Roman doctrine he ought to have answered, "He whom ye adore present under the likeness of His footstool, the substance of which has been annihilated and has become not only His body and His blood, but the whole and entire Christ." See also Dr. J. B. Mozley *Lectures and other Theological Papers, The Holy Eucharist*, p. 215 (Lond. 1883). The whole section on Adoration is very instructive and full of important argument, as is the Lecture generally. I do not wish to dogmatize on the point whether it is right to speak of the Soul and the Divinity of Christ being present or not in the sacramental signs. It is a very mysterious subject on which over definition is to be avoided. But S. Augustine's language shews that he drew a distinction between the flesh of Christ and His Person.

Assessor) in favour of permitting the short anthem, "O Lamb of God." It was ruled that it may be sung publicly "during the communion time." In the ancient Mass it was said privately by the priest before communion (*Judgment* pp. 61—64).

But you may perhaps ask, 'Is not a ritual elevation of the Sacramental signs at or shortly after consecration a very ancient and almost universal custom?' I would reply: 'Yes; but originally not *at*, but *considerably after*, the consecration, and as an immediate invitation to communion.' It was accompanied, as now in the Greek rite, by the celebrant's words τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις, which were certainly regarded in the fourth century as meaning "holy things to holy persons" i.e. devout communicants.* They were met by a reverent disclaimer in the response of the people, ascribing true holiness to God and Christ alone, or to the blessed Trinity. Then communion followed at once. The significance of the invitation has however been obscured in the Byzantine rite, and others influenced by it ('S. James,' 'S. Mark' and the Armenian), by the postponement of the manual acts till after the elevation. The separation of the communion of the clergy from that of the people has worked in the same direction.

The transformation of this act in the Western Church into one of another character, where attention is prominently called to the words uttered by the priest and the gestures which he uses *in consecration*, cannot perhaps be exactly described. But it seems not unnatural to connect the main impulse to it with the controversies which were brought into prominence by the case of Berengar of Tours in the middle and later half of the 11th century (circa 1050—1080). A

* Mr. Brightman has kindly helped me to clear up this point. See S. Cyril Hierosol. *Cat. Myst.* v. 19, S. Chrys. *Hom.* xvii. in *Hebr.* § 5 t. xii. p. 245, S. Cyril Alex. in *S. Joh.* xx. 17. The old connection is preserved in *Lit. Apost. Const.* viii. 12 (Brightman p. 24) in the *Syrian* (ib. 101), the *old Ethiopic* (ib. 191) and the *Nestorian* (ib. 296). Mr. Brightman rejects explanations like 'holy things are offered to holy Persons,' 'holy things are lifted up to the heavenly sanctuary,' 'holy things are mixed with holy things' (the host placed in the chalice.)

Council of Paris ordered elevation of the host, after the words "This is my body," so that all might see it, in 1188.* It was not, however, till after the final definition of the doctrine of Transubstantiation at the fourth Lateran Council (A.D. 1215) that a general rule bearing on this subject was promulgated by the Roman Church in the person of Pope Honorius III., and then only in the way of a reverent inclination.† Bishop Poore's rule in our own Diocese was simply that "laymen should be warned to behave reverently at the consecration of the Eucharist and bend their knees, especially at the time when the sacred host is lowered after the elevation."‡

The old English rites were in some respects simpler in this point than the Roman. The full habit of adoration did not grow till the later centuries before the Reformation when Communion had become infrequent, and external worship had taken its place. It is against this bad result that we have specially to be on our guard and to take care that we do not unwittingly contribute to restore it. But true adoration addressed to the living person of Christ in connection with different points of His manward attitude towards us in the Sacrament, and recognising His loving presence in particular when He comes to us to minister to us His sacred Body and His most precious Blood, not only does not interfere with the general direction of our worship, but is in itself the right and natural, nay, we may say, with Bishop Beveridge, the necessary attitude of the Christian soul.

* Quoted by W. Maskell *Anc. Lit. of the Church of England* ed. 3 p. 137. Mr. G. G. Scott in his *Essay on the History of English Church Architecture*, pp. 116, 117, Lond. 1881, connects this change with the disuse in the West of the veils, which used to surround the altar or enclose the sanctuary, as they still do in the East. But the explanation, though interesting, is insufficient. He has much to say on these veils pp. 155—164.

† *Decretal. Greg. IX. lib. III. 41, 10.*

‡ *Sarum Charters and Documents* Rolls Series p. 147 (A.D. 1223) and in Wilkins, Labbe, &c.

XIV.—CAUTIONS AS TO PRESSING THIS PRACTICE INTO TOO GREAT PROMINENCE.

If this adoration, however, ceases to hold its proper subsidiary place, and becomes the chief end of the service, the result is contrary to the great principle above laid down. This, it is to be feared, is too much the case at those Communion services where few if any communicate except the Priest. This is what makes the custom now beginning in some places, and existing already in others, of bringing large bodies of children, very frequently and as a matter of course, to worship at the Sacrament, a subject of great anxiety to myself. I feel also much the same anxiety about pressing a whole congregation on a Sunday to attend as a matter of religious observance, many of them never being Communicants and some perhaps being unfit to be so.

This is not exactly a thing to be settled by authoritative interference, since, as you are aware, the Church of England nowhere orders non-communicants to withdraw, and it is clear that children, as well as grown up persons, might be present without communicating at the time of the Reformation. But I would, in all affection and sympathy, ask those who attach importance to this experiment—for an experiment it undoubtedly is—to consider certain lines of argument which seem to me personally to weigh upon the other side.

In the first place any departure from established custom on one side may be used to justify any other departure on another side. You are all aware that I have expressed my opinion on the inexpediency of Afternoon or Evening Communion services. Yet it is equally pleaded on behalf of them that there is no law of the Church against them. The Roman Church permits mass to be said on fast days up to the ninth hour, though not in Parish Churches; and the first mass at Christmas is said in the night. The Greek Church begins its celebrations in the Holy Sepulchre soon after midnight. Both however require fasting. Our Church has allowed the rule as to fasting to lapse by desuetude, and therefore custom rather than law stands between us and Evening Communion services.

Most of you will agree with me that this is decidedly a wholesome custom, and one not to be lightly infringed. Let us beware therefore how we make light of customs.

In the second place those who introduce experiments may be able, from their special graces and force of character and the general balance of their teaching, to deprive them almost entirely of injurious results. But the same action, if done as a general rule by all sorts of persons and without similar caution, might be far from innocuous. Yet a custom broken through by one wise man may be broken by hundreds of unwise ones in imitation of him.

For, in the third place, there would seem to be a danger in such methods of using up the forces of religion too quickly. An impression is undoubtedly quickly made; but is it maintained?

Again is there not a real danger that the balance of worship may be destroyed and the proportion of faith disturbed? The natural and proper instincts of childish reverence turn so readily to our Saviour. Hymns, pictures, little books all contribute to this impression. It is certainly difficult for them to think of Him as our great High Priest, and to have any true sense of the infinite value of His offering for sin, and of our duty to offer ourselves our souls and bodies in union with His sacrifice to the Father. Is it not the case that children and undisciplined persons generally, assisting at the Sacrament, think more of the subsidiary acts of worship and less of the principal one? And will it not be difficult for them to change this attitude of mind as they grow older?

Lastly is there not a danger in the tendency to substitute worship for edification, especially in the case of children, whose minds are naturally indolent and who have everything to learn? And is not the English Communion office, as a service standing by itself, deficient in certain important elements both of edification and worship? The lections from Scripture in it are generally very short, there is very little of the Old Testament, there is no psalmody, the element of intercession is comparatively slight. The Morning Prayer

and Litany supply these elements, but they are now seldom joined in one service with the Communion office by those who make a strong point of Eucharistic worship on a large scale.

Is it desirable to habituate our people to lose, perhaps during the whole of life, the discipline and instruction involved in careful following of the teaching of the Sundays and festivals, in the psalms and lessons of Mattins and the wider range of supplication in the Litany?

I know that this practice is introduced with a good object, and by zealous men, often worthy of high praise, in order to familiarize men's minds with the Sacrament and to make communion in after days easier, as well as to instil more reverence into both children and grown up people. I make you partakers of my anxieties lest, even if we gain more communicants, our success may be purchased at too dear a cost.

XV.—IN ANY CASE THERE MUST BE THE PROPER NUMBER OF
COMMUNICANTS TO RECEIVE WITH THE PRIEST.

I cannot, in any case, do otherwise than draw your attention, dear brethren in the ministry, to the rubric which requires that at least three communicants should partake with the Priest. If ever you find that such a number of communicants is not forthcoming, not once perhaps, but several times, you may be sure that you are advancing too fast for loyalty to the Church of England. This rule is a positive one, and I feel that I have no right to give you a dispensation from it. On occasion of a storm or accident it might not indeed be necessary for a Priest to deprive himself of the blessing of communion, if less than three are present; but in ordinary cases it is the duty of the clergy to make certain that the service is needed *as a Communion*. Nothing can be more certain than the mind of the Church of England that the service is essentially one for Communion. But the laity should help us by sending in their names beforehand, according to the rubric.

XVI.—RESERVATION OF THE SACRAMENT FOR WORSHIP NOT PERMISSIBLE.

If this caution is to be observed when the balance of truth is so protected as it is by the prayers and acts of the Liturgy, there can be no doubt that much greater caution is needed where there is no such protection. It is clearly not only contrary to the law of the Church of England, but contrary to the principles of Christian worship, as already laid down, to reserve the sacrament for the purpose of isolated worship, either by those who casually enter a church and see a light burning before pyx or tabernacle, or in a special service of Benediction. I do not suppose that these practices are anywhere in vogue in this Diocese; but it is possible that some to whom this letter comes with the weight of authority may be inclined to wish they were permissible, or may be associated, for certain purposes, with others who have adopted them. If a sense of mystery in religion were the chief thing to aim at, they might be considered permissible instruments of devotion. But this is a very low type of religion, much lower than even the Jewish ideal; and the practice is not a "due use" of the Sacrament (Art. xxv.) "Thou shalt love the Lord with all thy heart, and with all thy mind, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength" is fundamental to the Law as well as to the Gospel. The intelligence, will, and conscience must be at work, as well as the emotions.

If also we may judge such a thing by its fruits, we must remark that this temper of worship has in Romanist congregations not only led to infrequent communion, but has even led to the preference of the afternoon or evening service of Benediction, with its simple and irresponsible prostrations and vague affections, to the somewhat more responsible and self-denying duty of attendance at a morning mass, where at any rate much good may be learnt from the prayers and Scriptures, and from an entrance into the main purpose of the rite.

XVII.—CONSIDERATIONS ON PROPOSED RESERVATION FOR THE SICK.

I know indeed that reservation is sometimes honestly desired among ourselves for a more speedy and perhaps more reverent administration to the sick, and that clergy who desire to shew their reverence by fasting reception—as it is honourable in them to wish to do where it is possible—are sometimes at a loss how to act when suddenly called upon to attend a sick or dying person.

I cannot myself doubt that in such a case charity to the sick should override any scruple of conscience; and such cases are not very common, since those who require communion are more often chronic cases for whom previous arrangement can be made. There is perhaps a greater difficulty in populous places how to arrange for the Easter communion of sick cases. But, when all this is fairly considered, the balance of advantage is on the side of our present rule. It would be a very sad day indeed for the sick when the unique privilege of celebration by the bedside accorded to them by their mother the Church of England, became obsolete. Yet experience (as far as report of it has reached me) is to the effect that the practice of reservation does lead to the rapid diminution of the number of sick-room celebrations, if not to the entire cessation of the custom. Methods of meeting cases of extreme difficulty have been proposed, and on these I am willing to communicate privately with any clergy who may experience extreme difficulty. But I am unwilling, by mentioning them publicly, to seem to suggest as a general usage what might easily become dangerous if it were promulgated as a sort of law of the Church. In our own Diocese, with moderate populations and generally cleanly and not too crowded homes, the bed-side celebration ought to be a joy and delight to the Pastor.

XVIII.—RECOGNITION OF GOD'S PROVIDENCE IN THE LOSS
OF CERTAIN SACRED THINGS.

It is natural that those who are students of antiquity should regret the absence of the ancient custom of reservation, and its prohibition among us on account of its misuse. But if they are students also of Scripture they will recollect not only that the Church sometimes has to discharge the difficult duty of abolishing holy things that have been misused (as in the case of the brazen serpent), but also that it has to recognise God's Providence in the loss of what it might have much desired to retain. The ark of the covenant contained or had attached to it the most interesting and time-honoured symbols of the doctrine and sacraments and discipline of Christ, in the tables of the law, the pot of manna and Aaron's rod that budded. It was also in itself "the footstool" of God's feet, which the invisible Presence, "that sitteth upon the Cherubim," made the basis of His throne. Towards it prayer was directed, not indeed idolatrously but as a material though generally invisible centre of worship.*

Yet it was ordered by God's Providence first that two out of the three treasures of the ark should disappear, when it was placed in Solomon's Temple,† and then the ark itself, when the second Temple was built.‡ Yet God has taught us that the glory of the latter house was greater than the glory of the former. It was to the worship of the second Temple that our Saviour gave the sanction of His presence and approval, partly explicit and partly tacit. Let us not doubt that He approves our modest ritual and our more simply furnished Churches, and gives the glory of His presence wherever His faithful people come to meet Him, and to the silent single worshipper in them as truly as where a light burns before a tabernacle.

* The following references should be looked out:—Josh. vii. 6—15, Ps. xcix. 5 and cxxxii. 7, 1 Chr. xxviii. 2, Jeremiah iii. 16. The whole sanctuary is sometimes the footstool, Is. lx. 13, Lam. ii. 1.

† 1 Kings viii. 9.

‡ Josephus *B. J.* v. 5 § 5; Tacitus *Hist.* v. 9 'inania arcaua.

XIX.—ADORATION OF THE CROSS INTERFERES WITH THE
PROPER USE OF SYMBOLS.

Another kind of adoration to which our attention is perforce directed as one that requires regulation, is that of objects not identified by any one with the Saviour, but nevertheless closely connected with His sacred person, especially, the symbol of our salvation, the Cross. I am deeply grieved that it should be necessary to write on this subject, because it implies not only disloyalty on the part of those who have introduced such adoration, but a disregard on their part of that proper use of symbols which was becoming a matter of course among us. The use of a Cross as an ornament on or above the holy Table has become so common among us that it has almost ceased to excite any attention or surprise, or to be viewed except with joy or contentment. It is so natural and proper an object in that position, as a reminder that we are in a Christian building, and in the presence of the sanctuary to be used for the solemn "memorial" of Christ's passion, that it would be a great loss to give its presence any shade of party character. We know indeed that ornaments of this kind were by no means universal and perhaps not everywhere common before the Reformation in the Church of England.* In fact there is more English authority for a processional cross than for one that stands where ours usually does. But neither ought to be liable to the least suspicion. It is a vexatious perversity on the part of certain men with mediævalist leanings to introduce ceremonies of worshipping or

* Some kind of hanging or picture was generally behind the altar, but there was no rule that either a cross or a pair of candlesticks were to stand there. The only definite rules apparently were that one light should be placed on the altar at the time of mass, and that a cross for processions should be provided by the Parish. The head of this might often be detached and inserted in a standing foot on or over the altar. Such a detachable cross is much used in the Eastern Church to-day. I have seen it first carried in procession and then thrown into the sea, at Kyrenia, in Cyprus, on the Greek Epiphany. On the general rules as to the ornaments of the altar, see *Alcuin Club Tracts*, No. I. *The Ornaments of the Rubric*, by J. T. Micklethwaite, F.S.A., pp. 30, 31, Lond. 1897. I am grateful to Mr. Micklethwaite for much information, though I do not consider his thesis correct.

kissing the cross which can only end, unless they are checked, in a bitter controversy about what ought to be entirely outside controversy.

XX.—A KIND OF DIVINE WORSHIP PAID BY ROMANISTS TO THE CROSS. CONFUSION INTRODUCED BY SUBTLE DISTINCTIONS.

For it must be remembered that medieval theologians of the high standing of S. Thomas Aquinas determine that absolutely Divine worship is to be paid to the Cross.* It is true that later Roman teachers have recoiled from this extreme position and introduce the qualification “relative” or “respective.”† But what is a peasant likely to understand of such a qualification?

For observe that Divine worship when addressed to the Sacramental signs is defended by Roman doctors by the explanation that though they seem to be bread and wine they are not so in reality. Their substance as bread and wine has been, it is said, annihilated, and they have become not merely the Body and Blood of Christ but Christ Himself. On the other hand Divine worship, when addressed to the Cross or to Relics of Christ, is defended on the opposite principle, that they are so obviously and evidently material that no one can suspect the Church of idolatry in worshipping them. They are adored in themselves indeed, but not on their own account, but because of their relation to Him whose they are (in se, non propter se). Are not these dangerous subtleties difficult for even an educated mind to grasp and almost impossible for the mass of mankind?‡ The evidence of the senses is in the latter case appealed to as decisive, in the former rejected as delusive. And if, besides all this, we have to explain the lower kind of worship paid to the Blessed Virgin and the saints and their images, pictures and relics, the mind has to be furnished with a further set or sets of subtle distinctions. It may have indeed four or five kinds of adoration to practise in looking at the same altar, and trying

* *Summa* III, *quaest.* 25, *art.* 4. † See V. Thalhoffer *Katholische Liturgik* i. pp. 282—292, Freiburg i. Br. 1883. ‡ Bellarmine sees this difficulty *De cultu Sanctorum* ii. 22.

also to realize the one supreme and true Object of Divine worship in and through these outward forms. Far be it from us to say that it cannot be done, or that the teachers who have drawn these distinctions do not believe in them. But they have all the appearance of being drawn for the purpose of covering practices which had become popular and which the teaching body had not the courage or the power to resist. It is hard to believe that these distinctions exist consciously in the mass of mankind. Let us do nothing to involve the minds of our people in this entanglement.

Idolatry dies hard, even in the educated ; and a Church which has to preach the Gospel to all mankind, especially to the heathen, must remember its duty to make the worship of the one God easy and not difficult. It must give no opening to the weak and ignorant to put their trust as Christians in objects little removed from those in which their fathers and forefathers (whose inherited instincts they retain) put their trust as real habitations and vehicles of the Divine presence.

XXI.—PUBLIC WORSHIP AS CONFORMABLE TO HOLY SCRIPTURE.

Hitherto we have been considering public worship generally as far as it is conformable to the Catholic faith, that is to say as *Christian worship*, and have tested various forms of it by asking the question do they or do they not interfere with the great principle that all worship should be directed to the Trinity in Unity. There is also another test which we in the Church of England are especially bound to apply, namely, that of *conformity to Holy Scripture*. This is of course a test which may be readily misapplied, as it has been by those who are slaves of the letter, whether ultramontanes or puritans, and who think it necessary to find everything in so many words in the text of the Bible. It would be easy to give instances of such misapplication on the part of ultramontane innovators in religion as well as of those who aim at rigid simplicity, as when a Pope founds an argument for the possession of temporal as well as civil power by the Church on the text "Here are two swords" (S. Luke xxii. 38), or an

eager veneration of St. Joseph is supported by the words of Genesis "Go unto Joseph" spoken by Pharaoh of his prime minister (Gen. xli. 55). Not everything that the Church rightly teaches or does is to be found verbally in Scripture, and that Christian liberty to which the Holy Spirit leads us, cannot be abridged or extended by a mere citation of texts, or a proof that something is or is not mentioned in the Bible.

A right and moderate view of this subject has been secured for us mainly by the instrumentality of one man, whom we may gratefully claim as one of ourselves, Richard Hooker, who as Subdean of this Cathedral Church, Prebendary of Netheravon, and Rector of Boscombe, wrote the first books of his treatise *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* within a few miles of Salisbury.

XXII.—WORSHIP OF THE SAINTS TRIED BY THIS TEST.

OFFICIAL PRAYERS ADDRESSED TO THE BLESSED VIRGIN AND THE SAINTS.

On the other hand there is such a far-reaching power in the principles discernible in Scripture, that we must constantly refer to it for instruction when a form of worship is proposed to us. The most important form that comes before us under this head is the cultus or veneration of the Saints, a veneration which we are expressly told by its promoters is not divine adoration; and it therefore cannot be treated on exactly the same principles as the adoration of the Sacrament or of the Cross. They are either directly or relatively objects of Divine Adoration. The Saints, it is said, on the contrary, are objects of honour and veneration, or what is called *dulia*, literally the service rendered by slaves to a master. Nevertheless this service frequently takes the forms of the service of God, and is by no means confined to requests to Him that we may have their intercessions, but is extended to direct Invocations and to prayers for their protection and grace. Thus the following prayers to the Blessed Virgin are in general and official use in the Church of Rome, as seen by the two Offices printed in the Roman Breviary, one for use on Saturdays, the other called the "Little Office of the

Blessed Mary." Both contain the hymn *Ave Maris Stella*, in which she is addressed as "the gate of heaven" and petitioned as follows:—"Loose the chains of offenders, Bring forth light to the blind, Drive away our evils, Ask for all good things." "Shew that thou art a mother, Let him who being born for us, Bore to become thy Son, Receive our prayers through thee."* "Thou unique in the Virginity, Mild amid all others, Make us mild and chaste, Freed from our faults." "Grant us a pure life, Prepare us a safe way, That seeing Jesus, we may always rejoice together." This hymn contains indeed implications that these gifts and graces are to be obtained through intercession (*Bona cuncta posce*). But that intercession is of an imperative character (*Monstrata esse matrem*); and the greater part of the prayers in the hymn are direct appeals for grace. Throughout these offices words of Scripture which belong to the Church or to divine Wisdom are used of the blessed Virgin. Perhaps the most astonishing text is this from *Ecclesiasticus* xxiv. 9, 10:—"He created me from the beginning before the world, and I shall never fail. In the holy tabernacle I served before him," which is of course only applicable to the Wisdom of God. In one Antiphon attached to the Magnificat the Blessed Virgin is addressed as "Queen of the World," in another as "Queen of Heaven." In the second of these offices occurs the hymn *Memento rerum Conditor*, in which we find the verse "Mary mother of grace, Sweet parent of clemency, Do thou protect us from the enemy, And receive us in the hour of death," and to the *Nunc Dimittis* is attached this Antiphon:—"Under thy protection we take refuge, holy mother of God; do not despise our supplications in our necessities; but free

* Cassander in his *Consultatio*, art. xxi. (p. 971 in *Opera Omnia*, Paris 1616, and p. 155 in *Via ad pacem Ecclesiasticam* ed. Grotius 1642), quotes as being sung in some churches "Ora matrem et iube filio" and "O felix puerpera, Nostra pians scelera, Iure matris impera Redemptori." Bp. Andrewes quotes the first phrase correctly in his *Resp. ad Bellarmini Apologiam* (p. 236 A.C.L. 1851) as "Ora patrem et iube filio." The prayer "Iure matris impera . . . filio" is from the 'crown' of S. Bonaventura: see Ussher *Ans. to a challenge* c. ix. (*Works* iii. p. 489), and ep. Bp. Chr. Wordsworth's *Sequel to letters to Gordon*, p. 191 note. Lond. 1848.

us from all dangers ever glorious and blessed Virgin." Another Antiphon runs thus:—"Rejoice, O Virgin Mary, thou alone hast destroyed all heresies throughout the whole world," and another, "Suffer me to praise thee, O sacred Virgin: Give me strength against thy enemies," and, at the end of the Psalm (97), words properly applied to our Lord are applied to her, "Grace is poured upon thy lips; Wherefore God hath blessed thee for ever."

Similar direct prayers are addressed to the Saints, as in the hymn to S. Peter and S. Paul for the 29th June:—

O blessed Shepherd Peter graciously receive
The voices of those who pray, and with thy word unloose
The bonds of crime, to whom the power is given
To open heaven to the earth (terris) and to shut it
when opened.

Wondrous teacher Paul, instruct our lives (mores),
And draw with thee our hearts towards heaven; Until veiled
Faith beholds the noonday light, And Love alone reigns like the Sun.

XXIII.—FURTHER DEVOTIONS TO THE BLESSED VIRGIN PERMITTED IN THE ROMAN CHURCH.

I have purposely only cited official prayers. It would be easy to add much more startling examples of worship, in which the language of divine honour paid to God has been studiously copied and imitated, by approved and even beatified and sanctified writers, and applied especially to the Blessed Virgin, without any hint of disapproval on the part of the authorities of the Roman Church. In this matter, as Dr. Pusey has well shown at length, in his *Eirenicon*, addressed to the author of the *Christian Year*, permitted practice has run to almost incredible lengths, far exceeding anything spoken of in the Canons of the Council of Trent, which are comparatively speaking very moderate in assertion. In this practice the great mysteries of Redemption and Grace are ascribed to the Blessed Virgin almost as the equal and sometimes even as the superior power. She is considered our Co-Redemptrix, and has a common presence with Christ in the Eucharist. To her especially sinners are advised to turn as having a more tender heart than her Divine Son. (See *c.g.*, Pusey l. c. pp. 102, 103.)

XXIV.—EVIDENCE OF SCRIPTURE ON THIS POINT. OUR
RELATION TO ANGELS AND SAINTS.

What is the evidence of Scripture as to this—not merely as to the practical system, but as to the basis on which it rests? Not as to the excesses but as to the ordinary exhibitions of the habit?

As regards the holy angels, about whose condition we have far more light than on that of departed Christians, we have the evidence of the Apocalypse (xix. 10, xxii. 8). The Evangelist records that on two occasions when he was about to worship an angel who talked with him, evidently by throwing himself at his feet, he was plainly rebuked in the words “Do it not.” . . . “Worship *or* adore God.” Obviously this rebuke would have been most misleading if it had been his duty, or at any rate a praiseworthy and pious act on his part, to give the angel a worship or veneration such as the Romanists use, which is almost identical in outward form with that offered to God, but differs only or chiefly from it in intention.* Yet it is not as if Scripture was wholly silent as to our relation to angels. We are not forbidden wholly to have converse with angels. The Psalms are full of addresses to them, which shew the kind of language we may use towards them. Again and again we call upon them to join us in our worship of God. We have no warrant for going any further. So too we may, according to the use of the Church of England, call upon the spirits and souls of the righteous to bless God with the rest of His creation, as we do in the *Benedicite omnia opera*. We are not cut off from the communion of Saints, but we recognise its true conditions.

If then we have no warrant for this worship of angels, whom we know to be sinless, and to behold the face of God, *a fortiori* we have none for the worship of Saints as practised in the Roman Communion. See below chapter xxviii.

* See Thalhofer l. c. p. 296 who urges that all these outward acts must be judged according to their intention. Bp. Andrewes writes well on this point *Resp. ad Apol. Bellarmini* pp. 65, foll. A.C.L. 1851.

XXV.—ALL CHRISTIANS ARE WAITING FOR JUDGMENT.

The great theological and scriptural ground indeed on which we reject the invocation of Saints is one which is of a very broad character. It rests upon our assurance of the incompleteness of their state in another world. To this the ancient Church bore witness, as the Greek Liturgies do to the present day, when they offer prayers on behalf of all Saints, even the Blessed Virgin herself. The Church nowhere specifically prays for the Angels, which shows that she regards their state as a more perfect one than that of the highest Saints. We may not anticipate the result of judgment for any mortal, however much we may have reason to believe that God has blessed him or her during their earthly probation. We may not do it for anyone: much less may we make a list of those to whom one kind of prayer may be addressed whom we call "Saints," and a second list of those to whom a secondary kind of prayer may be addressed whom we call "Blessed." To do so offends against the precept "Judge nothing before the time until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and make manifest the counsels of the hearts; and then shall each man have his praise from God" (1 Cor. iv. 5 R.V.) This text plainly means that "then," and not till then, "shall each man have his praise," that which describes his own peculiar position, "from God", and not first from man. Again and again judgment is represented as future. "We shall all stand before the judgment seat of God. . . . Each one of us shall give account of himself to God" (Rom. xiv. 10, 12). "We must all be made manifest before the judgment seat of Christ, that each one may receive the things done in the body, according to what he hath done, whether it be good or bad" (2 Cor. v. 10 R.V.) What are these words of the Apostle but an echo of our Lord's own teaching about Himself:—"All that are in the tombs shall hear His voice and shall come forth: they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done ill unto the resurrection of judgment" (S. John v. 29 R.V.)? Remark, dear brethren, in each case the words implying universality,

“all,” “each,” “all that are in the tombs.” What would be the meaning again of our Lord’s words “they that have done good,” if all the really good had been in a state of saintly blessedness, enjoying the vision of God, perhaps ever since the hour of their death? The whole theory of the cultus of the Saints rests upon a very natural but wholly unscriptural idea that peculiar excellence, especially martyrdom, exempts men and women from the common lot of all men. There is a sense indeed in which the judgment of departed Christians will differ from that of the heathen. This is implied in the accounts of judgment, under different types and figures, given by our Lord in the latter part of the Gospel according to S. Matthew (ch. xxiv., xxv.) Similarly S. Paul teaches us that “those who sleep in Jesus shall God bring with him,” that is to say with our Saviour, and “the dead in Christ shall rise first.” He looks forward to his own death as “to depart and be with Christ,” which is “far better” than even to remain and work for Him on earth. But there is no distinction between one Christian and another in this view, no classification attempted between the “Saints” and the “Blessed” and common Christians. All the saved are together “in Paradise” waiting for judgment, when they will receive higher or lower places “according to the deeds done in the body.” Some will “suffer loss,” that is be placed in a lower position than they might expect; others will receive a higher place and fuller praise from God than either they or those who knew them imagined.

XXVI.—IMPOSSIBILITY OF RELATIVE PLACE BEING TAKEN
BEFORE THE END.

There are other considerations which might naturally weigh with us in forming a judgment on the duty of the Church as to the cultus or invocation of the Saints. To some (as to myself) it may seem a very strong argument that, from the nature of the case, it is impossible for men to take their final place, relatively to each other, in God’s Kingdom until the whole record of history is completed and the full purpose of God unfolded and brought to an issue. The final

judgment will be a great revelation, in which it will be explained to each and all what each has contributed to the execution of that design. To some it will surely be said : “ You meant well : you were zealous and active, but you did not use your mind conscientiously ; you neglected such and such warnings ; you failed to act on such and such principles of which you know the truth. See what a terrible hindrance your conduct was to the truth ; see how in the result, many ages after your death, the wrong turn you gave to practice has led other souls astray. You are saved, but without honour or dignity, as one who just escapes through the fire with his bare life.”

The fairness of this judgment can hardly be understood until the event has fully shewn what the consequences are. So again to others, little known and observed of men, it will be revealed how their quiet perseverance, or self-denial, their use of small means, and small opportunities, and small intellectual capacities, sowed seeds and laid foundations on which step by step great developments have grown. The last judgment will be a great scene of the reversal of human judgments, even when they have been judgments of great portions of the Church, not merely of worldly men.

XXVII.—OTHER CONSIDERATIONS. UNCERTAINTY OF THE EVIDENCE.

Another consideration is that of the extreme uncertainty of the communications made between ourselves and the other world. We all know the attempts to guarantee their reality by producing the evidence of visions and miracles and generally of “ legends”—a word which in the first instance simply meant acts of the saints, “ to be read ” (*legenda*) for the edification of the church. Investigation of this evidence does not indeed lead to a simple rejection of all legend as myth, and all ecclesiastical miracle as delusion. There is probability at least that God has sometimes thought fit to bless simple childlike faith even when mingled with superstition. But the enquiry also reveals, again and again, the painful part played by credulity and duplicity. We find cautious

reluctance on the part of honest leaders and teachers overborne by popular desire for marvels and local desire for gain. Are we in the Church of England at all prepared to plunge into this labyrinth of known uncertainty and delusion in order to revive a practice which, even on the showing of its promoters, is only an added comfort to spiritual life and not a necessity? Look at the new religion taught in Liguori's *Glories of Mary* if you wish to see the mischief in its true light.

XXVIII.—WHY PUBLIC WORSHIP OF THE SAINTS IS
DISALLOWED.

But it may be said: 'No doubt excess is to be avoided: but may we not make such simple requests to honoured names among the saints and departed persons for the assistance of their prayers, as we make to living friends?'

The answer, as regards public worship, is partly drawn from the absence of any hint of such invocation in Scripture. An argument from the silence of Scripture is not indeed an easy one to handle, and yet it can by no means be overlooked. The force of such argument differs of course with the subject matter. Whatever can be known by the light of nature is presupposed in Scripture, which is only a revelation, or the record of a revelation, as to what could not be so known. Scripture is complete only in relation to the end to which it is directed.* But as regards worship it certainly seems that Scripture is intended to be a sufficient guide both in respect to what it teaches and what it omits to teach, at any rate in broad principles if not in details. This is the principle laid down in Deuteronomy (xvii. 3 cp. iv. 2, xii. 32), where worship of the sun and moon and the host of heaven is counted as wickedness and transgression, because not commanded by God. And this thought is several times repeated by Jeremiah (vii. 31, xix. 5, xxxii. 35). No doubt the Old Testament ritual was more complete in detail than that of the New. But this matter of Invocation is not a matter of detail, but is in practice a very wide and extensive custom, encroaching largely upon other public services. And, as regards the letter of the New Testa-

* See the conclusion of Hooker, *E.P.* book ii. chap. 8, esp. sec. 5, 6, 7.

ment, none of us who look to our Lord's words, "Come unto me . . . and I will give you rest," can doubt both His power and His will to do all we need. Nor when we consider the emphatic teaching of S. Paul in regard to the one Mediator (1 Tim. ii. 5), and his rejection of that form of opposition to it in worship, which alone was a danger in the Church of the first age, the exaltation of the mediation of angels (Col. ii. 18—23), can we doubt that he would have as strongly opposed any other form of mediation expressed in worship. The word *ἑτελοθησκεία* "will-worship" is founded on the Old Testament view that man's own device in such matters is forbidden. So that we have not only the silence of Scripture but actual and definite indications, here and in the Apocalypse, bearing upon this question.* And, though requests for intercession addressed to living friends, over whom friendship gives us a right, (conditioned and limited, as they must be, by time and space,) are eminently proper, it does not follow that our place in the Communion of Saints gives us a right to claim from God such minute and personal attention on the part of the supposed leaders of that Communion as is implied by the invocation in question. It is His will that they should be out of our reach for the ordinary offices of friendship: it requires a revelation to assure us that they are at our disposal for these highest offices which we should scruple to ask or expect with great frequency, except from those whom we know very well.

XXIX.—WHY PRIVATE WORSHIP OF THE SAINTS IS DISALLOWED.

To the individual also nothing is permissible that endangers his moral life, either by wasting his energy or by weakening his sense of responsibility. Time spent in invocation of the Saints is time in most cases taken from direct prayer to God; and such invocation consists of prayers which might just as well be addressed to Him. But, if direct prayer to God

* On these texts the reader will do well to consult Bp. Andrewes *Responsio ad Apologiam Bellarmini*, pp. 241, 242, A.C.L. 1851. The quotation from S. Augustine, *contra epist. Parmeniani* ii. 8, is much to the purpose.

is possible, it is a duty to Him to offer it as fully as may be. The doubt again whether the Saints can hear our prayers, and, if they hear them, can find ability to attend to them all, must make a properly conscientious mind hesitate before it uses such prayer. Again, nothing can be more weakening to a sense of responsibility for sin and more injurious to the honour of God, than to turn aside from prayer to God for forgiveness to some easy or gentle Saint who is to intercede for us and mitigate God's wrath. Tenderness to self, unwillingness to repent, hard thoughts of God—these are miserable vices in a Christian character, but they are largely fostered by this habit if indulged on any large scale.

Again, I say, let us be wise in time. It is easy at present to check the beginnings of this dangerous habit. Let the clergy and parents be careful of what books of devotion are used by the young and the zealous. Let them be cautious as to the influence of members of other communions, especially in nurseries and schoolrooms. Let them enquire into the practice of the religious communities whose retreats they attend or whose charities they support.

XXX.—PUBLIC WORSHIP MUST BE WORSHIP OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

Further, brethren, there is a third principle, not so sacred perhaps as the two former, but nevertheless a religious principle as well as one involving expediency in a very high degree. It is, as we have seen, our duty to remember that we are guardians of Christian worship and that our worship must be in conformity with Holy Scripture. It is also our duty to remember that we are ministers of the Church of England. You will recollect the questions put to you at your ordination as Deacons and Priests, in which reference is made in the first case to "the due order of this Realm," and in the second to "the order of the Church of England," and your promise as priests "so to minister the Doctrine and Sacraments and the Discipline of Christ as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church and Realm hath received the same."

This is not merely an ecclesiastical rule, but it has its roots very deeply in our religion. Our Lord's portraiture of Himself as the Good Shepherd is full of teaching on the duty of speaking to the people in a voice that they understand. "The sheep hear his voice and he calleth his own sheep by name." "The sheep follow him, for they know his voice, and a stranger will they not follow, for they know not the voice of strangers." (S. John x. 3—5).

So it was that the Cross was providentially ordered to speak to the three great nations of the world, in whose presence the Saviour suffered, in their own language. So the Gospels may be reasonably divided as a Hebrew Gospel, a Roman Gospel—though not in the Latin tongue—and a Greek Gospel, together with the universal Gospel according to S. John. So it was most strikingly on the day of Pentecost. In the record of the Acts it is three times emphatically recorded that the bystanders heard the Apostles speak "every man . . . in his own language," "in our own language wherein we were born," "we do hear them speak in our tongues the wonderful works of God" (Acts ii. 6, 8, 11).

We feel sure that God has, in these different ways, consecrated the great principle of nationality, since language is the chief symbol of national life.

It is our duty, then, not only to preach and to read the Scriptures and prayers in the tongue of the people, but to speak to them in a way which they will understand, both in words and outward acts. The language of signs, especially of ritual signs, is a very powerful language to attract or to repel.

It is a grievous error to adopt or adapt a foreign ritual, unsuited to the religious habits and unwelcome even to the prejudices of our people. It is one thing to do what is necessary to exhibit the doctrine of the Church. That is, in all conscience, a hard enough message. How unwilling are our people sometimes to listen to words about doctrine, which teach them that they are sinners in fact as well as in word! How readily they fall into grave moral faults themselves and palliate them in others, and think us over strict in

upholding the law of the Church as to prohibited degrees or infractions of the marriage tie! How lightly they think of the sin of schism! It is criminal, when we have such difficulties, to increase our difficulties unnecessarily by talking to people in what is to them a foreign language, and so to give them a pretext for not listening to us. There are words and phrases, innocent in themselves, which are not the English of our Prayer-Book, and a light use of them may simply destroy our influence.

But if this is true in regard to words outside the Church, how much more is it in regard to acts of public worship!

It is our duty to give no offence either by word or deed, even to those who may be prejudiced, unless it be such offence as the preaching of the Cross necessarily involves in the ignorant and worldly. As Bishop Thomas Wilson well says, "Prudence is very necessary in dangerous times; it being no small fault to give occasion to the raising of storms against the Church and her ministers, for want of having a due regard to the times and to the passions of carnal men" (*Sac. Pr.* p. 68 A.C.L.) How much more is this true if offence is given to devout fellow Christians!

I have written thus, dear brethren, desiring in no way to give an impression that I have reason to doubt your entire loyalty to the Church of England. Four alone of all the hundreds of beneficed clergy, whom it has been my privilege to have known in this Diocese in the past twelve years, have, to my knowledge, become unfaithful to her teaching; and they have gone in three very different directions. I pray God to pardon them and to pardon any defect or imprudence of mine which may have contributed to their errors. But, as each generation passes away, the old warnings must be from time to time repeated, and perhaps with more of reason against errors in the direction of excess than of defect.

For as the general level of worship and doctrine becomes gradually raised, as, thank God! it surely does, it is very natural that men should wish to advance further, and to create an atmosphere about them in which they will be able to realize the inheritance of our Church in the ritual

traditions which we see in other countries of Christendom. In doing so, however, they are apt to forget the actual in pursuit of the ideal. The very virtues of the clergy, their zeal and self-denial and devotion to their ministerial and pastoral work, separate them from much of the so-called secular life of the country in which they used to take a more prominent share. They have for the most part smaller private incomes, smaller public incomes, smaller libraries, fewer friends, fewer social engagements, fewer amusements, fewer interests outside their work. All this tends to centre and contract their interests upon the details of public worship, and to incline them to trust more to eye and ear as instruments of training the spirit of men, than to the discipline of mind and intellect and character. When I think, indeed, of the perfect simplicity of the great men of the last generation, and of their force in the ministry of the Word and Sacraments, their energy in catechizing and other like duties, and the remarkable results which they accomplished with apparently intractable material, I can only regret how very much their memory has faded and their example ceased to operate. You will therefore, I trust, be patient with one another, and by close and constant association with one another, as one of the first of the "duties to your neighbour," strive to give to each other that balance which cannot be obtained from the example of those who are gone. Let no party spirit or shyness prevent you from contributing to each other's education.

XXXI.—APPLICATION OF THE PRINCIPLE.

But take the principle I have laid down very seriously. Think what the best characteristics of Englishmen are, such as simplicity and straightforwardness, self-reliance coupled with respect for order, reserve in expressing their inmost feelings and in making professions or proclamations of piety. These characteristics are the result of our history and are a very remarkable blending of British and Celtic, Norman, Saxon, and Danish, and other elements of race and population, developed in the long struggles between Church and State,

Kings, Nobles and Commons, Puritans and Cavaliers, Church and Sects, Whigs and Tories, and the like. Nor can we forget the debt we owe to the United States, India, and the British Colonies, as a training ground for the development of character in our race. No one can understand the growth of these characteristics, or their tenacity of root, who does not understand something of history. But a man, however ignorant of history, must be very weak-sighted who does not recognise their present value. It is to a people so constituted that we, my brethren, have to minister, and unless we keep their character in mind, and thoroughly respect its strong points, we shall be no true representatives of the Good Shepherd.

In public worship be simple, without an irritating variety of gesture and an artificial obtrusiveness of prostration and genuflection, and teach your people, especially your choirs, to be so. The choirs, loving and helpful as they are, easily catch defects and exaggerate mistakes. *Decipit exemplar vitii imitabile*. On the other hand remember always in Whose presence you are; and be reverent, as servants in their Master's House.

That wonderful funeral service lately held in Westminster Abbey, when we laid the mortal remains of Mr. Gladstone to rest (2 June, 1898), was impressive very greatly through its simplicity. It will live long in the minds of those who witnessed or took part in it as a thoroughly English scene both in the way of simplicity and of reverence.

In reading the service be clear and distinct. "The sheep hear His voice." I fear this is not the case always with the Shepherds of to-day: but some clergy think it a proper custom to gabble or mumble, to read mysteriously or affectedly, or to read almost in a whisper. This is clearly wrong: but the fault is no new one. My predecessor Bishop Richard Poore, the founder of our Cathedral, lays down most decidedly in A.D. 1223, re-echoing the words of his predecessor Hubert Walter when Archbishop of Canterbury: "We order that the words of the Canon (or consecration prayer) be said roundly and distinctly. Likewise let all the

hours, and offices also, be said openly and distinctly, so that the words be not cut short or abbreviated by too great haste." I pray you, brethren, be none of you offenders in this respect. It has been, I may remark, a sort of inspiration to me to write the latter part of this letter in Bishop Poore's Hall, and to feel how, under very altered circumstances, I could re-echo many of his wise words.

Lastly, I would say, respect the English book of Common prayer. It needs very little supplementing indeed, provided you will take pains to understand it. Respect both what is in it textually and literally, and the spirit of reserve and simplicity that underlies it. For my own part the better I know it the more I admire it; and the more I feel that it is easier to criticize it imprudently, than to understand it thoroughly. Let it be said, at least of this Diocese, that it is possible to go from Parish to Parish and to find the same services intelligently and intelligibly performed, so that all our people may really recognize the Church as their old and familiar home. There can be no greater rebuke to the clergy of our Church than for an intelligent person to be able to say, "I went to the service, but I really did not know what was being done: I did not recognize the service." I have not, thank God, heard this said of any of you, but I have heard it said of others.

I have added, by way of appendix, a few counsels on points of ritual or order where caution or explanation seems to be required. Some of them have already been published as Appendix V. to my Visitation Addresses of 1894.

XXXII.—ON THE MINISTRY OF PENITENCE ESPECIALLY IN PRIVATE.

Before concluding this letter I will draw your attention to another portion of our ministry which is a subject of criticism on the part of many of our laity, a criticism which is to a great extent suggested by those English characteristics to which I have referred. This ministry is not indeed at present, (except on very rare occasions, of which I can only remember one or two in my administration of this Diocese), directly a

part of public worship. But it has an intimate connection with it, as being a prelude to Holy Communion, and it therefore falls within the general scope of this letter. This is the ministry of Penitence, as the ancient Church called it, which is especially a subject of criticism when it takes the form of private confession and absolution. It is objected to as a piece of ecclesiastical pretentiousness, as invading the reserve natural to Englishmen, and as dangerous to spiritual health both in the confessor and the penitent. This last feeling is particularly present when it is observed that the penitents are chiefly of another sex.

We ought surely to recognize that there is reason in some of this criticism; and should do nothing, by wilfully or imprudently arousing prejudice, to make the due exercise of this ministry less possible. For that it is a true help to the really penitent in the Church of England, when exercised by the right persons towards the right persons, no one who has even a little experience can doubt.*

XXXIII.—EVIDENCE OF SCRIPTURE ON THE SUBJECT.

In treating this matter in the light of Scripture we ought to remember that one of the texts often cited in support of it, that about "binding" and "loosing" in the xvth and

* The reader will do well to consult Hooker *E.P.* Book vi., which is almost entirely concerned with this subject; Abp. Ussher *Answer to a Challenge* cc. iv, v. *Works* iii. pp. 90—176; J. Morinus *Commentarius Historicus de disciplina in administratione Sacramenti Penitentiae XIII. primis seculis in ecclesia Occidentali et huc usque in Orientali observatu* first published in 1651; and Bingham's *Antiquities of the Christian Church*. He gives a summary account of the matter in book xv. ch. 8, *What preparation the ancients required as necessary to communicants to qualify them for a worthy reception*. Books xvi. and xvii. give details on *Discipline*, xviii. on *Penitence* and xix. on *Absolution of Penitents*. See also N. Marshall's *Penitential Discipline* Lond. 1714, reprinted in Anglo-Catholic Library; and the articles on *Excommunication*, by Rev. I. Gregory Smith, and on *Exomologesis* and *Penitence* by Rev. G. Mead in Smith and Cheetham's *Dict. of Chr. Antiquities*. There are long notes by Dr. Pusey on the subject in the Oxford Library of the Fathers appended to Tertullian *De Paenitentia*. I may also refer to the late Bishop of Lincoln's *Twelve Addresses* 1873 No. 7, pp. 112—120; and his *Miscellanies Literary and Religious* ii. pp. 189—211 1879, and to Dr. E. B. Pusey's introduction to Gaume's *Advice on hearing Confession*, 1878.

xviiiith chapters of S. Matthew, has, primarily, nothing to do with what we call "absolution." The power given by our Lord first to S. Peter and then to the Apostles, in connection with His doctrine about the Church, is a power concerning things not persons. It is a power to "bind" or "prohibit" some things and to "loose" or "permit" others,* a power, given by Christ to His Church as a society, of making rules on the initiation of its chief Pastors. On this text we may rest the validity of the canonical rules of the Church, but not the ministry of Penitence to persons.

The ministry to persons rests chiefly upon our Lord's words (S. John xx. 21) which we repeat in Ordination; and it clearly must be exercised in the name of the Church and in accordance with its rules, and this is its connection with the power of "binding" and "loosing."

All ancient authors agree that from the first, as now, it was exercised specially in two ways:† (1) by admitting persons to baptism or refusing it to them: and hence we say in the Creed, "I acknowledge one baptism, for the remission of sins;" (2) by excluding guilty persons from the communion of the Church and re- admitting them to it on repentance, as S. Paul first delivered over the guilty Corinthian to Satan, and then ordered his re-admission, lest he should be swallowed up with overmuch sorrow (1 Cor. v. 5, 2 Cor. ii. 5—7). The whole of this case, it may be remarked, is treated as a public one.

The other passage of Scripture specially bearing on this

* See Lightfoot *Horae Hebraicae* on S. Matt. xvi. 19 for ample quotations showing the meaning of the Hebrew *âsar* to 'bind' or 'forbid' and *hittir* to 'loose' or 'permit.' See also for further instances Schoettgen, and Buxtorf's *Lexicon Chald. et Talm.* On the power of the Church in making laws see Hooker *passim*, but especially his summary in relation to penitential discipline *E.P.* vi. 2, 2. To those who are in the habit of making common-place books I would recommend this passage to be copied out. The cautions of the XXth Article must of course always be observed.

† This is the express teaching of S. Cyril of Alexandria on S. John xx. 23 (book xii.), and of other fathers quoted by Bingham *Ant.* xix. 1, 2. S. Ambrose says "Unum in utroque mysterium est" *de Pœn.* i. 8. This also is S. Jerome's meaning in the well-known phrase, evidently a gloss on Acts xxvii. 44, "Secunda post naufragium tabula

subject is found in the two last paragraphs of the Epistle of S. James. Here we have a picture of a sick man visited by the "elders" or "presbyters," that is the body of clergy belonging to the Church; but it appears that others are also present. The clergy anoint him with oil and pray over him that his sickness may be healed, "and if he has committed sin it shall be forgiven him." Mutual confession of offences is recommended and prayer for one another. Here the ministry of forgiveness is very closely connected with prayer, and the Presbyters act together as a body. Other texts which have been held to bear upon this topic may be found discussed in the sixth book of Hooker (4, 5) with his usual thoroughness.

XXXIV.—SKETCH OF ANCIENT PENITENTIAL DISCIPLINE.
GRADUAL CHANGE TO PRIVACY.

Inasmuch as the Church is a voluntary religious society its punishments and acts of discipline are spiritual, and consist of censures leading if necessary to exclusion, for a greater or less period, and in a greater or less degree, from the fellowship of the society and especially from its chief act of fellowship, the Holy Communion.

The ministry of Penitence is a part of this discipline, applied to persons who may, from whatever cause, have become wholly or partially unworthy of Christian fellowship.

That this ministry is now generally exercised in private, and by a single Presbyter, of course subject to appeal to the Bishop, is a concession to human weakness and to convenience, rather than a primitive or an ideal condition of things. One man may sit alone to exercise it, but in so doing he must remember that he is acting as the repre-

est culpam simpliciter confiteri" in his *Ep. 84 ad Pammachium et Oceanum* sec. 6, which is quoted by Gratian, *Deer.* II. 33, *Dist.* I., c. 72 *de penitentia*, and by the Council of Trent, *Sess.* XIV. *de poenit. canon* 2. St. Jerome is not however laying down a rule, but speaking of his own regret for his early errors: and the Council of Trent probably forgot that he urges a Christian Virgin Demetrias in another Epistle (130 sec. 9) so to live as to have no need of this "secunda tabula" of penitence. See below end of chapter xxxix.

sentative of the whole body, both of clergy and laity, of clergy as the ministers of the act, of laity as the body which receives back to Christian fellowship or refuses the society of the penitent, and whose prayers avail with those of the clergy to gain God's compassion and pardon. The primitive discipline was that of public confession, especially of grave faults, with circumstances of shame and sorrow, attended by intercessory prayer on the part of the whole Church both clergy and laity on behalf of the sinners, and finally concluded by re-admission to communion. This was an act of laying on of hands which immediately preceded the reception of the sacrament. If the Bishop were present he was specially the minister of this absolution, and it pertained particularly to his office to direct it when absent. On occasion not only the whole body of Presbyters, but a single Presbyter or even a Deacon might be delegated to perform the principal duty, when death was imminent, as we see in S. Cyprian's *Epistles* (18 ep. 19, 20). This, however, as regards Deacons was a Latin rather than a Greek custom.*

This privilege of Deacons, in cases of necessity, to hear confessions and impose penances is recognised, while it is restrained, by two English Councils under Archbishop Hubert Walter, and by our own Bishop Richard Poore.† It seems to have stood much on a par with their ministry of baptism, which (as we have seen) is the other half of the same power. Similar considerations have led to a partial recognition of the action of laymen in both spheres, Baptism and Penitence. A story was circulated in the middle ages of an unreconciled Penitent and an unbaptized person desiring Baptism travelling together alone in a boat, and falling into danger of shipwreck. The Penitent baptized his fellow-traveller, who thereupon reconciled him, and both were held to have done right when they

* See for further details Morinus' *De poenitentia* viii. 23, p. 588 foll. ed. Antwerp 1682, and Bingham *Ant.* xix. chap. 2.

† York in 1195 and London 1200: Wilkins *Conc.* i. pp. 501-2, and 505. Cp. *Sarum Charters* p. 139. See more in Martenne *Ant. Eccl. Rit.* i. 6, 7.

escaped to land.* And Aquinas† holds that in necessity a Layman may hear a confession, and that whatever the action lacks of sacramental virtue is supplied by the great High Priest. This is surely reasonable, and should be recollected by our Physicians, Soldiers and Sailors of all grades, and generally by all in contact with danger. Joinville received such a confession in the Crusade; and Bayard made one to a member of his household when mortally wounded, in 1524.

The sign of readmission was universally imposition of hands, and this was accompanied with prayer that God would absolve the penitents and remit and pardon their sins, in a form not unlike that in our Communion Office.

The offices first for the exclusion, and then for the reconciliation of penitents in public, are to be found in the Sarum services for Ash Wednesday and for Thursday in Holy Week, and apparently were used up to the sixteenth century.‡

Private Confession and Absolution was gradually substituted in ordinary cases for this solemn public act. It began first apparently in a natural distinction being drawn in favour of those who came forward to acknowledge their faults. The substitution at length became almost entire, being the result of various tendencies such as are observed in all parts of the Church's discipline, and such as almost necessarily accompany the attempt of a victorious Christianity to treat all persons born in a district as members of the Church.§

* This is given by Ivo *Decret.* i. 191 and Gratian *Decret. de Consecratione* Dist. 4, 36, as from S. Augustine *ad Fortunatum*. It is not however in the only letter to Fortunatus extant in the works of Augustine (No. 115) nor anywhere in his works. It has all the appearance of a fiction: but it illustrates opinion.

† *In lib. sent* dist. 17 quæst. 3 art. 3, 9, 2. See more in Morinus *De Poen.* viii. 24 and Martenne l. c. S. Benedict XIV. *de Synodo Dioec.* vii. 14, decides in the contrary sense, and is followed by Liguori, *Theol. Mor.* Lib. v., tr. 4, cap. 2, § 540.

‡ The first is given in the note to Dickinson's edition of the *Missal*, the second in the text. Both are in the *Processional* and *Gradual*.

§ The Epistle of Pope Leo I. *to the Bishops of Campania* no. 168 (alias 136) A.D. 459, in which he rebukes them for publishing the sins of penitents, refers to those undergoing *public* penance. Morinus vii. 1 dates the prevalence of the custom of making a distinction as to public penance between secret and open sins A.D. 700—730, the time of Bede.

For the discipline of public penance would not seem strange, and does not seem strange, to new converts from heathenism in our own day, who have lately gone through the great open trial and spiritual crisis of accepting Baptism as full-grown men and women. But when people have been baptized as infants, and adult baptism is the exception not the rule around them, their feelings are more tender and they shrink from publicity. Hence the Church has to consider how to help them to realise the sinfulness of sin and to submit to, what is more necessary to them, an educational training instead of a sharp external discipline. This it has sought to give in private confession.

The objects of the change were, therefore, to save the position and feelings of penitents and to give greater opportunities to the clergy to educate their consciences. It was thought, not unnaturally, more edifying that a certain reserve should be used, enabling a greater variety of influences than shame and distress to be brought to bear on penitents.

So much for the method of ministration. As regards the sins to be confessed in it, we note that in the primitive Church there was no penance exacted under the Canons except for the gravest faults. Originally it would seem that the three capital sins, which, as it were, stand at the head of the three great divisions of human error, Idolatry, Murder, and Adultery,* or like heinous offences, alone needed to be confessed. Others were left to the conscience of the penitent.† It is noticeable, as an evidence of this, that the severe

* See the evidence well collected in Rev. George Mead's article on *Penitence*, *Dict. of Chr. Ant.*, vol. ii. p. 1599 foll. Idolatry is the great sin belonging to the class of sins of the *intellect* (or Pride); Murder the most striking sin of the *angry* temper, and Adultery of the *sensual temper*. This is well brought out by Gregory of Nyssa in his *Epistola Canonica ad Letoium*. Op. tom. i. pp. 646 foll. Paris 1615. He follows naturally the Platonic division of the soul into the λογιστικόν, ἐπιθυμητικόν and θυμοειδές. Early Latin writers take their text from the decree of the Apostles, Acts xv. 29, where three classes may be distinguished of things to be avoided, (1) meats offered to idols, (2) blood and things strangled, (3) fornication. Tertullian, *e.g.*, interprets this as a prohibition of the three great sins, *De Pudicitia* 12.

† See for instance an important passage of Faustus Reiensis *Serm.* 15, quoted by Hooker under the name of Salvianus, E.P. vi. 4, 6, with others of like import. See also *ib.* 5, 16. Cp. Marshall ch. 2 pt. 2 p. 84 foll.

Council of Elvira and the milder Council of Ancyra, at the beginning of the fourth century, deal almost exclusively with these three sins in their canons of penance. Of course nothing prevented men from voluntarily seeking advice on their inward state, and this was often done.*

XXXV.—THE LATERAN CANON AND OUR OWN DISCIPLINE.

Now if we compare this primitive state of things with the Canon of the fourth Lateran Council (No. 31, A.D. 1215), which ordered private confession of all sins at least once a year to the 'proprius sacerdos,' and with the offices of the Church of England, which deal with penitential discipline, namely, those for Holy Communion and for the Visitation of the Sick, we shall see that our Church desired to return very much to the primitive discipline, but to adhere at the same time to the spirit of gentleness which underlay the changes which had been found almost necessary and expedient owing to the altered circumstances of the Church. The Lateran canon opens as follows: "Omnis utriusque sexus fidelis, postquam ad annos discretionis pervenerit, omnia sua solus peccata confiteatur fideliter, saltem semel in anno, proprio sacerdoti, et injunctam sibi poenitentiam studeat pro viribus adimplere, suscipiens reverenter ad minus in Pascha eucharistiae sacramentum; nisi forte de consilio proprii sacerdotis, ob aliquam rationabilem causam ad tempus ab ejus perceptione duxerit abstinendum: alioquin et vivens ab ingressu ecclesiae arceatur et moriens Christiana careat sepultura." The confessor is ordered to act like a discreet physician, "diligenter inquirens et peccatoris circumstantias et peccati, per quas prudenter intelligat, quale illi consilium debeat exhibere et cujusmodi remedium adhibere." He is strictly forbidden to reveal the person of the penitent.

We should judge wrongly if we supposed that the main object of this Lateran Canon was to establish private confession in order to enlarge the power of the priesthood. The object clearly was to bring every one of the years of discretion

* Cp. Origen in Ps. xxxvii. Hom. 2, 6, quoted by Hooker l. c. 7.

to Holy Communion, and to secure, in the way least likely to be disagreeable to the people, that they should not come with mortal sin upon their consciences. The man who does not obey the canon is to be denied entrance into the Church and Christian burial, not because he has not been to confession, but because he has put himself out of Communion. No doubt in the three hundred years that elapsed between the Lateran Council and the Reformation the system had been found not to work well. It rendered communion infrequent; it fostered a coarse and material conception of sin; it checked the development of a sense of responsibility; it encouraged priestly pretentiousness. This led to the modifications wisely introduced by our forefathers, which were directed to meet all these ill consequences of the medieval system, while retaining the ancient institution in such a form as seemed suitable to the times. The object of course was to ensure reception of Holy Communion with the greatest reverence and preparation, but with the utmost frequency which might be expedient.

Our English discipline of private confession, therefore, differs from the Roman in three very important and, I venture to assert, most valuable particulars. In the first place it emphasises most strongly the Scriptural duty of self-examination, and makes private confession to a priest an entirely subsidiary duty, and one left to a man's own conscience to decide upon. Secondly, it suggests confession only of sins in regard to which a man cannot quiet his own conscience, or in other words, "any weighty matter." Thirdly, it permits confession to other discreet and learned ministers, and does not limit it to the "*proprius sacerdos*," as the Lateran Council does, though this order has been greatly infringed in practice. I may add to this that it directs reference to the Bishop, after the older plan, in regard to everyone who may be, for any reason, debarred from Communion against his will. See the rubric at the beginning of the Communion office. This, inferentially at least, restores to the Bishop his proper place in penitential discipline, since, of course, a penitent who is refused Communion can appeal

to the authority to whom the Priest must report a case of such public refusal. The rubric in question presupposes that the people have sent in their names for Communion, and that the Priest finds among them offenders directly against God or against their brethren. If he excludes any from Communion he is to report them to the Ordinary and the Ordinary is to proceed against the offending person "according to the Canon." The latter part of this rubric, about the report, was added in 1662. "The Canon," therefore, probably does not mean the "Laws of the Church" generally, but the 109th Canon of 1604, which implies punishment in the Ecclesiastical courts, involving excommunication.

On the other hand our Church secures to the penitent who comes forward of his own free will, the milder treatment of secrecy as to the matter of his confession, according to the precedent of Leo 1st and the Lateran Canon. In the 113th Canon of 1604 it strictly forbids the revelation, by the minister "to any person whatsoever," of "any crime or offence committed to his trust or secrecy (except they be such crimes as by the laws of this realm his own life may be called in question for concealing the same) under pain of irregularity." The latter, I may remark, is a very severe punishment, involving suspension from the duties of the clerical office. A priest, then, may not reveal what is said to him in private confession, even to the Bishop. But if a penitent desire to appeal to the Bishop, against unjust refusal of Communion, I have not the least doubt that he may do so. The law of secrecy is entirely for *his* benefit not for that of the Priest. In these matters we are servants of our people, set, after the Lord's example, to wash their feet before holy Communion.

It is, as I have said, part of the ancient law of the Church that the Bishop is the chief minister of penitence, but there are many indications that it was right for him in any difficulty, to consult his presbyters. Such an appeal for instance to shorten the discipline which forbids a man Communion, ought, in my opinion, to be heard by the Bishop in Chapter if it is at all an unusual case.*

* See for interesting matter bearing on this point the article on *Penitence* l. c. pp. 1606, 1607.

XXXVI.—WHAT OUR PRACTICE OUGHT TO BE.

We must therefore beware how we infringe the liberty guaranteed to our people. We have no right to press confession indiscriminately upon a mixed audience. We ought to teach our people the special danger of heinous sins as separating us from God and His Church; we ought, sometimes, to repel certain persons from Communion. But if we do not know them to be guilty of grievous sins we have no right to press them to confession either public or private. They have a right to guide their own consciences, and this responsibility on the whole works well, and produces a fine, independent type of character. This was clearly the object of the changes made by our Church in the sixteenth century, which have effected the condition of discipline under which we live.

If people ask our help, however, we must give it, nothing doubting that it is God's design that we should be able to counsel the penitent and to give the benefit of absolution and to pronounce remission of sin to those who wish to be admitted to Holy Communion. This end must always be kept in view if we wish to understand the practice to be followed.

XXXVII.—THE OUTWARD SIGN OF IMPOSITION OF HANDS.

As to the outward sign to be used, I have no doubt that we ought to keep to the ancient rite of imposition of hands to be imparted either at once, if the necessary conditions have been fulfilled, or at the end of the period of discipline, if a period is needed. The Roman Church, for some obscure reasons, has given up this primitive practice, apparently from the middle of the 13th century, though S. Charles Borromeo attempted a partial restoration of it in the Province of Milan, in the form of lifting up the hand.* Our

* See a collection of information on the subject in Morinus *de Poen.* viii. 15. S. Thomas Aquinas argues that imposition of hands is not necessary; *Summa* III., q. 84, art. 4. The Schoolmen differ a good deal on the question of the "matter": see G. L. Hahn *Lehre von den Sakramenten* p. 149, Breslau 1864. Finally the Council of Trent calls the "quasi-matter" of the Sacrament of Penitence "the acts of the penitent, contrition, confession, and satisfaction."

own Sarum rites order public absolution to be given *elevata manu*; and imposition of hands is ordered in the reconciliation of a sick penitent in the Leofric Missal of the 11th century (p. 238 foll.) There is a beautiful ancient collect, ordered in the Gelasian and later service-books, to be said by the minister for himself, which I recommend for your use before saying the absolution either publicly or privately. It runs thus, as well as I can translate it:—

“Be favourable, O Lord, to our supplications; and of Thy goodness hearken unto me who myself first need thy mercy; and whereas, for no desert of mine, but by the gift of thy grace, thou hast appointed me to minister this holy act, grant that I may execute thy office with boldness; and do thou thyself perform thy work of pity through the ministry of our unworthy hands: through Christ our Lord. Amen.”*

XXXVIII.—THE FORM OF WORDS, FIRST PRECATORY, THEN INDICATIVE.

As to the words which we should use in the reconciliation of a penitent, whether privately or publicly, before his admission to Communion, if we look to antiquity we find that they always were couched in the form of a prayer. This has always continued the only form in the Greek Church, and such a form stood equally alone in the West until the 13th century. Two old precatory forms in fact are still ordered to be said first in the Roman Rituale, and cannot be supposed to have lost the value which they once undoubtedly possessed, although another form is now joined to them.†

The date of the addition of an indicative form, as it is called, containing the words “I absolve thee,” is fixed by a short tract of S. Thomas Aquinas on the question of the

* *Adesto, Domine, supplicationibus nostris; et me, qui etiam misericordia tua primus indigeo, clementer exaudi: et quem non electione meriti sed dono gratiae tuae constituisti operis huius ministrum, da fiduciam tui muneris exsequendi, et tu ipse in nostro ministerio, quod pietatis tuae est, operare. Per Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen.*

† The account of this matter given by the Council of Trent is an inversion of the facts as far as history is concerned. The form “I absolve thee” is added to the prayers, not the prayers to the form; *Sess. XIV. De Poen. cap. 3.*

right form, in answer to a "libellus" of some unknown author sent him by the General of his Order. He does not attempt to prove "I absolve thee" to be an old form, or to refute the assertion that great schoolmen, like William of Auxerre, William of Paris, and Cardinal Hugo (of S. Cher), had been opposed to it. He bases his support to it upon S. Paul's words (2 Cor. ii. 10), "To whom ye forgive anything I forgive also; for what I also have forgiven, if I have forgiven anything, for your sake have I forgiven it in the person of Christ," and on the analogy of the baptismal and confirmation forms "I baptize thee," "I sign thee." And against the earlier authorities he sets the judgment of the Doctors teaching at Paris apparently in his own day. As to the meaning of the words he does not entirely approve of the explanation "I declare thee absolved," but supposes them to equal "I impart to thee the sacrament or ministry of absolution."*

The precatory form is certainly the more Scriptural, as we can see by comparing the passage of S. James; and the indicative form is liable to be misunderstood by those who think that it implies a claim to omniscience and omnipotence on the part of the priest. But explained in either of the two ways named by Aquinas there is nothing arrogant in it. Our Church has preserved both in the service for the Visitation of the sick, where the priest is ordered to absolve the penitent first in the indicative form and then to say the very ancient prayer or collect beginning "O most merciful God, who, according to the multitude of thy mercies, dost so put away," &c. This collect appears in the Gelasian and Gregorian Sacramentaries, and therefore seems to go back to the sixth or seventh century.

In the ministry to the sick the indicative form, "I absolve thee," exhibits our office as that of a judge, deciding on the evidence before us, that the person is fit for Communion. If he has not told us the truth, or is not really penitent, the

* *Opusculum V de forma absolutionis*, Works tom. xix. pp. 176 foll. Venice 1737. Cp. *Summa* III. quaest. 84 art. 3. See more in Morinus *de Pæn.* viii. 8 foll.

absolution does not convey God's grace of pardon. We may hope, however, that the sick usually do tell the truth under such circumstances. We at any rate cannot be blamed for arrogance in using these words. But if we have not taken pains to ascertain the signs and character of penitence, or if we decide hastily and without study of the conditions which the Church exacts before it admits an offender to Communion, we may justly be blamed. Bishop Poore insists on the obvious duty of consulting the Bishop or wise men (*Sarum Charters* p. 143).

The collect that follows exhibits our office as that of a physician of souls, an almost more important duty.

The further question, whether the form "I absolve thee" should be used by us in the private absolution of those who are not sick, is not quite easy to answer. It was ordered to be used in the Prayer-book of 1549: but the order was struck out in the revision of 1552, and it has never been restored.

The indicative form cannot, therefore, considering the history of the rite, be considered as necessary. Nor on the other hand does omission in this case appear to be prohibition, if we are clear that a person is then and there fit for Communion. It has interested me to find that my predecessor Bishop Burnet considered either form to be proper, but himself, in private absolution, used the form in the Communion Office.* But in any case we should use a prayer—e.g. the collect, or the form in the Communion Office, both of which are certainly adequate forms by themselves. If we use the collect it will be necessary to make such slight modifications of phrase as will adapt it to a person in health. As to the form of confession nothing is laid down, and it may vary according to the circumstances. The person making it should however be instructed that he is confessing to God, in the presence of one who is at once a witness on behalf of the whole Church and an ambassador of Christ.

* See Pusey's *Gaume* p. cxxviii.

XXXIX.—CAUTIONS AS TO THE CONDUCT OF THE MINISTER.

As regards the attitude of the minister it is right that he should be exceedingly cautious, neither to exact an enumeration of all sins, nor to suggest unthought of sins to the penitent. The words of the *Homily of Repentance* may well be remembered by him: "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" (p. 577 S.P.C.K., 1846). In order to avoid undue pressure or suggestion, and as a matter of common sense, it is right first to hear what the person who is troubled in mind has to say. This may of itself suffice. But if it is clear that questions must be asked, the minister should follow generally the lines of the exhortation in the Communion Office. This will be perfectly safe, and will enable him clearly to do his main duty, which is to pronounce, either then or later, that a person is fit to receive holy Communion. For he will have followed the instructions of our own Church as to preparation for holy Communion. He may therefore go on to ask the following questions:—

- (1) Have you carefully examined your conscience by the rule of God's commandments, and confessed *all* your sins to Him? Have you considered sins of omission, or neglect of the duties of love to God and man, as well as sins of commission?
- (2) Have you done all in your power to reconcile yourself to your neighbours and to make restitution for any wrong that you have done?
- (3) Have you committed any of the great sins named in the exhortation, and are you satisfied that you have truly repented of them? Have you been guilty of fraud?
- (4) Is there anything still weighing on your conscience which you wish now to confess?

If the answers are satisfactory, we have done all that we are bound to do in testing a person's fitness for the Sacrament. But if they are not, we ought, in deference to ancient custom, to defer absolution till such time as fitness is shewn

and in case of difficulty to take careful advice, of course without indicating the person requiring help. The indicative form and the laying on of hands should not be used except as a direct prelude to the Sacrament. Originally the laying on of hands was given in the same service as the Communion.

There are however two other dangers which we must specially guard against. In the first place we must beware of introducing the elaborate and artificial distinction between *venial and mortal sins* which occupies so large a place in the manuals of moral theology of the Church of Rome. In the second place we must avoid in any way giving currency to the idea that *satisfaction*, made by the penitent, is a substitute for proper reparation to our neighbour and faith in the atonement made by our Blessed Lord.

The distinction between venial and mortal sins is in one way matter of common sense. "In many things (says St. James) we all offend" (iii. 2). But as carried out in detail, in connection especially with the Jesuit theory of "probabilism," which dominates Roman moral teaching at the present day, it is a terrible snare to the conscience. "Probabilism" means that if you are in doubt about a thing, and can find an "opinio probabilis" in its favour, you may safely do it. This means in practice that you must discover one "Doctor gravis et probus" who permits it, after the manner of the School of Hillel among the Jewish Rabbis.* But

* A full discussion of this subject will be found in the text and notes to Liguori's *Theologia Moralit* tom. i. of the Paris edition of 1872. Great part of the labour of the defenders of probabilism is taken up with dexterously combating or evading the condemnation of 65 propositions of Jesuit morality by Pope Innocent XI. in 1679. The following thesis is Gury's: "Licet sequi opinionem vere et solide probabilem, relicta tutiore aequè probabili, vel etiam vere probabiliori, ubi de solo licito vel illicito agitur" (l. c. p. 61). The same page gives the approbation of all Liguori's opinions on the part of the court of Rome, as being safe for a confessor to follow in practice. What some of those opinions are may be learned e.g. from the *Christian Remembrancer* vols. 27 p. 38 foll. and 28 p. 401 foll. both for 1854. There is a good passage on the danger of this distinction between sins in Dr. G. Salmon's sermon entitled *Truthfulness* in his *Non-miraculous Christianity*, &c., pp. 240--6, Lond. 1881.

since there is usually some one who takes a milder view than others of any particular sin, it is often easy to find excuse for the conscience, and so have authority to rank what may really be a great sin among venial offences. Further the teaching as to the importance of quantity in distinguishing venial from mortal sins is excessively misleading.

These teachers mean by "venial" sins, not merely such as all men would honestly consider less important, but cases of theft, fraud, lying, deceit, uncleanness, cruelty,* which moralists of any strictness would consider very serious, and which, when habitual, would go far to ruin the whole character. Many of these are made light of by a series of distinctions as to intention, quantity, frequency, consequences, directness and indirectness of the act, and the like, and thus the conscience is depraved, and its standard made shifty, by the very authority which ought to elevate it, that of the representative of God.

Liguori's own standard of truthfulness may be gathered from his manner of citing passages from the Fathers in his *Glories of Mary*.† A writer, who recommends this book, cautions those who use it not to employ it in controversy, for "it is only necessary to mention that S. Alphonsus did not scruple to make the most important additions to the passages which he quoted from the Fathers; and this, though perfectly allowable in a book of meditations, of course destroys its value as a work of authority in matters of controversy." Both the original author's act, and the justification of it as "perfectly allowable in a book of meditations," are explained by the lax system of morals taught in the confessional as administered by the advocates of "probabilism."

The question of *Satisfaction* would require a volume for its

* See for a painful instance the "probable" opinion cited by Liguori, lib. iv. tr. iv. cap. 1, No. 374. Bull-fights, forbidden elsewhere, are allowed in Spain by a decree of Pope Clement VIII, ib. No. 365.

† See the *Chr. Remembrancer*, vol. 30, p. 452 foll., 1855. These articles on Liguori and other important material were reprinted by their author, Rev. F. Meyrick, then Fellow and Tutor of Trin. Coll., Oxford, under the title of *Moral and Devotional Theology of the Church of Rome*, Lond. 1857. The passage quoted is on p. 38 of the article in question.

treatment, but I venture to lay down the following principle with regard to it. The schoolmen divide the "matter" of penitence into three parts, *Contrition* or genuine sorrow, *Confession* and *Satisfaction*. By Satisfaction the Church of Rome understands fastings, prayers and alms, and other acts of piety enjoined by the Confessor. See the *Council of Trent, Session xiv. on Penitence*, canon 13. It would, however, be more true to moral theology to divide this head into three parts, and to avoid the use of the ambiguous term Satisfaction, which in early writers differs little from sorrowful confession,* but in strict Theology describes the Atonement made by our Lord for us. There are in fact five parts of true penitence, (1) *Sorrow*, (2) *Confession*, (3) *Reparation*, (4) *Submission to discipline*, (5) *Loving Self-oblation* of the penitent to God in humble faith in the merits of Christ. We may call this last *Faith in the Atonement*. No penitence can be complete without all these. None for instance is adequate without *Reparation*. For all sin is against our neighbour as well as against God. Even the most secret fault involves sins of neglect and omission, and therefore requires some *Reparation* to be made to man for our indolent carelessness as to his claims upon us. As regards *Submission to discipline*, the minister of penitence must be careful to teach that the penances enjoined are not in themselves "satisfactory," but merely educational. He must be careful also not to enjoin, as penances, religious acts which are otherwise duties, or which will thereby become associated with disagreeable sensations. Lastly he must teach that love to God and thankfulness for the atonement of Christ is absolutely necessary for reconciliation of the soul to Him.

Lastly I would remind my younger brethren that the words of the Exhortation, "Let him come to me *or to some other discreet and learned minister*" give them, what they must often feel that they need, an opening to decline confessions which may be dangerous to them to receive. The Roman Church exacts serious conditions from its Confessors

* See Pusey's Tertullian in *Library of the Fathers*, note K.

before they are licensed. In the Greek Church it is stated that a Confessor must be forty years of age. The Church of England should not be less cautious. But if it is absolutely unavoidable that they should hear confessions which they would rather decline, let there be no secrecy, no lack of precaution.

Private confession is quite a different thing from secret confession, as many rules of the medieval church testify. One of Bishop Poore's rules is: "Confessiones mulierum audiantur extra velum, et in propatulo quantum ad visum, non quantum ad auditum" (l. c. p. 141). I see no reason to doubt the wisdom of this rule; and, for the sake of protection, I would advise the minister to sit within the altar rails, in his surplice or gown, with black scarf or almuce, and to let the penitent kneel outside it. "Let all things be done decently and in order." "Provide things honest in the sight of all men." "Let no man despise thee."

I cannot do better than to sum up the Roman and English views of the subject in the words of Hooker (*E. P.* vi. 4, 13 and 15).

The Roman view is: "1. That the only remedy for sin after baptism is sacramental penitency. 2. That confession in secret is an essential part thereof. 3. That God himself cannot now forgive sins without the priest. 4. That because forgiveness at the hands of the priest must arise from confession in the offender, therefore to confess unto him is a matter of such necessity, as being not either in deed, or at the least in desire performed, excludeth utterly from all pardon,* and must consequently in Scripture be commanded, wheresoever any promise of forgiveness be made."

With regard to private confession and absolution the English view is: "The minister's power to absolve is publicly taught and professed; the Church not denied to

* The strange custom of beating the dead body or the tomb of an excommunicated person, who has shown signs of contrition before decease, and then absolving him, has been introduced to meet this difficulty. See the Roman *Rituale* tit. 3 cap. 4.

Liguori v. 4, 2 § 540 cites this as a reason against confession to laymen having any validity.

have authority either of abridging or enlarging the use and exercise of that power; upon the people no such necessity imposed of opening their transgressions unto men, as if remission of sins otherwise were impossible; neither any such opinion had of the thing itself as though it were either unlawful or unprofitable, saving only for these inconveniences, which the world by experience observed in it heretofore. And in regard thereof, the Church of England hitherto hath thought it the safer way to refer men's hidden crimes unto God and themselves only; howbeit, not without special caution for the admonition of such as come to the holy Sacrament, and for the comfort of such as are ready to depart the world."

This seems to me a fair statement of the salient points of difference between English and Roman discipline. As regards the debatable points who should and who should not be counselled to come to confession, I give my own judgment, with all submission to the general rules of the Church, and without claiming such authority for my judgment as I should claim for a definite exposition of these rules.

I think that there are many persons living with heavy sin upon their consciences, sin perhaps that has found expression in single dark acts, or sin that has become habitual, who would be very much helped by confession. To such it may mean all the difference between interior light and darkness. Such confession may need to be repeated, perhaps at regular intervals, in order to test the progress and perseverance of the penitent. There are others, of scrupulous consciences, who may be made easy and at peace by it, who should nevertheless, in their own interest, not be advised to seek it often. There are many others to whom I would say, as S. Jerome does to Demetrias (*ep.* 130, 9), "*Nos ignoremus poenitentiam, ne facile peccemus. Illa quasi secunda post naufragium tabula miseris sit: in virgine integra servetur navis.*" A Christian virgin should not need that second plank of penitence, on which those who have made shipwreck of life may escape safe to land.

XL.—ON PUBLIC PRAYER TOUCHING THE FAITHFUL DEPARTED.

There remains one question on which I feel sure some of you will desire to have a distinct answer from myself, namely to what extent I should be able and willing to sanction "additional services" containing prayers for the faithful departed. To this I would reply that I should have to compare any forms submitted to me with the prayers already existing in the Prayer-book. For although I do not think it necessary that every syllable of such services should be found in the Bible or Prayer-book, I have no right, in sanctioning prayers to be used in Church, to go beyond the "lex supplicandi" supplied by the Prayer-book (see ch. vii.), especially on a matter where there is great difference of opinion and feeling among Churchmen. Now the prayers touching the departed contained in the Prayer-book (besides the general petitions in the Lord's prayer and the *Te deum*) are marked by two characteristics. Firstly they treat the departed as part of the whole communion of saints, rather than as a separate class. Secondly they look forward beyond the intermediate state to the joy of the resurrection and the glory of heaven. Thus in the first collect of the *Order for the Burial of the Dead* we pray to God "that we, with all those that are departed in the true faith of thy holy Name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in thy eternal and everlasting glory." And in the Communion Office we pray that "with them we may be partakers of thy heavenly kingdom," and that "by the merits and death of thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we and all thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins and all other benefits of his passion." Fuller forms of this type may be found in our Cathedral Commemoration Service (first held 5th November, 1889) and in a Commemoration Service for Wimborne Grammar School (first held 25 July, 1896); and I should be willing to sanction similar services elsewhere.

As regards the short versicle "Fidelium animæ," often found at the close of English adaptations of the "hour"

offices, I would remark that it does not occur in the Sarum Breviary, nor even in the English Marian primer of 1555. It began to be introduced here and there shortly before the Reformation, as in the Compline, Rouen 1497. If any such service were sent to me containing it, I should either direct the hour service to end as it did in the Sarum books, or substitute such a fuller form as this:—"Lord grant to all thy faithful people to rest in peace and to rise in glory." For what may without offence be used in private devotion, or on a sepulchral monument, cannot so readily be prescribed for use in a Church to which all parishioners have rights of access, and which should be the common home of all Christians.

XLI.—CONCLUDING EXHORTATION.

Finally, my brethren, I would exhort you to unity in the common faith. This is held by the clergy of the Church of England, I am convinced, with greater tenacity and conformity to the simple truth of the Gospel, than by the ministers of any other religious body, whatever its claims may be. It is by this faith that we shall be saved. Do not let transitory irritation or party feeling lead you to think lightly of this priceless bond; but by trying to understand one another where you differ on details, and by supporting one another gently and temperately where you agree, help the whole body to a more balanced and rounded apprehension of the truth. As a Bishop I see the good in every honest and pious Christian man, and I by no means limit this perception to our own communion. But I see particularly the enormous value of your life and work. I may say this with scarcely a reserve as to any one of you; and I long to be able to keep you united to one another, and to the dear flock of Christ committed to us, without strain or heartburning, suspicion or sharpness. God grant this of His great mercy!

Your loving Friend and Bishop,

JOHN SARUM.

SALISBURY,

4th July, 1898

APPENDIX.

COUNSELS ON SOME POINTS OF ORDER AND RITUAL WHERE
CAUTION OR EXPLANATION IS NECESSARY.

1. The *Te deum* consists of three parts and should be so divided as to music and recitation : (1) the hymn *Te deum laudamus* addressed to the blessed Trinity, in which the threefold "Holy, Holy, Holy" of the Angels answers to the threefold doxology of the Church on earth. Both doxologies (viz. verses 5, 6 and 11—13) may well be said by the minister and congregation together, or by the full Choir. In any case we should make a fresh start at (2) the hymn *Tu rex gloriæ, Christe* addressed to Christ as God, and (3) the Versicles and Responses, almost entirely from Scripture, beginning *O Lord save thy people*, which might be attached to any other hymn and, with a slight change, to an evening hymn. This division should be brought to the attention of musical composers, organists and choirmasters, and should be observed especially in any solemn use of the *Te deum*.

2. Banns of Matrimony, when published in the morning, should, strictly speaking, be published after the Nicene Creed "immediately before the sentences for the offertory." In the afternoon "immediately after the second lesson." The rubric prefixed to the marriage service has been for a long time printed incorrectly in our Prayer-books.

3. My rule is that no marriage licenses should be issued to either party in a Divorce suit. Such remarriages should be discouraged, even in the case of an innocent person. The license clearly acts as an encouragement. On the other hand, when the party on whose suit a divorce has been obtained, is remarried "under civil sanction," and there is no other reason for debarring him or her from holy Communion, the clergy are not, in my opinion, authorised to refuse Communion. See the resolutions of the *Lambeth Conference* of 1888, No. 4 C (ed. S.P.C.K., p. 278).

4. I am constantly receiving requests regarding *Special Services for the burial of the Dead*. Those authorised in this Diocese have for many years been printed in the Diocesan Kalendar, where the clergy may find them for themselves. Of course I am always ready to give advice in any difficulty that may arise.

5. As regards the elements for holy Communion, they should be prepared by or immediately under the direction of the Priest. Where the chalice is mixed, it should be prepared before the service begins,

and placed upon the credence table or in some other accustomed place, and remain there until the offertory. If more Communicants than were expected are found to be present, an addition may be made to it at that time.

Question has been raised as to the quantity of water which should be added. Bishop Poore's rule in his *Constitutions*, § 58, was that the wine in the chalice should be more in quantity than the water, "major pars vini et modicum aquae ponatur" (*Sarum Charters and Documents*, p. 148, Rolls Series, 1891). The Lincoln rule was, "aqua modica, tamen quod stet per substantiam et colorem vini" (see my *Holy Communion* ed 2, p. 290). The printed *Missale Sarum* (p. 656 ed. Dickinson) has: "Item cavendum est ne apponatur nisi modicum de aqua; quia si tantum poneretur quod speciem vini tolleret, non conficeretur."

This is based upon what Honorius III. calls "the reasonable custom of the Church at large" that the wine should be in the greater proportion. He therefore reproves and forbids the contrary custom which was, it seems, growing up in Sweden (*Archiepiscopo Ablasensi* i.e. *Upsalensi* "Perniciosus valde, sicut audivimus" *Decretal. Greg. IX.* lib. III. 41, 14 in 1220). The Council of Tribur on the Rhine in 895 had laid down that the mixture was to be two thirds wine and one third water "quia major est majestas sanguinis Christi quam fragilitas populi" (Canon xix. *Labbe Conc.* ix. p. 451). But this proportion has no great authority. Thomas Aquinas speaks of "modica aqua" (*In art. fid. et sacr. eccl. expositio* tom. viii. p. 47, ed. Ven. 1776). Eugenius IV., who generally follows him, turns this into "aqua modicissima" in his *Decretum ad Armenos* in 1439 (*Labbe xiii.* p. 536), and this is now the rule of the Roman Church. The Greek Church, however, mixes wine and water in equal proportions, as I learn from the Very Rev. A. Paraschis.

There seems no authority for so large an admixture of water as has been suggested in the interests of some who fear temptation to excess; and therefore the Resolution of the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury of 5 July, 1883 ("the Church . . . has never prescribed the strength or weakness of the wine to be used") and Resolution 2 of the Lambeth Conference of 1888 ("true wine diluted or undiluted" ed. S.P.C.K. p. 277) must, in my judgment, be interpreted in the sense of the Church at large. A really light wine, with an admixture of water of equal or nearly equal proportion, can be injurious to no one.

6. I have already explained that the congregation at least should sit during the reading of the Epistle. In fact the clergy were also expected to do so according to the Sarum Liturgy, except of course the Epistoler. See Dickinson's *Missale Sarum* p. 586 and Maskell *Anc. Lit. of the Church of England* p. 50 &c. ed. 3.

7. I wish that we could have the same responses everywhere both before and after the Gospel: *Glory be to Thee, O Lord* before it, and

Thanks be unto Thee, O Lord, for this Thy Holy Gospel after . They are addresses to our Saviour Christ, whose words the Gospel especially contains, and Whom we should think of as present in the midst of us, as He has promised.

8. While the shorter exhortation is being read, at the words "Draw near with faith" some of the congregation should be encouraged to come forward and kneel at the altar-rails, as the Theological students now do at Salisbury. "With faith" means "with loving confidence and faith in the gift offered," and the phrase is adopted from Heb. x. 19—22, cp. iv. 16. Some people ignorantly think it means "spiritually and not literally," but this is a mistake. The communicants ought to come forward in person to show the close union of the clergy and faithful in the "royal priesthood" of the Church.

9. It seems to me (following Bp. Andrewes and others) most fitting that the priest should kneel when he communicates himself, now that other communicants kneel. When all stood, as in old days, of course he also stood; and he stands as the representative of Christ to minister to the people. But it is fitting for him, when he himself receives, to consider that he receives from the hand of the Great High Priest; and kneeling is therefore the more devout and appropriate posture. It is in fact an act of communion rather than an act of administration.

10. "The communion in both kinds" is to be "delivered" to the people "into their hands." The chalice should not be waved about, and the people should be allowed to take it, in agreement with Psalm cxvi. 12 (*Heb.* = 'I will take or lift up' from *nasà*).

11. The *Gloria in Excelsis* may be said or sung kneeling or standing. The latter is however the more usual and appropriate posture when the service is choral. Strangers in a place should follow the custom of the Church whatever it be.

12. The reverent consumption of what remains of the consecrated bread and wine is a matter requiring some little care. It seems best, after the larger pieces have been eaten, to brush the small fragments gently into the chalice and so consume them, rather than to attempt to take them up with the fingers or on the palm of the hand, which is often difficult and may be even slightly indecorous. In cleansing the chalice only water should be used. To add wine to the chalice (called in old days "augere" or "augere sanguinem") was a form of consecration. It was long in use, e.g. among the Cistercians: see Gieseler *Ch. Hist.* E. T. iii. p. 324. But to consecrate fresh wine is to defeat the object of cleansing the vessels. The fact that such a consecration would now be irregular among us does not make it less technically valid. Wine should therefore not be used in cleansing the chalice. A little water should first be poured on the paten and from the paten into the chalice.

PASTORAL LETTER.*

To the faithful Laity of the Church of Christ within the Diocese of Salisbury, John, by Divine permission Bishop of Salisbury, greeting. Grace to you and peace and joy in the holy Spirit be multiplied.

1. Dear brothers and sisters in the household of Christ, the attention which has recently been called, in some parts of the country, to certain ritual and liturgical questions among us has given me an opportunity of addressing a letter to our clergy, in which I have put before them certain general considerations on the subject of public worship and on the ministry of penitence, particularly in the form of private confession and absolution, and have endeavoured to draw certain conclusions which I trust may be helpful to them.

That letter will, I hope, be read and pondered by many of yourselves; but I think that it may be desirable that you should have from me a simpler and shorter statement both of the law of the Church of England on the subject of the services of the Church, and of the general principles which ought to regulate the whole conduct of public worship. I believe also that many of you will be desirous to know what it is right to think as regards that ministry of penitence which is closely connected with admission to holy Communion.

You will not, I am persuaded, imagine that, in taking this course, I am unmindful of the debt which this Church and Nation owe to the clergy as a body, and especially to those of them who have taken pains to raise the standard of reverence, beauty, and expressiveness, as well as of frequency

* This Letter was considered by some twenty-seven members of the Chapter, besides myself, on Friday, 1st of July; and those present were good enough unanimously to express a general approval of its contents.

and regularity in our public services. It is my earnest desire and prayer that this standard may be maintained, and that defects and shortcomings, especially as regards infrequent celebrations of holy Communion, and the inadequate use of our churches for daily and festival services, may be remedied wherever they still exist. The laity have a right to frequent celebrations, and the clergy have a duty to say public prayer, when not reasonably hindered, on week days as well as on Sundays. We must all heartily desire that the unity of the faith, which exists in singular fulness among our clergy, may be duly, fitly, constantly and consistently manifested to the eye and ear, as well as to the heart and mind, by unity of outward expression in public worship.

I have therefore thought it right to use the occasion of the awakening of the public mind to interest on the subject, to give such quiet teaching of principle, as will, I trust, enable both clergy and laity, and both men and women, not only to perceive what is right to be done in regard to matters that are at present in question, but to have rules to guide their consciences in future. May God's holy Spirit direct the hearts of those who read as well as the hand of him who writes these words !

2. In the first place the *law of the Church of England as to the service of the Church* and the general direction of public worship is that of primitive Christianity: "Let nothing be done without the Bishop." The Presbyters have, of course, their own share of responsible ministry; but the Bishop is the authorised interpreter of the Prayer-book when "doubts" arise. He receives the promises of the clergy at ordination. He is in the first instance the "lawful authority" referred to in their solemn declaration on admission to office. He is Pastor of every Parish, though acting generally through others. He has therefore to bear a great load of responsibility as a centre of unity. Both clergy and laity are interested in maintaining this authority, and in lightening this load. Let me remind you, indeed, dear brothers and sisters, that difficulties which have arisen in regard to innovations have, in the experience of history, arisen as much

from the laity as from the clergy. Congregational emulation and local ambition, and the eagerness of devout but untrained minds seizing upon isolated aspects of truth, have been potent sources of mischief in all movements which have brought dangers to the Church. Be on your guard, I pray you, against any tendency of this kind in yourselves.

I have therefore explained to our brethren of the clergy that no services or forms of prayer, outside the Prayer-book, may be used in public worship, unless directed, issued, sanctioned or allowed by the Bishop, including of course those already approved by my predecessors. I trust that you, especially the Churchwardens and Sidesmen, will assist me in seeing that this rule is carried out.

3. I have also called the attention of the Clergy to three great principles to be recollected in regard to public worship. It must be *Christian*, both in what it avoids and in what it expresses; it must be *in conformity with holy Scripture*; and it must be *worship according to the use of the Church of England*. As *Christian worship* it must avoid all superstition, and must express the true faith, since, above all things, it is worship of the Blessed Trinity in Unity. The special worship of any one person of the Blessed Trinity, where it is offered, must therefore be a subsidiary act, and not be permitted to cause confusion as to the general Object of our worship. We must not, for example, let it be supposed by anyone that the principal Object of worship in Holy Communion is the presence of Christ, separated in thought from the Unity of the Godhead, and bound up with the sacramental signs of His Body and Blood. Nor can we think it a "due use" of this holy rite (see Art. xxv.) that separate worship of His Presence should be directed towards the reserved Sacrament.

Nor is it right that the mind should be confused by anything approaching divine worship being paid to the cross, or to any other sacred but material thing. Such symbols are useful as reminders of the character of our worship. They become dangerous when they are turned into objects of worship.

4. The Invocation of Saints and Angels, practised in the Church of Rome, is not permissible to English Churchmen, as not being, in the opinion of our Church, *in conformity with the teaching of Holy Scripture*. It does not agree with that teaching, nor with the example set therein, as to the attitude of God's people on earth to the holy Angels, of whose perfection in blessedness we have greater evidence than we have as regards the present perfection of departed Saints. Nor does it agree with what is revealed to us as to the future judgment of all men. Nevertheless we have communion of another kind, as sympathetic fellow-worshippers, with the members of the invisible Church of God, both Angels in Heaven and departed Saints in Paradise. It is not strange that some persons should desire more. But God has ordered the conditions of our life on earth, not as we like, but as is best for our probation. He has separated us, for a time, from many offices of love and friendship with the departed, and we must humbly bow to His Providence.

5. The duty of *conforming to the Use of the Church of England* is not only one of ecclesiastical order, but is a religious duty based on our Lord's teaching about the character of the good Shepherd, who speaks to the sheep in a voice that they know and understand. It is based also on the recognition of national life in the record of the great miracle of Pentecost and in other parts of Holy Scripture.

It is the duty of Englishmen to respect the best characteristics of Englishmen such as unpretentious simplicity, self-reliance coupled with respect for order, and reserve in expressing emotion. It is no small fault either in clergy or laity to irritate such feelings by artificiality, exaggeration or affectation, by sudden or obtrusive gestures and postures, by seeming in any way to despise or make light of the Prayer-book. Respect one another and respect the Prayer-book, both in what it teaches directly and in its reserved and sober spirit.

At the same time I would affectionately remind the laity that the more hard-working and self-denying the clergy are, the more naturally their thoughts centre on the service of

God ; and that it is the duty of all to help them in their efforts to make it more regular and frequent, more reverent, bright and beautiful. If some of the clergy have an ideal, which men of sober judgment may criticise, let the latter not forget what is noble in such aspirations. If we determine to go on working together, on the foundations laid by our forefathers, we may, by God's blessing, establish a type of Christianity, which will be English at once and Catholic, and which will play a great part in the future development of God's Kingdom, and counteract the influence of ultramontane error.

In this connection I should especially like to thank the members of our Choirs for their self-denying labours in the service of the Church ; for the regularity of their attendance, both at practices and in public worship ; for their reverence and good behaviour in Church ; and for their recollection of their duty to consecrate their daily lives more than others to God's glory and the good of His people. I have often had occasion to feel and to express this gratitude at Confirmation-times to the members of particular Choirs, but I wish to make a more general and formal acknowledgment now. I have also much cause to thank the Parish Clerks and Sextons and the Bell-ringers, who are all rising to a higher conception of the dignity of their sacred duties.

6. The *ministry of penitence* in the Church of England, as regards private confession and absolution, is a matter on which caution is always necessary, on account of the "inconveniences which the world hath by experience observed in it heretofore," to use the words of our great Salisbury theologian, Richard Hooker (*E.P.* vi. 4, 15). These "inconveniences" are matters of common notoriety, and I cannot be surprised that many among yourselves are anxious about them. The general order of the Church of England is, however, perfectly clear, and is distinct from the Roman in the following points :—Firstly private confession is wholly voluntary among us, while in the Church of Rome it is compulsory, at least once a year, on all who desire to come to Holy Communion. Secondly, the minister of penitence has no right to require a

detailed enumeration of all sins, but should listen to the disclosure of those which, after careful self-examination, weigh upon the penitent's conscience, giving it such assistance as may be needed. The Church of Rome requires all "mortal sins" to be confessed,* even those of thought, which are against the 10th Commandment, and has thereby entangled itself in an endless and indeed most dangerous discussion as to what are "venial" and what "mortal" sins.† Thirdly, the Church of England leaves the penitent free to choose whatever "discreet and learned minister" he may prefer, to whom to open his grief, whereas the Church of Rome lays down that confession should be made to the parish priest (though this order is largely infringed in practice).

No Pastor of our Church has a right to contravene this teaching, or to lay down conditions for coming to Holy Communion which are inconsistent with it. If he gives further counsels from his own experience, he must be very careful to distinguish them from the order of the Church. Private confession was introduced, in the place of public penance, as a concession to the natural feeling of men, who shrank from open shame, and yet desired to be reconciled to the Church. It is so continued among us, though of course not forbidden to others who desire to use it. We clergy have no right, however, indiscriminately to press this ordinance, intended for the relief of mankind, in such a manner as to make it a snare to the scrupulous or a burden to sadden the hearts of those whom God has not made sad.

7. As regards *public prayer touching the faithful departed* I am willing to give wider sanction to such forms as are already in use in our Cathedral Church, or elsewhere by my authority; but I cannot go beyond the standard set us by our Prayer-book in those parts of it which bear upon this subject.

* See the Council of Trent *Session xiv. de Pœnitentia* chap. 5 and canon 7.

† On the danger of this distinction in practice I may refer to an interesting sermon of Dr. G. Salmon's, Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, entitled *Truthfulness*, in his *Non-miraculous Christianity, &c.*, Lond. 1881.

8. Finally, I would exhort you all, dear brothers and sisters, to remember the extreme value of the points in which we are all happily agreed. The Church of England is really so united that it often forgets its union in denouncing some partial danger or zealously defending some less important practice. This is the failing of a noble or at any rate of an open character. But we must not forget that we do not stand alone in the world. If we are to do God's work in manifesting the truth of the Gospel for the salvation of souls, it must be by making much of the points in which we agree. I can certainly notice a great advance in this matter during my lifetime, and, I believe, even during my episcopate. If certain teaching is requisite at this moment in regard to certain dangers, I believe it will be loyally accepted by those who require it. But let no one triumph over a brother who has received a check or a word of warning. Let each think how his own presentation of the truth may be improved. If some may confess to a zeal that has outrun discretion, let others reflect on shortcomings, indolence, and indifference, or one-sidedness of another character.

It is a comfort inexpressible, dear brothers and sisters in Christ, that I can address words of this kind to you with a consciousness that in every Parish they will find an echo, if not in every heart, yet in a daily increasing body of faithful men and women who are learning to think less of themselves and more of the kingdom of God. To which may He bring us all in His own good time and in His own way!

Believe me, with much affection,

Your faithful Friend and Pastor,

JOHN SARUM.

SALISBURY,

4th July, 1898.





