





LIBRARY  
OF THE  
UNIVERSITY  
OF ILLINOIS

✓



A

PASTORAL LETTER

TO THE

CLERGY OF THE DIOCESE OF EXETER,

ON THE

PRESENT STATE OF THE CHURCH.

BY HENRY, LORD BISHOP OF EXETER.

LONDON:

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.

1851.

*Publications of the Bishop of Exeter.*

---

- Letters to the late Charles Butler, on the Theological parts of his Book of the Roman Catholic Church ; with Remarks on certain Works of Dr. Milner and Dr. Lingard, and on some parts of the Evidence of Dr. Doyle. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 16s.
- Charges delivered at the Triennial Visitations in 1836, 1845, and 1848. 8vo. 2s. each.
- A Letter to the Clergy of the Diocese of Exeter on the Observance of the Rubric in the Book of Common Prayer. 12mo. 6d.
- An Ordination Sermon, preached in the Cathedral Church of Exeter. 12mo. 1s.
- A Sermon preached in behalf of the National Society ; with a Pastoral Letter to the Inhabitants of Plymouth. 12mo. 6d.
- A Letter on the Missionary Exertions of the Church. 8vo. 6d.
- A Reply to Lord John Russell's Letter to the Remonstrance of the Bishops against the Appointment of Dr. Hampden. 8vo. 1s.
- A Letter to the Archdeacons of the Diocese of Exeter, on the proposed Office of Scripture Readers. 8vo. 1s. 6d.
- A Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury on the Case of the Rev. James Shore. 8vo. 1s.
- A Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury on the Gorham Case. 8vo. 3s. 6d.
- A Letter to the Churchwardens of the Parish of Brampford Speke. 8vo. 1s.
- A Speech on the Second Reading of a Bill to make lawful Marriages within certain of the prohibited Degrees of Affinity. 8vo. 1s. 6d.
- A Pastoral Letter to the Clergy of the Diocese of Exeter on the Present State of the Church. 8vo.

---

Sermons preached at the Visitation of the Bishop of Exeter in 1845. 12mo. 6s. 6d.

## C O N T E N T S.

---

	Page
1. Judgment in <i>Gorham v. Bishop of Exeter</i> . . . . .	2
2. Doctrinal Statements of Archbishop of Canterbury . . . . .	14
3. Doctrinal Matters in other Dioceses . . . . .	45
4. Statements in Bishop of London's Charge, 1850 (as re- marked upon by Lord John Russell) . . . . .	51
5. Catholic Doctrine: Sacramental System . . . . .	64
6. Catechising . . . . .	82
7. Address of Twenty-four Archbishops and Bishops on Ritual Matters . . . . .	83
8. Royal Supremacy . . . . .	93
9. Diocesan Synod . . . . .	108

---

## APPENDIX.

No. I.—Address from Clergy in Prussia . . . . .	115
II.—Sir G. Grey's Letter to Archbishop of Canterbury, &c.	117





## A PASTORAL LETTER.

---

---

REVEREND AND DEAR BRETHREN,

It has pleased God to continue to me the power of meeting you once more in my triennial Visitation of the Diocese, over which He has been pleased to place me.

Permit me, however, so far to consult for my own ease and relief, at the age of three years beyond the ordinary length of man's life, as to substitute a written Address for the Charge which it is usual for a Bishop to deliver to his clergy on every recurrence of these stated seasons.

In truth, I am willing to hope, that by this change I am doing what is likely to make our meeting in Visitation less burthensome to you as well as to myself; and also, in one most important particular, more edifying, more according with the feelings which ought to animate a Bishop and his Clergy, on the rare occasions of their being brought together in that their sacred relation; for, instead of my detaining you with the delivery of a long Charge, I shall be enabled (with the blessing of God) to partake with you of that blessed Sacrament which is the crown and completion of the Communion of Saints upon earth, and which, as such, is regarded by the Apostle as the especial end and purpose of the "coming together" of Christians. I request, therefore, that the Ministers of the several churches, in which our Visitation shall be holden, will make the necessary preparation for our receiving together the Lord's Supper.

In looking back to the matters which have most interested us in the interval since our last triennial meeting, there is one particular, which stands forth in glaring and disastrous prominence—I mean, the blow which has been dealt (unknowingly, I doubt not, and unintentionally) by the Judicial Committee of her Majesty's Privy Council against the Catholicity, and therefore the essential character, of our Church, as a sound branch of the Church of Christ, by deciding that it does not hold, as of Faith, one of the articles of the creed of Christendom.

I need not go into particulars. Suffice it to say here, as I have before said in my formal Protest against the judgment which is registered in the Court of Arches,—that that judgment proceeded, 1st, on a statement of the doctrines objected to, which was notoriously at variance with the real facts of the case; 2ndly, on an utter disregard of some of the canons of the Church, which ought to have been especially observed and enforced in deciding on such a case. In short, we have been made to feel, that the law of the land has, by a most unhappy mistake, intrusted to a body of men of high character and attainments, but wholly deficient in that knowledge—the knowledge of the laws and doctrines of the Church—which alone could make any persons competent to the discharge of the judicial duties in such a cause—the decision of a question purely spiritual, nay, strictly and undeniably doctrinal.

In truth, as the consigning of those duties to this tribunal was admitted to have been an oversight by the Noble and Learned Lord who originated the Act which gave the jurisdiction; so was it a direct violation of the principle of the great constitutional statute, the 24 Hen. VIII. c. 12, the Statute of Appeals. That statute states in its memorable preamble, that “by sundry old and authentic histories and chronicles, it is manifestly declared and expressed, that this realm of England is an empire, and so hath been accepted in the world, governed by one supreme head and King, having the dignity and royal

estate of the imperial Crown of the same ; unto whom a body politic, compact of all sorts and degrees of people, divided in terms, and by names of spirituality and temporality [have] been bounden to bear, next to God, a natural and humble obedience." The same statute proceeds to assert the power of the King "to render and yield justice, and final determination, in all causes happening to occur within the limits of his realm, without restraint or provocation to any foreign princes or potentates ; the body spiritual whereof having power, when any cause of the law divine happened to come in question, or of spiritual learning, then it was declared, interpreted, and shewed by that part of the said body politick, called the Spirituality, now being usually called the English Church, which always hath been reputed, and also found, of that sort, that both by knowledge, integrity, and sufficiency of number, hath been always found, and is also at this hour, sufficient and meet of itself, without the intermeddling of any exterior person or persons, to declare and determine all such doubts, and to administer all such offices and duties as to their rooms spiritual doth appertain."

The statute next declares that "the laws temporal for trial of property of lands and goods, and for the conservation of the people of this realm in unity and peace, was administered, adjudged, and executed by sundry judges, and ministers of the other part of the said body politick, called the temporality ; and both their authorities and jurisdictions do conjoin together, in the due administration of justice, the one to help the other."

Such is the ancient constitution of England ; and if a still more particular declaration were needed, of the matters in which the spiritual judge hath, according to that constitution, sole cognizance and jurisdiction, such declaration is given, together with the reason for excluding the temporal judge, by *Bracton*, the highest ancient authority on our constitutional law : "Sunt enim causæ spirituales, in quibus judex sæcularis

non habet cognitionem nec executionem, cùm non habet *coercitionem*." The secular judge has not the cognizance of such causes, both for the reasons stated in the statute which we have now recited, and also because he cannot give effect to any judgment which he might pronounce, by the only coercion which can be applied in such causes, the coercion of spiritual censures. *Bracton* proceeds to deny in like manner the right of the spiritual judge to intermeddle with causes secular; for, says he, their rights or jurisdictions are limited and separate—after such sort, however, that the spiritual and civil sword ought to aid each other.\*

Need I cite the well-known saying of Lord Coke, not wont to regard too favourably the rights and jurisdiction of the Spirituality? "Certain it is, that this kingdom hath been best governed, and peace and quiet preserved, when both parties, that is, when the justices of the temporal courts, and the ecclesiastical judges, have kept themselves within their proper jurisdiction, without encroaching or usurping upon one another." 4 Inst. 321.

The Statute which has here been cited, as declaring the true constitution of the English Monarchy, gives the ultimate appeal in causes spiritual there enumerated to the Archbishop of the province in which they arise. But an Act of the following year, 25 Hen. VIII. c. 19, entitled "The Submission of the Clergy and Restraint of Appeals," having first enacted, "according to the said submission and petition of the said clergy," that "thirty-two persons, sixteen to be of the Clergy, and sixteen to be of the Upper and Nether House of Parliament," should "examine the canons and constitutions, provincial and synodal, theretofore made, and such of them as the King and the said thirty-two, or the more part of them, should deem and adjudge worthy to be continued, kept, and obeyed, should

\* Cùm eorum jura, sive jurisdictiones, limitatæ sunt et separatæ, nisi ita sit, quòd gladius juvare debeat gladium.—*Bracton*, 107.

be from thenceforth kept, obeyed, and executed within this realm," provided, *meanwhile*, that as there should be no appeals made out of this realm, so in *all* matters, whether those enumerated in the Statute of the preceding year or other, for lack of justice at or in any of the Courts of the Archbishops of this realm, or in any of the King's dominions, the parties grieved might appeal to the King's Majesty in his High Court of Chancery, and that upon every such appeal a Commission should be directed to such persons as should be there named by the Crown.

Now this, I apprehend, was clearly a provision *ad interim*. The Court to which the ultimate appeal had, during several generations, whether abusively or not, been in fact carried, the Pope's Court at Rome, having been formally repudiated and deprived of all jurisdiction, a necessity arose for the creation of some other Court to exercise appellate jurisdiction, until a permanent provision should be made on the report of the thirty-two Commissioners empowered for that purpose by the very Statute which meanwhile gave the appeal to the King in his Court of Chancery. That Commission not having completed its report during the reign of Henry, another similar Commission was appointed under the authority of 3 & 4 Edw. VI. c. 11, and this latter Commission did, in fact, complete its report in the form in which it has come down to us, under the title of "Reformatio Legum."

On reference to this important document, a document which failed of becoming the Law of the Land only through the death of King Edward before the royal confirmation was given to it, the following was the prescribed course of proceeding in cases of appeal. In Tit. "*De Appellationibus*," c. 11, it is directed, that the order in which appeals be made shall be the same as is prescribed in 25 Hen. VIII. c. 19, s. 3, in the statute of the submission of the clergy, under which the original Commission for reviewing the canons was constituted, and by which the

ultimate appeal, which had hitherto, during several generations, been to Rome, was given to the King in Chancery, to be executed by Delegates. That order is from Archdeacons, and others below the rank of Bishop having jurisdiction, to the Bishop, from Bishops to the Archbishop, from the Archbishop to our Majesty. “ Quò cum fuerit causa devoluta, eam vel concilio provinciali definire volumus, si gravis sit causa, vel à tribus quatuorve Episcopis, à nobis ad id constituendis.” It needs hardly be said that any cause involving doctrine, or a part of Faith, is *gravis causa*, and that, consequently, it was intended by the framers of this document, that every appeal involving doctrine should be referred to a Provincial Council. Lesser causes, such as those specified in 25 Hen. VIII. c. 19, might be sent to three or four Bishops.

Now considering the whole history of this Commission, especially its original formation under the same statute which gave to the King, for the first time since the foundation of the monarchy, the ultimate appellate jurisdiction in causes spiritual, then looking to the recommendation of the Commissioners as to the fittest way in which the King should exercise the jurisdiction so conferred upon him; and, finally, comparing that recommendation with the provision of the Statute passed to meet the sudden emergency caused by the renunciation of the authority of the Pope, it is difficult to conceive a doubt, that the great lawyers, temporal and ecclesiastical, of that age, the very age of the Reformation, concurred in the decision, after grave and repeated consideration, that the only proper tribunal of ultimate appeal in all causes strictly spiritual, was that of the Provincial Council.

Guided by this high authority, and acting on the manifestly sound principle—a principle in accordance alike with the laws of the Church, and with the spirit of the English Constitution—that the spirituality are to decide when any cause of the law divine shall come in question—the Bishops, last year, introduced

a Bill into Parliament, the object of which was to give effect to the recommendation of the thirty-two Commissioners empowered by the statutes of King Henry VIII. and King Edward VI. How was this Bill received? With the most vehement, and, I must add, the most impassioned, opposition by the Ministers of the Crown. The President of her Majesty's Council, in a tone which cannot be forgotten by any who heard him—a tone more imperious even than his *dictum* was arbitrary and unconstitutional—declared, that the Queen hath by her Prerogative a right to decide ultimately all questions merely and purely spiritual—even questions of faith. But this was not the worst. This *dictum* was supported, not indeed in a tone of similar violence, but calmly, deliberately, solemnly, as might be expected from one who sat that night on the woolsack presiding over the deliberations of the House—by the Lord Chief Justice of England himself—who confidently, and with all the authority of his high place, declared that the Constitutions of Clarendon recognised and established that Prerogative which had just before been so peremptorily asserted by the minister of the Queen.

Now that no such Prerogative did in fact exist—that, in direct contradiction to the assertion both of the President of the Council and of the Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench, the Constitutions of Clarendon recognised and established the principle which is the very opposite to that which was ascribed to them, the principle that spiritual causes ought to receive their final decision from spiritual authority—will be apparent from a simple inspection of the Constitutions. The 8th chapter, which alone specially relates to this subject, is as follows:—“De appellationibus, si emerint, ab Archidiacono debet procedi ad Episcopum; ab Episcopo ad Archiepiscopum; et si Archiepiscopus defuerit in justitia exhibenda, ad Dominum Regem perveniendum est postremò, ut, præcepto ipsius, in curiâ

Archiepiscopi controversia terminetur, ita quod non debeat ultra procedi absque assensu Domini Regis.”\*

Even this is not all ; it is not necessary to look back for the assertion of this sound constitutional and Christian principle to the early laws of England. It is virtually affirmed in a statute much more recent, in the 13th of Queen Eliz., c. 12, “An Act for the Ministers of the Church to be of sound Religion”—a statute declared to be fundamental in the Treaty of Union between England and Scotland. The 20th of the Thirty-nine Articles therein established declares that “the Church hath authority in controversies of faith.”

A retrospect of this recent passage in our constitutional history—joined to experience, scarcely less recent, of denial to the Church of that justice which would have been granted as a simple matter of course to a railway company or a turnpike trust—(I refer to the well-known refusal in the Hampden case of a rule to bring to adjudication a question on which half of the judges who sate on the bench, and that half which was not least entitled to respect for the confidence reposed in their wisdom, learning, and integrity by the whole people of England)—a retrospect, I say, of these matters (and others less flagrant might be made to swell the account) has not failed to fill the Churchman’s mind with strange forebodings—to excite apprehensions respecting a much longer continuance on the part of the State of a recognition of those rights and duties of the Church, which will not, cannot, be abandoned by her, be the cost of adhering to them what it may ; for, on them her faithfulness to a higher Power than any which human laws can affect to give or claim—nay, her very being, as “the Church of the

\* Matth. Paris, in An. 1164. Lord Lyttleton (Hist. Hen. II., notes, vol. iv. p. 142) thus remarks on this constitution : “It manifestly asserted the *Royal Supremacy* by subjecting the power of appealing to Rome *in Ecclesiastical Causes* to the will and pleasure of the King, whereas the Pope claimed the right of receiving such appeals as inherent in his See.”



living God, the Pillar and Ground of the Truth,"—manifestly depends.

The statement of these lamentable and ill-omened occurrences has drawn me from the consideration of the case itself, which was made to lead to them. To that case I now return—a case involving no lighter interests than the doctrine of the essential grace of Baptism, hitherto maintained by every branch of the Catholic Church from the earliest period—implied in the Sacrament itself, as it is a Sacrament—and expressly affirmed in the most comprehensive of the Church's creeds.

The Article of "One Baptism for the remission of sins," was repudiated by the Judicial Committee, under circumstances which aggravated the blow to a degree which previously would have seemed absolutely incredible. The Archbishops of Canterbury and York were consentient and even eager parties to the decision. They had been summoned, as you know, together with the Bishop of London, to attend the hearing of the cause, in order to advise. Yet both of them were disqualified from being *judges*—both, therefore, open to just recusation as *assessors*—one as having already pronounced judgment by his official, the Dean of the Court of Arches—the other, as having virtually pleaded the cause of Mr. Gorham in a Charge delivered to his clergy, while the suit was yet pending in the court below.

That I did not take objection to the presence of such assessors, is a matter on which I may perhaps be open to reasonable blame. The question was brought to my consideration by my very learned and faithful counsel, and was decided by me contrary to what was, I believe, the inclination of their opinion. But I frankly avow, that, whatever might have been the indications of the leaning of the two Archbishops (and I was not blind to them), I yet could not bring myself to think it possible, that they would declare their deliberate judgment in direct contradiction to the doctrine of the Church, on a question on which

that doctrine was pronounced in terms so plain and conclusive, that, if it were contradicted, there seemed no possibility of ascribing to any portion of the language of our Formularies any definite meaning whatsoever. I also avow that I shrank from the painful, as well as invidious, office of proclaiming my entire want of confidence in the soundness of Christian belief of the two highest functionaries in our Church ; nor was I without hope, that, even if they should prove themselves unworthy of all trust in such a cause, yet the plain and unquestionable meaning of the Church's words, set forth, as I was sure it would be—and as we doubt not that it was—faithfully, zealously, and ably, by the third episcopal adviser, would be sufficient to satisfy the minds of the judges that the mind of the Church was in full accordance with its plain *dicta*.

True, I could not be insensible to the notorious fact that more than one of the judges were not Churchmen. Yet were they all men of high estimation, of great intellectual qualifications, and of much experience in dealing with documents of all kinds, whether previously acquainted with their general nature or not.

I therefore did not resist (as I was advised that I might successfully resist) the appointment of such assessors to such judges. The consequence has been most disastrous. Would that it affected me only ! I should then be free from that self-reproach which I cannot altogether succeed in attempting to silence, that I rashly sacrificed the highest and most sacred interests of Catholic Faith to feelings too much akin to courtesy and delicacy to individuals.

The decision was pronounced : but yet let me do justice to the Judges, in saying that that decision did not go the length, which has been commonly supposed, of pronouncing the clerk whom I had rejected, fit and worthy to be instituted to the cure of souls to which the Crown had presented him. They merely adjudged, that sufficient ground had not been laid by

me for rejecting him ; that, in consequence, my jurisdiction *pro hâc vice* was null, and had passed to the Archbishop as superior ordinary. Thus it became the duty, no less than the right, of the Archbishop to decide on the fitness of the party : a duty and a right unalienable—judicial—spiritual : a right intrusted to him for the good of the Church by the Church's Divine Head—a duty inseparable from that right, and binding on him, as having voluntarily accepted the high responsibility of Chief and Metropolitan Bishop in this great section of the Lord's vineyard.

Regarding the matter thus in its true and manifest aspect, and according to the express order of Her Majesty in Council, on the Report of the Judicial Committee, " That the sentence of the Court below ought to be reversed, and that it ought to be declared that the Lord Bishop of Exeter has not shown sufficient cause why he did not institute Mr. Gorham to the said vicarage ; and that, with this declaration, the cause be remitted to the Arches Court of Canterbury, to the end that right and justice be done in this matter pursuant to the said Declaration : " it is plain that the Archbishop's judicial duty began, when the judgment of the Queen in Council was made known to him. It was a duty, I repeat, *unalienable*—one from which he could not, if he wished, escape—*judicial*, for it involved his sentence of the fitness or unfitness of the presentee to be intrusted with mission to discharge the office and work of a priest in a particular portion of the Lord's vineyard—*spiritual*, for the whole power *exercised* in giving the mission—the power *conferred*—the power *received*—had direct, mere, reference to the souls of men—" the cure and government of the souls of the parishioners." Need I cite authority in so plain a matter ?

And yet I grieved to read the statement of the Archbishop in answer to an address from a portion of you, my clergy, in which he declared that, in issuing the fiat for institution in Mr. Gorham's case, he had acted not judicially, but *ministerially*.

Ministerially ! Why, the ministry which he had to exercise was a judicial ministry ; it could not be exercised except judicially. It might be exercised carelessly, thoughtlessly, faithlessly, at the bidding, or the supposed bidding, of another. Still, it was, in itself, essentially judicial. Institution is an act of jurisdiction—of spiritual, divinely constituted jurisdiction. Ministerially ! Whose minister could he deem himself to be in giving the rule and government of souls, but the minister of his Divine Lord ?\* He could not exercise this, or any other power ministerially, except as the minister of one who has the power in himself—*Nihil dat, quod non habet*. Will he say, that the temporal sovereign has this power ? To affect to act ministerially in such a case, to give mission and authority over souls, as the minister of man, is to renounce the Divine authority of the office in which the power of mission is lodged—to fling the commission of Christ under the footstool of an earthly throne ! And this, too, when the Crown itself had too just and true a sense of its own duty, as well as of the duty of the Archbishop, to require, to accept, or even to be prepared for such a surrender ! That surrender can be regarded only as the voluntary betraying of a high and most sacred trust. “*Traditor potestatis, quam Sancta Mater Ecclesia a Sponso suo acceperat.*” May it be a solitary instance ! May the remembrance of it be accompanied with those compunctuous feelings, which, if it be remembered as an error, it cannot fail to carry with it ! May it thus, with

\* Is not the very nature of the Act a sufficient authority for saying as I have here said of it ? But, if more be needed, I refer to the highest authorities, both ecclesiastical and civil. *Bishop Gibson* (Cod., p. 806) says distinctly, “Institution is a spiritual act.” And he cites *Lord Coke* (1 Inst. 344 a, and 1 Rolle, 191) as saying the same. He cites, too, the authority of our Reformers, in *Reformatio Legum* (Tit. de admittendis ad Ecclesiast. Beneficia, c. vii. p. 78), expressed in the following strong terms (after speaking of the *Cognitores* or Examiners to be appointed by the Bishop, before the Clerk is admitted): “*Et etiam Episcopum in primis optabile est ipsum (si fieri potest), in hoc cognitionis negotio versari. Manus enim hoc unum est ex omnibus summum et maximum, in quo status Ecclesiæ præcipuè fundatus est.*”—Such is the language of *Cranmer* and his colleagues.

God's blessing, secure both the Archbishop and the Church in which he fills the highest place, from all danger of his again forgetting the responsibilities of his sacred office! That his Grace did not deem it his duty to act judicially in this case, is the more to be deplored, by reason of the very inadequate view which he states himself to have actually taken of the import of Mr. Gorham's doctrine. In a published answer of his (dated August 8, 1850), to an address from the "Metropolitan Church Union," is the following remarkable sentence, "Nothing which I find in the law of God gives me reason to believe, that I should be acting in conformity with His will if I refused Mr. Gorham admission to the cure of souls, on the ground of his *hesitating*\* to affirm the spiritual regeneration of every baptized child."

From this statement it is quite clear that the Archbishop, sitting merely to advise, when called upon, the judicial committee, had not given attention to this matter, nor had been asked his opinion upon it:—else it is impossible that he should have thus represented Mr. G. as only "*hesitating to affirm*" what it is certain that he expressly, repeatedly, peremptorily *denied*.

But if his Grace had dealt with the question of institution

\* That his Grace should have written thus, is very surprising, when we look at the words of Mr. Gorham himself, which the Archbishop characterises, as "*hesitating to affirm*."

*Ans. 15.*—"As infants are by nature unworthy recipients, being born in sin and the children of wrath, *they cannot receive any benefit from Baptism*, except there shall have been a *preventive act of grace* to make them worthy." This statement, when his attention was specially called to it, in order that, if he thought fit, he might correct it, he solemnly re-affirmed.—*Ans. 70.*

Again (*Ans. 19*), of "baptised infants, who, dying before they commit actual Sin," are pronounced by the Church to "be undoubtedly saved," he said, "therefore they *must have been regenerated by an act of grace preventive to their Baptism*, in order to make them worthy recipients of that Sacrament."

In *Ans. 27*, he said, "*The new nature must have been possessed* by those who receive Baptism rightly; and therefore possessed *before* the seal was affixed."

In *Ans. 60*, "That filial state" (meaning the adoption to be the *Sons of God*), "though clearly to be ascribed to God, was given to the worthy recipient *before* Baptism, and *not in* Baptism."

*judicially*, he must have informed himself of the words really spoken by Mr. G. and must have weighed well their actual import. In that case we can hardly doubt what his judgment must have been, when given, on full information and deliberation, publicly and solemnly, in the face of all Christendom.

You, my Reverend Brethren, know the painful step which that institution compelled me to take—no less, than to declare that I could no longer hold communion with my metropolitan. That I made this declaration under an awful sense of the responsibility involved in it, I need not say. It could not but be manifest to me, that if I was wrong—if the Archbishop had not, by instituting Mr. Gorham, become a *fautor* of the heretical tenets held by him—and if he had not, as such, forfeited his right to Catholic Communion, any one of his comprovincial Bishops, who thereupon renounced communion with him, would himself, by so doing, have deserved to be put out of the pale of the Church.

I wish, that subsequent consideration and experience had weakened my confidence in the fitness and necessity of the step taken by me. But it has been far otherwise. The Archbishop has recently revived and renewed doctrinal statements of his own, which it would have been more satisfactory to hope were, if not forgotten by others, silently withdrawn by himself. Yet within these few weeks, in answer to an address from the Archdeacons and Clergy of the diocese of Canterbury, he has recurred to what he claims to have been a prophetic warning of his own on the Romish character and tendency of principles then denounced.

“Ten years have elapsed,” said he, “since I thought it necessary to warn the clergy of another diocese against the danger of adopting principles, which, when carried out, tend naturally to those Romish errors, against which our fathers protested, and which were renounced by the Anglican Church.”

Now, what were those principles which he thus gravely con-

demns, and which, in addressing the clergy of the diocese of Chester in 1841, he scrupled not again and again to ascribe to the agency of Satan—"the subtle wiles of that adversary against whom the Church is set up, and *whose power it is destined to overthrow?*" p. 19. We will see; but, first, we must remark, that the part here assigned to the Church is far more exalted, than any which the writers against whom the wrath of the charge is so furiously directed, ever ventured to claim for it. That *she* is "destined to overthrow the power of Satan," is indeed to give "to the body a power which really belongs to the Head alone," p. 33. "The seed of the woman," one who is incarnate, without taint of Adam's corrupted nature, was to bruise the serpent's head. The author of the charge adopts the reading of *Rome*, "*she shall bruise thy head.*"

But to proceed: In the body of his Charge, in that year, he professed to "confine himself to a brief review of two points, in which the interests committed to us are essentially concerned." The first is, the "doctrine, that, lying under God's wrath and condemnation, we are justified by Faith in Jesus Christ: this plain and simple truth," he added, "has uniformly been assailed by every instrument which the enemy [the devil] could bring to bear against it."

In dealing with this particular, having first censured, by the way, the recommendation of *reserve* in bringing forward the doctrine of our atonement by Christ's death—a censure, in which I gladly concurred with him, but in respect to which it has since been stated by the writer of the tract that his meaning was misunderstood—the Archbishop thus proceeded:—"It has been another part of the same system to involve the article of our Justification in obscurity; what has been done for us, and what is to be wrought in us, are confused together; and, practically, man is induced to look to himself, and not to his Redeemer, for acceptance with God."

This is, I need not say, a very grave charge—it is no less

than ascribing to certain writers a doctrine which strikes at the very foundation of our Christian Hope. Grave, however, as the accusation is, I should not think it necessary to say anything, if the charge itself were not founded on a statement directly contrary to the real doctrine of our Church, and of the Catholic Church of all ages. "By one way alone," says he (p. 23), "can man possess the Son; that is, by believing in Him. And, therefore, *Faith alone can justify; Faith alone can appropriate* to us that remedy which God has appointed for the healing of our plague; *Faith alone can give* us an interest in that sacrifice which God has accepted as the satisfaction for sin. Thus, 'being justified by Faith, we have peace with God through Jesus Christ.' "

Now, if by this no more were intended, than that it is *by Faith* that *Justification*, the gift of God, conferred in and by his own appointed instrument, *is received by us*, it would be impossible to find fault with it. We should only have to lament, that words are used which, in their obvious meaning, go much further—because they are not accompanied by those reservations which our Church teaches us to use, when we say, "that we are justified by Faith only." In short, to say, "*Faith alone can justify*,"—" *Faith alone can appropriate* to us that remedy,"—" *Faith alone can give* us an interest in that sacrifice,"—taken in the plain and obvious sense of the words, is simply to contradict the 11th Article of our Church, interpreted by the authority to which itself refers for its interpretation—"the Homily of Justification," *i. e.* "of salvation of mankind, by only Christ our Saviour, from sin and death everlasting."

That homily distinctly, and in terms, declares, that "the Faith, by which we are justified, has, in part, for its object *Baptism*, as *God's instrument* in *conferring* remission of original sin, and *repentance and conversion*, as the *condition* of the remission of actual sin committed after Baptism;" that is, of



the *continuance* of Justification. The words of the Homily are as follows:—

“ The true understanding of this doctrine, We be justified freely without works, or that we be justified by faith in Christ only, is not, that this our own act to believe in Christ, or this our faith in Christ, doth justify us (for that were to count ourselves to be justified by some act or virtue that is within ourselves); but the true understanding and meaning thereof is, that *although we have faith*, hope, charity, repentance, dread and fear of God within us, and do never so many works thereunto; yet we must renounce the merit of all our said virtues—as things that be far too weak, and insufficient, and imperfect, to deserve remission of our sins, and justification; and therefore we must trust only in God’s merey, and the sacrifice which our High Priest and Saviour Christ Jesus, the Son of God, once offered for us upon the Cross, to obtain thereby God’s grace, and *remission*, as well of our *original Sin in Baptism*, as of all actual sin committed by us *after Baptism*, if we truly repent and turn unfeignedly to Him again.”

Such is the plain and express language of our Church, so plain and express, that “ the Assembly of Divines at Westminster ” being called on, in the year 1643, *to advise Parliament in the alteration of Religion*, and being ordered to review the 39 Articles (for the purpose of making them *more Calvinistic*), found it necessary to *strike out* of the 11th *all reference to the Homily*, and left it thus, “ That we are justified by Faith only is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort,” *omitting* the words, “ *as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification*,” and substituting, “ Notwithstanding, God doth not forgive them that are impenitent, and go on still in their trespasses ” (Neale, H. P., App. No. 1, p. 816).

“ Justification is the office of God only,” and He has appointed for His justification of us, not one condition only, Faith, but two, Faith and Baptism—which are indeed one; for, Baptism is the Sacrament of Faith, *Sacramentum Fidei*, as it is called by the ancients. Faith uses Baptism, as the divinely appointed act and deed of conveyance of the righteousness of God. If we speak of “ Faith *appropriating* ” the gift, this must first be given in and by Baptism, God’s instrument. The believer

“arises and is *baptised, and washes away his sins*, calling upon the name of the Lord” (Acts xxii. 16). And the Homily “of Common Prayer and Sacrament” says, “*God embraceth us in the Sacraments, and giveth Himself to be embraced of us;*” and in the Homily on the Resurrection, the Christian is charged to bring Faith to a Sacrament, in the same way as to the word of Christ, “Bring, then, Faith to Christ’s Holy Word and Sacrament.” To believe, without accepting the proffered gift, in the way which Christ instituted, without thus proclaiming our belief, without openly enlisting ourselves in His service, without taking up our Cross, and declaring ourselves before the world ready to fight under it as Christ’s banner against sin, the world, and the devil—all which is done by our being baptized with the Baptism which Christ ordained—to believe, I repeat, without adding to belief this blessed qualification of Christian Baptism, where it can be had, is, in effect, not to believe—it is to reject our Lord’s own word, “He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved.”

In saying this, do I charge the Archbishop with teaching that Baptism is unnecessary? Far from it. I say only that he declines to give to Baptism its proper place in God’s gracious dispensation for the salvation of men; and this charge is strengthened by what immediately follows; for his Grace continues, “It is true, that, being thus accepted with God, and endued with His Spirit, man becomes a new creature.”

But when, and how, does the word of God tell us that man is “accepted with God, and endued with His Spirit?” In and by *Baptism*. To become a new creature, he must be “born again of water and of the Spirit.” Why is not this stated? Apparently, for no other reason than because his Grace is unwilling to acknowledge that Baptism is the appointed channel of that grace which makes us new creatures.

It seems to be for a similar reason that his Grace is next

pleased to say, "But he is not accepted with God because he is a new creature, but *because* Christ has made atonement for the wrath which in his old nature he had incurred."

Now, in this sentence, the word "*because*" is used in one sense only, as if it were univocal, as if there were only one sense in which it could be used: whereas, it bears several senses. There are, in short, several particulars, every one of which may be stated as a *cause* of our justification: in other words, there are several sorts of causes.

I. The *efficient* cause is God himself. So the third part of the Homily tells us, "*God of his mercy, through the only merits and deservings of His Son Jesus Christ, doth justify us.*"

II. The *meritorious* cause is, "His most dearly beloved Son, our only Redeemer, Saviour, and *Justifier*, Jesus Christ," as is expressed in the second part of the same Homily.

III. The *formal* cause is, as the same Homily states in its very outset, "the forgiveness of man's sins and trespasses."

IV. The instrument by which God is pleased to *convey* it, is "*Baptism*" in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, as we have just seen in the passage cited from the same Homily.

V. The instrument by which man *receives* it, is *faith* in the merits of Christ, and in the promises of God made to us in and by that Baptism.

VI. The *continuing* or *preserving* cause is "walking in newness of life." The same Sacrament, which gives him Justification, makes him a new creature. "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature" (2 Cor. v. 17); and "as many as are *baptized into Christ* have *put on Christ*" (Gal. iii. 27), they are "in Christ" most strictly. And if he abide in Christ, *continuing* justification is caused. "Abide in Him, that when He shall appear, we may have confidence, and not be ashamed before Him at His coming" (1 John ii. 28).

Now, from this statement it is apparent, that to say, as the Archbishop says, "Man is not accepted with God (or justified) *because* he is a new creature, but *because* Christ has made atonement for the wrath which in his old nature he had incurred," is simply to confound the use of language: it is to say, what is true in one sense, and untrue in another; for it is true, that "man is not justified by his being a new creature," as the *meritorious* cause; but it is not true, if it be meant of the *continuing, preserving, conditional* cause.

In like manner, if the sentence were reversed, and if it were said, "Man is *not* accepted with God because Christ has made atonement for him, but because he perseveres in newness of life," this would be true in one sense of the word "because," and untrue in another. It would be true, if it were understood, that man is not accepted with God because of the atonement of Christ, *if* he observe not the condition, *if* he walk not in that newness of life, of which baptism, the sacrament of justification, is also the sacrament and exponent. In other words, he is accepted with God *because*, that atonement having been made, *he walks in newness of life*. It would be untrue, if it were meant that, without regard to the *merits of Christ's atonement*, man is accepted of God because he walks in newness of life.

Again, the Archbishop himself says, "Faith alone can justify." If any one else were to say, faith alone *cannot* justify, for a man is not justified *because* he has faith, this would be just as true, and just as untrue, as the Archbishop's statement. In other words, it would be either true or untrue according to the meaning put on the word "*because*." If it should mean the *meritorious* cause, then it would be true that "faith alone *cannot* justify," for a man is not justified by faith as *deserving* justification; but if it should mean the *instrumental receiving* cause, then it would not be true. In like manner, the Archbishop's assertion would be true or untrue, according to the

sense in which he should ascribe justification to faith ; if as to the *meritorious* cause, it would be manifestly untrue ; if as to the *instrumental receiving* cause, then it would be undeniably true.

But is this to be said of *faith* only ? May it not also be said of “newness of life ?” Assuredly it may. Newness of life is not, either less or more than faith, the *meritorious* cause of our justification. But it is as much a cause of justification, as faith is, though a cause of not the same kind. It is a conditional, continuing, preserving cause ; therefore it would be quite as true to say “newness of life justifies,” or “we are justified by newness of life,” as to say “Faith justifies,” or “we are justified by faith.”

In truth, it is obvious to remark, that the Apostle James says that “Abraham was *justified by works* ; that faith wrought with his works, and by works, in his instance, faith was made perfect. Ye see, then,” he proceeds, “how that by works a man is justified, and *not by faith only*. Likewise, also, was not Rahab the harlot justified by works ? For, as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also.”

In these instances, works and faith were alike causes, though different causes, of justification : neither of them the *meritorious* cause, but both, in their several ways, causes, concurrent causes.

Before I leave this part of my subject, I cannot but remark on a most unhappy inaccuracy of language in all the Archbishop’s statements upon it. He says (as we have already seen) “Faith *alone* can justify ;” “Faith *alone* can appropriate,” &c. ; “Faith *alone* can give us an interest,” &c.

Now, this is a formula not only not accordant, but absolutely inconsistent, with the words of the Apostles and of the Church. The Apostles often speak of our being *justified by faith*, but never by faith *only*, much less by faith *alone* ; in other words, they were not *solifidians*. One of them says, “Ye see that a

man is justified by works, and *not by faith only*:" the same Apostle, as we have seen, says, that "Faith is dead, being *alone*." True it is, that the Church does say, in its 11th Article, "That we are justified by Faith *only*" (with the qualification which has been cited from the Homily); but never does the Church say, as the Archbishop says, "Faith *alone* justifies," or "we are justified by faith *alone*." For Faith *alone* means Faith *without* good works of any kind, either internal or external. "Faith *alone*," therefore, is considered by the Church, no less than by the Apostle, "as *dead*"—in no sense does it, or can it, justify. On the other hand, to be justified by Faith *only*, means, in the language of the Church, to be justified by Faith *not alone*, but by *true living faith*—Faith *accompanied by other Christian graces*—hope, charity, repentance, fear of God, with their proper works, yet renouncing the merit of all such graces, and trusting only in God's mercy for the merits of the sacrifice of our blessed Lord.

This is not a mere logomachy; if it were, I should be ashamed to have recourse to it. On the contrary, I believe that the abuse of language, here noticed, has misled the Archbishop, as well as many of those who may speak and think with him, into very grave errors of belief and doctrine. It has a manifest tendency to exaggerate the efficacy of *mere* faith—to make those who adopt it more ready, than they otherwise could be, to assign to such mere faith an undue importance in the Christian system—to make it all in all; and so to reduce practically to nothing, or almost nothing, the other not less necessary ingredients in the Christian life. This is seen in most of the ignorant schisms of the day—schisms, unhappily, still more mischievous than they are ignorant, for they delude the sinner into blindness to his sins.

Especially, I believe it to have largely contributed to a most extraordinary and most unsound statement, to which I am about to invite your attention.

In an Appendix (p. 78) to which his Grace refers for a more particular explanation of his views, he says,—“Lest silence should be misconstrued, I think it needful to say, that in my judgment a clergyman would be departing from the sense of the Articles if he were [among many other particulars] to speak of Justification by Faith, as if Baptism and newness of heart concurred towards our justification; or as if ‘a number of means go to effect it.’ *Tract 90*, p. 13.”

I shall not be deterred by the unhappy notoriety of the quarter in which the Archbishop has found this statement, from expressing my own hearty assent to it, or from briefly stating, why I think it demands the assent of every Christian.

If Baptism does not *concur towards* our Justification, what is the meaning of the Article in the Nicene Creed—“I acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins”? Is not “remission of sins” our being “accounted righteous,” that is, justification? And is not Baptism here expressly declared to “concur towards” “remission of sins,” therefore “towards justification”? Again, what is the meaning of the Church, in its homily of salvation (p. 3), “Our office is, not to pass the time of this present life unfruitfully and idly, after that we are *baptized or justified*?” If “baptism does not concur towards justification,” what is the meaning of St. Paul himself—(Tit. iii. 7)—“Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he *saved us by the washing of regeneration*, and renewing of the Holy Ghost, that, *being justified by his grace*, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life? It is plain, on comparing this text with Rom. v. 1, that St. Paul, under the phrase “justified by faith,” includes *baptism*, for in Tit. iii. he says, *δικαιωθέντες τῇ ἐκείνου χάριτι*, while in Rom. v. he says, *δικαιωθέντες οὖν ἐκ πίστεως*. *Hooker* (Sermon on Justification) says, “The *justification* which St. Paul discourseth of, seemeth, in his meaning, only, or especially, to be that act of grace which is *dispensed* to persons

at their baptism, or at their entrance into the Church, when they, openly professing their faith, and undertaking their Christian duty, God most solemnly and formally doth *absolve them from all guilt, and accepteth them to a state of favour* with him." B. Jewell (Def. of Apol., p. ii, c. 11, s. 3), says, "We confess, and have evermore taught, that *in the sacrament of baptism*, by the death and blood of Christ, is given *remission of all manner of sin*, and that not in half, in part, or by way of imagination, or by fancy; but whole, full, and perfect, of all together; so that now, as St. Paul saith, 'there is no condemnation to them that be in Christ Jesus.'" It cannot be necessary to multiply quotations, yet, I will add, from Mason (Vind. of the English ministry, p. 169), "Holy Orders is a sacrament, that is to say, in a larger sense; because, it is a sign, to which there is annexed a promise of grace, though not of *justifying grace*, as in baptism and the Lord's Supper." S. Chrys., in Rom. viii. 30, ἐδικαίωσε διὰ τῆς τοῦ λουτρῶ παλιγγενεσίας.

Will it be said, that his Grace meant no more than to denounce the assertion, that Baptism concurs towards justification, as its *meritorious* cause? That would be a very convenient way of escaping from the position: but it is inadmissible, for more than one reason:—1st, because his Grace must equally denounce the assertion (if any should dare to make it) of Justification by Faith as the meritorious cause.

But, 2ndly, there is a still stronger reason. The very passage referred to by him, as containing the doctrine which he condemns, distinctly disclaims the assertion that Baptism does in any sense concur *as the meritorious cause*; for it declares that "our Lord is the meritorious cause of our justification"—that Faith is the internal instrument, and Baptism the outward instrument. Baptism may be the hand of the giver, and Faith the hand of the receiver. As we have seen in the homily of "Common Prayer and Sacraments," "In Sacraments God embraceth us, and God offereth Himself to be embraced by us."



Will his Grace ascribe to Faith more, or to Baptism less, than this? I do not wish to bind him down to terms or illustrations; but the Church has a right to ask, whether he holds, that grace is conferred through Baptism? If he does, he contradicts himself. If he does not, how can he defend himself from the charge of denying an Article of the Creed, when he denies that Baptism—"one Baptism for the remission of sins"—"concurrs towards our justification"? in other words, how can he acquit himself of having put forth a palpable heresy?

But he further condemns the assertion that "a number of means go to effect justification."

Now, does not his Grace mean the very same thing when he says that we are "justified by Faith alone"? He will not, he cannot say, that we are justified by Faith, as the *meritorious* cause. What more, then, can it be, than one of the instrumental causes, "the means to effect justification"?—the instrument by which we *receive it*? just as Baptism has been seen, on the plainest construction of the 11th Article interpreted by the Homily, to be the instrument by which *God confers it*.

But let us look to the very words of the passage which his Grace condemns:—

"A number of means go to effect our Justification. We are justified by Christ alone, in that He has purchased the gift; by Faith alone, in that Faith asks for it; by Baptism alone, for Baptism conveys it; and by newness of heart alone, for newness of heart is the life of it."

Now, this statement I accept, though I dislike its phraseology; I prefer the clearer, and more symmetrical, language of Dr. Waterland, who thus sums up the fourth division of his masterly treatise on Justification:—

"The sum of what has been offered under the present head is, that we are justified by God the Father, considered as *principal* and *first mover*; and by God the Son, as *meritorious Purchaser*; and by God the Holy Ghost, as *immediate efficient*; and by Baptism, as the ordinary *instrument of conveyance*; and by faith of such a kind, as the ordinary *instrument of reception*; and lastly, by *faith and holiness*, as the necessary *qualifications*

and *conditions* in adults, both for the first *receiving* and for the perpetual *preserving* it.

“Such and so many are the *concurring causes*, operating in their order and degree, towards man’s *first*, or final, *justification*. It would be altogether wrong to separate them, or to set them *one against* another, or to advance any one or more, to the exclusion of the rest.” \*

Thus, the shaft aimed at the Tractarians does in truth strike no less a name than Waterland.

But is Waterland the only great divine whom his Grace assailed? No! a greater than Waterland is the next object of his attack.

“To speak of forgiveness, or works of mercy,” as “availing to obtain remission of sins from God,” is also, in the Archbishop’s judgment, “to depart from the sense of the Articles,” and therefore one of the suggestions of the great adversary of souls. But this is the express language of Bishop Bull, as it is given in his *Harmonia Apostolica* :—

“How much they [forgiveness of things which our neighbours have committed against us—and works of mercy] avail to obtain remission of sins from God, is sufficiently clear from that well-known passage, Dan. iv. 27, where the holy Prophet suggests this wholesome counsel to King Nebuchadnezzar, as yet sticking fast in his sins:—‘Redeem thy sins by almsgiving, and thine iniquities by showing mercy to the poor.’ Herewith agreeth in the New Testament what St. James teacheth in this same second chapter, v. 13: ‘Judgment without mercy to him who hath showed no mercy.’”

I have cited this passage from one of the very places to which his Grace refers us. It appears, therefore, that he knew *whom* he here charged with departing from the sense of the Articles which he had repeatedly subscribed.

But had he not a right to attack Bishop Bull, if he thought he was in error, and was doing, however unconsciously, the work of the Devil? Most certainly: but then I think it was his duty to tell his clergy, that it was Bishop Bull, rather than the Tractarians, whose false teaching he thus denounced.

\* Waterland on Doctrine of Justification, vol. ix. pp. 461, 462.

I shall not enter into any argument to prove the soundness of the position, which his Grace condemns. In truth, I cannot deal with it as a matter of discussion ; as the tenet of men,—no ! not of the most learned, or greatest of men. For, is it not also the tenet of Him who is God as well as man ? Read His parable of the cruel creditor, and then where is the man who will dare to say, that “ to speak of forgiveness, or works of mercy as availing to obtain remission of sins before God ” is “ to depart from the sense of the Articles of religion to which we all subscribe ” ? If it were, never more would I permit a clergyman to subscribe those Articles before me—never more would I permit myself, by the grace of God, to act as Bishop, in a Church which so contradicts the plain teaching of our Lord. Did the writer, who ventured thus to brand this sentiment with his anathema, ever seriously ponder—did he ever cursorily notice—the force of that petition, which is often on his lips, and always, I doubt not, in his heart—that petition, which is at once the source of all our consolation, and the simplest and plainest warning of our duty—“ forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us ”—“ *for, if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you ; but if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses* ” ? This is the comment of our Lord himself on His own heavenly lesson of mercy : yet this we have seen condemned by the highest officer in our Church, as heterodox, as Popish, ay, and—by implication—I tremble while I write the word—as devilish !

I turn to “ the other error, to which his Grace alludes as no less injurious to the Saviour’s glory,” than what we have already considered, the supposed contradiction to the doctrine of Justification by Faith.

This second error is treated with still more severity than the former.

“ Practically, our Saviour is treated with dishonour, when the Church, which He has established, is made to usurp his place, to perform his acts, to receive his homage; is so represented as to be, virtually, *the author of Salvation*, instead of the channel through which salvation flows. This is, in truth, to depose Him from his Throne, and to invest his subjects with the authority which belongs to Himself alone.”—p. 30.

Again—

“ The members of the Church are branches of the Vine; but the Church is not the Vine: that name belongs to Christ alone. The Church is ‘ the pillar and ground of the Truth;’ but the Church is not the Truth, neither has it life in itself: Christ alone is the way, the truth, and the life, through which every individual member of the Church must seek access to God.

“ Yet all this, undeniable in itself, is practically contradicted, whenever the services, and the ordinances, and the ministerial office, are magnified beyond their due proportions, or placed before the people with a prominence to which they have no claim.”—p. 34.

All this, and a great deal more which it would be tedious to recite, is stated in the Charge, without mention of any particular writer, or writing, to whom, or which, these remarks apply. But reference is made to Appendix III., the history of which is, I believe, without example in literary, theological, or controversial history.

In the Charge, as delivered to his Grace’s Clergy in 1841, and as first published, this Appendix, p. 80, lays the whole load of invective on a work entitled ‘ Church Principles ’—divers passages of which were adduced, with whatever success, to illustrate and justify the reproaches heaped upon it. I am not about to enter on a defence of that work (which, however, I am proud to avow that I estimate most highly)—for, the task of defending it has been superseded by the accuser himself, who, in a second edition of his Charge—not acknowledging that his censure of the work had been unfounded or excessive—silently, and without the slightest remark, struck out all mention of it, and all the various passages which had been cited from it. In lieu of the matter thus carefully removed, other words of the writer himself were introduced, heaping fresh contumely on some one or other, so as exactly to supply the

chasms, and to leave the bulk of letterpress and number of pages the very same as before. Strange as this proceeding must appear, I should not think it necessary to remark upon it, were it not to exhibit one specimen of what I cannot but regard as the very lamentable rashness, with which the grave accusations contained in that document have been hazarded. "How can we venture," said the then Bishop of Chester, "with such plain declarations [of Scripture] on the one hand, and with nothing, literally nothing, except a vague inference, on the other—how can we venture *to interpose the Church instead of Christ, as the mediator between God and man?* to represent the Church as the ground of our Christian privileges,"\* or affirm, that "it is simply as members of the body that we have any rights at all?" †

So stood the passage in the original publication. In the second edition all reference to 'Church Principles' was struck out, as well as the words cited from that work. Instead of them was inserted what follows: "Or affirm that *Christ has appointed the Church as the only way to eternal life*" (referring to Tract 48, p. 12).

I have looked at that Tract—but in vain;—the words are not there. I have looked also into another work, where I *have* found them—*Bishop Pearson's Exposition of the Creed*, Art. ix. p. 383. Bishop Pearson, whom we, in common with the whole Church of England, have been wont to revere as one of the most sound—few, I believe, would contradict me if I said *the* most sound—and judicious, as well as most learned and able, of all the divines of our Church in the palmy days of its theology; Bishop Pearson places this at the head of his enumeration of the reasons for the necessity of believing the 9th Article of the Creed "the Holy Catholic Church." I will give the words as they there occur, and will add so much of

\* "Church Principles, 150."

† "Ibid. 137."

what immediately follows as is necessary to do full justice to the passage cited:—

“The necessity of believing the Holy Catholic Church appeareth first in this, that *Christ hath appointed it as the only way unto eternal life*. We read at the first, that ‘the Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved’ (Acts ii. 17). And what was then daily done, hath been done since continually. Christ never appointed two ways to Heaven; nor did He build a Church to save some, and make another institution for other men’s salvation. ‘There is none other name under Heaven given among men whereby we must be saved’ (Acts iv. 12) but the name of Jesus; and that name is no otherwise given under Heaven than in the Church. As none were saved from the deluge but such as were within the ark of Noah, framed for their reception by the command of God; as none of the first-born of Egypt lived, but such as were within those habitations whose door-posts were sprinkled with blood for their preservation; as none of the inhabitants of Jericho could escape the fire or sword, but such as were within the house of Rahab, for whose protection a covenant was made; so none shall escape the eternal wrath of God which belong not to the Church of God.”—Art. IX. 525.

This statement of Bishop Pearson is thus made, by a successor of his in the see which he once adorned, to bear all \* the contumely which could be heaped on all imaginable extravagancies of doctrine on the Article of the “Church;” especially, it is said in express terms, “to interpose the Church instead of Christ, as the mediator between God and man.” Nay, it is exhibited as the last and crowning instance of “the subtle wiles of that adversary, against whom the Church of Christ is set up, and whose power it is destined to overthrow.”

But, again I may be asked, is not Bishop Pearson, how great soever his authority in general may be, amenable like other men to just censure? Undoubtedly he is: but let the words of Bishop Pearson, with their context, be duly weighed; and then, if any, except him who pronounced the censure, really think it to be just, I will not enter on the very idle task of seeking to undeceive them.

\* There is a reference to *British Critic*, lix., as calling the Church “a Sacrament.” It is often so called by S. Cyprian, Ep. ad Cornel, 45 (Fell) and 59; ad Anton., 55; ad Magnum, 69; ad Jubaian, 73; and in “De Unit. Ecc.”

It is enough for me to have illustrated the soberness, the truth, and justice of that charge, which denounced the principles of Waterland, Bull, and Pearson, as leading “from one Romish tenet to another, till in some congregations all that is distinctive in Protestant doctrine has disappeared.”

The most unpleasant part of our duty, in respect to the Charge, still remains—to exhibit a few of the statements of the author himself:—

“It is convenient, no doubt, in language, to embody the multitude who believe in Christ under one comprehensive term: and our Lord has himself taught us by example that we may do this safely and legitimately.\* But language may mislead. We may personify a body, for the convenience of discourse, and by degrees forget that a community is not a person.”—*Charge*, p. 30.

Now, whatever be the danger or the blame of using such language, let it be laid on the proper subject, which, in the present instance, is *the word of God*; that very word, which our Church, in its form of ordering Priests, has set forth as the most effectual of all its warnings to the candidates for the holy office which it is about to confer. “The Church and congregation which you must serve is *His Spouse and His Body*.”

This is a particular, which must not be dismissed cursorily.

Scripture, as we see, speaks of the Church, as having that, which is equivalent to personality.

Our Blessed Lord took our nature, not only that He might, in that nature, by suffering and dying for us, redeem us from the sentence which stood against us; but also, that, by His human nature, He might unite us to Himself—God as well as Man—in such an union as we could not apparently be capable of, except by being united to His human nature.

Now, this union is commenced by an instrument appointed by Christ Himself, namely Baptism. “We are baptised *into His Body* ;” by some supernatural and mysterious operation, we, our bodies and souls, are, in Baptism, united to the Body

\* Matt. xvi. 18.

and Soul of Christ; and, thereby, to the Godhead; and the Holy Spirit it is, by whom we have this union—an union, which makes us to be as truly in the lineage of the second Adam, as we are naturally in the lineage of the first Adam. This is our new birth, the being born of the Spirit.

The union of all so “born again” is called in Scripture “the Church” which is said to be “the Body of Christ,” and Christ “the Head of the Church,”—“One Body”—not merely a metaphorical, or even politic Body, but a real though mystical Body—having that which is common to Christ, its Head, and, to us, as the principle of oneness—namely, the “one Spirit.” Now this Mystical Body is, as we have seen, repeatedly called in Scripture by names indicating Personality. In 1 Cor. xii. 13, it is called *Christ*. Let, who will, dare to condemn such expressions.

Again, from what has been said, it will be seen, that all who seek Salvation on the terms of the Gospel, must be Members of the Church. That any persons have in fact said, that they are *saved by the Church*, I know not, and—I should have added—I believe not, had not the Archbishop said, that there are such persons: for he says, “the Church has been made, first an *abstraction*” (what may have been intended by this word so applied, I presume not to guess)—“and then a person, and then a *Saviour*.” Who the persons are, who do this, and on what words of theirs the charge is grounded, his Grace does not tell us: if he means, as I fear he means, all who say, that none, on the Gospel-terms, are saved, who are not *in* the Church—I must express my most confident dissent from his Grace’s censure of this statement. It seems to me not only according to the judgment of all our soundest divines, but also to the express word of God—“the Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved”—so our Translators render the word, which literally is “the saved”—thus showing the sense in which they understood the propo-



sition, however expressed. The same censure seems to me to contradict likewise the Ninth Article of the Creed, "I believe the Holy Catholic Church."

In truth, the process of individualizing the members of the Church, to the neglect of its *essentially corporate* nature, is to oppose the whole tenor of the teaching of our Lord, and of his Apostles, on this mysterious subject. Theirs is the Dispensation of *Grace*—the other the Dispensation of *Judgment*. But, Judgment is not for this life. So long as this life lasts, the members are regarded *in the body* (unless, indeed, judicially cast out). For the separation of the goats from the sheep—the gathering of the tares into bundles, to be burned, and of the wheat into the barn—the gathering of the good fish into vessels, and casting the bad away—the severance by the Angels of the wicked from among the just—shall not be made until "the end of the world"—until "the Lord come."

But the writer proceeds to give what he calls "a simple analysis of the Church."

"When Jesus declared that he would build his Church upon a rock, and that the gates of hell should not prevail against it, he simply declared that there should hereafter ever be a body of men believing in Him as the Son of God—a body which Satan might assail, but should never succeed in destroying. He did not say that he would set up a power upon earth which should possess his authority, act in his stead, and as his vicegerent dispense his anger or his favour. We look in vain for a single sentence in which such a purpose is implied: a purpose so important, and, I may add, so extraordinary, that it must have been written in words which none could fail to read. But advantage has been taken of the obscurity of language to maintain and encourage this idea."—*Charge*, p. 31.

Now, let us read the words of Christ himself, and then estimate, as we may, the comment on them, which I have here cited:—"Upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of Heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven; and what-

soever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in Heaven.”—Matt. xvi. 18.

The power which He thus promised to give to Peter, he subsequently gave to all the Apostles, as the Church:—“ If thy brother shall trespass against thee, tell it unto the Church; but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican. Verily I say unto *you*, whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.”—Matt. xviii. 15, 17, 18.

Again, on His appearance to them after His resurrection—“ Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you: as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.”—John xx. 21—24.

Will it be said that this power was given to the Apostles only, not to those who should come after them? I answer with another text: “ All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth; *go ye, therefore*, and disciple all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.”—Matt. xxviii. 18—20.\*

If it still be contended, that in these gracious and wondrous words, addressed by our risen Lord to his Apostles (of which an inspired Evangelist has told us that He therein “ spake of the things concerning the Kingdom of God,” or the Church:)—if any one will still contend, that “ He did not say that He would

\* The same gracious commission is declared in a manner, if possible, still more solemn, even in the Prayer of the Son of God to his Almighty Father: “ *As Thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world.*”—John xvii. 18.

set up a power upon earth which should possess His authority, act in His stead, and as His vicegerent dispense His anger or His favour,"—I answer, that this cannot be affirmed by any Minister, much less by any Bishop of our Church; for every one of us, my Reverend Brethren, hath again and again solemnly declared our assent and consent to what is every day declared in God's house, that "Almighty God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, hath given power and commandment to His ministers, to declare and pronounce to His people, being penitent, the absolution and remission of their sins." Again, to the awful formula of absolving the dying penitent: "Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to His Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him, of His great mercy forgive thee thine offences; and *by His authority committed to me*, I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

There are one or two other propositions, which, whatever might be thought of them when spoken in the see of Chester, acquire importance when commended to the whole Church by the Primate of all England:—

"Perhaps it is too much to expect, what nevertheless we earnestly desire, that there should be no schisms or divisions among Christians; that the Church of Christ should ever be a seamless coat; that all the congregations of faithful men should ever be so strictly one, as to think alike and agree unanimously upon all subjects—upon such subjects, for instance, as diocesan episcopacy, or infant Baptism, or liturgical forms, or Church-membership, or a national Establishment."—p. 15.

Probably it is too much to expect, that there should be no schisms or divisions among Christians. It would be equally too much to expect, that there should be no adulteries among Christians. But is this a reason why either schisms or adulteries should be regarded as not sinful? Of the particular points here specified, there are some, at least, of which it might be hoped that a Bishop, much less an Archbishop, would not hold them to be mere trifles. Episcopacy is regarded by our

Church as essential to the collation of the power of ministering in the congregation, and consecrating the sacramental elements to be the body and blood of Christ. Is this a matter of trifling moment?—Of Infant Baptism it is declared by one of our Articles, that it “is in any wise to be retained in the Church as most agreeable with the Word of God.” The Church has further given as a reason for baptising infants that “none can enter into the kingdom of God, except he be born again of water and of the Spirit;” it has moreover declared that “by this text we may perceive the great necessity of this sacrament where it may be had;” lastly, it has declared, that “it is certain, by God’s Word, that children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved.” Is it possible, then, that Infant Baptism should be a matter on which the Church ought not to expect her members to agree?—Again, is Church membership itself a matter of little moment? Is not separation from the Church schism? and is not schism a sin from which we constantly pray our “good Lord to deliver us?”—Yet we are told by this high authority, that “on questions such as these there may be always some minds which may differ from the conclusions which we believe to be justly drawn from Scripture and experience. So that the unity which the Scriptures demand may be understood to be the unity of those who hold alike the great doctrines of Christian truth, but *consent to differ* on matters concerning which Scripture does not carry determinate conviction to every honest mind.”

Now, on the principle here stated, what right have we to make exception of “the *great* doctrines of Christian truth?” May not minds be honest, to which Scripture does not carry determinate conviction, even concerning these truths? Why, therefore, if there be not the general duty of holding the unity of the Church, may we not consent to differ on *great* matters also? But who shall undertake to tell us what parts of gospel truth are *little*? Be this as it may, St. Paul does not concur

with the Archbishop in this expedient of “consenting to differ;” his words are in a somewhat different tone: “Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ,” that is, as ye would bear the name, and partake of the salvation, of Christ, “that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment.” We, my brethren, will adhere to St. Paul; and not “consent to differ,” even though we have the authority of our Primate for doing so.

One extract more; it shall be the last.

There are, we know, two great particulars in the Christian dispensation, of which—and of which only—Scripture says that the mystery is great—that is, of great import—1st. The union of the Godhead and manhood in Christ Jesus—“Without controversy great is the mystery of godliness; God was manifest in the flesh.” 2nd. The union of the God-man with His Church. The husband is commanded to love his wife because she is his flesh, “even as the Lord the Church. For we are members of His body—[we are] of His flesh, and of His bones. For this cause shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh.” “This,” adds the Apostle, “is a great mystery; but I speak concerning Christ and the church” (Eph. v. 31, 32).

Besides this very express declaration, there are many pregnant intimations of similar mysterious import. We are “baptized into Christ,” and “as many as are baptized into Jesus Christ, have put on Christ,” “baptized into His body.” “As the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body are one body, so also is Christ.” (Here, as Hooker remarks, the Church has the very name of Christ applied to it.) “For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body.—Now, ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular” (1 Cor. xii. 12, 13, 27).

Again, as by one of the two Sacraments of the Gospel

(which also are expressly called “the mysteries of God”) we are inserted into the mystical body, so, in the other, we are made to feed on His body. “The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?” “His flesh is meat indeed, and His blood is drink indeed.”

Yet, notwithstanding all these and other plain and express declarations and proofs in Scripture of the awfully mysterious nature of the union of the Church with its Divine Head, an union intimately connected with, and flowing from, the other great “mystery of His incarnation,” we read the following passage in the Charge :—

“One of the first and most needful works of the Reformers was to pierce the veil, to *divest the Church of the mystery in which it had been shrouded*, and to disclose it to the world in its true and scriptural form, as the company of believers.”—p. 32.

I forbear all comment; for as comment would be most painful, so also it is unnecessary. Let me only say, that the same rationalistic process which dares “to pierce the veil, and divest the Church of the mystery in which,” as the union of men in and with Christ, “it has been shrouded” by God, will also divest the incarnation of the Son of God of its mystery, and reduce it to some intelligible formula, expressing the mere operation of the Spirit of God on some chosen human spirit. Meanwhile, let us remember that our Church has plainly declared its real sense on this article of our creed. For, in the most solemn of all its services, it commands us to thank God, “for that he hath vouchsafed to assure us, by our duly receiving the body and blood of Christ, that we are *very members incorporate in the mystical body of his Son*, which is the blessed company of all faithful people.” Such is our Church’s own statement of its own mystical nature.

After all this, is it possible for any minister of the English Church who would speak “the words of truth and soberness”

to hesitate what he must say of the statements which we have read from this unhappy Charge? I declare solemnly, and with a deep sense of the responsibility which attaches to such a declaration, concerning a document proceeding from such a quarter, that I could not name any one work of any minister in our Church, which, though of double the bulk, contains half so many heretical statements as are contained in this one Charge.

Painful it is, most painful, to make this avowal—But my first and plainest duty is, to “keep,” so far as God shall enable me to keep, “that good thing,” the deposit of the true Faith, which has been committed to us; to behave myself, in this one particular at least, as a Bishop ought to behave “in the house of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.”

But why, if such are my feelings, why have I so long delayed to make the exposure? My brethren, nine years ago, on the very first occasion after that Charge was published, I addressed you respecting some of its errors, but without pointing to the author. Time past on, and no defence was offered; I hoped, therefore, as it was surely not unreasonable to hope, that the work itself was withdrawn and forgotten. But it has lately been made to assume a new and most formidable *revival*. It has been publicly appealed to by its author, as a prophetic protest against certain teaching, called Romanizing, which threatens the very existence of the Church of England as a sound branch of the Church of Christ.

Such a protest, issuing from the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, in a formal address to his clergy, and through them to the clergy, and unhappily, the laity of all England, could not fail to be made an instrument to swell an ignorant and fanatical cry against Catholic truth itself. Accordingly, it has been one of the stock materials of agitation at public meetings in the late crisis—a crisis, of which I scruple not to say, that for

bigotry, credulity, and injustice, it has had no parallel since the too famous Popish Plot of Charles II.'s reign. In particular, the Lord-Lieutenant of a great county, after having descanted on the supposed Popish teaching of many of our clergy, thus spoke of his Grace's protest before a public meeting of that county.

“To show you,” said he, “that I have good authority for what I have said, I will read to you a short extract from the admirable address of the Primate of all England, the Archbishop of Canterbury.” Then follows the passage from his Grace's Letter to the Archdeacons and the Clergy of his diocese, which I have already cited.

“Ten years have elapsed since I thought it necessary to warn the clergy of another diocese against the danger of adopting principles which, when carried out, tend naturally to those Romish errors against which our fathers protested, and which were renounced by the Anglican Church.”

Here, then, we have the most authoritative, if not the most powerful, stimulant of the passions and prejudices of a very large portion of the whole population of England. For what corner of our island was not penetrated by the insane clamour? In what class or order of the laity amongst us were there not found dupes of a most ignorant and senseless delusion? When men of rank and education suffer themselves to partake of the blind and intemperate passions of the populace, they become populace themselves; and are sometimes more prominent than the rest, in coarse and vulgar violence, because, having burst the bands of conventional decorum, they have nothing left to restrain them.

The worst consequence of these outrages is, that they largely tend to make sensitive and ingenuous minds recoil from a Church, which has so feeble a hold on its professed followers. When they see many of the wealthy and educated join in insult to those, whose office alone would protect them from the attacks of any sincere Churchman—especially, when they see these



attacks founded on entire ignorance of the doctrines which their own Church teaches, and even of the first elements of Catholic truth—ignorance which would disgrace the poorest child in our national schools—they are too ready to yield to the suggestion, that there can be nothing real in such a system. They fall, therefore, an easy prey to the first artful—or even earnest—minister of Rome, who seeks to pervert them; and then their very perversion, caused by the violence of popular Protestantism, becomes a fresh incitement of the ignorant fury which has wrought the mischief.

But enough of this. If any of you have been made objects of attack from such quarters as I have alluded to, I trust you have had too much reliance on the dignity of your own character, and on the power of God's word, to suffer even a passing annoyance from it to disturb you, much less to shake your firmness in teaching those Catholic truths which have been confided to you by the Holy Spirit of God.

In order that you may discharge this your prime duty faithfully, it is necessary that you note well the spirit of the times, and guard your precious deposit with especial vigilance on that side, from which the danger is most imminent—in other words, in this our generation, from Ultra-Protestantism—a system which, in its full-grown strength, (God grant, whatever be present appearances, that it attain not to that strength among ourselves!) is far more pernicious than Romanism itself; for Romanism, while it corrupts and mars the truth by accretions of error more or less destructive, according to the varying conditions of the hearts on which they fall, does yet retain the whole body of Faith itself, which the other (accompanied though it often be by much of piety) maims and truncates, at the bidding of man's wisdom, squaring the Revelations of God to its own presumptuous measure of what is reasonable, good, and edifying.

Against this most specious, and therefore most dangerous

foe, it is for us, my brethren, to direct all our energies, humbly praying for God's strength to support, and His wisdom to guide us. That we need that wisdom, and that strength, in more than common measure ; that we must strive for them, therefore, with more than common fervency of prayer, is too plain from all that passes around us ; above all, from much that we have to deplore in quarters in which we might have hoped to find sympathy and co-operation. A few instances I deem it necessary to recite to you.

I have now before me a statement of an examination for holy orders, in which the candidate in one of his written papers said of the two Sacraments that "in one, Life is begun, in the other, Life is perfected." Upon this, a conversation ensued between the Bishop and the candidate, in which the latter having cited in proof of his position the office of Private Baptism, the Bishop said, "I admit that that office does certainly favour your view, but I consider the doctrine a very dangerous one to preach generally."

"My Lord," replied the candidate, "I believe it to be truth, and, if ordained, I cannot hold it back."

*The Bishop.*—"I am aware that this is said to be the view of the Church, but I repeat, I think it an unwise and dangerous doctrine on which to base public teaching."

*The Candidate.*—"I believe it to be the basis of the exhortations in the Apostolical Epistles, and I designed it to be the groundwork of my preaching. I hope I am not wrong."

*The Bishop* passed on to other matters.

In the course of the same examination the examining chaplain objected to several of the statements of the same candidate, among them, to the following explanation of the text, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."

*Candidate.*—"I consider that in these words our Lord chartered his Eleven as an Apostolic College, with undying powers of succession ; and the application I make of this doctrine is, that none should presume to minister in holy things who cannot show their connexion with this Apostolic

College by lawful ordination from Bishops, in the true succession from the Apostles."

*Examining Chaplain.*—"This is a very strong statement, Mr. ——."

*Candidate.*—"I believe it to be true, Sir."

*Examining Chaplain.*—"What, then, will you do with those who cannot get this succession?"

*Candidate.*—"I pronounce no opinion concerning them. He who is sole governor of His own world, and who has placed them in this position, will deal with them according to the laws of His own love and mercy. He has not revealed aught concerning these exceptional cases; and I dare not re-adjust His laws."

*Examining Chaplain.*—"I am aware that this is the view of what are called the *great* Divines of our Church. I think it very uncharitable. If the Bishop thinks fit to ordain you with these views, the responsibility is his own."

The Bishop, I rejoice to say, did ordain him then deacon, and, at the end of a year, priest: more than this, when this young clergyman, not long afterwards, went into another diocese, the same Bishop (a pious, amiable, excellent man) added to the formal words of the testimonial, "The manner in which Mr. —— acquitted himself at my examination for deacon's and priest's orders was such as proved to me that he possessed great mental resources, and a readiness in exercising them beyond what is commonly met with."

This statement I have from the clergyman himself, who is well known to me; a man, I need not add, of no common talents, energy, and firmness. But what must be the effect of such declarations against Catholic truth, by the highest authorities, on ordinary men? Can that truth have its fair, unimpeded course in a diocese over which such a ruler presides?

The same Bishop, now the Archbishop, in the case of a clergyman nominated to a curacy, required to see some of his sermons, saying (and I applaud him for saying), that he "thought Bishops ought more generally to read sermons" (*i. e.*, examine the doctrine held by the writers) "before they instituted or licensed." One of the sermons was on the text 2 Cor. v. 20, 21, "Now then we are ambassadors for Christ," &c. In it was a single sentence respecting Baptism, as follows:—

“ At the font it was, that ‘ we put on Christ,’ and were regenerated, or made new creatures in Him: then the old world of sin and wrath passed away: then ‘ all things became new ’ in our new birth to grace and reconciliation to God.”

His Grace commented on this to the effect, that such bold statements without qualification were dangerous. The curate answered, that in the sermon “ *he went on to say*—as was indeed necessary from the text—that persons might fall into sin after Baptism, and so require a fresh ‘ reconciliation.’ ”

*Archbishop.*—“ *I see you do* ; but still I dislike expressions which people (who seldom carry away with them more than a single sentence from a sermon—a single thing that may startle them) may take hold of, and derive from it some extreme and unguarded opinion.”

That sermon I have myself read, and I can truly say, that I have rarely read one which puts forth plain apostolic teaching in a more sober or guarded tone. That it should have been received by the Archbishop as it was received, fills the mind with strange forebodings—with anticipations of coming trials, which may God, who only can, avert ! For indeed, indeed, this is no matter of every-day experience—no casual display of indiscretion, such as will sometimes occur in the administration of spiritual power by one who, whatever be his endowments, is yet liable to error, like ourselves. No ! it too plainly manifests the bent, or rather the fixed purpose, of his soul. It points the course on which his onward march is resolutely set ; it tells us what we have to dread—what to guard against—in a sincere and earnest mind, wielding, with principles like his, the vast power of the Primate of all England, the second spiritual Chief of Christendom—*alterius orbis Papa*. That power is no longer a matter of speculation—it is a power in eager, intrepid, irresponsible action. Irresponsible ! said I ? That is a light word. It is a *transcendent* power, riding over every diocese, and controlling the judgment of every bishop within his province. There is not one amongst us who, if he refuse to institute (as I shall,

nevertheless, continue to refuse) any clergyman who shall teach as Mr. Gorham insists, and as his Grace proclaims, that he has a right to teach—there is not one of us who will not find his sentence reversed by the judgment of our Archbishop. Meanwhile, liberal as is his dealing with doctrine which he dares not adopt as his own, he prescribes a cautious *reserve* respecting truths which yet he professes to hold. His *disciplina arcani*, it seems, forbids the clergy henceforth to bring prominently before their people the “dangerous” truth of the spiritual efficacy of Baptism; and texts of St. Paul which inculcate it are henceforth placed in the *index expurgatorius* of modern Lambeth! After this, shall we hear from that very quarter complaints against others for alleged *reserve in bringing forward the doctrine of the Atonement*? Is that doctrine more truly the doctrine of the gospel, than the efficacy of the blessed Sacrament, which, by Christ’s own ordinance, is the one only way in which He first confers the benefit of that atonement? But I will say no more on this particular, except to ask, whether there be any reasonable ground to hope, that the article in our Creed, “I acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of Sins,” will by our Primate be ordinarily enforced as it ought?

I turn to another diocese, to what, I am assured by testimony the most trustworthy, occurred not long ago, and very probably occurs there almost as often as an ordination is holden. I give the case as it was sent to me by a very respectable clergyman of my own diocese, who had made inquiries about it, omitting only one or two words of comment by his correspondent:—

“I have examined three of the men who were present at the memorable Charge of which you want information; their stories all agree in substance. Our Bishop warned them against the use of the word *Catholic*, as a *party-word*, and expressed his regret that it should have been retained in *one* place in the Liturgy (the Creeds not being, in his opinion, as he stated, part of the Liturgy).” “From the character of my informants I make this statement with the utmost confidence.”

Now in that diocese what hope is there that encouragement will be given to the due preaching of the Catholic faith? “which faith, whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold;” “which faith, except a man do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly?”

Compared with this, the case which I am about to state, as having occurred in a third diocese, may be thought comparatively of little moment; yet, in itself, I deem it to be no light indication of the un-Catholic views which are too commonly suffered to prevail in our Church.

There is a deacon still permitted, under licence of the Bishop, to officiate as a deacon-assistant to a resident incumbent in a southern diocese, who, ten years ago, was a candidate, in the usual course, for the order of priests; but his Bishop “refused to admit him to examination, avowedly and solely on the ground of his *declining to deny* positively all mysterious presence of our Blessed Lord’s body and blood in the Holy Eucharist, excepting *in the faithful receivers*, and desiring to leave the same an open question, neither to affirm nor deny any such presence.”

The candidate, be it observed, distinctly denied what the Church denies, and affirmed what the Church affirms, *in her own words*; but he declined assenting to a certain negative proposition which the Bishop laid before him.

Thus it will be seen, that a clergyman of unquestioned integrity, ability, zeal, faithfulness in the discharge of all his sacred duties—one against whom no valid objection can, we must presume, be raised (for he is still the licensed assistant of his rector)—this very deserving clergyman is cut short in his ministerial course, because, in speaking of one of the most awful mysteries of our religion—the real spiritual presence of our Lord’s body and blood in the Holy Eucharist—he feels himself bound in conscience to decline to be wise “above that which is written”—to be silent, where the word of God and

the voice of the Church have not spoken. And this course he found himself the rather bound to take, because the Church, so far as she speaks at all, seems to favour a conclusion contrary to that of the Bishop; for the 28th Article speaks of the body and blood of Christ as “given” and “taken,” as well as “eaten” in the Supper, “only after *an heavenly and spiritual manner.*” Again, that there is some special effect wrought on the Bread and Wine in the prayer of “Consecration” seems to be implied by the distinction ordered in the Rubric, in dealing with what “remains of the Bread and Wine *unconsecrated*”—which “the curate shall have to his own use;” and what may “remain of that which was *consecrated,*” for this “shall not be carried out of the Church,” but “the curate and such communicants as he shall call unto him shall *reverently eat and drink* the same.” Even the order, that “when all have communicated,” and before the post Communion, “the minister shall return to the Lord’s Table and *reverently place upon it what remaineth of the consecrated elements, covering the same with a fair linen cloth,*” has the same aspect.

The declaration at the end of the order for the Holy Communion, concerning the direction that the communicants should receive kneeling, while it disclaims all adoration of any *corporal* presence of Christ’s natural flesh and blood, and says, that his “*natural body and blood* are in heaven and not here,” defines nothing with regard to the *spiritual* presence of Christ’s *glorified body*. So much for the authority of our Church on this question.

All the Catholic fathers of the Church, during the ages when the Church was undivided, constantly speak of the Holy Eucharist as having in it a real mysterious presence of our Lord’s blessed body and blood, without defining the manner of that presence.

All ancient liturgies, too, except one, agree in using words of prayer that the Holy Ghost would descend, not only on the

worshippers but on *the gifts*; and all, without exception, preserve and continually refer to the notion of a *real and mysterious presence*, to be believed, but not defined; and where there is agreement of the ancient liturgies, one with another, in those points we have great reason to believe, that they had the sanction of the holy apostles themselves.

This view, which the Bishop's negative proposition would absolutely exclude, and declare to be untrue, has always been allowed by the Church of England; for, not to mention others, Bishop *Andrewes*, Bishop *Jeremy Taylor*, Bishop *Ken*, Bishop *Wilson*, all set it forth in their published works; and of the divines who were appointed by Royal Commission to revise and prepare for Convocation our present Book of Common Prayer in 1660, three, at least, Bishop *Cosin*, Bishop *Sparrow*, and Mr. *Thorndike*, have recorded their judgment to be substantially the same.

Yet, not for affirming, but for *declining to contradict*, what has been thus affirmed by the ancient fathers, by the ancient liturgies, by the most eminent and soundest of the divines of the Church of England during the last two centuries and a half, and against which no declaration of the Church itself can be even pretended, a meritorious and exemplary deacon, I repeat, has been excluded by his Bishop from the priesthood, although still allowed to be worthy of holding a licence in his diocese.

This case becomes the more startling, when we bear in mind that the same Bishop thus addressed his clergy on the judgment in the Gorham case:—

“ If the sign in Baptism may be separated from the thing signified in the case of adults, may it not also in the case of infants ?

“ And here I ask, is it so certainly declared in God's word, and so clearly to be proved from our own formularies and articles, taken in connexion, that the question, founded on such argument as I have supposed, must be answered in the negative, as to unchurch the questionist, and cut him off from honest ministering in our communion ?”



Upon this I beg leave to suggest a very obvious comparison, and to ask a very plain question.

Does the mere declining to affirm a metaphysical proposition, not any where declared or implied in either holy Scripture or our Church's teaching, respecting the manner of Christ's presence in the Eucharist, bear any comparison with the contradiction of the express words of the Prayer Book? I put the matter thus: Because it is necessary to correct the glaring inaccuracy of the Bishop's statement of the real effect of Mr. Gorham's tenet respecting the efficacy of Baptism of Infants; and to show that it went much further than to suggest a question, as this Bishop puts it. I refer to the words of Mr. Gorham, already cited in note, p. 13. But even if the fact were as the Bishop states it, why should it be "unfair to unchurch the questionist, and cut him off from honest ministering in our communion;" and not unfair to unchurch the unfortunate deacon, and cut *him* off from honest ministering in our communion? Alas! the reason is too apparent. The deacon, if he erred, erred on the side of anxiety for Catholic truth; Mr. Gorham on the side of Puritanism; and, as the Bishop's sympathies are with the one and against the other, he decided accordingly: in other words, he applauds the latitude conceded to one who denied an article of the Creed, and arrests the fair course of ministerial action of another, who denied nothing which the Church affirms, nor affirmed anything which the Church denied.

If the injustice could be aggravated, it would be by the non-withdrawing of the deacon's licence as assistant. Can this have been caused by misplaced lenity? Misplaced, I say, for it would be very strange lenity to allow a heterodox deacon still to minister. But supposing lenity to have been the cause, let us see the real cruelty and injustice of such lenity.

If the licence had been withdrawn when the cause of offence arose, the deacon would have had an appeal from the Bishop to the late Archbishop; and those who know anything of the

principles of the late Archbishop cannot have any doubt what his decision would have been. Nay, if the licence were even *now* withdrawn, and so the opportunity were given of appealing to the present Archbishop, the deacon would have great reason to hope that his Grace's decision, given under the responsibility of an appellate judge, would restore to him the character of a Catholic, and thus extort the further justice of his being admitted to the priesthood.

Two years ago, no consideration could have induced me to take the course which I have now taken, to make the statements which I have here made ; but a crisis has come over us. The Catholic Faith, in one of its essential articles, has been assailed by the too manifest incompetency (in such a question) of five Lay Judges, acting under the advice of the two Primates of England. The Bishops of all England, assembled in an unusually large body last year (only two of the number, I believe, were absent), after long and repeated deliberation, refused to make any declaration respecting that decision, and so to affirm the great truth, which, nevertheless, almost all of them profess to hold.

This, in my judgment, left no option what course I am bound to take. At whatever hazard to "the peace of the Church" so called (that false peace which is nothing better than the lifelessness of a comatose body)—at whatever, not hazard, but certainty, of the destruction of my own peace during the few years, or months, which may yet remain to me (fewer, it is likely, by reason of the struggle)—I have deemed it my plain duty to encounter all, and, it may be, worse than all, these temporal consequences—rather than abandon the Cause of that Truth, which (however unworthy) I am called by my holy office to guard. That amongst you, my Reverend Brethren, and other Presbyters of the Church, I shall have many who are ready and eager to bear the burthen with me, and so to lighten it, I have no doubt. May true peace—the

peace of the inner man—that peace which passeth all understanding—be yours and theirs, and mine! and then little shall we heed the reproaches which will be heaped upon us from all quarters—as on them “that trouble Israel.” “Is there not a cause?”

But I turn to other recent matters, which have caused much interest in the Church, and some of which (because misunderstood) have been much misconceived and misrepresented. I have seen a statement, made by one whose accuracy I cannot doubt, that Books of Devotion have been put into the hands of the people by some Ministers of our Church, “in which all but divine honour is ascribed to the Virgin Mary.” Such books would seem to me worthy of all censure, and the clergymen who distribute them, of exemplary punishment. In truth, I cannot understand why such persons have not been proceeded against.

I have seen also, that “prayer for the dead is urged as a positive duty.” Whatever might have been said on this subject during the continuance of the first Book of Common Prayer of King Edward VI., I cannot but consider that to urge such an alleged *duty* now, is an excess well meriting correction. The *lawfulness* of prayers for the departed in the Church of England was decided by the Court of Arches, in the celebrated *Woolfery* case. But this does not make it lawful for a clergyman to urge as a *duty* a practice which the Church thought it best to withdraw from the public service.

I have seen, again, that “a superstitious use of the sign of the Cross is recommended as profitable.” Now, I am quite sure that you will agree with me in condemning any such recommendation. I will go further, and say, that I think, in the present state of our Church, a faithful and discreet clergyman would be very cautious how he recommended the use of

the Cross in any case in which the order of the Church, or common practice, has not authorized it. "The use of Crucifixes" seems still more dangerous, and the recommendation of them more rash; for although there is nothing, in itself, wrong in having pictures, or even other effigies, which may set before our minds the great act of our Redeemer's love, we ought not to forget the idolatrous purposes which such things have been made to serve in the Church of Rome; and any practice which might seem to give countenance, much more encouragement, to so dreadful an abuse, would, in my judgment, merit all reprobation.

But, while I agree in all these points, there are one or two particulars, on which I am bound in candour to express an opinion somewhat at variance with the high authority from which I am quoting—one, with whom I generally and gladly concur, and from whom I never differ but with reluctance and diffidence.

I read, then, in the same place, a condemnation of the statement, that "the mediation of the Saints is a probable doctrine;" (by *doctrine*, I conclude, is here meant *opinion*).

Now, I must frankly own, that I see nothing whatever in any degree objectionable in setting forth such an opinion, as an opinion. The mystical union of Christ with his Church and all its members, which is the foundation of the Communion of Saints, is not removed by death. We must beware, therefore, of even seeming to condemn a statement, which recognises the dead as still exercising the communion of saints,—as still retaining a pious love of the brotherhood (one main ingredient in their cup of bliss)—as still interceding with God for the members of His Church militant upon earth. This appears to flow most naturally from the belief that the state of the Saints in bliss is a state of full consciousness of the past, of remembrance of the temptations and dangers from which they were themselves mercifully delivered by God's grace, and therefore of chari-

table intercession with the Father of all Mercies, through the one Mediator, that He will deliver by the same grace those who are still engaged in their Christian warfare.

This opinion, be it remembered, does not affirm, that the Saints are cognizant of particular things now passing upon earth; much less does it at all imply, that they can hear the prayers of any, who, by an unauthorized will-worship, may presume to pray to them for their mediation, which is, I suppose, what the authority I have referred to meant to condemn. In short, to ascribe to departed saints a mediation different from that which is practised by every other living member of Christ, is superstitious and Roman; while the other tenet is truly Catholic.

Again, I see the same high authority number among the errors of Rome, which our own Church has renounced, that “a propitiatory virtue is attributed to the Eucharist.”

I am not aware of our Church having anywhere condemned such a doctrine. That it has condemned (as we all, from our hearts, condemn) “as blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits,” “the sacrifices of Masses—in the which it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and dead to have remission from pain or guilt”—we know and heartily rejoice. But this is very far indeed from saying or meaning that the Eucharist hath not “a propitiatory virtue;” and we must be very careful how we deny that virtue to it. The consecrated elements ought not to be separated in our minds from the propitiation for our sins, continually presented for us before the throne of God. Whether we regard them in correspondence with the meat-offerings and drink-offerings of the Old Testament, as Memorials of the one great Sacrifice, and so, in union with that Sacrifice, by virtue of Christ’s appointment, representing, and pleading to the Father, the atonement finished on the Cross,—or, as answering to those portions of the typical sacrifice which were eaten by the priests and offerers—in either case they are intimately united with the

altar in heaven, and with its propitiatory virtue. "In these holy mysteries," in an especial manner, heaven and earth are brought together. *Sursum corda*. "Therefore with angels and archangels, and all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify Thy glorious name." The partakers of the sacrifice are partakers of the Altar, and of all its inestimable benefits, the first of which is, the propitiation for our sins.

For, in the Eucharist, as a *Sacrament*, "we eat our ransom," as St. Augustine says—we receive spiritually "the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for us," "His Blood which was shed for us:"—in the same Eucharist, as a *Sacrifice*, we, in representation, *plead* the one great Sacrifice, which our great High Priest continually presenteth for us in Heaven. In Heaven He presenteth ever before the Father, in person, Himself—mediating with the Father, as our intercessor: on earth, He, invisibly, sanctifies what is offered, and makes the earthly elements, which we offer, to be sacramentally and ineffably,—but not in a carnal way—His Body and His Blood.

For, although once for all offered, that sacrifice, be it remembered, is ever living and continuous—made to be continuous by the resurrection of our Lord. Accordingly, St. John tells us in Rev. v. 6, 12, that "he beheld, and lo, in the midst of the throne stood *a lamb as it had been slain*, and to him is continually addressed the triumphant song of the heavenly hosts, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing." To Him his Church on earth in the Eucharistic service, in like manner, continually cries, "O Lord God, *Lamb of God*, son of the Father, that *takest* away the sins of the world." Not that *tookest* away, but still *takest*;—"Agnus Dei, qui *tollis* peccata Mundi."

As, then, the sacrifice is continuous, its propitiatory virtue is continuous, and the fullness of the propitiation is pleaded for the whole Church whensoever the commemoration of it is

exhibited in the Eucharist. So it was declared in all the ancient Liturgies ; so likewise it is expressed in that of the First Book of Edward VI. in the fullest and plainest terms. And although in the Second Book of Edward this particular was somewhat reduced and obscured, and was not restored to its former prominence even in 1662, yet enough happily still remains to connect us in this, as in most other Articles, with the primitive and Catholic Church. For, in one of the Collects, our Church teaches us to say, —“ O Lord and heavenly Father, we, Thy humble servants, entirely desire Thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving ; most humbly beseeching Thee to grant, that by the merits and death of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in His blood, *we and all Thy holy Church* may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of his passion.”

In reference to this particular, I will venture to bring before you a passage addressed to you by me, in my Charge fifteen years ago :—

“ And not only is the entrance into the Church by a visible sign, but that body is visible also in the appointed means of sustaining the new life, especially in that most sacred and sublime mystery of our religion, the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, the commemorative sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ : in which the action and suffering of our great High Priest are represented and offered to God on earth, as they are continually by the same High Priest Himself in Heaven ; the Church on earth doing, after its measure, the same thing as its Head in heaven ; Christ in heaven presenting the sacrifice, and applying it to its purposed end, properly and gloriously ; the Church on earth commemoratively and humbly, yet really and effectually, by praying to God (with thanksgiving) in the virtue and merit of that sacrifice which it thus exhibits.”—pp. 43, 44.

In truth, this matter seems to me so clear, that I can hardly doubt it is merely a question of words which divides the writer to whom I refer and myself, and that he means only to condemn the phrase “ propitiatory virtue,” in the sense of “ making a propitiation,” not in that of *obtaining the favour of God by pleading “ the death of his Son, showed forth ”* in this Sacrament.

There is another particular on which I venture to entertain a similar persuasion. "The secret practice of *auricular* confession, as a means of grace," would not, I am confident, be condemned by that eminent prelate, in terms so large as are employed by him, had he not been satisfied that he had guarded his censure with qualifications, which sufficiently take it out of all application to the doctrine and practice of the Church of England. For, that the Church of England has always holden, and does hold, "auricular confession to be a means of grace," is a proposition too manifest to admit dispute:—what the Church of England does not hold, but is held by the Church of Rome, is, that "auricular confession" is necessary to salvation—that the repentance which is necessary for the forgiveness of post-baptismal sin, includes such confession—that the so-called sacrament of penance, having for its matter, or *quasi* matter, contrition, confession, and satisfaction—that is, the performance of the penances enjoined by the priest, or the future sufferings in purgatory on account of them—is a sacrament of the gospel. The denial of this, then, must, I am confident, have been all that was really meant by the high authority to whom I allude, when he includes "the secret practice of auricular confession as a means of grace," "and the administration of what is termed the sacrament of penance," among "those things which, if they are compatible with the principles of the English Church, would separate it from that of Rome by an almost imperceptible line, which men would be prepared to pass without much fear of incurring the guilt of schism."

I know not whether anything is meant by "administering the sacrament of penance" distinct from what is commonly called "confession and absolution by a priest." The word "*Penance*" is, indeed, used for repentance in one place in the Prayer-Book, and the Homilies speak of *absolution* as, in some sort, a *sacrament*; still, I should think the use of such language as, at the best, pedantic, and very liable to be misunderstood. Whether



any minister of our own church has used it, I am not aware ; happily, my own diocese has not furnished me with any instances, nor have I chanced to read or hear of any elsewhere.

But, as to the practice of auricular confession, I have had several cases brought to my attention ; and in dealing with them, I have had no other difficulty, than in ascertaining and distinguishing the exact circumstances of each case. Where, as in one instance, it appeared as if the clergyman had himself incited the penitent to have recourse to confession before him, not being within either of the two cases where it is prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer, namely, either for the quieting of the conscience in preparation for Holy Communion, or when a sick person, feeling his conscience troubled with any weighty matter, is to be moved to special confession of his sins—there I have warned the clergyman to abstain from a course, which seems ill-accordant with the teaching and mind of our Church. I condemn it, in short, where it is enforced or recommended as a part of the ordinary discipline of Christian life. But never would I permit myself to say anything in discouragement of auricular confession in either of the two cases mentioned above : *auricular* confession, I say, because it is the phrase used by our Church in the first Book of King Edward VI., speaking of secret confession—and because the 113th canon straitly charges and admonishes the minister to whose trust and secrecy a crime or offence is committed, not to reveal it under pain of *irregularity*, a very grave canonical disability. Let me add, that I presume not to interfere with the conscience of any, who (to use the words of our first reformed liturgy)—“think needful or convenient, for the quieting of their consciences, particularly to open their sins to the priest” at any time. What I deprecate is, that this should be made a regular observance,—still more, that any priest should advise it as such.

Confession, and consequent absolution by the priest, are, I

need not say, among the most usual objects of ignorant and unchristian obloquy, in these days of schismatical presumption. Let me detain you for a few minutes, with very briefly reminding you of the history of the ordinance in Christian antiquity, and of the course taken by our own Church in respect to it.

“That godly discipline of the Primitive Church,” the loss of which our own Church annually deplores, “that such persons as stood convicted of notorious sin were put to open penance,” was, in the early ages of the Church, so blessed with manifest comfort and amendment of the penitent, that those who were conscious of *secret* sin, and felt the misery of it, sought for themselves the benefit of open confession and penance, and absolution at the hands of those who were empowered thereto by God. But, after the empire had become Christian, and so the world had mixed itself with the Church, the consequences of public confession of secret sin to those who made it, and the scandal arising to the Church at large, rendered it necessary for such public confession to be forbidden. But, in lieu of it, private and secret confession was received and encouraged, and absolution pronounced, when they, in whom the power was lodged, had sufficient proof of the sincere and heartfelt repentance of those who confessed. Experience of the good effects of this voluntary secret discipline caused it to extend so widely, that Pope Innocent III., at the great Lateran Council in 1215, scrupled not to put forth a canon which changed the nature of this secret discipline from voluntary to compulsory, making it necessary, under the penalty of mortal sin, that every one, *utriusque sexûs*, should, once at least in every year, make confession *proprio sacerdoti*, and earnestly strive to perform the penance which that priest should enjoin.

From this source, when once it was opened, flowed in, as a torrent, the multiplied evils of the Romish Confessional. Penance, as distinguished from repentance, which was regarded

only as a part of it, was exalted to be a sacrament of equal necessity to salvation with Baptism itself, to all who should fall into sin after Baptism. But this penance was, as I have just said, not merely contrition, however sincere and fervent, but confession to the priest, and satisfaction, or the performance of the penitential works enjoined by him. These three—contrition, confession, and satisfaction—were called the matter, or *quasi* matter, of the sacrament; and absolution, or the words “I absolve thee,” pronounced by the priest, its *form*, that is, the *word*, which, joined to the matter, constituted the outward sign of the invisible grace conveyed in the sacrament, namely, remission of sins.

In the three centuries which followed this daring innovation of Innocent till the time of Luther, the abuses and corruptions which ensued were too numerous and too notorious to need to be here recounted. Suffice it to say, that one of them, the sale of indulgences, was made by the providence of God to be the proximate cause of that great religious revolution, which, while it rescued a large portion of the North of Europe from the spiritual domination of the Pope, has also caused a rent in the House of God, through which too many, flying from the tyranny of Rome, stopped not till they had cast themselves out of the Church itself.

Of indulgences, the most scandalous of all the corruptions of Rome, permit me briefly to state the real nature. It is intimately connected with the subject on which I am now writing.

I have already said, that part of the matter, or *quasi* matter, of the Roman sacrament of penance, is *satisfaction*, or performance of the penitential works imposed by the priest after confession. But this satisfaction does not necessarily precede *absolution*. It may be deferred for an indefinite period; though meanwhile absolution has its full effect in delivering from the eternal punishment in hell; but if satisfaction be not fully performed in this life, it will remain to be compensated by the

pains of purgatory. Still, there are means of alleviating, or altogether escaping, those pains. The Church has at its disposal "a heavenly treasure,"\* which is infinite, consisting of the merits of those sufferings of our Lord, which exceeded what was necessary for the redemption of mankind; and also all the works of the Virgin Mary, who had no sins of her own for which to make satisfaction; and lastly, those penal works of the saints, which were over and above what was required to satisfy for themselves. Out of this treasure the Church is enabled to disburse whatever may be necessary, to supply, in whole or in part, the deficiencies of her faithful children, whose penances would else stand against them in the account of God.

One of the propositions for which Luther was condemned by Leo X. was the denial of this claim of the Church of Rome. Leo had, as we know, tried the faith of that Church's sons, in this particular, pretty severely, for he had authorized the public sale of these indulgences for money—to be applied to the usés of his sister Maddalena.†

That so enormous an abuse should have provoked those inquiries which led to the Reformation, can be no matter of surprise; nor that it should have urged some of the too ardent Reformers to a denial even of the sacred truth—the power of absolution left by our Lord to His Church—on which the abuse was founded. Happily, by the mercy of God, our own Church, in this as in so many other particulars, was enabled to retain the truth, casting off the foul corruption with which Rome had polluted it.

Our Church confers the power at the ordination of priests, proclaims it generally in the very commencement of Morning and Evening Prayer, requires that it be specially exercised for

\* "Cœlestes hos Ecclesiæ thesauros," the Council of Trent calls this.—*Sess. XXI.*

† Guicciardini, *Historia d' Italia*, l. xiii. p. 579.

the quieting of the conscience of those who need it before the Holy Communion, and, lastly, provides an express and absolute form of absolution, "by the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to His Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in him," which form the priest is bound by the plain law of the Church to pronounce over every sick penitent after special confession of his sins, "*if he humbly and heartily desire it.*"

Why have I deemed it necessary to trespass on your patience with this detail of matters, which are, I doubt not, already well known to you? Because among the particulars which were the subject of the loudest clamour during the late exhibition of rampant Puritanism, this power of absolution, most solemnly given to the Church by our Lord, after his resurrection, was assailed with every invective which lawless and triumphant ignorance could heap upon all who adhere to the faith "once delivered to the saints."

I have also deemed it the more necessary to dwell on this matter, because a brief sentence which fell from the pen of one of our most learned and faithful Bishops, and which was doubtless intended by him to be understood only of the Roman corruptions of confession, has been, through an unguarded omission of a few cautionary words, greedily seized on, and applied to the sound doctrine of the Church of England.\* Be this as it may, we, my reverend friends, will, with God's blessing, never cease thankfully to acknowledge the great privilege herein conferred by Christ upon His Church; and, under a humbling sense of our own responsibility in exercising it with all Christian discretion and humility, yet with all Christian confidence, will invite our people to have recourse to this ministration of our Lord's most merciful authority, whensoever the spiritual necessities of any of them shall need it. We will tell

\* It is so, by *Lord John Russell*, in his celebrated letter to the *Bishop of Durham*.

them, that when we hear their confession, and pronounce the word of pardon over them, we act not, and speak not, in our own persons, but, like the Apostle, “ in the person of Christ :” that therefore, if we affect to absolve those whom we have not good reason to judge truly penitent, or refuse to absolve those who are indeed penitent, our judgment is void to them on whom it is pronounced ; and sinful in ourselves, in proportion as the error shall have been caused by want of due care in qualifying ourselves, by the study of God’s Word, and other helps, for this very grave part of our ministerial duty, or by any defect of due earnestness and caution at the time of performing it.

If any shall ask us, what then can be the use of that sentence pronounced by man, which, if pronounced without due reason, is wholly inoperative, leaving its subjects still to be judged according to God’s law ? we answer, that the absolving power of the priest is a way, appointed by Him who best knoweth what is in man, of bringing the sinner to repentance and salvation ; that if he be a sincere penitent, conscious in himself of the sincerity of his repentance, and if he have that faith which is never separate from true repentance, he will rejoice to receive the pardon which is promised to repentance in general, now actually assured to him by his Saviour Himself, through the mouth of the minister whom He has empowered to speak it in His name. In doing this, however—in endeavouring to make this great means of grace (absolution after confession) effectual to the merciful end for which it was instituted by Christ (the comfort and support of sorrowing sinners)—we shall not omit to tell them, that we seek not to bring their consciences under our keeping, for that they cannot shake off their own individual responsibility for their own life ; that we are only helpers of their faith and repentance, and we would hope too of their joy. Especially, let them know that we seek not to be made, without necessity, depositories of their secret sins ; that if they can attain to true Christian hope, by their own humble

confession to Almighty God, they ought thankfully to enjoy the comfort of that hope; but, if they cannot attain to it of themselves, we are ready to receive, in the sacred confidence which belongs to such communication, that unbosoming of their inward state which will enable us to discharge our high commission. That this has been the teaching and the practice of our reformed Church, and of all its faithful ministers, I hardly need to tell you. Till the last century—in many respects a melancholy portion of our Church's existence—the blessedness of this exercise of the power of the keys has always been earnestly enforced.

It appears in King Edward the Sixth's Injunctions, set forth in the first year of his reign, that confession was at that time practised generally by members of our Church in Lent.\* The same appears from the Articles to be inquired of within the diocese of Canterbury, in the Visitation by Archbishop Cranmer, in the second year of the same King.†

In the first year of Queen Elizabeth, she, as is well known, put forth her 'Injunctions;' and afterwards Archbishop Parker, and the Bishops with him, drew up 'Interpretations and further Considerations' of these 'Injunctions.' Among them is the following:—"Ecclesia Christi est, in qua purum Dei Verbum prædicatur, et sacramenta juxta Christi ordinationem administrantur; et in qua clavium authoritas retinetur."‡

Among "Certain principal Articles of Religion, set forth by the order of both Archbishops Metropolitans, and the rest of the Bishops, for the Uniformity of Doctrine, to be read by Parsons, Vicars, and Curates at their first possession-taking," is the following:—"I do acknowledge that Church to be the spouse of Christ, wherein the Word of God is truly taught, the Sacraments orderly ministered according to God's institution, and *the authority of the keys duly used.*"§

\* Cardwell's Documentary Annals, No. II.

† No. X.

‡ No. XLIII.

§ No. XLVI.

In the 113th Canon of 1603 is a direct proof of the common practice of confession and absolution at that period ; for it says, “ If any man confess his secret and hidden sins to the minister, for the unburdening of his conscience, and to receive spiritual consolation and ease of mind from him, we do straitly charge and admonish him, that he do not reveal and make known to any person whatsoever any crime or offence so committed to his trust and secresy, under pain of irregularity.”

In the year 1696, certain ministers having openly and scandalously given absolution to Sir John Friend and Sir William Parkins, at their execution for conspiracy against the life of King William III., though they made no special confession of sins, the Archbishop of Canterbury (*Tennison*) and the Archbishop of York (*Sharp*), together with twelve other Bishops then in London, put forth a ‘ Declaration ’ concerning this irregular and scandalous proceeding, in which, after stating and enforcing the Rubric in the office of ‘ Visitation of the Sick,’ they proceed to say, “ If those ministers knew not the state of these men’s souls, how could they, without manifest transgression of the Church’s order, as well as the profane abuse of *the power Christ has left with his ministers*, absolve them from all their sins ? ” \*

Surely these facts are more than sufficient to show, that ministers, who in these days receive the confession of penitents, and pronounce absolution thereupon, act in full accordance, not only with the Church’s law, but also with the constant practice of the most faithful of its rulers and teachers. *Hooker* and *Saravia* confessed to each other ; and *Bishop Sanderson*, on his death-bed, called on his chaplain to absolve him.

It will be seen from what I have here said, that I am very far from wishing to discourage your teaching high Catholic

\* Documentary Annals, No. CLXIX.



doctrine ; that, on the contrary, I warmly commend it, if it be done with discretion, and due consideration of the ability of your people to receive it. In truth, it is to the general diffusion and hearty acceptance of such doctrine, that I look, under God, for the restoration of peace and strength to our Church. In saying this, I hope I say no more than would be desired by the other Bishops of our Church.

And yet, we have had to lament, that a somewhat different tone has been adopted by some of the highest amongst them.

The Archbishop of Canterbury expresses his confidence, that his Clergy will never be wanting in resistance to any attempts which may be made “to weaken or subvert *the Protestant Faith*, of which they are the *appointed guardians* :” and he tells the Laity, that “their principal duty is, to promote the teaching and preaching of *the Protestant Faith*.”

Now, it is not with anything like a wish to carp at words, that I avow my ignorance of what is meant by the phrase “the Protestant Faith.” “Protestant” and “Faith” are terms, which do not seem to me to accord together ; the object of “Faith” is divine Truth, the object of “Protestant” is human error. How, therefore, can one be an attribute of the other ?

I suppose, however, it is wished to say, that the Clergy ought in their teaching to dwell *mainly* on the denial of Roman Errors, and that the Laity ought to do their utmost to promote such denial.

But, if this be the advice intended, I must frankly say, that I cannot concur in it. I think it is the first duty of the Christian Minister to “preach the pure word of God”—and quite a secondary, and very inferior matter, to preach against the errors which may elsewhere obscure it. Where, indeed, those errors are actively taught, there it is the duty of the Minister, first to inform himself thoroughly of the truth specially assailed, and then to warn his people against the antagonist error. I put

strongly the duty of first *informing himself*; because there is really no course so dangerous, none so likely to forward the views of the enemy, as for a well-meaning, but ill-instructed, Minister to enter into controversy with the Romanists. If he fails, as he will be almost sure to fail, in his crude attempt, the adversary will gain not only a triumph—but also, it is probable, a greater or less number of converts. For many of the people may be tempted to conclude, (however unreasonably,) that because their own respected Pastor has been worsted in the conflict, therefore truth is on the other side. I advise you, therefore, if you be visited by a Romish Propagandist before you are prepared for the controversy, to beware of rushing into it. Content yourselves, in the first instance, with urging on your people the authority of their Church; and then advise with those of your Brethren, who most merit your confidence, how you shall best cope with the adversary. They will probably caution most of you to be satisfied with availing yourselves of the labours of some of the many able vindicators of the truth, whom our own Church has so abundantly produced:—and to avoid committing your sacred cause to the danger of being inadequately asserted by yourselves.

But, in truth, there are very few among you, who are at all likely to be brought into collision with such opponents; and those who are not, will almost always find it their safest, and most effectual, way of guarding their people's faith, to preach the Catholic Truth in its purity and integrity, without embarrassing themselves, or confusing the minds of their people, by mixing it with the confutation of either Roman or Genevan error.

The Book of Articles gives you the best general directions. The 19th tells you, that “the visible Church is a Congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered in all things that of necessity are requisite to the same.”

Now of "the pure word of God," the eighth article tells you where it is to be found, even in "the three Creeds, which ought thoroughly to be received and believed, for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture." The articles of these Creeds, therefore, are to be preached by us if we are faithful ministers of the Gospel, in their purity and integrity, and *as* "the Word of God," as articles of "the Catholic faith, which except a man believe faithfully he cannot be saved." In other words, it is not enough to preach them as mere truths—much less as probable and safe opinions—they must be preached, I repeat, as integrant parts of the Catholic Faith. If, therefore, any article of any one of these Creeds shall ever be assailed from any quarter worthy of consideration, and in such manner assailed as shall threaten to impair the faith of the weak members of our Church, whether throughout its whole extent or in any of your own congregations in particular, there it is your plain and imperative duty to meet the danger with all the powers which God has given you: in such case you must "contend zealously for the Faith," not always by defending it controversially, but by putting it forth so plainly, so strongly, so repeatedly, as shall ensure (with God's blessing) its being firmly fixed in the hearts, as well as the understanding, of your people, as the undoubted and "pure word of God."

Now one article of our Creed, "I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins," has been thus assailed from the very highest quarter which could be named—her Majesty in Council; not, thank God, of her own mind, but in accordance with the report and recommendation of the Judicial Committee of that Council, two of the five who so reported not being known to be members of our Church. This high authority has put forth a solemn adjudication that this article of the Creed, if true, is not such a truth as a minister of the Church may not deny, without thereby disqualifying himself from

being admitted to the cure of souls, one main particular of which is, we have seen, to preach the pure word of God. This article, therefore, it is our manifest duty to bring forward most prominently, and to show how comprehensive is the great truth which it affirms. If baptism confer the remission of sins, it removes the only bar to our receiving the grace of God, which is no less than our being, by the Spirit of God, born again, and made the sons of God by adoption, so that we may truly pray to God in the words which our Lord himself commanded us to use when we pray, “*Our Father which art in Heaven,*” because, being baptized in the name of the Holy Trinity, we are “baptized into Christ,” made “one with Him and He with us,” and so by the wondrous operation of His spirit we have the same father as our Lord Jesus Christ—as he assured us in his own gracious message to his Apostles after his resurrection: “I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and to my God and your God.” Such is the pregnancy of that article of our Creed, which it has been our painful lot to hear contradicted by the highest secular authority.

The duty of maintaining this great truth might no less be shown from another part of the nineteenth Article of the Church, which declares as essential to its very existence that in it “the sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ’s ordinance in all things that of necessity are requisite to the same.” For, why is it that this great importance is ascribed to the sacraments? Is it because they are ordinances of our Lord? Doubtless it is. But ordinances of what kind? mere *ritual* observances? mere tests of our obedience? They are characterized by our Church as “necessary to salvation.” In what respect necessary? *ex necessitate præcepti*? or *ex necessitate medii*? In other words, are they mere positive commandments, or are they the appointed means of saving grace, channels by which the Holy Spirit, and with the Spirit communion with the Son, and so with the Father, is wonderfully given?

Our Church has plainly told us that it is in this sense they are necessary; for it tells us in the 57th canon that “the doctrine both of Baptism and of the Lord’s Supper is so sufficiently set down in the Book of Common Prayer to be used in the administration of the said sacraments, as nothing can be added unto it that is material or necessary.” But that in the administration of the said sacraments such is “the doctrine set down” admits not of question.

And here, my reverend brethren, bear with me for a moment, while I urge upon you the *duty* (no lighter word befits the occasion) of *frequent* communion. In some of your churches, I rejoice to say, that blessed feast is celebrated on every Sunday. Why should it not be in all? Will “the spirit of the age” call such a practice “Romanizing”? Alas! the ignorance of such a cry would be more glaring even than its wickedness. It was Romish corruption, which first caused the rareness of communion of the laity; a corruption which our reformers did much to correct. The first book of Edward VI. contemplated daily communion, and our present book orders weekly communion, wherever there are several priests. The spirit of that order would at least encourage the same frequency, wherever it can be had. We have indeed the express authority of the Bishops in 1661 to this effect: “The priest, standing at the Communion-table, seemeth to give us an invitation to the Holy Sacrament, and *minds us of our duty*, viz., to receive the Holy Communion, some at least, every Sunday.”\*

One consideration more is connected with this particular: by *whom* are these great channels of grace to be set in action? May any one, of his own mere motion, and at his own pleasure, presume to minister herein? The Church has answered this question in the twenty-third Article, and it there tells us that “it is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching or ministering the sacraments in the con-

\* Card. Conf. 342.

gregation, unless he be lawfully sent ;” and we find from the preface of the Ordinal that “from the Apostles’ time there have been three orders of ministers in Christ’s Church, bishops, priests, and deacons ; and that none shall be accounted to be a bishop, priest, or deacon, in our own Church, who has not been admitted thereunto according to the form following” in that book, which is by imposition of the hands of the Bishop : and the twenty-sixth Article says, that whatever be the qualities of the persons so admitted to these sacred offices, yet “forasmuch as in the ministration of the word and sacraments, they do not the same in their own name, but in Christ’s, and do minister by his commission and authority, we may use their ministry. Neither is the virtue of Christ’s ordinance taken away by their wickedness, nor the grace of God’s gifts diminished from such as by faith do rightly receive the sacraments administered unto them, which be effectual because of Christ’s institution and promise, although they be ministered by evil men.”

These are the principles, which, under the designation of “the Sacramental System,” we have heard of late, from one end of England to another, loudly and confidently reprobated by ignorant declaimers of all ranks, except the lowest—thank God! the poison has not yet spread much amongst them—“to the poor, the gospel,” wherever it “is preached,” is still dear.

For, what is, in truth, the sacramental system? It rests on the incarnation of our blessed Lord. Through His “taking our flesh,” He united manhood with His Godhead. Through His own appointed instrument, “Baptism in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,” He made the baptized to be baptized into His body—thus giving to them union with His manhood, united as it is with the Godhead—thus likewise giving to them a new nature, and a new life : for His manhood is to us the source and the channel, from and by which all spiritual grace is poured forth on men. “Of His

fulness we have all received, and grace for grace ;”—grace flowing from Him—the grace which was given by the Father to Him, as “ the Son of man.”

As, therefore, we are made by Baptism to be “ in Him,” to “ live in Him,” so in and by the other sacrament, the Supper of the Lord, are given to us the means to sustain us in that blessed life—the food and aliment of our new being:—for “ the bread which we break is the Communion of the Body of Christ ”—“ the cup of blessing, which we bless, is the Communion of the Blood of Christ ”—of that Body which is “ meat indeed,” of that Blood which is “ drink indeed.” In a word, these two sacraments are the means—one, of our first union, the other of our continuing and growth “ in Him,” who is the “ one Mediator between God and Man ”—Himself both God and Man—perfect God and perfect Man—who made his *Manhood* to be a quickening, life-giving principle to all “ His Brethren ”—so He in love and mercy deigned to call us.

Such is “ the Gospel,” which the apostles were bidden to “ go into all the world, and preach to every creature ”—such is “ the pure Word of God,” set forth in Holy Scriptures, taught plainly in our own Book of Common Prayer at the ministration of our sacraments—the “ due ministration of which, according to Christ’s Ordinance, in all things that of necessity are requisite to the same,” is, as we have just seen, declared by our Church’s article to be essential to its very existence, as a true part of the visible Church of Christ.

To this, the sacramental system—with which our own Church is so bound up that they must stand or fall together—we, my reverend brethren, will, with God’s blessing, faithfully, zealously, immoveably adhere.

And yet, we grieve to think to how large a number, even of ministers within our Church, it is an object of the bitterest and most unsparing hostility. A few years ago, in a journal which is the organ of this party, and which, I am sorry to hear, more

than one of the clergy of our own diocese have selected to be the channel of complaints to the world against their Bishop; nay, which, while these sheets are passing through the press, has been used as the first channel of communication of her Majesty's gracious pleasure to the Bishops, in a letter from the Secretary of State to the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, dated April 1st, 1850,—in this journal, the doctrine of spiritual regeneration in Baptism—the very key-stone of the whole system—was thus characterised: “The new Birth given unto us by God in Baptism; this is a doctrine of Rome, and of DEVILS.” Now, I say with all seriousness—and, if I know myself, I say it in Christian charity—that it would be well for those who thus write, to bear in mind, while God, in mercy, gives them time, how nearly—if the doctrine thus denounced by them be true (and at least the *primâ facie* teaching of their Church declares it to be true)—such denouncement of it must approach to the “sin unto death”—the irremissible sin—to “blasphemy against the Holy Ghost.”

True it is that this has been one effect of that neglect of discipline, the restoration of which the Church declares is “much to be wished:” it has exposed the holy sacraments to the rash judgment of the weak in faith. Such persons are tempted to measure the grace which was *given* by the actual state of the *present* man, in the case of those of their brethren who may have fallen into notorious sin, “walking after the flesh;” and, from their fall, they are further tempted to deny altogether the efficacy of that sacrament, especially, by which they were incorporated into the Church, “the body of Christ.” For, when once this essential efficacy has been denied in some cases, a lower estimate of the sacrament is almost unconsciously formed, and its efficacy is questioned in all—its simple definition is put aside as no longer applicable, or explained away by a qualified and non-natural interpretation. Most certainly, had such weak brethren sate in the chair of the Reformers, the



Catholic truth of the Sacraments would not have been preserved in our Formularies, nor would Rome's imposition of *her* sacraments have been met, as the Reformers protested against them, by the Scriptural argument, that to the two blessed Sacraments of the Gospel alone had the Lord "tied and annexed the promise of the forgiveness of our sins and of our holiness and joining in Christ." \*

The Church can use no plainer language in her Formularies: therefore, for protection from the late Judgment, which was founded upon the abuse and desecration of her mysteries of grace, she looks, under God, to those who, when they were admitted to bear the holy orders of her Head, promised "to minister the Sacraments as the Lord commanded," and received His divine authority and command "to be faithful dispensers of the Word of God and of His Holy Sacraments." It is for us, my brethren, to disabuse the minds of the people committed to our charge, and to call upon them to take, by that "wisdom which is from above," and which is "without partiality," a more comprehensive view of the works of the flesh, remembering that divisions and heresies, and those works which engender filthiness of the spirit, though absolved and even glorified by the world, are as solemnly and infallibly condemned by the Word of God, as the grosser indulgences of animal lust, which the world itself is constrained to class among the deeds of darkness and shame.

We must also remind them that the Church is the *witness of grace*. She tenderly intercedes "for all them that fall," and she beseeches the good Lord "to raise them up," and "finally to beat down Satan [the tempter and accuser] under our feet,"—and this she does in the same supplication in which she invokes strength for such (of her members) "as do stand, and comfort and help for the weak-hearted." The same tenderness, the same witness of grace appears in her articles. In the 16th,

\* Homily of Common Prayer and Sacraments.

she defends the efficacy of holy Baptism, by defending from rash and immature judgment her prodigal children, who have wilfully committed even deadly sin. "Not every deadly sin willingly committed after Baptism" is to be treated as fatal to salvation, far less as indicative of a graceless Sacrament; it is a "*departure from grace given*," it is "a fall into sin after having received the Holy Ghost."

Now, because primitive discipline has ceased, must sinners remain unconscious of their real condition? Is there to be no measure of the extent of their sin, and of the awfulness of their danger? No, my Brethren; it is for us to point out to them the peculiar enormity of the practice of sin by a Christian; *we must*, if it were possible, *define the nature and degree* of a Christian's disobedience; we must rouse them to behold "their garments polluted," "the temple of God defiled," "the Son of God trodden under foot;" we must tell them that they are "counting the blood of the covenant, wherewith they had been sanctified, an unholy thing; that they have done despite unto the Spirit of *grace*;" we must remind them "*whence* they have fallen;" we must explain to them what must be their "repentance, if unto salvation, not to be repented of," repentance from ingratitude, from sinning against grace, and mercy, and love; from "crucifying afresh" that loving Saviour who had "redeemed them from all sin," who had made them "children of His kingdom," had prevented their earliest infancy by His grace, "suffering them as little children to come unto Him," and had "sealed them by His Spirit unto the day of redemption." It is for us to call them *back* to the fold of the good shepherd and His green pastures of holiness and peace; but if, through our negligence in setting faithfully before them the exceeding sinfulness of sin in a member of Christ, "its guilt of many stripes," they have no sense of the greatness of their fall, no anxiety about the essential measure of their contrition—shall not we

fall with them? shall we not offend against that solemn caution which with our commission we received—"If any member of the Church do take any hurt or hindrance by reason of your negligence, ye know the greatness of the fault, and also the horrible punishment that will ensue"?

For indeed our Lord has abundantly instructed us by His Apostles how to "divide the word of truth" to every brother, whether he be walking in the light or "walking disorderly," sowing to the Holy Spirit or sowing to the flesh; how "to teach and to premonish, and to feed and to provide for His family." And most especially in those solemn and comprehensive epistles which, from His throne of glory as the one great head of His Church, He hath sent by His servant John,\* hath He given to us perfect models of ministering in His dispensation of grace, forewarned unto judgment. Well for us, if we make them our models, and with the hearing ear "hear what the Spirit saith unto the Churches"! They are addressed to the angels or bishops of the Churches, and to the whole clergy also, who are not only the watchmen of "Him who walketh in the midst and holdeth the seven stars in His right hand," and "the stewards of His mysteries," but are also His "messengers" or angels; and as we study these sacred messages from "Him who searcheth the reins and hearts of us all," we must observe that each epistle, though addressed to the angel,† and making *him* accountable for "the works" of the Church committed to his charge, addresses also the workers themselves, and brings all their most secret works to light before their angel and themselves. We are hereby taught that the Bishop with his clergy, and the congregation committed to their charge, are addressed as *one*—that the works of all members of the Church are the works of the Bishop, who must be guilty of blood-guiltiness, if not truly and faithfully disallowing what must be, in the people, deadly to the life in Christ.

\* Rev. ch. ii. iii.

† "I know *thy* works" in every Epistle.

Little know they who release their brethren from their baptismal responsibility, by questioning their reception of baptismal grace, who allow them, unrebuked and unconvicted of the deadliness of their sin, to bury this their talent in the earth, and call them away to seek some other gift from the same Lord, whom they have ungratefully wronged—little know they, what solemn calls to repentance and self-abasement before the Father of mercies, they suppress:—little know they to what remorse those, whom they so mislead, must at last awaken, when they shall find what they have really lost,—their names blotted out of the book of life. It is the natural temptation of the disobedient to strive to shake off the responsibility of those privileges which they neglect and defile. The Jews of old in their disobedience yearned for what they deemed the uncovenanted freedom of the heathen; and they were at once arrested by the inspired rebuke of the prophet: “That which cometh into your mind shall not be at all, that ye say, We will be as the heathen, as the families of the countries, to serve wood and stone.”\* They had been chosen and endowed above all the families of the earth, and therefore were they visited for their own offences, for polluting their holy calling, for despising their blessed position in covenant with God. And so must the wilful polluter of the temple of the Holy Ghost† be warned of his deadly sacrilege; he cannot expunge from the record of the judgment-books the dedication of the temple; he cannot exchange for a heathen doom the destruction of having “destroyed the temple of God.” He must then be warned truly, faithfully, and fully, of the deadliness of wilful sin, ere he fill up the measure of his iniquities, and sin the sin unto death, the second death.‡ If the faithful be a living epistle of Christ,§ the apostate Christian is an incarnate blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, and nought

\* Ezek. xx. 32.

‡ Ibid. iii. 17 (Greek).

† 1 Cor. vi. 19.

§ 2 Cor. iii. 3.

remains of one, who *was* graciously redeemed from Egypt and nourished by the bread from heaven, but a carcase fallen in the wilderness of this world.\*

But let us turn from this saddening view of the Holy Sacraments, as defining the nature and extent of the Christian's sin and the deadliness of his apostacy, to their luminous and cheering use in "edifying the Body of Christ." This is the theme, on which all our great divines so love to dwell. The Sacraments shew us the Church, not as a congeries of opinions, but as a living body, begotten from above, with holy acts of life. This has been the comfort of many faithful ones in our land, since that interpretation of Holy Baptism which seemed to degrade all members of the Church, was sanctioned by the State: they have seen that the life of the Church went on, that the "one baptism for the remission of sins" was as duly administered as when Saul of Tarsus "arose and was baptized and washed away his sins." It is one and the same Body, one Faith, one Baptism; and the faithful still enjoy the holy Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ by the same holy mysteries of the Cup of Blessing, which we bless, and the Bread which we break. A blessed summary of Holy Writ do we find in the unchangeable language of the Symbols of the Sacraments, a language which no corruption nor private interpretation can successfully pervert. And they, who, by the Holy Spirit, set themselves to study that language and act out its Truths, find therein mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven, which remain as parables to those who think they have already attained to the full knowledge of "the high calling of God in Christ Jesus."

To the clergy, the Holy Sacraments, in this respect, are inexpressibly valuable: other professions have their summaries and compendiums, in which is concentrated the experience of

\* Heb. iii. 17.

past ages; and the most learned and wisest members thus learn how to arrange their own digested knowledge ready for practice according to the principles which are indicated by the recognized symbolism of their profession. So have we, my Brethren, provided for us, not as the result of human experience, but as the forecasting of Divine wisdom, a digest of instruction for our own ministry, a compendium of truths contained in, and drawn from, the written Word of God; and the more we “inwardly digest” the Holy Scriptures, and the wiser we become in their “analogy of the faith,” the clearer will be our vision of the rich grace and purport of Christ’s Holy Sacraments. We may be startled at finding their wondrous language convicting ourselves, and the popular opinions of our times, of spiritual ignorance and backsliding;—at finding the standard of modern piety below the very first element of the Symbols of Baptism, *e.g.* the victory over death by the death of Christ (and many may still be “in bondage” all their lifetime “through fear of death,” unlike the early Christians, who carried their lives in their hands, and read in their martyrdom the first symbol of their Baptism); we find many professing and scarcely realising the Baptism of that Baptist, whose Baptism conveyed not the Holy Ghost. But let us not be discouraged, let us remember how we have received and heard, let us go on unfolding the mystery of Baptism, the death of the old man, “the flesh and all its affections and lusts crucified” with Christ, “the new creature” in Christ risen with Him from the mystical waters of His Death, sojourning “the citizen of Heaven,” as a “stranger and pilgrim upon earth,” the cares and tribulation of which are made wondrously to work the discipline of the “dying daily” of the body of sin.

Then let us read in the symbol of the Eucharist, how the free grace of the new creation is continued in spiritual preservation: the table spread in the wilderness of this world with

“angels’ food,” from which the member of Christ feeds on life and incorruption, cleansed from all sin by the Blood of that Lamb of God, who, though once offered, yet still lives, and because He lives, all the members of His mystical Body live also, and “out of His fulness” receive “meetness for the inheritance of the saints in light.” How solemn and eloquent is this to them, who, though “many members, are One Body,” “One Bread!” who bear the Cross in testimony, the tri-une witness of “the three that bear witness on earth, the Spirit and the Water and the Blood; and these three agree in one.”

There is no case or condition of any Christian in the Church on earth, but may be classed in the symbolical history set forth in the Sacraments; he is either “rebelling against” or acting out the truths which they express, he is either “resisting the Holy Spirit,” or “growing in the grace,” which they convey. Let us study then in watchfulness and prayer “the mystery of the faith,” so that we “hold it in a pure conscience;” the “One Baptism for the remission of sins” is realized\* spiritually and practically, when the baptized enjoy the sense of deliverance from the curse and penalty of their sins, by and with a holy remission from their thralldom and dominion.

Still further, what a manual of education is symbolised in holy Baptism, and set forth in our Baptismal Service and Catechism! Ask those Christian parents who, in “faith with thanksgiving,” bring up their children in this “nurture and admonition of the Lord;” who, with the discipline of the fallen nature, can thus combine the training of the new creature in the grace and loving presence of our Father in Heaven; thus preaching the gospel of

\* This is to be an instance of the “mystery of the faith,” viz. that each part of it has an inward power upon us. Thus the “One Baptism for the Remission of Sins” is acting all our life in its grace of delivering us from the *power* of our sins; thus are we *really remitted*, or set free, in the “mystery of faith.”

Christ to the earliest affections, and overcoming the world by showing a better, even the reality of the “kingdom of heaven opened,” and its holy light and glorious crowns. Ask those Christian parents, and they will tell you with what feelings they read the opinions of the privy councillors which questioned their being “fellow-workers with God” in their labour of love. Had their faith not been founded on that sacred canon of their Saviour—“Whosoever doeth the will of my Father, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God”—had they not lived in the truth and found the “strength of Christ made perfect in their own weakness”—and had they not found His forewarnings of their trials and promises of His grace ever fulfilled—these opinions might have made them deem it sad to be a Christian parent, and their hearts might have yearned for the lower but covenanted blessedness of the Jewish Dispensation. We must not “feed the lambs” of Christ with hypothetical doubtings of His love, and disputatious “mockage of His sacraments.” It is impossible to over-rate the importance of early habits of trust in God and reverential love and childlike simplicity of faith;—*habits*, not dogmas.

But if that holy sacrament of love, which witnesses so abundantly from the very helplessness of childhood to the free and unmerited grace of Him who “came to seek and to save,” be suppressed through misgivings, or treated with prevarication,—if, at a time when honesty, and truth, and singleness of purpose, and sincerity of speech, be wanted to mould the quick discerning feelings of the young, the Saviour’s own embrace of little children be treated with suspicion (for “in sacraments,” as says the Homily, “God embraceth us and offereth himself to be embraced of us,”)—if “the one Baptism for the remission of sins” represent no longer the words of the apostle, “Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and *ye shall receive*



*the gift of the Holy Ghost*, for the promise is to you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call,"\*—what is this but poisoning the waters of truthfulness and guileless dealing at their very source, and sowing seeds which must bear their bitter fruit of doubt and wavering throughout after-life? How much of the Tempter's power, in the evil heart of unbelief, may not be traced to the practical neglect or misgiving of God's sacramental blessing, in Christ, upon childhood? If the child be trained in the assurance of the Covenant, as already "come † unto mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem,"—if the habit be formed of receiving all things at the hand of God, as His gracious gifts and tokens of the Saviour's love,—if "to live" the happy days of childhood "be Christ," will there be found in after-life that deadness, so often complained of by the popular piety of the day, in realising the rich promises of God as all too gracious and strangely above the experience of this world? It may be, that the child, thus faithfully trained in the full assurance of "being regenerate and made the child of God by adoption and grace," may "grieve," instead of "daily being renewed by, the Holy Spirit," ‡ and may wander into the far country of sin and death, and, wasting his substance of baptismal grace, may serve the powers of darkness and try to feed his famished spirit upon the husks of this world. But, will he be less likely to come to himself, because his memory is stored with truths of "the nurture and admonition of the Lord,"—the sure and certain blessedness of "his Father's house"? In our early training of children, we cannot too earnestly and piously provide that the contrast shall indeed be found great between the true happiness and holy serenity of union with Christ in His Church, "the City of Truth," and the fearful changeableness,

\* Acts ii. 38.

† Heb. xii. 22. Not "ye will come," but *προσεληλύθατε*.

‡ Collect for Christmas-day.

the strife and contention, the evil surmisings, the form of godliness, the idolatry of the world.

Our Church has lovingly provided us with the means of such instruction by its Catechism. And, while some of the "No Popery" babblers of the day decry the practice of catechizing children in the middle of Evening Prayer, as commanded by the Church's law, let us remind them of what as good Protestants as the best among them have written on this subject. "Catechising," says Bishop Stillingfleet, "is the special glory of the Reformation. Till then, there was scarcely any effective catechising. Now, indeed, and under the stimulus of the Reformation, catechising is strictly enjoined by the Council of Trent, and practised in the Church of Rome."\* *Bishop Wilson*† refused to allow a sermon at Evening Prayer, "which would," he said, "in a great measure, set aside the express *duties of catechising*, bound upon us by laws, rubrics, and canons; which, if performed, as they should be, with seriousness, and pains in explaining the several parts of the catechism, would be of more use to the souls, both of the learned and ignorant, than the very best sermon out of the pulpit."

In contrast with these Bishops of past generations, it is painful to read in a report of "the British and Foreign School Society" for 1849, that a Bishop of our Church, in moving "a vote of thanks to her Majesty and Prince Albert for their continued support of that Society," denounced the principle of "the National Society for educating the children of the poor," by instructing them in the Prayer Book and in the Church Catechism, as an "invidious" and "a *pernicious*" principle. He even apologised for "not having yet taken any steps to have *that principle abrogated*." His own requisition was, that the instruction of these children should be "based on the simple and plain truths of Scripture,"—as if those truths, rightly understood, were at variance with our Church's teaching.

\* Ecc. Cases, 38.

† Charge 1747, pp. 213 and 215.

Now this Bishop, doubtless, holds confirmations, and he must know, that no one ought to be admitted to that holy rite, who has not been instructed in our Church Catechism. He also knows, that no one ought to be admitted to holy communion, unless he have been confirmed, or is ready and desirous to be confirmed. It is difficult, therefore, to understand how he would have them duly prepared for receiving this sacrament, which is "necessary to salvation," unless they be taught as our Church requires, and as he would forbid, them to be taught.

When such things occur in such places, it is a plain duty publicly to protest against them. For, while they are permitted to pass unnoticed, we have no right to wonder that some, even good, men fly from our Church, as nothing better than an "unreal mockery."

#### *Address of the Bishops.*

Having thus gone through the principal doctrinal matters, to which our attention has recently been called, I must not omit to say a few words in respect to ritual differences.

It was my misfortune to be unable to concur with the great majority of the Bishops, in an Address which they have set forth on this subject to the Clergy of their Dioceses. If ritual differences were the principal matters which at present cause divisions amongst us, I should fully recognise the fitness of such an united effort to produce harmony.

But is this the fact? Is it not rather true that differences on incomparably higher matters, grave questions of doctrine, are those which really interfere with the unity and peace of the Church?

Is it then accordant with the true dignity—or even very manifestly consistent with the first duty—of Bishops, to close their eyes, and seal their mouths, against the daring violation

of an article of the Creed, and to look at nothing but little ritual irregularities?

These are matters which, so far as they may transgress the laws of the Church, ought, in my opinion, to be dealt with by every Bishop in his own diocese; for they cannot be dealt with justly or effectively without looking to the specialties of every particular case. When, therefore, zeal for "the faith once delivered to the saints" was insufficient to draw from us a declaration of our adherence to Catholic truth in the great article of "One Baptism for the remission of Sins," and of our determination to stand by the plain, dogmatic teaching of our Church, that "the inward and spiritual grace" of that sacrament is "a death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness,"—I deemed it little short of mockery, to put forth an united address to our clergy, praying them to submit to us, as doubts, these small matters, many of which do not seem to them to be doubtful at all.

Neither could I join in "entering a clear and unhesitating protest against the principle, that as the Church of England is the ancient Catholic Church settled in this land before the Reformation, and was then reformed only by the casting away of certain strictly defined corruptions, therefore whatever form or usage existed in the Church before its reformation may now be freely introduced and observed, unless there can be alleged against it the distinct letter of some formal prohibition."

To this principle (making reasonable allowance for the terms in which it is expressed—not by those who profess, but by those who condemn it) I am disposed to ascribe much of weight and justice. Where any office in the prescribed ritual, though not in express words, yet in its plain spirit, or according to the analogy of the service-book in general, rejects an ancient usage or practice, which it may be attempted to engraft upon it anew, there I should think the attempt unreasonable or culpable.

But where no prohibition, expressed or implied, and no

reason drawn from the particular office, or from the general tone and nature of our Liturgy, is opposed to the introduction of a Catholic usage practised before Edward the Sixth's reign, I am not prepared to say that such a thing is always improper—much less merits the reprobation of the whole episcopal body.

The Convocation of 1640, in its eighth canon, distinctly recognises the principle, against which my Right Reverend Brethren, out of Convocation, have felt it their duty to protest. That canon “commends it to all good and well-affected people, members of this Church, that they be ready to tender unto the Lord — acknowledgment, by doing reverence and obeisance, both at their coming in and going out of the said churches—according to the most ancient custom of the primitive Church in the purest times, and *of this Church also for many years of the reign of Queen Elizabeth.*”

Nay, that the practice of “doing due and lowly reverence, when in time of divine service the name of the Lord Jesus shall be mentioned,” had been observed before any canon or rubric ordered it, is plain from the order itself given in the 18th canon of 1603, which expressly says of the practice, “as hath been accustomed.”

In truth, on what other principle can we justify our own most proper and edifying service at the *consecrating of every new Church*? Where is the modern canon which enjoins or authorizes it?

For these reasons, and for others which it is not necessary to state, I ventured to urge my brethren to relinquish the proposed letter to the clergy—a measure which seemed to me manifestly nugatory, and which professes to be excused only by the common-place phrase “under present circumstances”—and instead of it I advised, that, as honest churchmen and faithful bishops, we should go to the foot of the throne, there dutifully lay before her Majesty a plain statement of what those “present cir-

cumstances" are—the country agitated from one extremity to another by religious differences—all confidence in the rulers of the Church shaken—individual clergymen and laymen flying from the communion of such a Church, by reason of the paralysis under which it seems to them to be dragging on a worthless and lifeless existence;—a widely extended suspicion that many more—some it may be of our very best, most learned, most attached brethren—will soon follow; above all, I proposed that we should submit to her Majesty, that the only reasonable hope of staying the progress of the contagion is, that she will be graciously pleased, in accordance with the practice of the best and wisest of her predecessors, and with the dictates of constitutional law, to call together the authorities of the Church in Convocation, and empower and require them to deliberate on the existing evils, and devise and submit for her Majesty's sanction such remedies as to their united wisdom shall seem meet.

To do less than this seemed to me, I repeat, nugatory; to affect to heal our manifold disorders by a few honeyed words, and an appeal to feelings and good nature against a professed principle, seemed to be worse than nugatory—to endanger that portion of public respect which is still conceded to us—and, worst of all, to expose the high office, which we bear, to lasting dishonour and degradation.

But although I thus declined to subscribe the Episcopal Address, and while I fully admit the right of the clergy to practise all that is not forbidden by the law of the Church, while, too, I would applaud the exercise of that right to the utmost, whensoever their own people agree with them in its exercise,—I yet am bound to warn them of the rashness of exercising it against the liking and without the concurrence of their people.

Will they say that the practices which they use are only the outward expression, familiar in the ancient Church, of

Catholic feelings and Catholic principles—feelings and principles which are their own? I answer, that they ought to consult not for the indulgence of their own feelings, but for the edification of their people. Common worship ought to be the expression of common feeling. If they are anxious that their people should join them in the outward expression of high Catholic feeling, let them wait till they shall be enabled by God's blessing to elevate the tone of their people's devotion to a level with their own. Meanwhile let them be cautious, how they call on them to join in practices, which suit not lower, that is ordinary, feelings. To act otherwise is in the strictest sense of the word *preposterous*; it is to place an effect before its proper cause; to force the expression of sentiments which are not yet, and cannot soon or easily be, inculcated—nay, against which any premature attempt to inculcate them can hardly fail to raise an insuperable obstacle.

Yet there is one consideration which must not be omitted.

It may be truly urged, that, the common prayer of the faithful being not primarily nor chiefly designed to edify man, but to worship God, and God having been pleased to reveal to us something respecting the worship of Him in heaven—that it is formal, ceremonial, aye, and musical, choral, antiphonal—divine worship upon earth ought to be a representation, after our poor measure, of what we read of the worship of the heavenly hosts. It is easy, therefore, to conceive a state of feelings in a parish, which ought not to regulate the service of the Church; which ought not to be allowed to prescribe what is sometimes called the plainness and simplicity of Protestant worship. Let us hope, however, that these cases are not only exceptional, but also rare.

Neither am I disposed to recommend any consideration of popular feeling, beyond the particular congregation intrusted to the minister's charge. If that congregation prefers a more ornate or elaborate service, than many or all the parishes around it, I should consider it an invasion of Christian, and

even of civil, liberty, to control the services of any Church at the bidding of those who do not belong to it. Yet instances have of late been very frequent, in which the prejudices and passions of a whole town have been made to bear on some peaceful portion of it, assembling under their proper pastor, and worshipping God with more of reverential and, it may be, ceremonial observance, than accords with the devotional habits and taste of their neighbours. In the metropolis, we know, this tyrannical and domineering spirit has led to outrages disgraceful to a civilized people. I wish I could add, that we have ourselves witnessed no instances of a similar kind.

But, without alluding to particular cases, let me make one general remark. Where the congregation consists mainly of the poorest orders, there we commonly observe a great love of a majestic and even elaborate service. The ornaments of their Church—the storied glass—the painted and, it may be, gilded walls—the Table of the Lord, elevated above the rest, and decked with sober yet costly furniture—the pealing organ—the chanted Psalms—the surpliced choristers—the solemnity of the whole ritual—gladdens, while it elevates, their minds; they recognize in it their own high privilege as Christians, and rejoice to find themselves equal participants with their richest neighbours, in the homage thus paid to the common Lord and Father of all. In truth, when we consider the little which the poor man has to delight his heart, and touch his imagination, in his own squalid home, we ought to rejoice that he can find enjoyment in the House of Prayer, his Father's House. For this reason, few occurrences have affected me more, than the lamentations of the poor worshippers in one of the districts of the metropolis, when they saw, or thought they saw, at the dictation of a riotous and lawless mob of strangers, the approaching surrender of the ritual which they loved, and which was their weekly—to many among them the daily—solace of that poverty to which the providence of God



had consigned them. Incidents such as this cannot be separated from the general character of the proceedings of the past winter. The rioters at St. Barnabas's were stimulated to their violence by the words and deeds of men of a far higher order than their own.

In particular, at a meeting held at the Freemasons' Hall on December 5, 1850, over which a Noble Lord, justly renowned for his benevolence, presided, the following were a few of many things which may well excite the attention of sober members of our Church. The Noble Chairman himself opened the proceedings with a speech, in which, having first declared himself strongly against the then recent "Papal Aggression," he thus proceeded:—"But enough of this outside mischief; let us turn our eyes to that which is within" (great cheering and waving of hats)—"from Popery in flower to Popery in the bud" (cheers and laughter)—"from the open enemy to the concealed traitor—from the menace that is hurled at our Church to the doctrine that is preached from our pulpits—from the foreign assailant to the 'foes that are of a man's own household.'" He then enlarged on "the manifest tendency in many of our clergy in faith and practice to the faith and practice of the Church of Rome"—"the adoption of rites, ceremonies, and language, fitted only to a Popish meridian—the teaching of false and heretical doctrines—the practice of *auricular confession*—the most monstrous perhaps of all the monstrous practices of the Roman system"—(with what knowledge of our own English system and of the Word of God, on which it is founded, this particular was thus dealt with, we have already seen; but he adduced another instance)—"the *sacerdotal forgery of a sacrificing priesthood*, and the necessary and inevitable train of abominable superstitions." (Great cheering.)

Now upon this, if any thing I could say should be deemed worthy of the attention of this Christian nobleman, I would ask one or two questions. Does his Lordship mean by "a sacri-

ficing priesthood" those priests who profess to offer any sacrifice except "the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving"—and the "commemorative sacrifice," or rather the commemoration of the sacrifice of our Blessed Lord? If he does, let him name any one such priest within the Church of England. I myself never heard of one, nor do I believe that his Lordship ever did. But if by the phrase he refers merely to those who claim the Divine commission to consecrate the elements at the Lord's Supper, and offer "the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," and the *commemorative sacrifice*—then I must not be afraid to tell him, that, before he sets himself up as a "Master of our Israel," it would be well for him to inform himself in the rudiments of our system.

The Noble Lord was followed by a gallant officer, who, with a hardihood which might be not unsuitable to him on other occasions, was pleased to say, "I do not like the professions of the Tractarians in this matter—what had they done with reference to the Papal Aggression? They called it 'Schism.' They only employed that nice, convenient, little word 'Schism.'"

This gentleman, I doubt not, goes to Church. Now it might be a matter of some curiosity to ascertain whether it ever crossed his mind, that schism—from which he every Sunday prays to be delivered—is *a sin*? and that therefore to condemn the Pope's brief as an act of *schism*, was not only the most appropriate course for bishops and priests to take, but was also a far graver condemnation, than could be pronounced by the greatest masters of vituperation on all the platforms of all the halls in London? Did it also ever occur to him to inquire, what is the nature and how wide the comprehension of that sin? above all, how near an approach to it he makes, who indulges in ignorant and fanatical abuse of the rulers and ministers of the Church to which he professes to belong?

Of the other speakers, the most eminent in rank, and pro-

bably in knowledge, was a noble Earl, who distinguished himself by the coolness and caution with which he spoke. He knew enough of the Articles and Liturgy of his Church to have some grave misgivings, lest the doctrines and practices which had called forth the indignant eloquence of those who had preceded him, were really authorized by that Church. He therefore said, "We have a right to ask of the rulers of the Church, and ascertain for our own satisfaction, and beyond a doubt, whether the practices complained of are according to the laws and canons of our Church (cheers). If they are, then I say it is our bounden duty—*holding the opinions we hold as to the Gospel of Christ*—to endeavour to get these laws altered," (cheers) "and *our beloved Church purified from these errors.*" (Loud cheers.) His Lordship further said, "That we should endeavour by some means or other to check the progress of these opinions, either by *a determined expression of our own views*, or some other course, I am convinced is right." •

Now on this, by far the most important speech of the day, we may be permitted to ask the following questions: Did the noble Earl, and those whom he addressed, do what he said "it was their bounden duty" to do? Did they "ask the rulers of their Church" the questions which they were bound to ask? Which of those rulers, if any, did they ask? What answers did they receive to their inquiries? Again, has he, or those who act with him, yet made up their minds what course they shall take to "check the opinions" which he complains of, and to "purify their beloved Church from its errors?" Is that course "a determinate expression of their own views?" Have they any views in which they agree? If they have, what are those views, and, above all, what are "their Church's errors?" An answer to these questions would probably be very useful to the cause of truth, aye, and of peace; for they might test the real authority of the Theology of Freemasons' Hall.

This meeting must yet detain me a little longer. One of the speakers, seconding a vote of thanks to the chairman, after complimenting those who had preceded him "on sentiments so sound, and principles so Christian" as they had delivered, expressed his regret that sentiments equally sound, and principles equally Christian, had "not proceeded from him who occupied the most distinguished position in that diocese." (cheers.) "Had the Bishop of London," (hissing and excitement) "had that prelate expressed his disapprobation of that which had been the cause of their now assembling together, he firmly believed they would not have had to enter their present protest" (cheers).

It was *immediately* after this *hissing and excitement* at the bare mention of their Bishop, that the noble chairman, in acknowledging the honour done to him by their vote of thanks, said, "While he thanked *them* most sincerely for this mark of their esteem, he must *most fervently thank Almighty God who had called him to preside over such a meeting*, and to be in some measure a leader in such a work; and he did thank God *emphatically*, because he gathered from the expressions which had been used, from the manner in which they had received the resolutions, and *from the manner in which they had received the heart-stirring addresses of the speakers*, that this was no passing sentiment, no evanescent determination," &c.

Now, why have I dwelt on this meeting? Certainly not for the purpose of exposing, what most of us must think, the absurdity, and, as we have been sorry to see, the profaneness, of some of its sayings—but to mark one of its results—a result far more important, than has followed from any, or all the other meetings which the late popular fever called forth. No fewer than 320,000 signatures are said to have been appended to the address to her Majesty which emanated from it, headed by many most respectable noblemen, members of Parliament, and other distinguished laymen. That those who signed this

address approved the language used at the meeting, or were generally cognizant of it, I do not believe; but such a manifestation of feeling from so large a body of men, not accustomed, it may be, to consider deeply the matters involved in these discussions—but many, very many of them, grave, reflecting, faithful members of the Church to which they profess to belong—such a manifestation of feeling, I say, from so large a body of such men, cannot be regarded otherwise than as a matter highly deserving the consideration of every reflecting minister in our Church. If it tells us the extent to which delusion has been carried, it tells us also the dangers which follow from rash and unreflecting innovation.

### *Royal Supremacy.*

Among the discussions which have been provoked by recent occurrences, one of the most to be lamented is that which concerns the true meaning of the supremacy of the Crown. The unhappy claim made by the Lord President of a royal prerogative to decide, in the last resort, all questions arising in any cause, however merely spiritual—even questions of faith; and the still more unhappy support given to that claim in the House of Lords by the Lord Chief Justice of England; could not but excite general and profound emotion. If the claim be true, then is the commission given by our Lord to his Apostles to “feed his sheep” virtually abandoned in this country, and transferred to the secular power; then is the Church of England no longer really a Church—no longer a branch of that Catholic Church, whose first and highest title it is to be “the Pillar and Ground of the Truth.” That truth would, in England, be recognised as at the disposal of the Ministers of the Crown for the time being—Ministers, who hold their offices at the pleasure of a Parliament which no longer professes to be a body of Churchmen—no longer bound to uphold, as the highest

interest of themselves and the people whom they represent, the spiritual rights and duties of the Church.

The excitement which followed this astounding pretension was the occasion of the actual secession of some from our communion, and of the disquieting the minds, and, I fear, of shaking the confidence, of many others. One of those, whose minds were thus disturbed, solemnly applied to me, as his Bishop, to solve the doubt which perplexed him, before he could, with a quiet conscience, subscribe the declaration contained in the 36th canon, previously to his being ordained priest.

I felt the solemnity of the appeal thus made to me; and, under a deep sense of the duty which it imposed, I proceeded to answer the inquiry. I have since reconsidered that answer, and have sought the counsel of the highest living authorities to which I could have recourse, both theological and legal. The conviction of my own mind, after such additional inquiry, and with the unanimous consent of the eminently learned men whom I consulted, was, I rejoice to say, not only not shaken, but most signally confirmed.

I subjoin the answer which I gave to the inquirer, and will add to it a few particulars, in illustration of the soundness of the principles on which it is grounded.

The question proposed to me relates to only the first of the three Articles contained in the 36th Canon of the Synod of 1603.

But as this is not the only Article relative to the Royal Supremacy, to which subscription is required before you are admitted to Holy Orders, I shall, in answering your inquiry, include consideration of the 37th Article of Religion of 1562, which also you are called upon to subscribe.

There is indeed an additional and obvious reason for considering the two Articles together, because, as both of them express the mind of the Church on the same matter, if there be any ambiguity in the words of that Article of which you ask me to give my construction, we may most properly have recourse to the other to assist us in interpreting it.

Looking to the Article in the 36th Canon by itself, the first observation to be made on it goes far towards answering your inquiry.

“The King’s Majesty, under God, is the only supreme governor of this realm, and of all other his Highness’s dominions and countries, as well in all Spiritual or Ecclesiastical things, or causes, as temporal.”

Such is the main proposition ; and of this, if it stood alone, we could hardly doubt, that it was so expressed, chiefly for the purpose of excluding every claimant of the Supreme Government in such things or causes within this realm, except the lawful Sovereign thereof. But this is placed beyond all reasonable question by the latter clause, which simply denies all “jurisdiction, power, or authority, to every *foreign* Prince, Prelate, State, or Potentate.”

It seems, therefore, that the intention of the framers of this Article was to state, *who* is the Supreme Governor in this realm in all spiritual things and causes, rather than to define *what* is the nature and extent of the power recognised in that Supreme Governor. If, therefore, you are satisfied in your own conscience, that the Queen is, in any sense, “under God, the supreme governor in this realm in all spiritual causes,” to the exclusion of all foreign jurisdiction, you may safely subscribe this Article.

But the 37th Article of Religion of 1562 is also to be subscribed ; and its words fully sustain the interpretation which I have given to the Article in the Canon.

It first affirms, that “the Queen’s Majesty hath the chief power in this Realm of England, and all other her Dominions, unto whom the chief government of all Estates of this Realm, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Civil, in all causes doth appertain, and is not, nor ought to be, subject to any foreign jurisdiction.” And afterwards there is a special denial of all “jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome in this Realm of England.”

So far this Article has manifestly the same meaning as the other. The main object is to exclude *all foreign jurisdiction*, especially of *the Pope*.

But the Article proceeds to declare something of the Supremacy itself, and to this it is necessary that our closest attention be given.

It says “When we attribute to the Queen’s Majesty the chief government, by which titles we understand the minds of some slanderous folks to be offended, we give not to our Princes *the ministering* either of *God’s Word*, or of the Sacraments.”

Now the effect of denying to the Crown *the ministering of God’s Word*, is manifestly to exclude the right and power validly to pronounce what is the force and meaning of God’s Word in any particular, which may be involved in any cause Ecclesiastical. It leaves that right and power to those to whom it appertains by authority committed to them by God ; in other words to “The Church,” of which the 20th of the very same Articles, entitled, “Of the Authority of the Church,” expressly says that it “hath authority in controversies of Faith.”

But the 37th Article goes still further in limiting the power given in its acknowledgment, that “the Queen hath the chief government of all Estates in this Realm, whether Ecclesiastical or Civil, in all causes ;”—for it says, that it thereby means to acknowledge no more than “that only prerogative, which we see to have been given always to all godly princes in Holy Scrip-

ture by God himself—that is, that they should *rule* all Estates and Degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Temporal, and *restrain* with the *civil sword* the stubborn and disobedient.”

Now, this is no less than an express *exclusion of the crown* from all “authority in controversies of faith,” leaving to its control only the *civil* results in all causes Ecclesiastical, and the coactive power *in foro exteriori*, especially as relates to *temporal* punishment.

It follows, therefore, on an accurate examination and collation of the 1st Article of the 36th canon of 1603, and the 37th Article of Religion of 1562, that there is not any real ground for raising in the most sensitive mind any scruple in subscribing them, by reason of their “rendering unto *Cæsar* the things that be *God’s*.”

Whether any Act of the State at any period, whether of King Henry VIII. or of Queen Elizabeth, or of any subsequent sovereign, hath virtually interfered with the inherent rights of the Church, or rather, hath usurped to the Crown a power which no human Legislature can lawfully affect to bestow, is a question which it is not necessary to consider in answering the inquiry which has been submitted to me—an inquiry which relates, I repeat, only to subscription to the Article in the 36th canon.

More might be urged in confirmation of the view here taken ; but I can hardly doubt, that what I have now said, will suffice to allay any apprehension, that you cannot safely subscribe those Articles which the Church requires you to subscribe, as a condition precedent to your being admitted to Holy Orders.

It will be seen, that in the answer which I gave to the inquiry put to me, I rested some part of my argument on Queen Elizabeth’s disclaimer of all right “of ministering either of God’s Word or of the Sacraments.” I am well aware that many persons regard this disclaimer as involving nothing more than what is literally expressed in it—in a word, denying to Princes, as such, the power of exercising the functions of the Christian ministry. In deference to such persons, I would not insist on this argument further than it can be plainly shown to avail ; and I have, in truth, the less reason to insist upon it, because the other grounds stated are amply sufficient to justify our conclusion. But let me say one word, to show the reason for which the argument in question has real and great force in my own consideration of it.

Why does not the *supremacy* of the Crown carry with it a



right “of ministering the Word and Sacraments”? Manifestly because such right belongs to those only to whom our Lord himself hath given His commission so to minister. But what was the matter of that commission? So far as respects our present argument, it was to “preach the Gospel”—to “teach those who were admitted into the Church by Baptism to observe all things whatsoever Christ hath commanded”—lastly, to “feed his sheep,” to “feed his lambs”; to feed them, that is, with the word of truth, as well as with the spiritual food of the body and blood of Christ. But if it is the want of a divine commission which incapacitates the Crown for thus ministering the Word and Sacraments, does it not, in a still higher degree, incapacitate it for deciding *what* the Word of God is?—*what* the due administration—and, still more, the spiritual efficacy of the Sacraments? Is not a higher spiritual authority required to pronounce absolutely *what* is the truth which God commands his ministry to teach, than to teach in conformity with it? Is not such an exercise of authority *teaching*, and teaching of the highest and most transcendent kind? In this respect the spiritual supremacy differs essentially from the secular. In the nature of civil judicature there is nothing which makes the Crown incapable of exercising it. On the contrary, we know that in the earlier ages of the monarchy, the Sovereign sat in his own tribunal, and administered the laws in his own person. This he could never do in “causes of the law divine.”

But I turn to the words of the “Admonition” appended to Queen Elizabeth’s Injunctions, which are cited in the 37th Article:—

“We give [to our Princes] *that only prerogative*, which we see to have been *given always to all Godly Princes in Holy Scriptures* by God himself; that is, that they should *rule* all states and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical or temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil-doers.”

Now, what is “the Prerogative given to Godly Princes in Holy Scriptures?” Happily, we need not involve ourselves in any extensive search for it ; for we have almost contemporary evidence of the sense put on the words in the age in which they were used. The 2nd Canon of 1604 excommunicates, *ipso facto*, “whosoever shall hereafter affirm that the King’s Majesty hath not the same authority in causes ecclesiastical, that the godly kings had amongst the Jews and Christian emperors in the Primitive Church.”

Now, it happens that one of the most illustrious of the divines who sate in the Convocation which made this canon, *Bishop* (then *Dean*) *Andrews*, selected by King James to defend his supremacy against Cardinal Bellarmine, thus speaks of that supremacy in his work called ‘*Tortura Torti* ;’ “*Docendi munus, vel dubia legis explicandi, Rex non assumit*” (p. 380). “*Adhibebit in sacris legibus ferendis, quos adhibere par est, quosque ratio suadet, rerum illarum consultissimos, de eis optime respondere posse. Et in his, quæ ad Deum pertineant, Amariam Sacerdotem, non Zabadiam Ducem, jubebit præsidere.*” 2 Chron. xix. 21 (p. 381). The words of the text here cited are these : “*And, behold, Amariah, the High Priest, is over you in all matters of the Lord. And Zabadiah, the son of Ishmael, the ruler of the house of Judah, for all the king’s matters.*”

This, then, is “the authority in causes ecclesiastical, that the godly kings had amongst the Jews,” intended by the canon. It is thus set forth by Bishop Andrews, selected by the King to defend his true prerogative, and specially thanked and applauded by him for having so defended it.

But let us see what King James himself said on the same subject. He was a prince who, whatever were his faults or foibles, would have been distinguished by his learning if he had been a subject ; and, as a prince, he was specially distinguished by his earnestness in asserting his prerogative. Let us see, then, how he writes on this matter.

In his ‘Apology for the Oath of Allegiance,’ we meet with what follows :—

“ I never did, nor will, presume to create *any articles of Faith*, or to be *judge thereof*; but to *submit my exemplary obedience* unto them [the Hierarchy of the Church] in as great humility, as the meanest of the land,” p. 269.

Again, after divers quotations from Scripture,—

“ If these examples, sentences, titles, and prerogatives, and innumerable other in the Old and New Testaments, do not warrant Christian kings, within their own dominions, to govern their Church, as well as the rest of their people, in being ‘*Custodes utriusque tabule*,’ *not by making new Articles of Faith* (which is the Pope’s office, as I said before), but by commanding obedience to be given to the word of God, by reforming the religion according to His prescribed will, by assisting the spiritual power with the temporal sword, by reforming of corruptions, by procuring due obedience to the Church, by judging, and cutting off all frivolous questions and schisms, as Constantine did, and finally, by making *decorum* to be observed in every thing, and establishing orders to be observed in all indifferent things for that purpose, *which is the only intent of our Oath of Supremacy*: if this office of a King, I say, do not agree with the power given him by God’s word, let any indifferent man void of passion judge.”

Once more, in his ‘Defence of the Rights of Kings.’—

“ The first council held at Constantinople bears this title or inscription: ‘The dedication of the Holy Synod to the most religious Emperor Theodosius the Great, to whose will and pleasure they have submitted these Canons by them addressed and established in Council.’—And there they also beseech the said Emperor to confirm and approve the said Canons. The like hath been done by the Council of Trullo, by whom the Canons of the 5th and 6th Councils were put forth and published. This was not done because emperors took upon them to be infallible *judges of doctrine*; but *only* that emperors might see and judge whether Bishops (who feel the prick of ambition, as other men do) did propound nothing in their convocations and consultations, but most of all in their determinations, to undermine the emperor’s authority, to disturb the tranquillity of the commonwealth, and to cross the determination of precedent councils.”—pp. 427, 428.

In the same reign, a very remarkable and formal declaration was made of the nature of the Royal Supremacy.

Certain magistrates in Ireland had, in 1622, refused to take

the Oath of Supremacy, and were summoned before the Privy Council to be censured. On this occasion *Usher*, then Bishop of Meath, was appointed to address the recusants. "The part," said he, "which is most proper for me to deal in is, the information of the conscience touching the truth and equity of the matters contained in the oath." The effect of his speech is stated by his biographer to have been such, "That divers of the offenders, being satisfied that they might lawfully take their oaths, did thereby avoid the sentence of præmunire, then ready to be pronounced against them." A copy of this speech was sent to the King, who, in a letter from himself to the Bishop, expressed his sense of the greatness of the service thus rendered, "in our Castle Chamber at Dublin, at the censure of those disobedient magistrates who refused to take the Oath of Supremacy, wherein your zeal to the maintenance of our just and lawful power, defended with so much learning and reason, deserves our princely and gracious thanks; which we do by this our letter unto you, and so bid you farewell. Given under our signet, at our Court at Whitehall, the 11th day of January, 1622."

Two years afterwards, *Usher* was translated to the see of Armagh, his elevation to which seems to have been in part owing to the great satisfaction which he had given to James in this matter.

Now, let us see the statement of the King's "just and lawful power," as asserted in the oath of supremacy, which called forth these strong testimonies of the royal approbation.

The "first conclusion" drawn by *Usher* is this,—

"That whatsoever power is incident unto the king by virtue of his place, must be acknowledged to be in him *supreme*: there being nothing so contrary to the nature of sovereignty, as to have another superior power to overrule it."

"In the second place, we are to consider, that God for the better settling of piety and honesty among men, and the repressing of profaneness and other vices, hath established *two distinct powers* upon earth: the one of

*the keys*, committed to the Church; the other of *the sword*, committed to the civil magistrate. That of *the keys* is ordained to work upon the inner man; having immediate relation to the *remitting or retaining of sins*. That of the *sword* is appointed to work upon the outward man; yielding protection to the obedient, and inflicting external punishment upon the rebellious and disobedient. By the former, the spiritual officers of the Church of Christ are enabled to 'govern well,' to 'speak, and exhort, and rebuke, with all authority,' to loose such as are penitent, to commit others unto the Lord's prison, until their amendment, or to bind them over to the great day, if they persist in wilfulness and obstinacy. By the other [the *Sword*] princes have an imperious power assigned by God unto them, for the defence of such as do well, and executing *revenge* and *wrath* upon such as do evil; whether by death, or banishment, or confiscation of goods, or imprisonment.

"Let this, then," says he, "be our second conclusion, that the power of the sword and of the keys are two distinct ordinances of God, and that *the Prince hath no more authority to enter upon the execution of any part of the Priest's function, than the Priest hath to intrude upon any part of the office of the Prince.*

"In the third place, we are to observe, that the power of *the civil sword* (the *supreme* management whereof belongeth to the king alone) is not to be restrained unto *temporal* causes only; but is by God's ordinance to be extended likewise unto *all spiritual or ecclesiastical things and causes*, that as the spiritual rulers of the Church do exercise their kind of government, in bringing men unto obedience, not of the duties of the first table only (which alone concerneth piety and the religious service, which man is bound to perform unto his Creator) but also of the second table (which respecteth moral honesty, and the offices that man doth owe to man),—so the civil magistrate is to use his authority also in redressing the abuses committed against the first table, as well as against the second; that is to say, as well in punishing of an heretic, or an idolator, or a blasphemer, as of a thief, or a murderer, or a traitor.

"And howsoever by this means we make both Prince and Priest to be, in their several places, *custodes utriusque tabule*, yet do we not hereby any way confound both of these offices together. For, though the *matter* wherein their government is exercised may be the same; yet, is the *form* and *manner* of governing therein always different, the one reaching to the *outward* man only, the other to the *inward*: the one binding or loosing the soul, the other laying hold of the body and the things belonging thereunto.

"That there is *such a civil government in causes spiritual or ecclesiastical*, no man of judgment can deny. For, *must not Heresy* (for example) *be acknowledged to be a cause merely spiritual or ecclesiastical?* and yet by

what power is an Heretic put to death ? The officers of the Church have no authority to take away the life of any man : it must be done therefore *per brachium sæculare.*"

In reply to an objection that the words be general, that "*the king is the only supreme governor of this realm, and of all other his Majesty's dominions and countries,*" he answers,

"First, that where a civil magistrate is affirmed to be *the Governor* of his own dominions and countries, by common intendment, this must needs be understood of a *civil government*, and *may in no reason be extended to that which is entirely of another kind.*" "Secondly, that when there is any ambiguity in any part of an oath, it ought to be taken according to the understanding of him for whose satisfaction the oath was ministered. Now, in this case, it has been sufficiently declared by public authority, that no other thing is meant by the *government* here mentioned, but that of the *civil sword* only."

He appeals for this to the 37th of the Articles of 1562, which were established by the Statute 13th Eliz. c. 12.

"Seeing, therefore," says he, "that makers of the law have full authority to expound the law, and they have sufficiently manifested, that by the *supreme government* given to the Prince they understand that kind of government which is exercised *with the civil sword*, I conclude, that nothing can be more plain than this, that without all scruple of conscience, the king's majesty may be acknowledged *in this sense* to be the only supreme governor of all his highness's dominions and countries, as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes, as temporal."

I have dwelt thus at length on this important document, because of its manifest contradiction of much of the Erastian mis-statements, which we have lately heard set forth in very high, as well as in very low, places.

If confirmation of what has been said be wanted, we may look to a case which occurred in the very beginning of the following reign, proving how the statesmen of all parties, in those days, understood that great constitutional principle, the Ecclesiastical supremacy of the Crown.

When the clamour against *Mountague* (soon afterwards Bishop of Chichester) was at its height, on account of his book entitled 'The Gagger gagged,' Morton, Bishop of Lichfield,

brought several accusations against him. The Duke of Buckingham appointed a conference at York House, to hear the case, which conference was attended by seven or eight lords, among them the Earls of Warwick and Pembroke, and the Lord Saye, strongly opposed to the doctrinal views of Mountague. *Inter alia*, the Bishop “accused Mr. Mountague to have denied the oath of supremacy in plain terms.”

“ ‘That were somewhat strange,’ quoth the Dean [of Carlisle]. ‘As strange as it is,’ quoth the Bishop, ‘I will prove it. For, in his answer to the Gag., p. 68, where the Papist objected to us as an error, and yet said truly, that we hold a woman may be supreme Governess of the Church *in all causes*, as well ecclesiastical as temporal, as Queen Elizabeth was,—for this saying Mr. Mountague giveth him the lie, and affirms that no Protestant ever thought so.’ And the Bishop added, that he thought this saying of Mr. Mountague was not far from treason.

“ Cosin, afterwards Bishop of Durham, appeared for Mountague, who was obliged to go to Windsor; and he “shewed that ‘Mountague had not blamed the Gagger for the words recited, but for leaving out other words which should have gone along with them.’ ‘What words are they,’ quoth the Duke? Mr. Cosin saith, ‘*over all persons*,’ my lord, and directed him to the place. Upon this, the Duke sharply rebuked the accusing Bishop, who replied ‘that he stood to Mr. Mountague’s first words.’ ‘What,’ quoth my Lord Chamberlain and the Earl of Carlisle, ‘You must give a man leave to finish his answer before you can justly pass any censure upon him.’ Mr. Mountague, in the words immediately following, saith as much as you or any reasonable man can require him to say; p. 69. His words are these:—(and my lord chamberlain read them:) ‘We say princes have supreme power in earth, under God, *over all persons, in all causes* whatsoever within their dominions, even in causes merely ecclesiastical, *to compel them to do their duties by the civil sword. Not over all causes to do as they will, to command or change belief or faith.*’ ‘So that this accusation,’ quoth my lord the duke, ‘might have been well spared, for *we are all of Mr. Mountague’s mind*; and if you be not so likewise, my Lord of Lichfield, you are much to blame.’

“ ‘Nay,’ quoth the Bishop, ‘I am very glad that things are thus answered and solved.’” \*

Not long before these matters occurred, *Dr. Thomas Jackson*, the glory of the University of Oxford in the reign of James

\* Cosin’s Works (Oxford, 1850), vol. ii. pp. 52, 53.

I., and one of the profoundest thinkers in that or any other age, put forth the following clear exposition of the principle on which, as we have seen, contemporary statesmen acted :—

“ But how do we say the king is *supreme governor in ALL causes*, except we acknowledge him supreme governor *in causes merely spiritual*? Even in *these* he is supreme governor ; but not over *them*, as he is over all *persons* ecclesiastical or civil. When we acknowledge him supreme governor *in all causes*, we do not acknowledge it in his power to alter any thing that is instituted by Christ (as either to assign the power of ordination to such as are not bishops, or to authorize any to administer the Sacraments which are not lawfully ordained presbyters, or to dispense with the mode of administering the Sacraments). But *how* do we make him supreme in causes merely spiritual? In such a question as administering the body and blood of Christ in both kinds, he hath full power to call a *synod* of bishops and clergy, and upon declaration or decision made by them, to *compel* every bishop and priest to administer in both kinds, and every layman so to receive, under penalty. *The truth of the doctrine being resolved by the synod*, and the contrary error condemned for heresy, *he hath a coercive power* over every bishop to compel him to convert and censure delinquents.

“ The case is really the same, as concerning his *supreme* power in temporal causes : in all which it is not necessary to his supremacy that he sit as judge, but that he compel them to whom cognizance of such causes doth properly belong, to punish delinquents, and settle peace throughout his dominions.”—Jackson, iii. 924.

*Mason*, a writer of scarcely less authority, and of about the same time, thus writes in defence of the Royal Supremacy, according to the Church of England :—

“ Whether kings have power or authority to determine, judge, or decide anything in ecclesiastical matters. of themselves, as the proper judges and determiners of those matters, is not the question—is nothing to the purpose. The king hath not the keys of the kingdom of heaven ; but yet he may justly exercise his kingly authority over those who have them, in order to oblige them to make the proper use thereof. Which of us did ever assert that princes are the supreme judges or determiners *in controversies of faith and religion*? It belongs to the spiritual pastors to explain the doubtful things of the law ; and to kings to *publish* the truth, when it is explained, and to *enforce* it, with his commands, upon all his subjects, of what order or condition soever they be.”—(*Mason's Vindication of English Ministry*, p. 228.)

In the next generation, *Archbishop Bramhall*, a name worthy



of all commendation, thus gives us his judgment on the same subject, against his Roman adversary :—

“ We never did believe that our kings, in their own persons, could exercise any act pertaining either to the power of order or jurisdiction : nothing can give that to another which it hath not itself. They meant only a civil or political head, as Saul is called the head of the Tribes of Israel, to see that public peace be preserved ; to see that all subjects, as well ecclesiasticks as others, do their duties in their several places ; to see that all things be managed for that great and architectonical end, that is, the weal and benefit of the whole body politick, both for soul and body.” (He cites the 37th Article.)\*

Again :—

“ We derive not any spiritual jurisdiction from the Crown, but either liberty or power to exercise *actually* and *lawfully* upon the subjects of the Crown, that *habitual jurisdiction* which we received at our ordination, or the enlargement and dilatation of our jurisdiction *objectively*, by the Princes referring more causes to the cognizance of the Church, than formerly it had ; or lastly, the increase of it *subjectively*, by their giving to ecclesiastical judges an *external coercive* power, which formerly they had not.

“ To go yet one step higher. In cases that are indeed spiritual, or merely ecclesiastical, *such as concern the Doctrine of Faith, or Administration of the Sacraments*, or the ordaining or degrading of ecclesiastical persons, sovereign princes have (and have only) an architectonical power *to see that clergymen do their duties* in their proper place.” †

Bishop *Jer. Taylor* writes thus in his ‘*Episcopacy Asserted* :’—

“ The Bishop’s Jurisdiction hath a compulsory derived from Christ only, viz., the infliction of censures by excommunications, and other *minores plagæ*. But yet this *internal* compulsory, through the duty of good Princes to God, and their favour to the Church, is assisted by the secular arm, either superadding a temporal penalty in case of contumacy, or some other way abetting the Church. So that, ever since then, Episcopal Jurisdiction hath a double part, an external, and an internal ; *this* is derived from Christ, *that* from the King ; which because it is concurrent in all acts of Jurisdiction, *therefore* it is, that *the King is supreme of the Jurisdiction*, viz., that part of it which is *the external compulsory*.”—Bishop *Jer. Taylor*, vii. 172.

\* Archbishop *Bramhall’s Works*, Answer to M. de la Militière, p. 25.

† *Ibid.*, *Just Vind.*, i. p. 134.

A statement of Bishop Stillingfleet continues the testimony a little later :—

“The ecclesiastical jurisdiction, *in foro exteriori*, is derived from the Crown. And therefore those who have spiritual jurisdiction may be properly enough called the king’s judges. (Not that kings, as such, have ecclesiastical jurisdiction, but the bishops exercise the jurisdiction which belongs to their office by the laws of the land). This was always the case respecting the *ordinary* jurisdiction of bishops ; but, before the Reformation, *the Pope* being considered the *supreme* ordinary, they had from *him* sometimes a deputed and extraordinary jurisdiction.

“In the ordinary jurisdiction of bishops, there are two things especially to be distinguished :

“I. The original *right* belonging to their office, which they have from Christ, the Founder and Head of the Church, the Fountain of Spiritual jurisdiction.

“II. The *authority* to execute such a jurisdiction within the realm, and the rules and measures of exercising it—which are prescribed by the laws of the land—to transgress the bounds so prescribed is an offence against the Crown and Royal Dignity.”—Ecl. Cases, ii. 50.

To these, our own worthies, let me add one testimony from an eminent foreign Protestant, the illustrious *Isaac Casaubon*, in his book ‘*De Libertate Ecclesiasticâ*,’ written about the year 1607 ; (after arguing against appeals to the Pope,) he thus says :—

“It remains that I say a few words concerning *Appeals to the Prince*. Now, it is a very different matter when a prince, and when a greater synod is appealed to ; for the bishops who assemble in a synod are the lawful judges of divine affairs. Appeals, therefore, are made *to them*, as to those to whom the cognizance of such controversies belongs ; but the prince is appealed to, *not that he should pronounce sentence concerning divine matters*, but that he should commend it to be duly and orderly pronounced ; for he is the keeper and defender of good order and discipline, and of all lawful ordinances, no less in the Church than in the rest of the State.”—Hiekes on Priesthood, App. ccxciii.

This is in strict accordance with the constitution of Clarendon (as, we have already seen), namely, that “When an appeal came to the King from the Archbishop, he was not to

take cognizance of the cause himself, but was to provide that justice be done *in the court of the Archbishop*,—and the appeal not carried further (*i.e.* to Rome) without the King's consent."

The contests of our early Kings, in respect to appeals, had nothing whatever to do with any claim of the crown to *decide* them. Such claim was not pretended, nor thought of; the only matter in dispute was, *whether the Pope had the right to receive appeals* without the permission of the King.

A still earlier document than the Constitutions of Clarendon may be cited to the same effect—the charter of King William the Conqueror (separating the Hundred Court from the court of the Archbishop). It is among 'The Laws and Institutes of England,' published by the Record Commission, by authority, 1840 :—

"Nullus Episcopus vel Archidiaconus de legibus Episcopalibus amplius in Hundret placita teneat :—Nec causa, quæ ad regimen animarum pertinet, ad iudicium sæcularium adducant."—vol. i. p. 495.

These authorities may suffice to show what is meant in the First Canon of 1604, by "restoring to the crown of this kingdom the *ancient* jurisdiction over the state ecclesiastical."

The Second Canon excommunicates

"whosoever shall hereafter affirm that the King's Majesty hath not the same authority in causes ecclesiastical that the Godly Kings had amongst the Jews, and *Christian Emperors in the Primitive Church.*"

We have seen above what was the authority in such causes of "the Godly Kings among the Jews." We will now see what it was in "the Christian Emperors." One citation will suffice—from the Theodosian Code—a collection of the constitutions of sixteen emperors from the year 312 (the year of Constantine's conversion) to the year 438, when it was compiled at the command of Theodosius the younger. The laws relating to religion are (almost all) in the sixteenth book; and on examining them it will be found that they are drawn up in

conformity with the Canons of the Church—that they refer to those Canons—and avoid making new ordinances by the authority of the Emperor, who only armed the laws of the Church with a civil penalty. The constitution of Theodosius the younger, (made Emperor with Honorius A.D. 408,) which is transferred to the code of Justinian, (Lib. i. Tit. ii. Const. 6,) is as follows :—

“ Imp. Honor. et Theodos. Præfecto Prætorii Illyrici.

Omni innovatione cessante, vetustatem et *canones pristinos Ecclesiasticos*, qui usque nunc tenuerunt, etiam per omnes Illyrici provincias servari præcipimus : ut si quid dubietatis emerit, id oportet (non absque scientia viri Reverendissimi Sacrosanctæ Legis Antistitis Ecclesiæ Urbis Constantinopolitanæ, quæ Romæ veteris Prærogativâ lætatur).—*Conventui Sacerdotali sanctoque judicio reservari.*

*Justinian* himself, as is declared in the preface to his Novel 83, claims τὴν ἐξουσίαν full power of legislation in civil matters, but no more than guardianship and protection, τὴν παραφυλακὴν, in respect to laws of the Church.

#### *Diocesan Synod.*

I come, in conclusion, to a matter on which, above all others, I am anxious to communicate with you. This diocese has been specially and formally injured by the obtrusion into it of a minister holding heretical opinions on an article of the Creed, in defiance of the decision of the Bishop and of the Spiritual Court of the Archbishop. That the Archbishop himself, acting avowedly as the minister of the secular powers, has been the instrument to commit this wrong, by instituting a presbyter condemned by the authorities of the Church, does not lessen the wrong itself; unhappily it has only tended to make redress more difficult.

The consequence is, that your Bishop thus finds his spiritual rights, duties, and responsibilities in Christ's Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, impaired and marred by his position in the National Church. And yet, need I say, that a National

Church is only an adventitious and accidental ordinance in that system, of which particular churches are integral and essential parts? For, as you know, according to the ancient principles of the Catholic Church, every Diocese is, in itself, a whole; therefore, if there were no National Church, yet would the Catholic Church remain whole and entire. Not so, if there were no particular churches, for then would there be no parts to constitute the whole.

True it is, that the unity of the Church depends on the unity of the Episcopate. But to this unity of the Church in any nation, it is not necessary that there should be a National Church; for, that unity would be effected by the communion which every particular Church is bound to hold with every other.

In short, a National Church owes its origin, under God's blessed provision for the Nation itself, to the convenience of having a common system, in and by which neighbouring churches, specially connected by being under the same temporal Sovereign, may act more vigorously and more usefully, by being sustained by the common action of all under one united ecclesiastical polity. It is a main part of that polity, that one chief Bishop presides over many others, with appellate jurisdiction, in order to secure the observance of the common canons.

This National system, wise and beneficial as it is ordinarily found to be, is yet not essential to the being of the Church; so that it may be—God forbid that with us it ever should be—necessary to infringe it, in vindicating the Catholic Faith. The chief Bishop may, whether by unfaithfulness or other less culpable cause, abuse the power intrusted to him—may himself pervert instead of enforcing the canons—may even carry that perversion so far as to violate some essential part of that faith. The form of polity, under which the particular churches are combined, may be such as shall provide no mode of remedying the

evil. Therefore, as in the system of our civil polity it is necessary to recognise the principle that the Sovereign can do no wrong—in other words, that there be no constitutional power of dealing with him as a wrong-doer—and so it is the duty, as well as the wisdom, of the people, to endure every excess of power that is tolerable, and to have recourse to every practicable expedient to lighten the mischief, rather than proceed to the disruption of the commonwealth; in like manner, it is the duty and wisdom of every of the several particular churches, combined in that union which is called a National Church, to try every course by which it can affirm its own catholicity, rather than renounce the union itself. If no such course can be devised; if remaining in the union would involve a particular church in irremediable and hopeless opposition to the Catholic faith; then the duty of a church so circumstanced is plain and simple. It must, with whatever pain and at whatever sacrifice, renounce an union which is become heretical, and therefore no longer any part of the Catholic and Apostolic Church.

Now, if the judgment in what is called the Gorham Case had committed our National Church to a denial of the article of the Creed “I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins”—which it clearly would have done, if it had spoken with the voice of our National Church what it did speak by the voice of five lay lawyers, with the assent and counsel of our two Archbishops—then it would have been necessary for every particular Church, first to exert every endeavour to induce the united body to recall and disclaim the heretical decree; and, when every endeavour had been exerted in vain, then to renounce all further connexion with a body, which had so cut itself off from the unity of the body of Christ.

Happily, our position is not so trying. The judicial committee of Privy Council advised her Majesty to pronounce a Judgment, which, under the existing law of the Church, had the effect of declaring that your Bishop had, in a particular

case, so exercised his jurisdiction as to have injured a particular clergyman, and therefore that the jurisdiction in that case should pass to the Archbishop, whose duty it would be to consider for himself the merits of the case, and to form and pronounce his own judgment, which must be final, upon those merits.

That the Archbishop, instead of doing this, thought fit to desert the duty of his office, and at once to institute the Crown's presentee, without further examination, did no more commit the Church to a complicity in his act, than if, on the presentation to him by the Crown of a clerk, against whom he was formally warned that he was unfit for the cure of souls by reason of the unsoundness of tenets holden by him, the Archbishop had wilfully, and in despite of such warning, proceeded to institute him.

Such, I confidently state, was the effect of this unhappy Judgment. It demonstrated the extreme peril, even to a continuance of Union, from the law, which imposes upon the Church such a tribunal; it exhibited the Archbishop as regardless of an essential duty of his high office; and it has entailed on those immediately concerned the necessity of protesting against the whole proceeding. I have, as your Bishop, publicly and solemnly made my protest accordingly; but there remains something to be proposed to you, my reverend brethren, to which I shall now proceed to call your attention.

It is my purpose—the execution of which has been delayed by me till the present occasion—to invite you, immediately after the close of my visitation, to meet me in a **DIOCESAN SYNOD** at the cathedral city, and there to call on you to express or refuse your concurrence with me in a Declaration, that we adhere, and by the blessing of God will continue to adhere, faithfully and at every hazard, to the article of the Creed “I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins,” which article we consider to have been virtually denied, when Her

Majesty decided, as she did, on the report and recommendation of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

I wish further to announce to you, that when we shall have met together in a Diocesan Synod mainly for this purpose, I shall be anxious to obtain the benefit of your counsel on such other matters, as shall seem most to demand our deliberation, whether affecting the Church at large, or our own diocese in particular.

It is long since any of my predecessors held such a synod; yet *Bishop Hall*\* speaks of the measure as one very fit and desirable; and, in other dioceses, the practice of holding them does not appear to have been disused, even in times not very remote. *Dr. Thomas Jackson*, in the reign of King James I., tells us that "he remembered with joy of heart the *Synods of the Diocese* in which he was bred"—the diocese of Durham. Those synods seem to have been composed only of the bishop, with the dean and chapter, and other officers of the sec. But I would rather seek the benefit of the counsel and authority of a much larger body; and I proceed to detail to you the course which, after mature consideration, I have deemed it best to take in order to realise my object.

Let me, in the outset, have the satisfaction of informing you that as we should not attempt (nor indeed wish) to make canons binding even on ourselves, there will be no doubt of the entire lawfulness of such a synod. I have sought and obtained the very highest legal authority, to assure us on this point; and, in seeking that authority, I especially drew attention to the necessity of the synod being composed mainly of *representatives*, elected by the clergy of the different deaneries. This, I rejoice to be told, will not make the legality of our meeting at all doubtful.

That if there is to be any meeting of so numerous a body of clergy—comprising nearly 800 persons—it must be effected by

\* *Bishop Hall's Works*, vol. x. p. 434.



representation, is manifest. Yet my desire is, that there shall be as great consideration, as possible, of the judgment of all.

I propose, therefore, that the synod consist of the bishop, his full chapter, his archdeacons, his chaplains, the deans rural, and about sixty other presbyters, that is, two to be chosen by the presbyters of every of our thirty deaneries out of their own numbers :

That all the matters, to be brought under consideration of the synod, be stated to every ruri-decanal chapter, at least a month before the meeting of the synod :

That the election of the representatives be not made till at least a fortnight after those matters have been stated :

That the ruri-decanal chapters may themselves discuss the several matters, and authorize their representatives to report their sentiments in writing to the synod ; nevertheless the representatives shall not be concluded by the judgment of their respective chapters, but shall speak and vote in the synod according to their own judgment :

That it shall be open to every ruri-decanal chapter to propose to the bishop, at least six weeks before the meeting of the synod, any matters which they shall think it desirable to bring under consideration :

That the bishop shall decide what matters shall actually be brought under the consideration of the synod ; and, as before stated, shall announce them to the several rural deans, through the archdeacons, at least a month before the meeting of the synod.

As the synod is in the nature of a council of the bishop, it is plain, that no resolution can be deemed an act of the synod which has not his concurrence.

Lastly, I hope to be able, if it please God, to hold the synod at Exeter, on Tuesday in the first week after my visitation is completed, and the two following days, if our deliberations shall so long continue.

“And now, brethren, I commend you to God, and to the word of his grace.” If He permit us to meet, may He guide our deliberations to His honour and the service of His Church! May He give to us the “meekness of wisdom,” that while we faithfully “keep that which is committed to us,” we may “avoid all vain babblings, and oppositions of science, falsely so called”! Believe me to be, in the fullest sense of the words,

Your affectionate Friend

and Brother in Christ,

H. EXETER.

LONDON, April 9, 1851.

## A P P E N D I X.

---

### No. I.

I AM not prevented by the too favourable terms applied to myself, from placing before you the following address, which was transmitted to me in the course of last summer, from thirty-seven ministers in Prussia, many of them occupying high positions.

I forbear publishing the signatures, as I know not whether such publication might compromise the parties.

My reason for presenting it to your notice, is, that you may see the importance which is attached to our present struggle, in quarters whence we were not prepared to experience much sympathy.

“ Berlin, May and June, 1850.

“ MY LORD BISHOP.—May it please your Lordship, We, the undersigned members of the Protestant church of this country, feel it to be our duty to bear a public testimony of the deep interest we take in the momentous crisis the Church of England finds herself involved in, and of the most sincere respect and admiration for the eminent part your Lordship is taking in this great struggle between a *Christian Church* and a *State* yielding more and more to the corruption of the anti-christian and anti-ecclesiastical spirit of the day.

“ It was your Lordship, who, under God’s blessing and guidance, with the wisdom and courage of a faithful shepherd and true bishop, broke through plausible fallacies and snares of a false and hollow peace, far more dangerous than the worst chances of that *good fight* your Lordship has opened by raising the standard of the *church militant* on the decisive point.

“ Your Lordship at once, with an eye sharpened by faith, and science, and experience, perceived the whole bearing of a case where the question of State and Church—nay, the question of State decision in matters of faith—was brought to an issue on a point so vital to all branches of the church of Christ.

“ But this general feeling of Christian brotherhood is not the only nor indeed the principal reason for our addressing your Lordship on this occasion. Your Lordship cannot but be aware that we are in this country under the very same trial and struggle our brethren of the Church of England are called to. Nay, we are threatened with dangers even much greater than those the Church of England can have to encounter. For while, on the one hand, our church has for a much longer period, and in a higher degree, given herself up to the debilitating influences of latitudinarian principles and practices, the State, on the other hand, after having taken but too great a part in this gradual revolutionizing of the church, has at last itself fallen almost a prey to revolution, who prepares herself to dispose of all the powers of that State in the service of her deeply-rooted hatred of Christianity; while in England the State still is essentially a Christian one, whatever the ruling powers of the day may be, and at any rate stands on so solid a basis that almost nothing will shake it, as long as it does not in fatal and wilful blindness forego those blessings it has hitherto derived from its union with the Church and general spirit of Christianity.

“ And now, who would deny that this great struggle between Church and State, which we see kindling in all Christian countries, implies a common cause, a common enemy, a vital community of peril, action, suffering, hope, fear, and, with the Lord’s blessing, final victory and peace?

“ Thus, then, we may truly say, that the battles your Lordship and your brethren and children of the Church of England are fighting and to fight are *our* battles also, and that we have a right to look on your Lordship as one of *our* leaders in the fight also, and a duty not only to acknowledge you as such in our silent prayers, but also with our loud cheers, strengthening our own weakness in the flesh by your example, that we may at any time be able and

privileged to say with your Lordship, in the words of the apostle, '*We have fought a good fight, we have finished our course, we have kept the faith.*'

"May it, then, please our Lord and Saviour more and more to strengthen you with *His* strength, to enlighten you with *His* wisdom, and to let you enjoy the reward of having '*strove lawfully,*' not only in those heavenly gifts that are independent of earthly success, but also in an honourable and safe peace of that church, amongst the chief ornaments and strongest pillars [of which] history will for ever record your Lordship! With this most earnest prayer we have the honour to be, in all reverence and affection, your Lordship's faithful and obedient servants."

## No. II.

SINCE the preceding sheets were in the press, the following documents have been sent to me :—

1. A letter of his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, enclosing—
2. A copy of a letter to his Grace from the Right Hon. Sir G. Grey, accompanying—
3. A copy of an Address to her Majesty, which is stated to be signed by 63 Peers, 108 Members of [I suppose, the other House of] Parliament, and 321,240 other lay members of the Church of England.

As these documents have immediate connexion with THE PRESENT STATE OF THE CHURCH, and have a manifest bearing on much of the matter of the preceding LETTER to my Clergy, I have thought it right to present them in this place ; adding—

4. A letter to his Grace from myself, communicating, in obedience to her Majesty's commands, the sentiments

which I entertain on the matters specified in the Address, and the course which I feel it my duty to pursue, in furtherance of her Majesty's gracious purposes.

---

(I.)

“ Lambeth Palace, April 7th, 1851.

“ MY LORD,—It is my duty to transmit to your Lordship the copy of an Address lately presented to Her Majesty, together with a Letter from Sir George Grey to myself, conveying Her Majesty's commands on the subject of the Address. Your Lordship, I am well assured, will concur in the sentiments which Her Majesty has been pleased to express, and will employ your influence to promote the result which Her Majesty desires and contemplates—the restoration of that unity and concord which has been interrupted in many parishes, and which is so far more essential to the welfare and edification of the Church than the observance or omission of those outward forms and usages which have given occasion to the recent dissensions.

“ I remain, my Lord,

“ Your faithful Servant and Brother,

“ J. B. CANTUAR.

“ The Lord Bishop of Exeter.”

---

(II.)

“ Whitehall, 1st April, 1851.

“ MY LORD ARCHBISHOP,—I have received the Queen's commands to transmit to your Grace the accompanying Address, which has been presented to Her Majesty, signed by a very large number of lay members of the United Church of England and Ireland, including many Members of both Houses of Parliament.

“ Her Majesty places full confidence in your Grace's desire to use such means as are within your power to maintain the purity of the doctrines taught by the Clergy of the Established Church, and to discourage and prevent innovations in the mode of conducting

the services of the Church not sanctioned by law or general usage, and calculated to create dissatisfaction and alarm among a numerous body of its members.

“ I am, therefore, commanded to place this Address in your Grace’s hands, and to request that it may be communicated to the Archbishop of York and to the suffragan Bishops in England and Wales, who, Her Majesty does not doubt, will concur with your Grace in the endeavour, by a judicious exercise of their authority and influence, to uphold the purity and simplicity of the Faith and Worship of our reformed Church, and to reconcile differences among its members injurious to its peace and usefulness.

“ I have the honour to be,  
“ My Lord Archbishop,  
“ Your Grace’s obedient Servant,

“ G. GREY.

“ His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury.”

---

(III.)

To Her Most Gracious Majesty VICTORIA, by the  
grace of God of Great Britain and Ireland Queen,  
Defender of the Faith :

The Loyal Address of the Undersigned Lay Members of the  
United Church of England and Ireland,

HUMBLY SHEWETH,—

That we, the undersigned, have witnessed with the deepest indignation the insult lately offered to Your Majesty by the so-called Apostolical Letter of the Bishop of Rome, which we regard as aimed alike against Your Majesty’s crown and dignity and the civil and religious liberties of Your Protestant subjects.

Happy, by the blessing of God, under your benign government, we look to Your Majesty as the sole fountain of honour within this realm ; and we therefore denounce, as arrogant and audacious, the recent act of a foreign Priest and Potentate, who, in defiance of

Your Majesty's prerogative, has presumed to parcel out Your dominions into provinces and dioceses, fill them with his nominees, and invest the holders thereof with territorial titles,—assailing thus the independence achieved by our forefathers at the glorious Reformation, and aspiring at the establishment of a power not permitted even in the darkest periods of the middle ages.

We earnestly beseech Your Majesty to resist this intolerable aggression ; and we tender our hearty assurance, that nothing shall be wanting on our part to give effect to Your Majesty's determination.

But we desire also humbly to represent to Your Majesty our conviction, confirmed by the recent testimony of several Bishops of our Church, that the Court of Rome would never have attempted such an act of aggression, had not encouragements been held out to that encroaching power by many of the Clergy of our own Church, who have, for several years past, shown a desire to assimilate the doctrines and services of the Church of England to those of the Roman Communion. While we would cheerfully contend for the principles of the Reformation against all open enemies, we have to lament that our most dangerous foes are those of our own Household ; and hence we feel that it is to little purpose to repel the aggressions of the foreigner, unless those principles and practices, which have tempted him to such aggressions, be publicly and universally repudiated.

We are conscious that the evils to which we allude are deeply seated, and have been the growth of a series of years, and hence we entertain no expectation that they can be suddenly eradicated. But we humbly intreat Your Majesty, in the exercise of Your Royal Prerogative, to direct the attention of the Primates and Bishops of the Church to the necessity of using all fit and lawful means to purify it from the infection of false doctrine ; and, as respects external and visible observances, in which many novelties have been introduced, to take care that measures may be promptly adopted for the repression of all such practices. Without attempting to enumerate with particularity the innovations to which we allude, we may briefly notice,—

The manner in which what is termed “ the Sacramental system”



is carried out,—by an exaggerated veneration for the chancel, in our parish churches ; its costly decoration, as a place especially holy, its separation in some instances from the body of the Church by the Popish “ rood-screen ;” and its enrichment by symbolical ornaments, such as crosses, candlesticks, tapestry, &c. :—all intended to bring back into the Church the ideas of an Altar and a Sacrifice ; notwithstanding their sedulous exclusion from all the Formularies of the Church.

Connected with the same system we notice the withdrawal of the service from the body of the people into the Chancel, where the prayers are often read or intoned, with the reader’s face turned towards the so-called “ altar,” and away from the congregation ; so as to change the Protestant service, of united minister and people, into an imitation of the Romish ritual, wherein the priest prays for the people in words neither heard nor understood by them.

These “ histrionic arrangements ” of the public services of the Church may, some of them, viewed singly, seem to possess little importance. But it is far otherwise when they are considered as parts of a corrupt system ; and coupling these and various other innovations with the adoption, by the same parties, of the Romish system of Auricular Confession, Penance, and Priestly Absolution, there seems no reason to doubt the existence of a settled purpose in many of the parties so acting to bring back our Protestant Church to those very corruptions, both of doctrine and practice, from which it was cleansed by the blessed Reformation.

Already great alarm is naturally created by the apparent return of so many members of the Church of England to Romish superstitions, and this state of things, if suffered to continue, will probably lead some of the people to depart from the faith of their Fathers, and many more to feel a general distrust of, and alienation from, all forms and ministrations of religion.

While we feel deeply conscious that the true and effectual remedy for the dangers which beset our Protestant Church belongs to no human power, but only to the Supreme Head of the Church, whose Almighty aid is to be sought by humble, persevering prayer, we are thankful that, by the Constitution and the existing laws, there

is vested in Your Majesty, as the Earthly Head of our Church, a wholesome power of interposition;—which power we entreat Your Majesty now to exercise. The records of the reigns of Your Majesty's illustrious predecessors, both before and since the glorious Revolution, furnish many examples of the manner in which the mischiefs and abuses which at various times have sprung up in the Church, have been dealt with, by the exercise of the Royal Authority.

That it may please Your Majesty, on a view of the peculiar perils in which our Protestant Church is now placed, to interpose for its defence, is our humble petition; and that it may please God long to preserve Your Majesty in the full enjoyment of all Your Royal Authority, for the well-being of this nation, and for the furtherance of His own glory, is the earnest prayer of

Your Majesty's loyal Subjects.

---

(IV.)

17, Albemarle Street, 11 April, 1851.

MY LORD ARCHBISHOP,—I yesterday received your Grace's letter of the 7th instant, enclosing a copy of a letter to you from Sir George Grey of the 1st instant, and with it a copy of an Address to her Majesty, which she has been pleased to command him to transmit to your Grace, and to request you to communicate to your suffragans—as well as the gracious intimation of her Majesty's pleasure thereupon, that we should “endeavour, by a judicious exercise of our authority and influence, to uphold the purity and simplicity of the faith and worship of our Reformed Church, and to reconcile differences among its members injurious to its peace and usefulness.”

It is gratifying to me to state, in respect to the most important particular of her Majesty's gracious command, that I have just printed a Pastoral Letter to my clergy, in which I have strongly urged them “to uphold the purity of” the Catholic faith, which is, we rejoice to know, “the faith of our Reformed Church.”

In the same Letter, while I did not feel myself authorized to

interfere with the liberty of my clergy, I have earnestly pressed on them the fitness of their abstaining from introducing into divine service any innovation, which is not required by law, or which, if allowed by law, is not in accordance with the feelings of their congregations.

I have also pressed upon them the duty of promoting the peace of the Church, wherever it can be obtained without the sacrifice of any portion of the Truth.

In examining the Address to her Majesty, most numerous signed, which she has been pleased to command to be communicated to us, it is my painful duty first to remark on an expression in it, which I would gladly hope was not intended to convey the meaning which yet the words themselves seem to import. "What is termed 'the Sacramental system,'" applied as the words are in the Address, appears to me to be a very unbecoming mode of speaking of that sacred body of truths and ordinances, which are, in one word, the Gospel itself—that Gospel, which Christ has commanded His ministers to preach to every creature—that Gospel, which is the only source of all our hope and all our comfort—and of which the two sacraments, "necessary to salvation," are the prime particulars.

It is made the leading matter of complaint in the same Address, that the "Sacramental system is carried out by an exaggerated veneration for the chancel in our parish churches—its costly decoration, as a place especially holy."

That this veneration may never have been "carried to an exaggerated"—that is, I suppose, an excessive—extent, I do not presume to say, though I have never chanced to witness it. But I am bound, in candour, to avow, that I think the chancel, being the place in which the highest mysteries of our religion are celebrated, ought to be distinguished by some peculiar, and even great, veneration; for it ought, in my judgment, by reason of the solemn service performed in it, to be regarded "as a place especially holy."

As little do I think "its costly decoration" a reasonable ground of complaint. On this particular, I would rather appeal to the second, and better, thoughts of the sixty-three Peers, and hundred and eight members of Parliament, who signed the Address. They

will, on reflection, I am confident, recognise the fitness of their being at all times anxious to testify their humble thankfulness for God's abundant bounty to themselves, by making the decoration of His House—and especially of the more sacred part of His House—bear some due proportion to the magnificence, which they have no scruple in exhibiting in their own mansions.

The Address further complains of “ the separation of the chancel from the body of the Church by the *Popish Rood-Screen*.”

In my own diocese I have never had occasion to see any such separation made by any Rood-Screen in any newly erected church. We have, indeed, many such screens of venerable antiquity, and of great architectural beauty ; of which, as the Rood itself has for centuries been taken away, and with it all danger of any idolatrous or superstitious use, I will never consent to the removal of any one.

In truth, this separation of chancels by screens, of open work, I approve ; though, from consideration of the expense, I do not require them in newly built churches. In stating the reason of my approval, I beg leave to adopt the words of Bishop Beveridge, one of the most learned in ecclesiastical antiquities, and history—one, too, of the most truly Evangelical Bishops who ever served God in this branch of the Catholic Church.

In his sermon at the opening of his newly-built Church of St. Peter's, Cornhill, November 27, 1681—in which he had erected a screen—he thus speaks :—

“ The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper being the highest mystery  
 “ in all our religion, as representing the death of the Son of God  
 “ to us, hence that place where this Sacrament is administered was  
 “ always made and reputed the highest place in the Church, and  
 “ therefore also it was wont to be separated from the rest of the  
 “ Church by a screen, or partition of net-work, in Latin *Cancelli*,  
 “ and that so generally, that from thence the place itself is called a  
 “ chancel.” . . . . “ It cannot easily be imagined that the  
 “ Catholic Church, in all ages and places for thirteen or fourteen  
 “ hundred years together, should observe such a custom, as this,  
 “ except there were great reasons for it—what they were, it is  
 “ not necessary for us to inquire now—it may be sufficient to ob-

“ serve at present, that the chancel in our Christian Churches was always looked upon as answerable to the Holy of Holies in the Temple; which you know was separated from the Sanctuary, or body of the Temple, by the command of God Himself.”

Of “ the enrichment of the Chancel by symbolical ornaments, such as crosses, candlesticks, tapestry, &c.,” I will say something in detail.

“ Crosses,” if removable, I deem to be unauthorized, and therefore unfit to be retained: in truth, in my own diocese I believe that none such are used. But “ Crosses” attached to buildings, or wrought into cloths, or other furniture, I by no means presume to disallow. Indeed, I deeply lament, that the corrupt practice of the Church of Rome, in respect to this most venerable and affecting symbol of our Redemption, has made our Church deem it expedient to forego the pious and edifying use of it, which was enjoyed by the primitive Church during many ages.

“ Candlesticks” I dare not condemn:—for, we know that they stand, and have uniformly stood, on the Holy Table in every royal Chapel—in, I know not how many, Episcopal Chapels—in almost every Cathedral, and in the Chapels of the Colleges in both our Universities. Yet, I advise not the use of them in Parish Churches, nor have I placed them in my own Chapel.

“ Tapestry” on the walls of Churches has long been used in England, although it probably was never very prevalent here. Whether it be fit that such a matter be made the subject of Episcopal Prohibition, is a question on which I must decline to form an opinion. But that either “ Tapestry” or “ Crosses,” or “ Candlesticks,” at all tend—much less are “ *intended*—to bring back into the Church the ideas of an *Altar or Sacrifice*” I cannot conceive. In truth, I have never heard of any minister of our Church desiring to encourage the “idea of any Altar or Sacrifice,” except the *Commemorative Sacrifice*, which our Church, so far from being “ sedulous to exclude,” has at all times held and taught.

“ Intoning,” and other kindred practices, I leave, as the Law of the Church has left them, to the discretion of the minister; earnestly advising my clergy not to adopt any such practices without the full concurrence of their people.

With regard to “ the adoption of Auricular Confession, Penance, and ‘Absolution,’ ” I deem it impossible to speak, as the Address speaks—namely, as if they were distinctively parts of the “ Romish system.” On the contrary, *duly practised*, they are not only in accordance with the teaching of the ancient Church, but they have also the express authority of our own reformed Church, as edifying means of grace, and as blessed with our Lord’s promise of His Spirit going with His ministers in dispensing them.

To affirm anything like necessity to salvation attached to these holy ordinances—(or rather to this holy ordinance, for they are, in truth, but one)—I hold to be worthy of all reprobation, and contrary to the teaching of our Church.

I have deemed it my duty thus to consider the various particulars mentioned in the Address, to which your Grace, at the command of Her Majesty, has called my attention.

In conclusion I venture to request your Grace to communicate to Sir George Grey, for the purpose of its being laid before Her Majesty, what I have written above, in obedience to Her gracious command—together with the humble and dutiful expression of my firm resolution to do my utmost, by the Grace of God, to maintain that Holy Truth and Worship which He has been pleased to entrust to the faithfulness of this His Church,—and for which Her Majesty, “ the only supreme Governor of this realm, in all things Ecclesiastical as well as temporal,” has thus testified her royal care and watchfulness.

I am, my Lord Archbishop,

Your Grace’s most humble

And obedient Servant,

H. EXETER.

His Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.

LONDON :  
Printed by WILLIAM CLOWES and SONS,  
Stamford Street.











