

ARTICLE XVIII

OF OBTAINING ETERNAL SALVATION
ONLY BY THE NAME OF CHRIST.

DE SPERANDA AETERNA SALUTE TAN-
TUM IN NOMINE CHRISTI.

They also are to be had accursed, that presume to say, that every man shall be saved by the Law or Sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that Law, and the Light of Nature. For Holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the Name of Jesus Christ, whereby men must be saved.

Sunt et illi anathematizandi qui dicere audent, unumquemque in lege aut secta quam profitetur, esse servandum, modo juxta illam et lumen naturae accurate vixerit: cum sacrae literae tantum Jesu Christi nomen praedicent, in quo salvos fieri homines oporteat.

§ 1.—SOURCE.

Composed by the English Reformers, 1552-3.

§ 2.—OBJECT.

The Article is directed against the theory of certain Anabaptists, that as long as people were conscientious in following out their own systems, it was a matter of no significance whether they accepted or rejected the Gospel of Christ. This error is referred to in the REFORMATIO LEGUM, "De Haeresibus," Cap. 11:—

"Horribilis est et immanis illorum audacia qui contendunt in omni religione vel secta, quam homines professi fuerint, salutem illis esse sperandam, si tantum ad innocentiam et integritatem vitae pro viribus enitentur juxta lumen, quod illis praelucet a natura infusum. Auctoritate vero sacrarum literarum confixae sunt hujusmodi pestes. Solum enim et unicum ibi Jesu Christi nomen nobis commendatum est, ut omnis ex eo salus ad nos perveniat."

§ 3.—EXPOSITION.

(1.) LATITUDINARIANISM ANATHEMATISED.

They also are to be had accursed (sunt anathematizandi), that presume to say, that every man shall be saved by the Law or

Sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that Law, and the Light of Nature.

The present Article alone of all the thirty-nine contains an anathema. The only error, therefore, expressly anathematized by our Church is the Latitudinarian spirit, which finds its logical basis in the denial of all objective truth, going upon the supposition either that there is no such thing as Revelation, or that all religions are equally acceptable to God; the spirit which asks, 'What does it matter what a man believes, so long as he lives a good life according to his light?' and to which Pope has given expression in the oft-quoted lines:—

"For modes of faith let graceless zealots fight;
His can't be wrong whose life is in the right."

But all experience goes to show that conduct in the long-run corresponds with belief. Conduct depends upon Creed; thought lies at the foundation of action, and no structure of just deeds can be safely built unless the underlying thought be sound and firm. Thus in the CHURCH CATECHISM that which is to be believed is taught before anything is said of that which is to be done, and the ATHANASIAN CREED plainly declares:—

"Quicumque vult salvus esse:
Ante omnia opus est ut teneat catholicam fidem."¹

This brings us to the second part of our Article:—

- (2.) THERE IS ONLY ONE TRUE RELIGION, ONE WAY OF SALVATION, VIZ., THAT EMBODIED IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST.

For Holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the Name of Jesus Christ, whereby men must be saved. (See Acts iv. 12; S. John xiv. 6; 1 S. John v. 11, 12.)

Mankind falls into two great divisions:—

- (a) Those who have the Gospel offered to them in this life.
(b) Those who have not this offer.

Taking (a) the case of those who have the offer of the Gospel,

¹ Cf. the words which occur in the decree on Original Sin of the COUNCIL OF TRENT (Session V.):—

"Ut fides nostra catholica sine qua impossibile est placere Deo . . . permaneat."

we meet with no difficulty. Those who deliberately reject the one way of salvation do so at their peril (S. Mark xvi. 16).

When, however, we come to consider (b) the case of those who have not the offer of the Gospel in this life, a difficulty arises, because the wording of the Article might seem to imply that all heathen, &c, must necessarily perish eternally, even though they had striven to live a good life according to their light. But there are several passages of Scripture—*e.g.*, Rom. ii. 12–16; Acts x. 34, 35—which show us that people who make the best use they can of the light given to them will be judged according to it; that God will in no case require more than He has given (S. Luke xii. 48). What is most needful for us to keep in mind is that, whether in this life men hear of Christ or not, it is only through His meritorious work that they can be pardoned and saved; His Sacrifice is the only Sacrifice for sin. We must recognise, then, the existence of objective truth; that Christ's work has an objective value for men, apart from our individual appreciation of it. His Sacrifice accomplished something for us before it was presented to us as an object of faith; it effected something for mankind (1 S. John ii. 2); the subjective impression on man's heart is an after-thing, following upon faith in that eternal work. Thus the Church believes that faithful Jews who lived under the Old Dispensation are saved, and that "baptized infants dying before they commit actual sin are undoubtedly saved."¹ Neither of these classes can in this life have had explicit knowledge about Christ, yet His work avails for them. So, too, with the heathen, the good are saved, not by the Law or Sect which they profess, but by the work of Christ. The overlooking of the Intermediate State,² which is only too common amongst us, tends very much to cripple our Theology when dealing with questions such as the present. May it not be that after death righteous heathen have opportunity of accepting what Christ has done for them, and of coming to the knowledge of Him, Whose work had availed for them during their life on earth, while yet they knew Him not?

It is not the case, then, that man is free to choose a religion for himself, as though all were equally true. There is only one true religion—that of Jesus Christ. It is the firm conviction of this that has made the Church from the very first a *missionary* institution, not content that Christianity should take a place as

¹ See Rubric at the close of the Office for the Public Baptism of Infants.

² Cf. Art. XXVI. of the SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION, quoted, p. 151.

one amongst many religions of the world, but seeking, according to her Lord's command, to embrace within her fold "every creature" (S. Mark. xvi. 15). This action she takes because, as members of the Church, we are brought into Covenant with God, wherein His grace is pledged to us and His promises made; of these, therefore, we may have the certainty upon our performing the conditions of the Covenant. Those outside the Covenant cannot have this same assurance.

It cannot, surely, be thought a matter of little importance whether men accept the Gospel and become members of the Church or not, when we remember what great pains God is represented in Scripture as taking in order to bring men into the Church, rather than save them outside it. See S. Matt. xi. 11; Acts ii. 47; and note especially the case of Cornelius, who, though accepted by God as a Gentile (Acts x. 34, 35), yet is brought into the Church (Acts xi. 13, 14).

[In the XLII. Articles of 1553 here followed the Article on the binding force of the Moral Commandments:—

ALL MEN ARE BOUNDE TO KEPE THE
MORAL COMMAUNDEMENTES
OF THE LAWE.

OMNES OBLIGANTUR AD MORALIA
LEGIS PRAECEPTA SERVANDA.

The Lawe, whiche was geuen of God by Moses, although it binde not Christian menne, as concerning the Ceremonies, and Rites of the same: Neither is it required, that the Ciuile Preceptes and Ordres of it shoulde of necessitie bee receiued in any commune weale: Yet no manne, (bee he neuer so perfecte a Christian) is exempte and lose from the Obedience of those Commaundementes, whiche are called Moral. Wherefore thei are not to be harkened vnto, who affirme that holie Scripture is geuen onlie to the weake, and do boaste theimselues continually of the spirit, of whom (thei sai) thei haue learned soche things as thei teache, although the same be most evidently repugnant to the holie Scripture.

Lex a Deo data per Mosen, licet quoad caerimonias et ritus Christianos non astringat, neque civilia ejus praecepta in aliqua republica necessario recipi debeant, nihilominus ab obedientia mandatorum quae Moralia vocantur nullus, quantumvis Christianus est solutus. Quare illi non sunt audiendi, qui sacras literas tantum infirmis datas esse perhibent, et spiritum perpetuo jactant, a quo sibi quae praedicantur suggeri asserunt, quanquam cum sacris literis apertissime pugnent.

The Article was struck out from this place in 1563, but the first part of it, down to the words "which are called Moral," was at the same time added to Article VII. (where see notes). That the second part, which condemns an error of the Anabaptists, was altogether omitted in 1563 may be taken as indicating that, during the ten years which had elapsed since the Article was originally framed, Anabaptist opinions had receded very much into the background, so that there was not the same necessity that the Church should expressly condemn them. Other changes made in 1563 point in the same direction:—

- (i.) The words "et hodie Anabaptistae repetunt" were omitted from Article IX.
- (ii.) The Article "DE GRATIA" of 1553, which condemned extravagant Anabaptist opinions, was altogether omitted.
- (iii.) The Article on "HERETICKES CALLED MILLENARI" of 1553 was also omitted.]

ARTICLE XIX

OF THE CHURCH.

DE ECCLESIA.

The Visible Church of Christ, is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered, according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.

As the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred: so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith.

Ecclesia Christi visibilis est coetus fidelium, in quo verbum Dei purum praedicatur, et Sacramenta, quoad ea quae necessario exiguntur, juxta Christi institutum recte administrantur.

Sicut erravit Ecclesia Hierosolymitana, Alexandrina et Antiochena: ita et erravit Ecclesia Romana, non solum quoad agenda et caerimoniarum ritus, verum in his etiam quae credenda sunt.

§ 1.—SOURCE.

Composed by the English Reformers, 1552–3. With the first part of the Article we may compare the definition of the Church given in the AUGSBURG CONFESSION, Part I. Art. VII. :—

"Est autem ecclesia congregatio sanctorum, in qua evangelium recte docetur, et recte administrantur sacramenta."

§ 2.—OBJECT.

This Article was doubtless drawn up with a twofold object:—

- (a) To make clear what we are to understand by the Church, some definition on this point being especially necessary at the time of the Reformation, when visible unity with Rome had been broken.
- (b) In view of the breach with Rome, to justify the action of the Church of England by recording the conviction that the Church of Rome had erred in matters of faith.

§ 3.—EXPOSITION.

(1.) THE CHURCH IS VISIBLE.

We should first note that the Article speaks of the Visible Church of Christ. All that is laid down in the Articles with reference to the Church applies to the Visible Church, and nothing is anywhere said of an invisible Church. Here, as throughout, our Articles are strictly Scriptural. No distinction is drawn by the New Testament writers between a visible and an invisible Church, but the Church appears in the Apostolic Epistles as a visible society, with its rite of admission (Baptism), its rules and organisation; a body which may be known and observed of all men. That Christ Himself intended to found a Church in the sense of a visible society, and not merely in that of an invisible aggregation of pious souls, known only to God, is indicated by:—

(a) *His method*; which was not to scatter His teaching haphazard over the world, for men to make what they could of it, but to train an organised body of disciples, who should preach the Gospel and admit others to their fellowship (S. Matt. xxviii. 19; cf. Acts ii. 41, 42, 47).

(b) *His institution of certain corporate acts as Sacraments.*

(i.) Baptism, a ceremony not new in itself, but understood by the Jews at the time as instituting into the visible society of God's people.

(ii.) The Holy Eucharist, which is essentially a corporate action.

(c) *His teaching*; e.g., on the subject of the Kingdom of God. It should be noted, too, that our Lord's Prayer, recorded in S. John xvii. 21, 22, implies a visible unity of His followers.

The definitions of the Church given in the Lutheran formularies agree with that of our Article.

See AUGSBURG CONFSSION, Part I. Art. VII., quoted in § 1 above.

See also SAXON CONFSSION, Art. XII. :—

“Dicimus igitur Ecclesiam visibilem in hac vita coetum esse amplectentium Evangelium Christi, et recte utentium sacramentis.”

Cf. Art. XV. of the same Confession :—

“Vult enim Deus conspici aut audiri suam ecclesiam in mundo, et vult se junctam esse multis publicis signis a reliquis gentibus.”

The formularies of the Swiss School of Reformers, on the other hand, draw the distinction between the Visible and the Invisible Church, and speak of the true Church as invisible.

SCOTCH CONFSSION, Art. XVI. :

“Sicut in unum Deum Patrem, Filium et Spiritum Sanctum credimus, ita etiam ab initio fuisse et nunc esse, Matt. iii. 9, et in consummationem usque mundi futuram unam Ecclesiam constanter credimus, id est, societatem et multitudinem hominum a Deo electorum. . . . Haec ecclesia est invisibilis, soli Deo nota, qui solus novit, quos elegit.”

SECOND HELVETIC CONFSSION, Art. XVII. :

“Unde et ecclesia invisibilis appellari potest, non quod homines sint invisibiles, ex quibus ecclesia colligitur, sed quod oculis nostris absconsa, Deo autem soli nota, judicium humanum saepe subterfugiat.”

WESTMINSTER CONFSSION, XXV. 1, 2 :

“The catholick or universal church, which is invisible, consists of the whole number of the elect that have been, are, or shall be gathered into one, under Christ the head thereof. . . . The visible church, which is also catholick or universal under the gospel, . . . consists of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion, together with their children.”

See also the SECOND BAPTIST CONFSSION, Art. XXVI. :—

“The Catholic or Universal Church, which (with respect to the internal work of the Spirit and truth of grace) may be called invisible, consists of the whole number of the elect.”

(2.) THE VISIBLE CHURCH IS THE CONGREGATION OF THE FAITHFUL.

The Visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men,

By ‘congregation’ (coetus) is here meant, not a body of people assembled in one place, but the whole number of God's people. In this sense the same Latin word is used in the Vulgate; see, e.g., Exod. xii. 19, “Qui comederit fermentatum, peribit anima ejus de coetu Israel.”

By ‘faithful men’ are meant believers in Jesus Christ.

(3.) TWO NOTES OF THE CHURCH ARE GIVEN.

(i.) in the which the pure word of God is preached, and

(ii.) the Sacraments be duly ministered, according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.

In the XI. Articles of 1559 three notes of the Church are given:—

“I do acknowledge also that Church to be the spouse of Christ, wherein the word of God is truly taught, the Sacraments orderly ministered according to Christ’s institution, and the authority of the keys duly used” (Article III.).

Cf. the HOMILY FOR WHITSUNDAY, 2nd part, pp. 494, 495:—

“The true Church is an universal congregation or fellowship of God’s faithful and elect people, built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the head cornerstone. And it hath always three notes or marks, whereby it is known: pure and sound doctrine, the Sacraments ministered according to Christ’s holy institution, and the right use of ecclesiastical discipline.” [*I.e.*, as explained in the context—“the authority of the keys to excommunicate notorious sinners, and to absolve them which are truly penitent.”]

The same three notes of the Church are given in the Ordinal:—

The Bishop. Will you then give your faithful diligence always so to minister the Doctrine and Sacraments, and the Discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, &c.?

Answer. I will do so, by the help of the Lord.

Two only of these three notes or marks are expressly mentioned in the present Article:—

(a) *The Preaching of the pure Word of God.* (See Rom. x. 17; 2 Tim. iv. 2.)

We must distinguish the Word preached from the Word written, *e.g.*, in the passage of 2 Tim. just referred to “the Word” cannot, of course, signify “the Bible.” By “the Word of God,” the preaching of which is a note of the Church, we must understand the great doctrines of the Church with reference to the Person and Work of our Lord Jesus Christ (Acts xiii. 26; *cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 1–4), which were embodied at a very early time in short dogmatic statements, and formed the nucleus of our Creeds. We have frequent allusions in the New Testament to the body of sound doctrine entrusted to the keeping of the Church, and which she proclaims to men (1 Tim. i. 10, vi. 3; 2 Tim. i. 13, iv. 3; Tit. i. 9, 13, ii. 1, 2). It is with reference to this that we pray in the Ordination Service, “Replenish them with the truth of Thy doctrine,” and that the Bishop, in the same service,

gives to each ordained priest the charge, “Take thou authority to preach the Word of God.”

This body of doctrine, which it is one of the marks of the Church to hand on unimpaired, is not, of course, to be in any way set against the Bible. The WORD PREACHED and the WORD WRITTEN should always go together. Thus, when the Bishop says the words above quoted, he delivers the Bible at the same time to the newly ordained priest. In order that Church doctrine may be handed on unimpaired constant reference should be made to Scripture, which is the standard of doctrine. (See Article VI.).

The Church is first, then, a *Dogmatic Institution*, a preacher of doctrine.

(b) *The due ministration of the Sacraments.*

Steadfastness in Sacraments is necessary as well as steadfastness in doctrine (Acts ii. 42; Eph. iv. 5). Next to the teaching office of the Church comes the ministerial. *Cf.* the charge in the Ordinal to which reference has already been made—“Take thou authority to preach the Word of God, and to minister the holy Sacraments in the congregation.”

The Church system is thus *Sacramental* as well as *Dogmatic*. In the Article emphasis is laid on the due administration of the Sacraments “according to Christ’s ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.”

The requisites are:—

(i) In Baptism—

Water.

The formula, “In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.”¹ (See S. Matt. xxviii. 19).

(ii) In the Holy Communion—

The elements of Bread and Wine.

The recital of Christ’s words of Institution.

A duly ordained minister (so our Church provides in the Ordinal).²

The Notes of the Church given in the Article—the Preaching of the Word and the due administration of the Sacraments—

¹ That both water and the words are considered essential to the Sacrament by the Church is clear from the questions asked when a child is received who has been privately baptized:—“With what matter was this child baptized?” “With what words was this child baptized?”

² With our Church’s requirement that the Sacraments are to be administered “according to Christ’s ordinance in all those things that of necessity are re-

demand a *Ministry*, carrying with it the idea of Church order and discipline. The third note of the Church, as stated in the Homilies and the Ordinal, is thus implied, though not expressly stated, in our Article.

The following extracts on the Notes of the Church may be compared (in addition to the passages already quoted from the Augsburg and Saxon Confessions):—

REFORMATIO LEGUM, “De Haeresibus,” Cap. 21:

“Nos enim eam quae cerni potest Ecclesiam sic definimus, ut omnium cœtus sit fidelium hominum, in quo Sacra Scriptura sincere docetur, et sacramenta (saltem his eorum partibus quae necessariae sunt) juxta Christi praescriptum administrantur.”

FIRST HELVETIC CONFESSION, Art. XV.:

“Quae quidem quum solius sit dei oculis nota, externis tamen quibusdam ritibus, ab ipso Christo institutis, et verbo dei velut publica legitimaque disciplina, non solum cernitur cognosciturque, sed ita constituitur, ut in hanc sine his nemo (nisi singulari dei privilegio) censeatur.”

CALVIN'S INSTITUTES, IV. 1, 9:

“Ubi quumque enim Dei verbum sincere praedicari atque audiri, ubi sacramenta ex Christi instituto administrari videmus, illic aliquam esse Dei Ecclesiam nullo modo ambigendum est.”

SCOTCH CONFESSION, Art. XVIII.:

“Notas ergo verae Ecclesiae Dei credimus, confitemur, et profitemur, primum et ante omnia, veram praedicationem Verbi Dei, in quo Deus seipsum nobis patefecit, sicut Prophetarum et Apostolorum scripta nobis declarant. . . . Deinde recta Sacramentorum Jesu Christi administratio, quae verbo et promissioni Dei annecti debent, ut illud in cordibus nostris confirmet et obsignent. Postremo loco est disciplina Ecclesiastica recte administrata, sicut Dei verbum praescribit ad reprimendum vitium et virtutem fovendam.”

quisite to the same,” contrast what is laid down in THE CHIEF PRINCIPLES OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION AS PROFESSED BY THE PEOPLE CALLED QUAKERS:—

(a) Concerning Baptism.

“As there is one Lord, and one faith, so there is one baptism . . . and this baptism is a pure and spiritual thing, to wit, the Baptism of the Spirit, and fire.”

(b) Concerning the Communion, or Participation of the Body and Blood of Christ.

“The communion of the Body and Blood of Christ is inward and spiritual . . . of which things the breaking of bread by Christ with His disciples was a figure which they even used in the Church for a time, who had received the substance, for the cause of the weak.”

(4.) LOCAL CHURCHES ARE LIABLE TO ERROR, AND HAVE ERRED.

As the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred: so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith.

The Church as a whole has the promise of Divine guidance, and that the gates of hell shall not prevail against her (S. John xvi. 13; S. Matt. xvi. 18); she is the pillar and ground of the truth (1 Tim. iii. 15). The several parts of the Church, however, are singly liable to error, and have in fact erred. See, *e.g.*, in the New Testament, the letters to the Seven Churches of Asia in Rev. ii., iii.

In the present Article:—

(a) First, the patriarchates of the Eastern Church are named as having erred. It is not clear what errors are referred to, the statement of the Article being quite general; perhaps the denial of the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Second Person in the Holy Trinity may be intended.

(b) But the real point of this part of the Article, doubtless, is the expression of the conviction that the Church of Rome has erred. In this case, again, the statement is quite general, and should be understood as referring to the Mediæval corruptions which were a principal cause of the breach with Rome in the sixteenth century.

We may compare REFORMATIO LEGUM, “De Haeresibus,” Cap. 21:—

“Etiam illorum insania legum vinculis est constringenda, qui Romanam Ecclesiam in hujusmodi petra fundatam esse existimant, ut nec erraverit, nec errare possit; cum et multi possint ejus errores ex superiore majorum memoria repeti, et etiam ex hac nostra proferri, partim in his quibus vita nostra debet informari, partim etiam in his quibus fides debet institui.”

ARTICLE XX

OF THE AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH.

DE ECCLESIAE AUCTORITATE.

The Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies, and authority in controversies of Faith: and yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's Word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the Church be a witness and keeper of Holy Writ: yet, as it ought not to decree anything against the same, so besides the same, ought it not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of salvation.

Habet Ecclesia Ritus sive Cere-
monias statuendi jus, et in fidei
controversiis auctoritatem: quam
vis Ecclesiae non licet quicquam
instituere, quod Verbo Dei scripto
adversetur, nec unum Scripturae
locum sic exponere potest, ut alteri
contradicat. Quare licet Ecclesia
sit divinorum Scriptorum testis et
conservatrix, attamen ut adversus
eos nihil decernere, ita praeter illos
nihil credendum de necessitate salu-
tis debet obtrudere.

§ 1.—SOURCE.

Composed by the English Reformers. In 1553, and in the first draft of 1563, the Article began with the words, "It is not lawful for the Church to ordain," &c. ("Ecclesiae non licet quicquam instituere"). The important clause at the beginning (in **thick type** in the Latin) appears in the Latin edition of 1563 as expressly sanctioned by the Queen; and the Article, with this clause added, was approved by Convocation, ratified by the Crown, and enforced by Parliament in 1571. The Wurtemberg Confession may have been the model from which the new clause was taken. Cf. the Article "De Ecclesia":—

"Credimus et confitemur . . . quod haec Ecclesia habeat jus judicandi de omnibus doctrinis . . . quod haec Ecclesia habeat jus interpretandae Scripturae. . . . Quare et Ecclesia sic habet auctoritatem judicandi de doctrinis, ut tamen contineat se intra metas Sacrae Scripturae, quae est vox sponsi sui, a qua voce nulli, ne angelo quidem, fas est recedere."

§ 2.—OBJECT.

The object of the Article in its present form seems to be to guard against—

- (a) Undue exaggeration of the authority of the Church on the one hand, and
- (b) Undue depreciation of that same authority on the other.

§ 3.—EXPOSITION.

(I.) THE AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH.

The Church hath power (jus) to decree Rites or Ceremonies, and authority in controversies of Faith.

This Article stands in close relation to the preceding. The Church being a visible society of men, Divinely organised, it follows that there must be an inherent power of ordering whatever is necessary for the corporate life of her members; like other societies, she must have authority to enact and enforce the rules which her members are bound to observe. Thus—

- (a) The Church has the right of decreeing forms of worship and rites or ceremonies, wherewith to consecrate, or to celebrate, events in the lives of her children.
- (b) Moreover, since controversies on matters of faith are constantly liable to occur, she must have power to settle points of dispute which may arise from time to time.

That the Church has this twofold authority is affirmed in our Article.

- (a) By the power which she has to decree rites or ceremonies, the Church ensures that all things are done, in accordance with the Apostolic precept, "decently and in order" (1 Cor. xiv. 40). The custom of the "churches of God" is quoted by S. Paul as deciding a controverted ceremonial matter (1 Cor. xi. 16). We may add that Christ Himself recognised the right of the Jewish Church to ordain ceremonies when He bade His disciples observe and do the things commanded by those who sat in Moses' seat (S. Matt. xxiii. 2, 3); and when He expressly declared that while the great Moral Commandments of the Law have the first claim, yet, at the same time, the ceremonial precepts of the Church should not be passed over (S. Matt. xxiii. 23).

(b) We have already seen that to the Church as a whole the Lord has given the promise that she shall be led into all truth (S. John xvi. 13); she is the pillar and ground of the truth (1 Tim. iii. 15); she has, therefore, authority to determine doctrine. The authority attaching to decisions of the Church is stated by our Lord Himself (S. Matt. xviii. 17); and we may see examples of the exercise of that authority in the New Testament; *e.g.*, when disputes arose concerning circumcision and other matters, the question, which agitated the whole Christian community, and in which the freedom of the Gospel was involved, was decided by a decree of the Church, after a representative Council held at Jerusalem (Acts xv. 19-29). See also the charges given by S. Paul to Timothy and Titus respectively, which imply an authority of the Church in matters of faith (1 Tim. i. 3; Tit. iii. 10). It is on the principle that the Church has such authority that Creeds and Formularies of Faith have in all ages been constructed and promulgated.

(2.) THE AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH LIMITED BY HOLY SCRIPTURE.

The Divinely inspired Scriptures are entrusted, not to the individual, but to the Church, which is a witness and keeper of Holy Writ. (*Cf.* Rom. iii. 2.)

(i.) The Church is a witness, inasmuch as in her life, as the visible Kingdom of Christ on earth, she testifies to the truth of His Gospel and His promises; she lets her light shine before men in defence and confirmation of the Gospel.

(ii.) The Church is also the keeper of Holy Writ; she hands on from age to age the Sacred Books, promulgating them as the Word of God in succeeding generations, and guarding them from corruption or perversion.

In Holy Scripture we have the infallible truth of God, but we, in our apprehension of it, are fallible; how, then, can we guard against receiving it wrongly? In order that Divine truth, as embodied in Holy Scripture, may pass into the minds of men, that same Holy Spirit, Who inspired Scripture, is Himself given to the Church to lead and guide into all truth (S. John xvi. 13).

It is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's Word written.

(a) *As regards Rites or Ceremonies.*

These must not be contrary to Scripture, but at the same time it is not necessary that they should have the express authority of Scripture.

The Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies, . . . yet . . . it ought not to decree anything against the same (*viz.*, Holy Writ).

Cf. what is laid down in Article XXXIV. :—

"Traditions and ceremonies . . . may be changed according to the diversities of countries, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's Word."

Thus, *e.g.*, the use of the surplice in Divine Service, and of the sign of the Cross in Baptism, are Ceremonies decreed by the Church, and not contrary to Holy Scripture, although, at the same time, neither have they direct Scriptural sanction.

(b) *With regard to Doctrine.*

In this case it is necessary that what is laid down by the Church should have the express authority of Scripture.

The Church hath . . . authority in controversies of Faith: . . . yet . . . besides the same (*viz.*, Holy Writ) ought it not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of salvation.

Our Article further makes it clear what is meant when it is said that doctrine laid down by the Church should have the express warrant of Scripture; it is meant, not that a text or two must be found to support it, but that the Church must see that such doctrine is consistent with the whole tenor of Scripture.

neither may it so expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another.

On the subject dealt with in this Article the words of the CREED OF POPE PIUS IV. should be compared :—

"Apostolicas et ecclesiasticas traditiones, reliquasque ejusdem Ecclesiae observationes et constitutiones firmissime admitto, et amplector.

"Item sacram Scripturam juxta eum sensum, quem tenuit et tenet sancta mater Ecclesia, cujus est judicare de vero sensu et interpretatione sacrarum Scripturarum, admitto, nec eam unquam nisi juxta unanimum consensum Patrum accipiam, et interpretabor."

Two incidental, but significant, points should be noted in the above extract:—

- (i.) "Ecclesiastical traditions" have the first place, being mentioned before the Holy Scripture.
- (ii.) While of the former it is said "*firmissime* admitto," with regard to Holy Scripture the formula used is simply "admitto."

See also the decree of the COUNCIL OF TRENT, "De Canonicis Scripturis" (Session IV.):—

"Synodus . . . orthodoxorum patrum exempla secuta, omnes libros tam Veteris, quam Novi Testamenti, cum utriusque unus Deus sit auctor, nec non traditiones ipsas, tum ad fidem, tum ad mores pertinentes, tanquam vel ore tenus a Christo, vel a Spiritu Sancto dictatas, et continua successione in ecclesia catholica conservatas, pari pietatis affectu et reverentia suscipit et veneratur."

ARTICLE XXI.

OF THE AUTHORITY OF GENERAL
COUNCILS.

DE AUCTORITATE CONSILIORUM
GENERALIUM.

General Councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of Princes. And when they be gathered together (forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God) they may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God. Wherefore things ordained by them as necessary to salvation, have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scripture.

Generalia Concilia sine jussu et voluntate principum congregari non possunt, et ubi convenerint, quia ex hominibus constant, qui non omnes Spiritu et Verbo Dei reguntur, et errare possunt, et interdum errarunt, etiam in his quæ ad normam pietatis pertinent: ideoque quæ ab illis constituuntur, ut ad salutem necessaria, neque robur habent, neque auctoritatem, nisi ostendi possint e sacris literis esse desumpta.

§ 1.—SOURCE.

Composed by the English Reformers, 1552-3.

§ 2.—OBJECT.

To assert the sole right of the Civil Power to call General Councils, and to express the conviction that some of the Councils, which were at the time commonly reputed General Councils, had fallen into error.

§ 3.—EXPOSITION.

(1.) GENERAL COUNCILS.

This Article is closely related to the preceding. In Article XX. it is laid down that the Church has authority in controversies of Faith; the present Article is concerned with General Councils, by which the Church exercises that authority, for they

are an important stage in the process by which the judgment of the Church on matters of Faith has been ascertained. In order that a Council may be ranked as a General Council it is necessary that two main conditions should be fulfilled; it should be—

- (a) *Representative* of the Church at large; and
- (b) *Free*; i.e., there must be no constraint placed upon the members by any civil or spiritual ruler, or by any faction within the Church itself.

The real test, however, of the œcumenicity of a Council consists in the reception of such Council and its work by every portion of the Church. The Divine Spirit is promised to the whole Church, and the consentient witness of the whole Church is therefore necessary. If this principle be kept in mind, deference to the decisions of General Councils is quite intelligible; the actual deliberations of Synods may perhaps be marked by polemics and by bitterness of tone, but they are the regular machinery for registering the agreement of the Church, and their authority only becomes decisive after their verdict has been accepted by the Church at large. Their decisions, therefore, in the result, represent, not the tyranny of chance majorities, but the working out in balanced formulæ of complex Scriptural truth.

The opinion of our English Reformers with regard to General Councils may be illustrated from the *REFORMATIO LEGUM*, "De Summa Trinitate et Fide Catholica," Cap. 14:—

"Nam quaedam illorum, qualia sunt præcipua illa quatuor, Nicenum, Constantinopolitanum primum, Ephesinum et Chalcedonense, magna cum reverentia amplectimur et suscipimus. Quod quidem iudicium de multis aliis quae postea celebrata sunt ferimus, in quibus videmus et confitemur sanctissimos patres de beata et summa Trinitate, de Jesu Christo Domino et Servatore nostro, et humana redemptione per eum procurata, juxta Scripturas divinas multa gravissime et perquam sancte constituisse. Quibus tamen non aliter fidem nostram obligandam esse censemus, nisi quatenus ex Scripturis sanctis confirmari possint. Nam concilia nonnulla interdum errasse, et contraria inter sese definivisse, partim in actionibus juris, partim etiam in fide, manifestum est."

Cf. also *STAT. I ELIZABETH*, c. 1, quoted under heading (5.) below.

The opinion of both Saxon and Swiss schools of Reformers may be gathered from the following extracts:¹—

HERMANN'S CONSULTATIO:

"Which things nevertheless we set furth to be receyued and obserued of men committed to our charge, none otherwise than as a beginninge of so holie and necessary a thinge, until a general reformation of congregacions be made by the holie empire, by a fre and Christian council vniuersall or national."

WURTEMBERG CONFESSION, Art. XXXIV., "De Conciliis":

"Fatemur sua debere esse in Ecclesia de dogmatis et sacris iudicia, et magnam esse legitimorum Conciliorum auctoritatem. Sed longe omnium maxima sit auctoritas verbi Dei necesse est. . . . Testantur quoque exempla, non Pontifices tantum, sed etiam Concilia errasse."

SCOTCH CONFESSION, Art. XX.:

"Quemadmodum non temere damnamus illud quod viri pii, congregati in generali concilio legitime convocato, nobis proposuerunt; ita sine justo examine non admittimus quicquid hominibus, generalis concilii nomine obtruditur: manifestum enim est, quod sicut fuerunt homines, ita etiam eorum quidam manifeste errarunt, idque in rebus maximi ponderis et momenti. Quatenus ergo concilium, sententiam et mandatum quod dat, probat plano Dei verbo, eatenus statim idipsum reveremur et amplectimur."

SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION, Art. II.:

"Quapropter non patimur nos in controversiis religionis vel fidei causis urgeri nudis Patrum sententiis, aut conciliorum determinationibus, multo minus receptis consuetudinibus, aut etiam multitudine idem sententium, aut longi temporis præscriptione. Ergo non alium sustinemus in causa fidei iudicem, quam ipsum Deum per Scripturas sanctas pronunciantem, quid verum sit, quid falsum, quid sequendum sit, quidve fugiendum."

Cf. the DECLARATION OF THE FAITH, CHURCH ORDER, AND DISCIPLINE, OF THE CONGREGATIONAL OR INDEPENDENT DISSENTERS. "Principles of Church Order and Discipline," § 2:

"They believe that the New Testament contains, either in the form of express statute or in the example and practice of the Apostles and Apostolic Churches, all the Articles of Faith necessary to be believed, and all the principles of order and discipline requisite for constituting and governing Christian societies; and that human traditions, fathers and councils, canons and creeds, possess no authority over the faith and practice of Christians."

¹ Luther himself appealed more than once to a future General Council.

(2.) GENERAL COUNCILS SHOULD BE SUMMONED BY THE CIVIL POWER.

General Councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of Princes.

Cf. a letter of Cranmer to Melancthon dated Lambeth, March 27, 1552:—

“I could wish, therefore, that those who excel others in erudition and judgment should be assembled together, after the example of the Apostles; and declare their judgment, as well respecting other subjects of dispute, as likewise especially respecting this controversy, and attest their agreement by some published document. But you will perhaps say, ‘And I also have often expressed the same wish; but this matter cannot be effected without the aid of princes.’ I have therefore [consulted with]¹ the king’s majesty, who places his kingdom of England at your disposal, and most graciously promises, not only a place of security and quiet, but also his aid and assistance towards these godly endeavours.”—*Original Letters*, vol. i. p. 26.

Under the Roman Empire large bodies of bishops would not have been allowed to assemble from all parts without the sanction of the civil power, and at the present time, when the time-honoured intimate relation between Church and State is still, in many nations, maintained, the statement of the Article holds good. There can be no doubt, however, that the union between Church and State is loosening all over Christendom, and in the event of its being everywhere dissolved, the commandment and will of Princes would have no concern with the Councils of the Church.²

(3.) GENERAL COUNCILS MAY ERR, AND SOMETIMES HAVE ERRED.

And when they be gathered together (forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God) they may err, and sometimes have erred,

¹ One or more words are here wanting in the original.

² Some of the Reformers were inclined to give a much more prominent position to the civil power in the Councils of the Church than our Article affirms. See, *e.g.*, WESTMINSTER CONFSSION, XXIII. 3:—

“The civil magistrate may not assume to himself the administration of the word and sacraments, or the power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven; yet he hath authority, and it is his duty, to take order, that unity and peace be preserved in the Church, that the truth of God be kept pure and entire, that all blasphemies and heresies be suppressed, all corruptions and abuses in worship and discipline prevented or reformed, and all the ordinances of God duly settled, administered, and observed. For the better effecting whereof, he hath power to call synods, to be present at them, and to provide that whatsoever is transacted in them be according to the mind of God.”

even in things pertaining unto God (in his quae ad normam pietatis pertinent).

The words of the Article are strictly true, as the evidence of history shows; *e.g.*:—

- (a) The Council of Ariminum, A.D. 359, at which about 400 bishops were present, secured a temporary triumph for Arianism.
- (b) A Council was held at Ephesus A.D. 449, the violent and disorderly proceedings of which gained for it from Pope Leo the title of ‘Latrocinium’ (*i.e.*, Ruffian-synod), by which it is commonly known. It pronounced in favour of Eutychianism.

These were fairly representative Councils, but are not, of course, reckoned as General Councils, because their decisions have not been accepted by the Church at large. The infallibility of a Council can never be guaranteed at the moment, but the test of the value of its decisions is, as we have seen, their after-reception by the Church.

The object which the compilers of our Article here had in view seems to have been to record the conviction that some of those Councils which were commonly spoken of in the Western Church at the time as “General Councils” had erred, “in his quae ad normam pietatis pertinent;” thus:—

- (i.) The Fourth Lateran Council (1215) had laid down the doctrine of Transubstantiation.
- (ii.) The Council of Constance (1414) had withheld the cup from the laity in the Holy Eucharist.

(4.) DECISIONS OF COUNCILS AS TO THINGS NECESSARY TO SALVATION MUST BE FOUNDED ON SCRIPTURE.

Wherefore things ordained by them as necessary to salvation, have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scripture.

A General Council is summoned to declare what has always been the Faith, not to propound a new faith. The Faith has been once for all delivered (S. Jude 3), and is enshrined in Holy Scripture, which is thus the Church’s standard of doctrine; nothing may, therefore, be taught as an article of Faith unless it be traceable to Holy Scripture. Our Church is here simply carrying out the great Reformation principle which has been already laid down—that “Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation.” (See Article VI., and notes there.)

(5.) TABLE OF COUNCILS ACCOUNTED ŒCUMENICAL.

A. D. 325. Nicæa (1).	A. D. 1215. Lateran (4).
381. Constantinople (1).	1245. Lyons (1).
431. Ephesus.	1274. Lyons (2).
451. Chalcedon.	1311. Vienne.
553. Constantinople (2).	1409. Pisa.
681. Constantinople (3).	1414-18. Constance.
787. Nicæa (2).	1430. Basle. Removed to Florence.
869. Constantinople (4).	1512. Lateran (5).
1123. Lateran (1).	1545-63. Trent.
1139. Lateran (2).	1869. Vatican.
1179. Lateran (3).	

All these Councils are recognised as General Councils by the Church of Rome.

The English Reformers reverently accepted the first four. See the extract from the REFORMATIO LEGUM quoted above (under heading (1) of this section), and *cf.* STAT. I ELIZABETH, c. 1, by which it is determined that nothing shall be henceforth accounted heresy but that which has been so adjudged,

“By the authority of the Canonical Scriptures, or by the first four General Councils, or any of them, or by any other General Council, wherein the same was declared heresy by the express and plain words of the said Canonical Scriptures.”

The Act has been repealed, but the words quoted may be taken as indicating the mind of the Reformers. The second and third Councils of Constantinople merely confirmed decrees of the preceding General Councils; hence they also may be considered as recognised by the English Church.

The Orthodox Eastern Church acknowledges the first seven Councils in the list given above as Œcumenical Councils. *Cf.* the ‘Holy Catechism’ by Bernadaces, p. 16:—

Q. What is an Œcumenical Council?

A. An assembly of the holy fathers and teachers of the Church from all parts of the world to inquire and decide concerning questions of the Christian Faith.

Q. How many Œcumenical Councils of this sort have there been?

A. Seven, and the first of them composed the Creed.

The authorities of the Eastern Church were also willing to recognise the sessions at Florence, which were a continuation of the Council opened at Basle (1430).

It will have been already gathered from the examples we have given that the formularies which give expression to the views of the Swiss School of Reformers do not assign a very high value to the decisions of Councils. The very important and widely approved SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION, however, in Article XI, holds to the first four Councils:—

“Et ut paucis multa hujus causæ dicamus, quæcunque de incarnationis Domini nostri Jesu Christi mysterio definita sunt ex Scripturis sanctis, et comprehensa symbolis ac sententiis quatuor primarum et præstantissimarum Synodorum, celebratarum, Nicææ, Constantinopoli, Ephesi et Chalcedone, una cum beati Athanasii symbolo, et omnibus his similibus symbolis, credimus corde sincero, et ore libero ingenue profiteremur, condemnantes omnia his contraria.”

ARTICLE XXII

OF PURGATORY.

DE PURGATORIO.

The Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory, Pardons, Worshipping and Adoration as well of Images, as of Reliques, and also Invocation of Saints, is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God.

Doctrina Romanensium de Purgatorio, de Indulgentiis, de veneratione et adoratione tum imaginum tum reliquiarum, nec non de Invocatione Sanctorum, res est futilis, inaniter conficta, et nullis Scripturarum testimoniis innititur, imo verbo Dei contradicit.

§ 1.—SOURCE.

Composed by the English Reformers. In 1553 the Article began with the words "Scholasticorum doctrina"—"the doctrine of the Scholeaucthoures." The phrase "doctrina Romanensium"¹ was substituted for this in 1563.

Another change was also made in the wording of the Article at the revision in 1563. The adverb "pernitiose," which stood before the verb "contradicit" in the Latin text of 1553, was struck out.

§ 2.—OBJECT.

To repudiate the teaching of the Church of Rome on the heads named in the Article. It should be remembered, however, that the decree of the Council of Trent which deals with the subjects treated of in this Article bears date December 4, 1563, so that the framers of our Article (1553) could not have had this in their mind, but were rather referring to the current corrupt teaching of the Latin Church in the times immediately preceding the Reformation. This is, indeed, sufficiently indicated by the wording of the original Article, which speaks of "the doctrine of the School-

¹ The words 'Romanenses' and 'Romanistae' occur as early as 1520, being used by Luther, and by Ulrich von Hutten (the author of the 'Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum'), to designate the extreme Mediæval party.

authors." The change of this expression to "Romish doctrine" in the Elizabethan revision is significant; it was doubtless made because our Reformers were realising that the Church of Rome, at the Council of Trent, was adopting the teaching of the later Schoolmen as its own. The decrees of the Council upon the particular subjects in hand could not, however, have been before the revisers at the time when the change in the wording of our Article was made.

§ 3.—EXPOSITION.

This Article condemns the Romish doctrine on the following heads, as not satisfying the test which has been already laid down, viz., that doctrine decreed by the Church must have the warrant of Holy Scripture. On the contrary, it is affirmed of the doctrine here dealt with, that it is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God.

(1.) PURGATORY.

The doctrine of Purgatory depends upon the distinction between the temporal and the eternal punishment of sin, to which every man is liable. It is held that God does indeed, for the sake of the merits and intercession of our Lord Jesus Christ, pardon sin, and at the same time remit the eternal punishment due to it. The sinner is, however, still liable to temporal punishment,¹ which he must expiate by acts of penance in this life. Whatever is not expiated in this life must be expiated after death; the soul, therefore, continues to bear, in the next world, the temporal punishment of its sins. In order to shorten this purgatorial punishment, the prayers and supererogations of men on earth, and especially the offering of masses, are of great efficacy. Such is the "Romish doctrine," which led to serious results both in practice and doctrine. The souls of those that depart hence in the Lord are conceived as lying in flames, enduring torments equal to those of the lost, for a longer or shorter period between death and the day of judgment.² Their friends on earth may obtain mitigation of their

¹ The Council of Trent (Session XIV.) declares:—

"Falso omnino esse et a verbo Dei alienum, culpam a Domino nunquam remitti, quin universa etiam poena condonetur."

Cf. Canon XIII. on the Sacrament of Penance (the same Session):—

"Si quis dixerit . . . fictionem esse, quod, virtute clavium sublata poena aeterna, poena temporalis plerumque exsolvenda remaneat, anathema sit."

² 1 Cor. iii. 11-15 is sometimes quoted in support of this.

punishment by prayers, and by paying the priest to say mass for their souls; hence arose a most shameful traffic in holy things. Serious doctrinal consequences also followed. Purgatory was often so taught as to invalidate the power of the Passion of Christ, and to imply that there is an expiatory virtue in human suffering and merit;¹ so much sin must be atoned for by just so much suffering, either inflicted upon the sinner by God, or voluntary penal visitations upon himself, or possibly the balance may have to be made up from the supererogatory works of saints. It is this popular doctrine of Purgatory which is justly condemned in our Article.

The Council of Trent affirmed the doctrine of Purgatory, but at the same time made an attempt to clear away abuses connected with it. See Session XXV. (December 1563):—

“Cum Catholica ecclesia, a Spiritu Sancto edocta ex sacris litteris et antiqua patrum traditione, in sanctis conciliis et novissime in hac oecumenica synodo docuerit, purgatorium esse, animasque ibi detentas fidelium suffragiis potissimum vero acceptabili altaris sacrificio juvari, praecepit sancta synodus episcopis, ut sanam de purgatorio doctrinam, a sanctis patribus et sanctis conciliis traditam, a Christi fidelibus credi, teneri, et ubique praedicari diligenter studeant: apud rudem vero plebem difficiliores ac subtiliores quaestiones, quaeque ad aedificationem non faciunt, et ex quibus plerumque nulla fit pietatis accessio, a popularibus concionibus secludantur; incerta item, vel quae specie falsi laborant, evulgari ac tractari non permittant; ea vero, quae ad curiositatem quandam aut superstitionem spectant vel turpe lucrum sapiunt, tanquam scandala et fidelium offendicula prohibeant.”

We must not, of course, understand that when the compilers of our Article censured ‘the Romish doctrine of Purgatory,’ they at the same time intended to reject the doctrine of the Primitive Church concerning the Intermediate State. Those who depart this life in a state of grace go to be with Christ (Phil. i. 23), and pass into a state of blessed rest and peace (Rev. xiv. 13);²

¹ The Council of Trent saw the danger involved, and attempted to guard against it:—

“Accedit, quod dum satisfaciendo patimur pro peccatis, Christo, qui pro peccatis nostris satisfecit, conformes efficimur. . . . Neque vero ita nostra est satisfactio haec, quam pro peccatis nostris exsolvimus, ut non sit per Christum; nam qui ex nobis tanquam ex nobis nihil possumus, eo co-operante omnia possumus. Ita non habet homo unde gloriatur, sed omnis gloriatio nostra in Christo est” (Session XIV.).

² Cf. the words of the prayer in the Burial Service:—

“Almighty God, with Whom do live the spirits of them that depart hence in the Lord, and with Whom the souls of the faithful, after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, are in joy and felicity.”

but we must not conceive of them as altogether inactive, or as though asleep;¹ the work of grace, begun in this life, goes on in their souls, they attain to higher and higher degrees of perfection, till at last they will, with joy, behold the Face of God in Heaven. It is obvious that in many at the time of their departure from this life there is much good, mingled with much evil as yet unsubdued. We cannot for a moment think of such as lost souls; neither, on the other hand, can we imagine them as fitted, at the moment of death, for the Beatific Vision of Heaven. Should we not, therefore, conclude that the good work begun in them will be continued in the waiting state beyond the grave, the evil being, by the continued operation of the Spirit of God, purged away, till they too are fitted, with all saints, to behold the Face of God with joy?

Further, we should not forget that the members of Christ who have departed this life are still, by virtue of the common union with the living Lord, in close communion with us on earth; the Church Militant here and the Church Expectant in Paradise are vitally and indivisibly one, so that our brethren who have been taken from us into Paradise still have their part in the mutual offices of the members of the One Body. Of all the mutual helps we enjoy in the Body of Christ, there is nothing that binds us so closely to one another as the ministry of prayer. We pray continually for those we love in Christ while they are living here, and natural impulse and deep instinct of piety alike prompt us to continue to pray for them when they have passed from our sight to join the waiting Church beyond the grave.

¹ This error was revived by some at the Reformation period, and was expressly condemned by the 40th of the XLII. ARTICLES of 1553:—

THE SOULLES OF THEM THAT DEPARTE THIS LIFE DOE NEITHER DIE WITH THE BODIES, NOR SLEEP IDLIE.	DEFUNCTORUM ANIMAE NEQUE CUM COR- PORIBUS INTEREUNT, NEQUE OTIOSE DORMIUNT.
--	---

Thei whiche saie that the soules of suche as departe hens doe sleepe, being without al sence, fealing, or perceiuing vntil the daie of iudgment, or affirme that the soules die with the bodies, and at the laste daie shalbe raised vp with the same, doe vtterlie dissent from the right beliefe declared to vs in holie Scripture.

Qui animas defunctorum praedicant usque ad diem iudicii absque omni sensu dormire, aut illas asserunt una cum corporibus mori, et extrema die cum illis excitandas, ab orthodoxa fide, quae nobis in sacris litteris traditur, prorsus dissentiunt.

See also REFORMATIO LEGUM, ‘De Haeresibus,’ Cap. 12:

“Quidam impie philosophantur animas hominum ex hac vita migrantium, quando semel ex corporibus excesserunt, usque ad supremum ultimi iudicii tempus, vel somno involvi, vel prorsus ad nihilum recidere; tum autem cum extremi iudicii dies erit, illas rursus vel a somno excitari, vel cum propriis corporibus ab interitu resurgere.”

There is abundant evidence which goes to prove that the practice of Prayer for the Dead prevailed in the Primitive Church.¹

(a) The ancient Liturgies all contain commemoration of and intercession for the departed. A few quotations are here given:—

The Greek Liturgy of S. James of Jerusalem²:

Μνήσθητι, Κύριε ὁ Θεός, τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ πάσης σαρκός, ὧν ἐμνήσθημεν, καὶ ὧν οὐκ ἐμνήσθημεν, ὀρθοδόξων, ἀπὸ "Αβελ τοῦ δικαίου μέχρι τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας· αὐτοὺς ἐκεῖ αὐτοῖς ἀνάπαισον ἐν χώρᾳ ζώντων, ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου, ἐν τῇ τρυφῇ τοῦ παραδείσου, ἐν τοῖς κόλποις Ἀβραάμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ, τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἡμῶν. ὅθεν ἀπέδρα ὁδύνη λύπη καὶ στεναγμός· ἔνθα ἐπισκοπεῖ τὸ φῶς τοῦ προσώπου σου καὶ καταλάμπει διὰ παντός.

The Clementine Liturgy³:

Ἐπεὶ τῶν ἐν πίστει ἀναπαυσμένων δεηθώμεν.

S. Cyril of Jerusalem, in his Lectures on the Mysteries⁴ (v. 9), thus speaks:

Εἶτα μνημονεύομεν καὶ τῶν προκεκοιμημένων, πρῶτον, πατριάρχων, προφητῶν, ἀποστόλων, μαρτύρων, ὅπως ὁ θεὸς ταῖς εὐχαῖς αὐτῶν καὶ πρεσβείαις προσδέξεται ἡμῶν τὴν δέησιν· εἶτα καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν προκεκοιμημένων ἁγίων πατέρων καὶ ἐπισκόπων καὶ πάντων ἁπλῶς τῶν ἐν ἡμῖν προκεκοιμημένων, μεγίστην ὄνησιν πιστεύοντες ἕσθαι ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἱπὲρ ὧν ἡ δέησις ἀναφέρεται τῆς ἁγίας καὶ φρικτωδεστάτης προκειμένης Θεοσίας.

The Greek Liturgy of S. Mark⁵:

Τούτων πάντων τὰς ψυχὰς ἀνάπαισον, Δέσποτα Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν ἐν ταῖς τῶν ἁγίων σου σκηναῖς, ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου, χαριζόμενος αὐτοῖς τὰ τῶν ἐπαγγελιῶν σου ἀγαθά.⁶

¹ We may refer to 2 Tim. i. 16-18 as indicative of Apostolic practice. It is generally agreed by commentators that Onesiphorus, for whom S. Paul there prays, was dead at the time when the Epistle was written. Cf. iv. 19, where it is noteworthy that greeting is sent, not to Onesiphorus himself, but to his household.

² Dating from the earlier part of the fourth century, and adopted throughout the patriarchate of Antioch.

³ Embodied in the Apostolical Constitutions, and dating, perhaps, from the middle of the third century.

⁴ Delivered about the middle of the fourth century.

⁵ This dates very probably from the fourth century, and was used in the patriarchate of Alexandria.

⁶ There can be no doubt that the custom of Prayer for the Dead passed from the Jewish to the Christian Church. 2 Macc. xii. 39-45 testifies to the use of prayers for the dead amongst the Jews about two centuries before our Lord's

(b) Inscriptions in the Catacombs also afford valuable incidental testimony to the practice of the primitive Christians, and show us that in early times death was not conceived as forming a barrier to the prayers which the living offered for their loved ones who had gone before.

Typical examples of such inscriptions are the following:—

- (i.) KALIMERE DEUS REFRIGERET SPIRITUM TUUM UNA CUM SORORIS TUAE HILARE.
- (ii.) DOMINE NE QUANDO ADUMBRETUR SPIRITUS VENERES DE FILIUS IPSEIUS QUI SUPERSTITIS SUNT BENIROSUS PROJECTUS.
- (iii.) ERENEA VIVAS IN DEO. A. Ω.

That our Reformers did not intend in the present Article to censure the Primitive practice of Prayer for the Dead will appear more clearly if we attentively consider the history of the text of the Article itself. The leading divines of our Church in Edward VI.'s reign¹ were apparently divided on the question. Some of those who had come more immediately under the influence of the Swiss school of Continental Reformers² condemned the practice of praying for the dead, and classed it with Mediæval corruptions which should be swept away.³ This view of the matter prevailed in the first draft of the Article as it stood in October 1552, when the text ran thus:—“Scholasticorum doctrina de Purgatorio, *de precatatione pro defunctis*,” &c.; but the

coming; and we are assured by the most competent Jewish scholars that during the time of our Lord's earthly ministry prayers for the dead were continually offered in the synagogue services, as they still are to-day. Sacrifices were also offered in the Temple for the departed, and vicarious abutions undertaken by the living on behalf of those who had died while in a condition of ceremonial defilement (cf. 1 Cor. xv. 29). Our Lord Himself during His sojourn upon earth, and His Apostles too, who were loyal observers of the traditions of their fathers, must often have joined in prayers for the departed.

¹ The earlier English formularies, issued in the reign of Henry VIII., had commended the practice. See, e.g., the KING'S BOOK:—

“And truly it standeth with the very order of charity, a Christian man to pray for another, both quick and dead, and to commend one another in their prayers to God's mercy, and to cause other to pray for them also, as well in masses and exequies” (Formularies of Faith, p. 375).

² The line taken up by the Swiss school of Reformers may be gathered from the SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION, Art. XXVI:—

“Credimus enim fideles recta a morte corporea migrare ad Christum, ideoque viventium suffragiis aut precibus pro defunctis, denique illis suis officiis nihil indigere. Credimus item infideles recta præcipitari in Tartara, ex quibus nullus impiis aperitur, ullis viventium officiis, exitus.”

³ Thus in the ninth of a series of Articles drawn up by Bishop Hooper we find that “the doctrine of the schoolmen of purgatory, pardons, prayers for them that are departed out of this world,” are alike condemned.

words italicised were deliberately struck out before the Articles were published.¹

(2.) PARDONS, OR INDULGENCES.

The theory of Indulgences was so uncertain that in 1552 the Cardinals dissuaded Pope Adrian VI. from issuing any decree on the subject. It is said that they grew out of what was originally a remission, either wholly or in part, of ecclesiastical censures or dispensation from ecclesiastical rules of discipline. Pope Urban II. (1088) granted 'Indulgence' to all who fought for the Holy Sepulchre. His successors extended this to all who, not being able to go in person, maintained a soldier to go in their place. At a later period this was extended by Innocent III. to those who joined in crusade against heretical Christians. Pope Julius II., in order to raise money for rebuilding S. Peter's at Rome, published 'Indulgences' to all who would make contributions, a practice which was continued by his successor, Leo X. As regards the popular doctrine of Indulgences, the distinction between the temporal and eternal punishment due to sin, which underlies the doctrine of Purgatory, underlies it also. The superabundant merits of Christ and the supererogatory works of the Saints form a sort of treasury of merit, upon which the Pope may draw, and apply it to individual Christians for the remission of such temporal punishments and penances for sin as remain to be inflicted after the sins themselves and their eternal punishment have been remitted.

Bellarmino gives expression to the "Romish doctrine" of Indulgences censured by our Article:—

"Ecclesia et scholae theologorum indulgentias vocant remissiones poenarum, quae saepe remanent eluendae post remissionem

¹ We may here note that in two passages in the Communion Service we have regard to the departed.

(i.) We commemorate the faithful dead in the Prayer for the Church Militant:—

"And we also bless Thy holy Name for all Thy servants departed this life in Thy faith and fear; beseeching Thee to give us grace so to follow their good examples, that with them we may be partakers of Thy heavenly kingdom."

(ii.) In the prayer of Oblation we beseech—

"That by the merits and death of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in His blood, we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins and all other benefits of His passion."

The phrase "all Thy whole Church," taken in its full and proper sense includes those members waiting in Paradise.

culparum et reconciliationem in sacramento poenitentiae adeptam, quas remissiones summi pontifices ex paterna lenitate . . . certis temporibus, et non sine justa aliqua et rationabili causa concedere solent" (De Indulgentiis, I. Cap. 1).

"Exstat in ecclesia thesaurus satisfactionum ex Christi passionibus infinitus, qui nunquam exhauriri poterit. . . . Ad hunc thesaurum superfluentium satisfactionum pertinent etiam passiones beatæ Mariæ virginis et omnium aliorum sanctorum, qui plus passi sunt, quam eorum peccata requirerent" (Ibid., Cap. 2).

"Indulgentia proprie est absolutio judiciaria, annexam habens solutionem ex thesauro" (Ibid., Cap. 5).

"Per indulgentias non tollitur nisi reatus poenae temporalis, qui remanet culpa dimissa. . . . Indulgentiae liberant homines a reatu poenae non solum coram ecclesia, sed etiam coram Deo" (Ibid., Cap. 7).

"Res certissima est, et apud Catholicos indubitata, indulgentiis juvari posse animas, quae in purgatorio poenas luunt" (Ibid., Cap. 14).

The COUNCIL OF TRENT on this subject decreed (Session XXV.) as follows:—

"Synodus indulgentiarum usum, christiano populo maxime salutarem et sacrorum conciliorum auctoritate probatum, in ecclesia retinendum esse docet et praecipit; eosque anathemate damnat, qui aut inutiles esse asserunt, vel eas concedendi in ecclesia potestatem esse negant. In his tamen concedendis moderationem juxta veterem et probatam in ecclesia consuetudinem adhiberi cupit, ne nimia facilitate ecclesiastica disciplina enervetur. Abusus vero, qui in his irrepserunt, quorum occasione insigne hoc indulgentiarum nomen ab haereticis blasphematur, emendatos et correctos cupiens, praesenti decreto generaliter statuit, pravos quaestus omnes pro his consequendis, unde plurima in christiano populo abusum causa fluxit, omnino abolendos esse."

Thus, while the Council affirmed that the Church has the power to grant Indulgences, and that the use of them is salutary, it at the same time strongly condemned abuses connected with them, and made a real attempt at reform in the matter. Since the sale of Indulgences was, on any theory, an abuse, the office of quæstor was abolished by the Council.

(3.) THE WORSHIPPING AND ADORATION OF IMAGES.

It is only too true that in the times preceding the Reformation there was a great deal of superstitious veneration, and even actual worship of images in and for themselves. This our Church strongly

and justly condemns. We have the express word of God on the subject in the Second Commandment, which directly forbids us to make any graven image for the purpose of worshipping it.

The COUNCIL OF TRENT (Session XXV.) speaks somewhat guardedly with reference to the honour to be paid to images:—

“Imagines porro Christi, deiparae virginis et aliorum sanctorum in templis praesertim habendas et retinendas, eisque debitum honorem et venerationem impertiendam, non quod credatur inesse aliqua in iis divinitas vel virtus, propter quam sint colendae, vel quod ab eis sit aliquid petendum, vel quod fiducia in imaginibus sit figenda, veluti olim fiebat a gentibus, quae in idolis spem suam collocabant: sed quoniam honor, qui eis exhibetur, refertur ad prototypa, quae illae repraesentant: ita ut per imagines, quas osculamur, et coram quibus caput aperimus et procumbimus, Christum adoremus, et sanctos, quorum illae similitudinem gerunt, veneremur.”¹

The teaching of schoolmen and great divines of the Roman Church, however, certainly comes under the condemnation of our Article; *e.g.*—

(a) Thomas Aquinas declares that the same reverence should be displayed towards an image of Christ, and towards Christ Himself; and seeing that Christ is adored with the adoration of latria,² it follows that His image is to be adored with the adoration of latria.³

(b) Bellarmine (De Imaginibus, II. Cap. 21) writes as follows:—

“Imagines Christi et sanctorum venerandae sunt, non solum per accidens vel improprie, sed etiam per se et proprie, ita ut ipsae terminent venerationem ut in se considerantur, et non solum ut vicem gerunt exemplaris.”

As to the usage of the Primitive Church, the Christians of the first ages, through fear of idolatry, did not use images of Christ, but only emblematical representations, such as the Lamb and the Good Shepherd, besides the sign of the Cross. In the time of

¹ The Council recognised the prevalence of abuses in connection with images by taking measures for reform in the matter:—

“Omnis porro superstitio in Sanctorum invocatione, Reliquiarum veneratione, et imaginum sacro usu tollatur: omnis turpis quaestus eliminetur, omnis denique lascivia vitetur: ita ut procaci venustate imagines non pingantur nec orientur, et Sanctorum celebratione, ac Reliquiarum visitatione homines ad comessationes atque ebrietates non abutantur.”

² *λατρεία* is the technical term for the highest kind of veneration or worship due to God alone, as distinct from *δουλεία*, which may be rendered to creatures.

³ *Summa Theologiae*, III. xxv.

Gregory the Great (*i.e.*, at the close of the sixth century) the custom of setting up representations of sacred subjects in churches had become common, and we find that Pope advocating the continuance of the custom for the better instruction of the minds of the ignorant. The Eastern Church was agitated by a keen controversy on the subject of images during the eighth century, which issued in the decrees of the Second Council of Nicæa (787). It was then decided that the sign of the Cross, and images of our Lord, the Blessed Virgin, saints, and angels, might be set up in churches.¹

The proper and edifying use of images and pictures is not condemned by our Article. As Gregory the Great says, “It is one thing to worship an image, quite another thing to learn by it what is to be worshipped;” and it cannot be denied that images and pictures are of very great value in keeping great truths or facts continually before the minds of Christian people. The deplorable ignorance of very large numbers in this country concerning the fundamentals of our most holy Religion is doubtless owing, to a very considerable extent, to the neglect by our Church of that most effective method of teaching—by the eye. The strong language of the Homilies against images was justified by the circumstances of the time, but is felt to be not altogether applicable to the conditions of to-day. Recent restorations in our churches have furnished us with beautiful representations of the infant Christ in the arms of the Blessed Virgin, of the Crucifixion, and of our Lord in glory. Thus the great foundation truths of the Incarnation and the Atonement, together with the glorious issue of our Religion, the glorification of humanity in Christ upon the Divine Throne in Heaven, are constantly set forth before all.

How far images or pictures may be safely introduced into churches without danger of idolatry is a question that may be left to the discretion of the Church in each age and country.

The reaction from the Mediæval abuse of images led some of the Reformers on the Continent, especially those of the Swiss school,² not merely to condemn the abuse of images, but to altogether exclude and forbid any use of them.

¹ In the Eastern Church at the present day all statues and carved images are rigidly excluded from churches, the Second Commandment being adhered to in its strictly literal sense. Painted representations of our Lord, of the Mother of God, and of the Saints, called Icons, are, however, retained, and play a very important part in the devotions of the faithful.

² Luther did not object to the use of images, considering them as in themselves indifferent. Thus the Crucifix was retained by his followers, and is regularly used in Lutheran worship at the present day.

TETRAPOLITAN CONFESSION, XXII. :

“Et in statuas denique atque imagines, nostri sacras orationes strinxerunt, eo potissimum, quod aperte coli et adorari coeperunt, inanesque sumptus in eas fieri, qui esurienti et siti, et nudo Christo debebantur, quod denique et cultu illarum sumptuque, quamlibet cum verbo Dei pugnante, merita apud Deum quaerunt. . . . Per se quidem liberum esse usum imaginum et nostri fatentur, sed quantumvis liber sit, Christiano spectandum est quid expediat, quid aedificet, et eo loci, eaque ratione imaginibus uti, ut nemini objiciat offendiculum.”

SAXON CONFESSION, Art. XXII. :

“Alii apud alias statuas existimantur esse magis propitii. Hi furores cum palam similes sint ethnicorum, et haud dubie valde iritent iram Dei, et a docentibus taxandi sunt, et a piis magistratibus severe puniendi.”

SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION, Art. IV. :

“Rejicimus itaque non modo Gentium idola, sed et Christianorum simulacra. Tametsi enim Christus humanam assumpsit naturam, non ideo tamen assumpsit, ut typum praeferret statuariis atque pictoribus. . . . Spiritu suo se nobis perpetuo affuturum promisit. Joan xvi., 2 Cor. v. Quis ergo crederet umbram vel simulacrum corporis aliquam conferre piis utilitatem? . . . Ut vero instituantur homines in religione, admonenturque rerum divinarum et salutis suae, praedicare jussit Evangelium Dominus, Marc xvi., non pingere et pictura laicos erudire.”

(4.) THE WORSHIPPING AND ADORATION OF RELICS.

We cannot wonder that our Church in the present Article strongly condemns the worship of relics, when we recall the disgusting spectacles of degrading superstition and of insatiable avarice afforded by the numerous pilgrimages to noted shrines in the times immediately preceding the Reformation. The ridiculous impostures to which the demand for relics gave rise are alluded to in some of the formularies and writings of the period. See, e.g., SCHMALKALD ARTICLES (p. 310):—

“Reliquiae sanctorum refertae multis mendaciis, ineptiis et fatuitatibus. Canum et equorum ossa ibi saepe reperta sunt. Et licet aliquid forte laudandum fuisset, tamen propter imposturas istas, quae diabolo risum excitarunt, jam dudum damnari debuissent, cum praesertim careant verbo Dei, et non necessariae et inutiles sint.”

Cf. HOMILY AGAINST PERIL OF IDOLATRY (Third Part):—

“And, because relics were so gainful, few places were there but they had reliques provided for them. And, for more plenty

of reliques, some one Saint had many heads, one in one place, and another in another place. Some had six arms and twenty-six fingers. And, where our Lord bare His cross alone, if all the pieces of the reliques thereof were gathered together, the greatest ship in England would scarcely bear them. . . . And not only the bones of the Saints, but everything appertaining to them was an holy relique. In some place they offer a sword, in some the scabbard, in some a shoe, in some a saddle that had been set upon some holy horse, in some the coals wherewith St. Laurence was roasted, in some place the tail of the ass which our Lord Jesus Christ sat on, to be kissed and offered to for a relique. For, rather than they would lack a relique, they would offer you a horse bone instead of a virgin's arm, or the tail of the ass, to be kissed and offered unto for reliques. O wicked, impudent, and most shameless men, the devisers of these things! O seely, foolish, and dastardly daws, and more beastly than the ass whose tail they kissed, that believe such things!”

The COUNCIL OF TRENT recognised the prevalence of serious abuses in connection with the practice of the veneration of relics;¹ while an attempt was made to remove these, the practice itself was commended (Session XXV.):—

“Sanctorum quoque martyrum et aliorum cum Christo viventium sancta corpora, quae viva membra fuerunt Christi, et templum Spiritus sancti, ab ipso ad aeternam vitam suscitanda et glorificanda, a fidelibus veneranda esse per quae multa beneficia a Deo hominibus praestantur; ita ut affirmantes, sanctorum reliquias venerationem atque honorem non deberi, vel eas aliaque sacra monumenta a fidelibus inutiliter honorari, atque eorum opis impetrandae causa sanctorum memorias frustra frequentari, omnino damnandos esse, prout jam pridem eos damnavit, et nunc etiam damnat ecclesia.”

We may hold much the same position with regard to relics as in relation to images. It is one thing carefully to treasure precious relics, quite another thing to worship them. The latter action is justly condemned by our Article, but the former is due to a beautiful instinct of natural piety, in accordance with which we cherish, in the home, relics of loved friends departed, and, as a nation, carefully preserve in museums and public buildings relics and mementoes of national heroes and public benefactors. Such relics, whether of our own personal friends or of great men

¹ See p. 154, note 1.

of history, may often arouse within us lofty and noble thoughts, leading to high purposes and great resolves. In a similar manner, the contemplation of relics of the Saints of the Church may be most helpful to us who strive to follow in their train. From the time of the earliest persecutions relics of martyrs have been held in great respect by Christians. It was the general custom for the faithful to meet at the tombs of the martyrs, as in the Catacombs at Rome, for worship; and it was this, doubtless, which led to the practice in later times, when churches were built in other lands, of preserving within the altar a relic of some saint or martyr, in imitation of those first tombs of the martyred saints. From the period that the Empress Helena discovered the true Cross, relics occupied a very prominent position in the thoughts and affections of Christendom. An excellent statement of the true Christian position is afforded by the declaration of the Church at Smyrna after the martyrdom of Polycarp, when the Jews desired that his body should be entirely consumed lest the Christians should worship his relics:—

Ἐπέβαλον γοῦν τινας Νικήτην τὸν τοῦ Ἡρώδου πατέρα, ἀδελφὸν δὲ Ἀλκῆς, ἐντυχίῃ τῷ ἡγεμόνι, ὥστε μὴ δοῦναι αὐτοῦ τὸ σῶμα, ‘μὴ,’ φησὶν, ‘ἀφέντες τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον, τοῦτον ἄρξωνται σέβειν.’ Καὶ ταῦτα εἶπον, ὑποβαλόντων καὶ ἐπισχυσάντων Ἰουδαίων, οἱ καὶ ἐτήρησαν μελλόντων ἡμῶν ἐκ τοῦ πυρὸς αὐτὸν λαμβανεῖν, ἀγνοοῦντες ὅτι οὔτε τὸν Χριστὸν ποτε καταλιπεῖν δυνησόμεθα, τὸν ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ παντὸς κόσμου τῶν σωζομένων σωτηρίας παθόντα, οὔτε ἕτερόν τινα σέβειν. Τοῦτον μὲν γὰρ, υἱὸν ὄντα τοῦ θεοῦ, προσκυνοῦμεν· τοὺς δὲ μάρτυρας, ὡς μαθητὰς καὶ μιμητὰς τοῦ Κυρίου, ἀγαπῶμεν ἀξίως, ἐνεκα εὐνοίας ἀντανακλάτου τῆς εἰς τὸν ἴδιον Βασιλείου καὶ Διδάσκαλου. ὧν γένοιτο καὶ ἡμᾶς συγκοινωνοὺς τε καὶ συμμαθητὰς γενέσθαι. Ἰδὼν οὖν ὁ ἑκατοντάρχης τὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων γενομένην φιλονεκίαν, θεὸς αὐτὸν ἐν μέσῳ, ὡς ἔθος αὐτοῖς ἔκασεν. Οὕτως τε ἡμεῖς ὑστερον ἀνελόμενοι τὰ τιμιώτερα λίθων πολυτελῶν καὶ δοκιμώτερα ὑπὲρ χρυσίου ὅσα αὐτοῦ, ἀπεθέμεθα ὄπου καὶ ἀκόλουθον ἦν. Ἐνθα ὡς δυνατὸν ἡμῖν συναγομένοις ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει καὶ χαρᾷ παρέξει ὁ Κύριος ἐπιτελεῖν τὴν τοῦ μαρτυρίου αὐτοῦ ἡμέραν γενέθλιον, εἰς τε τὴν τῶν προη-
θληκότων μνήμην, καὶ τῶν μελλόντων ἀσκήσιν τε καὶ ἐτοιμασίαν.¹

¹ Eusebius, "Hist. Eccles.," IV. Cap. xv.

The Reformers of the Swiss School were not merely against the veneration of relics of the saints, but were opposed to preservation of such relics at all. See, *e.g.*—

SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION, Art. V. :

“Multo vero minus credimus reliquias divorum adorandas esse aut colendas. Veteres isti sancti satis honorasse videbantur mortuos suos, si honeste mandassent terrae reliquias, postquam astra petisset spiritus; ac omnium nobilissimas reliquias majorum aestimabant esse virtutes, doctrinam et fidem, quas ut commendabant cum laude mortuorum, ita eas exprimere annitebantur, dum vivebant in terris.”

(5.) INVOCATION OF SAINTS.

Finally, our Article condemns the corrupt practice of the Latin Church in the times preceding the Reformation, when Invocation of Saints was carried on in such a way that only too often the common people worshipped the creature instead of the Creator.¹ Theoretically, of course, a distinction was kept between prayers addressed to God Himself as the Author and Giver of all good, and invocations of the saints, asking for their intercessions, in the name of Christ, on behalf of the suppliant. Thus, in theory, the prerogative of God as the one only independent Author of good, and the sole Mediatorship of Christ, was guarded. It is obvious, however, that in practice these two great truths might, with unlearned people, easily be obscured, as in fact they were, and that to such an extent that it is scarcely too much to say that by the sixteenth century invocation of the saints had taken the form of a grotesque polytheism. Thus Erasmus writes² concerning the prevailing custom of the day:—

“Some worship divers gods with divers ceremonies. This man every day salutes Christopher and visits his image, with what object? Because he persuades himself that if he does so he will that day be safe from an evil death. Another adores a certain Rochus. Why? Because he believes he will drive away the plague. Another mutters prayers to Barbara or George, that he

¹ Cf. SAXON CONFESSION, Art. XXII. :

“Maria Mater gratiae, Tu nos ab hoste protege, In hora mortis suscipe.”
Hos versiculos audivimus doctorem theologiae monachum praefari morienti, et saepe repetere, cum quidem nullam Christi mentionem faceret, et possent exempla multa recitari.

² In the “Encomium Moriae.”

may not fall into the hands of the enemy. This man fasts to Apollonia, that he may escape the toothache. Another visits the image of S. Job, that he may avoid the itch. In fact, as many things as there are that we either fear or wish for, so many gods have we made for them."

The decree of the COUNCIL OF TRENT on this subject (Session XXV.) runs as follows:—

"Mandat sancta Synodus omnibus episcopis . . . ut . . . fideles diligenter instruant, docentes eos, Sanctos una cum Christo regnantes, orationes suas pro hominibus Deo offerre, bonum atque utile esse suppliciter eos invocare; et ob beneficia impetranda a Deo per Filium ejus Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum, qui solus noster Redemptor et Salvator est, ad eorum orationes opem auxiliumque confugere: illos vero qui negant Sanctos, aeterna felicitate in coelo fruente, invocandos esse: aut qui asserunt, vel illos pro hominibus non orare, vel eorum, ut pro nobis etiam singulis orent, invocationem esse idololatriam, vel pugnare cum verbo Dei, adversarique honori unius mediatoris Dei et hominum Jesu Christi, vel stultum esse in coelo regnantibus voce vel mente supplicare, impie sentire."

As in the case of its decrees on Purgatory and on the use of Images, the Council worded its declaration on the Invocation of Saints cautiously. That the saints pray for us who are members of the Church Militant is not, of course, to be denied,¹ but the practice of invoking them is justly censured by our Article, especially in view of the serious evils which are seen to result from the custom. It will be noticed that the Tridentine decree affirms that Invocation of Saints is not repugnant to the Word of God, and in no way interferes with the Mediatorial office of Christ, Who is the only Mediator between God and man. Whatever may be said or thought about the theory, such affirmation could scarcely be made with respect to the popular practice either of the pre-Reformation Church, or of the Church of Rome at the present day, for in Roman Catholic devotions which have authoritative sanction, more supplications are sometimes addressed to deceased human beings than to God the Father or to Christ; the Mediation of Christ is altogether out of sight, and the saints are addressed as though they were themselves independent dispensers of the blessings prayed for.

¹ See what has been said above under the head of Purgatory, p. 149.

A few examples are here given:—

(a) From the "Raccolta":¹

"We fly beneath thy shelter, O holy Mother of God; despise not our petitions in our necessities, and deliver us always from all perils, O glorious and blessed Virgin."

"Leave me not, my Mother, in my own hands, or I am lost. Let me but cling to thee. Save me, my Hope; save me from hell."

"Michael, glorious prince, chief and champion of the heavenly host, . . . vouchsafe to free us all from every evil, who with full confidence have recourse to thee."

"Benign Joseph, our Guide, protect us and the holy Church."

(b) The following passages from Liguori's "Glories of Mary"² may be compared in this connection:—

"Often we shall be heard more quickly, and be thus preserved, if we have recourse to Mary and call upon her name, than we should be if we called on the Name of Jesus our Saviour."

"Many things are asked from God, and are not granted; they are asked from Mary, and are obtained."

"At the command of the Virgin all things obey, even God."

"Mary has only to speak and her Son executes all."

With such utterances as those above quoted we may contrast these passages of Scripture, S. Matt. xi. 28; S. John xiv. 6, 14; Acts iv. 12; 1 Tim. ii. 5, 6; Heb. vii. 25. We recall, moreover, how that angels are recorded in the New Testament to have promptly refused and forbidden acts of reverence done to themselves; see Rev. xix. 10, xxii. 8, 9.

¹ The prayers which this contains have Papal sanction, being specially "indulged." The passages given are from the English translation (Burns & Oates, 1873).

² Alfonzo Maria de Liguori was born at Naples in 1696, and died 1787. The "Congregation of Rites" declared in 1803 that "in all the writings of Alfonzo de Liguori there is not one word that can be justly found fault with;" and in 1839 he was solemnly canonised.

Reformers on the Continent, both of the Saxon and Swiss schools, were emphatic in their repudiation of the practice of Invocation of Saints, as the formularies of the period testify :—

TETRAPOLITAN CONFSSION, Cap. XI. :

“*Rejectus est et alius circa haec abusus, quod quidam precibus et jejuniis, Deiparam quoque virginem Mariam, aliosque divos sic demereri volunt, ut per eorum intercessionem et merita, cum animae, tum corporis malis liberentur, bonisque omne genus cumulentur.*”

AUGSBURG CONFSSION, Part I. Art. XXI. :

“*Sed Scriptura non docet invocare Sanctos, seu petere auxilium a Sanctis. Quia unum Christum nobis proponit mediatorem, propitiatorium, pontificem, et intercessorem.*”

SAXON CONFSSION, Art. XXII. :

“*Hoc loco reprehendimus hanc corruptelam ethnicam, quod defenditur consuetudo alloquentium homines, qui ex hac vita discesserunt, et petitur ab eis vel auxilium vel intercessio. . . .*

Hanc doctrinam de Mediatore obscuratam et corruptam esse, manifestum est, cum confugerent homines ad matrem Virginem, tanquam magis propitiam, et alii alios mediatores quaererent.”

WURTEMBERG CONFSSION, Art. XXIII. :

“*Fatemur etiam quod sancti in coelis, suo quodam modo, pro nobis coram Deo orent, sicut et Angeli pro nobis sunt solliciti; et omnes creaturae pro salute nostra coelesti quodam modo ingemiscunt, et nobiscum, quemadmodum Paulus loquitur, parturiunt. Sed sicut ex gemitu reliquarum creaturarum non est instituendus cultus invocandi eas, ita ex oratione sanctorum in coelis non est approbandus cultus invocandi sanctos: de his enim invocandis nullum extat in sacris literis vel mandatum, vel exemplum.*”

FRENCH CONFSSION, Art. XXIV. :

“*Quicquid homines de mortuorum sanctorum intercessione commenti sunt, nihil aliud esse quam fraudem et fallacias Satanae, ut homines a recta precandi forma abduceret.*”

BELGIC CONFSSION, Art. XXVI. :

“*Sola igitur diffidentia morem hunc induxit, quo sanctos (quos colere putamus) dedecore potius afficimus, dum ea patramus, quae tantum abest ut illi unquam viventes fecerint, ut potius ea constanter, et pro officio suo, rejecerint, sicuti scripta eorum testantur.*”

SECOND HELVETIC CONFSSION, Art. V. :

“*Proinde sanctos coelites sive divos, nec adoramus, neque*

colimus, nec invocamus, neque illos coram Patre in coelis pro intercessoribus aut mediatoribus nostris agnoscimus.”

Art. XXIII. : “*Divos coelites invocare, aut his uti pro intercessoribus, prohibet sacerdotium Christi Domini et vera religio.*”

A comparison of the above extracts shows us that, while the Lutheran school rejected the practice of Invocation of Saints, the formularies which give expression to the Helvetic and Calvinistic theology go further, and deny that the saints pray for us.

ARTICLE XXIII

OF MINISTERING IN THE
CONGREGATION.

DE MINISTRANDO IN ECCLESIA.

It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching, or ministering the Sacraments in the Congregation,¹ before he be lawfully called and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the Congregation, to call and send Ministers into the Lord's vineyard.

Non licet cuiquam sumere sibi munus publice praedicandi, aut administrandi Sacramenta in Ecclesia, nisi prius fuerit ad haec obeunda legitime vocatus et missus. Atque illos legitime vocatos et missos existimare debemus, qui per homines, quibus potestas vocandi ministros atque mittendi in vineam Domini publice concessa est in Ecclesia, co-optati fuerint et adsciti in hoc opus.

§ 1.—SOURCE.

Composed by the English Reformers, 1552-3.

We may compare the AUGSBURG CONFESSION, Part I. Art. XIV. :—

“De ordine ecclesiastico docent, quod nemo debeat in ecclesia publice docere, aut sacramenta administrare, nisi rite vocatus.”

The language of this Article of the Augsburg Confession was adopted in the tenth of the XIII. ARTICLES of 1538 :—

“De ministris Ecclesiae docemus, quod nemo debeat publice docere, aut sacramenta ministrare nisi rite vocatus, et quidem ab his, penes quos in Ecclesia, juxta verbum Dei, et leges ac consuetudines uniuscujusque regionis, jus est vocandi et admittendi.”

¹ The word ‘Congregation’ is evidently used here in the same sense as in Article XIX. (where see notes). It should be remarked that the Latin version has ‘Ecclesia’; cf. Deut. xxiii. 1, 2, where the Vulgate gives ‘Ecclesia’ as the equivalent of *קהל*, the word denoting the whole assembly of Israel as the people of God. *Ἐκκλησία* is thus used in the New Testament in Acts vii. 38, Heb. xii. 23. We may illustrate from the wording of CANON 55 :—

“Christ's Holy Catholic Church; i.e., the whole congregation of Christian people dispersed throughout the whole world.”

§ 2.—OBJECT.

The Article is evidently directed against the error of those who maintained that any one believing himself called to the work of the Ministry was bound to exercise the functions of a Minister in defiance of all Church Authority.

§ 3.—EXPOSITION.

(1.) THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN CLERGY AND LAITY.

It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching, or ministering the Sacraments in the Congregation.

That men may enjoy the blessings of the Gospel it must first be preached to them. Preachers, therefore, must be sent (Rom. x. 15). Thus Christ sent forth His Apostles (S. John xx. 21); and the Mission was handed on by them to others, so that the setting apart of certain members with authority to preach the Word publicly, and to be her ministers in sacred ordinances, dates from the very beginning of the Church's existence (Acts xiii. 1-3, xiv. 23; Eph. iv. 11, 12; Phil. i. 1). Such ministers of the Church are spoken of in the New Testament as “ambassadors of Christ” (2 Cor. v. 20), “ministers of Christ” (1 Cor. iv. 1), or “of God” (2 Cor. vi. 4), and “stewards of the mysteries of God” (1 Cor. iv. 1: cf. Col. i. 25; Tit. i. 7); they cannot of themselves assume authority as such, but must be called to the office by God Himself (Acts xx. 28; Heb. v. 4).

(2.) THE NEED OF ORDINATION FOR THE CLERGY.

It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching, or ministering the Sacraments in the Congregation, before he be lawfully called and sent to execute the same.

We find in the New Testament :—

(a) That election by the people did not constitute a man a minister. See, e.g., Acts vi. 5, 6, where, after the Seven Deacons had been chosen by the whole body of the brethren, we read that they were admitted to their office by the imposition of the Apostles' hands.

(b) Neither did the express inward call of the Holy Spirit itself alone suffice. See Acts xiii. 2, 3, where we have the account of the Ordination of SS. Barnabas and Paul by imposition of hands in obedience to a Divine command,

although they had already received the call of the Holy Spirit.

(c) We gather, therefore, that, from the very foundation of the Church, *Ordination* has been considered *necessary*. See the passages above quoted, and notice especially how, when the Apostles themselves were passing away from the earth, provision was made for the permanence of a duly ordained ministry¹ (1 Tim. iii., iv. 14, v. 22; 2 Tim. i. 6, ii. 2; Tit. i. 5).² Thus the Threefold Ministry has come down to us by succession from the Apostles.

Cf. the Preface to the ORDINAL:—

“It is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scripture and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles’ time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ’s Church: Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. Which Offices were evermore had in such reverend Estimation, that no man might presume to execute any of them, except he were first called, tried, examined, and known to have such qualities as are requisite for the same; and also by publick Prayer, with Imposition of Hands, were approved and admitted thereunto by lawful Authority.”

¹ Several passages in the Epistle of S. Clement of Rome to the Corinthians (written 92-96 A.D.) are important in this connection:—

“Κατὰ χώρας οὐκ καὶ πόλεις κηρύσσοντες (scil. οἱ ἀπόστολοι) καθίστανον τὰς ἀρχαὶς αὐτῶν, δοκιμάσαντες τῷ πνεύματι, εἰς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους τῶν μελλόντων πιστεῦεν” (xlii. 4).

“Καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἡμῶν ἐγνωσαν διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὅτι ἐρίσ ἐσται ἐπὶ τοῦ δόξματος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς. Διὰ ταύτην οὐκ τὴν αἰτίαν πρόγυωσιν εἰληφότες τελείαν κατέστησαν τοὺς προειρημένους καὶ μεταξύ ἐπινομήν ἔδωκαν, ὅπως, ἐὰν κοιμηθῶσιν, διαδέξωνται ἕτεροι δεδοκιμασμένοι ἄνδρες τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτῶν. Τοὺς οὐκ κατασταθέντας ὑπ’ ἐκείνων (scil. ἀποστόλων) ἢ μεταξύ ὑφ’ ἑτέρων ἑλλογίμων ἀνδρῶν, συνευδοκησάσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας πασῆς, καὶ λειτουργήσαντας ἀμέμπτως τῷ ποιμνίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ ταπεινοφροσύνης, ἡσύχως, καὶ ἀβαναύσως, μεμαρτυρημένους τε πολλοὺς χρόνους ὑπὸ πάντων, τούτους οὐ δικαίως νομιζόμεν ἀποβάλλεσθαι τῆς λειτουργίας” (xlii. 1-3).

² In the Pastoral Epistles we may trace the development of the Threefold Ministry. Two grades of ministers of the Church are mentioned—

(i.) *διακόνους* (1 Tim. iii. 8);

(ii.) *πρεσβύτεροι*, or *ἐπισκόποι* (1 Tim. iii. 1); both these names being indifferently used for holders of one and the same office. Cf. Tit. i. 5-7; Acts xx. 17, 28.

Then (iii.) above these two orders we have the office held by Timothy and Titus at Ephesus and Crete respectively, with powers delegated by the Apostle S. Paul to ordain ministers (1 Tim. v. 22; Tit. i. 5), to take measures for ensuring the teaching of sound doctrine (1 Tim. i. 3, iv. 6, 13, 14; 2 Tim. i. 13, ii. 2, iv. 2-4; Tit. i. 9, 13, ii. 1, 2, 15), to administer discipline (1 Tim. iii. 10, v.; Tit. iii. 10), and to provide for the due order of the Church (1 Tim. iii. 15; Tit. i. 5). No official title is given to Timothy and Titus; but to this third and highest order the name *ἐπίσκοπος* was afterwards transferred.

(3.) WHOM ARE WE TO CONSIDER LAWFULLY ORDAINED?

Those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the Congregation, to call and send Ministers into the Lord’s vineyard.

The former part of the Article lays it down that Ministers must not be self-appointed; in this last clause it is declared that they must be appointed by those who have authority in the Church for this purpose; those are to be considered as lawfully ordained who are chosen and called by men who have public authority. It will be noticed that in the Latin text the words “*co-optati et adsciti*” correspond to the English “*chosen and called*”; both Latin words imply that Ministers must be admitted to their office by those who are themselves Ministers.

“By men who have public authority given unto them¹ in the Congregation”; i.e., *by the Bishops*. Episcopal Ordination is the necessary qualification in order to the exercising of Ministerial functions in the Church of England.

See the Preface to the ORDINAL:—

“And therefore, to the intent that these Orders may be continued, and reverently used and esteemed, in the [United] Church of England [and Ireland]; no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in the [United] Church of England [and Ireland], or suffered to execute any of the said Functions, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto, according to the Form hereafter following, or hath had formerly Episcopal Consecration, or Ordination.”

We see in the adoption of the Episcopal form of Government by the Church Universal from the earliest times the guiding

¹ The wording of the Article is somewhat vague here. We shall not be surprised at this if we recollect that the text still stands exactly as composed in 1552, when it was based upon, or drawn up with reference to, a previous Article which was the outcome of conferences between English and Lutheran divines (see § 1 above). The English Church itself has always held fast to the Episcopal government of the Church, and insisted on the necessity of Episcopal Ordination, in this respect retaining its organic unity with the pre-Reformation Church, and parting company with foreign Reformers, both Lutheran and Swiss. Certain individual bishops, who sympathised rather with the polity of Continental Reformed bodies than with the Order of the English Church, may have been guilty of irregularities (e.g., Archbishop Grindal, in Queen Elizabeth’s reign, licensed a certain John Morrison to officiate in England, who had only received Presbyterian orders in Scotland), but still the *Rule of the Church in this country has always been the same*.

hand of the Holy Spirit. The first serious departure from it was owing to the action of certain so-called Reformers in some countries (*e.g.*, in Germany, Geneva, and Scotland) in the sixteenth century.¹ Since that time we have had ample proof that Gospel Truth and the Divinely-appointed Constitution of the Church stand or fall together; where the latter is departed from the former is soon tampered with, or imperfectly held.

¹ It was not the wish of the earlier generation of Lutheran Reformers to abandon the historic constitution of the Church. *Cf.* Melancthon, *Apol. Augsburg Conf.*, VII. xiv. 23, 24 :—

“Hac de re in hoc conventu (*viz.* : at Augsburg) saepe testati sumus, nos summa voluntate cupere conservare politiam ecclesiasticam, et gradus in ecclesia factos etiam humana auctoritate. . . . Porro hic iterum volumus testatum, nos libenter conservaturos esse ecclesiasticam et canonicam politiam, si modo episcopi desinant in nostras ecclesias saevire.”

Owing to the hostility of the bishops the Lutheran Reformers were unable to secure the episcopal succession, and we find accordingly that episcopacy was gradually abandoned in those States which had espoused the cause of the Reformation. It was suppressed in Hesse in 1526, and in Denmark in 1536, but lingered in Prussia until 1587; while in Sweden, where the Reformation was carried out on Lutheran lines, the old episcopal arrangements were continued and remain to the present day.

In Switzerland, Zwingli, whose tendencies were at once Erastian and republican, abandoned episcopacy from the first, framing his ecclesiastical polity upon the republican model of the civil government. Calvin, on the other hand, not only expressed a willingness to recognise the authority of the bishops (when exercised without tyranny), but even declared that those who refuse obedience to such authority are worthy of anathema :—

“Itaque quicquid jubent (*scil.* episcopi) ac praescribunt, id necessario observandum esse contendunt a populo Christiano: qui violaverit, eum duplicis inobedientiae reum esse, quod Deo et ecclesiae sit rebellis. Sane si veri episcopi essent, aliquid eis in hac parte auctoritatis tribuerem, non quantum sibi postulant, sed quantum ad politiam ecclesiae rite ordinandam requiritur” (*INSTITUTES*, IV. x. 6).

“Talem nobis hierarchiam si exhibeant in qua sic emineant episcopi, ut Christo subesse non recusent, ut ab illo tanquam ab unico capite pendeant et ad ipsum referantur . . . tum vero nullo non anathemate dignos fatear, si qui erunt, qui non eam reverentur, summaque obedientia observant” (*De Necessitate Reform. Eccles.*).

ARTICLE XXIV

OF SPEAKING IN THE CONGREGATION
IN SUCH A TONGUE AS THE
PEOPLE UNDERSTANDETH.

DE PRECIBUS PUBLICIS DICENDIS
IN LINGUA VULGARI.

It is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God, and the custom of the Primitive Church, to have Publick Prayer in the Church, or to minister the Sacraments, in a tongue not understood of the people.

Lingua populo non intellecta publicas in Ecclesia preces peragere, aut Sacramenta administrare, Verbo Dei et Primitivae Ecclesiae consuetudini plane repugnat.

§ 1.—SOURCE.

Composed by the English Reformers.

§ 2.—OBJECT.

To reform the usage of the Church in the matter of the language used in Public Worship. The explanation of the use of Latin in the Western Church is to be found in the fact that at one time that language was understood all over Western Christendom. It was only by slow degrees that Latin ceased to be a living language, but in the lapse of centuries it gradually came about that the Church services, the language of which was stereotyped, were said in a tongue of which the bulk of the people understood less and less. So very gradual, however, was the decay of the language, that no definite time occurred for changing the language of the service-books until the Reformation. In 1553 the Article on this subject ran as follows :—

MENNE MUST SPEAKE IN THE CONGREGATION IN SOCHE TOUNG AS THE PEOPLE VNDERSTANDETH.

AGENDUM EST IN ECCLESIA LINGUA QUAE SIT POPULO NOTA.

It is moste semelie, and moste agreeable to the Woorde of God that in the congregation nothing be openlie readde, or spoken in a tongue vnknewen to the people, the whiche thinge S. Paule didde forbidde except some were presente that should declare the same.

Decentissimum est et Verbo Dei maxime congruit, ut nihil in Ecclesia publice legatur aut recitetur lingua populo ignota, idque Paulus fieri vetuit, nisi adesset qui interpretaretur.

THE COUNCIL OF TRENT (Session XXII., September 1562) decreed:—

“Etsi missa magnam contineat populi fidelis eruditionem, non tamen expedire visum est patribus, ut vulgari passim lingua celebraretur.”

Cf. CANON IX. of the same Session:—

“Si quis dixerit . . . lingua tantum vulgari Missam celebrari debere . . . anathema sit.”

The fact that the Church of Rome was holding fast to the use of the Latin language in the public services of the Church, doubtless accounts for the stronger form in which our Article was recast in 1563.

§ 3.—EXPOSITION.

The Article simply affirms that to have Publick Prayer in the Church, or to minister the Sacraments, in a tongue not understood of the people, is a thing plainly repugnant to—

(1.) the Word of God. See especially 1 Cor. xiv. 11–19.

The general rule laid down in Holy Scripture is, “Let all things be done unto edifying” (1 Cor. xiv. 26).

(2.) the custom of the Primitive Church.

It is quite certain that, in the earliest times, Christians in every land offered common Prayer and celebrated the Holy Eucharist in the vernacular. Thus the Liturgies of the Greek-speaking Churches of the East were Greek, and the Liturgy of the Church of Rome itself (at first a Greek-speaking community) was also Greek in the very earliest days; we may see a survival of this in the “Kyrie Eleison” still repeated before the Lord’s Prayer in the Mass.

It is to be noted that in this Article—

(1.) *The Church of England takes Holy Scripture as its Rule*, contrary to which nothing may be decreed (cf. Article XX.), and (2.) *takes the Primitive Church as its pattern*.

Throughout the Reformation period we find the authorities of the English Church constantly referring to the practice of the Primitive Church as their standard. In illustration of this we may quote the following passages:—

THE ACT OF UNIFORMITY, 1549.

“Haveinge eye and respecte to the most sincere and pure Christian Religion taught by the Scripture, as to the usages of the Primatyve Church.”

THE COMMINATION, 1549:

“Brethren, in the primitive Church there was a godlye discipline . . . until the saide discipline may bee restored agayne; (which thynge is muche to bee wysshed).”

THE ORDINAL (Preface), 1549:

“From the Apostles’ tyme there hath bene these orders of Ministers in Christes Church.”

THE ACT OF UNIFORMITY, 1552:

The Prayer Book of 1549 is spoken of as “a verye godly Order, agreeable to the Worde of God, and the Primative Church.”

“HOMILY AGAINST PERIL OF IDOLATRY, 1562:

“The usage of the primitive Church, which was most pure and incorrupt” (p. 180).

“And there is no doubt but the primitive Church next the Apostles’ times was most pure” (p. 212).

“The primitive Church, which is specially to be followed as most incorrupt and pure” (p. 231).

THE CANONS, 1604:

“Forasmuch as the ancient Fathers of the Church, led by example of the Apostles, appointed prayers and fasts to be used at the solemn Ordering of Ministers; and to that purpose allotted certain times, in which only Sacred Orders might be given or conferred: we, following their holy and religious example, do constitute and decree . . .” (Canon XXXI.).

Extracts are here appended from some of the more important Continental Confessions, to show how Reformers of various schools dealt with the question of the language to be used in Public worship:—

AUGSBURG CONFESSIO, Part II. Art. III., “De Missa”:

“Servantur et usitatae ceremoniae fere omnes, praeterquam quod Latinis cantionibus admiscantur alicubi Germanicae, quae additae sunt ad docendum populum. Nam ad hoc unum opus est ceremoniis, ut doceant imperitos. Et non modo Paulus praecipit uti lingua intellecta populo in ecclesia, sed etiam ita constitutum est humano jure.”

WURTEMBERG CONFESSIO, Art. XXVII.:

“Sicut enim conciones et precatationes lingua Ecclesiae nota habendae sunt, ita et sacramenta noto sermone dispensanda sunt.

Etsi enim licebit aliquoties peregrina lingua propter studiosos uti, tamen consensus Catholicae Ecclesiae hoc exigit, ut necessaria ministeria Ecclesiae fiant sermone vernaculo."

SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION, Art. XXII.:

"Taceant ergo omnes peregrinae linguae in coetibus sacris. Omnia proponantur lingua vulgari, et quae eo in loco ab hominibus in coetu intelligatur."

ARTICLE XXV

OF THE SACRAMENTS.

DE SACRAMENTIS.

Sacraments ordained of Christ, be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession: but rather they be certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace, and God's good will towards us, by the which He doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in Him.

There are two Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord.

Those five, commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures: but yet have not like nature of Sacraments with Baptism and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.

The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about: but that we should duly use them. And in such only as worthily receive the same, they have a wholesome effect or operation: but they that receive them unworthily, purchase to themselves damnation, as Saint Paul saith.

Sacramenta a Christo instituta, non tantum sunt notae professionis Christianorum, sed certa quaedam potius testimonia, et efficacia signa gratiae atque bonae in nos voluntatis Dei, per quae invisibiliter ipse in nobis operatur, nostramque fidem in se, non solum excitat, verum etiam confirmat.

Duo a Christo Domino nostro in Evangelio instituta sunt Sacramenta, scilicet, Baptismus et Coena Domini.

Quinque illa vulgo nominata Sacramenta, scilicet, Confirmatio, Poenitentia, Ordo, Matrimonium, et Extrema Unctio, pro Sacramentis Evangelicis habenda non sunt, ut quae partim a prava Apostolorum imitatione proflexerunt, partim vitae status sunt in Scripturis quidem probati, sed Sacramentorum eandem cum Baptismo et Coena Domini rationem non habentes: ut quae signum aliquod visibile seu ceremoniam a Deo institutam non habeant.

Sacramenta non in hoc instituta sunt a Christo, ut spectarentur, aut circumferrentur, sed ut rite illis uteremur: Et in his duntaxat qui digne percipiunt, salutarem habent effectum: Qui vero indigne percipiunt, damnationem (ut inquit Paulus) sibi ipsis acquirunt.

§ 1. SOURCE.

The first clause of the Article is evidently taken from Article IX. of the XIII. ARTICLES of 1538:—

“Docemus, quod Sacramenta quae per Verbum Dei instituta sunt, non tantum sint notae professionis inter Christianos, sed magis certa quaedam testimonia et efficacia signa gratiae, et bonae voluntatis Dei erga nos, per quae Deus invisibiliter operatur in nobis, et suam gratiam in nos invisibiliter diffundit, siquidem ea rite susceperimus; quodque per ea excitatur et confirmatur fides in his qui eis utuntur.”

The wording of this passage of the XIII. Articles is in its turn traceable to the AUGSBURG CONFESSION, Part I. Art. XIII.:—

“De usu sacramentorum docent, quod sacramenta instituta sint, non modo ut sint notae professionis inter homines, sed magis ut sint signa et testimonia voluntatis Dei erga nos, ad excitandam et confirmandam fidem in his qui utuntur proposita.”

A careful comparison shows us that, while adopting the phraseology of the Augsburg Confession, the English divines made very significant additions to it.

In the XLII. ARTICLES of 1553 the Articles on the Sacraments ran thus:—

[Our Lorde Jesus Christe hathe knitte together a companie of newe people with Sacramentes, moste fewe in numbre, most easie to bee kepte, moste excellent in significatione, as is Baptisme, and the Lorde's Supper.]

The Sacramentes were not ordeined of Christe to be gased upon, or to be carried about, but that we should rightlie use them. And in soche onely as worthelie receiue the same, thei haue an wholesome effecte, and operacione, [and yet not that of the woorke wrought, as some men speake, whiche worde, as it is straunge, and vnknowne to holie Scripture; so it engendreth no godlie, but a verie superstitious sense.] But thei that receiue the Sacramentes vnwoorthelie purchase to theimselues damnatione, as Saincte Paule saith.

[Dominus noster Jesus Christus Sacramentis numero paucissimis, observatu facillimis, significatione praestantissimis, societatem novi populi colligavit, sicuti est Baptismus et Coena Domini.]

Sacramenta non instituta sunt Christo ut spectarentur aut circumferrentur, sed ut rite illis uteremur: Et in his duntaxat qui digne percipiunt, salutarem habent effectum, [idque non ex opere, ut quidam loquuntur, operato; quae vox, ut peregrina est et Sacris literis ignota, sic parit sensum minime pium sed admodum superstitiosum.] Qui vero indignè percipiunt, damnationem (ut inquit Paulus) sibi ipsis acquirunt.

Sacramentes ordeined by the worde of God be not onely badges, and tokens of Christien mennes professione, but rather thei bee certeine sure witnesses, and effectuell signes of grace, and Goddes good will towarde vs, by the whiche he dothe worke inuisible in vs, and dothe not onlie quicken, but also strengthen, and confirme our faith in him.

Sacramenta per Verbum Dei instituta, non tantum sunt notae professionis Christianorum, sed certa quaedam potius testimonia et efficacia signa gratiae atque bonae in nos voluntatis Dei, per quae invisibiliter ipse in nobis operatur, nostramque fidem in se non solum excitat, verum etiam confirmat.

This Article was entirely recast in 1563.

(1.) The opening paragraph¹ (enclosed in brackets above) was altogether omitted.

(2.) In 1553 the idea was condemned that the Sacraments have a wholesome effect, arising “*ex opere operato*.” This phrase had been understood, at the time, to mean, that the mere act of receiving, altogether apart from a right disposition in the recipient, confers the grace of the Sacrament. Such an opinion could not, of course, be too strongly condemned.²

The condemnation, however, in reality arose from a misunderstanding of the meaning of the expression. “*Ex opere operato*” was, in the scholastic terminology, opposed to “*ex opere operantis*,” and was meant to exclude all idea of human merit; it signified that Grace is given to man upon performance of the outward work, or action, to which God has attached the promise, and was

¹ This paragraph was taken almost verbatim from S. Augustine's Epistle to Januarius. The same words had been made use of by Alesius in the debate on the subject of the Sacraments in 1536.

² The theory that the Sacraments confer grace “*ex opere operato*” was also condemned in the following formularies:—

AUGSBURG CONFESSION, Part I. Art. XIII:

“Dannant igitur illos, qui docent, quod sacramenta ex opere operato iustificent, nec docent fidem requiri in usu sacramentorum, quae credat remitti peccata.”

XIII. ARTICLES, Art. IX.:

“Neque enim in illis verum est, quod quidam dicunt, sacramenta conferre gratiam ex opere operato, sine bono motu utentis, nam in ratione utentibus necessum est, ut fides etiam utentis accedat, per quam credat illis promissionibus, et accipiat res promissas, quae per sacramenta conferantur.”

SAXON CONFESSION, Art. XV.:

“Aperte damnamus portentosum errorem monachorum, qui scripserunt, summionem mereri remissionem peccatorum, et quidem ex opere operato, sine bono motu utentis. Haec pharisaica imaginatio pugnat cum dicto, Justus sua fide vivet.”

not meant to imply that Grace is given for any merit in the performance of the action by man (this would be "*ex opere operantis*"). Thus the spiritual partaking of Christ, whereby we dwell in Him, and He in us, is not, ordinarily,¹ granted to us apart from the performance of the outward action (viz., the partaking of the consecrated Elements in the Eucharist), to which Christ Himself has attached the promise of the spiritual blessing. This efficacy of the Sacrament is not, of course, owing to any virtue or merit in our action, but solely to the work performed by Divine agency through it.

The COUNCIL OF TRENT (Session VII.) affirmed the efficacy of the Sacraments "*ex opere operato*."

See CANON VIII. :—

"Si quis dixerit, per ipsa novae legis Sacramenta ex opere operato non conferri gratiam, sed solam fidem divinae promissionis ad gratiam consequendam sufficere; anathema sit."

At the same time the Council so worded its declarations as to guard the meaning of the expression.

Cf. CANON VI. (of the same Session) :—

"Si quis dixerit, Sacramenta novae legis non continere gratiam, quam significant, aut gratiam ipsam non ponentibus obicem non conferre . . . anathema sit."

When the phrase "*ex opere operato*" had been cleared from the objectionable sense which had become attached to it the Reformers could no longer object to it, and the clause in this Article (enclosed in brackets above) which condemned it was, therefore, removed in 1563.

¹ We must insert this qualifying word, because we doubt not that God gives the spiritual grace apart from the performance of the action commanded, when the performance of such action has been rendered impossible by adverse circumstances. We are bound to use the Sacraments wherever they may be had, but God in His operation is not tied to them.

Cf. the Rubric in the Order for "the Communion of the Sick" :—

"But if a man, either by reason of extremity of sickness, or for want of warning in due time to the Curate, or for lack of company to receive with him, or by any other just impediment, do not receive the Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood, the Curate shall instruct him, that if he do truly repent him of his sins, and stedfastly believe that Jesus Christ hath suffered death upon the Cross for him, and shed his Blood for his redemption, earnestly remembering the benefits he hath thereby, and giving him hearty thanks therefore, he doth eat and drink the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ profitably to his soul's health, although he do not receive the Sacrament with his mouth."

(3.) The concluding paragraph was transposed and made the first paragraph of the new Article.

(4.) The middle portion of the Article as it now stands was composed and inserted.

One small change has been since made in the wording of this section. As originally drawn up in 1563, besides the statement that the "five commonly called Sacraments . . . are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel," it also contained a very express declaration that "Penance"¹ hath not the like nature of a Sacrament with Baptism and the Lord's Supper :—

<p>"But yet have not like nature of Sacraments with Baptism and the Lord's Supper. In which sort neither is Penance, for that it hath not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God."</p>	<p>"Sed Sacramentorum eandem cum Baptismo et Coena Domini rationem non habentes: quomodo nec poenitentia, ut quae signum aliquod visibile seu ceremoniam a Deo institutam non habeant."</p>
--	---

The words "quomodo nec poenitentia" and the corresponding words in the English text were omitted when the Articles were re-issued in 1571.

§ 2. OBJECT.

(1.) To condemn disparagement of the Sacraments by declaring that they are more than badges or tokens of our profession.

(2.) To distinguish Baptism and the Holy Eucharist from other ordinances "commonly called sacraments" by claiming for them the special title of "Sacraments of the Gospel."

(3.) To emphasise the necessity of a right disposition in the recipient.

§ 3. EXPOSITION.

THE NAME "SACRAMENT."

The Latin "sacramentum" was used in early times as a rendering of the Greek *μυστήριον*. It is thus used, *e.g.*, in the Vulgate version of Eph. i. 9, iii. 3, v. 32; Col. i. 27; 1 Tim. iii. 16; Rev. i. 20.

Our word "Sacrament" therefore simply represents the Greek

¹ This special reference to "Penance" in the Article of 1563 was probably due to the fact that some had been inclined to class that ordinance as a third "Sacrament of the Gospel." The X. ARTICLES (1536) had treated of three Sacraments—(1) "The Sacrament of Baptism;" (2) "The Sacrament of Penance;" (3) "The Sacrament of the Altar." The Lutheran Reformers also gave an honourable place in their system to Confession and Absolution. Melancthon, in the "Apology" for the Augsburg Confession, writes (p. 167) :—

"Absolutio proprie dici potest sacramentum poenitentiae."

name "Mystery," which has been applied to the sacred ordinances of the Church from primitive times,¹ and which is still the usual name of the Sacraments in the Eastern Church at the present day. Other derivations of the name have been proposed; *e.g.*, it is sometimes stated that the ordinances of the Church obtained the name of "Sacraments" owing to the resemblance of the initiatory rite of Baptism, wherein the Christian pledges his fidelity to Christ, to the ceremony attending the Roman soldier's taking the oath of loyalty (*sacramentum*) to his commander. However suggestive this comparison may be, it does not appear to be the true account of the origin of the term "Sacrament" as applied to the ordinances of the Church.

The word "Sacrament," meaning "Mystery," is capable of a very wide signification.

Cf. the HOMILY OF COMMON PRAYER AND SACRAMENTS (p. 377):—

"In a general acceptation the name of a Sacrament may be attributed to anything whereby an holy thing is signified."

But the word is commonly used by the Church in a more restricted sense to denote—

"Visible signs expressly commanded in the New Testament, whereunto is annexed the promise of free forgiveness of our sin and of our holiness and joining in Christ" (*Ibid.*, p. 376).

See also the explanation given in the CHURCH CATECHISM:—

"*Question.* What meanest thou by this word *Sacrament*?"

"*Answer.* I mean an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us, ordained by Christ Himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof."

THE SACRAMENTAL PRINCIPLE.

(a) God always, by His very nature, wishes to declare Himself. From all eternity, even before the universe was made, He has done so, by the eternal generation of the Son, which

¹ *Cf.*, *e.g.*, the opening words of the first of the series of Lectures delivered (A.D. 386) by S. Cyril of Jerusalem on the Sacraments:—

Ἐπόθουν ὑμῶν καὶ πάλαι, ὃ γνήσια καὶ περιπόθητα τῆς ἐκκλησίας τέκνα, περὶ τῶν πνευματικῶν τούτων καὶ ἐπουρανίων διαλεχθῆναι μυστηρίων.

Ἄλλως τε καὶ χωρητικοὶ τῶν θειοτέρων κατέστητε μυστηρίων, θεοῦ καὶ ζωοποιῶ βαπτισματος ἀξιοθέντες.

may thus be spoken of as a Sacrament. The Son, or Word, of God, is something outward to declare God Himself, Who is hidden (Col. i. 15).

(b) God declares Himself in Creation. The visible creation is Sacramental, being an outward sign of the invisible God (Rom. i. 20).

(c) God has declared Himself more particularly in the Incarnation. The human body of Jesus living amongst men was an outward and visible sign of the dwelling of God with men, and of His union with man (Col. ii. 9).

We see, therefore, that when God uses Sacraments in the Church, His action is most suited to His own nature. He acts upon that same principle in accordance with which He has always acted.

We now come to examine the statements of our Article in detail. It treats of—

(I.) THE NATURE OF SACRAMENTS.

(A.) WHAT SACRAMENTS ARE NOT.

Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession.

Zwingli held that the grace of God is always given to the spirit of man immediately.

Cf. FIDEI RATIO, § 7:—

"Credo, imo scio omnia sacramenta tam abesse ut gratiam conferant, ut ne adferant quidem aut dispensent. Qua in re forsans audacior tibi videri potero, potentissime Caesar.¹ Sed stat sententia. Nam gratia ut a spiritu divino fit aut datur (loquor autem latine cum gratiae nomine utor, pro venia scilicet indulgentia et gratuito beneficio) ita donum istud ad solum spiritum pervenit. Dux autem vel vehiculum spiritui non est necessarium, ipse enim est virtus et latio qua cuncta feruntur, non qui ferri opus habeat; neque id unquam legimus in scripturis sacris, quod sensibilia, qualia sacramenta sunt, certo secum ferrent spiritum, sed si sensibilia unquam lata sunt cum spiritu, jam spiritus fuit qui tulit, non sensibilia."

According to this view Sacraments can never be means of grace. With regard to Baptism, therefore, Zwingli taught that it is merely the external badge of membership in the Christian community, or a sort of certificate of spiritual life, which, however, if imparted at all, was imparted independently of the material element.

¹ The treatise was addressed to the Emperor (Charles V.).

FIDEI RATIO, § 7 :—

“Baptismo igitur Ecclesia publice recipit eum, qui prius receptus est per gratiam. Non ergo adfert gratiam baptismus, sed gratiam factam esse ei cui datur, Ecclesiae testatur. Credo igitur, O Caesar, sacramentum esse sacrae rei, hoc est factae gratiae, signum. Credo esse invisibilis gratiae, quae scilicet Dei munere facta et data est, visibilem figuram sive formam, hoc est visibile exemplum, quod tamen fere analogiam quandam rei per spiritum gestae prae se fert. Credo testimonium publicum esse.”

Cf. the same writer's words in his treatise “De Baptismo” :—

“Baptismus foederis vel pacti signum est, non in hunc finem institutum, ut eum qui baptizari solet justum efficiat, vel fidem baptizati confirmet. Impossible enim est ut res aliqua externa fidem hominis internam confirmet et stabiliat” (Works, ii. 63).

The same principle is also laid down by Zwingli with regard to the Eucharist :—

“Nihil ergo eorum, quae externa sunt, fidem firmare vel nos in illa certiores reddere potest. Quod idem simili ratione de Eucharistia quoque, vel Coena Domini pronunciamus” (Works, ii. 63).

This view of the Sacraments had spread widely on the Continent, and had also found its way into this country. It is expressly repudiated in our Article, as it was also by Luther, who denounced the opinion as “diabolical,” and by Calvin, who characterised the teaching of the Zurich Reformer as “profana,”¹ “falsa et pernicioso.”² Even those of our English divines who went furthest in their agreement with the “Reformed” theology rejected the idea that the Sacraments are bare signs;³ *e.g.*, Hooper thus writes to Bucer (from Zurich, June 19, 1548) :—

“You write word, reverend sir, that you cannot believe the sacraments to be bare signs. Far be such a belief from the most unlearned Christian! . . . I do not write for the sake of dispute, but that I may testify to you, that the sacraments with us are not bare signs” (Original Letters, i. 47, 48).

¹ In a letter to Viret, 1542.

² In a letter to Zebedæus, 1539.

³ Zwingli himself was not always consistent, for at the Conference at Marburg (1529) he signed the following statement :—

“Baptismum esse sacramentum ad fidem a Deo institutum et praeceptum, non nudum signum, aut tesseram professionis Christianae, sed et opus Dei, in quo fides nostra requiritur, et per quam regeneramur.”

Latimer expresses himself more strongly :—

“In all ages the devil hath stirred up some light heads to esteem the Sacraments but lightly, as to be empty and bare signs” (Ridley's Works, p. 114).

Cf. also the following extracts from formularies :—

AUGSBURG CONFESSIO, Part I. Art. XIII. :

“De usu Sacramentorum docent, quod sacramenta instituta sint, non modo ut sint notae professionis inter homines, sed magis ut sint signa et testimonia voluntatis Dei erga nos, ad excitandam et confirmandem fidem in his qui utuntur proposita.”

SAXON CONFESSIO, Art. XIII. :

“Quae tamen non sunt tantum signa professionis, sed multo magis (ut vetustas dixit) signa gratiae.”

SCOTCH CONFESSIO, Art. XXI. :

“Itaque vanitatem eorum, qui affirmant, Sacramenta nil aliud quam mera et nuda signa esse, omnino damnamus.”

BELGIC CONFESSIO, Art. XXXIII. :

“Itaque signa illa minime vana sunt aut vacua.”

In the REFORMATIO LEGUM the following statement is made on the subject (“De Haeresibus,” Cap. 17) :—

“Magna quoque temeritas illorum est, qui sacramenta sic extenuant ut ea pro nudis signis, et externis tantum indicibus capi velint, quibus tanquam notis hominum Christianorum religio possit a caeteris internosci.”

(B.) WHAT SACRAMENTS ARE.¹

(i.) Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession.

The Church is a visible society, Baptism the initiatory rite admitting to Church membership, and the Holy Eucharist the pledge and security of union. The Sacraments may thus be looked upon as badges or tokens of our profession as Christians. *Cf.* 1 Cor. i. 13–17, where S. Paul's argu-

¹ With the wording of our Article we may compare Calvin's definition :—

“Videtur autem mihi haec simplex et propria fore definitio, si dixerimus externum esse symbolum, quo benevolentiae erga nos suae promissiones conscientibus nostris Dominus obsignat, ad sustinendam fidei nostrae imbecillitatem; et nos vicissim pietatem erga eum nostram, tam coram eo et angelis, quam apud homines testamur. Licet etiam majore compendio aliter definire; ut vocetur divinae in nos gratiae testimonium, externo signo confirmatum, cum mutua nostrae erga ipsum pietatis testificatione” (INSTITUTES, IV. xiv. 1).

ment seems to imply that Baptism was regarded as an acknowledgment on the part of a convert of allegiance to his new Master.

But Sacraments have a far higher significance than this—

(ii.) **Rather they be certain sure witnesses . . . of grace, and God's good will towards us.**

The Sacraments are pledges of the Divine Will in regard to man, and sureties of the truth of God's promises; they are "pledges to assure us" of "the inward and spiritual grace given unto us" (CHURCH CATECHISM).

When it is said that they are "certain sure witnesses," it is meant that they are such witnesses of God's grace and good will as we may feel confident will never deceive us.

(iii.) **Effectual signs¹ of grace, and God's good will towards us.**

In other words, a Sacrament actually effects that of which it is the sign. Baptism is a sign of Regeneration, and actually effects the same. Thus in the Baptismal Office, immediately after the act of Baptism, the Priest says, "Seeing now, dearly beloved brethren, that *this Child is regenerate*" (cf. Tit. iii. 5; 1 S. Pet. iii. 21).

Again, the Holy Eucharist is an outward sign of our Communion with Christ, and the partaking of it actually effects that Communion (1 Cor. x. 16). Cf. the words of the long Exhortation in the Communion Service:—

"For as the benefit is great, if with a true penitent heart and lively faith we receive that holy Sacrament; (for then we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ, and drink His blood; then we dwell in Christ, and Christ in us; we are one with Christ, and Christ with us)." . . .

(iv.) **By the which He doth work invisibly in us.**

The words "by the which" refer to the Sacraments, as is clear in the Latin text (*per quae*). The Sacraments are thus the channels whereby the grace of God flows into the soul; they are the "means whereby we receive" the inward and spiritual grace (CHURCH CATECHISM).

We should note that God is declared to be the efficient

¹ We may illustrate the meaning of the expression from Cranmer's "Answer to Gardiner" (Works, vol. iii. p. 38):—

"They be no vain nor bare tokens, as you would persuade (for a bare token is that which betokeneth only and giveth nothing, as a painted fire which giveth neither light nor heat); but in the due ministration of the Sacraments God is present, working with His Word and Sacraments."

Cause, Who confers grace by the Sacraments; the Sacraments themselves are not efficient, but instrumental, causes of grace. Canon VI. of Session VII. of the COUNCIL OF TRENT (quoted above, p. 176), speaks of the Sacraments as "conferring" grace.

With the wording of our Article of the BELGIC CONFES-
SION, Art. XXXIII. :—

"Sunt enim Sacramenta signa, ac symbola visibilia rerum inter-
narum et invisibilium, per quae ceu per media Deus ipse virtute
Spiritus Sancti in nobis agit."

(v.) **And doth not only quicken (excitat), but also strengthen and confirm our faith in Him.**

This clause is directly opposed to the Zwinglian theory of the Sacraments; see the passages from Zwingli quoted above, p. 180.

(2.) **THE NUMBER OF SACRAMENTS.**

There are two Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord.

Of Sacramental Ordinances our Church gives a place of special honour to those two, the institution of which by our Lord Himself is expressly recorded in the New Testament, viz. :—

(a.) Baptism (S. Matt. xxviii. 19), and

(b.) The Lord's Supper (1 Cor. xi. 23-26).

Cf. CHURCH CATECHISM :—

"*Question.* How many Sacraments hath Christ ordained in His Church?

"*Answer.* Two only, as generally necessary to salvation, that is to say, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord."

The position of the English Church is well illustrated by the REFORMATIO LEGUM, "De Sacramentis," Cap. 2. Quid in Sacramento quaerendum sit :—

"Ad Sacramenti perfectionem tria concurrere debent. Primum evidens est et illustris nota, quae manifeste cerni possit. Secundum est Dei promissum, quod externo signo nobis repraesentatur et plane confirmatur. Tertium est Dei praeceptum, quo necessitas nobis imponitur, ista partim faciendi, partim commemorandi; quae tria cum autoritate Scripturarum in Baptismo solum occurrant, et Eucharistia, nos haec duo sola pro veris et propriis novi testamenti sacramentis ponimus."

See also the **HOMILY OF COMMON PRAYER AND SACRAMENTS** (p. 376):—

“And as for the number of them, if they should be considered according to the exact signification of a Sacrament, namely, for visible signs expressly commanded in the New Testament, whereunto is annexed the promise of free forgiveness of our sin and of our holiness and joining in Christ, there be but two, namely, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord.”

The express limitation of the term “Sacrament,” as a definite title, to seven ordinances of the Church appears to be traceable to Peter Lombard (d. 1164), who, in the Fourth Book of his “Sentences,” gives the name in its narrower sense to those seven ordinances which were subsequently recognised, at the Council of Florence (1430), and at the Council of Trent, as *the Sacraments of the Church*.¹

See Canon I. of Session VII. of the **COUNCIL OF TRENT** (March 1547):—

“Si quis dixerit, Sacramenta novae legis non fuisse omnia a Jesu Christo Domino nostro instituta; aut esse plura vel pauciora quam septem, videlicet: Baptismum, Confirmationem, Eucharistiam, Poenitentiam, Extremam Unctionem, Ordinem, et Matrimonium; aut etiam aliquod horum septem non esse vere et proprie Sacramentum; anathema sit.”

Cf. the **CREED OF POPE PIUS IV.**:—

“Profiteor quoque septem esse vere et proprie Sacramenta novae legis, a Jesu Christo, Domino nostro, instituta, atque ad salutem humani generis, licet non omnia singulis necessaria . . . illaque gratiam conferre.”

The Eastern Church also recognises the same **Seven Sacraments**. See, *e.g.*, the “Holy Catechism” by N. Bernardaces (p. 22):—

“Q. How many Mysteries are there, and what are they?”

“A. Seven—(1) Baptism; (2) Unction or Holy Ointment;² (3) the Eucharist or Holy Communion; (4) Penance or Confession; (5) Holy Orders; (6) Marriage; and (7) Prayer-oil.”³

The formularies of the Lutheran or Saxon school, when dealing with the Sacraments, treat of two only, but at the same time

¹ In England the **BISHOPS' BOOK** (1537) and the **KING'S BOOK** (1543) acknowledged the Seven Sacraments.

² Corresponding to our Confirmation.

³ *I.e.*, or anointing the sick.

they do not, as a rule, expressly exclude the other five ordinances from the number of the Sacraments. The **WURTEMBERG CONFESSION**, however, argues at length against the reception of these five as Sacraments of the Church.

The Confessions of the “Reformed” departed much further in this matter, as in most other points, from the position of the Roman Church. The number of Sacraments is by them more expressly limited to two:—

Cf. **FRENCH CONFESSION**, Art. XXXV.:

“Agnosimus duo tantum Sacramenta toti Ecclesiae communia.”

SCOTCH CONFESSION, Art. XXI.:

“Nunc tempore Evangelii, nos duo solum habere praecipua a Christo instituta Sacramenta, agnosimus et confitemur, quae ab omnibus illis utenda praecipiuntur, qui volunt corporis ipsius membra haberi, scilicet Baptismus et Coena vel mensa Domini, quae vulgo communio Corporis et Sanguinis ejus vocatur.”

BELGIC CONFESSION, Art. XXXIII.:

“Praeterea sufficit nobis is Sacramentorum numerus, quem Christus ipse verus et unicus Doctor noster instituit. Sunt vero illa duo duntaxat, nimirum Sacramentum Baptismi, et sacrae Coenae Domini nostri Jesu Christi.”

The **SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION**, while it affirms (in Article XIX.) that there are only two Sacraments of the Church, goes on to speak in very disparaging terms of some of those other ordinances which were counted as Sacraments in the times preceding the Reformation:—

“Novi populi Sacramenta sunt Baptismus et Coena Dominica. Sunt qui sacramenta novi populi septem numerent. Ex quibus nos poenitentiam, ordinationem ministrorum, non papisticam quidem illam, sed apostolicam, et matrimonium, agnosimus instituta esse Dei utilia, sed non sacramenta. Confirmatio et Extrema unctio, inventa sunt hominum, quibus nullo cum damno carere potest ecclesia. Neque illa nos in nostris ecclesiis habemus. Nam habent illa quaedam, quae minime probare possumus.”

(3.) **THE FIVE SACRAMENTAL ORDINANCES.**

Those five, commonly called **Sacraments**, that is to say, **Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction**, are not to be counted for **Sacraments of the Gospel**.

Besides the two great Sacraments ordained by Christ, there are other ordinances of the Church which have a sacramental nature (*i.e.*, which are “an outward and

visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace"), and are therefore "commonly called Sacraments"; yet they are not to be put upon the same level with Baptism and the Holy Eucharist; they have not like nature of Sacraments with Baptism and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God. Although the two great Sacraments are thus separated from the other five ordinances named, sacramental character is not denied to these ordinances; on the other hand, the writers of our formularies acknowledge or imply, in several passages, that they are in some sense Sacraments. See, *e.g.* :—

HOMILY OF SWEARING, Part I. (p. 74) :—

"By like holy promise the Sacrament of Matrimony knitteth man and wife in perpetual love."

HOMILY OF COMMON PRAYER AND SACRAMENTS (p. 377) :—

"For this visible sign, I mean laying on of hands, is not expressly commanded in the New Testament to be used in Absolution, as the visible signs in Baptism and the Lord's Supper are; and therefore Absolution is no such Sacrament as Baptism and the Communion are. And, though the Ordering of Ministers hath his visible sign and promise, yet it lacks the promise of remission of sin, as all other Sacraments besides do. Therefore neither it nor any other Sacrament else be such Sacraments as Baptism and the Communion are."

We must now proceed to speak a little more in detail of the five Ordinances named in the Article, and to indicate the position they occupy in the system of our Church.

(A.) Confirmation.

The name "Confirmation" is traced by some to S. Ambrose,¹ but does not seem to have been in common use before the sixth century.²

In the New Testament we have mention of the ordinance

¹ Cf. "De Mysteriis," vii. 42 :—

"Ye have received the spiritual seal. . . . God the Father hath signed you, Christ our Lord hath confirmed you, and, as ye are taught by the apostolic lection, hath given you the pledge of the Spirit in your hearts."

² Probably the earliest example of the unqualified use of the title "Confirmation," of which we can definitely fix the date, occurs in a treatise of Paschasius, a deacon of Rome (d. 512 A.D.). That writer, alluding to Acts xix. 4-6, says :—

"See how great is the power of the Holy Spirit! In Baptism is bestowed the remission of sins; in the coming of the Holy Spirit gifts of supernatural powers are conferred, and miraculous signs are performed by the confirmed" ("De Spiritu Sancto," ii. 4).

itself as administered by the Apostles to the newly baptized. In Acts viii. 14-17 we read that SS. Peter and John were sent to Samaria, and that by imposition of their hands a special gift of the Holy Ghost was imparted to those who had been previously baptized by Philip. Again, in Acts xix. 4-6 we read of special gifts of the Spirit through the imposition of S. Paul's hands upon those whom he had previously baptized. See also Heb. vi. 2, where the "laying on of hands" is spoken of, and apparently connected with Baptism.

In early Christian literature the ordinance is usually called "Chrism,"¹ or anointing, and "the Seal."

The outward sign in Confirmation is the laying on of hands; the inward grace, a special gift of the Holy Spirit. The spiritual life, having been begun in Baptism, is strengthened by the imparting the plenary gift of the Holy Spirit to those confirmed. The Church therefore gives a special injunction to the Godparents at the close of the Baptismal Service :—

"Ye are to take care that this Child be brought to the Bishop to be confirmed by him." . . .

In the East the "Chrism" has always been ministered with Baptism, but in the Western Church Baptism and Confirmation have been separated for nearly a thousand years. This dissociation of the two rites may be traced to two causes :—

(a.) In the early Church Baptism was normally administered at special seasons (Easter and Pentecost), in the presence of the Bishop, and the baptized were then confirmed immediately upon leaving the font. The extension of the administration of Baptism to other times, when the Bishop, who alone could confirm,² was not present, led to the separation of the two ordinances, Confirmation being administered, as it now is, by the Bishop in periodical visits.³

¹ This is the usual name in the Eastern Church at the present day; cf. "Orthodox Confession" (p. 161) :—

Τὸ δεύτερον μυστήριον εἶναι τὸ μύρον τοῦ χρίσματος.

² Exceptions have been allowed to this, especially in the Eastern Church, where Confirmation may be validly administered by every priest, though the Chrism must have been consecrated by a bishop. Tradition, however, from the first points to the Bishop as the minister of this ordinance, and in the passages of the New Testament already referred to it is recorded as administered by Apostles alone.

³ The 60th CANON (of 1604) orders the Bishop, or his Suffragan, to confirm at the customary triennial visitation, but in modern times it has been found necessary to hold "Confirmations" more frequently.

(b.) The growth of the practice of Infant Baptism also contributed to the dissociation of that Sacrament from Confirmation, it being felt that the latter rite was scarcely applicable in its full significance to the baptized infant.

In the English Church, since 1662, a renewal of Baptismal vows has been required of the Candidate before Confirmation, a feature peculiar to the English rite. We must not, of course, fall into the error of supposing that personal responsibility begins with the day of Confirmation; on the contrary, in the Baptismal Office, the Godparents are exhorted:—

“Ye must remember, that it is your parts and duties to see that this infant be taught, so soon as he shall be able to learn, what a solemn vow, promise, and profession, he hath here made by you.”

From what has been said it is clear that our Church regards “Confirmation” as of perpetual obligation, and gives it a very important place in the spiritual life of her children.¹

With the position taken up by the Church of England we may contrast what is said in some of the Continental Confessions of the Reformation period:—

SAXON CONFESSION, Art. XIX.:

“In ritu confirmationis, fiebat exploratio doctrinae, in qua singuli recitabant summam doctrinae, et palam profitebantur se improbare furores ethnicos et haereticos, et velle se esse et manere verae Ecclesiae membra, et non discessuros a vera sententia, quam tunc profitebantur. Hic mos erat utilis ad erudiendos homines, et retinendos in vera agnitione Dei. Ac in ecclesiis nostris similia fiunt in catechesi juniorum, et in privata confessione, in qua pastores doctrinam populi explorant. Sed ritus confirmationis, quem nunc episcopi retinent, quid est nisi inanis umbra?”

WURTEMBERG CONFESSION, Art. XI.:

“Non est nobis dubium, quin Apostoli initio revelati et confirmati in die Pentecostes Evangelii, contulerint impositione manuum admirandum donum Spiritus sancti credentibus in Christum, ut variis linguis loquerentur. Et sentimus utilissi-

¹ In addition to being (a) a strengthening of the spiritual life, begun in Baptism, by the special gift of the Holy Spirit, and (b) a solemn renewal of Baptismal vows, Confirmation is also (c) the entrance to the full privileges of membership in the Church. See the rubric at the end of the “Order of Confirmation:—

“And there shall none be admitted to the Holy Communion, until such time as he be confirmed, or be ready and desirous to be confirmed.”

num esse, ut pueri et adolescentes a Pastoribus Ecclesiae suae in Catechismo examinentur, et si quidem pie ac recte fuerint eruditi, approbentur; si vero prave, emendentur. Sed ex personali et temporali facto Apostolorum non est absque certo mandato Dei generale et perpetuum Sacramentum in Ecclesia statuendum.”

The estimation in which Confirmation is held by the Church of England may be further illustrated from the answer of the Bishops to the Puritan objections to the “Order of Confirmation” in 1661. Exception was taken to the wording of the “Collect,” the Puritans stating their objections thus:—

“We desire that the practice of the Apostles may not be alleged as a ground of this imposition of hands for the confirmation of children, both because the Apostles did never use it in that case, as also because the Articles of the Church of England declare it to be a ‘corrupt imitation of the Apostles’ practice’ (Art. xxv.).

“We desire that imposition of hands may not be made, as here it is, a sign to certify children of God’s grace and favour towards them; because this seems to speak it a sacrament, and is contrary to that fore-mentioned 25th Article, which saith that ‘confirmation hath no visible sign appointed by God.’”

To this the Bishops replied:—

“Prayer after the imposition of hands is grounded upon the practice of the Apostles (Heb. vi. 2, and Acts viii. 17); nor doth 25th Article say that confirmation is a corrupt imitation of the Apostles’ practice, but that the five commonly called Sacraments have ground partly of the corrupt following the Apostles, &c., which may be applied to some other of these five, but cannot be applied to confirmation, unless we make the Church speak contradictions.”

(B.) Penance.

The inward grace of this Sacramental Ordinance is promised by our Lord Himself (S. John xx. 22, 23), but it is not recorded in the New Testament that the grace of Absolution was attached by our Lord to any special outward sign, and on this ground the writers of our Article refused to place Penance on the same level with Baptism and the Holy Eucharist.

Cf. the HOMILY FOR WHITSUNDAY:—

“Christ ordained the authority of the keys to excommunicate notorious sinners, and to absolve them which are truly penitent” (p. 495).

Also the HOMILY OF COMMON PRAYER AND SACRAMENTS :—

“For, although Absolution hath the promise of forgiveness of sin, yet by the express word of the New Testament it hath not this promise annexed and tied to the visible sign, which is imposition of hands. For this visible sign, I mean laying on of hands, is not expressly commanded in the New Testament to be used in Absolution, as the visible signs in Baptism and the Lord's Supper are; and therefore Absolution is no such Sacrament as Baptism and the Communion are” (pp. 376, 377).

At first Confession was made publicly before the Church, such open confession being necessary before the guilty person could be admitted again into the communion of the Church. At a very early period,¹ however, it was recommended that penitents should confess their sins privately to a spiritual adviser, who might judge of the expediency of public confession and penance, if likely to tend to the quieting of the penitent's conscience and the edification of the Church. This “godly discipline” of the Primitive Church had a twofold character—

- (a) It was the regular form for the readmission of the penitent to Church communion and sacramental privileges.
- (b) It had also for its express object the reassurance of the troubled conscience of the offender himself.

When the primitive disciplinary system of the Church fell into disuse,² that part of the Absolution which concerned authoritative restoration to Holy Communion also ceased to be used, but the reassurance of the conscience of the penitent by God's pardon being conveyed to him through the definite outward act of the Ministry of the Church was in no way affected by the cessation of the public discipline. The power of Absolution conferred upon the Ministry by the ordaining words of Christ Himself lasted on, when the primitive disciplinary system had passed away.

This power of Absolution the Church of England still claims for her priests; for—

- (a) She has deliberately retained in her formula of Ordination

¹ Cf., e.g., Origen on Ps. xxxvii. Hom. 2 :—

“Tantummodo circumspecte diligentius cui debeas confiteri peccatum tuum. . . . Si intellexerit et praeviderit talem esse languorem tuum qui in conventu totius Ecclesiae exponi debeat et curari, ex quo fortassis et caeteri aedificari poterunt, et tu ipse facile sanari.” . . .

² In the fifth century Pope Leo the Great directed that both confession and penance should take place in private under the direction of a priest; and in the seventh century all public penance was discontinued, a result largely owing to the publication of the ‘*Penitential*’ of Theodore of Tarsus, Archbishop of Canterbury.

of Priests those very words of Christ, which have ever been understood by all to be the basis of the power of Absolution :—

“Receive the Holy Ghost for the Office and Work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the Imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained.”

- (b) Provision is made in the Church's system for the exercise of this power conferred at Ordination—
 - (i.) In the Absolution pronounced by the priest at Morning and Evening Prayer, and in the Communion Service.
 - (ii.) Besides providing forms of Absolution, to be pronounced, after General Confession, in the public services of the Church, the Church of England also authorises Private Confession.

See the First Exhortation in the COMMUNION SERVICE :—

“If there be any of you, who by this means cannot quiet his own conscience herein, but requireth further comfort or counsel, let him come to me, or to some other discreet and learned Minister of God's Word, and open his grief; that by the ministry of God's Holy Word he may receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice, to the quieting of his conscience, and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness.”

Cf. the Office for the VISITATION OF THE SICK :—

“Here shall the sick person be moved to make a special Confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter. After which Confession, the priest shall absolve him (if he humbly and heartily desire it) after this sort :—

“Our Lord Jesus Christ, Who hath left power to His Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him, of His great mercy forgive thee thine offences: And by His authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins, In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.”

If we are to be loyal to our Church we must strenuously resist those who would altogether deprive us of the great help to the spiritual life which special private Confession and Absolution affords. The Church of England does not set forth such special Confession as necessary to salvation, or of necessity obligatory upon all her members, but as voluntary, and to be used by her

children as they feel their need;¹ at the same time, however, it is obvious that God has given us means of grace in His Church that we may duly use them. Private Confession is therefore distinctly recommended for such as feel scruples about coming to Communion on account of a disquieted conscience,² and is enjoined upon a sick person whose conscience is troubled with any weighty matter.³

That our Church, since the Reformation, intends to retain the practice of private Confession is also clear from the words of CANON I 13 (1604):—

“Provided always, that 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 not any way bind the said Minister by this our Constitution, but do straightly charge and admonish him, that he do not at any time reveal and make known to any person whatsoever any crime or offence so committed to his trust and secrecy (except they be such crimes as by the laws of this realm his own life may be called into question for concealing the same), under pain of irregularity.”

It should be noted that Confession is not the main subject of this Canon, which deals with the matter of presentation of crimes, &c., to the ordinary, and is entitled “Ministers may present”; but the manner in which Confession is incidentally alluded to

¹ The Church of England in this differs from the Church of Rome, which regards Penance as a true and proper Sacrament in the narrow sense of the term, and necessary to salvation. Cf. the following Canons of Session XIV. of the COUNCIL OF TRENT:—

- I. “Si quis dixerit, in Catholica Ecclesia, Poenitentiam non esse vere et proprie Sacramentum pro fidelibus, quoties post baptismum in peccata labuntur, ipsi Deo reconciliandis, a Christo Domino nostro institutum; anathema sit.”
- VI. “Si quis negaverit, Confessionem Sacramentalem vel institutam, vel ad salutem necessariam esse jure divino; aut dixerit, modum secretae confitendi soli sacerdoti, quem Ecclesia Catholica ab initio semper observavit et observat, alienum esse ab institutione et mandato Christi, et inventum esse humanum; anathema sit.”
- VII. “Si quis dixerit, in Sacramento Poenitentiae, ad remissionem peccatorum necessarium non esse jure divino, confiteri omnia et singula peccata mortalia . . . aut demum, non licere confiteri peccata venalia; anathema sit.”
- VIII. “Si quis dixerit, confessionem omnium peccatorum, qualem Ecclesia servat, esse impossibilem, et traditionem humanam, a piis abolendam; aut ad eam non teneri omnes et singulos utriusque sexus Christi fideles, juxta magni Concilii Lateranensis constitutionem, semel in anno, et ob id suadendum esse Christi fidelibus, ut non confiteantur tempore Quadragesimae; anathema sit.”

² See the Exhortation in the Communion Service quoted above.

See the passage quoted above from the Order for the Visitation of the Sick.

affords conclusive testimony to the fact that Confession of “secret and hidden sin” to the Minister was assumed by the clergy of that day (1604) as quite a regular and normal thing in the Church of England.

The formularies of the Lutheran or Protestant Reformers retain the practice of private Confession and Absolution, with certain safeguards and stipulations:—

AUGSBURG CONFESSIO, Part II. Art. IV.:

“Confessio in ecclesiis apud nos non est abolita. . . . Sed de confessione docent quod enumeratio delictorum non sit necessaria, nec sint onerandae conscientiae cura enumerandi omnia delicta, quia impossibile est omnia delicta recitare.”

SAXON CONFESSIO, Art. XVI.:

“De confessione privata facienda pastoribus, adfirmamus ritum privatae absolutionis in Ecclesia retinendum esse; et constanter retinemus, propter multas graves causas. Sed simul docemus, non praecipendam esse, nec postulandam enumerationem delictorum in illo privato colloquio.”

WURTEMBERG CONFESSIO, Art. XIV.:

“Etsi autem sentimus, enumerationem peccatorum coram sacerdote non esse necessariam ad salutem, nec esse aliquod meritum remissionis peccatorum, tamen damus operam, ut generalis confessio peccatorum quantum fieri potest et licet, in Ecclesiis nostris conservetur, idque duabus de causis. Una est, ut hoc privato colloquio rudiores de rebus necessariis admoneantur et erudiantur. Altera, ut hac occasione privatim audiat Evangelium Christi, de remissione peccatorum, quod Evangelium est vera clavis regni coelorum, et absolutio a peccatis, et ut per auditum Evangelii, seu absolutionis, fides vel concipiatur, vel confirmetur.”

The formularies influenced or drawn up by theologians of the Swiss school for the most part speak strongly against the retention of private confession to a priest; e.g. :—

TETRAPOLITAN CONFESSIO, Art. XX.:

“Nam innumeras animas illa de peccatis sacerdoti confitendis constitutio, in gravem desperationem adegit, totque aliis vitiis obnoxia est, ut pridem abrogari debuerit.”

SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSIO, Art. XIV.:

“Credimus autem hanc confessionem ingenuam, quae soli Deo fit, vel privatim inter Deum et peccatorem, vel palam in templo, ubi generalis illa peccatorum confessio recitatur, sufficere, nec necessarium esse ad remissionem peccatorum consequendam, ut

quis peccata sua confiteatur sacerdoti, susurrando in aures ipsius, ut vicissim cum impositione manuum ejus audiat ab ipso absolutionem: quod ejus rei nec praeceptum ullum, nec exemplum exstet in scripturis sacris. . . . Rite itaque et efficaciter ministri absolvunt, dum evangelium Christi, et in hoc remissionem peccatorum, quae singulis promittitur fidelibus, sicuti et singuli sunt baptizati, praedicant, et ad singulos peculiariter pertinere testantur. Nec putamus absolutionem hanc efficaciorum fieri, per hoc, quod in aurem alicui, aut super caput alicujus singulariter innumeratur."

(C.) Orders.

The outward sign is the laying on of hands (see Acts vi. 6, xiii. 3; 1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6); the inward grace is a special gift of the Holy Ghost for the work of the Ministry. See the passages in 1 and 2 Tim. referred to, which clearly imply that a spiritual gift passed to Timothy through, and simultaneously with, the imposition of hands.

Cf. the ORDINAL:—

"When this Prayer is done, the Bishop with the Priests present shall lay their hands severally upon the head of every one that receiveth the Order of Priesthood; the Receivers humbly kneeling upon their knees, and the Bishop saying,

"Receive the Holy Ghost for the Office and Work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the Imposition of our hands. . . ."

The words thus recited in the act of Ordination are a prayer, but a prayer which the Church is assured it is God's will to grant; they are spoken, therefore, in sure confidence that the gift accompanies the outward sign.¹

[On the subject of "Orders" see further the notes on Articles XXIII. and XXXVI.]

(D.) Matrimony.

See Eph. v. 31, 32, in the Vulgate:—

"Propter hoc relinquet homo patrem, et matrem suam, et adhaerebit uxori suae; et erunt duo in carne una. Sacramentum hoc magnum est."

¹ Calvin was willing to give the name of "Sacrament" to "Orders." See, *e.g.*, INSTITUTES, IV. xix. 28:—

"Quantum ad verum presbyterii munus attinet, quod ore Christi nobis est commendatum, libentur eo loco (scil. Sacramenti) habeo. Illic enim ceremonia est, primum ex Scripturis sumpta, deinde quam non esse inanem nec supervacua, sed fidele spiritualis gratiae symbolum, testatur Paulus."

Holy Scripture dwells upon—

(a) The Divine Institution of Matrimony (S. Matt. xix. 4–6; Eph. v. 31).

Cf. the opening address in the Marriage Service, where Holy Matrimony is spoken of as "an honourable estate, instituted of God in the time of man's innocency."

(b) The deep mystery of the union of man and wife in marriage (Eph. v. 32).¹

The paramount sacredness of marriage is, as all history shows, "a mystery," *i.e.*, a secret of God's law, fully revealed in Christ. In heathen thought marriage has ever been a contract far less sacred than the indissoluble tie of blood, and wherever Christian principle is renounced or obscured that idea recurs in modern times.

(c) The high dignity of Matrimony as "signifying unto us the mystical union that is betwixt Christ and His Church" (see Exhortation at the commencement of the Marriage Service, and *cf.* Eph. v. 23 *et seqq.*).

(d) The indissolubility of the Marriage tie.

This is distinctly affirmed by our Lord (S. Matt. xix. 4–6; S. Mark x. 6–9), and emphasised in the most striking manner in that part of the Marriage Service where it is directed—

"Then shall the Priest join their right hands together, and say,
"Those whom God hath joined together let no man put asunder."

Cf. also the Betrothal portion of the Service, where each of the contracting parties plights troth to the other—

"till death us do part"

The indissoluble character of the Marriage bond is again affirmed in the third Collect of the Post-Matrimonial part of the Service:—

"O God, who . . . knitting them together, didst teach that it should never be lawful to put asunder those whom thou by Matrimony hast made one."

Divorce, therefore, is altogether inconsistent with the Divine Institution of Matrimony. It is true that it was allowed by the

¹ It cannot be doubted that in Eph. v. 32 the word *μυστήριον* (= Sacramentum) applies to the type (the mutual relation of husband and wife) as well as to the Antitype (the mutual relation of Christ and His Church).

Jewish Law, but the legislation of Moses was in this respect imperfect, because of the imperfection of those for whose sake it was given (S. Matt. xix. 7, 8). Separation *a mensa et thoro*, for the grave cause of adultery, is of course allowed, in accordance with our Lord's special exception (S. Matt. v. 32, xix. 9); but the *vinculum matrimonii* is in no way dissolved by such separation, nor may either of those so living apart from one another, even though the innocent party, marry again before the other's death (*cf.* Rom. vii. 2, 3; 1 Cor. vii. 39). Re-marriage of one party before the death of the other is (according to the original Divine Institution, upon which Christ has re-established Matrimony) nothing else than adultery (S. Matt. xix. 9; S. Mark x. 11, 12; S. Luke xvi. 18; Rom. vii. 3).¹

(E.) **Extreme Unction.**

See S. Mark vi. 13; S. Jas. v. 14, 15.

In the former passage the anointing of the sick with oil is connected with bodily healing; in the latter, solemn anointing with prayer is connected with bodily healing and with forgiveness of sins.

Unction with oil, of a Sacramental character, has certainly been in use in the Church from the very earliest times. A solemn anointing of the sick is still practised in the Eastern Church, professedly as a means of healing; it is called "Holy Oil," or "Prayer-Oil" (*Τὸ εὐχέλαιον*), and is administered by a number of priests conjointly (varying from three to seven).²

¹ The mind of our Church is shown in CANON 107 (of 1604):—

"In all sentences for Divorce, Bond to be taken for not marrying during each other's Life."

Cf. COUNCIL OF TRENT, Session XXIV. Canon vii. :—

"Si quis dixerit, Ecclesiam errare, cum docuit, et docet, juxta Evangelicam et Apostolicam doctrinam, propter adulterium alterius conjugum matrimonii vinculum non posse dissolvi; et utrumque, vel etiam innocentem, qui causam adulterio non dedit, non posse, altero conjugue vivente, aliud matrimonium contrahere; mocharique eum, qui dimissa adultera aliam duxerit, et eam, quae dimisso adultero alii nupserit; anathema sit."

The authorities of the Greek Church allow *divorce* on ground of adultery, and also allow re-marriage to the innocent party. The Protestant and Reformed Confessions do not treat of this matter fully, but the Continental Reformers were inclined to allow re-marriage to the innocent divorced party. *Cf.*, *e.g.*, SAXON CONFESSION, Art. XVIII. :—

"Personae innocenti, cum re cognita pronunciatum esse libera, non prohibetur conjugium."

² This is in literal conformity with S. Jas. v. 14: *προσκαιεσάσω τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους τῆς ἐκκλησίας.*

Cf. the "Holy Catechism" (Orthodox Eastern Church) by Bernadaces:—

"Q. What is the seventh Mystery, and what is its operation?"

"A. The seventh Mystery is the Prayer-Oil, in which the sick man is anointed with oil, and the priest invokes the Divine Grace, which heals the weaknesses of soul and body" (p. 28).

In the West a new theory grew up with Scholasticism. It was seen that bodily healing did not always follow upon the anointing of the sick, and the operation of the accompanying grace of Unction was therefore transferred from the physical to the spiritual sphere. In the twelfth century the term "Extreme Unction" came into use, and the Council of Trent limited the solemn anointing to those who are near death:—

"Declaratur etiam, esse hanc Unctionem infirmis adhibendam, illis vero praesertim, qui tam periculose decumbunt, ut in exitu vitae constituti videantur: unde et Sacramentum exeuntium nuncupatur" (Session XIV. Cap. iii.).

In the Prayer Book of 1549 the Anointing of the sick was retained, and an attempt made to restore its primitive aspect:—

"If the sicke person desyre to be annoynted, then shal the prieste annoynte him upon the forehead or breast only, makyng the signe of the crosse, saying thus,

"As with this visible oyle thy body outwardly is annoynted: so our heauenly father, almyghtye God, graunte of his infinite goodnesse, that thy soule inwardly may be annoynted with the holy gost, who is the spirite of al strength, counforte, reliefe, and gladnesse. And vouchesafe for his great mercy (yf it be his blessed will) to restore unto thee thy bodely helth, and strength, to serue him, and sende thee release of al thy paines, troubles, and diseases, both in body and minde. And howsoeuer his goodnesse (by his diuine and unsearchable prouidence) shall dispose of thee: we, his unworthy ministers and seruants, humbly beseeche the eternall majestie, to doe with thee according to the multitude of his innumerable mercies, and to pardon thee all thy sinnes and offences, committed by all thy bodily senses, passions, and carnall affections: who also vouchsafe mercifully to graunt unto thee gostely strēghth, by his holy spirite, to withstand and ouercome al temptacions and assaultes of thine aduersarye, that in no wise he preuaile against thee, but that thou mayest haue perfit victory and triumph against the deuil, sinne, and death, through Christ our Lord: Who by his death hath ouercomed the Prince of death, and with the father, and the holy gost euermore liveth and reigneth God, worlde without ende. Amen."

In the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI. (1552) that part of the Visitation Office which referred to the Anointing was dropped, and it has not since been restored. Thus a practice undoubtedly Scriptural has ceased to be enjoined in the Church of England, and there has been lost an Apostolic ordinance, whereby, with the assurance of an outward and visible sign, the faithful were prayed over, for the forgiveness of their sins, and their restoration to health, or spiritual support in their sickness.

The Continental Reformers not only denied to Unction the dignity and title of a Sacrament, but for the most part urged the discontinuation of its observance:—

CALVIN'S INSTITUTES, IV. xix. 18 :

"Ejusdem rationis est ista unctio, cujus esse manuum impositionem supra demonstravimus; nempe histrionica hypocrisis, qua citra rationem, et sine fructu, Apostolos referre volunt."

SAXON CONFESSION, Art. XIX. :

"Praeterea unctio, quae nunc extrema nominatur, fuit olim medicatio; ut ex Jacobi epistola perspicuum est. Nunc spectaculum est plenum superstitionis. Dicunt remitti peccata, per istas unctiones; et addunt invocationem mortuorum, quam etiam necesse est improbare. Ideo hi ritus non servantur in nostris ecclesiis, nec ante haec tempora Ecclesia sensit esse necessarios."

WURTEMBERG CONFESSION, Art. XXII. :

"Fatemur Apostolos unxisse aegros oleo, qui et corporalem sanitatem consecuti sunt. Fatemur etiam Epistolam, quae inscribitur Jacobo, jubere Presbyteros Ecclesiae ad aegrotos vocari, ut ungant eos oleo, et orent pro ipsis, ad consequendam sanitatem. Sed haec tum utiliter exercebantur cum ministri Ecclesiae adhuc ornati erant dono aegrotos corporaliter et admirabiliter sanandi. Postquam autem hoc donum, confirmato Evangelio in Ecclesia, defuit, res ipsa testatur, hanc unctionis ceremoniam otiose nunc et inutiliter usurpari."

SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION, Art. XXV. :

"Papisticam visitationem cum sua illa unctione extrema, diximus superius, nos non approbare, quod absurda habeat, et a Scriptura canonica non approbetur."

Before we pass on to consider the concluding paragraph of Article XXV., we must note that in dealing with the five Sacra-

mental Ordinances the Article says that they are "such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in Scripture." The use of the word "partly" here would seem to imply that all five ordinances must fall into one or other of the two classes named. This, however, can scarcely be the sense intended, because, according to the principles of our leading Reformers, as expressed elsewhere, and according to the Prayer Book and Homilies, Confirmation, Penance, and Orders would not belong to either class. The words "have grown of the corrupt following of the Apostles" probably refer especially to Extreme Unction,¹ while the words "states of life allowed in Scripture" doubtless refer to Matrimony.

(4.) THE SACRAMENTS ARE TO BE USED DULY, AND TO BE RECEIVED WORTHILY.

The Sacraments² were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about: but that we should duly use them. And in such only as worthily receive the same, they have a wholesome effect or operation; but they that receive them unworthily, purchase to themselves damnation, as S. Paul saith.

No one would think of supposing that the Sacraments

¹ The words may, however, have been intended, with a wider application, to refer to some of the other ordinances named, for we must remember that the writers of the Article had in view these ordinances as celebrated in the Western Church in the times immediately preceding the Reformation, when superstitious ceremonies, not traceable to their primitive and Apostolic institution, had been added to them.

² From its contents we should conclude that this last paragraph refers to the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist only. The expressions "gazed upon," "carried about," can only refer to this one Sacrament, and the passage of Scripture quoted has reference to it alone. How is it, then, that "Sacraments" are spoken of in the plural? Most likely the plural is used with reference to the two outward signs in this one Sacrament.

Cf. SECOND EXHORTATION in the Communion Service in the Prayer Book of 1559:—

"Dearly beloved, forasmuch as our duty is to render to Almighty God our Heavenly Father, most hearty thanks for that he hath given his son our Saviour Jesus Christ, not only to die for us, but also to be our spiritual food and sustenance, as it is declared unto us, as well by God's word, as by the holy Sacraments of his blessed Body and Blood."

QUEEN ELIZABETH'S INJUNCTIONS, 1559:—

"It is ordered for the more reverence to be given to these holy mysteries, being the Sacraments of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ." . . .

So also the Greek word "mysteries" (corresponding to the Latin "sacramenta") is used to denote the Eucharist alone:—

"We who have duly received these holy mysteries" (Post-Communion Thanksgiving).

were ordained by Christ merely for exhibition, as a spectacle to onlookers; the end and object of their institution is the personal participation of the faithful. In order to such participation two conditions must be fulfilled:—

- (a) The Sacraments must be **duly (rite) used**; *i.e.*, they must be “duly ministered according to Christ’s ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same” (Article XIX.);¹ there must be the matter, the form, and the minister (see notes, p. 131).
- (b) They must be **worthily (digne) received** by us after due self-examination and fitting preparation.

Those who do not participate **rite** cannot be truly said to receive the Sacrament at all. Those who do not participate **digne** receive to themselves **damnationem** (*cf.* 1 Cor. xi. 29).

See further the notes on Article XXIX.

¹ *Cf.* the HOMILY OF THE WORTHY RECEIVING, &c., OF THE SACRAMENT:—

“But before all other things, this we must be sure of, specially, that this Supper be in such wise done and ministered as our Lord and Saviour did and commanded to be done, as His holy Apostles used it, and the good fathers in the Primitive Church frequented it” (pp. 473, 474; ed. S.P.C.K.).

ARTICLE XXVI

OF THE UNWORTHINESS OF THE MINISTERS, WHICH HINDERS NOT THE EFFECT OF THE SACRAMENT. DE VI INSTITUTIONUM DIVINARUM QUOD EAM NON TOLLAT MALITIA MINISTRORUM.

Although in the visible Church the evil be ever mingled with the good, and sometimes the evil have chief authority in the Ministration of the Word and Sacraments: yet forasmuch as 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, both in hearing the Word of God, and in the receiving of the Sacraments. Neither is the effect of Christ’s ordinance taken away by their wickedness, nor the grace of God’s gifts diminished from such as by faith and rightly do receive the Sacraments ministered unto them, which be effectual because of Christ’s institution and promise, although they be ministered by evil men.

Nevertheless, it appertaineth to the discipline of the Church, that inquiry be made of evil ministers, and that they be accused by those that have knowledge of their offences, and finally, being found guilty by just judgment, be deposed.

Quamvis in Ecclesia visibili, bonis mali semper sunt admixti, atque interdum ministerio Verbi et Sacramentorum administrationi praesint, tamen cum non suo sed Christi nomine agant, ejusque mandato et auctoritate ministrent, illorum ministerio uti licet, cum in Verbo Dei audiendo, tum in Sacramentis percipiendis. Neque per illorum malitiam effectus institutorum Christi tollitur, aut gratia donorum Dei minuitur, quoad eos qui fide et rite sibi oblata percipiunt, quae propter institutionem Christi et promissionem efficacia sunt, licet per malos administrentur.

Ad Ecclesiae tamen disciplinam pertinet, ut in malos ministros inquiratur, accusenturque ab his, qui eorum flagitia noverint, atque tandem justo convicti judicio, deponantur.

§ 1.—SOURCE.

Much of the language of this Article is taken from Article V. of the XIII. ARTICLES of 1538 (words common to the two are

printed in *italics* in the Latin Version), which in turn was based to some extent upon Article VIII. of Part I. of the AUGSBURG CONFESSION :—

“*Quantum ecclesia proprie sit congregatio sanctorum, et vere credentium; tamen, cum in hac vita multi hypocritae et mali admixti sint, licet uti sacramentis, quae per malos administrantur, juxta vocem Christi: Sedent Scribae et Pharisei in cathedra Moisis, etc. Et sacramenta et verbum propter ordinationem et mandatum Christi sunt efficacia, etiamsi per malos exhibeantur. Damnant Donatistas et similes, qui negabant licere uti ministerio malorum in ecclesia, et sentiebant ministerium malorum inutile et inefficax esse.*”

§ 2.—OBJECT.

To repudiate the opinion of some of the sectaries of the day, that the validity of the Sacraments is destroyed by personal unfitness in the Minister.

The REFORMATIO LEGUM (“De Haeresibus,” Cap. 15) speaks thus of the Anabaptists :—

“*Deinde ab Ecclesiae corpore se ipsi segregant, et ad sacrosanctam Domini mensam cum aliis recusant accedere, seque dicunt detineri vel ministrorum improbitate, vel aliorum fratrum.*”

The Donatists¹ (in North Africa, A.D. 311–415) acted upon the principle that no one who is excommunicated, or who *deserves to be excommunicated*, can validly perform any sacramental action; and this opinion was revived by Wiclif² (1324–1384), who seems to have held that a priest living in mortal sin is *ipso facto* degraded from his priesthood, so that all sacraments ministered by such an one are invalid. It is obvious that, according to this theory, no one would ever know for certain whether any sacrament was valid or not, because the state of the officiating Minister's soul can really be known to God alone.

¹ The Donatists are expressly condemned by name in the AUGSBURG CONFESSION (quoted above, § 1). Cf. also the SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION, Art. XVIII. :—

“*Caeterum execramur in praesenti Donatarum errorem, qui doctrinam ad administrationem sacramentorum, vel efficacem vel inefficacem, ex mala vel bona ministrorum vita aestimant.*”

² A Council held at Blackfriars (1382) condemned a series of propositions embodying the doctrines of Wiclif; amongst them was the following :—

“*That if a bishop or a priest be in mortal sin he cannot ordain, consecrate, or baptize.*”

The COUNCIL OF TRENT (Session VII., March 1547) passed the following Canon (On the Sacraments, XI.) :—

“*Si quis dixerit, in ministris, dum Sacramenta conficiunt et conferunt, non requiri intentionem saltem faciendi quod facit Ecclesia; anathema sit.*”

From this doctrine of the necessity of “intention”¹ on the part of the Minister, it follows that if he withhold his inward assent, either from personal unbelief, from ill-will, or whatever cause, the act is void and conveys no grace. Thus is the effect of the Sacraments made to depend upon the worthiness of the Minister.²

The Eastern Church holds that the validity of the Sacraments is in no way affected by unworthiness in the Minister.

Cf. the “Holy Catechism” (Orthodox Eastern Church) by Nicolas Bulgaris, where it is said of an unworthy Minister :—

“*Certainly he celebrates a Mystery, since he has, as we said, the seal of the Mystery of the Priesthood, and the stamp indelibly, and the Mysteries entirely take place through the grace of the All-Holy Spirit, and the Blood of endless power which was shed from Christ's side, that is through the supernatural power which Christ gave of the Mysteries being effected every day unto the end of the age. And this all the theologians in common assert, saying that the Mysteries do not proceed as from the agent, or as from the priest who celebrates them, but as from that which is performed, namely, as from the Mystery celebrated*” (p. 26).

§ 3.—EXPOSITION.

(1.) IN THE CHURCH THE EVIL AND GOOD ARE MINGLED.

In the visible Church the evil be ever mingled with the good.

Our Lord illustrated the nature of the Church in many parables. The kingdom of heaven is likened by Him—

(a) To a field where tares are mingled with the wheat (S. Matt. xiii. 24–30).

¹ Previously to the Council of Trent the doctrine of “intention” was merely a scholastic opinion, but it has Papal sanction as early as 1439, when it appears in a bull of Eugenius IV.

² Cf. Bellarmine, “Disput. Controv. de Justific.” (III. viii. 5) :—

“*No one can be certain, with the certainty of faith, that he receives a true sacrament, because the sacrament cannot be valid without the intention of the minister, and no man can see another's intention.*”

- (b) To a "net that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind" (*Ibid.* 47, 48).
- (c) To a marriage feast to which the servants "gathered together all as many as they found, both bad and good" (*Ibid.* xxii. 8-14).
- (2.) EVEN IF THE EVIL BE IN AUTHORITY WE MAY USE THEIR MINISTRY, BECAUSE THE UNWORTHINESS OF THE MINISTER DOES NOT HINDER THE EFFECT OF THE SACRAMENT.

Sometimes the evil have chief authority in the Ministration of the Word and Sacraments: yet forasmuch as 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, both in hearing the Word of God, and in the receiving of the Sacraments. Neither is the effect of Christ's ordinance taken away by their wickedness, nor the grace of God's gifts diminished from such as by faith and rightly do receive the Sacraments ministered unto them, which be effectual because of Christ's institution and promise, although they be ministered by evil men.

The Ministers of the Church do not administer their own Sacraments, but Christ's, and the Church in receiving the Sacraments has respect unto Christ Himself, and not to the Minister, so that it receives them not so much from the Minister as from Christ Himself through the Minister (*cf.* 2 Cor. v. 20; 1 Cor. iii. 5-7; Acts iii. 12, 16; and see especially S. Matt. xxiii. 2, 3, where our Lord enjoins that the ministry of the Scribes and Pharisees, who were personally unworthy, is to be used in observing the precepts of the Mosaic Law). The virtue and efficacy of Sacraments, since it depends solely on "Christ's institution and promise," cannot be hindered by unworthiness in the Minister. The source of the spiritual blessing conveyed to the faithful recipient is Christ's promise, not the goodness of the Minister.¹

- (3.) CHURCH DISCIPLINE SHOULD PROVIDE FOR THE REMOVAL OF SUCH MINISTERS AS ARE PROVED TO BE UNWORTHY.
- Nevertheless, it appertaineth to the discipline of the Church, that inquiry be made of evil Ministers, and that they be accused by

¹ Very many passages in S. Augustine's treatise, "De Baptismo contra Donatistas," have an intimate bearing upon the subject of our Article; *e.g.* :-

"Baptismus vero Christi verbis evangelicis consecratus et per adulteros et in adulteris sanctus est, quamvis illi sunt impudici et immundi; quia ipsa ejus sanctitas pollui non potest, et in sacramento suo divina virtus assistit, sive ad salutem bene utentium, sive ad perniciem male utentium."

those that have knowledge of their offences, and finally, being found guilty by just judgment, be deposed.¹

Some special prerogatives and responsibilities of Ministers are acknowledged not only by the Church, but by every sect; and even those who take a low view of the Ministry demand a high standard of life from those who are the selected Ministers of the Congregation. Much more, therefore, should this be the case with the Church, which regards the Priesthood of its Ministers as a delegation, not so much from the Body, but rather from the Priesthood of the Head, Jesus Christ (*cf.* Lev. x. 3; 1 Tim. iii. 2, 3; Tit. i. 7, 8). From the very earliest times provision has been made for the removal of unworthy Ministers, by whose conduct the holy Name of God is dishonoured and the consciences of the brethren offended (1 Tim. v. 1, 19, 20; vi. 3-5). It is a matter for much regret that the legal machinery for removing clergy of known evil life has in the English Church for so long a time been difficult to work. Recent legislation has, however, done something towards rendering it more effectual.

¹ *Cf.* SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION, Art. XVIII. :-

"Atqui debet interim justa esse inter ministros disciplina. Inquirendum enim diligenter in doctrinam et vitam ministrorum in synodis. Corripiendi sunt peccantes a senioribus, et in viam reducendi, si sunt sanabiles, aut deponendi, et velut lupi abigendi sunt per veros pastores a grege Dominico, si sunt incurabiles."

ARTICLE XXVII

OF BAPTISM.

Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened; but it is also a sign of Regeneration or new Birth, whereby as by an instrument, they that receive Baptism rightly, are grafted into the Church; the promises of the forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God, by the Holy Ghost are visibly signed and sealed; faith is confirmed, and grace increased, by virtue of Prayer unto God.

The Baptism of young children is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ.

§ 1.—SOURCE.

This Article was composed by the English Reformers, and first appeared as the 28th of the XLII. Articles of 1553. The last paragraph then ran as follows:—

“The custome of the Churche to christen yonge children, is to bee commended, and in any wise to bee retained in the Churche.”

The wording was altered to its present stronger form at the Elizabethan revision (1563). Whereas in the earlier draft it was simply stated that Infant Baptism is tenable as a Church custom, it is now declared to have a higher authority: it is “most agreeable with the institution of Christ.”

In the text of the Article as it stood in 1553 and 1563 the

DE BAPTISMO.

Baptismus non est tantum professionis signum ac discriminis nota, qua Christiani a non Christianis discernantur, sed etiam est signum Regenerationis, per quod tanquam per instrumentum recte Baptismum suscipientes, Ecclesiae inseruntur, promissiones de remissione peccatorum atque adoptione nostra in filios Dei per Spiritum Sanctum visibiliter obsignantur, fides confirmatur, et vi divinae invocationis, gratia augetur.

Baptismus parvulorum omnino in Ecclesia retinendus est, ut qui cum Christi institutione optime congruat.

ARTICLE XXVII

207

Latin “signum Regenerationis” was represented in the English Version by “sign and seal of Regeneration.” The words “and seal” were omitted in 1571. In this connection, however, we should note that the verb “obsignantur,” a few lines lower down, is still rendered “signed and sealed.”

§ 2.—OBJECT.

To declare the grace and blessings given in Baptism, in opposition to those who held the Sacrament to be simply a bare sign. It was, further, the object of those who recast the concluding paragraph in 1563 to make it plain that the English Church holds Infant Baptism to be the normal type of Baptism.

Although Infant Baptism is only expressly mentioned at the close of the Article, indications are not wanting which show that the compilers of the former part, in speaking of Baptism, had the Baptism of Infants in view. Thus in the clause “recte Baptismum suscipientes Ecclesiae inseruntur” we cannot help remarking that only the objective qualification (recte) is mentioned, while the subjective qualifications (digne, cum fide) are not given here, as they are in the next Article. This fact points to the conclusion that the wording of the Article is concerned with the case of Infant Baptism only.

§ 3.—EXPOSITION.

THE ACT OF BAPTISM.

The Greek words βαπτίζω, βαπτισμός, denote, in the language of Scripture, any washing, whether by dipping or pouring; see, e.g., S. Mark vii. 4; S. Luke xi. 38. The outward act in the Sacrament significantly points to the inward grace—as the filth of the body is removed by washing with water, so are the stains of the soul by remission of sins; and, if we follow the Baptismal Ritual of the early Church, the immersion and rising again from the water of the Font symbolises our death and burial with Christ, and our rising again to newness of life with Him (Rom. vi. 3–5).¹

Immersion in Baptism has fallen into disuse in our cold climate, but it should be remembered that it is still stated in

¹ Cf. the CHURCH CATECHISM, where the inward and spiritual grace of the Sacrament is explained as “a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness.”

our Baptismal Office to be the normal and desirable mode of Baptism :—

“And then naming it after them (if they shall certify him that the Child may well endure it), he shall dip it in the Water discreetly and warily, saying, . . .

“But if they certify that the Child is weak, it shall suffice to pour Water upon it, saying the foresaid words.”¹

We now proceed to analyse the contents of the Article.

(1.) BAPTISM IS A SIGN OF OUR PROFESSION.

Baptism is . . . a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened (qua Christiani a non Christianis discernantur).

In other words, Baptism makes a man a Christian; Christians are those incorporated into the Body of Christ by Baptism.

But it has been already laid down (in Article XXV., where see notes) that the Sacraments are more than badges or tokens. Baptism, therefore, has a higher significance.²

(2.) BAPTISM IS A SIGN OF REGENERATION.

Baptism is not only a sign of profession . . . but it is also a sign of Regeneration or new Birth. (S. John iii. 5; Eph. v. 26; Tit. iii. 5.)

The immersion of a person, or the pouring of water upon

¹ Cf. what is said as to the manner of Baptism in the “Teaching of the Apostles,” Cap. VII. :—

“Περὶ δὲ τοῦ βαπτίσματος, οὕτω βαπτίσατε ταῦτα πάντα προεϊπόντες, βαπτίσατε εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐν ὕδατι ζῶντι. Ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἔχῃς ὕδωρ ζῶν, εἰς ἄλλο ὕδωρ βάπτισον· εἰ δ' οὐ δύνασαι ἐν ψυχρῷ, ἐν θερμῷ. Ἐὰν δὲ ἀμφότερα μὴ ἔχῃς, ἔκχεον εἰς τὴν κεφαλὴν τρις ὕδωρ εἰς ὄνομα Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ καὶ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος.”

Contrast the SECOND BAPTIST CONFESSION, Art. XXIX. :—

“Immersion or dipping of the person in water is necessary to the due administration of that ordinance.”

The Church's Baptism is sometimes contemptuously spoken of as “sprinkling”; it ought not to be necessary to point out that the Church nowhere sanctions “sprinkling.”

² Calvin (INSTITUTES, IV. xv. 1) lays down that Baptism is not merely a sign :—

“Proinde quibus visum est Baptismum non aliud esse quam tesseram ac notam qua religionem nostram apud homines profiteamur, quomodo imperatoris sui insignia praeferunt milites, in suae professionis notam; ii quod primum erat in Baptismo non perpenderunt. Id vero est, quod a nobis accipiendus sit cum hac promissione, Quicumque crediderint, et baptizati fuerint, salvos fore.”

him in Baptism is the outward and visible *effectual*¹ sign, whereby is conveyed the inward and spiritual grace of Regeneration.² Thus in the CHURCH CATECHISM the grace given in Baptism is declared to be—

“A death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness.”

See the following passages in the Baptismal Office :—

“We call upon thee for this Infant, that he, coming to thy holy Baptism, may receive remission of his sins by spiritual regeneration.

“Give thy holy Spirit to this Infant, that he may be born again.”

After the act of Baptism the following words occur :—

“Seeing now, dearly beloved brethren, that this Child is regenerate, . . .

“We yield thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased thee to regenerate this Infant with thy holy Spirit.”³

(3.) BY BAPTISM WE ARE GRAFTED INTO THE CHURCH, THE BODY OF CHRIST.

whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive Baptism rightly, are grafted into the Church (Rom. vi. 3–5; 1 Cor. xii. 13; Gal. iii. 27).

¹ See Article XXV.

² Hence “regenerated” and “baptized” may be used as synonymous and interchangeable terms. See notes on Article IX. § 4 (ii.), p. 77.

³ The opinion of our Reformers as to Regeneration in Baptism may be illustrated by a few quotations :—

CRANMER, in his “Answer to Gardiner,” writes thus :

“For if you understand the matter, would you resemble a knave playing in a prince's coat (in which nothing is inwardly wrought and altered) unto a man being baptized in water, who hath put upon him outwardly water, but inwardly is apparelled with Christ, and is, by the omnipotent working of God, spiritually regenerate, and changed into a new man” (Works, vol. iii. p. 487).

Again we read :

“Whosoever will be spiritually regenerated in Christ, he must be baptized himself” (Works, vol. ii. p. 455).

Similarly, in his CATECHISM, the same author says (p. 187) :

“I trust you understand, good children, wherefore Baptism is called the bath of Regeneration, and how in Baptism we be born again, and made new creatures in Christ.”

Cf. RIDLEY's words (Works, p. 240) :

“After that manner the water in Baptism hath grace promised, and by that grace the Holy Spirit is given : not that grace is included in water, but that grace cometh by water.”

In direct contrast to the doctrine of the English Church stands the view of

See CHURCH CATECHISM :—

“In my Baptism ; wherein I was made a member of Christ.

Cf. the following quotations from the Baptismal Office :—

“That of his bounteous mercy he will grant to this Child that thing which by nature he cannot have ; that he may be baptized with Water and the Holy Ghost, and received into Christ's holy Church, and be made a lively member of the same.”

“That he, being delivered from thy wrath, may be received into the ark of Christ's Church.”

Immediately after the act of Baptism the Priest is directed to say—

“We receive this Child into the congregation of Christ's flock,” &c.

“Seeing now, dearly beloved brethren, that this Child is regenerate and grafted into the body of Christ's Church.”¹

(4.) BY BAPTISM ARE VISIBLY SIGNED AND SEALED THE DIVINE PROMISES—

(a.) OF FORGIVENESS OF SINS ;

(b.) OF OUR ADOPTION AS SONS OF GOD.

The promises of forgiveness of sin . . . are visibly signed and sealed. (Acts ii. 38, xxii. 16.)

In the NICENE CREED we “acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins.”²

See the following passages in the Baptismal Office :—

“Who . . . by the Baptism of thy well-beloved Son, Jesus Christ, in the river Jordan, didst sanctify Water to the mystical washing away of sin.”

“We call upon thee for this Infant, that he, coming to thy holy Baptism, may receive remission of his sins by spiritual regeneration.”

the Continental Reformers of the Swiss school, as expressed in the CONSENSUS TIGURINUS, Art. XX.:

“Qui in prima infantia baptizati sunt, eos in pueritia vel ineunte adolescentia, interdum etiam senectute, regenerat Deus.”

¹ RIDLEY writes thus :—

“The society or conjunction with Christ through the Holy Ghost is grace ; and by the Sacrament we are made the members of the mystical body of Christ, for that by the Sacrament the part of the body is grafted in the head.”

² According to Socinians, Baptism is *merely* a declaration or sealing, and not in any sense the instrument of Remission of sins. “Remissionis declarationem et obsignationem” is the expression of Socinus himself.

“Ye have prayed that our Lord Jesus Christ would vouchsafe to receive him, to release him of his sins.”

“Regard, we beseech thee, the supplications of thy congregation ; sanctify this Water to the mystical washing away of sin.”

The promises . . . of our adoption to be the sons of God, by the Holy Ghost are visibly signed and sealed. (Gal. iii. 26, 27.)

See the CHURCH CATECHISM :—

“In my Baptism ; wherein I was made . . . the child of God.”¹

Cf. the Thanksgiving in the Baptismal Office :—

“We yield thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased thee . . . to receive him for thine own Child by adoption.”

The words “by the Holy Ghost” were first inserted in the English version of the Article in 1563, though the corresponding words “per Spiritum Sanctum” are found in the Latin text of 1553.

In the edition of 1563 the clause was printed thus :—

“Our adoption to be the sons of God, by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed.”

As thus printed, the words “by the Holy Ghost” might be taken either in connection with the words that precede them or with the words following. As now commonly printed, the words are connected with the clause preceding, thus :—

“Our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly,” &c.

In this case the words express the truth that our adoption as sons of God is connected with the gift of the Holy Spirit (*cf.* Rom. viii. 14–16 ; Gal. iv. 5, 6). But at the last authoritative revision of the Articles (1571) the pointing we have given above was adopted, a comma being placed after “God,” and no stop after the words “Holy Ghost.” According to this punctuation, the clause is an express statement to the effect that the Holy Ghost is the Agent in Baptism (S. Mark i. 8 ; Tit. iii. 5).

¹ Contrast Calvin's teaching (INSTITUTES, IV. xv. 22) :—

“Accedit postea sacramentum sigilli instar, non quod efficaciam Dei promissioni, quasi per se invalidae, conferat, sed eam duntaxat nobis confirmet. Unde sequitur, non ideo baptizari fidelium liberos, ut filii Dei tunc primum fiant qui ante alieni fuerint ab Ecclesia . . . quia promissionis beneficio jam ante ad Christi corpus pertinebant.”

(5.) BY BAPTISM FAITH IS CONFIRMED AND GRACE INCREASED.

Faith is confirmed, and grace increased, by virtue of prayer unto God (*vi divinae invocationis*).

It would seem that the description of the grace and significance of Baptism, as far as the person baptized is himself concerned, ends with the word "sealed" (after which a colon is placed in the edition of 1571), and that the clause following, with which we are now concerned, is intended to refer to the effect of the solemnisation of Baptism upon those present at the service. This view of the meaning of the Article is confirmed when we seek to parallel its phraseology (as we have done in the case of the earlier statements of the Article) from the Baptismal Office. The passage in the Office where "confirmation of faith" and "increase of grace" are spoken of has reference, not to the child baptized, but to the congregation present at the service. With the wording of the Article—

"FAITH IS CONFIRMED and GRACE INCREASED,"

cf. the wording of the Thanksgiving after the reading of the Gospel in the Baptismal Office:—

"Almighty and everlasting God, heavenly Father, we give thee humble thanks, for that thou hast vouchsafed to call us to the KNOWLEDGE OF THY GRACE, and FAITH in thee: INCREASE THIS KNOWLEDGE and CONFIRM THIS FAITH in us evermore. Give thy holy Spirit to this Infant," &c.

It will be noted that as far as the word "evermore" the terms of the prayer are general, evidently referring to the whole congregation assembled; but from that point onward the prayer is concerned with the infant brought to Baptism. The coincidence of the wording of the Article with the wording of the prayer quoted can scarcely be accidental.

(6.) INFANT BAPTISM IS TO BE RETAINED, AND IS DECLARED TO BE MOST AGREEABLE WITH THE INSTITUTION OF CHRIST.

The Baptism of young children is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ.

See S. Mark x. 13-16 (the passage read in the Baptismal Office). We there read of a spiritual blessing being given to unconscious infants¹ on the ground of the faith of those

¹ Παιδια is the word used in S. Mark, but the parallel passage (S. Luke xviii. 15) has βρέφη.

who brought them. The passage, therefore, has a very direct bearing upon the question of Infant Baptism. Our Lord by His action answered by anticipation the question, which of necessity was sure to arise, whether the New Covenant could take in unconscious infants, as the Old Covenant did; whether, when He was no longer upon earth, little children might be made partakers of His Blessing. Christ Himself made the answer to this question clear, both by word and deed. Not only is it the case that infants may come unto Him (S. Mark x. 14), but those who have reached mature years must become like little children in order that they may come unto Him (*Ibid.* v. 15; S. Matt. xviii. 3). Infant Baptism is, therefore, not merely allowable and justifiable, but it is, in the abstract, the normal pattern of Christian Baptism: "*cum Christi institutione optime congruat.*"

In the Baptismal Office we may see it stated how infants are qualified for Baptism.

(a) The opening exhortation begins thus:—

"Dearly beloved, forasmuch as all men are conceived and born in sin; and that our Saviour Christ saith, None can enter into the kingdom of God, except he be regenerate and born anew of Water and of the Holy Ghost," &c.

Since infants are born in Original Sin, Baptism is needful for their recovery.¹

(b) Infants are also specially qualified to receive Baptism

¹ We should especially note the intimate connection between the denial of Original Sin and (i.) the refusal of Baptism to infants, or (ii.) the emptying of Infant Baptism of its true significance, and its retention merely as a ceremony of dedication to God. If the taint of Original Sin passes on to unconscious infants at birth, so also may the righteousness of Christ at the Font of new birth. On the other hand, if the taint of sin does not pass on to infants they do not need any regeneration, and Infant Baptism, with the significance which the Church teaches, is unnecessary.

Cf. X. ARTICLES, Art. II., on Baptism:—

"Infants must needs be christened because they be born in original sin."

XIII. ARTICLES, Art. VI.:—

"Quia vero infantes nascuntur cum peccato originis, habent opus remissione illius peccati, et illud ita remittitur (scil. per Baptismum) ut reatus tollatur."

KING'S BOOK:—

"But also it appertaineth and is offered unto infants, which, because they be born in original sin, have need and ought to be christened."

HERMANN'S CONSULTATIO:—

"Because they admit not original sinne, they (*i.e.*, the Anabaptists) also refuse the baptisme of children, and in as much as in them lyeth, they draw away the moste parte of men from God and eternal salvation."

because of "their innocency," which Christ "exhorteth all men to follow" (see the address in the Office after the reading of the Gospel).

Since infants are free from actual sin, in their case no impediment is opposed to the operation of the grace of God in the Sacrament.

At the time of their Baptism infants, of course, have not as yet conscious faith or repentance, which are the necessary subjective qualifications in the recipient of the Sacrament¹ :—

"Why then are Infants baptized, when by reason of their tender age they cannot perform them ?

"Because they promise them both by their sureties ; which promise, when they come to age, themselves are bound to perform" (CHURCH CATECHISM).

From the time that the Church of Christ was first set up on earth as a society,² Infant Baptism, although not universally adopted in practice,³ was yet in theory almost universally believed to be right and proper. Tertullian, indeed, is found opposing it,⁴ but S. Cyprian and sixty-six bishops assembled in council with him (A.D. 253) were in favour of Infant Baptism, the necessity and appropriateness of which they grounded upon the doctrine of Original Sin, and upon the words of our Lord recorded in the Gospels, supporting it also by reference to the admission of Hebrew infants into covenant with God by Circumcision.

At the Reformation period the Anabaptists rejected the practice

¹ In this connection it should be remembered that Circumcision was of the nature of a Covenant (Gen. xvii. 9, 10, 14), but this circumstance did not prevent the Jewish child from being admitted into that Covenant before he was able consciously to perform the conditions.

² The Baptisms which followed upon the first proclamation of the Gospel were of necessity, for the most part, Adult Baptisms ; but from the mention of the Baptism of whole households in such passages as Acts xvi. 15, 33 ; 1 Cor. i. 16, we gather that children of tender age, as well as persons of mature years, were baptized by the Apostles.

³ Many, *e.g.*, voluntarily and purposely, postponed their Baptism, frequently even to their deathbed, in order that all the sins of their lives might be certainly removed by Baptismal grace, and in fear lest they should incur the guilt of post-Baptismal sin.

⁴ *Cf.* Tertullian, "De Baptismo," Cap. xviii. :—

"Itaque pro cuiusque personae condicione ac dispositione, etiam aetate, cunctatio baptismi utilior est, praecipue tamen circa parvulos. . . . Ait quidem dominus, Nolite illos prohibere ad me venire. Veniant ergo, dum adolescentur ; veniant, dum discunt, dum quo veniant docentur ; fiant Christiani, cum Christum nosse potuerint. Quid festinat innocens aetas ad remissionem peccatorum ?"

of Infant Baptism,¹ and many in England followed their error, as we gather from the provision of Stat. 32 Henry VIII. c. 49, § 11, by which they were excluded from the king's pardon who held "that infants ought not to be baptized, and if they be baptized, they ought to be re-baptized when they com to lawfull age."

Cf. REFORMATIO LEGUM, "De Haeresibus," Cap. 18 :—

"Deinde crudelis illorum impietas in baptismum irruit, quem infantibus impartiri nolunt, sed omnino nulla ratione."

See also Ridley's letter quoted in the notes on Article I., pp. 23, 24.

Objections are urged against Infant Baptism, and the practice itself is rejected, by the Baptists amongst modern Dissenters.²

Cf. SECOND BAPTIST CONFESSION, Chap. 29 :—

"Baptism is an ordinance of the New Testament. . . . Those who do actually profess repentance towards God, faith in, and obedience to our Lord Jesus Christ, are the only proper subjects of this ordinance."

A little reflection shows that a false and Donatistic conception as to the nature of the Church underlies the Baptist doctrine and practice. In the view of that sect the Church is the sum of individual elect men and women, only to be increased by individual conversions, and made up, therefore, of really godly persons : the process of renewal of the souls of men which Christ intended should be carried on within His Church is thus left to exterior agencies. The Catholic doctrine, on the other hand, is that the Church of God is a great educational society, within which, by the due use of the various means of grace, God's gifts are to be fostered and developed ; within which, being adopted as sons of God in Baptism, men come under all the holy influences of the Divine Family, and so grow up unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.

The Continental Reformers, both of the Saxon and of the Swiss school, retained the practice of Infant Baptism :—

¹ See the passage quoted above from "Hermann's Consultatio," p. 213, note.

² The Quakers, since they reject the outward form of Baptism, of necessity also reject Infant Baptism.

Cf. THE CHIEF PRINCIPLES OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION, AS PROFESSED BY THE PEOPLE CALLED QUAKERS. "Concerning Baptism," § 12 :—

"As there is one Lord, and one faith, so there is one baptism. . . . And this baptism is a pure and spiritual thing, to wit the baptism of the Spirit and fire. . . . As to the baptism of infants, it is a mere human tradition, for which neither precept nor practice is to be found in all the Scripture."

AUGSBURG CONFSSION, Part I. Art. IX. :

“De Baptismo docent . . . quod pueri sint baptizandi, qui per baptismum oblati Deo recipiantur in gratiam Dei.

“Damnant Anabaptistas, qui improbant baptismum puerorum, et affirmant pueros sine baptismo salvos fieri.”

TETRAPOLITAN CONFSSION, Art. XVII. :

“Infantibus quoque illud conferendum nostri docent, non minus quam sub Mose olim circumcidebantur.”

SAXON CONFSSION, Art. XIV. :

“Retinemus et infantium baptismum: quia certissimum est, promissionem gratiae etiam ad infantes pertinere, et ad eos tantum qui Ecclesiae inseruntur. Quia de his dictum est: Sinite parvulos ad me venire, quia talium est regnum coelorum. . . . Nec iudicamus hunc morem tantum otiosam caerimoniam esse, sed vere tunc a Deo recipi et sanctificari infantes: quia tunc inseruntur Ecclesiae, et ad tales promissio pertinet.”

WURTEMBERG CONFSSION, Art. X. :

“Agnosimus Baptismum tam infantibus quam adultis in Ecclesia . . . ex institutione Christi dispensandum.”

FRENCH CONFSSION, Art. XXXV. :

“Praeterea quamvis Baptismus sit fidei et resipiscentiae sacramentum, tamen quum una cum parentibus posteritatem etiam illorum in Ecclesia Deus recenseat, affirmamus infantes sanctis parentibus natos, esse ex Christi auctoritate baptizandos.”

SCOTCH CONFSSION, Art. XXIII. :

“Baptismum pertinere, tam ad infantes fidelium quam ad ipsos fideles adultos et intellectu praeditos agnosimus et confitemur, atque ita errorem Anabaptistarum damnamus, qui negant Baptismum infantibus usque dum cognitionem et fidem habuerint.”

BELGIC CONFSSION, Art. XXXIV. :

“Anabaptistarum itaque errorem hic detestamur, qui non modo unico, et semel suscepto baptismo contenti non sunt: sed et baptismum infantium e fidelibus natorum damnant. Nos vero eos eadem ratione baptizandos, et signo foederis obsignandos esse credimus, qua olim in Israele parvuli circumcidebantur.”

SECOND HELVETIC CONFSSION, Art. XX. :

“Damnamus Anabaptistas, qui negant baptizandos esse infantulos recens natos a fidelibus. Nam juxta doctrinam evangelicam, horum est regnum Dei, et sunt in foedere Dei, cur itaque non daretur eis signum foederis Dei? Cur non per sanctum baptismum initiarentur, qui sunt peculium et in ecclesia Dei?”

ARTICLE XXVIII

OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

DE COENA DOMINI.

The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another: but rather it is a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's Death. Inasmuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ, and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ.

Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ: but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.

The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner: And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper, is Faith.

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.

Coena Domini non est tantum signum mutuae benevolentiae Christianorum inter sese, verum potius est Sacramentum nostrae per mortem Christi redemptionis. Atque ideo rite, digne et cum fide sumentibus, panis quem frangimus est communicatio Corporis Christi: similiter poculum benedictionis, est communicatio Sanguinis Christi.

Panis et vini transubstantiatio in Eucharistia, ex sacris literis probari non potest, sed apertis Scripturae verbis adversatur, **Sacramenti naturam evertit**, et multarum superstitionum dedit occasionem.

Corpus Christi datur, accipitur, et manducatur in Coena, tantum caelesti et spirituali ratione. Medium autem quo Corpus Christi accipitur, et manducatur in Coena, fides est.

Sacramentum Eucharistiae ex institutione Christi non servabatur, circumferebatur, elevabatur, nec adorabatur.

§ 1.—SOURCE.

This Article was composed by the English Reformers, and first appeared as the 29th of the XLII. Articles of 1553. At the Elizabethan Revision (1563) significant alterations were made.

(a) In the second paragraph the statement that Transubstantiation "overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament" was added.

(b) In 1553 the third paragraph of the Article ran thus:—

Forasmuche as the trueth of mannes nature requireth, that the bodie of one, and the self same manne cannot be at one time in diuerse places, but must nedes be in some one certeine place: Therefore the bodie of Christe cannot bee presente at one time in many, and diuerse places. And because (as holie Scripture doeth teache) Christe was taken vp into heauen, and there shall continue vnto thende of the worlde, a faithful man ought not, either to beleue, or openlie to confesse the reall, and bodilie presence (as thei terme it) of Christes fleshe and bloude, in the Sacramente of the Lordes supper.

Quum naturae humanae veritas requirat, ut unius ejusdemque hominis corpus in multis locis simul esse non posset, sed in uno aliquo et definito loco esse oporteat, idcirco Christi corpus, in multis et diversis locis, eodem tempore, praesens esse non potest. Et quoniam, ut tradunt Sacrae literae, Christus in Coelum fuit sublatus, et ibi usque ad finem seculi est permanurus, non debet quisquam fidelium carnis ejus et sanguinis Realem et Corporalem (ut loquuntur) praesentiam in Eucharistia vel credere vel profiteri.

The present paragraph beginning "The Body of Christ is given" was substituted for this in 1563.

While the theory of the Roman Church as to the manner of the Presence of Christ in the Eucharist was rejected as emphatically as ever, and an additional difficulty in the way of its acceptance stated, the new paragraph guards the truth from perversions of an opposite character. The paragraph of 1553 which it replaced must have suggested a view of the Sacrament in accord with that of Zwingli and his successors in the Swiss Reformation; it expressly excluded the presence of our Lord's humanity in any way whatever at the celebration of the Eucharist. The present wording of the Article declares, on the other hand, that the Body of Christ is given (by the minister), taken, and eaten (by the communicant); in other words, that there is a Real Objective Presence.¹

We are able to show very clearly that in substituting the new paragraph it was intended to recognise the 'Real Presence.' The fact that the wording is due to Bishop Geste of Rochester

¹ See the Exposition of this part of the Article, given below.

has been established by the discovery among the State papers of a letter from Geste to Cecil (dated December 22, 1566), in which he expressly states "ye article was of myn own pennyng," and defends the use of the adverb "only" in the clause "The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner," saying that by it he did not intend to "exclude ye presence of Christis Body from the Sacrament, but only ye grossenes and sensiblenes in ye receavinge thereof"; adding besides, "I wold not for all that denye thereby any thing that I had spoken for ye presence."¹

It is, moreover, abundantly clear that the change made in the wording of the Article in 1563 was most distasteful to those who sympathised with the views of the Swiss Reformers on the Eucharist. Cf., e.g., a letter written by Humphrey and Sampson to Bullinger (July 1566), in which are pointed out what the writers conceive to be the blemishes still remaining in the Church of England:—

"Lastly, the Article composed in the time of Edward the Sixth respecting the spiritual eating, which expressly oppugned and took away the Real Presence in the Eucharist, and contained a most clear explanation of the truth, is now set forth among us mutilated and imperfect" (Zurich Letters, i. p. 165).

§ 2.—OBJECT.

The Article is divided into four clearly defined paragraphs, each having its own object:—

- (a) The Sacrament is declared to be more than a bare sign.
- (b) The Roman theory as to the manner of Christ's Presence in the Sacrament is repudiated.
- (c) The opinion that there is no Real Presence of Christ in the Sacrament is repudiated.
- (d) Certain practices common in pre-Reformation times are declared to be not traceable to Christ's institution.

§ 3. EXPOSITION.

NAMES GIVEN TO THE SACRAMENT.

(f) *The Breaking of Bread.*

This is apparently the earliest designation of all; see Acts ii. 42 (*ἦσαν δὲ προσκαρτεροῦντες . . . τῇ κλάσει τοῦ*

¹ The text of the Bishop's letter is given in full in Appendix V.

ἄρτου, where the Peshitto Syriac Version renders by "Eucharist"), xx. 7 (ἐν δὲ τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων, συνηγμένων ἡμῶν κλάσαι ἄρτον:—Peshitto, "to break the Eucharist"). The name is derived, of course, from the action of breaking the Bread, which has from the first, in imitation of the Lord's own action (λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ΕΚΛΑΣΕ, S. Luke xxii. 19; cf. parallels), formed part of the Eucharistic Celebration.

(ii.) *The Eucharist.*

S. Paul speaks of ἡ εὐχαριστία in 1 Cor. xiv. 16, and the same word is most likely also used with special reference to the Holy Eucharist in 1 Tim. ii. 1. Cf. the account of the Institution, "καὶ ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΗΣΑΣ ἔκλασε, καὶ εἶπε," κ. τ. λ (1 Cor. xi. 24.; and see also S. Matt. xxvi. 27; S. Mark xiv. 23; S. Luke xxii. 19). This is the name most usual in the primitive Church; e.g., see the "Didache," chap. ix., where the section dealing with the Sacrament is headed "περὶ δὲ τῆς εὐχαριστίας," and cf. Justin Martyr, Apol. i. c. 66, "καὶ ἡ τροφή αὕτη καλεῖται παρ' ἡμῖν εὐχαριστία."

It is a matter for much regret that the name "Eucharist," which, in addition to being Scriptural and primitive, so well expresses the character of the Sacrament as our "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," should to a great extent have fallen into disuse; a disuse traceable in the case of our own Church, no doubt, to the fact that the only titles directly given to the Sacrament in the Prayer Book are "The Lord's Supper" and "The Holy Communion," or "The Communion." For the use of the title "Eucharist" we have the sanction of this twenty-eighth Article, the Latin text of which has "Eucharistia" in two places where the English version gives "The Lord's Supper."

(iii.) *The Communion.*

S. Paul uses this word in connection with the Sacrament in 1 Cor. x. 16 (τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας ὃ εὐλογοῦμεν, οὐχὶ ΚΟΙΝΩΝΙΑ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστι; τὸν ἄρτον ὃν κλῶμεν, οὐχὶ ΚΟΙΝΩΝΙΑ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστιν;). The name properly denotes the act of participating, and in this sense only it was used with reference to the Sacrament in early times, but in post-

Reformation times it has been very largely used to designate the whole Office.

(iv.) *The Lord's Supper.*

1 Cor. xi. 20 is the only passage in the New Testament where the expression Κυριακὸν δεῖπνον occurs; it is there used of the Agape or Love-Feast, with which, at that early period, the celebration of the Holy Eucharist was joined. It can scarcely, however, be fairly claimed that Holy Scripture sanctions the appropriation of the title "Lord's Supper" to the Holy Eucharist, now that it has been separated from the Agape. As a title of the Eucharist the name dates from the Reformation period, since which time it has been in more or less common use by those separated from the Church of Rome. In some of the earlier symbolic writings of the sixteenth century "Eucharist" is the title given to the Sacrament, as, e.g., in Zwingli's "Fidei Ratio," and in the Tetrapolitan and First Helvetic Confessions; but it is at the same time spoken of as "sacrosancta Christi coena" (Tetrapolitan Confession, Cap. xviii.) and "coenam mysticam" (First Helvetic Confession, Art. XXIII.). "Lord's Supper" is the title adopted in the Augsburg Confession (Art. X.), and the great majority of subsequent formularies, both of the Saxon and Swiss schools, followed its lead¹—Bohemian Confession (Art. XIII.), First Confession of Basle (Art. VI.), Calvin's Institutes (IV. xvii.), Confessio Variata (Art. X.), Saxonica (Art. XV.), Cözengerina, French Confession (Art. XXXVI.), Scotch (Art. XXI.), Belgic (Art. XXXV.), Second Helvetic (Art. XXI.), Catechesis Heidelbergensis (§§ lxxv.—lxxxii.), Consensus of Sandomir, and the Formula of Concord. Of the formularies issued during the course of the English Reformation, the earlier ones speak of "the Sacrament of the Altar" (X. Articles, Bishop's Book, and King's Book), while in the XIII. Articles the Sacrament is spoken of under the title of "The Eucharist." It is in the reign of Edward VI., when the teaching of the Continental Reformers began to have more influence upon the theology of our own Re-

¹ Of the later Continental formularies, the Wurtemberg Confession retains the title "Eucharist," adding in a parenthesis, "sic enim libuit majoribus nostris Coenam Dominicam vocare" (Art. XIX.).

formers, that we first meet with the title "Lord's Supper" in authoritative formularies of our Church (First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI. and XLII. Articles).

(v.) *The Liturgy.*

The word *λειτουργία* has passed through the following stages of meaning:—

- (a) In classical Greek it denoted a civil or political service performed by an individual, or by a few, for the good of the many.
- (b) In the Septuagint it is regularly used, together with its cognate words, of the service of Priests and Levites in the Tabernacle or Temple (see, *e.g.*, Exod. xxviii. 31, 39; Num. iv. 12; 1 Chron. ix. 28, xvi. 4; and *cf.* in the New Testament, S. Luke i. 23; Heb. ix. 21).
- (c) In the terminology of the Christian Church the word was used to denote any ministerial function, but soon became narrowed in meaning so as to refer especially to the Service of the Altar.

In this last sense *ἡ λειτουργία*, or the fuller *ἡ θεία λειτουργία*, is the usual name of the Eucharistic Office in the Eastern Church at the present day.

(vi.) *The Mass.*

This name for the Sacrament had been most widely used in the Western Church for many centuries previous to the Reformation.¹ Its origin is lost in obscurity, and many derivations have been suggested, the one now generally accepted being that which traces the origin of the term "Missa" to the words pronounced by the deacon at the dismissal of the catechumens, "Ite, missa est." The title has in itself no doctrinal significance, but since the Church of Rome has retained it to the practical exclusion of all other names of the Sacrament, it is not unnaturally associated in the popular mind with Roman doctrine.

We now proceed to consider the statements of the Article in detail.

(I.) THE SACRAMENT IS NOT A BARE SIGN, BUT A PARTAKING OF THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST.

The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another,

¹ In the Prayer Book of 1549 the Communion Office was headed, "The Supper of the Lorde, and the Holy Communion, commonly called the Masse."

but rather it is a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's Death. Inasmuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ. (See 1 Cor. x. 16.)

Cf. the CHURCH CATECHISM:—

"Question. What is the inward part, or thing signified?

"Answer. The Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper."

See also the HOMILY FOR GOOD FRIDAY (1st Part):—

"Yea, and we shall be hereby the more ready to receive our Saviour and Maker in his blessed Sacrament to our everlasting comfort and health of soul" (p. 445; ed. S.P.C.K.);

and the HOMILY OF THE WORTHY RECEIVING, &C., OF THE SACRAMENT:—

"But thus much he must be sure to hold, that in the Supper of the Lord there is no vain ceremony, no bare sign, no untrue figure of a thing absent, but, as the Scripture saith, the table of the Lord, the bread and cup of the Lord, the memory of Christ, the annunciation of his death, yea the communion of the Body and Blood of the Lord in a marvellous incorporation, which by the operation of the Holy Ghost, the very bond of our conjunction with Christ, is through faith wrought in the souls of the faithful, whereby not only their souls live to eternal life, but they surely trust to win to their bodies a resurrection to immortality" (p. 476).

The contrast between the teaching of our Church and that of the Swiss Reformer Zwingli with regard to the nature of the Sacraments, and their place in the spiritual life of Christians, which we have already had occasion to note (see on Article XXV., p. 179), appears again markedly in the present Article, which plainly declares that the Sacrament is not merely a love-feast, but a means of grace. Contrast Zwingli's statement of the import of the Eucharist given in his book, "De vera et falsa religione":—

"Est ergo sive eucharistia sive synaxis sive coena dominica nihil aliud, quam commemoratio, qua ii, qui se Christi morte et sanguine firmiter credunt patri reconciliatos esse, hanc vitalem mortem annunciant, hoc est laudant, gratulantur et praedicant. Jam ergo sequitur, quod qui ad hunc usum aut festivitatem con-

veniunt mortem domini commemoraturi, hoc est annunciaturi, sese unius corporis esse membra, sese unum panem esse ipso facto testentur" (Works, vol. iii. p. 263).

We should note that in this first paragraph of the Article the Sacrament is declared to be "a partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ to such as rightly (rite), worthily (digne), and with faith (*cum fide*) receive" it. Of the qualifying words here used, the first, *rite*, refers to the objective conditions, the due administration of the Sacrament "according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same" (see on Article XIX., p. 131, and Article XXV., p. 200).

Digne and *cum fide* refer to the subjective conditions. The meaning of these two qualifications, which are not to be considered as identical, is well illustrated by a reference to the Latin Version of the Exhortation in the Communion Office (1560):—

"Nam sicut magnum beneficium est spiritualiter manducare corpus, et bibere sanguinem Christi, manere in Christo, et habere Christum in se habitantem, ac unum effici cum ipso; quod contigit illis qui *digne* accedunt, id est corde contrito et humiliato, cum vera fide ac fiducia certa misericordiae promissae per Christum; ita praesens periculum est, si *indigne* accedamus, quia effici-mur rei corporis et sanguinis Domini, et ad iudicium et condemnationem manducamus, quod non discernimus corpus Domini, nec ei debitum habemus honorem."

The qualifications referred to, therefore, seem to be:—

- (a) Reverence for Christ's Body sacramentally present (*digne*).
- (b) Faith in the promise attached to the Sacrament by God (*cum fide*).

That by *digne* we should understand "with reverence" also appears from Cranmer's use of the word:—

"And here is to be diligently noted that we ought not *unreverently* and *unadvisedly* to approach unto the meat of the Lord's table, as we do to other common meats and drinks, but with great fear and dread lest we should come to the holy table *unworthily*, wherein is not only represented, but also spiritually given unto us very Christ Himself" (Works, vol. ii. p. 402).

(2.) TRANSUBSTANTIATION REPUDIATED.

The Corporal Presence of Christ in the Eucharist was asserted (circ. 830) by Paschasius Radbertus, a monk (and afterwards

abbot) of Corbey. A controversy followed, in which Radbertus was opposed by Bertram (Ratramnus), a monk belonging to the same monastery, as well as by some of the foremost scholars of the time, amongst them Rabanus Maurus (Archbishop of Mentz) and Johannes Scotus, and at a later period by Berengarius (Archdeacon of Angers).¹ In the succeeding centuries, however, the doctrine seems to have made way, as is indicated by the fact that Berengarius was condemned by a Council at Verceil in 1050, the writings of Johannes Scotus being also condemned at the same time. At the FOURTH LATERAN COUNCIL (1215) the doctrine of Transubstantiation was expressly decreed in the following terms:—

"Una vero est fidelium universalis ecclesia, extra quam nullus omnino salvatur, in qua idem ipse sacerdos et sacrificium Jesus Christus, cujus corpus et sanguis in sacramento altaris sub speciebus panis et vini veraciter continentur, transubstantiatis pane in corpus et vino in sanguinem potestate divina, ut ad perficiendum mysterium unitatis, accipiamus ipsi de suo, quod accepit ipse de nostro" (Cap. 1).

Finally, the COUNCIL OF TRENT laid down (Session XIII., October 1551):—

"Quoniam autem Christus redemptor noster corpus suum id, quod sub specie panis offerebat, vere esse dixit: ideo persuasum semper in Ecclesia Dei fuit, idque nunc denuo sancta haec Synodus declarat, per consecrationem panis et vini conversionem fieri totius substantiae panis in substantiam corporis Christi Domini nostri, et totius substantiae vini in substantiam sanguinis ejus, quae conversio convenienter et proprie a sancta Catholica Ecclesia Transubstantiatio est appellata."

Cf. Canon II. of the same Session:—

"Si quis dixerit, in sacrosancto Eucharistiae Sacramento remanere substantiam panis et vini una cum corpore et sanguine Domini nostri Jesu Christi, negaveritque mirabilem illam et singularem conversionem totius substantiae panis in corpus, et totius substantiae vini in sanguinem, manentibus duntaxat speciebus panis et vini, quam quidem conversionem Catholica Ecclesia aptissime Transubstantiationem appellat; anathema sit."

The terminology connected with the theory of Transubstantiation is that of the scholastic philosophy of the Middle Ages, and

¹ Lanfranc, who was Archbishop of Canterbury from 1070 to 1089, took up the controversy against Berengarius.

philosophical opinions of the schoolmen underlie the doctrine. It is stated that, after the Consecration, the "substantia" of the Body and of the Blood of Christ altogether take the place of the "substantia" of the Bread and of the Wine respectively, although the "species" (*i.e.*, appearance) of bread and wine remain. The opinion that the "substance" of a thing is separable from its "accidents" (*viz.*, appearance, touch, taste, smell, by which it is apprehended by our senses as existing in a certain place) necessarily underlies this theory, because, after Consecration, the "accidents" of bread and wine remain, whereas it is held by Romanists that the "substance" of the Elements is wholly changed. It is evident that the truth of the doctrine does not admit of demonstration, since we have no sense by which the "substance" of a thing may be apprehended apart from its "accidents"; it is, moreover, of course open to question whether the "substance" of anything can be said to exist at all apart from its "accidents."

Concerning this doctrine of Transubstantiation our Article declares¹ :—

(a) **Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ: but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture.**

Cf., *e.g.*, 1 Cor. xi. 26–28, where S. Paul speaks of the consecrated Elements as "this bread," "this cup."

(b) **It overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament.**²

For a Sacrament consists of two parts,³ the outward part

¹ The same three objections to Transubstantiation are stated in the REFORMATIO LEGUM, "De Haeresibus," Cap. 19 :—

"Peregrinum enim est, et alienum a sacris literis . . . et a conditione sacramentorum longe dissidens; postremo communis quaedam sentina superstitionum multarum in Ecclesiam Dei compartatarum."

² *Cf.* Calvin's INSTITUTES, IV. xvii. 14 :—

"Evertitur ergo sacramenti natura, nisi in modo significandi terrenum signum rei coelesti respondeat. Ac proinde perit nobis mysterii hujus veritas, nisi verus panis verum Christi corpus repraesentet."

WURTEMBERG CONFESSION, Art. XIX. :—

"Necessitas ipsa veritatis sacramenti exigere videtur, ut cum vera praesentia corporis Christi verus panis maneat."

We have seen that several additions made at the Elizabethan revision (1563) are traceable to the Wurttemberg Confession; possibly, therefore, the clause, "overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament," which was inserted at that revision, may have been suggested by the passage quoted above from the same formulary.

³ *Cf.* the CHURCH CATECHISM :—

"Question. How many parts are there in a Sacrament ?

"Answer. Two; the outward visible sign, and the inward spiritual grace,"

(*signum*), and the inward part (*res*); but according to the Transubstantiation theory, the *signum* is altogether changed into the *res*, and thus the Sacramental character of the rite is destroyed.

(c) **It hath given rise to many superstitions.**

E.g., the use of the reserved Sacrament as a charm, processions of the Sacrament, &c. (see notes on the last paragraph of the Article).

(3.) **THERE IS A REAL OBJECTIVE PRESENCE IN THE EUCHARIST. The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper.**

The precise wording of this paragraph of the Article, when fairly considered, is only consistent with the doctrine of an Objective Presence. It is not said that the "sign" or "symbol" of the Body, but that the very Body of Christ Itself, is in the Sacrament—

(a) **given**, *i.e.*, by the Priest. It is the Body of Christ before the communicant receives it; the Presence of Christ's Body is objective.

(b) **taken**, by the communicant; and that which is taken must be external to him who takes it.

(c) **eaten**. See the quotations from the Homilies under heading (1) above, and note that it is not there said that in the Sacrament we receive 'symbols of Christ,'¹ but Christ Himself.

Very many passages might be quoted from the writings of the Fathers which testify to the belief of the Primitive Church in the Real Presence. Of these a few examples are here given :—

S. Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch (martyred A.D. 100–118),² ad Smyrn. vii., writes with reference to the Docetæ :

"Εὐχαριστίας καὶ προσευχῆς ἀπέχονται, διὰ τὸ μὴ ὁμολογεῖν τὴν εὐχαριστίαν σάρκα εἶναι τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τὴν

¹ This is the teaching of Zwingli. See his "Expositio fidei Christianae," §§ 63–66 :—

"Spiritualiter edere corpus Christi, nihil est aliud quam spiritu ac mente niti misericordia et bonitate dei per Christum . . . Verum cum ad coenam domini cum hac spirituali manducatione venis, et domino gratias agis pro tanto beneficio, pro animi tui liberatione, qua liberatus es a desperationis pernicie, et pro pignore, quo certus es de aeterna beatitudine, ac simul cum fratribus panem et vinum, quae jam symbolicum Christi corpus sunt, participas, jam proprie sacramentaliter edis, cum scilicet intus idem agis quod foris operaris, cum mens reficitur hac fide quam symbolis testaris."

² This is the date assigned by Lightfoot. Harnack gives the date as "soon after 130."

ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν παθοῦσαν, ἣν τῇ χρηστότητι ὁ πατὴρ ἡγειρεν.”

Justin Martyr (martyred A.D. 165), *Apol. i.* 66 :—

“Οὐ γὰρ ὡς κοινὸν ἄρτον οὐδὲ κοινὸν πόμα ταῦτα λαμβάνομεν· ἀλλ’ ὃν τρόπον διὰ λόγου Θεοῦ σαρκοποιηθεὶς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας ἡμῶν ἔσχεν, οὕτως καὶ τὴν δι’ εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ’ αὐτοῦ εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφήν, ἐξ ἧς αἷμα καὶ σάρκες κατὰ μεταβολὴν τρέφονται ἡμῶν, ἐκείνου τοῦ σαρκοποιηθέντος Ἰησοῦ καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ἐδιδάχθημεν εἶναι.”

Irenæus (circ. 180 A.D.), arguing against the Gnostics, thus writes (*Adv. Hæc.*, v. 2) :—

“Ὅποτε οὖν καὶ τὸ κεκραμένον ποτήριον, καὶ ὁ γεγωνῶς ἄρτος ἐπιδέχεται τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ γίνεται ἡ εὐχαριστία σῶμα Χριστοῦ, ἐκ τούτων δὲ αὔξει καὶ συνίσταται ἡ τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν ὑπόστασις· πῶς δεκτικὴν μὴ εἶναι λέγουσι τὴν σάρκα τῆς δωρεᾶς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἣτις ἐστὶ ζωὴ αἰώνιος, τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Κυρίου τρεφομένην, καὶ μέλος αὐτοῦ ὑπάρχουσαν.”

S. Cyril of Jerusalem, “*Lectures on the Mysteries*” (delivered A.D. 386), iii. 3 :—

“Ὡσπερ γὰρ ὁ ἄρτος τῆς εὐχαριστίας μετὰ τὴν ἐπίκλησιν τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος οὐκ ἔτι ἄρτος λιτός, ἀλλὰ σῶμα Χριστοῦ.”

Cf. iv. 6 :—“Μὴ πρόσσεχε οὖν ὡς ψιλοῖς τῷ ἄρτι καὶ τῷ οἴνῳ· σῶμα γὰρ καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ κατὰ τὴν δεσποτικὴν τυγχάνει ἀπόφασιν· εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἡ αἴσθησις σοι τοῦτο ὑποβάλλει, ἀλλὰ ἡ πίστις σε βεβαιούτω. μὴ ἀπὸ τῆς γεύσεως κρίνης τὸ πρᾶγμα, ἀλλ’ ἀπὸ τῆς πίστεως· πληροφοροῦ ἀνενδοίαστος σώματος καὶ αἵματος Χριστοῦ καταξιωθεῖς.”

Amongst the words of our own English Reformers, who so constantly professed to hold by the doctrines of the Primitive Church, we find statements as to the Real Presence in the Eucharist as strong as those just quoted; *e.g.* :—

RIDLEY says :

“In the Sacrament is a certain change, in that that bread, which was before common bread, is now made a lively presentation of Christ’s Body, and not only a figure, but effectuously representeth His Body; that even as the mortal body was nourished by that visible bread, so is the internal soul fed with the heavenly food of Christ’s Body, which the eyes of faith see, as the bodily eyes see only bread. Such a sacramental mutation I grant to be in the bread and wine, which truly is no small

change, but such a change as no mortal man can make, but only that omnipotency of Christ’s Word” (*Works*, pp. 274, 275).

“We behold with the eyes of faith Him (the true Lord and Saviour of the world) present after grace, and spiritually set upon the table; and we worship Him which sitteth above, and is worshipped of the angels. For Christ is always assistant to His Mysteries, as the said Augustine saith” (*Ibid.*, p. 251).

LATIMER :

“And the same presence may be called the real presence (because to the faithful believer there is the real or spiritual body of Christ), which thing I here rehearse, lest some sycophant or scorner should suppose me with the Anabaptist to make nothing else of the Sacrament but a bare and naked sign” (*Works*, vol. ii. p. 252).

JEWEL :

“We affirm that bread and wine are holy and heavenly mysteries of the Body and Blood of Christ, and that by them Christ Himself, being the true bread of eternal life, is so presently given unto us [sic nobis praesentem exhiberi] as that by faith we verily receive His Body and His Blood” (*Apol.*, Part ii. p. 32; ed. S.P.C.K.).

It is sometimes urged that by the Declaration on Kneeling (commonly called the “Black Rubric”), which is inserted in the Prayer Book after the Communion Office, the English Church is committed to a denial of the Real Presence. In considering the Declaration, however, the following points should be carefully borne in mind :—

- (a) It was inserted in 1552 as an afterthought,¹ and *solely on the Royal authority*,² so that the Church was not in any way committed to it in its original form.
- (b) At the Elizabethan revision (1559) the Declaration was altogether suppressed.

¹ The Prayer Book passed both Houses of Convocation on April 14, 1552, and it was decided that it should come into use on All Saints’ Day following. On September 27, when three editions had been completed, the printing was suddenly stopped, on the ground that many printer’s errors had crept in, and at the last moment (October 27) the Declaration was added.

² An entry in the Privy Council Register (October 27, 1552) orders—

“A letter to the Lord Chancellor to cause to be signed unto the Book of Common Prayer, lately set forth, a certain Declaration signed by the King’s Majesty, and sent unto his Lordship, touching the kneeling at the receiving of the Communion” (Burnet’s “Reformation,” ed. Pocock, iii. 368, note 76).

- (c) When reintroduced in 1661 a very significant change was made in the wording:—

1552.	1661.
<p>"We dooe declare that it is not ment thereby, that any adoration is doone, or oughte to bee doone, eyther unto the Sacramentall bread or wyne there bodily receyued, or unto anye <i>reall and essentiall presence</i> there beeyng of Christ's naturall fleshe and bloude."</p>	<p>"It is hereby declared, That thereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread or Wine there bodily received, or unto any <i>Corporal Presence</i> of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood."</p>

It thus appears that the Church would not have the "Black Rubric" in the Prayer Book until the words which might be taken for a denial of the truth of the Real Presence had been removed.

- (d) Further, what is said in the Declaration with respect to "the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ" being "in Heaven, and not here" is not inconsistent with Roman doctrine, and may be paralleled from the decrees of the COUNCIL OF TRENT. Cf. Session XIII. (October 1551):—

"Neque enim haec inter se pugnant, ut ipse Salvator noster semper ad dexteram Patris *in coelis* assideat, *juxta modum existendi naturalem*, et ut multis nihilominus aliis in locis sacramentaliter praesens sua substantia nobis adsit, ea existendi ratione, quam etsi verbis exprimere vix possumus, possibilem tamen esse Deo, cogitatione per fidem illustrata assequi possumus et constantissime credere debemus."

- (4) THE BODY OF CHRIST IS PRESENT AFTER AN HEAVENLY AND SPIRITUAL MANNER.

The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner.

While the doctrine of a *corporal* Presence, such as is implied in the theory of Transubstantiation, is excluded, the Church of England holds the doctrine of a *spiritual* and *real* Presence. The use of statements with regard to the *natural* Body and Blood of Christ when speaking of the Sacrament is rather misleading; for Christ present in His Sacrament is Christ Crucified and Risen, so that His Body is a *spiritual* Body (σῶμα πνευματικόν, 1 Cor. xv. 44), i.e., a Body fully indwelt in and solely animated by πνεῦμα,

and hence, though material (S. Luke xxiv. 39), possessing powers and capabilities which do not belong to the *natural* body (S. John xx. 19). It should also be remembered that the Body of Christ, of which we speak, is the Body united everlastingly to the Deity of the Second Person in the Blessed Trinity (cf. Article II.), so that the capabilities of other bodies, whether *natural* or *spiritual*, can be no measure of the capabilities of the glorified Body of Him Who fills all things (Eph. iv. 10). We are not, therefore, called upon to choose between an obsolete scholastic philosophy (implied in the definitions of the Church of Rome)¹ and a merely figurative interpretation of our Lord's words (as given by Zwingli); but, in accordance with the teaching of the formularies of our Church, we hold a *real spiritual* Presence of the Body of Christ, acknowledging that to define further the manner of that Presence is beyond the reach of our knowledge.

We may here notice the doctrine expressed by the formularies of the Lutheran type. They emphatically assert the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament:—

AUGSBURG CONFSSION, Part I. Art. X.:

"De coena Domini docent, quod corpus et sanguis Christi vere adsint, et distribuantur vescentibus in coena Domini, et improbant secus docentes."

SAXON CONFSSION, Art. XV.:

"Sed in usu instituto in hac communione vere et substantialiter adesse Christum, et vere exhiberi sumentibus corpus et sanguinem Christi."

¹ The doctrine of a *Real* though *Spiritual* Presence (as opposed to the conception involved in the doctrine of Transubstantiation) was held by some of those divines of the sixteenth century who were on the whole opposed to a doctrinal Reformation; e.g.:

Cardinal CAJETANUS (Papal Legate in Germany, before whom Luther was cited to appear in 1518) writes:

"Manducatur verum Corpus Christi in sacramento, sed non corporaliter, sed spiritualiter. Spiritualis manducatio, quae per animam fit, ad Christi carnem in sacramento existentem pertingit" (Opusc., Tom ii. Tract. 2; "De Euch.," Cap. v.).

GARDINER (Bishop of Winchester 1531-51; 1553-56, a great upholder of the Royal Supremacy, but otherwise an opponent of the Reformers), says:

"The Catholic teaching is, that the manner of Christ's presence in the Sacrament is spiritual and supernatural, not corporal nor carnal, not natural, not sensible, not perceptible, but only spiritual, the how and manner whereof God knoweth" (Quoted in Cranmer's Answer to Gardiner, Works, vol. iii. p. 241).

WURTEMBERG CONFESSION, Art. XIX. :

"De substantia Eucharistiae sentimus et docemus, quod verum corpus Christi et verus sanguis ejus in Eucharistia distribuatur, et refutamus eos qui dicunt panem et vinum Eucharistiae esse tantum absentis corporis et sanguinis Christi signa."

FORMULA OF CONCORD :

"Credimus, quod in coena Domini corpus et sanguis Christi vere et substantialiter sint praesentia, et quod una cum pane et vino vere distribuantur atque sumantur. Credimus, verba testamenti Christi non aliter accipienda esse, quam sicut verba ipsa ad literam sonant, ita, ne panis absens Christi corpus et vinum absentem Christi sanguinem significant, sed ut propter sacramentalem unionem panis et vinum vere sint corpus et sanguis Christi" (p. 599).

"Docent, quemadmodum in Christo duae distinctae et non mutatae naturae inseparabiliter sunt unitae, ita in sacra coena duas diversas substantias, panem videlicet naturalem et verum naturale corpus Christi in instituta sacramenti administratione hic in terris simul esse praesentia" (p. 736).

With regard to the Eucharist, therefore, the Reformers of the Saxon school, though rejecting 'private masses,' were much more conservative than the Swiss Reformers. Cf. :—

AUGSBURG CONFESSION, Part II. Art. III. :

"Falso accusantur ecclesiae nostrae, quod missam aboleant, retinetur enim missa apud nos, et summa reverentia celebratur. Servantur et usitatae ceremoniae fere omnes."

SAXON CONFESSION, Art. XV. :

"In ipso autem ritu servamus morem usitatum universae Ecclesiae veteris, Latinae et Graecae."

Luther met Zwingli in conference at Marburg (1529), but could come to no agreement with him on Eucharistic doctrine, and always vehemently opposed the teaching of the Swiss Reformer on this point. He himself rejected scholastic dogmas on the subject, and in his reply to Henry VIII. of England spoke of Transubstantiation as "impious" and "blasphemous." He held strongly, however, to the Real Presence, while refusing to define the precise manner of that Presence. "Consubstantiation" is the name generally used to designate Luther's own theory, and the Lutheran doctrine as finally set forth in the Formula of Concord.

(5.) THE MEANS OF RECEPTION IS FAITH.

The mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper, is Faith.

This clause of the Article refers to the subjective part of the Sacrament, the inward reception and eating by the individual. The means whereby this takes place is faith. It is not, of course, the case that the Sacrament derives its efficacy from our faith, or that faith produces the Presence of Christ within the heart; but He is present externally, and faith appropriates Him. During Christ's sojourn upon earth in the flesh, the power of the Lord was present to heal (S. Luke v. 17), but only those who had faith were able to appropriate the healing grace which flowed from His sacred Body. So now in the Eucharist we acknowledge a *real* Presence of Christ external to ourselves from which the Sacrament derives its efficacy, and we confess that this Presence is also *spiritual*, because the medium by which the external Presence affects us, and is with us, is not material contact but spiritual efficacy.

Calvin's doctrine of the Eucharist should be particularly noted. He rejected Transubstantiation,¹ and also objected to the Lutheran view as involving the *ubiquity*² of our Lord's risen Body;³ but, on the other hand, he rose far above Zwingli's teaching as to the nature and use of the Sacrament, maintaining that while the Bread and Wine are symbols or representations⁴ to which no

¹ "Mira enim astutia hic lusit Satan, ut mentes hominum e cœlo abstractas, perverso errore imbueret, ac si panis elemento affixus esset Christus. Ac primo quidem praesentia Christi in sacramento minime talis somnianda nobis est qualem Romanae curiae artifices confinxerunt; ac si locali praesentia, corpus Christi manibus atrectandum, atterendum dentibus, ore deglutendum sisteretur" (INSTITUTES, IV. xvii. 12).

² Hence those in Switzerland who held Luther's view were called *Ubiquitarians*.

³ "Alii . . . fatentur panem Coenae vere substantiam esse terreni et corruptibilis elementi, nec quicquam in se pati mutationis, sed sub se habere inclusum Christi corpus. . . . Sed quia in pane corpus ipsum locantes, ubiquitatem illi affingunt naturae suae contrariam, addendo autem Sub pane, illi occultum latere volunt: tales astutias e suis latebris paulisper extrahere necesse est" (INSTITUTES, IV. xvii. 16).

⁴ "Itaque sub pane et vino repraesentantur: quo discamus non modo nostra esse, sed nobis destinata in spiritualis vitae alimentum. Id est quod antea admonuimus, a rebus corporeis quae in sacramento proferuntur, quadam analogia nos ad spirituales deduci. Sic quum panis nobis in symbolum corporis Christi datur, haec statim concipienda est similitudo, Ut corporis nostri vitam panis alit. . . . Quum vinum in symbolum sanguinis propositum intuemur: cogitandum quos corpori usus vinum afferat (*Ibid.*, IV. xvii. 3).

Presence of Christ is attached, yet those who receive in faith¹ do really and truly partake of the Body and Blood of Christ,² which are thus in effect communicated to the faithful simultaneously with the Bread and Wine. It is usual to speak of this teaching as the doctrine of the *Virtual* Presence.

After the acceptance of the *Consensus Tigurinus* (1549), which embodied Calvin's doctrine on the Eucharist, that doctrine was generally adopted throughout Switzerland, and appears in the Confessions subsequently issued by, or under the influence of, Reformers of the Swiss school. *Cf.*, *e.g.* :—

FRENCH CONFSSION, Art. XXXVI. :

"Quamvis enim nunc sit in coelis, ibidem etiam mansurus, donec veniat mundum judicaturus: credimus tamen eum arcana et incomprehensibili spiritus sui virtute per fidem apprehensa, nos nutrire et vivificare sui corporis et sanguinis substantia."

SCOTCH CONFSSION, Art. XXI. :

"Atque etiam quod in Coena Domini rite usurpata, Christus ita nobis conjungitur, quod sit ipsissimum animarum nostrarum nutrimentum et pabulum."

BELGIC CONFSSION, Art. XXXV. :

"Ut autem panem hunc spiritualem et coelestem Christus nobis figuraret, sive repraesentaret; instituit Panem et Vinum terrenum et visibilem in Corporis et Sanguinis sui Sacramentum: ut iis nobis testificetur, quam vere accipimus et tenemus manibus nostris hoc Sacramentum, illudque ore comedimus (unde et postmodum vita haec nostra sustentatur), tam vere etiam nos fide (quae animae nostrae est instar et manus et oris) recipere verum corpus et verum sanguinem Christi, in animis nostris, ad vitam spiritualem in nobis fovendam."

¹ "Ego vero nego posse comedi absque fidei gustu: vel (si cum Augustino loqui magis placet) nego plus referre homines ex Sacramento quam vase fidei colligunt" (*Ibid.*, IV. xvii. 33).

² "Quicquid ad exprimendam veram substantialemque corporis ac sanguinis Domini communicationem, quae sub sacris Coenae symbolis fidelibus exhibetur, facere potest, libenter recipio: atque ita ut non imaginatione duntaxat aut mentis intelligentia percipere, sed ut re ipsa frui in alimentum vitae aeternae intelligantur" (*Ibid.*, IV. xvii. 19).

"Quod si humanitus excogitata symbola, quae imagines sunt rerum absentium potius quam notae praesentium, quas etiam ipsas fallaciter saepissime adumbrant, earum tamen titulis interdum ornantur: quae a Deo sunt instituta, multo majori ratione rerum nomina mutantur, quarum et certam minimeque fallacem significationem semper gerunt, et adjunctam habent secum veritatem" (*Ibid.*, IV. xvii. 21).

SECOND HELVETIC CONFSSION, Art. XXI. :

"Ergo accipiunt fideles quod datur a ministro domini, et edunt panem domini, ac bibunt de poculo domini: intus interim opera Christi per spiritum sanctum percipiunt etiam carnem et sanguinem domini, et pascuntur his in vitam aeternam."

Of the German Reformers, Melancthon approximated to Calvinistic doctrine on the Eucharist. In the *CONFESSIO VARIATA* (1540) he substituted for the wording of the Augsburg Confession ("quod Corpus et Sanguis Christi vere adsint, et distribuuntur in coena") the following clause:—

"Quod cum pane et vino vere exhibeantur Corpus et Sanguis Christi."¹

(6.) CERTAIN PRACTICES COMMON IN MEDIAEVAL TIMES ARE DECLARED TO BE NOT TRACEABLE TO CHRIST'S INSTITUTION.

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.

A few words must be said concerning each of the practices here referred to:—

(i.) *Reservation.*

In pre-Reformation times the Reserved Host was sometimes worn round the neck,² held in the hand when undergoing the ordeal of fire,³ or buried with the dead.⁴ Such practices were not by the ordinance of Christ, Who instituted the Sacrament that it might be received. See the last paragraph of Article XXV., which states:—

"The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about: but that we should duly use them."

Cf. COUNCIL OF TRENT (Session XIII.) :—

"Fuerit a Christo Domino, ut sumatur, institutum" (Cap. v.).

There can scarcely, however, be any objection to Reservation of the Sacrament, when the express purpose of such

¹ This wording agrees with Calvin's manner of speaking; *e.g.* :—

"Dico igitur, in Coenae mysterio per symbola panis et vini, Christum vere nobis exhiberi, adeoque corpus et sanguinem ejus" (*INSTITUTES*, IV. xvii. 11).

² Thus Pope Benedict XIII., when he fled in disguise from Avignon, for his special protection bore upon his breast a little box containing the consecrated Element.

³ *E.g.*, Fra Domenico, when going forth to the ordeal of fire on behalf of Savonarola, refused to enter the flames without bearing in his hand the consecrated Host. The incident will be familiar to readers of George Eliot's "Romola."

⁴ This practice must have spread to some considerable extent, since we find it forbidden "to give the Eucharist to the bodies of the departed" by the Council of Carthage (397), and again by that of Auxerre (578).

Reservation is that those may receive who otherwise would be unable to do so. *E.g.*, it is often impossible, and at all times difficult, to secure a reverent celebration of the Holy Communion, or indeed any celebration at all, in the crowded dwellings of the poorest in our large cities, in cases of dangerous infectious diseases, or in critical cases of accidents. The communicating of such special cases with the Reserved Sacrament would be quite in accord with the practice of the Primitive Church.¹

Cf. JUSTIN MARTYR, *Apol. i.* :—

“Εὐχαριστήσαντος δὲ τοῦ προεστῶτος καὶ ἐπευφημήσαντος παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ οἱ καλούμενοι παρ’ ἡμῖν διάκονοι διδόνασιν ἐκάστῳ τῶν παρόντων μεταλαβεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐχαριστηθέντος ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος καὶ τοῖς οὐ παροῦσιν ἀποφέρουσι” (*Cap. 65*).

“Καὶ ἡ διάδοσις καὶ ἡ μετάληψις ἀπὸ τῶν εὐχαριστηθέντων ἐκάστῳ γίγεται καὶ τοῖς οὐ παροῦσι διὰ τῶν διακόνων πέμπεται” (*Cap. 67*).

In the Prayer Book of 1549 Reservation for the Communion of sick persons was allowed, though with certain restrictions :—

“And yf the same daye there be a celebracion of the holy cōmunion in the churche, then shall the priest reserue (at the open communion) so muche of the sacrament of the body and bloud, as shall serue the sicke person, and so many as shall communicate with hym (yf there be any). And so soone as he conueniently may, after the open communion ended in the church, shall goe and minister the same.

“And yf there be moe sicke persons to be visited the same day that the curate doth celebrate in any sicke mā’s house; then shall the curate (there) reserue so muche of the sacramente of the body and bloud: as shall serue the other sicke persons, and such as be appoynted to communicate with them (yf there be any). And shall immediately cary it, and minister it unto them.”

In the second Prayer Book (1552) permission to reserve the Sacrament was withdrawn; but in the Latin Prayer Book authorised by Queen Elizabeth (1560) Reservation for the sick was again permitted.²

¹ In the Eastern Church at the present day, as in primitive times, the Sacrament is reserved for the purpose of Communion only.

² Calvin altogether opposed Reservation, even for the purpose of communicating the sick. *Cf.* INSTITUTES, IV. xvii. 39 :—

“Quorsum igitur evadet altera (scil. consecratio),cujus vis ad aegrotos usque non pervenit? Sed enim qui sic faciunt, habent veteris Ecclesiae exemplum. Fateor, verum in re tanta, et in qua non sine magno periculo erratur, nihil tutius est quam ipsam veritatem sequi.”

The rubric which now stands at the end of the Communion Service directing that the Consecrated Elements shall be reverently consumed immediately after the Blessing has historically no connection with Reservation. It was inserted at the revision of 1661, a century after the practice of Reservation had ceased in the English Church, and its purpose was to guard against any profane use of the Consecrated Elements.

(ii.) Closely connected with the Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament are the *Carrying about* and *Worshipping* of the Consecrated Elements.

In East and West alike, in primitive times, the Sacrament was reserved for purposes of Communion only; but in the Middle Ages we find a development in the Western Church, the Reserved Host being treated as an object of worship. The events of Holy Week were dramatised, the Host being carried in procession on Palm Sunday, placed in a sepulchre on Good Friday, and carried in the procession on Easter Day. After the institution of the Feast of Corpus Christi (in the thirteenth century) a procession of the Host soon became the characteristic observance of the Festival.¹ At first the Host was always veiled when thus carried, but by degrees the custom obtained of placing it in a vessel of glass or crystal fitted into a case of precious metal (called the Monstrance), and it was thus exposed to the veneration of the faithful.² Thus in pre-Reformation times men professed great reverence for the Blessed Sacrament by worshipping, whether at a celebration, or when the Host was carried in procession, and yet at the same time neglected the very end of the Institution of the Sacrament—its constant reception by all the faithful—so that it had come about that the people communicated very rarely. At the Reformation a reaction set in. Our Reformers, seeing that the purpose for which Christ instituted

¹ M. Thiers has shown (“*Traité de l’Exposition du S. Sacrament*”) that the origin of the procession is not to be traced to this Festival, because instances of the procession are on record before the Festival was instituted.

² The exposition of the Sacrament at other times than the Festival of Corpus Christi dates from the seventeenth century; and in the present day, with some form of service, it is a matter of very frequent occurrence in the Roman Church. Such service concludes with the Blessing pronounced by the priest, who makes the sign of the Cross over the people with the Monstrance; hence the rite has gained the name of “*Benediction*.”

the Sacrament had been obscured, emphasised the Communion aspect of the Eucharist, and drew attention to the fact that the worshipping of the Sacrament, which had for so long held a prominent place in the devotions of the Western Church, was not "by Christ's ordinance."

While the Reformers thus found it necessary for those times to protest against the worshipping of the Sacrament, which had taken the place of frequent participation, they had no intention of refusing worship to Christ present in His Sacrament. *E.g.*, RIDLEY says:—

"We worship, I confess, the same true Lord and Saviour of the world . . . we behold with the eyes of faith Him present after grace, and spiritually set upon the table; and we worship Him which sitteth above, and is worshipped of the angels" (Works, p. 251).

Christ present in the Sacrament is to be worshipped, for, as God (and the Manhood has been "taken into God"), worship is due to Him, under whatever conditions He manifests Himself. The worship is not directed to the outward sign, the substance of Bread and Wine; it is obvious that no adoration ought to be done unto the Sacramental Bread and Wine bodily received (Black Rubric).

(iii.) *Elevation.*

The Elevation referred to in the Article is the lifting up of the Consecrated Elements for the adoration of the people, a practice usual in the West in pre-Reformation times, though not formally authorised before the thirteenth century, and now occupying a prominent place in the celebration of Mass in the Church of Rome.

Such Elevation was expressly forbidden in the Prayer Book of 1549, by a rubric inserted immediately after the Consecration:—

"These wordes before rehersed are to be saied, turning still to the Altar, without any eleuacion, or shewing the Sacrament to the people."

This prohibition was, however, removed in 1552, and has not since been revived.

The statement of the Article should not be taken as covering the Elevation of the Sacrament in presenting the Sacrifice to the Father, a ritual action almost universal in

early times,¹ and traced, in primitive Liturgies, to the action of our Lord Himself at the Institution of the Sacrament. *Cf.*, *e.g.*, the Greek Liturgy of S. James:—

"Ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ἣ παρεδίδοτο, μᾶλλον δὲ ἑαυτὸν παρεδίδου, ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς καὶ σωτηρίας

[ἔτα ὁ ἱερεὺς τῇ χειρὶ τὸν ἄρτον κατασχὼν λέγει]
λαβὼν τὸν ἄρτον ἐπὶ τῶν ἁγίων καὶ ἀχράντων καὶ ἀμόμων καὶ ἀθανάτων αὐτοῦ χειρῶν, ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ ἀναδείξας σοὶ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ, εὐχαριστήσας, ἀγιάσας, κλάσας, ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν τοῖς αὐτοῦ μαθηταῖς καὶ ἀποστόλοις, εἰπὼν" κ.τ.λ.

The Elevation of the Sacrament (corresponding to the typical heaving and waving of the Peace Offering) was thus in primitive times a representation on earth of the continual showing forth of Christ's Sacrifice before the Father in heaven (*cf.* 1 Cor. xi. 26), and was avowedly "by Christ's ordinance," for the elevation, no less than the blessing and the breaking, of the Bread was stated to be done in imitation of His own action.

The connection in which the words "lifted up" stand in the Article justifies us in limiting their application to the "shewing to the people," for there is in the present Article no question as to the Eucharistic Sacrifice; but the paragraph in which the words occur is concerned with those devotions to the Sacrament which had so largely taken the place of Communion, and had thus obscured the great end of its institution.

The great moderation of the wording of this last paragraph of the Article is very noticeable. It is not asserted that the practices referred to are contrary to Christ's ordinance, but simply affirmed that such uses do not come within the scope of what has been Divinely ordained. In dealing with the same subjects the Continental Confessions speak much more strongly. *Cf.*, *e.g.*:—

SAXON CONFESSION, Art. XV.:

"Est et manifesta profanatio, partem coenae Domini circumgestare et adorare."

WURTEMBERG CONFESSION, Art. XIX.:

"Alius error est, quod una pars Eucharistiae soleat in singu-

¹ It is found in the Liturgies of S. James, S. Basil, S. Chrysostom, the Armenian and Coptic Liturgies, and others. It occurs in the modern Roman Service, as well as the Elevation for the adoration of the congregation.

THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES

larem cultum Dei circumgestari et reponi. Vetat autem Spiritus Sanctus ne cultus Dei, sine certo Dei mandato, instituat.

See also SCOTCH CONFESSION, Art. XXII.:

“Adoratio, veneratio, circumgestatio per plateas urbium, conservatio panis in pixide, vel capsula, non sunt legitimus usus Sacramenti corporis Christi, sed mera ejusdem profanatio.”

WESTMINSTER CONFESSION, XXIX. 4:

“Worshipping the elements, the lifting them up, or carrying them about for adoration, and the reserving them for any pretended religious use; are all contrary to the nature of this sacrament, and to the institution of Christ.”

On May 1, 1900, the Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Temple) delivered an opinion on the Reservation of the Sacrament, in which he came to the conclusion that “the Church of England does not at present allow Reservation in any form.” The conclusion was supported by a lengthy argument, in the course of which it was stated that “the language of the XXVIIIth Article cannot be taken otherwise than as condemning the practice altogether.” This seems to go beyond what the Article, strictly interpreted, actually says, and the Archbishop’s remark would more properly apply to the Lutheran and Calvinistic formularies quoted above.

ARTICLE XXIX

OF THE WICKED WHICH DO NOT EAT THE BODY OF CHRIST IN THE USE OF THE LORD’S SUPPER.	DE MANDUCATIONE CORPORIS CHRISTI, ET IMPIOS ILLUD NON MANDUCARE.
--	--

The wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as Saint Augustine saith) the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ: yet in nowise are they partakers of Christ, but rather to their condemnation do eat and drink the sign or Sacrament of so great a thing.

Impii et fide vera destituti, licet carnaliter, et visibiliter (ut Augustinus loquitur) Corporis et Sanguinis Christi Sacramentum, dentibus premant, nullo tamen modo Christi participes efficiuntur. Sed potius tantae rei Sacramentum, seu Symbolum, ad judicium sibi manducant et bibunt.

§ I.—SOURCE.

This Article first appeared in the draft presented to Convocation in 1562. It was, however, struck out from the Articles as sanctioned by the Queen, and was not published until 1571, when it was reinserted by the Bishops.

The scruples of Cecil, or of the Queen, who both inclined to pre-Reformation doctrine on the Eucharist, may account for the withdrawal of this Article from the Convocation records in 1562; or perhaps its suppression should be traced to a desire to deal tenderly with those who held Roman doctrine, and who were still at this time in communion with the Church of England.

In 1571, however, the secession of the Romanist party in England was taking place,¹ so that there was no need for the continued exercise of such forbearance. This circumstance would account for the readmission of the Article at that date.

A further ground for hesitation in promulgating the Article may have been the doubt raised as to the authenticity of the

¹ For the first eleven years of Elizabeth’s reign the Roman party made their Communion and celebrated in English churches according to the Prayer Book. The final Bull of excommunication was not issued from Rome until 1570.

words quoted and attributed to S. Augustine.¹ The fairness of the quotation was, we know, called in question by Cecil during an interview with Archbishop Parker, which took place in 1571.²

§ 2.—OBJECT.

To guard against merely mechanical views of the Sacrament, and to provide a safeguard by reminding us how alone we may receive the Sacrament beneficially. We may compare the Article with the words of the Exhortation in the Communion Office:—

“For as the benefit is great, if with a true penitent heart and lively faith we receive that holy Sacrament . . . so is the danger great, if we receive the same unworthily. For then we are guilty of the Body and Blood of Christ our Saviour; we eat and drink our own damnation, not considering the Lord’s Body.”

§ 3.—EXPOSITION.

It is clear, of course, that there can be no beneficial reception by those who are in a state of sin; the Sacrament cannot act as a sort of charm in the case of such as come without faith and unprepared. On the other hand, we have seen that Christ is present objectively in the Sacrament, His Presence not depending upon the mental emotion or spiritual condition of the recipient.

Now we are not here involved in any contradiction. We distinguish in the Holy Eucharist three parts—the *Signum*, the *Res*, and the *Virtus Sacramenti*.³ Of these the *Signum*, viz., Bread and Wine, is evidently received by all communicants. The *Res*,

¹ The passage in question occurs in the twenty-sixth Treatise on S. John. It was rejected by the Benedictine editors of S. Augustine as not being genuine, but the words occur in Alcuin, Bede, and others.

² An account of the occurrence is given in Strype’s “Parker,” pp. 331, 332.

³ For this threefold division we have the sanction of the Church Catechism. It can scarcely escape the notice of an attentive reader that there is a marked difference between the account of Baptism and that of the Holy Eucharist there given. In the instruction on the Sacrament of Baptism two heads are given:—

“What is the outward visible sign or form in Baptism?”

“What is the inward and spiritual grace?”

while in the account given of the Eucharist the teaching of the Catechism is arranged under three heads:—

“What is the outward part or sign (*Signum*) of the Lord’s Supper?”

“What is the inward part, or thing signified (*Res*)?”

“What are the benefits whereof we are partakers thereby (*Virtus Sacramenti*)?”

the Body and Blood of Christ, is really there, and is sacramentally received by all.¹ But while the reality of the Sacrament is not dependent upon faith,² our own individual ability to partake spiritually of Christ is thus dependent. Christ’s Presence is only realised by the faithful; only they receive the *Virtus* of the Sacrament; only they “so eat the Flesh of Christ and drink His Blood”³ that He evermore dwells in them, and they in Him.

The wicked, as our Article says, are in no wise partakers of Christ; on the contrary, by their wilfulness and misuse of His most holy Ordinance, they incur condemnation. (See the passages of Scripture quoted below.)

It is to be noted that, since It neither derives virtue nor efficacy from the worthiness of the receivers, nor suffers any loss or diminution of Its power and perfectness by reason of their unworthiness, therefore the Sacrament *always takes effect*; but not always the same effect. To some it is the savour of life, unto life; to others, of death, unto death:—

“In such only as worthily receive the Sacraments, they have a wholesome effect or operation: but they that receive them unworthily, purchase to themselves damnation” (Article XXV.).

¹ Cf. Cranmer, Works, iii. p. 146:—

“As of some the Scripture saith, that their riches is their redemption, and to some it is their damnation; and as God’s word to some is life, to some it is death and a snare, as the prophet saith; and Christ Himself to some is a stone to stumble at, to some is a raising from death; not by conversion of substances (i.e., it is one and the same word and one and the same Christ, whatever the effect may be), but by good or evil use, that thing which to the godly is salvation, to the ungodly is damnation: so is the water in Baptism, and the Bread and Wine in the Lord’s Supper, to the worthy receivers Christ Himself and eternal life, and to the unworthy receivers everlasting death and damnation: not by conversion of one substance into another (the Sacraments are the same in both cases), but by godly or ungodly use thereof.”

² Cf. SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION, Art. XIX. :—

“Interim sicut a dignitate, vel indignitate ministrorum, non aestimamus integritatem sacramentorum, itaque neque a conditione sumentium. Agnoscimus enim sacramentorum integritatem ex fide vel veritate meraque bonitate Dei dependere. Sicut enim Verbum Dei manet verum Verbum Dei, quod non tantum verba nuda recitantur, dum praedicatur, sed simul a Deo offeruntur, et intelligant, rebus tamen significatis non perfruuntur; eo quod vera fide non recipient: Ita sacramenta verbo, signis, et rebus significatis, constantia, manent vera et integra Sacramenta, non tantum significantia res sacras, sed Deo offerente etiam res significatas, tametsi increduli res oblatas non percipiant. Fit hoc non dantis aut offerentis Dei vitio, sed hominum sine fide illegitimeque accipientium culpa; quorum incredulitas fidem Dei irritam non facit.”

³ Prayer of Humble Access in Communion Office.

Our exposition is in accordance with Scripture teaching on the subject; see, *e.g.*:—

(a) 1 Cor. xi. 27: ὡστε ὃς ἂν ἐσθίῃ τὸν ἄρτον, ἢ πίνη τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ Κυρίου ἀναξίως, ἔνοχος ἔσται τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Κυρίου.

A person who received unworthily could not be said to be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord if the Elements, after consecration, were mere ordinary bread and wine.

(b) 1 Cor. xi. 29: ὁ γὰρ ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων κρίμα ἐαυτῷ ἐσθίει καὶ πίνει, μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα.

But there would be no blame in not discriminating the Lord's Body, unless that Body were present there.

It is also in accord with the teaching of St. Augustine where his text is undisputed and his teaching unambiguous, see *e.g.* *Tract. in Joan.*, xxvii. 11: "Ut carnem Christi et sanguinem Christi non edamus tantum in sacramento, quod et multi mali; sed usque ad spiritus participationem manducemus, ut ejus spiritu vegetemur et non scandalizemur."

With the doctrine thus stated Cranmer's words are in agreement when he writes: "The diversity is not in the body, but in the eating thereof, no man eating it carnally; but the good eating it both Sacramentally and Spiritually, the evil only Sacramentally." *On the Lord's Supper*, pp. 224, 225 (ed. Parker Society). Ridley in the disputation at Oxford before his death expressly affirmed his agreement with St. Augustine: "Evil men," he said, "do eat the very true and natural Body of Christ Sacramentally and no further, as St. Augustine saith. But good men do eat the very true Body both Sacramentally and Spiritually by grace." *Ridley's Works*, p. 246 (ed. Parker Society). The Article clearly, therefore, should not be interpreted as denying that there is a Sacramental eating of the Body of Christ which even the wicked share.

ARTICLE XXX

OF BOTH KINDS.

DE UTRAQUE SPECIE.

The Cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the lay people. For both the parts of the Lord's Sacrament, by Christ's ordinance and commandment, ought to be ministered to all Christian men alike.

Calix Domini laicis non est denegandus: utraque enim pars Dominici Sacramenti ex Christi institutione et praecepto, omnibus Christianis ex aequo administrari debet.

§ 1.—SOURCE.

Composed by the English Reformers, and first inserted at the Elizabethan revision (1563).

§ 2.—OBJECT.

To restore to the laity participation in the Chalice, which, by a strange abuse, had been taken from them in the Western Church.¹

We may trace the withdrawal of the Cup from the laity to the operation of two causes:—

- (a) The danger of irreverence suggested this course as a means for securing the Chalice from profanation. Even in the eleventh century, when Communion in both kinds was still the rule of the Church, the consecrated Wine was sometimes administered through a tube as a precaution against spilling any portion of it.
- (b) The growth of the belief in Transubstantiation also contributed to the discontinuance of the administration of the Sacrament in both kinds, for it was held that our Blessed Lord was so entirely and indivisibly present in either Element that all who were partakers of the consecrated Host

¹ In the Eastern Church both Elements are given to the communicants together in a spoon, the consecrated Bread being first dipped in the Chalice.

received therein His Body and His Blood. This is called the doctrine of "*Concomitance*."¹

The COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE (Session XIII., June 15, 1415) enforced Communion in one kind, justifying it both as a safeguard against dangers, and also from the doctrine of Concomitance. The decree of the Council on the subject runs as follows:—

"Et sicut haec consuetudo ad evitandum aliqua pericula et scandala est rationabiliter introducta, quod licet in primitiva ecclesia hujusmodi sacramentum reciperetur a fidelibus sub utraque specie, postea a conscientibus utraque, et a laicis tantummodo sub specie panis suscipiatur: cum firmissime credendum sit, et nullatenus dubitandum, integrum Christi corpus et sanguinem tam sub specie panis, quam sub specie vini veraciter contineri. Unde cum hujusmodi consuetudo ab ecclesia et sanctis patribus rationabiliter introducta, et diutissime observata sit, habenda est pro lege, quam non licet reprobare, aut sine ecclesiae auctoritate pro libito mutare."

Further, the penalty of excommunication is threatened:—

"Item ipsa sancta Synodus decernit et declarat super ista materia, reverendissimis in Christo patribus, et dominis patriarchis, primatibus, archiepiscopis, episcopis, et eorum in spiritualibus vicariis ubilibet constitutis, processus esse dirigendos, in quibus eis committatur et mandetur auctoritate hujus sacri Concilii sub poena excommunicationis, ut effectualiter puniant eos contra hoc decretum excedentes, qui communicando populum sub utraque specie panis et vini exhortati fuerint, et sic faciendum esse docuerint."

At the outset of the Reformation in Germany, Luther protested against the withdrawal of the Cup from the laity,² and the AUGSBURG CONFESSION reformed the abuse. See Part II. Art. I:—

"Laicis datur utraque species sacramenti in coena Domini, quia hic mos habet mandatum Domini (Matt. xxvi.) Bibite ex hoc omnes. Ubi manifeste praecepit Christus de poculo, ut omnes

¹ The doctrine appeared as early as the time of S. Anselm, who stated "in utraque specie totum Christum sumi" (Epistles, Lib. iv. ep. 117).

² In his famous "Prelude on the Babylonish Captivity of the Church" (1520), Luther characterised departure from primitive rule in this matter as impiety.

bibant, et ne quis possit cavillari, quod hoc ad sacerdotes tantum pertineat, Paulus ad Corinth. exemplum recitat, in quo apparet totam ecclesiam utraque specie usam esse."

In the reign of Henry VIII. the English Church was not prepared to go so far in a reforming direction as to alter the prevailing custom in this matter, and when the German reforming party (whose deputies had been in conference, in 1538, with representative English divines)¹ freely censured the withdrawal of the Cup from the laity as an abuse, England replied with the SIX ARTICLE LAW, the second Article of which expressly declared that Communion in both kinds is not necessary for all.

Stat. 1 Ed. VI. c. 1, however, in conformity with a unanimous decree of Convocation, legalised Communion in both kinds, which was also provided for in the two Prayer Books of 1549 and 1552.

With our Article we may compare the tenth of the XI. Articles of 1559, which affirms:—

"I am of that mind also, that the holy Communion or Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, for the due obedience to Christ's institution, and to express the virtue of the same, ought to be ministered unto the people under both kinds: and that it is avouched by certain fathers of the Church to be a plain sacrilege, to rob them of the mystical cup for whom Christ hath shed his most precious Blood, seeing he himself hath said, Drink ye all of this; considering also, that in the time of the ancient doctors of the Church, as Cyprian, Hierom, Augustine, Gelasius, and others, six hundred years after Christ and more, both the parts of the Sacrament were ministered to the people."

When the COUNCIL OF TRENT reassembled in 1562, under Pope Pius IV., both the Emperor Ferdinand and the Cardinal of Lorraine, with other representatives from France, urged the desirability of yielding Communion in both kinds. In the result, however, Decrees and Canons were agreed upon confirming the mediæval practice (Session XXI.):—

"Itaque sancta ipsa Synodus, a Spiritu sancto, qui spiritus est sapientiae et intellectus, spiritus consilii et pietatis, edocta, atque ipsius Ecclesiae judicium et consuetudinem secuta, declarat ac

¹ See pp. 6, 7.

docet, nullo divino praecepto Laicos et Clericos non conficientes obligari ad Eucharistiae Sacramentum sub utraque specie sumendum; neque ullo pacto salva fide dubitari posse, quin illis alterius speciei communicatio ad salutem sufficiat."

CANON I.—Si quis dixerit, ex Dei praecepto, vel necessitate salutis, omnes et singulos Christi fideles utramque speciem sanctissimi Eucharistiae Sacramenti sumere debere; anathema sit.

CANON II.—Si quis dixerit, sanctam Ecclesiam Catholicam non justis causis et rationibus adductam fuisse, ut Laicos atque etiam Clericos non conficientes sub panis tantummodo specie communicaret, aut in eo errasse; anathema sit.

CANON III.—Si quis negaverit, totum et integrum Christum omnium gratiarum fontem et auctorem sub una panis specie sumi, quia, ut quidam falso asserunt, non secundum ipsius Christi institutionem sub utraque specie sumatur; anathema sit.

To the decrees on Reformation passed at the twenty-second Session of the Council was appended a further decree referring to the Pope the question of yielding the chalice to the laity:—

"Insuper, quum eadem sacrosancta synodus superiori sessione duos articulos alias propositos, et tum nondum discussos, videlicet: an rationes, quibus sancta catholica ecclesia adducta fuit, ut communicaret laicos atque etiam non celebrantes sacerdotes sub una panis specie, ita sint retinendae, ut nulla ratione calicis usus cuiquam sit permittendus; et: an, si honestis et Christianae caritati consentaneis rationibus concedendus alicui vel nationi vel regno calicis usus videatur, sub aliquibus conditionibus concedendus sit, et quanam illae sint, in aliud tempus, oblata sibi occasione, examinandos atque definiendos reservaverit; nunc, eorum, pro quibus petitur, salutis optime consultum volens, decrevit, integrum negotium ad sanctissimum dominum nostrum esse referendum, prout praesenti decreto refert, qui pro sua singulari prudentia id efficiat, quod utile reipublicae Christianae, et salutare petentibus usum calicis fore judicaverit."

§ 3.—EXPOSITION.

By Christ's command and ordinance both kinds should be administered to all. His words at the Institution of the Sacrament, with reference to the Cup, were, Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες (S. Matt. xxvi. 27); and S. Mark (xiv. 23) adds, καὶ ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες. Cf. also S. Paul's testimony in 1 Cor. x. 21, xi. 26, et seqq.

Two considerations which are sometimes brought forward as justifying Communion in one kind may be briefly noticed:—

(a) It has been urged that it was to priests our Lord said the words, "Drink ye all."

But this argument scarcely applies, since the Roman Church withholds the Cup from all present at the celebration of the Eucharist, whether priests or laymen, except only the consecrating priest.

(b) There is the argument from the doctrine of "Concomitance," viz., that in the one Species we receive both the Body and the Blood of the Lord, for in the Body we have the Blood.

But the Blood of Christ of which we partake in the Eucharist is emphatically stated by our Lord to be His Blood as *shed* in Sacrifice for us:—

"This is my Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins" (Prayer of Consecration).

Cf. the words of administration:—

"The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee." . . .

We do not, of course, assert that those who communicate in one kind only lose the grace of the Sacrament which is necessary to salvation; at the same time the withdrawal of the Cup from the laity is a mutilation of Christ's ordinance.

Since our Lord enjoined the reception of both Elements, it is the part of loyal Christians thankfully to receive both, being assured that no part of His ordinance is without its effect and grace, and that therefore the partaking of the chalice has its own special significance. For the participation of the Blood of Christ as shed in Sacrifice seems particularly to have reference to our need as sinners, so that participation in the Consecrated Cup is participation in the Life of Christ, as charged with all the healing power which flows from His atoning Sacrifice.