

In this connection the same Confession also emphasises the unique character of the Sacrifice of Christ:—

“De his opinionibus nostri admonuerunt, quod dissentiant a Scripturis sanctis, et laedant gloriam passionis Christi. Nam passio Christi fuit oblatio et satisfactio, non solum pro culpa originis, sed etiam pro omnibus reliquis peccatis.” . . .

We may also compare the ninth of the XI. ARTICLES of 1559:—

“The doctrine that maintaineth the mass to be a propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and dead, and a mean to deliver souls out of purgatory, is neither agreeable to Christ's ordinance, nor grounded upon doctrine Apostolic, but contrariwise most ungodly and most injurious to the precious redemption of our Saviour Christ, and his only sufficient Sacrifice offered once for ever upon the altar of the Cross.”

The word “blasphema” was inserted in the Article in 1563.

§ 2.—OBJECT.

To set forth the unique character and the completeness of the Sacrifice which Christ offered on the Cross, and to oppose the idea current in the times immediately preceding the Reformation with regard to the repetition of that Offering in the “Sacrifices of Masses.”

§ 3.—EXPOSITION.

(1.) THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST, ONCE OFFERED, IS THE ONLY SACRIFICE FOR SIN.

The Offering of Christ once made is the perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual, and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. (See Heb. ix. 25, 26; x. 10, 26.)

The doctrine of the Atonement has been already treated in Articles II. and XV. (where see notes). The point specially emphasised in the present Article is the unique character and the completeness of the Sacrifice of Christ, a truth which had been obscured by the pre-Reformation system with regard to the offering of Masses. (See the quotations from the Augsburg Confession, Part II. Art. III., given in § 1 above.)

ARTICLE XXXI

OF THE ONE OBLATION OF CHRIST
FINISHED UPON THE CROSS.

DE UNICA CHRISTI OBLATIONE
IN CRUCE PERFECTA.

The Offering of Christ once made is the perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual, and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the Priests did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.

Oblatio Christi semel facta, perfecta est redemptio, propitiatio et satisfactio pro omnibus peccatis totius mundi, tam originalibus quam actualibus. Neque praeter illam unicum est ulla alia pro peccatis expiatio. Unde Missarum sacrificia, quibus vulgo dicebatur, sacerdotem offerre Christum in remissionem poenae aut culpae pro vivis et defunctis, blasphemata sunt, et perniciosae imposturae.

§ 1.—SOURCE.

This Article was composed by the English Reformers, and first appeared as the thirtieth of the XLII. Articles of 1553. It is parallel to Article III. Part II. of the AUGSBURG CONFESSIO, but there is not such close verbal agreement between the two as to warrant the conclusion that our Article was directly based upon the very much longer statement of the Lutheran formulary. Like our Article, the Augsburg Confession refers to the popular theory which led to the excessive multiplication of Masses:—

“Accessit opinio, quae auxit privatas missas in infinitum, videlicet quod Christus sua passione satisfecerit pro peccato originis, et instituerit missam, in qua fieret oblatio pro quotidianis delictis, mortalibus et venialibus. Hinc manavit publica opinio, quod missa sit opus delens peccata vivorum et mortuorum ex opere operato. Hic coeptum est disputari, utrum una missa dicta pro pluribus, tantundem valeat, quantum singulae pro singulis. Haec disputatio peperit istam infinitam multitudinem missarum.”

It is significant that in each place where the Offering of Christ is touched upon in the Articles the sufficiency of His Sacrifice as an Atonement for *all* sin is especially dwelt upon:—

ARTICLE II.:

“To be a Sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men.”

ARTICLE XV.:

“He came to be the Lamb without spot, who by sacrifice of himself once made, should take away the sins of the world.”

If the words of this thirty-first Article are carefully compared with the (more or less) parallel passage in the Augsburg Confession, the very emphatic manner in which this truth was stated by our English Reformers comes out in strong relief:—

AUGSBURG CONFESSION:

“Passio Christi fuit oblatio et satisfactio, non solum pro culpa originis, sed etiam pro omnibus reliquis peccatis.”

Our Article contains the additional words, “*perfecta*” . . . “*totius mundi*.” Similar phraseology also appears in the Consecration Prayer as arranged in 1552:—

“Who made there, by his one Oblation of himself once offered, a full, *perfect*, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of *the whole world*.”¹

(2.) CONDEMNATION OF THE IDEA THAT IN THE SACRIFICES OF MASSES THERE IS A REPETITION OF THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST.

Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the Priests did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.

¹ In Bullinger's “*Decades*” (1550), a book which exercised considerable influence in England, and was recommended by the Convocation of Canterbury (1586) as a text-book for curates who were not licensed to preach, there is likewise emphasised the sufficiency of the Sacrifice of Christ for the sins of the whole world:—

“Itaque relinquitur jam indubitatum Christum Dominum plenariam esse propitiationem, satisfactionem hostiamque, ac victimam pro peccatis (pro poena, inquam, et pro culpa) *totius mundi*, et quidem solam.”

What the Article thus strongly condemns is the popular theory (*vulgo dicebatur*) of the times immediately preceding the Reformation, in consequence of which the number of private Masses had been enormously multiplied, wherein it was supposed that Christ was offered for the remission of pain (especially Purgatorial pain) or guilt, and whereby both the unique character of the Sacrifice of Christ and the great end of the Institution of the Sacrament (*viz.*, its reception by the faithful) had been obscured.

A strict attention to the precise wording of the Article, and a comparison with the Augsburg Confession (see § 1 above), make it evident that it is not the Primitive and Catholic doctrine as to the Eucharistic Sacrifice which is here condemned, but the common opinion bound up with the pre-Reformation system of sacrifices of Masses (note the plural), which had come to be regarded as efficacious for living or dead “*ex opere operato*,” and as affording in themselves a satisfaction apart from, or supplementary to, the Sacrifice of our Saviour Christ upon the Cross.¹

These “sacrifices of Masses” are said by our Article to be:—

- (a) Blasphemous fables, in that it was taught that Masses are sacrifices for sin distinct from the Sacrifice of Christ.
- (b) Dangerous deceits, or pernicious impostures (*perniciosae imposturae*).

Such strong language is indeed justified, for terrible results had followed upon the popular theory; so many Masses were said for so much money, and in this way (so it was asserted) souls were released from Purgatory. It is easy to see how such a system would degenerate into most disgraceful imposture, and traffic for the sake of gain.

¹ Bishop Gardiner, who was on the whole decidedly conservative in matters of doctrine, protested against the popular conception with which our Article deals. *Cf.*, *e.g.*, his Sermon on S. Peter's Day, 1548:—

“When men added to the Mass an opinion of satisfaction, or of a new redemption, they put it to another use than it was ordained for.”

Cf. the same prelate's words, as quoted by Cranmer, On the Lord's Supper:—

“This is agreed, and by the Scriptures plainly taught, that the Oblation and Sacrifice of our Saviour Christ was and is a perfect work, once consummated in perfection without the necessity of reiteration, as it was never taught to be reiterated, but a mere blasphemy to presuppose it. It is also in the Catholic teaching, grounded upon the Scripture, agreed that the same Sacrifice once consummated was ordained by Christ's institution in His most Holy Supper to be in the Church often remembered and showed forth” (p. 344).

Cf. the HOMILY FOR REPAIRING AND KEEPING CLEAN OF CHURCHES:—

“What dens of thieves the churches of England have been made by the blasphemous buying and selling the most precious Body and Blood of Christ in the Mass” (p. 289).

The HOMILY OF THE PLACE AND TIME OF PRAYER also speaks of the

“gross abusing and filthy corrupting of the Lord’s Holy Supper, the Blessed Sacrament of His Body and Blood” (p. 369).

This thirty-first Article, while it “rightly censures that erroneous view of the Sacrifice, does not declare against the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice rightly understood.”¹

It should be noted that the protest contained in the latter half of the Article is connected with the dogmatic statement of the former part by the word “**Wherefore**,” indicating that the condemnation of the second part is directed against those who impugned the truth stated in the first, viz., against such as professed to make a fresh propitiation for sin distinct from that made upon the Cross of Calvary, or in any way to supplement “the one Oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross.” The Primitive and Catholic doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice (it should scarcely be necessary to state) does not in any way contravene this great truth.

THE SACRIFICIAL ASPECT OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST.

In the Eucharist as a *Sacrament* we receive spiritually the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; in the same Eucharist as a *Sacrifice* we in representation plead the one great Sacrifice which our High Priest continually presents for us in Heaven; for one characteristic idea of the whole service, which comes out with especial prominence in the Primitive Liturgies, is that it is a representation on earth of the pleading of His Atoning Sacrifice by our Lord within the veil (Heb. ix. 24). The Sacrifice was once for all offered on Calvary. It can never be repeated or supplemented (Heb. ix. 25, 26), but its propitiatory virtue is ever-living and continuous (*cf.* Rev. v. 6, 12, where our Lord appears as the “Lamb as it had been slain,” bearing before the Father the memorial of His Sacrifice), and the fulness of the propitiation

¹ Palmer’s Treatise on the Church, vol. i. p. 400 (ed. 1842).

is pleaded for the whole Church,¹ wheresoever the commemoration of it is exhibited in the Holy Eucharist, wherein we, the members, are joined with our Head in His priestly action. When the priest says, “Lift up your hearts,” we are in spirit lifted up to Heaven, entering in spirit the very Holy of Holies, and joining “with angels and archangels, and with all the company of Heaven,” in the Triumphal Hymn; then on the Altar, with the very acts and words of Christ, we make before the Father² the Memorial which Christ commanded us to make, in correspondence with the continual memorial made by Himself in Heaven.

TESTIMONY TO THE DOCTRINE OF THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE.

(1.) *Holy Scripture.*

In dealing with the testimony of Holy Scripture, our chief concern must necessarily be to carefully study the significance of our Lord’s own words in instituting the Sacrament. In the first place, it cannot escape us that the words occur in a Sacrificial setting; our Lord spoke at a *Sacrificial time*. Close attention to the words of Holy Scripture reveals further that He spoke in *Sacrificial terms*, in words which can only be rightly understood by reference to the old Sacrificial system.

Τοῦτο ποιείτε—“Make this your offering.”

The verb employed occurs very many times in the Septuagint in the sense “to offer”; e.g., Exod. x. 25, xxix. 38, 39; Lev. ix. 7, xvi. 24; *cf.*, in the New Testament, Heb. xi. 28, and note especially that our Lord Himself uses the same word (S. Matt. xxvi. 18) in this sense with reference to the Passover Feast He was about to celebrate. In the same sense—“to offer”—the word also occurs with reference to the Eucharist in Justin Martyr’s “Dialogue with Trypho,” c. 41:—

“καὶ ἡ τῆς σπειδάλεως δὲ προσφορά, ὧ ἄνδρες, ἔλεγον, ἡ ὑπὲρ τῶν καθαριζομένων ἀπὸ τῆς λέπρας προσφέρεσθαι παραδοθεῖσα,

¹ *Cf.* the Prayer of Oblation:—

“We Thy humble servants entirely desire Thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; most humbly beseeching Thee to grant, that by the merits and death of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in His blood, we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His passion.”

² A memorial before God, and not merely before man, is clearly intended, for the words of Institution are recited and the manual acts performed *in the course of a prayer to God*.

τύπος ἦν τοῦ ἄρτον τῆς εὐχαριστίας, ὃν εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ πάθους, οὐ ἔπαθεν ὑπὲρ τῶν καθαιρομένων τὰς ψυχὰς ἀπὸ πάσης πονηρίας ἀνθρώπων, Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν παρέδωκε ποιεῖν.”

Ἐἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.

Ἀνάμνησις does not occur very frequently in Holy Scripture. In the only other place in which it is found in the New Testament (Heb. x. 3) it is used of a Sacrificial memorial. Cf., in the Old Testament, Lev. xxiv. 7; Num. x. 10, where in each case the word is used with reference to a memorial before God. The Scriptural usage of the word is, in fact, restricted to this meaning.

(2.) *The Primitive Liturgies.*

These afford unmistakable evidence as to the belief of the Primitive Church. Though not actually composed by the Apostles and Fathers whose names they bear, they were the legitimate development of their unwritten traditions respecting the Eucharistic Sacrifice. Certain most important parts of these Liturgies are common to all, and the wording of these portions, it is only reasonable to conclude, may be assigned to a period considerably earlier than that from which the extant Liturgies date; perhaps it would be scarcely too much to say (with the great liturgiologist, Dr. Neale) that it has come down to us without material change from the Apostolic authors themselves. Besides this verbal agreement which appears in certain portions, the general tenor of the Liturgies also presents a remarkable agreement throughout, the same great conceptions with respect to the Sacrament running through all, though they may be expressed in varying phraseology. It can scarcely be doubted that this general tenor has also been derived from the tradition of the Apostles themselves, forming part of the *παράθηκη* which they handed down to their successors. In comparing the general tenor of the Primitive Liturgies, we must be impressed by the very distinct enunciation of the Sacrificial character of the Holy Eucharist, which is so prominent a feature of them all. We here quote one or two examples:—

LITURGY OF S. CLEMENT:

“Μεμνημένοι τοίνυν τοῦ πάθους αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ θανάτου καὶ τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσεως, καὶ τῆς εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἐπανόδου, καὶ τῆς

μελλοίσης αὐτοῦ δευτέρας παρουσίας, ἐν ᾗ ἔρχεται μετὰ δόξης καὶ δυνάμεως κρίναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκροὺς καὶ ἀποδοῦναι ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ, προσφερόμεν σοι τῷ βασιλεῖ καὶ Θεῷ, κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ διάταξιν, τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον, καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο, εὐχαριστοῦντές σοι δι’ αὐτοῦ, ἐφ’ οἷς κατηξίωσας ἡμᾶς ἐστάναι ἐνώπιόν σου, καὶ ἱερατεῦειν σοι.”

LITURGY OF S. JAMES:

“Μεμνημένοι οὖν καὶ ἡμεῖς οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ τῶν ζωοποιῶν αὐτοῦ παθημάτων, τοῦ σωτηρίου σταυροῦ, καὶ τοῦ θανάτου καὶ τῆς τριημέρου ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσεως, καὶ τῆς εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀνόδου, καὶ τῆς ἐκ δεξιῶν σου τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς καθέδρας, καὶ τῆς δευτέρας ἐνδόξου καὶ φοβερᾶς αὐτοῦ παρουσίας, ὅταν ἔλθῃ μετὰ δόξης κρίναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκροὺς, ὅταν μέλλῃ ἀποδοῦναι ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ, προσφερόμεν σοι, Δέσποτα, τὴν φοβερὰν ταύτην καὶ ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν, δέόμενοι.” . . .

(3.) *Early Christian Writers.*

THE DIDACHE (Palestinian Church, close of the first century A.D.):

“Κατὰ κυριακὴν δὲ Κυρίου συναχθέντες κλάσατε ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαριστήσατε προσεξομολογησάμενοι τὰ παραπτώματα ὑμῶν, ὅπως καθαρὰ ἡ θυσία ὑμῶν ἦ. Πᾶς δὲ ἔχων τὴν ἀμφιβολίαν μετὰ τοῦ ἐταίρου αὐτοῦ μὴ συνελθῆτω ὑμῖν, ἕως οὐ διαλλαγῶσιν, ἵνα μὴ κοινωθῇ ἡ θυσία ὑμῶν· αὕτη γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ ῥηθείσα ὑπὸ Κυρίου· Ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ καὶ χρόνῳ προσφέρειν μοι θυσίαν καθαρὰν· ὅτι βασιλεὺς μέγας εἰμί, λέγει Κύριος, καὶ τὸ ὄνομά μου θαυμαστὸν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι” (Cap. xiv.).

The reference here is to Mal. i. 11, 14.

S. IGNATIUS OF ANTIOCH (A.D. 100-118):

“Σπουδάσατε οὖν μὴ εὐχαριστία χρῆσθαι· μιά γὰρ σὰρξ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἐν ποτήριον εἰς ἔνωσιν τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, ἐν θυσιαστήριον, ὡς εἰς ἐπίσκοπος ἅμα τῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ καὶ διακόνοις, τοῖς συνδούλοις μου· ἵνα, ὃ ἐὰν πράσσητε, κατὰ Θεὸν πράσσητε” (Ad Philadelph., iv.).

JUSTIN MARTYR (A.D. 133-165).

See the passage quoted above (p. 255, 256) from the “Dialogue with Trypho,” c. 41. In the context Justin quotes Mal. i. 11 as prophetic of the Holy Eucharist.

IRENEUS (A.D. 180):

“Igitur Ecclesiae oblatio, quam Dominus docuit offerri in universo mundo, purum sacrificium reputatum est apud Deum, et acceptum est Ei” (Adv. Haer., IV. xviii.).

S. CYPRIAN (A.D. 250):

“NAM si Iesus Christus Dominus et Deus noster ipse est summus sacerdos Dei patris et sacrificium patri se ipsum primus obtulit et hoc fieri in sui commemorationem praecepit; utique ille sacerdos vice Christi vere fungitur, qui id, quod Christus fecit, imitatur et sacrificium verum et plenum tunc offert in ecclesia Deo patri, si sic incipiat offerre, secundum quod ipsum Christum videat obtulisse” (Ep. lxiii., ed. Goldhorn).

S. CYRIL OF JERUSALEM (A.D. 386):

“Εἶτα ἀγιάσαντες ἑαυτοὺς διὰ τῶν πνευματικῶν τούτων ἕμνων παρακαλοῦμεν τὸν φιλόανθρωπον Θεὸν τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ἐξαποστείλαι ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα, ἵνα ποιήσῃ τὸν μὲν ἄρτον σῶμα Χριστοῦ, τὸν δὲ οἶνον αἷμα Χριστοῦ. πάντως γὰρ οὐ ἂν ἐφάψῃται τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, τοῦτο ἡγιάσται καὶ μεταβέβληται. Εἶτα μετὰ τὸ ἀπαρτισθῆναι τὴν πνευματικὴν θυσίαν, τὴν ἀνάιμακτον λατρείαν, ἐπὶ τῆς θυσίας ἐκείνης τοῦ ἰλασμοῦ παρακαλοῦμεν τὸν Θεὸν ὑπὲρ κοινῆς τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν εἰρήνης, ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου εὐσταθείας, ὑπὲρ βασιλείων, ὑπὲρ στρατιωτῶν καὶ συμμάχων, ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν ἀσθενείας, ὑπὲρ τῶν καταπονομένων, καὶ ἀπαξοπλῶς ὑπὲρ πάντων βοηθείας δεομένων δεόμεθα πάντες ἡμεῖς καὶ ταύτην προσφέρομεν τὴν θυσίαν” (On the Mysteries, v. 7, 8).

(4.) *The Council of Nicaea* (A.D. 325), which we acknowledge œcumenical, in several of its Canons assumes the truth of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. Let one example suffice:—

“Ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν ἀγίαν καὶ μεγάλην σύνοδον, ὅτι ἐν τισι τόποις καὶ πόλεσι, τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις τὴν εὐχαριστίαν οἱ διάκονοι διδόνασιν. ὅπερ οὔτε ὁ κανὼν, οὔτε ἡ συνήθεια παρέδωκε, τοὺς ἐξουσίαν μὴ ἔχοντας προσφέρειν, τοῖς προσφέρουσι διδόναι τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ” (Canon. xviii.).

(5.) *The Prayer Book.*

It must be admitted that the Sacrificial aspect is not the prominent aspect of the Holy Eucharist dwelt upon in our Communion Office. It was thought necessary for those times by the Reformers to dwell rather upon the Eucharist as the Communion, because of the false conception current that the Offering of Calvary was literally repeated, or supplemented, at every celebration of Mass, and because such false notion had tended to obscure the great end of Christ's Institution, the frequent reception by all the faithful, so that it had come about that the bulk of the people com-

municated very rarely. Hence the Office was entitled “The Order for the Administracion of the Lordes Supper, or *Holy Communion*,” and the name “Holy Table,” or “Lord's Table,” is consistently used for “Altar” throughout in the Prayer Book.

Our Reformers, however, held the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice,¹ and our Office, framed as it was upon ancient models, contains, as we should expect, passages which indisputably testify to the Sacrificial character of the Sacrament; e.g. :—

(a) THE PRAYER OF CONSECRATION:

“And did institute, and in his Holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory² of that his precious Death, until his coming again.”

The words recited and the acts performed immediately afterwards themselves constitute the memorial, and these occur, it should be specially noted, not in the course of an address to the people, but during a Prayer to God the Father, and are therefore addressed to Him.³ The Eucha-

¹ Bishop RIDLEY, owing to his zeal in issuing injunctions (enforced by an Order of the Council, November 24, 1550) for the removal of stone Altars, and substitution of movable Tables, is sometimes referred to as an opponent of the Sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist. It is apparent, however, from many passages in his works (ed. Parker Society) that no one at that time held more strongly to the Primitive doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice than he. We quote one passage from his examination at Oxford (1555):—

“*Pie.* What say you to that council, where it is said, that the priest doth offer an unbloody sacrifice of the Body of Christ?”

“*Ridley.* I say, it is well said, if it be rightly understood.

“*Pie.* But he offereth an unbloody sacrifice.

“*Ridley.* It is called unbloody, and is offered after a certain manner, and in a mystery, and as a representation of that Bloody Sacrifice; and he doth not lie, who saith Christ to be offered” (p. 250).

² The word is, of course, adopted from our Lord's words at the Institution of the Sacrament, and signifies, as has been already indicated (p. 256), a Sacrificial Memorial.

Cf. CHURCH CATECHISM:—

“*Question.* Why was the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper ordained?”

“*Answer.* For the continual remembrance of the Sacrifice of the death of Christ, and of the benefits which we receive thereby.”

³ The significance of this will appear the more clearly if we compare the treatment which the Eucharistic Office has received at the hands of those who repudiate all notion of Sacrifice in connection with the Sacrament. While the English Reformers in this, as in other matters, took their stand upon the doctrine and practice of the Primitive Church, Calvin, on the other hand, thus

rist is thus primarily not a solemn reminder to men of Christ's Death, but Christ's own appointed way of pleading before the Father the memory of His Sacrifice.

(b) THE PRAYER OF OBLATION:¹

"We thy humble servants entirely desire thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving."

The words "Sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving" correspond to "*Sacrificium Eucharisticum*" of the older Service-books, and refer to the action of celebrating the Eucharist, not to the expressions of praise and thanksgiving occurring in the course of the Service.

(c) In this connection we may also draw attention to the reintroduction in 1559, by the ORNAMENTS RUBRIC, of such Vestments of the Ministers "as were in this Church of England, by the authority of Parliament, in the Second Year of the Reign of King Edward the Sixth."² The use

speaks of the Sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist as it appears in the writings of the early Fathers:—

"Sed quia veteres quoque illos video alio hanc memoriam detorsisse quam institutioni Domini conveniebat (quod nescio quam repetitae aut saltem renovatae immolationis faciem eorum Coena prae se ferebat). . . . Excusari tamen non posse arbitror quin aliquid in actionis modo peccaverint. Imitati sunt enim proprius Iudaicum sacrificandi morem, quam aut ordinaverat Christus, aut Evangelii ratio ferebat" (INSTITUTES, IV. xviii. 11).

Accordingly, when laying down the "Manner of Celebrating the Lord's Supper," the Swiss Reformer gives these directions:—

"After Prayer and the Confession of Faith, to testify in the name of the people that all wish to live and die in the doctrine of Christ, he says aloud, 'Let us listen to the Institution of the Holy Supper by Jesus Christ, as narrated by St. Paul in the eleventh chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians'" (Calvin's TRACTS, vol. ii. p. 119).

Then follows the reading of the portion of Scripture specified, succeeded by an exposition of it, and an exhortation based upon it. But all this is addressed to the people, and the Sacrament is therefore only a memorial in the sense of a reminder to the people of what Christ has done for them.

Cf. the directions given in the DIRECTORY FOR THE PUBLIC WORSHIP OF GOD drawn up by the Westminster Assembly of Divines:—

"Let the words of institution be read out of the Evangelists, or out of the First Epistle of the Apostle Paul to the Corinthians, chap. xi. 23, *I have received of the Lord, &c.*, to the 27th verse, which the minister may, when he seeth requisite, explain and apply."

¹ In the Book of 1549 this followed immediately after the Consecration, but since 1552 has been displaced, contrary to all Primitive usage, so that it is said after the Communion of the people.

² The precise wording of the Rubric, as inserted in 1559, is as follows:—

"And here is to be noted, that the Minister at the time of the communion, and at all other tymes in hys ministracion, shall vse suche ornamentes in the

of these vestments was distinctly understood at the time to imply a recognition of the Sacrificial character of the Sacrament.¹

It is sometimes urged that the absence of the word *Altar* from the Prayer Book indicates the intention of our Church (1552) to reject the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. The word occurs frequently in the Book of 1549, but was dropped in the revision of 1552.²

On this point we may note that—

- (a) In the *Act of Uniformity*, 1552, it was explained that the alterations in the Prayer Book had been made in order to "render the book fully perfect in all such places in which it was necessary to be made more earnest and fit for the stirring up of all Christian people to the true honouring of Almighty God, and with no intention of contradicting the former book." The First Book is, moreover, described as a "very godly order, agreeable to the Word of God and the Primitive Church."

In view of such statements as these we can scarcely interpret the substitution of *Table* for *Altar* as having been made with the intention of the rejecting the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. The true reason of the substitution is no doubt to be found (as has been already indicated) in the feeling of our Reformers that it was necessary for those times to lay special emphasis on the Communion aspect of the Holy Eucharist.

- (b) The word *Altar* is retained in the Office for the *Coronation* of the Sovereign.

Since we recognise in the Eucharist both Sacrifice and

church, as wer in vse by auctoritie of parliamēt in the second yere of the reygne of king Edward the VI. according to the acte of parliament set in the beginning of thys booke."

The Prayer Book of 1552, on the other hand, had provided—

"That the minister at the tyme of the Cōmunion and all other tymes in his ministracion, shall use neither albe, vestment, nor cope: but being archbishop or bishop, he shall have and wear a rochet; and being a preest or deacon, he shall have and wear a surplice onely."

¹ See p. 13, note. It should be remembered that the Puritan party petitioned at the Savoy Conference (1661), desiring that the Rubric might be "wholly left out," on the ground that it "seemeth to bring back the cope, albe, &c., and other vestments forbidden by the Common Prayer Book, 5 and 6 Edw. VI." The request was deliberately refused.

² The word *Priest*, however, was retained.

Sacrament, we speak of the structure upon which the Elements are consecrated both as the *Altar* and as the *Lord's Table*, or the *Holy Table*. Of the two names "Altar" is much the more ancient, the name "Table" being nowhere used in this connection by the Apostolic Fathers. "God's Board" was a frequent old English appellation for the Altar; *cf.*, *e.g.*, the rubric at the commencement of the Communion Office in the Prayer Book of 1549:—

"Then the Prieste standyng at Goddes borde shall begin."

It seems somewhat strange that those who object to the use of the name "Altar," on the ground that it is not found in the Prayer Book, should themselves habitually speak of the "Communion Table," a name to which their objection equally applies, for it occurs nowhere in the Book of Common Prayer.

For the purpose of comparison we here add extracts from the Canons of the COUNCIL OF TRENT (Session XXII.), which deal with the subject treated in our thirty-first Article:—

CANON I.—"Si quis dixerit, in Missa non offerri Deo verum et proprium sacrificium . . . anathema sit."

CANON III.—"Si quis dixerit, Missae sacrificium tantum esse laudis et gratiarum actionis, aut nudam commemorationem sacrificii in Cruce peracti, non autem propitiatorium; vel soli prodesse sumenti; neque pro vivis et defunctis pro peccatis, poenis, satisfactionibus et aliis necessitatibus offerri debere; anathema sit."

CANON IV.—"Si quis dixerit, blasphemiam irrogari sanctissimo Christi sacrificio in Cruce peracto per Missae sacrificium, aut illi per hoc derogari; anathema sit."

CANON V.—"Si quis dixerit, imposturam esse, Missas celebrare in honorem Sanctorum, et pro illorum intercessione apud Deum obtinenda, sicut Ecclesia intendit; anathema sit."

CANON VIII.—"Si quis dixerit, Missas in quibus solus sacerdos sacramentaliter communicat, illicitas esse ideoque abrogandas; anathema sit."

In a decree of the same Session it is admitted that a "private Mass" is not an ideal service:—

"Optaret quidem sacrosancta Synodus, ut in singulis Missis fideles adstantes non solum spirituali affectu, sed sacramentali

etiam Eucharistiae perceptione communicarent, quo ad eos sanctissimi hujus sacrificii fructus uberior proveniret: nec tamen, si id non semper fiat, propterea Missas illas, in quibus solus sacerdos sacramentaliter communicat, ut privatas et illicitas damnat, sed probat atque adeo commendat" (Cap. vi.).

It must be borne in mind that the above declarations bear date September 17, 1562, and that our Article, since it dates from 1553, could not have been drawn up with reference to the authoritative statements of the Tridentine Council.

The following statements of Continental Confessions may also be compared:—

AUGSBURG CONFESSIO. See § 1, pp. 250, 251.

TETRAPOLITAN CONFESSIO, Cap. XIX.:

"Et contra qui Missas celebrant, praesumunt Christum Patri offerre pro vivis et defunctis, Missamque tale opus faciunt, quo solo fere favor Dei et salus comparetur, quicquid vel credant homines, vel vivant. Unde et pudenda illa ac bis terque impia sacri hujus nundinatio irrepsit, factumque est, ut nihil sit hodie Missa questiosius. Privatas itaque Missas rejecerunt, propterea quod Dominus in commune, discipulis hoc sacramentum commendavit."

SAXON CONFESSIO, Art. XV.:

"Multi ante hoc tempus scripserunt, fieri oblationem in missa pro vivis et mortuis, et mereri eam facienti et aliis remissionem peccatorum ex opere operato. . . . Hac opinione cumulabantur sacrificia, et crescebant aucupia quaestus. Talis est et missarum mercatus, et prophanatio coenae Domini, fere in toto orbe terrarum. Vult autem Deus, vitiosos cultus taxari et aboleri. Ideo vocem divinam simpliciter et vere proponimus, quae errores illos damnat. Ac toto pectore adfirmamus coram Deo et tota Ecclesia in coelo et in terra, tantum fuisse unicum sacrificium propitiatorium, seu quo ira aeterni Patris adversus genus humanum placata est; scilicet, totam Filii Dei Domini nostri Jesu Christi crucifixi et resuscitati obedientiam."

WURTEMBERG CONFESSIO, Art. XIX.:

"Deinde cum sacrificii nomen latissime pateat, ac generaliter significet sacrum cultum, libenter concedimus verum et legitimum usum Eucharistiae posse hoc modo sacrificium dici. Et si Eucharistia juxta institutionem Christi ita celebratur, ut in ea adnuncietur mors Christi, et dispensetur Ecclesiae sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Christi, recte vocatur Applicatio meriti passionis Christi, his videlicet qui sacramentum sumunt."

SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION, Art. XXI. :

“Missa qualis aliquando apud veteres fuerit, tolerabilis an intolerabilis, modo non disputamus: hoc autem libere dicimus, missam, quae hodie in usu est per universam Romanam Ecclesiam, plurimas et justissimas quidem ob causas, in ecclesiis nostris esse abrogatam, quas sigillatim ob brevitatem nunc non commemoramus. Certe approbare non potuimus, quod ex actione salubri, spectaculum inane est factum, quod item facta est meritoria, vel celebrata pro pretio, quodque in ea sacerdos dicitur conficere ipsum domini corpus, et hoc offerre realiter, pro remissione peccatorum vivorum et mortuorum: adde et in honorem et celebrationem, vel memoriam sanctorum in coelis, etc.”

ARTICLE XXXII

OF THE MARRIAGE OF PRIESTS.

Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, are not commanded by God's Law, either to vow the estate of single life, or to abstain from marriage. Therefore it is lawful also for them, as for all other Christian men, to marry at their own discretion, as they shall judge the same to serve better to godliness.

DE CONJUGIO SACERDOTUM.

Episcopis, Presbyteris, et Diaconis, nullo mandato divino praeceptum est ut aut coelibatum voveant, aut a matrimonio abstineant. Licet igitur etiam illis, ut caeteris omnibus Christianis, ubi hoc ad pietatem magis facere judicaverint, pro suo arbitrato matrimonium contrahere.

§ 1.—SOURCE.

Composed by the English Reformers. In 1553 the corresponding Article ran as follows:—

THE STATE OF SINGLE LIFE IS COMMANDED TO NO MAN BY THE WORD OF GOD.

COELIBATUS EX VERBO DEI
PRÆCIPITUR NEMINI.

Bishoppes, Priestes, and Deacons are not commaunded to vove the state of single life without mariage, neither by Goddes lawe are thei compelled to absteine from matrimonie.

Episcopis, Presbyteris et Diaconis non est mandatum ut coelibatum voveant; neque jure Divino coguntur matrimonio abstinere.

In 1563 this was recast and added to, a more general title being then prefixed, to suit the reconstructed Article.

In the latter part of our present Article (added in 1563) it is to be noted that clerical marriage is *positively* declared lawful, whereas previously it had been merely stated *negatively* that no Divine command could be urged against it.

§ 2.—OBJECT.

To dispel the error that there is anything sinful or contrary to God's law in the marriage of clergy, and to declare that Priests are free to marry, even as laymen are.

The estate of celibacy was held in high esteem among Christians from a very early period. Widows, monks, or nuns who took vows of celibacy were considered to be embracing a higher mode of life. But such celibate life was, at the same time, regarded as a special vocation (*cf.* S. Matt. xix. 10-12; 1 Cor. vii. 7, 8, 38-40), only allowed on condition of strict chastity, and to be forced upon no one, nor on any account to be made a subject of boasting. As early as the third century it was urged that the celibate life should be adopted by the clergy in general, and at the Council of Nicæa (A.D. 325) it was proposed that clergy should be obliged to live apart from their wives whom they had married before their ordination. The proposition was not agreed to, owing to the opposition of Paphnutius, an aged confessor and himself a celibate, and in the result the Council simply prohibited second marriages on the part of the clergy. The Trullan Council, held at Constantinople (A.D. 692), declared that priests and deacons might live with their wives, as the laity do, according to the ancient custom and ordinance of the Apostles. To this decision the Eastern Church has adhered, allowing priests and deacons to live in marriage; only a priest living in celibacy, however, may be chosen as a bishop. In the Western Church various attempts were made by the Popes to enforce celibacy; *e.g.*, by Leo IX. (1048-1054), Nicolas II. (1058-1061), and by Alexander II. (1061-1073), who issued an excommunication against all those who should attend a Mass celebrated by a priest having a wife or concubine. A decree to the like effect was also issued by Gregory VII. (Hildebrand) in 1074, the rule of celibacy for the clergy forming part of the great scheme of that famous Pope for the reorganisation of the Church. Under Anselm, as Archbishop of Canterbury, it was ruled in this country (1102) that no one should be ordained who did not profess celibacy. In 1215 a Canon of the Fourth Lateran Council required celibacy, and from this time forward the Popes made persistent efforts to enforce the rule, so that by the beginning of the sixteenth century the idea that the clergy should live a celibate life had gained such hold that freedom for them to marry was not conceded without considerable opposition.

The AUGSBURG CONFESSION (Part II. Art. II.) claimed freedom for the clergy to marry upon the ground of (a) the Law of God, which no law of man can alter; (b) the custom of the Primitive Church; and (c) the impure single life of the clergy

which had in fact followed upon the absolute prohibition of their marriage.

In 1538, when certain representatives of the Lutheran Reformers came from Germany to confer with English divines, the rule of celibacy had not been formally abrogated in this country, and the deputies freely censured the enforcement of clerical celibacy, together with other remnants of Mediævalism, such as Communion in one kind, which were still at that time sanctioned in England. In view of their strictures, the third Article of the STATUTE OF SIX ARTICLES (1539) laid down that priests may not marry.

Permission was given for clergy to marry by the Ecclesiastical authorities in the first year of Edward VI., and this was confirmed by an Act of Parliament in the year following.

§ 3.—EXPOSITION.

(1.) The negative side of the matter:—

THERE IS NO DIVINE COMMAND FOR CELIBACY OF CLERGY.

Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, are not commanded by God's Law, either to vow the estate of single life, or to abstain from marriage.

It is stated in the New Testament that marriage is honourable in all (Heb. xiii. 4). Some of the Apostles themselves were married men (*e.g.*, S. Peter, S. Mark i. 30; 1 Cor. ix. 5), and the qualifications for the Ministry as given by S. Paul in the Pastoral Epistles have in view a married clergy (1 Tim. iii. 2, 5, 12; Tit. i. 6). We may add that the forbidding to marry is even mentioned as characteristic of the apostasy of later times (1 Tim. iv. 1-3).

(2.) The positive side of the matter:—

THE SAME FREEDOM IS CLAIMED IN THIS MATTER FOR THE CLERGY AS FOR THE PEOPLE.

Therefore it is lawful also for them, as for all other Christian men, to marry at their own discretion, as they shall judge the same to serve better to godliness.

Clergy and laity are alike free to marry, and the same high principle is set before each as the ground of action.

In dealing with the subject of Matrimony, the twenty-fourth Session of the COUNCIL OF TRENT (November 11, 1563) laid down the following Canon:—

CANON IX.—“Si quis dixerit, Clericos in sacris Ordinibus constitutos, vel Regulares castitatem solemniter professos, posse

matrimonium contrahere, contractumque validum esse non obstante lege ecclesiastica vel voto; et oppositum nil aliud esse quam damnare matrimonium, posseque omnes contrahere matrimonium, qui non sentiunt se castitatis, etiam si eam voverint, habere donum; anathema sit, cum Deus id recte petentibus non denegat, nec patiatur nos supra id quod possumus tentari."

The opinions of some of the leading Reformers on the Continent, and the statements of the chief Continental Confessions, on the subject of the Celibacy of the Clergy may be briefly noted.

Luther himself held very strong opinions on the matter, which he expressed in language characteristically vehement and somewhat unguarded. Monastic vows of celibacy he denounced as impious, and though he himself had taken such vows, he did not scruple to break them, adding to the scandal of his conduct by marrying one who had taken vows as a nun.

The AUGSBURG CONFESSIO speaks very strongly of the iniquity of the system of enforcing celibacy as practised at the time:—

"Cum autem extet mandatum Dei, cum mos ecclesiae notus sit, cum impurus coelibatus plurima pariat scandala, adulteria et alia scelera digna animadversione boni magistratus: tamen mirum est, nulla in re majorem exerceri saevitiam, quam adversus conjugium sacerdotum. Deus praecipit honore afficere conjugium. Leges in omnibus rebus publicis bene constitutis, etiam apud ethnicos, maximis honoribus ornaverunt. At nunc capitalibus poenis excruciantur, et quidem sacerdotes contra canonum voluntatem, nullam aliam ob causam, nisi propter conjugium. Paulus vocat doctrinam daemoniorum, quae prohibet conjugium, 1 Tim. iv. Id facile nunc intelligi potest, cum talibus suppliciis prohibitio conjugii defenditur" (Part II. Art. II.).

Cf. also TETRAPOLITAN CONFESSIO, Cap. XII.:

"Proinde nemini obsistere potuimus, qui vitam monasticam, indubitata jam Satanae servitute, cum Christiana mutare voluisset. Sicut nec aliis ex ordine ecclesiastico, qui ductis uxoribus, genus vitae honestae amplexi sunt, a quo proximis plus commodi, majorque vitae honestas, quam ab eo in quo erant, expectari potest. Denique nec eos qui apud nos, in verbi Dei ministerio, perseverarunt, arcere a jure conjugii, quicquid castitatis voverint, ob memoratas causas, nobis permisimus, cum divus Paulus praecipuus verae castitatis assertor, Episcopum quoque recipiat maritum."

BOHEMIAN CONFESSIO, Art. IX.:

"Docent etiam, ut Sacerdotes negotiis saecularibus non occupentur, praesertim vero, ut ab statu conjugii liberi sint, quo aptiores sint et expeditiores ad serviendum proximi commodis et ecclesiae. Etenim conjugium multa secum adfert impedimenta, quae multos, quo minus bene respondeant suae vocationi, remorantur. Proinde nostri idoneos magis, habilioresque ad Ministerium ecclesiae existimant coelibes, si quibus tamen hoc peculiare donum a Deo datum fuerit.

"Non quod Sacerdotes peccare putent, si matrimonium contrahant, si id moneat necessitas, sintve ad hoc aliae justae rationes. Nam et Paulus aperte docet, ad ecclesiastica munia tractanda, unus uxoris viros eligendos esse."

CALVIN'S INSTITUTES, IV. xii. 23:

"Una in re plusquam rigidi sunt et inexorabiles, ne conjugium Sacerdotibus permittant. Quanta apud eos scortandi grassetur impunitas dicere nihil attinet, ac foetido suo coelibatu freti occuluerunt ad omnia flagitia, haec tamen prohibitio clare ostendit quam pestiferae sint omnes traditiones, utpote quae non solum orbavit Ecclesiam probis et idoneis Pastoribus, sed horrendam invexit scelerum colluviem, multasque animas in gurgitem desperationis projecit. Certe quod sacerdotibus interdictum fuit conjugium, id factum est impia tyrannide, non modo contra verbum Dei, sed etiam contra omnem aequitatem. Primum vetare quod Dominus liberum reliquisset, nulla ratione hominibus licuit. Deinde nominatim Deum cavisse verbo suo ne haec libertas infringeretur, clarius est quam ut longa demonstratione uti necesse fit."

SAXON CONFESSIO, Art. XVIII.:

"Scimus autem voluntatem Dei esse, ne prohibeatur conjugium ullis personis, quae sunt idoneae ad conjugium; et quae extra conjugium non viverent absque periculo conscientiae: sicut Gen. ii., Matt. xix., 1 Cor. vii., scriptum est. Ideo conceditur apud nos conjugium sacerdotibus, et aliis personis, quae pie in conjugio vivere malunt, quam in coelibatu habere sauciatas conscientias, ne Deum invocare et pie vivere possint."

WURTEMBERG CONFESSIO, Art. XXI.:

"Praeterea non dubitamus, quin qui sunt verae honestatis amantes, sentiant conjugium non tantum laicis, ut vocant, verum etiam ministris Ecclesiae liberum esse. Dicit enim Epistola ad Hebraeos: Honorabile connubium in omnibus, et thorus immaculatus. Et Paulus probat conjugium in Episcopo, et adfirmat prohibitionem conjugii esse Spiritum erroris et doctrinam daemoniorum. . . . Nec obstare debet votum castitatis, propterea

quod tale votum humana superstitione, sine auctoritate verbi Dei, et contra fidem susceptum, non agnoscat a Deo."

SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION, Art. XXIX:

"Qui coelitus donum habent coelibatus, ita ut ex corde, vel toto animo, puri sint ac continent, nec urantur graviter, serviant in ea vocatione Domino, donec senserint se divino munere praeditos, et ne efferant se caeteris, sed serviant Domino assidue, in simplicitate et humilitate. Aptiores autem hi sunt curandis rebus divinis, quam qui privatis familiae negotiis distrahantur. Quod is adempto rursus dono, ustionem senserint durabilem, meminerint verbi apostolici, Melius est nubere, quam uri, 1 Cor. vii."

It will be observed that the formularies above quoted for the most part use stronger language and go much further (with the exception of the Bohemian and Second Helvetic Confessions, both of which commend the celibate life for such as feel a call thereto) than our Article. Our Article simply says that priests are not Divinely commanded to "vow the estate of single life." The Continental Reformers, generally speaking, in expressing their abhorrence and detestation of the prevalent corruption of the monastic life, were impelled to regard all such vows as contrary to the law of God, and therefore null and void.

ARTICLE XXXIII

OF EXCOMMUNICATE PERSONS, HOW
THEY ARE TO BE AVOIDED.

DE EXCOMMUNICATIS
VITANDIS.

That person which by open denunciation of the Church, is rightly cut off from the unity of the Church, and excommunicated, ought to be taken of the whole multitude of the faithful as an Heathen and Publican, until he be openly reconciled by penance, and received into the Church by a Judge that hath authority thereunto.

Qui per publicam Ecclesiae denunciationem rite ab unitate Ecclesiae praecisus est et excommunicatus, is ab universa fidelium multitudine, donec per poenitentiam publice reconciliatus fuerit, arbitrio Judicis competentis, habendus est tanquam Ethnicus et Publicanus.

§ 1.—SOURCE.

Composed by the English Reformers, and first appeared as the thirty-second of the XLII. Articles of 1553.

§ 2.—OBJECT.

The object both of this Article and of Article XXXIV. is the regulation of the internal discipline and usages of the Church, upon which subject there was much warm discussion in England during the reign of Edward VI.

§ 3.—EXPOSITION.

- (1.) THE CHURCH HAS THE POWER OF EXCOMMUNICATION.
That person which by open denunciation of the Church, is rightly cut off from the unity of the Church, and excommunicated.
In the Christian Church in all ages Excommunication has been practised, as indeed every society, if it is to exist in a healthy condition, must have the power of excluding unworthy members, and such as refuse to comply with the

conditions of membership.¹ The Lord Himself gave to the Church the power of Excommunication (S. Matt. xviii. 15-18), and we have in the New Testament itself evidences of the exercise of the power. (See 1 Cor. v. 3-5; 1 Tim. i. 20; cf. Tit. iii. 10.)

In the exercise of the disciplinary power of the Church three stages are to be distinguished:—

- (a) The offender is repeatedly admonished, in accordance with the Apostolic precept, *αἰρετικὸν ἄνθρωπον μετὰ μίαν καὶ δευτέραν νοουθεσίαν παραιτοῦ* (Tit. iii. 10).

Cf. S. Ambrose, De Offic., lib. ii. cap. xxvii.:—

“Cum dolore amputatur etiam, quae putruit pars corporis, et diu tractatur, si potest sanari medicamentis: si non potest, tunc a medico bono absciditur. Sic episcopi adfectus boni est, ut optet sanare infirmos, serpentina auferre ulcera, adurere aliqua, non abscidere: postremo quod sanari non potest, cum dolore abscindere.”

- (b) In case he persists in his error he is suspended from Communion. This is called the *Lesser Excommunication*, and did not exclude the offender from the Church, but from participation in the Eucharist and in the prayers of the faithful.

Cf. Theodoret, Epist. lxxvii. ad Eulalium:—

“Κωλύεσθωσαν μὲν τῆς μεταλήψεως τῶν ἱερῶν μυστηρίων, μὴ κωλύεσθωσαν δὲ τῆς τῶν κατηχομένων εὐχῆς, μηδὲ τῆς τῶν θείων γραφῶν ἀκροάσεως, μηδὲ τῆς τῶν διδασκάλων παραίνεσεως.”

This Lesser Excommunication was inflicted for less serious crimes, or upon those who, having committed serious offences, exhibited signs of true repentance, and expressed their willingness to submit to penitential discipline.

- (c) Lastly, there is the *Greater Excommunication*, or *Anathema*, as it was sometimes called, involving expulsion from the Church (1 Cor. v. 5, *παραδοῦναι τῷ Σατανᾷ*; cf. 1 Tim. i. 20), and cutting off the guilty person not only from all share in the holy offices of her members, but even from all Christian fellowship. (See under heading (2.) below.)

¹ We find Excommunication sanctioned under the Old Covenant, involving the separation of the offender from social intercourse and exclusion from participation in any Religious service (Gen. xvii. 14; Exod. xii. 19; Lev. vii. 20; Ezra x. 8; cf., in the New Testament, S. Luke vi. 22, *ἀφορῖσωσιν*; S. John ix. 22, *ἀποσυνάγωγος γένηται*; xii. 42; xvi. 2).

This extreme penalty was reserved for such as persevered in sin after repeated warning, or had denied the faith; and those thus cut off, if they remained impenitent, were not allowed Communion even in the hour of death, nor were they permitted the privilege of burial according to the rites of the Church.¹

It is with this Greater Excommunication that our Article is concerned.

That the Church of England claims the power of using such Excommunication² appears further from—

- (i.) CANON 65, which gives directions for the public denouncing of excommunicate persons.
 (ii.) CANON 85, which, in detailing the duties of Churchwardens or Questmen, specifies—

“Especially they shall see . . . that all persons excommunicated, and so denounced, be kept out of the Church.”

- (iii.) The RUBRIC at the commencement of the BURIAL OFFICE, which provides that—

“The Office ensuing is not to be used for any that die unbaptized, or excommunicate, or have laid violent hands upon themselves.”

- (2.) THE ATTITUDE OF CHRISTIANS TOWARD THE EXCOMMUNICATE.
That person which by open denunciation of the Church, is rightly cut off from the unity of the Church, and excommunicated,

¹ In the eleventh century, owing to the fact that powerful barons, princes, and kings, sometimes defied a sentence of Excommunication, we find the more terrible sentence of *Interdict* occasionally resorted to by the Popes. This was, in fact, an excommunication of a whole district, province, or kingdom, according to the circumstances of the particular case. A well-known example in English history is the Interdict under which Pope Innocent III. laid this country (March 24, 1208) on account of his struggle with King John.

² A form of publishing sentence of Excommunication was sanctioned by Convocation in 1571. After recounting the offence, it proceeds thus:—

“Et quoniam praedictus A.B. conscientia nequitiae suae, ad diem legitimum dictum comparere contempsit, et se justitiae contumaciter subduxit, et alios exemplo suo ad similem contumaciam animavit; idcirco hoc etiam vos insuper admonitos volo, episcopum nostrum nomine atque auctoritate Dei optimi maximi excommunicasse illum ab omni societate ecclesiae Dei, et tanquam membrum emortuum amputasse a Christi corpore. Hoc ille in statu versatur hoc tempore, et in tanto discrimine animae suae. Divus Paulus admonitus instinctu divini Spiritus, jubet ut talium hominum societatem, et contubernia fugiamus, ne participes simus ejusdem sceleris. Tamen, ut christiana charitas nos monet, quoniam ipse pro se orari non vult, nec periculum suum intelligit, oremus Deum omnes ejus nomine, ut aliquando agnoscat miseriam, et foeditatem vitae suae, et agat poenitentiam, et convertatur ad Deum: Deus enim noster est misericors, et potest lapsos etiam a morte revocare.”

ought to be taken of the whole multitude of the faithful as an Heathen and Publican.¹

Our Article is here referring to the words of the Lord, Who enjoined that when an obstinate offender refuses to listen to the admonition of the Church he is to be regarded as "an Heathen and Publican" (S. Matt. xviii. 17). The particular terms employed were adopted by our Lord from the phraseology of His Jewish contemporaries, amongst whom both heathen and publicans were looked upon with abhorrence, and held to be without the pale of religious society. We find the Apostles acting upon the rule laid down by the Lord, and directing that those who cause divisions and offences contrary to their doctrine are to be marked and avoided (Rom. xvi. 17). Christians are to withdraw themselves from the brother who walketh disorderly (2 Thess. iii. 6), and to have no company with him who obeys not the Apostolic tradition, or written injunction (2 Thess. iii. 6, 14). The Corinthian Christians are exhorted by S. Paul not to keep company, or even to eat, with the brother who is a fornicator, &c. (1 Cor. v. 11), and the incestuous person whom the Apostle has excommunicated is accordingly to be put away from among them (1 Cor. v. 13). Similarly, S. John directs that the man who transgresseth and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ is not to be received into their houses by his hearers, nor to be bidden God speed (2 S. John 9, 10).

By Excommunication the brotherhood of grace is dissolved, but the brotherhood of nature remains, and, since the power of the Church is only a spiritual power,² a man's natural and civil rights are unaffected; so that an excommunicate person does not thereby lose authority over his family, nor a ruler who has been excluded from the Church

¹ Cf. REFORMATIO LEGUM, "De Haeresibus," Cap. 15:—

"Quasi prius excommunicatio possit in quoquam intelligi, quam Ecclesia sententiam excommunicationis contra illum direxerit, in qua pronunciatum illum non secus vitandum, quam ethnicum et publicanum."

² S. Cyprian, ad Pompon. (Ep. iv., ed. Goldhorn), after quoting Deut. xvii. 12, 13, adds:—

"Interfici Deus jussit sacerdotibus suis non obtemperantes et iudiciis a se ad tempus constitutis non obaudientes. Et tunc quidem gladio occidebantur, quando adhuc et circumcisio carnalis manebat: nunc autem, quia circumcisio spiritalis esse apud fideles servos Dei coepit, spiritali gladio superbi et contumaces necantur, dum de ecclesia ejiciuntur."

his office or charge in civil matters. With the growth of the temporal power of the Popes, however, Excommunication was made to take effect in the temporal as well as in the spiritual sphere; and the Popes not only used it in such a way as to release men from natural obligations, but in their hands it became a powerful political engine for deposing sovereigns and absolving all subjects from their allegiance. Indirectly this misuse of Ecclesiastical censure favoured the progress of the Reformation, by confirming Henry VIII. and Queen Elizabeth in their alienation from the Roman See.

(3.) THE PURPOSE OF EXCOMMUNICATION.

It must always be remembered that in pronouncing sentence of Excommunication the Church has a merciful end in view.

(a) *Towards the whole Church*—It is a cutting off of the diseased member, so as to save the whole body from contamination (1 Cor. v. 6, 7).

(b) *With regard to the excommunicate person*—Even this extreme step is taken with a view to the spiritual benefit of the individual concerned, that he may be ashamed of his wrong-doing (2 Thess. iii. 14) and renounce his error (1 Tim. i. 20), so that eventually the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus (1 Cor. v. 5).

(4.) THE MEANS OF RESTORATION—PENANCE.

until he be openly reconciled by penance, and received into the Church by a Judge that hath authority thereunto. (See 2 Cor. ii. 6—10.)

"Penance" signifies repentance and contrition, together with acceptance of the punishment assigned by the Church. It is expressly stated that the offender should be "openly reconciled by penance," in order that the reception into the Church again may be as public an act as the formal exclusion. The "Judge that hath authority thereunto" is the Bishop, or the Ecclesiastical Court. In the case of temporary exclusion from Communion (Lesser Excommunication), the Prayer Book directs that the matter is to be referred to the *Ordinary*.

See the Rubric at the commencement of the Communion Office:—

"Provided that every Minister so repelling any, as is specified in this, or the next precedent Paragraph of this Rubrick, shall be

obliged to give an account of the same to the Ordinary within fourteen days after at the farthest. And the Ordinary shall proceed against the offending person according to the Canon."¹

There are many difficulties in the way of a proper administration of Church discipline, a state of things largely owing to the very imperfect manner in which the Reformation dealt with the Church's disciplinary system.² That due exercise of discipline is very necessary to the true well-being of the Church no one can doubt, and its restoration is much to be desired.

Cf. the address in the COMMUNION :—

"Brethren, in the Primitive Church there was a godly discipline, that, at the beginning of Lent, such persons as stood convicted of notorious sin were put to open penance, and punished in this world, that their souls might be saved in the day of the Lord; and that others, admonished by their example, might be the more afraid to offend.

"Instead whereof, (until the said discipline may be restored again, which is much to be wished,) it is thought good," &c.

The COUNCIL OF TRENT (Session XXV., December 4, 1563), while defending a due use of Excommunication and Ecclesiastical

¹ *Cf.* CANON 65 :—

Ministers solemnly to denounce Recusants and Excommunicates.

"All Ordinaries shall, in their several jurisdictions, carefully see and give order, that as well those who for obstinate refusing to frequent Divine Service established by public authority within this realm of England, as those also (especially of the better sort and condition) who for notorious contumacy, or other notable crimes, stand lawfully excommunicate, (unless within three months immediately after the said sentence of Excommunication pronounced against them, they reform themselves, and obtain the benefit of absolution,) be, every six months ensuing, as well in the Parish Church, as in the Cathedral Church of the diocese in which they remain, by the Minister openly, in time of Divine service, upon some Sunday, denounced and declared Excommunicate, that others may be thereby both admonished to refrain their company and society, and excited the rather to procure out a writ *De excommunicato capiendo*, thereby to bring and reduce them into due order and obedience. Likewise the registrar of every Ecclesiastical Court shall yearly between Michaelmas and Christmas duly certify the Archbishop of the Province of all and singular the premises aforesaid."

² See letter of Humphrey and Sampson to Bullinger (July 1566) :—

"But what shall we say respecting discipline, the sinews of religion? There is none at all, neither has our Church its rod, or any exercise of superintendence" (Zurich Letters, i. p. 164).

Cf. also letter of Withers to the Elector Palatine, where, speaking of the condition of the Church in England during Elizabeth's reign, he says :—

"But the ministry is in fact nothing at all, nor is there any discipline" (Zurich Letters, ii. p. 163).

censures, recognised that their use without sufficient cause had been productive of evil :—

"*Quamvis excommunicationis gladius nervus sit ecclesiasticae disciplinae, et ad continendos in officio populos valde salutaris, sobrie tamen magnaue circumspectione exercendus est, cum experientia doceat, si temere aut levibus ex rebus incutiatur, magis contemni quam formidari, et perniciem potius parere quam salutem.*"

Accordingly it was provided that the sword of Excommunication should not be lightly used, and that Ecclesiastical censures should be abstained from when an Execution could be made upon the property or the person of the individual concerned. The decree on the subject concludes with the following words :—

"*Nefas autem sit saeculari cuilibet magistratui prohibere ecclesiastico judici, ne quem excommunicet, aut mandare, ut latam excommunicationem revocet, sub praetextu, quod contenta in praesenti decreto non sint observata: cum non ad saeculares, sed ad ecclesiasticos haec cognitio pertineat. Excommunicatus vero quicumque, si post legitimas monitiones non respuerit, non solum ac Sacramenta et communionem fidelium ac familiaritatem non recipiatur, sed, si obdurato animo censuris annexus in illis per annum insorderit, etiam contra eum, tamquam de haeresi suspectum, procedi possit.*"

The Reformers of the Lutheran or Saxon school upheld the power of the Church to impose penance and to excommunicate; but of all those who separated from the Roman obedience in the sixteenth century, those who followed Calvin were most rigid in their notions of ecclesiastical discipline.¹ *Cf.*, e.g. :—

FRENCH CONFESSION, Art. XXXIII. :

"*Sequendum nobis putamus, quod Dominus noster Iesus Christus de Excommunicatione statuit, quam quidem approbamus, et una cum suis appendicibus necessariam esse arbitramur.*"

¹ Not a few English Churchmen, who, during their exile from this country owing to the Marian persecution, had come under the influence of the Zurich school of Reformers, were inclined, after their return in Elizabeth's reign, to despise the English Church owing to the laxity which prevailed in the administration of discipline (see p. 276, note 2).

BELGIC CONFSSION, Art. XXXII.:

“ Nos itaque omnia humana inventa, omnesque leges rejicimus, quae ad Dei cultum sunt introductae, ut iis conscientiae ullo modo illaqueentur, aut obstringantur. Easque solas suscipimus, quae idoneae sunt, vel ad fovendam alendamque concordiam, vel ad nos in Dei obedientia retinendos. Ad id vero imprimis necessaria est excommunicatio, ex praecepto verbi Dei usurpata, et aliae illi annexae disciplinae ecclesiasticae appendices.

ARTICLE XXXIV

OF THE TRADITIONS OF THE CHURCH.

DE TRADITIONIBUS ECCLESIASTICIS.

It is not necessary that Traditions and Ceremonies be in all places one, or utterly like, for at all times they have been divers, and may be changed according to the diversities of countries, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's Word.

Whosoever through his private judgment, willingly and purposely doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the Word of God, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly, (that others may fear to do the like) as he that offendeth against the common order of the Church, and hurteth the authority of the magistrate, and woundeth the consciences of the weak brethren.

Every particular or national Church, hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying.

Traditiones atque Ceremonias easdem, non omnino necessarium est esse ubique aut prorsus consimiles. Nam et variae semper fuerunt, et mutari possunt, pro regionum, temporum, et morum diversitate, modo nihil contra verbum Dei instituitur.

Traditiones et ceremonias Ecclesiasticas quae cum verbo Dei non pugnant, et sunt auctoritate publica institutae atque probatae, quisquis privato consilio volens et data opera publice violaverit, is, ut qui peccat in publicam ordinem Ecclesiae, quique laedit auctoritatem Magistratus, et qui infirmorum fratrum conscientias vulnerat, publice, ut caeteri timeant, arguendus est.

Quaelibet Ecclesia particularis, sive nationalis, auctoritatem habet instituendi, mutandi, aut abrogandi caeremonias aut ritus Ecclesiasticos, humana tantum auctoritate institutos, modo omnia ad aedificationem fiant.

§ 1.—SOURCE.

The first paragraph is taken, with a few small changes, from the fifth of the XIII. ARTICLES of 1538. (The words common to the two are printed in *italics* in the Latin text.)

In 1563 two additions were made:—

(a) In the first paragraph the word “temporum” was inserted,

evidently with the view of making the statement of principle more comprehensive.

- (b) The last paragraph was added, declaring that a national Church has authority to institute and abolish ceremonies. With the wording of this part of the Article we may compare the third of the XI. ARTICLES, which had been issued a few years before (1559):—

“Every such particular church hath authority to institute, to change, clean to put away ceremonies, and other ecclesiastical rites, as they be superfluous, or be abused, and to constitute other making more to seemliness, to order, or edification.”

§ 2.—*OBJECT.*

See the note on the object of Article XXXIII.

§ 3.—*EXPOSITION.*

- (I.) UNIFORMITY OF TRADITIONS AND CEREMONIES IS NOT NECESSARY.

It is not necessary that Traditions and Ceremonies be in all places one, or utterly like, for at all times they have been divers, and may be changed according to the diversities of countries, times, and men's manners.

This Article is not concerned with the laws and ordinances of God, which are binding on all men at all times, or with matters of faith which have been once for all delivered (S. Jude v. 3), but with things which are, in themselves, more or less indifferent. It is not necessary that there should be complete uniformity everywhere in such matters.¹

¹ Cf. with our Article the following extracts from Continental Confessions:—

AUGSBURG CONFESSION, Part I. Art. VII.:

“Nec necesse est ubique esse similes traditiones humanas, seu ritus aut ceremonias, ab hominibus institutas.”

BOHEMIAN CONFESSION, Art. XV.:

“Quanquam etiam nostri, non omnium ritus ac mores servant, quod neque fieri potest, neque ut ubique in omnibus Ecclesiis idem ritus et ceremonie servantur necessarium est. . . .

“Ad haec docent, Humanas traditiones pro inviolabilibus ac aeternis legibus non haberi oportere. Verum quemadmodum certis ac justis causis feruntur, ita etiam aliis causis ac rebus exortis, et diversum momentibus, liceat eas abque peccato violare.”

FRENCH CONFESSION, Art. XXXII.:

“Credimus expedire, ut qui electi sunt, ecclesiae alicujus praefecti, inter se dispiciant, qua ratione totum corpus commode regi possit. Ita tamen, ut

- (a) By *Traditions* are meant customs of the Church produced by the frequent and long-continued usage of the great part of the community.¹ Such usages have, as a matter of fact, varied according to the diversities of times, countries, and men's manners.

We may illustrate this point by reference to the Paschal Controversy in the early ages of the Church. While Anicetus was Pope (A.D. 157–168), S. Polycarp of Smyrna visited Rome and discussed the Paschal question with him, but without arriving at mutual agreement. “For neither could Anicetus persuade Polycarp not to observe it, because he had always observed it with John the disciple of our Lord, and the rest of the Apostles, with whom he associated; and neither did Polycarp persuade Anicetus to observe it, who said that he was bound to maintain the practice of the presbyters before him. Which things being so, they communicated together; and in the church Anicetus yielded to Polycarp, out of respect no doubt, the office of consecrating the Eucharist, and they separated from each other in peace, all the church being at peace; both those that observed and those that did not observe maintaining peace.”²

- (b) As to *Ceremonies*, the same principle holds good. Rigid uniformity is not necessary with regard to them, but they

ab eo, quod Dominus noster Jesus Christus instituit, nusquam deflectant. Hoc autem non impedit, quominus quaedam singulis locis peculiaris sint instituta, prout commodum visum fuerit.”

SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION, Cap. XXVII.:

“Quod si in ecclesiis dispare inveniuntur ritus, nemo ecclesias existimet ex eo esse dissidentes. Socrates, Impossibile fuerit, inquit, omnes ecclesiarum, quae per civitates et regiones sunt, ritus conscribere. Nulla religio eosdem ritus custodit, etiamsi eandem de illis doctrinam amplectatur. Etenim qui ejusdem sunt fidei de ritibus inter se dissentiunt. . . . Semper vero ecclesiae in hujusmodi ritibus, sicut mediis, usae sunt libertate. Id quod nos hodie quoque facimus.”

¹ The use of the word *Traditions* with this meaning may be illustrated from the HOLY CATECHISM (Orthodox Eastern Church), by Bernadaces (p. 16):—

“Q. Are all the sayings of the holy men enlightened and led by the Holy Ghost written, or did some remain unwritten?”

“A. There remained some unwritten, which have been kept by tradition in the Church from the time of the Apostles to this day.

“Q. Give some examples.

“A. To turn to the East when we pray, to make the sign of the Cross, for the priests to wear a peculiar dress, for us to kindle lamps in the church, and many other things.”

² Irenæus, quoted by Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., V. Cap. xxiv.

may be modified by local or temporal circumstances. Thus, to give examples illustrative of the principle of the Article, ceremonies have been affected by—

(i.) *Diversities of countries.*

Baptism is now generally performed amongst us by affusion, and not by immersion.

(ii.) *Diversities of times.*

In early days, when the Church was persecuted, the public assemblies of Christians for worship were held in secret places, in caves, or catacombs. At a later time, when Christianity became the acknowledged religion of the Roman Empire, gorgeous churches were built, and Divine worship celebrated with splendid ritual accessories.

(iii.) *Diversities of men's manners.*

The Kiss of Peace, a ceremony connected with the celebration of the Holy Eucharist in primitive times, has been discontinued.

The Article lays down one all-important limit to the diversity of Traditions and Ceremonies by providing that nothing be ordained against God's Word.¹

(2.) **THOSE WHO BREAK CHURCH TRADITIONS AND CEREMONIES ON THE GROUND OF PRIVATE JUDGMENT ARE TO BE REBUKED.**

Whosoever through his private judgment, willingly and purposely doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the Word of God, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly.

Traditions and Ceremonies are in themselves matters indifferent, but when established by the authority of the Church² they ought to be observed by all, on account of the reverence due to that authority, which is derived from God, Who has commanded us to obey our spiritual rulers (Heb. xiii. 17). The Christian Religion has for its end the raising and purifying of the individual man and the perfection of human society. Now no virtue tends so much

¹ Cf. SAXON CONFESSION, Art. XX. :—

"Est igitur prima regula: Nulli creaturae, non angelis, non hominibus, non regibus, non episcopis licet condere leges aut ritus pugnantes cum verbo Dei."

² Cf. the first clause of Article XX. :—

"The Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies."

to the accomplishment of this twofold purpose as brotherly love, which, besides rendering the individual like God Himself, Who is Love (1 S. John iv. 8), also creates the strongest union and greatest happiness in human society. Christ Himself did most particularly intend and enjoin that His followers should be joined together in one Body by mutual love (cf. S. John xiii. 34, 35; xv. 12; xvii. 21-23). The dissolving of this union, or the dislocating of this Body by the setting up of an individual private judgment against the common authority, and that, too, upon ground of matters in themselves indifferent, must be most reprehensible. People guilty of such action are to be rebuked.¹

The object of this rebuke is next stated in the Article, viz., that others may fear to do the like (cf. 1 Tim. v. 20).

Further, three evil consequences are traced to the action of those who openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church :—

Whosoever through his private judgment, willingly and purposely doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church . . . ought to be rebuked openly . . .

(a) **as he that offendeth against the common order of the Church, (1 Cor. xi. 16; xiv. 40)**

(b) **and hurteth the authority of the magistrate,**

Of course this effect can only follow when Church and State are closely related and civil sanction is given to Ecclesiastical traditions and ceremonies. The giving of such civil sanction to ordinances of the Church dates from the earliest times of the converted Roman Empire.

(c) **and woundeth the consciences of the weak brethren (1 Cor. viii. 12).**

It was very necessary for the Church to lay down that those should be rebuked who set up their private judgment against the common order, because considerable confusion was caused by action of this kind in the reign of Edward VI. As an example we might quote the case of Hooper, who, when nominated to the Bishopric of Gloucester (April 7, 1550), refused to be consecrated in what he called the "Aaronic habits,"² setting up his

¹ Cf. Queen Elizabeth's INJUNCTIONS, 1559 :—

"XXII. That they shall instruct and teach in their cures, that no man ought obstinately and maliciously to break and violate the laudable ceremonies of the Church, commanded by public authority to be observed."

² Original Letters, vol. i. p. 87.

own judgment in opposition to the "tradition" of the Church. Cranmer and Ridley, and even Peter Martyr and Bucer, strongly condemned his obstinacy in the matter.

(3.) THE POWER OF PARTICULAR OR NATIONAL CHURCHES IN THE MATTER OF RITES OR CEREMONIES.

Every particular or national Church, hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority.

In the first place we notice that the wording of the Article is carefully guarded. Those rites alone are referred to which are ordained *only by man's authority*. No particular Church, therefore, may change or abolish a ceremony which has the sanction of Divine authority, as the Sacraments have. Since the rites and ceremonies referred to in the Article are in themselves indifferent, and depend for their precise form, to a certain extent, upon local or temporal conditions, it follows that they may be changed. This concluding paragraph of the Article lays it down that each national Church has the power of changing such ceremonies. During the integrity of the Roman Empire the various parts of Europe under the civil dominion of Rome must be regarded as forming one nation; hence the summoning of Councils from the whole Empire to deal with ceremonial matters. Even after the Empire had fallen to pieces, the Church, in those countries of Western Europe which had formed part of the Empire, was for many centuries held together by the supremacy of the Roman See. During the Middle Ages, however, the various nations of modern Europe had been continually gaining independent strength, and at the Reformation, when the Papal Supremacy was thrown off, the power of changing rites and ceremonies was claimed for each separate nation.

Cf. the Preface to the Prayer Book, "*Of Ceremonies, why some be abolished, and some retained*":—

"And in these our doings we condemn no other Nations, nor prescribe anything but to our own people only: For we think it convenient that every Country should use such Ceremonies as they shall think best to the setting forth of God's honour and glory, and to the reducing of the people to a most perfect and godly living, without error or superstition; and that they should put

away other things, which from time to time they perceive to be most abused, as in men's ordinances it often chanceth diversly in divers countries."

The fact that the Sovereign, as head of the nation, played so prominent a part in the English Reformation, and successfully asserted the supremacy of the Crown in causes Ecclesiastical, also contributed in no small degree to that identification of the Church with the nation, which was an important outcome of the Reformation as it took place in this country.

The Article concludes with a statement of the great principle which should rule all regulations made with respect to rites and ceremonies—

So that all things be done to edifying (Rom. xiv. 19).

ARTICLE XXXV

OF HOMILIES.

The second Book of Homilies, the several titles whereof we have joined under this Article, doth contain a godly and wholesome Doctrine, and necessary for these times, as doth the former Book of Homilies, which were set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth; and therefore we judge them to be read in churches by the Ministers diligently, and distinctly, that they may be understood of the people.

OF THE NAMES OF THE HOMILIES.

1. Of the Right Use of the Church.
2. Against Peril of Idolatry.
3. Of Repairing and Keeping Clean of Churches.
4. Of Good Works, first of Fasting.
5. Against Gluttony and Drunkenness.
6. Against Excess of Apparel.
7. Of Prayer.
8. Of the Place and Time of Prayer.
9. That Common Prayers and Sacraments ought to be Ministered in a Known Tongue.
10. Of the Reverent Estimation of God's Word.
11. Of Alms-doing.
12. Of the Nativity of Christ.
13. Of the Passion of Christ.
14. Of the Resurrection of Christ.
15. Of the Worthy Receiving of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ.
16. Of the Gifts of the Holy Ghost.

DE HOMILIIS.

Tomus secundus Homiliarum, quarum singulos titulos huic Article subjunximus, continet piam et salutarem doctrinam, et his temporibus necessariam, non minus quam prior Tomus Homiliarum, quae editae sunt tempore Edwardi Sexti. Itaque eas in Ecclesiis per ministros diligenter et clare, ut a populo intelligi possint, recitandas esse judicavimus.

17. For the Rogation-Days.
18. Of the State of Matrimony.
19. Of Repentance.
20. Against Idleness.
21. AGAINST REBELLION.

§ 1.—SOURCE.

The First Book of Homilies was presented to the Convocation of 1543,¹ but not passed. In the year of Edward's accession (1547) it was printed, apparently on the sole authority of Cranmer, and ordered by Royal authority to be read every Sunday in churches.² This Book obtained the sanction of Convocation in the thirty-fourth of the XLII. ARTICLES of 1553:—

HOMILIES.

Thomelies of late geuen, and set out by the kinges auctoritie, be godlie and holsome, contening doctrine to bee receiued of all menne, and therefore are to be readde to the people diligentlie, distinctlie and plainlie.

HOMILIAE.

Homiliae nuper Ecclesiae Anglicanae per injunctiones Regias traditae atque commendatae, piae sunt atque salutare, doctrinamque ab omnibus amplectendam continent: quare populo diligentur, expedite, clareque recitandae sunt.

It was intended in Edward's reign to issue further Homilies,³ but the design was frustrated by the death of the king. The precise date of the publication of the Second Book of Homilies

¹ It was the outcome of an agreement of the Bishops—

"To make certain Homilies for stay of such errors as were then by ignorant preachers sparkled among the people."

² The titles of the Homilies contained in the First Book are as follows:—

1. A fruitful Exhortation to the reading of Holy Scripture.
2. Of the Misery of all Mankind.
3. Of the Salvation of all Mankind.
4. Of the True and Lively Faith.
5. Of Good Works.
6. Of Christian Love and Charity.
7. Against Swearing and Perjury.
8. Of the Declining from God.
9. An Exhortation against the Fear of Death.
10. An Exhortation to Obedience.
11. Against Whoredom and Adultery.
12. Against Strife and Contention.

³ This is indicated in the Rubric after the Nicene Creed in the Prayer Book of 1552:—

"After the Crede, if there be no sermon, shall follow one of the homelies already set forth, or hereafter to be set forth by commune auctoritie."

is uncertain, but the present Article (1563) commends it together with the former book. The last Homily, "Against Rebellion," was added in 1571, after the rising in the North (1569).

§ 2.—*OBJECT.*

To commend the doctrine contained in the Books of Homilies, and to provide for the reading of the Homilies in churches.

Cf. Rubric in the Communion Service after the Nicene Creed (1549):—

"After the Crede ended, shall folowe the Sermon or Homely, or some portiō of one of the Homelyes, as thei shalbe hereafter deuided."¹

See also Queen Elizabeth's INJUNCTIONS (1559):—

XXVII. "Because through lack of preachers in many places of the queen's realms and dominions the people continue in ignorance and blindness, all parsons, vicars, and curates shall read in their churches every Sunday one of the homilies, which are and shall be set forth for the same purpose by the queen's authority, in such sort, as they shall be appointed to do in the preface of the same."

This was one of the Articles excepted against by the Puritans, who laid great stress upon the necessity of a *preaching* ministry,² and also objected to the reading of aught else save Holy Scripture in the public services of the Church.

§ 3.—*EXPOSITION.*

THE MEANING OF THE WORD "HOMILY."

"Homily" is derived from the Greek *ὁμιλία*, denoting primarily "*social intercourse*," then "*familiar conversation*,"³ hence its Ecclesiastical meaning, "*a plain, familiar discourse*."

¹ In 1559 this Rubric was made to read as follows:—

"After the Crede, yf there be no sermon, shall folowe one of the Homelies already set furth, or hereafter to be set furth by comyn auctoritie."

In this form, with the exception that the word "common" has been omitted, it still remains in our Prayer Book.

² *E.g.*, at the Savoy Conference (1661) the Puritans made the following exception to the Rubric after the Nicene Creed:—

"We desire that the preaching of the word may be strictly enjoined, and not left so indifferent, at the administration of the Sacraments."

³ *Cf.* the use of the cognate verb in Acts xx. 11, ἐφ' ἱκανόν τε ὁμιλήσας ἀχρὶς αὐγῆς.

- (1.) BOTH BOOKS OF HOMILIES CONTAIN A GODLY AND WHOLESOME DOCTRINE; AND NECESSARY FOR THE TIMES WHEN THEY WERE COMPOSED.

The second Book of Homilies, the several titles whereof we have joined under this Article, doth contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times, as doth the former Book of Homilies, which were set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth.

The approval here given to the two Books of Homilies must not be understood as involving a literal acceptance of every statement or argument contained in them. Passages of Scripture were sometimes then applied in a manner we should not now consider consistent with sound principles of exegesis. Arguments, too, may occur here and there which appear to us unsound or obscure, and which may therefore need correction or explanation. What is required from those who assent to the Articles is a general acceptance of the teaching of the Homilies as testifying to great truths of Christianity, some of which having been more or less obscured by superstition, the emphatic reassertion of them, as in the Homilies, was very necessary at the time of the Reformation.

- (2.) THE HOMILIES ARE TO BE READ IN CHURCHES.

Therefore we judge them to be read in churches by the Ministers diligently, and distinctly, that they may be understood of the people.

During the sixteenth century there was much unsettlement and keen controversy upon points both of doctrine and discipline, so that instruction for the people in these matters was very necessary; although it was, at the same time, extremely difficult to provide for it, since very many of the clergy were either illiterate, and on that account not capable of preaching, or else strong partisans of Rome, or (especially in Elizabeth's reign) of Geneva. The incompetence of the clergy for the work of preaching, whether from lack of learning, or from intemperate zeal, is indicated by the fact that preaching was prohibited under each of the four sovereigns, Henry VIII., Edward VI., Mary, and Elizabeth. The Homilies were drawn up and appointed to be read—

- (a) Partly to supply the defect of sermons, owing to the great lack of competent ministers.

(b) Partly in order to secure something like unity of doctrine in those very unsettled times, and thus guard against the many heterodoxies, both old and new, with which the Church was then threatened.

AUTHORSHIP OF THE HOMILIES.

We have no complete record of the authorship of the several Homilies. Those contained in the First Book were published under the superintendence and upon the authority of Cranmer, to whom the composition of Homilies 1, 3, 4, 5 is also generally assigned. No. 2 is attributed to Archdeacon Harpsfield, 6 to Bishop Bonner, and 11 to Thomas Becon.

Of the Second Book the authorship is even more uncertain, though it is sometimes affirmed that Bishop Jewel was chiefly responsible for its compilation.¹ A considerable proportion of the matter is traceable to foreign sources, but the Sermons on the Passion (No. 13) and on the Resurrection (No. 15) are taken from Taverner's "Postils."²

¹ This view is given by Forbes and Harold Browne.

² A book of sermons on the Epistles and Gospels for Sundays and Holy Days, issued in 1540 under the auspices of Cromwell, the King's Vice-gerent, and with Cranmer's sanction.

ARTICLE XXXVI

OF CONSECRATION OF BISHOPS
AND MINISTERS.

DE EPISCOPORUM ET MINIS-
TRORUM CONSECRATIONE.

The Book of Consecration of Archbishops and Bishops, and Ordering of Priests and Deacons, lately set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth, and confirmed at the same time by authority of Parliament, doth contain all things necessary to such Consecration and Ordering: neither hath it anything, that of itself is superstitious or ungodly. And therefore, whosoever are consecrated or ordered according to the Rites of that Book, since the second year of the afore-named King Edward, unto this time, or hereafter shall be consecrated or ordered according to the same Rites, we decree all such to be rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered.

Libellus de Consecratione Archiepiscoporum et Episcoporum, et de Ordinatione Presbyterorum et Diaconorum, editus nuper temporibus Edwardi Sexti, et auctoritate Parliamenti illis ipsis temporibus confirmatus, omnia ad ejusmodi consecrationem et ordinationem necessaria continet, et nihil habet, quod ex se sit aut superstitiosum, aut impium. Itaque quicumque juxta ritus illius Libri consecrati aut ordinati sunt, ab anno secundo praedicti regis Edwardi, usque ad hoc tempus, aut in posterum juxta eosdem ritus consecrabitur, aut ordinabitur, rite, atque ordine, atque legitime statuimus esse et fore consecratos et ordinatos.

§ 1.—SOURCE.

Composed by the English Reformers in 1563. The corresponding Article of the XLII. ARTICLES of 1553, which was superseded by the present one, ran as follows:—

OF THE BOOKE OF PRAIERS, AND
CEREMONIES OF THE CHURCHE
OF ENGLANDE.

DE LIBRO PRAECATIONUM ET CAERI-
MONIARUM ECCLESIAE ANGLI-
CANAE.

The Booke which of very late time was geuen to the Churche of Englande by the kinge's auctoritie, and the Parlamente, containing the

Liber qui nuperrime auctoritate Regis et Parliamenti Ecclesiae Anglicanae traditus est, continens modum et formam orandi, et Sacra

maner and fourme of praiving, and ministring the Sacramentes in the Church of Englande, likewise also the booke of ording Ministers of the Church, set forth by the forsaid auctoritie, are godlie, and in no pointe repugnaunt to the holsome doctrine of the Gospel but agreable thereunto, ferthering and beautifying the same not a litle, and therefore of al faithfull membres of the Church of Englande, and chiefie of the ministers of the worde, thei ought to be receiued, and allowed with all readinesse of minde, and thankes geuing, and to bee commended to the people of God.

menta administrandi in Ecclesia Anglicana: similiter et libellus eadem autoritate editus de ordinatione ministrorum Ecclesiae, quoad doctrinae veritatem, pii sunt, et salutari doctrinae Evangelii in nullo repugnant sed congruunt, et eandem non parum promovent et illustrant, atque ideo ab omnibus Ecclesiae Anglicanae fidelibus membris, et maxime a ministris verbi cum omni promptitudine animorum et gratiarum actione, recipiendi, approbandi, et populo Dei commendandi sunt.

§ 2.—OBJECT.

To defend the validity of English Orders, and the Ordinal itself, against objections on the part both of Romanists and Puritans.

§ 3.—EXPOSITION.

(1.) THE ORDINAL (OF 1550) CONTAINS ALL THINGS NECESSARY.

The Book of Consecration of Archbishops and Bishops, and Ordering of Priests and Deacons, lately set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth, and confirmed at the same time by authority of Parliament, doth contain all things necessary to such Consecration and Ordering.

Roman Catholics deny the validity of English Orders. The grounds upon which this denial has been given at various times are:—

- (a) That there is a break in the continuity of English Orders because the Elizabethan bishops were not properly consecrated (The Nag's Head Fable).
- (b) That Parker's consecration was invalid because Barlow, his chief consecrator, had never received consecration.
- (c) That the succession was broken owing to the fact that the consecrators of Parker were "vacant" bishops; *i.e.*, without jurisdiction.

These grounds are now by educated and candid Roman Catholics for the most part given up as untenable.¹

- (d) If, therefore, English Orders are invalid, it must be because there is something wanting in the Ordinal itself. Upon this point the whole question now turns. It is admitted on all hands that English Orders were valid up to the year 1550. If they have been invalid since that date, it must be because some necessary thing was omitted in the Ordinal of 1550.

In order to investigate this matter the Ordinal of 1550 must be compared with the Pontifical which it superseded:—

- (i.) In the Ordinal the forms for admission to the Minor Orders disappear.

In Anglo-Saxon times five Minor Orders were recognised: (1) Ostiarius, (2) Lector, (3) Exorcist, (4) Acolyte, (5) Subdeacon. But before the Reformation these had long practically ceased to exist, although such Orders were

¹ With regard to—

(a) *The Nag's Head Fable*.

This is rejected by Courayer ("Dissertation sur la Validité des Ordinations des Anglois." Published 1723) and by Lingard (vol. vi., Appendix, pp. 670, 671) as unworthy of credit. It originated at Antwerp, forty-five years after the event, with an exiled priest named Holywood.

(b) *Barlow's Consecration*.

This is denied because there is no record of it. But the same argument might be used with regard to the consecration of many other bishops of the period; *e.g.*, Gardiner and Lee (Archbishop of York). "Did any one call in question the consecration of those bishops on that account? Why should we doubt the consecration of Barlow and not that of Gardiner? I fear the only reason is this—Gardiner did not consecrate Parker, and Barlow did" (Lingard, quoted in Hook's "Parker," p. 241, note). In answer to the argument *ex silentio*, it should be remembered that Barlow officiated as a bishop in the reign of Henry VIII. at the consecration of Skip (November 23, 1539), and of Bulkeley (February 19, 1542), and that he was treated as a bishop by Queen Mary's Commissioners, and deprived as such (Bailey's "Defence of Holy Orders in the English Church," pp. 39-41). At the same time it should also be noted that, even if Barlow was never consecrated, this would not invalidate Parker's consecration, because there is no doubt with respect to the consecration of the other three bishops present, Scory, Coverdale, and Hodgkins.

(c) *Lack of jurisdiction of Parker's consecrators*.

Parker's consecrators were bishops by consecration, and were already also bishops elect to sees which had been vacated by death. Thus there was no intrusion, and the mere fact that they had not "*potestas jurisdictionis*" (since there was no Archbishop to confirm them in the sees to which they had been elected) could not, on any principle, invalidate their "*potestas ordinis*."

still taken at the universities, perhaps with the very unworthy object in view, that those who took them might be able to plead "*benefit of clergy*."

In the Ordinal of 1550 the Church thus provided for the continuance of those Orders only which, in the light of history, it deemed permanent.

(ii.) On comparing the Ordination of Deacons with the corresponding portion of the Salisbury Pontifical, two points of difference only appear:—

(a) The characteristic vestments of a deacon (the stole and dalmatic) are no longer delivered to the person ordained.

(b) Deacons are not compared in the Ordinal to the Levites of the Old Testament.

So far it will be generally admitted that nothing essential was omitted in the Ordinal. We come to a difficulty, however, when we ask, 'What are the essentials of Priestly Ordination?' To this question somewhat varying answers have been given:—

(a) It is obvious that any acts or words used in conferring Orders which are not universal cannot be held to be essential. The only essentials, therefore, to valid Ordination are the laying on of hands and prayer, since these alone have been used by the whole Church from the beginning (Acts vi. 6, xiii. 3; 1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6).

(b) There is the view that the "*traditio instrumentorum*" is necessary to a true Ordination. To this the Schoolmen incline, but the custom cannot be traced farther back than the tenth century, and did not obtain in England until the eleventh; moreover, it has never in the Eastern Church formed a part of the Ordination ceremony.¹ The omission of the "*traditio instrumentorum*" cannot, therefore, be held to invalidate English Orders.²

¹ Pope Eugenius IV. (1431-1447) lays it down in his Epistle to the Armenians that the "*traditio instrumentorum*" is necessary to valid ordination. It is, however, remarkable that under the same Pope the COUNCIL OF FLORENCE (a continuation of that of Basle—1430—and recognised as œcumenical by the Eastern Church) acknowledged the validity of Orders in the Greek Church, which had always been conferred without the delivery of the chalice and paten.

² In the Ordinal of 1550 the "*traditio instrumentorum*" had been retained:—

"The Bisshop shall deliuer to euery one of them, the Bible in the one hande, and the Chalice or cuppe with the breade, in the other hande, and saying," . . .

(c) It has sometimes been urged that the recital of the words "*Receive the Holy Ghost*" is essential to a true ordination.¹ This form of words has been retained in the English Ordinal; yet, since it cannot be traced back earlier than the twelfth century, it cannot be maintained that its use is essential.

(d) It is sometimes objected by Roman Catholic controversialists that "*intention*" was lacking in the Bishops of the English Church at the Reformation period, and that therefore the Orders conferred by them are invalid. But surely the PREFACE TO THE ORDINAL may be taken as testifying to the right intention of the English Church at that time. It should be noted, too, that this very objection seems to imply that, as far as the actual forms and wording of Edward's Ordinal are concerned, English Orders might be valid.

It thus appears that, viewing the matter historically, the only *absolute essentials* for true Ordination are *laying on of hands* and *prayer*. Nothing essential, therefore, was omitted in the Ordinal of 1550.

With respect to the Form of Consecrating Bishops, it is sometimes objected by Roman Catholics that the Form of 1550 is invalid because it is not specified *at the time of the imposition of hands* what the intention of the rite is, there being no mention of the office of a bishop. It is also urged that the addition made in 1661 to the form of words used at the imposition of hands is tantamount to an admission that the previous form is invalid.² In answer to this objection it may be observed:—

¹ This is Bellarmine's view. Cf. COUNCIL OF TRENT (Session XXIII.):—

CANON IV.—"Si quis dixerit, per sacram ordinationem non dari Spiritum sanctum, ac proinde frustra Episcopos dicere: Accipe Spiritum sanctum . . . anathema sit."

Note that the Council does not declare the use of the words "*Accipe Spiritum sanctum*" to be essential, but merely anathematises those who say that the form referred to is useless.

² In the Ordinal of 1550 the form of words to be used at the imposition of hands runs thus:—

"Take the holy goste, and remember that thou stirre up the grace of God, which is in thee, by imposition of handes: for god hath not geuen us the spirite of feare, but of powere, and loue, and of sobernesse."

This wording remained unchanged in 1559, but in 1661 it was altered to its present form:—

"Receive the Holy Ghost, for the Office and Work of a Bishop in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the Imposition of our hands; In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen. And remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is given thee by this Imposition of our hands: for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and soberness."

- (i.) That the intention of the rite is clearly specified in the Prayer used previously in the service on behalf of the person to be consecrated:—

“Mercifully behold this thy servant now called to the Work and Ministry of a Bishop.”

- (ii.) That in the Pontifical of Pope Clement VIII. (1595) the only words used at the imposition of hands are, “Accipe Spiritum Sanctum.”

- (2.) THE ORDINAL CONTAINS NOTHING SUPERSTITIOUS OR UNGODLY. Neither hath it anything, that of itself is superstitious or ungodly.

Two points in the Ordinal gave great offence to the party which sympathised with the Swiss school of Continental Reformers:—

- (a) The use of the words, “*Receive the Holy Ghost*,” which are said, at the imposition of hands, to each one ordained priest, or consecrated bishop. Against the use of this form it was objected that God alone, and not man, can confer the Holy Spirit.

The words in question are taken from our Lord’s Commission to the Apostles after His Resurrection (S. John xx. 22). As used in the Ordinal they are a prayer, but of a very special kind, for we know that it is God’s will to answer it by accompanying the outward sign of imposition of hands with a special gift of His Spirit. The words are therefore said in sure confidence that the gift accompanies the outward sign. We have, moreover, examples recorded in Scripture of spiritual gifts being conferred instrumentally by man, acting under Divine authority (*e.g.*, Deut. xxxiv. 9; Acts viii. 17, xix. 6; 2 Tim. i. 6).

- (b) Against the use of the words, “*Whose sins thou dost forgive*,” &c., it was objected that God alone can forgive sins.

The Article defends the Ordinal from the charge of superstition or ungodliness, the Church of England teaching that at Ordination the Priest receives a special gift of the Holy Ghost for his office and ministry, and also the commission to absolve in Christ’s Name. (See Notes on Article XXV., under the head of “Penance,” pp. 190, 191.)

- (3.) THOSE ORDAINED OR CONSECRATED ACCORDING TO THE ORDINAL ARE RIGHTLY ORDAINED AND CONSECRATED.

And therefore, whosoever are consecrated or ordered according to the Rites of that Book, since the second year of the aforementioned King Edward, unto this time, or hereafter shall be consecrated or ordered according to the same Rites, we decree all such to be rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered.

What is here stated follows of course from the first point laid down in the Article, viz., that the Ordinal contains all things necessary to a valid Consecration and Ordination. The reason why the validity of the Orders of those ordained according to the Ordinal (of 1550) is so emphatically insisted on in the present Article is this:—When the Prayer Book was repealed in Mary’s reign, the Act mentioned the Ordinal by name as also repealed. On the accession of Elizabeth, when the Prayer Book was restored the Ordinal was not specified by name, it being understood to form part of the Prayer Book; but, on the ground of the omission to mention the Ordinal by name, Bonner, and others of his party, argued that all Ordinations since 1559 were in the eye of the law defective. Hence the necessity of maintaining, as in this Article, that those ordained or consecrated according to the Edwardine form were “rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered.”

The question of the validity of Anglican Orders, so far as controversy with Rome is concerned, was narrowed by Pope Leo XIII.’s letter, *Apostolicæ Curæ* (Sept. 13, 1896) to the form of the Anglican rite. The Roman case rests chiefly on the contention that “in the whole Ordinal not only is there no clear mention of the Sacrifice, of consecration, of the *sacerdotium*, and of the powers of consecrating and offering sacrifice, but every trace of those things . . . was deliberately removed” (§ 18). The Archbishops of England, in a reply addressed to the whole body of the Bishops of the Catholic Church (1897), vindicated the sacrificial character of the Eucharist as celebrated according to the Anglican rite (§ xi.), pointed to the Preface to the Ordinal as indicating the intention of our Church (§ xvii.), and urged that the Pope’s decree not only overthrows our orders but those of the Orientals and of his own communion (§ xx.).

ARTICLE XXXVII

OF THE CIVIL MAGISTRATES.

The Queen's Majesty hath the chief power in this Realm of England, and other her dominions, unto whom the chief government of all estates of this Realm, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Civil, in all causes doth appertain, and is not, nor ought to be subject to any foreign jurisdiction.

Where we attribute to the Queen's Majesty the chief government, by which titles we understand the minds of some slanderous folks to be offended, we give not to our Princes the ministering either of God's Word, or of Sacraments, the which thing the Injunctions also lately set forth by Elizabeth our Queen doth most plainly testify: but that only prerogative, which we see to have been given always to all godly Princes in holy Scriptures by God Himself, that is, that they should rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil-doers.

The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this Realm of England.

The Laws of the Realm may

DE CIVILIBUS MAGISTRATIBUS.

Regia Majestas in hoc Angliae regno, ac cæteris ejus dominiis, summam habet potestatem, ad quam omnium statuum hujus regni, sive illi Ecclesiastici sint, sive Civiles, in omnibus causis suprema gubernatio pertinet, et nulli externae jurisdictioni est subjecta, nec esse debet.

Cum Regiae Majestati summam gubernationem tribuimus, quibus titulis intelligimus animos quorundam calumniatorum offendi, non damus Regibus nostris, aut verbi Dei, aut Sacramentorum administrationem, quod etiam Injunctiones ab Elizabetha Regina nostra, nuper editae, apertissime testantur, sed eam tantum praerogativam, quam in Sacris Scripturis a Deo ipso, omnibus piis Principibus, videmus semper fuisse attributam, hoc est, ut omnes status atque ordines, fidei suae a Deo commissos, sive illi Ecclesiastici sint, sive Civiles, in officio contineant, et contumaces ac delinquentes, gladio civili coerceant.

Romanus Pontifex nullam habet jurisdictionem in hoc regno Angliae.

Leges Regni possunt Christia-

punish Christian men with death, for heinous and grievous offences.

It is lawful for Christian men, at the commandment of the Magistrate, to wear weapons, and serve in the wars.

nos propter capitalia et gravia crimina morte punire.

Christianis licet ex mandato Magistratus arma portare et justa bella administrare.

. § 1.—SOURCE.

This Article first appeared (in a much shorter form) as the thirty-sixth of the XLII. ARTICLES of 1553. It then ran as follows:—

OF CIVILE MAGISTRATES.

The King of Englande is Supreme Head in earth, nexte vnder Christe, of the Church of Englande, and Irelande.

The Bishope of Rome hath no iurisdiction in this Realme of Englande.

The ciuile magistrate is ordeined, and allowed of God: wherefore we must obeie him, not onely for feare of punishment; but also for conscience sake.

The ciuile lawes maie punishe Christien men with death, for heinous, and grieuous offences.

It is lawefull for Christians, at the commaundement of the Magistrate, to weare weapons, and to serue in laweful wares.

DE CIVILIBUS MAGISTRATIBUS.

Rex Angliae est supremum caput in terris, post Christum, Ecclesiae Anglicanae et Hibernicae.

Romanus Pontifex nullam habet jurisdictionem in hoc Regno Angliae.

Magistratus civilis est a Deo ordinatus atque probatus, quamobrem illi, non solum propter iram, sed etiam propter conscientiam, obediendum est.

Leges civiles possunt Christianos propter capitalia et gravia crimina morte punire.

Christianis licet ex mandato Magistratus arma portare, et justa bella administrare.

At the Elizabethan revision (1563) the first paragraph was remodelled, the title "*Supreme Head*" being disused, and the words "*chief power*" . . . "*chief government*" substituted for it; at the same time the long second paragraph was added. The object of these changes was to state more guardedly the Royal Supremacy, which in the Edwardine Article had been stated rather baldly, and in a manner liable to an Erastian construction. We know that Queen Elizabeth had scruples in this matter, and was unwilling to be spoken of as "*Head*" of the Church.¹

¹ See a letter of Jewel to Peter Martyr from London (no date):—

"The Queen declines being stiled the head of the Church, at which I certainly am not much displeas'd" (Zurich Letters, i. p. 24).

Cf. also a letter of Parkhurst to Bullinger (London, May 21, 1559):—

"The Queen is not willing to be called the head of the Church of England,

§ 2.—*OBJECT.*

The object of the Article is evidently twofold:—

- (a) To assert the Royal, and repudiate the Papal, Supremacy.
- (b) To condemn Anabaptist zealots, who set the civil authority at defiance and impugned the lawfulness of war.

Cf. REFORMATIO LEGUM, "De Haeresibus," Cap. 13:—

"Quin et Anabaptistarum profligandus est agrestis stupor, qui negant licere Christianis magistratum gerere, quasi propterea Christus in terras descenderit, ut rerum publicarum administrationem aboleret. Imo vero Spiritus Sanctus statuit principes et magistratus esse Dei ministros, ut benefactis favorem suum impartiant, et maleficia supplicis constringant; quae duo si rebus humanis abessent, maxima sequeretur omnium rerum confusio."

§ 3.—*EXPOSITION.*

(I.) ASSERTION OF THE ROYAL, AND REPUDIATION OF THE PAPAL, SUPREMACY.

The Queen's Majesty hath the chief power in this Realm of England, and other her dominions, unto whom the chief government of all estates of this Realm, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Civil, in all causes doth appertain, and is not, nor ought to be subject to any foreign jurisdiction.

The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this Realm of England.

The principle that every soul owes obedience to the Civil power is laid down in the New Testament; see especially Rom. xiii. 1; 1 S. Pet. ii. 13, 14; and *cf.* Acts xxv. 10, 11, where S. Paul appeals to Cæsar as supreme in his own cause. In the days, however, when the State was not Christian, the difficulty in determining the due relation between the Ecclesiastical and Civil powers was not felt, and the Church shrank from direct connection with the kingdoms of the world. Obedience to the heathen govern-

although this title has been offered her; but she willingly accepts the title of governor, which amounts to the same thing" (Zurich Letters, i. p. 29);

and a letter from Jewel to Bullinger (London, May 22, 1559):—

"The Queen is unwilling to be addressed, either by word of mouth, or in writing, as the head of the Church of England. For she seriously maintains that this honour is due to Christ alone, and cannot belong to any human being soever; besides which, these titles have been so foully contaminated by Antichrist, that they can no longer be adopted by anyone without impiety" (Zurich Letters, i. p. 33).

ment was indeed enjoined; but in its internal affairs the Church was self-governing, and we even find S. Paul rebuking the Corinthian Christians for going to law in the Civil courts (1 Cor. vi. 1-7). When, after the accession of Constantine, the ruling power of the State became, for the first time, professedly Christian, the previously existing conditions were at once modified. As a result of the "establishment" of Christianity as the Religion of the Empire, actual separation between Church and State became henceforth impossible.

We must here review the historical relations of Church and State in this country, together with the relations of England and Rome:—

(a) *In Saxon times.*

It must be remembered that at the time of the introduction of Christianity into the various kingdoms of Saxon England, the adoption of the new religion was looked upon as a public matter, affecting not merely the personal but also the official life of the king, and also the whole national life. From the time that England acquired national unity Church and State grew side by side, and the Church exercised an important influence in the development and consolidation of the life of the nation. At the same time the insular position of the country made it natural that business, Ecclesiastical as well as Civil, should be transacted within the limits of the island.¹ The King, we find, exercised a certain undefined authority, and had to a certain extent a right of intervention in Ecclesiastical affairs.

(b) *After the Norman Conquest.*

At the Conquest (1066) the existing relations of Church and State were altered. William had patched up his title to the English throne by Papal approval, and brought England under the visitatorial authority of the Roman See; at the same time he refused to be in any sense the Pope's

¹ The well-known appeal of Wilfrid (Bishop of York) affords a good illustration. Theodore of Tarsus (Archbishop of Canterbury), in reorganising the Church, mapped out dioceses and subdivided the large diocese of York. He proceeded in rather a high-handed manner, and Wilfrid, who from the first had assumed a somewhat unfriendly attitude towards him, objected, appealing in person to the Pope (A.D. 678). The Pope sided with Wilfrid, and by a Bull ordered him to be reinstated in his original and undivided see. The King and the Witan, however, refused to recognise the Pope's decision, and Wilfrid, on his return to this country, was imprisoned for appealing to a foreign power.

vassal, and strongly asserted the Royal prerogative. The Pope was to send no legate to this country unless invited to do so by the King, and English Churchmen were forbidden to leave the kingdom, to recognise any Pope, to excommunicate any noble, or to publish any Roman decree or letter without the Royal sanction. Another step taken in the reign of William I., which had very far-reaching consequences, was the separation of the Ecclesiastical and Civil courts. While the King in this matter conferred a great privilege upon the Church, at the same time he took care to retain his supremacy over it; for we find him not only nominating the bishops, but also refusing to allow any Church Synod to make decrees which had not first received his approval.

(c) *During the Middle Ages.*

Gregory VII. (Hildebrand), who became Pope in 1073, drew out a great scheme of Papal omnipotence in his famous "*Dictate*" of twenty-seven theses, and from his time we may date the commencement of the great struggle for supremacy between Church and State, taking the form, on the Continent, of a contest between the Pope and the Emperor, and, in this country, of constant friction between the Royal and Papal powers. During the succeeding centuries the Popes established considerable authority over Ecclesiastical affairs and persons, the English kings, however, protesting from time to time against encroachments upon their ancient right.

Henry II., in the *Constitutions of Clarendon* (1164), dealt a severe blow at the Papal power. These Constitutions prevented appeals to foreign Powers, regulated Ecclesiastical appointments, subjected Ecclesiastical property to taxation, and extended the power of the King as against Papal aggression. This attempt to resume the authority of the Crown over Ecclesiastical persons was opposed by Becket, and temporarily thwarted by the strong feeling excited by that prelate's murder.

Under Pope *Innocent III.*, who was contemporary with King *John*, the Papacy triumphed, the English king even consenting to hold his kingdom as a vassal of the Roman See. Yet even here we find signs of resistance to foreign aggression:—

- (i.) *Magna Charta* declares (June 15, 1215) that the English Church shall enjoy its full rights and privileges, a provision which clearly revives the anti-Papal part of the *Constitutions of Clarendon*.
- (ii.) Archbishop Langton, when ordered to excommunicate the Barons, refused, even under a threat of suspension from the Pope.

In the reign of *Edward I.* there was strong opposition to the suzerainty of the Roman Pontiff. King and Parliament declared that the Papal claims based on King John's surrender were void, no king having the power to cede the rights of the Crown and the liberties of the Church and nation. In 1307 a Parliament at Carlisle protested against the many forms of Papal exactions, and refused to allow the legate to leave the country with the money which he had collected.

In *Edward III.*'s reign the encroachments of Rome were further limited by the *Great Statute of Provisors* (1351), which guarded the rights of patrons against Papal interference, and by the *Statute of Præmunire* (1353), which made it treason to appeal to the Pope against the King.

A little later, by *13 Richard II. c. 2*, any introduction of Papal bulls or sentences into this country was made penal; and afterwards followed the *Great Statute of Præmunire* (16 Richard II.), which made penal all applications to a foreign jurisdiction, either in the Court of Rome or elsewhere.

(d) *At the Reformation.*

In the reign of *Henry VIII.* the struggle between Pope and King was brought to a conclusion, the claims of Rome upon the Crown and nation of England being once for all repudiated. In 1534 the Convocations both of Canterbury and York renounced the Papal Supremacy in this land, affirming "that the Pope of Rome hath no greater jurisdiction conferred upon him by God in Holy Scripture, in this kingdom of England, than any other foreign bishop."¹

¹ Concil. Magn. Brit., iii. 769, 782.

Cf. also REFORMATIO LEGUM, "De Hæresibus," Cap. 21:—

"Quapropter illorum etiam intolerabilis est error, qui totius Christiani orbis universam Ecclesiam solius Episcopi Romani principatu contineri volunt."

The following great Acts were passed by what is known as the *Reformation Parliament* (1534):—

- (i.) 25 Henry VIII. c. 19. *Act of Restraint of Appeals and Submission of Clergy.*

This confirmed the Act for Restraint of Appeals, 24 Henry VIII. c. 12, which finally abolished the Pope's appellate jurisdiction. It also embodied in an Act of Parliament the "*Submission*" which had been wrung from the clergy (February 11, 1531), in which the King was recognised as—

"Ecclesiae et cleri Anglicani singularem protectorem, unicum et supremum Dominum, et, quantum per Christi leges licet, etiam Supremum Caput."

- (ii.) 25 Henry VIII. c. 20. *Act for Restraint of Annates. Congé d'élire and Letter missive.*

Annates were the first year's entire profit of a benefice claimed by the Pope, according to a valuation. By this Act these were withheld from Rome, but almost immediately afterwards were, by 26 Henry VIII. c. 3, given to the King.

At the same time the right of the Church to elect her own officers was taken from her, though the formal *Congé d'élire* still remained.

- (iii.) 25 Henry VIII. c. 21. *Act concerning Papal Dispensations, Peter's Pence, etc. The exempt monasteries handed over to the King.*

By this Act dispensations, licenses, faculties, &c., formerly granted by the Pope, were transferred to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and England was finally freed from all financial relations with the Roman See.

By the same Act the exempt monasteries, *i.e.*, those which had been previously exempt from the jurisdiction of the Archbishop, or the ordinary, and subject only to the visitatorial jurisdiction of the Pope, were transferred so as to be under the immediate authority of the King as "Supreme Head" of the Church.

- (iv.) 26 Henry VIII. c. 1. *Act of Supreme Head.*

This Act declared the King to be "the only Supreme Head on earth of the Church of England, called *Ecclesia Anglicana*." This title had, indeed, been recognised by the Convocations both of Canterbury and York, but the qualification with which the clergy had accepted the title (*viz.*,

quantum per Christi leges licet) was omitted in the Act of Parliament. It is true that Henry claimed to be simply reviving the Constitutional Supremacy of the Crown, but the title "Supreme Head" had an ominous sound, and was in itself new. That the clergy realised the danger is evident from the guarded wording of their acknowledgment of the Royal Supremacy in their "*Submission*." It is, therefore, especially noteworthy that when this acknowledgment was embodied in the Act the qualifying clause was omitted.

By Henry VIII., and by his successor, Edward VI., the Constitutional Supremacy of the Crown was pressed a great deal too far, and used in a wrong way, and that, too, not unfrequently for the most unworthy ends; so that, while claiming to restore the ancient power of the Crown, the Tudors in reality made new claims, and used their power for the spoliation of the Church. The Acts of Parliament mentioned above, while they freed the Church from Papal aggression, at the same time robbed her of immemorial rights and subjected her to royal tyranny. Thus, according to the *Act for Restraint of Appeals*, it is in the King's power—

"To visit, repress, redress, reform, order, correct, restrain, and amend all such errors, heresies, abuses, contempts and enormities, whatsoever they be, which by any manner of *spiritual jurisdiction*, ought, and may be, lawfully reformed."

The Act also deprived the Church of her right to frame her own Canons and Constitutions. Again the *Act for Restraint of Annates* was accompanied by a tyrannical destruction of the Church's free right to elect to bishoprics. Further, by the *Act concerning Papal Dispensations, &c.*, the exempt monasteries (to be followed a little later by the other monasteries of the kingdom) were given over to the King and his creatures for spoliation. In this case, as also by 26 Henry VIII. c. 3 (transferring Annates, which had been recovered, from the Pope to the King), we find a Papal power or privilege made over to the Crown. The general tendency of Henry's legislation, in fact, was to set the King in the place formerly occupied by the Pope.¹ Under *Edward VI.*

¹ *Cf.* Letter of Withers and Barthelot to Bullinger and Gualter (August 1567):—

"When the supremacy was transferred to King Henry of pious memory, and all things which by the Canon law belonged to the Roman Pontiff as head of the Church were made over to him, he then being both king and pope" (Zurich Letters, ii. p. 149).

See also Introduction, p. 8 and note 2.

the precedents of the previous reign were followed, and the newly vindicated Supremacy of the Crown in matters Ecclesiastical, as having the right of visitation and reformation, and as being the source of episcopal jurisdiction, was unduly pressed and unconstitutionally used. The visitatorial power of the Crown was most unjustly used for the suppression and spoliation of guilds and chantries (*1 Edward VI. c. 14*). The powers of the bishops were suspended during a Royal Visitation of the kingdom,¹ Ecclesiastical affairs being ordered by *Royal Injunctions*,² and the *First Book of Homilies* was set forth solely upon the Royal authority. The "*Order of Communion*" (issued March 8, 1548) had received the formal sanction neither of Convocation nor of Parliament, but owed whatever authority it had simply to a Royal Proclamation.³ Another example of the high-handed government of the Church through the Privy Council which characterised this reign is seen in the "*Order of Council*" which commanded the demolition of altars, and, "instead of them, a table to be set up in some convenient part of the chancel within every church."

It is remarkable that *Queen Mary*, in the earlier part of her reign, exercised the Royal Supremacy as freely as her predecessors, retaining the title adopted by her father. As "*Supreme Head on earth of the Church of England*," she issued *Injunctions*⁴ (March 1554) bidding the bishops deprive married clergy, re-establish the ancient services and processions, and set forth homilies; also, by Commissions appointed under the authority of the Crown, she caused all the reforming bishops, on one ground or another, to be deprived.

(2) THE ROYAL SUPREMACY CAREFULLY GUARDED, SO AS TO EXCLUDE ERASTIANISM.

Where we attribute to the Queen's Majesty the chief government, by which titles we understand the minds of some slanderous folks to be offended, we give not to our Princes

¹ The Commission for the Visitation was issued May 4, 1547.

² These owed their authority to a most unconstitutional Act of Henry's reign, which made a Royal Proclamation of equal force with an Act of Parliament.

³ In the Proclamation the King states that the "*Order*" has been set forth "on the advice of his dear uncle and others of his Privy Council." There is thus no pretence even of Ecclesiastical sanction (Dodd "*Church History*," vol. ii. Appendix viii.).

⁴ This was purely a State Act, without any approval of Convocation.

the ministering either of God's Word, or of Sacraments, the which thing the Injunctions also lately set forth by Elizabeth our Queen doth most plainly testify: but that only prerogative, which we see to have been given always to all godly Princes in Holy Scriptures by God Himself, that is, that they should rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil-doers.

Under *Queen Elizabeth* the language of Henry VIII's legislation with regard to the Royal Supremacy was avoided, as being liable to misconstruction; the obnoxious title, "*Supreme Head*," was dropped,¹ and anything like an Erastian interpretation of the Supremacy was guarded against by the insertion of this second paragraph in our Article. The avowed aim of the Queen was simply to restore the ancient constitutional right of the English Crown. Thus 1 Elizabeth c. i. is entitled:—

"An Act for restoring to the Crown the ancient jurisdiction over the State, ecclesiastical and spiritual, and abolishing all foreign power repugnant to the same."

So also in the INJUNCTIONS (1559) it is laid down:—

"That all deans, archdeacons, parsons, vicars, and all other ecclesiastical persons shall faithfully keep and observe, and as far as in them may lie, shall cause to be observed and kept of other, all and singular laws and statutes made for the restoring to the crown the ancient jurisdiction over the state ecclesiastical, and abolishing of all foreign power, repugnant to the same. And furthermore, All ecclesiastical persons having cure of souls, shall, to the uttermost of their wit, knowledge, and learning, purely and sincerely, and without any colour or dissimulation, declare, manifest and open four times every year at the least, in their sermons and other collations, that all usurped and foreign power, having no establishment nor ground by the law of God, is, for most just causes, taken away and abolished: and that therefore no manner of obedience and subjection within her highness's realms and dominions is due unto any such foreign power. And,

¹ See note on the source of this Article, § 1, above, p. 299; and note also that in the "*bidding prayer*," while Edward VI. was described as "*Supreme Head immediately under God of the spirituality and temporality*" of the Church (Doc. Ann., i. p. 21), Elizabeth is entitled "*Supreme Governour of this realm as well in causes ecclesiastical, as temporal*" (*Ibid.*, p. 235).

that the queen's power within her realms and dominions is the highest power under God, to whom all men, within the same realms and dominions, by God's laws, owe most loyalty and obedience, afore and above all other powers and potentates in earth" (Doc. Ann., i. pp. 211, 212).

In the Queen's "admonition," embodied in the same Injunctions, the Royal Supremacy is further guarded from an Erastian interpretation:—

"And further her majesty forbiddeth all manner her subjects to give ear or credit to such perverse and malicious persons, which most sinisterly and maliciously labour to notify to her loving subjects, how by the words of the said oath it may be collected, that the kings or queens of this realm, possessors of the crown, may challenge authority and power of ministry of divine offices in the church; wherein her said subjects be much abused by such evil-disposed persons. For certainly her majesty neither doth, nor ever will challenge any other authority, than that was challenged and lately used by the said noble kings of famous memory, king Henry the Eighth, and king Edward the Sixth, which is, and was of ancient time due to the imperial crown of this realm; that is, under God to have the sovereignty and rule over all manner persons born within these her realms, dominions and countries, of what estate, either ecclesiastical or temporal, soever they be, so as no other foreign power shall or ought to have any superiority over them" (Doc. Ann., pp. 232, 233).

We may here draw attention to the attitude of the English Church towards the Pope. It does not deny that he is, as Bishop of Rome, a true bishop of the Catholic Church of Christ, but only protests against his usurped jurisdiction in this realm. It should also be noted that, while in the Injunctions of Edward VI. there is express mention of "the bishop of Rome his pretended and usurped power and jurisdiction,"¹ in Elizabeth's Injunctions reference is simply made in general terms to "usurped and foreign power." At the Elizabethan revision of the Prayer Book (1559), too, the clause, "from the tyranny of the bishop of Rome, and all his detestable enormities" (Good Lord deliver us), was omitted from the Litany.

This very moderate attitude of the English Church stands in contrast with the opinions expressed individually by some of her members, especially those who had sojourned abroad during the

¹ Doc. Ann., i. p. 5.

reign of Queen Mary, and had come under the influence of the Swiss school of Reformers.

See, *e.g.*, letter of Cox to Wolfgang Weidner (from London, May 20, 1559):—

"Meanwhile we, that little flock, who for these last five years, by the blessing of God, have been hidden among you in Germany, are thundering forth in our pulpits, and especially before our queen Elizabeth, that the Roman pontiff is truly antichrist" (Zurich Letters, vol. i. p. 27).

Letter of Humphrey and Sampson to Bullinger (dated July 1566):—

"In the ecclesiastical regimen there are retained many traces of the church of antichrist. For as formerly at Rome," &c. (*Ibid.*, p. 164).

Letter of Grindal to Bullinger (London, August 29, 1567):—

"That tyranny which the pope himself has for so many ages exercised over the church, is altogether abolished; and it is provided that all persons shall in future acknowledge him to be the very antichrist, and son of perdition, of whom Paul speaks" (*Ibid.*, p. 199).

Letter of Richard Hilles to Bullinger (London, July 27, 1571):—

"That labour of yours, of which you inform me, in replying to the whole of that impudent popish bull which the Roman antichrist has vomited forth against our most serene queen, will be, without doubt, very greatly approved by the three bishops aforementioned,¹ to whom you have sent those three copies" (*Ibid.*, p. 242).

Letter of Cox to Rodolph Gualter (Ely, February 4, 1573):—

"I have your book respecting the pope being antichrist, which this man² takes much pains to refute. You will not, I hope, allow him to triumph" (*Ibid.*, p. 282).

Language such as that which occurs in the passages just quoted is directly traceable to reformers of the Swiss school, many of whom maintained that the Pope is Antichrist, and spoke of the Church of Rome in their formularies as the Church of Antichrist.

¹ Viz., the Bishops of York (Grindal), Ely (Cox), and Salisbury (Jewel).

² Nicholas Saunders.

Calvin, by the language he uses, suggests that the Church of Rome is "Babylon"—"the synagogue of Satan,"¹ and compares conformity to Rome with apostasy from God, likening it to sacrificing to the calf at Bethel.² He, moreover, expressly affirms that the Pope is that Antichrist foretold in Scripture;³ yet he acknowledges that in the Church of Rome some vestiges of a Church remain.⁴

The FRENCH CONFESSION (Art. XXVIII.) declares:—

"Papisticos igitur conventus damnamus. . . . Ac proinde arbitramur, omnes eos, qui sese ejusmodi actionibus adjungunt, et iis communicant, a Christi corpore seipos separare."

Cf. the preface to the Judgment of the SYNOD OF DORT:—

"Hanc enim Ecclesiam, a Romani antichristi tyrannide et horribili papatus idololatria potenti Dei manu vindicatam." . . .

The outcome of the teaching of *John Knox* and his followers appears in the WESTMINSTER CONFESSION, XXV. 6:—

"There is no other head of the church but the Lord Jesus Christ: nor can the Pope of Rome in any sense be head thereof; but is that antichrist, that man of sin, and son of perdition, that exalteth himself in the church against Christ, and all that is called God."⁵

It is matter for much thankfulness that these opinions with regard to the Papacy, though shared by some prominent divines of the Elizabethan period, did not find expression in the authorised formularies of the English Church.

¹ INSTITUTES, IV. ii. 4.

² INSTITUTES, IV. ii. 9.

³ INSTITUTES, IV. ii. 12:—

"Antichristum in templo Dei sessurum praedixerunt Daniel et Paulus: Illius scelerati et abominandi regni ducem et antesignanum apud nos facimus Romanum pontificem."

⁴ INSTITUTES, IV. ii. 11:—

"Ut tamen manebant olim inter Iudaeos peculiare quaedam Ecclesiae praerogativae, ita nec hodie Papistis adimus quae superesse ex dissipatione vestigia Ecclesiae inter eos Dominus voluit."

"Sic quum foedus suum in Gallia, Italia, Germania, Hispania, Anglia deposuerit (scil. Deus): ubi illae provinciae Antichristi tyrannide oppressae sunt, quo tamen foedus suum inviolabile maneret, Baptismum primo illic conservavit, foederis testimonium, qui ejus ore consecratus, invita humana impietate vim suam retinet: deinde sua providentia effecit ut aliae quoque reliquiae extarent, ne Ecclesia prorsus interiret."

⁵ *Cf.* the similar passage in the IRISH ARTICLES of 1615, Appendix VI.

(3.) THE LAWFULNESS OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.

The Laws of the Realm may punish Christian men with death, for heinous and grievous offences.

The principle is laid down in Gen. ix. 6, and under the Mosaic Law not only murder but various other grievous offences were punishable with death (see, *e.g.*, Exod. xxi. 16, 17; Lev. xx. 9 *et seqq.*; Deut. xvii. 2–5, xxii. 20 *et seqq.*). In the New Testament, Rom. xiii. 4 indicates quite clearly that the infliction of capital punishment does not conflict with Christian principle. We see, therefore, that the abolition of the right of capital punishment would deprive the magistracy of a power given in the Old Testament, confirmed in the New, and which it possesses as God's minister.

The reassertion of this right of the civil power was felt to be necessary at the Reformation period, more especially on the Continent, owing to the spread of Anabaptism, which brought anarchy and confusion in its train.

Cf. AUGSBURG CONFESSION, Part I. Art. XVI:—

"De rebus civilibus docent, quod legitimae ordinationes civiles sint bona opera Dei, quod Christianis liceat gerere magistratus, exercere judicia, judicare res ex imperatoris, et aliis praesentibus legibus, supplicia jure constituere, jure bellare, militare, lege contrahere, tenere proprium, jusjurandum postulantibus magistratibus dare, ducere uxorem, nubere.

"Damnant Anabaptistas, qui interdicut haec civilia officia Christianis."

The SAXON CONFESSION has a long Article (XXIII.), "De Magistratu politico," in which occurs this passage:—

"Deinde justitia Dei conspicitur in politica gubernatione; quia vult puniri manifesta scelera a magistratibus: et cum ipsi, qui praesunt, non sumunt supplicia de sontibus, Deus ipse mirabiliter rapit eos ad poenas, et regulariter atrociam delicta punit atrocibus poenis in hac vita, ut dicitur: Qui gladium acceperit, gladio peribit: item, Scortatores et adulteros judicat Deus," &c.

SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION, Art. XXX:—

"Damnamus Anabaptistas, qui ut Christianum negant fungi posse officio magistratus, ita etiam negant quenquam a magistratu juste occidi, aut magistratum bellum gerere posse, aut juramenta magistratui praestanda esse, et caetera."

(4.) THE LAWFULNESS OF MILITARY SERVICE.

It is lawful for Christian men, at the commandment of the Magistrate, to wear weapons, and serve in the wars.

Christian nations, not less than individual Christians, are forbidden to enter upon strife for ambition's sake or merely upon a principle of revenge (S. Matt. v. 38-41; Rom. xii. 18, 19). "Peace on earth," sang the Angels at the Nativity; yet the true peace which Christ, the Prince of Peace, came to bring was soon seen to involve conflict with the evil that is in the world. Hence Christ Himself says, "I came not to send peace, but a sword" (S. Matt. x. 34). On account of the evil that is in the world, it will therefore be sometimes necessary for the Christian to fight, since true peace is not peace with evil and wrong. Hence war is sometimes necessary in order to resist unjust oppression or aggression, or for the protection of life, liberty, or independence. The prevalence of war between nations is evidence of the imperfection, or of the want, of international law. If the principles of Christianity and the sentiment of brotherhood, which our holy Religion inculcates, were widely diffused and firmly rooted in the hearts of men, and if a system of international morality were established and generally accepted, then, we imagine, the necessity for war would cease. On account of the mingling of evil with good in the world this state of things has not been attained, but it is the ideal goal to which all progress tends. Thus in the prophetic anticipations in the Old Testament of the reign of Messiah, the cessation of wars between the nations occupies a prominent place (see, *e.g.*, Isa. ii. 4; Hos. ii. 18; Zech. ix. 10). Of course it by no means follows that, in the present condition of the world, peace at any price is to be preferred to war. That it is not in itself wrong to serve in the wars at the command of the civil power may be gathered from—

- (a) The advice given by S. John the Baptist to soldiers (S. Luke iii. 14).
- (b) The commendation given to soldiers in several places in the New Testament (*e.g.*, S. Matt. viii. 5-13; Acts x. 1-4), without any intimation that their calling is in itself unholy.
- (c) The fact that many of the early Christians served in the

army of Imperial Rome,¹ and that many of the saints of the Church have been soldiers.

This concluding paragraph of the Article, like the preceding one, had special reference to the opinions of the Anabaptists. (See the quotations from the AUGSBURG CONFESSIO and SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSIO given under heading [3].)

¹ Cf. Tertullian, *Apol.*, Cap. xxxvii. :—

"Hesterni sumus, et vestra omnia implevimus, urbes, insulas, castella, municipia, conciliabula, castra ipsa, tribus, decurias, palatium, senatum forum; solum vobis reliquimus templa."

The stories of the "Thundering Legion" and of the martyrdom of the Theban Legion are well known.

ARTICLE XXXVIII

OF CHRISTIAN MEN'S GOODS WHICH
ARE NOT COMMON.

DE ILLICITA BONORUM COM-
MUNICATIOE.

The Riches and Goods of Christians are not common, as touching the right, title, and possession of the same, as certain Anabaptists do falsely boast. Notwithstanding every man ought of such things as he possesseth, liberally to give alms to the poor, according to his ability.

Facultates et bona Christianorum non sunt communia, quoad jus et possessionem, ut quidam Anabaptistae falso jactant. Debet tamen quisque de his quae possidet, pro facultatum ratione, pauperibus elemosynas benigne distribuere.

§ 1.—SOURCE.

Composed by the English Reformers, 1552-3.

§ 2.—OBJECT.

To condemn theories of Communism urged by the Anabaptists, especially on the Continent, and in some cases with the most terrible results.

The prevalence of Anabaptist opinions in England is indicated in Stat. 32 Henry VIII. cap. 49, § 11, by which they were excluded from the King's pardon who held:—

“That it is not leafull for a Christen man to beare office or rule in the Commen Welth: That no man's lawes ought to be obeyed: That it is not leafull for a Christen man to take an othe before any judge: . . . That all things be common, and nothing severall.”

Cf. REFORMATIO LEGUM, “De Haeresibus,” Cap. 14:—

“Excludatur etiam ab eisdem Anabaptistis inducta bonorum et possessionum communitas, quam tantopere urgent, ut nemini quicquam relinquunt proprium et suum. In quo mirabiliter loquuntur, cum furta prohiberi divina Scriptura cernant, et elemosynas in utroque Testamento laudari videant, quas ex propriis

facultatibus nostris elargimur; quorum sane neutrum consistere posset, nisi Christianis proprietates bonorum et possessionum suarum relinqueretur.”

See also the quotation from the AUGSBURG CONFESSION in the notes on Article XXXVII. § 3, heading (3), p. 311.

The BELGIC CONFESSION (Art. XXXVI.) also gives a summary of Anabaptist opinions which are to be condemned:—

“Quamobrem Anabaptistas et turbulentos omnes detestamur qui superiores dominationes et magistratus abjiciunt, jura ac judicia pervertunt, bona omnia communia faciunt, ac denique ordines omnes ac gradus, quos honestatis gratia Deus inter homines constituit, abolent aut confundunt.”

The earlier Anabaptists had strong Millenarian expectations; rejecting Infant Baptism, they taught that those who joined them must be baptized anew¹ with the baptism of the Spirit. They also proclaimed the equality of all Christians and community of goods. All external law they abolished.² The Bible they regarded as unnecessary, since the perfect children of God have in themselves the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. War was held to be unlawful, and oaths unnecessary, within the kingdom of Christ. These ideal notions the Anabaptists attempted to force by violence upon men unprepared for them, and, rapidly degenerating themselves, Antinomianism became prevalent amongst them. Their fanaticism knew no bounds, and drove them into every kind of madness, excess, and disorder. The outrages at Münster, which city became the scene of the wildest licentiousness, until Romanists and Protestants alike combined to secure its downfall (June 24, 1535), remain engraved upon the pages of history, an awful example of the terrible results to which sincere but ill-guided zeal may lead men.

§ 3.—EXPOSITION.

(1.) COMMUNISM IS NOT A NECESSARY OUTCOME OF CHRISTIANITY. The Riches and Goods of Christians are not common, as touching the right, title, and possession of the same, as certain Anabaptists do falsely boast.

Some have gathered from Acts ii. 44, iv. 32, that in the

¹ Hence the name “Anabaptist.”

² See REFORMATIO LEGUM, “De Haeresibus,” Cap. 13, quoted on Article XXXVII. § 2. *Cf.* the quotations in the notes on Article XXXVII. § 3, heading (3), p. 311.

earliest days of the Church the Christians at Jerusalem, by the very rules of the Christian society, surrendered all their property as individuals into one common stock; in fact, that Communism was their principle. Such an interpretation must, however, after careful consideration, be rejected on the following grounds:—

(a) We have clear evidence that the Apostles did not enforce any such rule of surrender of all private property. Thus S. Peter expressly tells Ananias that he had not been obliged to sell his property at all, and, moreover, that after he had sold it he had not been under any obligation to surrender the proceeds of the sale (Acts v. 4).

(b) A system of Communism is, of course, incompatible with Almsgiving, and—

(2.) ALMSGIVING IS A CHRISTIAN DUTY.

Every man ought of such things as he possesseth, liberally to give alms to the poor, according to his ability.

Almsgiving was the practice of the early Church on a very large scale (see, *e.g.*, Acts iv. 34–37, xi. 29, 30, xx. 35, xxiv. 17; Rom. xv. 25; 1 Cor. xvi. 1–3; Gal. ii. 10; 1 Tim. vi. 17, 18), in accordance with our Lord's own teaching (S. Matt. vi. 1–4; S. Mark x. 21, 22; S. Luke xxi. 1–4). In Acts ii. 44, iv. 32, we conclude, therefore, that S. Luke is describing, not an institution, but the spirit and temper of the first Christians. The Apostles, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, understood our Lord's teaching too well to convert what He intended to be a voluntary grace into an enforced rule. The sum of the whole matter is that, though Christian men's goods be not common, yet ought they to be communicated to one another, according as the brethren have need (Rom. xii. 13; 1 Cor. xvi. 2; Heb. xiii. 16).

ARTICLE XXXIX

OF A CHRISTIAN MAN'S OATH.

DE JURE JURANDO.

As we confess that vain and rash swearing is forbidden Christian men by our Lord Jesus Christ, and James His Apostle: so we judge that Christian religion doth not prohibit, but that a man may swear when the Magistrate requireth, in a cause of faith and charity, so it be done according to the Prophet's teaching, in justice, judgment, and truth.

Quemadmodum juramentum vanum et temerarium a Domino nostro Jesu Christo, et Apostolo ejus Jacobo, Christianis hominibus interdictum esse fatemur: ita Christianorum religionem minime prohibere censemus, quin jubente magistratu, in causa fidei et charitatis, jurare liceat, modo id fiat juxta Prophetæ doctrinam, in justitia, in judicio, et veritate.

§ 1.—SOURCE.

Composed by the English Reformers, 1552–3.

§ 2.—OBJECT.

This Article has reference to the same disorderly spirits as Article XXXVIII., combating their scruples in the matter of taking oaths.¹

Cf. REFORMATIO LEGUM, “De Haeresibus,” Cap. 15:—

“Praeterea nec juramentorum Anabaptistae legitimum relinquunt usum, in quo contra Scripturarum sententiam et veteris Testamenti patrum exempla, Pauli etiam Apostoli, imo Christi, imo Dei patris procedunt; quorum juramenta saepe sunt in sacris literis repetita.”

See also references given in the notes on Article XXXVII. § 3, heading (3), p. 311, and Article XXXVIII. § 2, pp. 314, 315.

¹ The Quakers, in their refusal either to take or administer an oath, as also in their objection to all war as utterly inconsistent with the spirit of the Gospel, revived the opinions of the Anabaptists.

§ 3.—EXPOSITION.

(1.) VAIN AND RASH SWEARING IS FORBIDDEN.

As we confess that vain and rash swearing is forbidden Christian men by our Lord Jesus Christ, and James His Apostle :

See the Third Commandment, and the words of our Lord recorded in S. Matt. v. 34–37, and of S. James in his Epistle v. 12. These passages are no doubt the ones referred to in the Article.

(2.) THERE IS NOTHING CONTRARY TO THE PRINCIPLES OF CHRISTIANITY IN TAKING AN OATH BEFORE A MAGISTRATE.

so we judge that Christian religion doth not prohibit, but that a man may swear when the Magistrate requireth, in a cause of faith and charity, so it be done according to the Prophet's teaching, in justice, judgment, and truth.

The Gospel prohibitions were evidently directed against "vain and rash swearing," against the habit, to which the Jews of our Lord's time were much addicted, of using oaths upon the most trifling occasions, swearing by Heaven, by Earth, by Jerusalem, and by the head (S. Matt. v. 34–36), without seriously considering themselves bound by such asseverations. In view of this prevalent practice Christ exhorts *ἔστω δὲ ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν* (*i.e.*, in your common intercourse with one another), *Ναὶ ναί, Οὐ οὐ· τὸ δὲ περισσὸν τούτων ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἐστίν* (S. Matt. v. 37). That our Lord's prohibition of swearing does not extend to solemn oaths before "the Magistrate . . . in a cause of faith and charity" is clear from His own example; for, on being Himself adjured, or called to answer upon oath, before the high-priest's judgment-seat, He refused not to do so (S. Matt. xxvi. 63, 64). In many passages in his Epistles S. Paul also solemnly calls God to witness the truth of his statements (*e.g.*, Rom. i. 9, ix. 1; 2 Cor. i. 18, 23; Gal. i. 20).

That to take an oath is not in itself unlawful appears from several places of Scripture (*e.g.*, Deut. vi. 13; Ps. xv. 1, 4, lxiii. 11), and under the Old Covenant a power was given to the judges of examining persons upon oath (Lev. v. 1). But the same Scripture likewise emphatically declares that, when an oath is taken, it must be done "in justice, judgment, and truth"

(Jer. iv. 2).¹ Further, God Himself is sometimes expressly said to swear (see Gen. xxii. 16; Jer. xlii. 26; Ps. lxxxix. 35, cx. 4, cxxxii. 11; Heb. vi. 13, vii. 21).

To conclude, if men were always truthful there would be no need for the administration of oaths; but while, on account of the evil that is in the world, solemn attestation of the truth by oath is required, it need not be refused by the Christian.

Bishop Barlowe, in his *Dialogue on the Lutheran Factions* (1553), shows that errors referred to in these concluding Articles were spread at the Reformation by the Anabaptists. He writes: "They obstinately hold that it is unlawful for a judge to require any oath of a Christian man (Article XXXIX.). They say that Christian men ought to make no provision or resistance against their enemies (Article XXXVII.) . . . also they show holy perfection outwardly . . . using their goods in common (Article XXXVIII.) . . . also some hold that no man ought to be punished or suffer execution for any crime or trespass, be it never so horrible" (Article XXXVII.), pp. 57, 59 (ed. Lunn).

¹ The passage from Jeremiah quoted in the Article is thus explained in the HOMILY OF SWEARING (p. 73, ed. S.P.C.K.):—

"Whosoever sweareth when he is required of a judge, let him be sure in his conscience that his oath have these three conditions, and he shall never need to be afraid of perjury. First, he that sweareth must swear truly; that is, he must, setting apart all favour and affection to the parties, have the truth only before his eyes, and for love thereof say and speak that which he knoweth to be truth, and no further. The second is, he that taketh an oath must do it with judgment; not rashly and unadvisedly, but soberly, considering what an oath is. The third is, he that sweareth must swear in righteousness; that is, for the very zeal and love which he beareth to the defence of innocency, to the maintenance of the truth, and to the righteousness of the matter or cause, all profit, disprofit, all love and favour unto the person for friendship or kindred, laid apart."

THE RATIFICATION.

This Book of Articles before rehearsed, is again approved, and allowed to be holden and executed within the Realm, by the assent and consent of our Sovereign Lady ELIZABETH, by the grace of God, of England, France, and Ireland Queen, Defender of the Faith, &c. Which Articles were deliberately read, and confirmed again by the subscription of the hands of the Archbishop and Bishops of the Upper House, and by the subscription of the whole Clergy in the Nether House in their Convocation, in the year of our Lord God 1571.

The last four Articles of 1553, struck out in 1563, ran as follows:—

ARTICLE XXXIX.

THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD IS NOT YEAT BROUGHT TO PASSE. RESURRECTIO MORTUORUM NONDUM EST FACTA.

The Resurrection of the dead is not as yet brought to passe, as though it only belonged to the soule, whiche by the grace of Christe is raised from the death of sinne, but it is to be loked for at the laste daie: for then (as Scripture doeth moste manifestlie testifie) to all that bee dead their awne bodies, fleshe, and bone shalbe restored, that the whole man maie (according to his workes) haue other rewarde, or punishment, as he hath liued vertuouslie or wickedlie.

Resurrectio mortuorum non adhuc facta est, quasi tantum ad animum pertineat qui per Christi gratiam a morte peccatorum excitetur, sed extremo die quoad omnes qui obierunt, expectanda est, tunc enim vita defunctis (ut Scripturae manifestissime testantur) propria corpora, carnes et ossa restituentur, ut homo integer, prout vel recte vel perditte vixerit, juxta sua opera, sive praemia sive poenas reportet.

¹ This Ratification dates from 1571, since which time no change has been made in the wording of the Articles.

ARTICLE XL.

<p>THE SOULLES OF THEM THAT DE- PARTE THIS LIFE DOE NEITHER DIE WITH THE BODIES, NOR SLEEP IDLIE.</p>	<p>The text of this Article is given in the notes on Article XXII., p. 149, footnote.</p>
---	---

ARTICLE XLI.

HERETICKES CALLED MILLENARII.

MILLENARII.

<p>Thei that goe about to renewe the fable of heretickes called Mil-lenarii, be repugnant to holie Scripture, and caste them selues headlong into a Juishe dotage.</p>	<p>Qui Millenariorum fabulam re vocare conantur, sacris literis ad-versantur, et in Judaica deliramenta sese praecipitant.</p>
--	--

ARTICLE XLII.

ALL MEN SHALL NOT BEE SAUED AT THE LENGTH.

NON OMNES TANDEM SERVANDI SUNT.

<p>Thei also are worthie of con-demnacion, who indeuoure at this time to restore the dangerouse opinion, that al menne, be thei neuer so ungodlie, shall at length bee saued, when thei haue suffered paines for their sinnes a certaine time appointed by Goddes justice.</p>	<p>Hi quoque damnatione digni sunt, qui conantur hodie perniciosam opinionem instaurare, quod omnes, quantumvis impii, servandi sunt tandem, cum definito tempore a justitia divina poenas de admissis flagitiis luerunt.</p>
--	---

On the omission of these Articles in 1563 see Introduction, p. 14, and compare the paragraph at the end of the notes on Article XVIII., p. 126.