

ARTICLE XXVI.

1563.

Ministrorum malitia non tollit efficaciam institutionum diuinarum.

Qvamus in Ecclesia visibili bonis mali semper sint admixti, atque interdum ministerio uerbi et sacramentorum administrationi præsint, tamen cum non suo sed Christi nomine agant, eiusque mandato et autoritate ministrent, illorum ministerio uti licet, cum in verbo Dei audiendo, tum in sacramentis percipiendis. Neque per illorum malitiam effectus institutorum Christi tollitur, aut gratia donorum Dei minuitur, quoad eos qui fide et ritè sibi oblata percipiunt, quæ propter institutionem CHRISTI et promissionem efficacia sunt, licet per malos administrantur.

Ad Ecclesiæ tamen disciplinam pertinet, ut in malos ministros inquiratur, accusenturque ab hijs, qui eorum flagitia nouerint, atque tandem iusto conuicti iudicio, deponantur.

i. Connection. If the Sacraments are "not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession," but "sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace," the important question arises, "Does their efficacy depend on the worthiness of him who ministers them"? It is to this question

1571.

Of the unworthynesse of the ministers, which hinder not the effect of the Sacramentes.

Although in the visible Church the euyl be euer myngled with the good, and sometime the euyl haue cheefe auctoritie in the ministration of the worde and Sacramentes: yet forasmuch as they do not the same in their owne name but in Christes, and do minister by his commission and auctoritie, we may vse their ministrie, both in hearing the word of God, and in the receauing of the Sacramentes. Neither is y^e effecte of Christes ordinaunce taken away by their wickednesse, nor the grace of Gods gyftes diminished from such as by fayth and ryghtly do receaue the Sacramentes ministered vnto them, which be effectuell, because of Christes institution and promise, although they be ministred by euyl men.

Neuertheless, it apparteyneth to the discipline of the Church, that enquire be made of euyl ministres, and that they be accused by those that haue knowledge of their offences: and finally, beyng founde gyltie by iust iudgement, be deposed.

that the Article, which we have now to consider, contains an answer.

ii. Object. It was necessary to give an answer to it, for not a few in the sixteenth century¹ made the validity of the Sacraments depend on the worthiness of those who ministered them, and some Anabaptists declined to come to the celebration of the Holy Eucharist on the ground of the questionable lives of those who celebrated at the altar². This, however, was only a revival of early errors, for the Novatians ascribed the efficacy of the Sacraments to the character of the Minister, and the Donatists³ refused to recognise the Ordination of Cæcilian by Felix of Apthonga on the ground that he had during persecution delivered up the sacred books and vessels. These ideas were revived again and again during the Middle Ages in consequence of the corrupt lives of many ecclesiastics, and were held by the adherents of Arnold of Brescia, the Vaudois⁴ and the less informed followers of Wiclif and Huss⁵.

iii. Origin. In its original shape the present Article formed the conclusion of the Fifth of the Thirteen Articles of 1538, and is expressed almost in the selfsame words. The Fifth of these Thirteen Articles in its turn derived⁶ at

¹ See Hardwick, *Hist. Art.* p. 103, n. 2.

² The *Reformatio Legum* speaks of Anabaptists, who separated from the Lord's Table on the plea that they were deterred "vel ministrorum improbitate vel aliorum fratrum." Cf. Alley, *Poore Man's Librarie*, i. 242 b.

³ The Confession of Augsburg specially mentions the Donatists and others like them, "qui negabant licere populo uti ministerio malorum in Ecclesia, et sentiebant ministerium malorum inutile et inefficax esse." *Sylloge Confessionum*, p. 171.

⁴ "The Vaudois maintained that priests in mortal sin could not con-

secrate the Eucharist, and that the transubstantiation took place not in the hand of the unworthy celebrator, but in the mouth of the worthy communicant; that a bad priest could not absolve; that it was better to confess to a pious laic than to a wicked clergyman." Bp Forbes, *On the Articles*, p. 480.

⁵ Their views led at the time of the Reformation to the idea not that the beneficial effect only, but the reality also of the Sacrament depended on the interior disposition, and the faith of him to whom the Sacrament was administered.

⁶ The Fifth of the Thirteen Articles

least some expressions from the Sixth and Seventh of the Augsburg series, though in other respects it departed considerably from that confession¹.

iv. **Analysis.** The Article lays down the following propositions:—That

- (a) The Sacraments have an objective value in virtue of their institution by Christ and the promise He has annexed to them, and therefore they do not depend for their efficacy on the character of the Minister;
- (β) The Clergy, who minister them, do so, not in their own name, but in the name of Christ;
- (γ) The Grace of God's gifts is not "diminished from such as by faith and rightly do receive the Sacraments ministered unto them; which be effectual, because of Christ's institution and promise, although they be ministered by evil men²";
- (δ) Nevertheless the exercise of godly discipline as regards evil ministers is an absolute duty on the part of the Church, which she cannot put aside.

v. **The Teaching of Holy Scripture** in reference to the above points is quite clear. Our Lord Himself, the great *Shepherd and Bishop of souls* (1 Pet. ii. 25), laid it

of 1538 runs, "Et quamvis in Ecclesia ... mali sint bonis admixti, atque etiam ministeriis verbi et sacramentorum nonnunquam præsint; tamen cum ministrent non suo sed Christi nomine, mandato, et auctoritate, licet eorum ministerio uti, tam in verbo audiendo quam in recipiendis sacramentis, juxta illud: 'Qui vos audit, me audit.' Nec per eorum malitiam minuitur effectus, aut gratia donorum Christi rite accipientibus; sunt enim efficacia propter

promissionem et ordinationem Christi, etiamsi per malos exhibeantur." Hardwick, *Hist. Art.* p. 264. Ed. 1859.

¹ *Sylloge Confessionum*, pp. 152, 153.

² Comp. Concil. Trident. Sess. vii. Can. 7. "Si quis dixerit, non dari gratiam per hujusmodi sacramenta semper et omnibus, quantum est ex parte Dei, etiam si rite ea suscipiant, sed aliquando et aliquibus: anathema sit."

down again and again that in the visible Church the evil would ever be mingled with the good. He warned His Apostles that the tares would be mixed with the wheat (Matt. xiii. 30), the sheep with the goats (Matt. xxv. 32), the good fish with the bad (Matt. xiii. 47, 48), the good grain with the chaff (Matt. iii. 12), the fruitful with the unfruitful branches of the vine¹ (John xv. 1 sqq.). To expect therefore perfection of the Ministers of Christ's Sacraments is to expect what cannot be realized in this mortal life², and no care and pains will infallibly prevent evil and depraved men from joining the most holy societies. Moreover our Lord Himself bade His disciples do whatever the Scribes and Pharisees bade them, not because they were themselves good men, but because *they sat in Moses's seat* (Matt. xxiii. 2, 3), and thus held an acknowledged official position, and He Himself had to bear with a Judas amongst His own Apostles. But as no one would be justified in refusing to accept Apostolic doctrine because one traitor was found in the original Apostolic College, so to reject the Sacraments because of the personal shortcoming of the Minister thereof, would be to acknowledge that they *did* minister in their own name, and not by Christ's institution, commission, and authority, and to introduce disastrous confusion. In direct opposition to this the Apostles teach not that holiness in the Minister, but that God's blessing on his Ministry, is the cause of blessing to the Church and to human souls. They remind their

¹ S. Paul also compares the Church to a great house, in which are not only vessels of gold and of silver, but also of wood and of earth, and some unto honour, and some unto dishonour (2 Tim. ii. 20).

² "God sometimes works," writes S. Chrysostom, "even by those who are unworthy; nor is the Grace of

Baptism at all impaired by the life of the priest." *Hom. viii.* in 1 Cor. Gregory of Nazianzum maintains that "the Baptism of Peter is no better than that of Judas, and he illustrates his assertion by the fact that a seal of iron gives as perfect an impression as a seal of gold." *Orat. de Bapt.*

converts that *Paul may plant and Apollos water*¹, but it is *God that giveth the increase* (1 Cor. iii. 6, 7), and that, great and glorious as is the Christian Ministry, yet *the treasure is in earthen vessels, to the intent that the greatness of the power may be of God and not of men*² (2 Cor. iv. 7).

vi. **Ecclesiastical Discipline.** Still, while the Article has a side of *comfort*³, for it would indeed be overwhelming if the validity of the Sacraments were to depend upon the personal character of the Minister, yet it has also a side of *warning* as to the necessity of seeing that those, who minister in holy things, be themselves men of holiness, and as to the need of godly discipline to secure this end. The Scripture testimony on this point is un mistakeable. (α) *The Old Testament* teaches us that even under a typical Dispensation *the Lord would be sanctified in them that come nigh Him* (Lev. x. 3), and would have *His priests clothed with righteousness* (Ps. cxxxii. 9), and the judgments which fell upon two of the sons of Aaron (Lev. x. 1, 2) for *offering strange fire before the Lord*, and on the sons of Eli for their immoral living (1 Sam. iv. 10, 11), attest the purity of life required of those who ministered to the Lord in holy things even under the Old Covenant. (β) Similarly the New Testament gives special instructions as regards the discipline of the Clergy, and S. Paul in the Pastoral Epistles enforces stringent rules as to *laying hands hastily on no*

¹ Ἐγὼ ἐφύτευσα, Ἀπολλῶς ἐπότισεν, ἀλλ' ὁ θεὸς ἠξίανεν = (God was giving the increase). "Observe the force of the *imperfect*, implying a continual bestowing of divine grace, as distinguished from the transitory *acts* of His Ministers, Paul and Apollos, whose operations are described by the aorists, ἐφύτευσα, ἐπότισεν." Bp C. Wordsworth *in loc.*

² "We," says the Apostle, "carry the treasure of Christ; we bear it through the world in its triumphal

progress; we dispense it to the people; but we bear it, not in vessels of gold and silver—like those in which the treasures of earthly conquerors is borne—but in vessels of clay; in order that the excellency of the power of what we dispense in the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments may be, and be seen to be, of God, and not of men." Bp C. Wordsworth on 2 Cor. iv. 7.

³ F. D. Maurice, *Sermon on the xxxix. Articles.*

*man*¹ (1 Tim. v. 22). He also directs that, while Timothy must not rashly *receive an accusation against an elder*, yet *he must reprove in the sight of all, them that sin*², that *the rest also may be in fear* (1 Tim. v. 19, 20), and thus exercise that ecclesiastical discipline, which all ages of the Church have acknowledged to be part of her duty.

vii. **The Doctrine of Intention.** As regards the doctrine laid down by the Council of Trent that on the part of the Minister of any Sacrament "there is required the intention at least of doing what the Church does," it will be sufficient to quote the words of Hooker. "What a man's private mind is," he writes, "as we cannot know, so neither are we bound to examine; therefore always in these cases the known intent of the Church generally doth suffice, and where the contrary is not manifest, we may presume that he which outwardly doth the work, hath inwardly the purpose of the Church of God." The "known intent" of the English Church to do what the Church does is plain from the words of the preface to our services of Ordination⁵. Where we have the external conditions of validity for a Sacrament⁶, a right *form* and *matter*, and

¹ Χείρας ταχέως μηδὲν ἐπιτίθει, 1 Tim. v. 22. *Manus cito nemini imposueris*, Vulg. "Indisputably the most ancient interpretation of these words is the imposition of hands in Ordination, *περὶ χειροτονούντων*, Chrys., Bp Ellicott *in loc.* So also Bp Pearson, *Minor Works*, ii. p. 385, and the first collect for the Ember Weeks, "lay hands suddenly on no man."

² Τοὺς ἀμαρτάνοντας, *persistentes in peccato*. "Those *πρεσβύτεροι*, who sin and continue in sin, and are known to continue in sin; rebuke them before all." Bp C. Wordsworth *in loc.*

³ "Si quis dixerit, in ministris, dum sacramenta conficiunt et conferunt, non requiri intentionem saltem faciendi, quod facit Ecclesia: anathema sit."

Concil. Trident. Sess. vii. Can. 11.

⁴ Hooker, *Ecccl. Pol.* v. 58, 3.

⁵ "And therefore, to the intent that these orders (the old orders of the Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons) may be continued, and reverently used and esteemed in the Church of England," the English Church provided a proper Minister, and a proper rite, valid in "matter and form." See below under Article xxxvi.

⁶ Canon Estcourt allows that "the intention requisite for the valid administration of a sacrament is the '*intentio generalis faciendi quod facit Ecclesia*'." *Question of Anglican Ordinations discussed*, p. 199; see also Gore, *Rom. Cath. Claims*, p. 156.

Minister, there "no spiritual disqualification, whether in understanding or morals, on the part of the administrator, is a bar to the validity of the rite, and this because of the great principle that the giver of the grace is not the minister, but the Holy Spirit¹." To go beyond the known intent of the Church, and to enquire into the Minister's private mind, is, in the words of Bishop Jewel, to venture into "the very dungeon of uncertainty²," an uncertainty which would make all Orders and all Sacraments precarious. We may well be content with the dictum of S. Thomas Aquinas himself³, when he says, "The Minister of a Sacrament acts as the representative (*in persona*) of the whole Church of which he is the Minister; in the words which he utters *the intention of the Church is expressed*, which suffices to the perfection of a Sacrament, *unless the contrary be expressed outwardly* on the part of the Minister, or the recipient of the Sacrament⁴."

¹ See Gore's *Rom. Cath. Claims*, pp. 147, 148.

² See Jewel, *Reply to Harding*, Art. 1, sect. 12. Ed. Parker Soc. "The heart of man," he adds, "is unsearchable. If we stay upon the intention of a mortal man, we may stand in doubt of our own baptism."

³ S. Thom. Aquin. *Summa*, Pars iii., Qu. lxiv., Art. 8, ad. 2. S. Thomas prefers this view on the ground "quia character nunquam imprimitur nisi per sacramentum," meaning by "character" the "effectus qui est res et sacramentum," as distinct from the *Virtus Sacramenti*. See Denny and

Lacey, *De Hierarchia Anglicana*, p. 87, sect. 133; Denny, *Anglican Orders and Jurisdiction*, pp. 93—98, S.P.C.K. 1893.

⁴ Bellarmine says, "It is not necessary to intend to do what the Roman Church does, but what the true Church does, whatever it may be; or what Christ instituted...He who intends to do what the Church of Geneva does intends to do what the Church Universal does...the error of the Minister as to the Church does not take away the efficacy of the Sacrament." Bellarmine, *Disputationes de Controversiis*. De Sacram. in gen. i. c. 27.

ARTICLE XXVII.

1563.

De Baptismo.

Baptismus non est tantum professionis signum ac discriminis nota, qua Christiani à non Christianis discernantur, sed etiam est signum Regenerationis, per quod tanquam per instrumentum rectè baptismum suscipientes¹, ecclesiæ inseruntur, promissiones de Remissione peccatorum atque Adoptione nostra in filios Dei, per Spiritum sanctum visibiliter obsignantur, fides confirmatur, et ut diuinæ inuocationis, gratia augetur.

Baptismus paruulorum omnino in ecclesia retinendus est, ut qui cum Christi institutione optimè congruat.

1571.

Of Baptisme.

Baptisme is not only a signe of profession, and marke of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from other that be not christened: but is also a signe of regeneration or newe byrth, whereby as by an instrument, they that receaue baptisme rightly, are grafted into the Church: the promises of the forgeuenesse of sinne, and of our adoption to be the sonnes of God, by the holy ghost, are visibly signed and sealed: fayth is confyrmed: and grace increased by vertue of prayer vnto God. The baptisme of young children is in any wyse to be retayned in the Church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christe.

i. **Connection.** Having spoken of the Sacraments generally the Articles proceed to treat of them particularly and separately, and first they deal with Holy Baptism.

ii. **Source.** It is difficult to find any exact model, on which the xxviiith Article is framed. It bears but little resemblance to any Article in any other Confession, either English or foreign, though a few expressions may be traced to the Sixth of the Thirteen Articles of 1538.

¹ An error of the press for "susipientes."

iii. **Object.** It is directed against two opposite classes of opinion:—

- (i) That of those, who, like the Anabaptists, regarded Baptism merely as a professional badge or sign of membership in the Christian Society, and repudiated Infant Baptism altogether¹;
- (ii) That of those who, like the extreme Mediæval School, unduly exalted the efficacy of the Sacrament².

iv. **Analysis.** The Article begins by asserting (i) What Baptism is *not*, and (ii) What it *is*:—

- (1) "It is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened³;
- (2) But it is also a sign of Regeneration⁴ or new Birth, whereby, as by an instrument⁵,

¹ "Because they admit not original sin, they (the Anabaptists) also refuse the baptisme of chyldren, and in as muche as in them lyeth, they drawe away the moste parte of men from God, and eternall salvation." Hermann's *Consultation*, T. vii. Lond., 1547.

² Some of this school taught the doctrine of "a quasi-physical union of the Holy Spirit with the element of water." See Hardwick, *Hist. Art.*, p. 105, n. Ed. 1859.

³ The Latin here is "a non Christianis."

⁴ In 1553 the Latin ran "signum regenerationis" as now, but the English was "a signe, and seale of our newe birth." In 1563 it was altered to "a signe of regeneration or newe byrth."

⁵ *Instrumentum* in Classical Latin denotes (1) an *implement* or *tool* of any kind, comp. Cæsar, *B. G.* vi. 30; (2) the *utensils necessary for any*

business, as that of the painter, the surgeon, the fowler, the huntsman. Comp. Pliny, *Epp.* iii. 19, 3. Here the figure seems to be taken from the grafting-knife of the gardener, whereby he grafts a shoot of one tree into the branch of another, and by the union produces fresh life. Comp. Bucerus in *Retract. in Matth.*, "agnoscit sacramenta recte dici *instrumenta*, organa et canales gratiæ"; Sir Thomas More, *Works*, i. 386, "God in the working of such clensing of the soule and infusion of grace, useth the sacramentes not as a *bare signe*, but as an *instrument*, with whiche and by whiche it pleaseth hym to worke them"; Ridley, *Disputation at Oxford*, "This Sacrament [the Eucharist] hath a promise of grace, made to those that receive it worthily, because grace is given by it, as by an *instrument*," *Works*, Ed. P. Society, p. 241; see Hardwick, *Hist. Art.*, p. 393. Ed. 1859.

- (α) They that receive Baptism rightly are grafted¹ into the Church;
- (β) The promises of the forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed²,
- (γ) Faith is confirmed,
- (δ) And Grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God³."

v. **Infant Baptism.** Having stated thus much concerning Baptism generally, the Article proceeds to speak of Infant Baptism. And here it differs considerably from the original draft of 1553. Then the clause ran, "The custome of the Church to christen yonge children, is to bee commended, and in any wise to be reteined in the Church⁴." This clause is simply permissive and almost apologetic. In the Article, as altered in 1563, a different complexion was given to it. "The Baptism of young children," ran the amended clause, "is in any wise⁵ to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ."

¹ "Ecclesiæ inseruntur." *Inserere* is the technical word for (1) *sowing* or *planting in a place*; (2) *grafting*. It is constructed sometimes with *in* and the accusative, as "in pyrum sylvaticam pyrum bonam inserere," Varro *R. R.*, i. 40, 5; sometimes with the ablative, "cortice virgam inserit," Ov. *Met.* xiv. 630; sometimes with the simple accusative, "inutilesque falce ramos amputans, feliciores inserit," Hor. *Epod.* ii. 13, 14.

² It is noticeable that in the Latin text of 1563 there is no comma after "per Spiritum sanctum." The clause runs without break "per Spiritum sanctum uisibiliter obsignantur."

³ "Ui diuinæ inuocationis." The words seem rather to mean "by virtue

of the invocation of the Divine Name," that Triune Name, which is invoked in Baptism and by our Lord's express command forms an essential part of the Baptismal Formula.

⁴ "Mos Ecclesiæ baptizandi parvulus et laudandus est et omnino in Ecclesia retinendus." The *Reformatio Legum*, "de Hæresibus," c. 18, reads "crudelis illorum impietas in baptismum irruit, quem infantibus imperitari nolunt, sed omnino nulla ratione."

⁵ *In any wise* corresponds to the Latin *omnino*. "Any wise" in the sixteenth century denoted "certainly," "by all means." *Wise* = *way* or *manner*. The Norman form was "guise" = the A. S. *wise*. Comp. *otherwise*, *likewise*, *crosswise*.

vi. **The Use of Water** for ceremonial purification has been familiar to all nations from the earliest times. With the Egyptians¹, the Greeks, and the Romans, solemn ablutions formed a necessary preliminary to all acts of devotion, especially prayer² and sacrifice³, and were essential to the removal of all ceremonial pollution, and of the guilt of homicide⁴, whether intentional or accidental.

vii. **Amongst the Jews** similar lustrations were equally frequent. We find this again and again, as when Jacob was returning from Padanaram to Palestine (Gen. xxxv. 2); when the Jewish people were about to receive the Law on Mount Sinai (Exod. xix. 10); when Aaron and his sons were consecrated to their office (Exod. xxix. 4); when Joshua was about to lead the host across the Jordan (Jos. iii. 5); when Solomon dedicated the Temple (2 Chron. iv. 2—6).

viii. **The Baptism of Proselytes.** At a later period these *divers washings* (Heb. ix. 10) were considerably multiplied. They preceded all great religious observances⁵. They accompanied all meals, and many of the most ordinary avocations of daily life (Mark vii. 3, 4). Moreover by Baptism, together with Circumcision and Sacrifice, all Israelites were admitted into covenant with God, and whenever a Gentile proselyte desired to enter the common-

¹ Herodotus tells us that the Egyptian priests bathed twice in the day and twice in the night to fit them for their sacred functions. *Hdt. Hist.* ii. 37.

² Comp. Hom. *Od.* iv. 759—761, Ἡ δ' ὑδρηναμένη, καθαρὰ χροὶ εἶμαθ' ἐλούσα, εἰς ὑπερῶν ἀνέβαινε σὺν ἀμφιπέδοισι γυναιξίν· ἐν δ' ἔθετ' οὐλοχύτας κανέω, ἡράτο δ' Ἀθήνη. Also Ovid, *Fast.* v. 680,

"Spargit et ipse suos lauro rorante capillos:

Et peragit solita fallere voce preces."

³ Comp. Plaut. *Aulular.* iii. 8, 534, "Eo lavatum ut sacrificem."

⁴ Comp. Virg. *Æn.* ii. 718, "Me bello e tanto digressum et cæde recenti Attractare nefas, donec me flumine vivo Abluero."

⁵ Compare Mark vii. 4; John ii. 6, iii. 25, xi. 55.

wealth of Israel, and to take the yoke of the Law upon him, Baptism was one of the essential ceremonies, so that it was an accepted axiom, "No man is a proselyte until he be circumcised and baptized¹."

ix. **The Baptism of John².** Hence when John the Baptist came to announce the Advent of the Messiah, and demanded that the Chosen People themselves should submit to his Baptism, if they would have a place in the Kingdom of Heaven, the Jews were not astonished at this, as though it was something unintelligible. It was a common saying with them that the sins of Israel delayed the coming of the Messiah, while their repentance would hasten it. Consequently *Jerusalem, and all Judæa, and all the region round about Jordan* (Matt. iii. 5) flocked forth to John, and *were baptized of him* after public confession of sin³ (Mark i. 5).

x. **The Baptism of our Lord.** The Baptism of John was in the strictest sense of the word preparatory. It possessed an outward and visible sign of a life-giving change, but the inward spiritual Grace in the fullest sense of the term was reserved for Christian Baptism. For Christ too adopted the ancient custom, but He enriched it with a new significance and a still mightier efficacy. First of all He Himself submitted to the Baptismal Rite⁴ in the

¹ See Schurer's *Jewish People in the time of Jesus Christ*, Div. ii. Vol. ii., p. 319; Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, pp. 745, 747, Ed. 2, 1884; Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* on Matt. iii. 6.

² The Johannine Baptism was not a mere repetition of the Baptism which accompanied Circumcision or of the Baptism of Proselytes, nor was it equivalent to Christian Baptism; it was more than the one, and less than the other; it was a Symbol of Repentance, but it was not a Laver of Re-

generation; and persons who had received it were baptized, if they became Christians, with the distinctively Christian Baptism. Comp. Luke iii. 3; Tit. iii. 5; Acts xix. 1—7; and see Döllinger, *First Age of the Church*, ii. pp. 182 sqq.

³ Ἐξομολογούμενοι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν (Mark i. 5) = *openly confessing their sins*. On Exomologesis, see the Article in Smith's *Dict. Christian Antiqq.* i. 644, &c.

⁴ As the Jewish high priest was consecrated to his office by (1) Baptism,

Jordan, and so sanctified "Water to the mystical washing away of sin¹." Secondly, with the same element of water He baptized by the hands of His disciples. Comp. John iii. 22, 26; iv. 1, 2. Thirdly, He directed that with the same element the Apostles should also everywhere baptize, and so admit proselytes and converts from Judaism into the Covenant of Grace, just as Circumcision had admitted into the Mosaic Covenant (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20).

xi. **Apostolic Baptism.** What Christ directed and solemnly enforced just before His Ascension (Matt. xxviii. 19) the Apostles practised. Thus (1) On the day of Pentecost S. Peter admitted upwards of three thousand of his countrymen to the Sacrament of Baptism² (Acts ii. 38—41); (2) Philip the Deacon baptized the Samaritans (Acts viii. 13, 16), and afterwards the Ethiopian eunuch (Acts viii. 38); (3) Saul the persecutor, though miraculously converted, was baptized by Ananias (Acts ix. 18); (4) as Paul the Apostle he baptized Lydia and her household (Acts xvi. 15), the Philippian jailor and his household (Acts xvi. 33), as also several converts at Corinth (Acts xviii. 8), sometimes doing so by his own hand, sometimes by the hands of others (1 Cor. i. 14). From that day to this Holy Baptism has been universally retained in the Christian Church, and it is plain that in primitive times it was not regarded as "a mere sign or badge," but as an actual means of

(2) Unction, (3) Sacrifice (Exod. xxix. 4—37; Levit. viii. 1—36), so our Lord was solemnly consecrated as our High Priest, (i) by Baptism in the river Jordan; (ii) by the Unction of the Holy Ghost, who descended and abode upon Him (Matt. iii. 16; Acts x. 38); (iii) by the daily sacrifice of Himself in lifelong and continuous obedience to His Father's will (Heb. x. 5, 7), and by its consummation—the sacrifice of Himself on the Altar of His

Cross.

¹ See the First Prayer in the Office for the Public Baptism of Infants.

² Originally Christian Baptism took place in the Jordan; a mere pouring or sprinkling was never thought of, Baptism being distinctly a *λουτρόν* or *bath*. The three thousand of Acts ii. 41 were not all necessarily baptized on the same day. Comp. Barnab. *Epist.* xi. 8; Döllinger, *First Age of the Church*, ii., pp. 182 sqq.

Grace, a Sacrament of Initiation, without which not even the great Apostle of the Gentiles, though miraculously converted on the road to Damascus, could be admitted into the Christian Church¹ (Acts ix. 18).

xii. **The Grace of Holy Baptism.** "Every man," as we have seen above², "that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam," suffers from the original "fault and corruption" of his nature. He is "very far gone from original righteousness," and being born in sin cannot in his natural condition *see the kingdom of God*³ (John iii. 3). For entrance into this Kingdom it is necessary that he *be born again* or *anew*⁴, that he *be born of water and the Spirit* (John iii. 3, 5). Of this new birth, this translation from a state of nature into a state of Grace, Baptism is the

¹ With regard to Christian Baptism in the Sub-Apostolic Age, we may notice—

(i) *Its Initiatory Function.*

Μηδεις δε φαγέρω μηδέ πιέτω από της ευχαριστίας υμών, άλλ' οι βαπτισθέντες εις βρομα Κυρίου, *Didache* ix. 5; Ευχαριστία, ης ουδενι άλλω μετασχειν εξόν εστιν η τω...λουσαμένω. Just. Mart. *Apol.* i. 66.

(ii) *Its Negative and Positive Aspects.*

Το υπέρ αφέσεως αμαρτιών και εις αναγέννησιν λουτρόν. Just. Mart. *ut supr.* Καταβαλομεν εις το ύδωρ γέμοντες αμαρτιών και ρύπου, και αναβαλομεν καρποφορούντες εν τη καρδια, και τον φόβον και την ελπίδα εις τον Ίησούν εν τω πνεύματι έχοντες. Barn. *Epist.* xi. 11.

(iii) *Its Relation to Faith.*

While faith had to be professed before Baptism, yet the faith accepted was rather a desire than a fixed consciousness, a faith which

was aided and developed by the Grace of Baptism; διὰ του λουτρού... ημεεις επιστεύσαμεν, Just. Mart. *Dial. c. Tryph.* § 14. Comp. Döllinger, *First Age of the Church*, *ut supr.*

² See Article ix., above, p. 143.

³ Ου δύναται ιδειν την βασιλειαν του Θεου. To see means *to partake of, to have part in.* Comp. ιδειν θάνατον, Luke ii. 26; θεωρείν θάνατον, John viii. 51. Our Lord does not say, "A man shall not," but "he cannot." It is a moral impossibility for him to have a share in the new kingdom.

⁴ *Ανωθεν.* This may mean either (i) *from above*, and that (a) *literally*, as of the Veil of the Temple rent in twain from the top, από ανωθεν έως κάτω (Matt. xxvii. 51, Mark xv. 38); (b) *figuratively*, James i. 17; iii. 15, 17; or (ii) *afresh, from the very beginning*, Luke i. 3; Acts xxvi. 5. The former rendering is generally adopted by the Greek Fathers, the latter by the Peshitto, Ethiopic, and Latin Versions. *Nisi qui renatus fuerit denuo*, Vulg. Comp. Westcott, *in loc.*

ordained instrument. As Circumcision admitted the Jew to the privileges of the Old Covenant, so Baptism admits the Christian to the privileges of the new and better Covenant, which God has ratified with the whole world in the Blood of the Mediator, Jesus Christ. They that receive Baptism rightly¹ are new born, i.e. they "are grafted into the Church," which is Christ's "mystical Body²," and are made "members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven." As members of Christ they have assured to them privileges which "by nature they cannot have." God of His bounteous mercy signs and seals to them the promise of (i) the forgiveness of their sins³; (ii) the assistance of the Holy Spirit⁴; and (iii) if they do not forfeit it, of eternal life⁵.

¹ *Rectè*, i.e. with the right *materies*, water, and the repetition of the prescribed *formula*.

² "Baptism is a Sacrament that God hath instituted in His Church, to the end that they which receive the same might thereby be incorporated into Christ, and so through His most precious merit obtain as well that saving grace of imputation which taketh away all former guiltiness, as also that infused Divine virtue of the Holy Ghost, which giveth to the powers of the soul their first disposition towards future newness of life." Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* v. 60, 2. "Admission into Christ is the great gift of Baptism. All Christians are agreed that Baptism is the act by which we are visibly incorporated into the historical Church. But if the historical Church is what we have already seen it to be, in no merely figurative sense, the Body of Christ, then incorporation into it must carry the blessing of membership in Christ... To the mind of S. Paul, inspired by the Holy Ghost, union with Christ was infinitely more than a metaphor. It did not mean to him an agreement with the principles of Christ, or sympathetic intercourse with His Person.

It meant, literally, a participation in His very self." Mason's *Faith of the Gospel*, pp. 267, 268, Ed. 1888. Cf. Rom. vi. 3; Gal. iii. 27.

³ Compare the words of S. Peter to the multitudes on the day of Pentecost, "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the *remission of your sins*" (Acts ii. 38); as also the words of Ananias to Saul of Tarsus, "Arise, and be baptized, and *wash away thy sins*" (Acts xxii. 16). The clause in the Nicene Creed, "I acknowledge one Baptism for the *remission of sins*," explicitly connects the forgiveness of sins with Baptism. The Apostles' Creed does so by implication, when it names "the forgiveness of sins" as the first consequence of membership of the Holy Catholic Church.

⁴ Compare again S. Peter's words, "Repent ye, and be baptized.....and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost" (Acts ii. 38), and see Acts xix. 1-7.

⁵ "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark xvi. 16), and salvation, in its ultimate stage, implies eternal life.

xiii. **Regeneration.** The Jews, as we have seen, were wont to speak of a proselyte as "one new born," as "one born into a new world¹." But with infinitely greater truth may the term be applied to one baptized into the Christian Church. For whereas by nature we were born in sin and made liable to all its consequences, we are by Baptism translated from our natural state into a higher state altogether. By this *laver of regeneration*² (Tit. iii. 5)

¹ "The Gentile that is made a proselyte, and the servant that is made free, behold, he is like a *child new-born*." "If any man become a proselyte, he is like a *child new-born*." Lightfoot *Hor. Heb.* on John iii. 3; Waterland, *Works*, iv., p. 429; Wall on *Infant Baptism*, Introd., p. 95.

² Regeneration, in Greek *παλιγγενεσία*, was a term not unknown to Classical writers—

(i) Thus

(a) Plutarch applies it to the transmigration of souls, to their being born again "into a new world";

(b) Marcus Antoninus applies it to the revival of nature in spring time from its winter sleep, *τὴν περιοδικὴν παλιγγενεσίαν τῶν ὄλων*, Marc. Anton. *Meditations*, xi. 1;

(c) Cicero in a letter to Atticus applies it to his restoration from exile to the dignities and honours of life at Rome, *Ad Att.* vi. 6, "hanc *παλιγγενεσίαν* nostram";

(d) Again, Josephus characterizes the restoration of the Jewish nation after the captivity, as *τὴν ἀνάκτησιν καὶ παλιγγενεσίαν τῆς πατρίδος*, *Antiq.* xi. 3, 9. Comp. also Plautus *Captivi*, iv. 2, III, "Dii immortales! *iterum natus* videor, si vera autumas." See Wet-

stein on S. Matt. xix. 28.

(ii) With this sense of renewal, revival, restoration, the word passes into the writings of the New Testament, and there it occurs twice, and twice only—

(a) In S. Matthew we read how, in reply to a question of S. Peter, our Lord said, *Verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed Me, in the regeneration (παλιγγενεσία), when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of His glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel* (Matt. xix. 28);

(β) In Titus iii. 5 S. Paul says that God *saved us through the laver of regeneration (διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας)*.

In the former of these passages the word denotes *the new birth of the whole creation*, the ἀποκατάστασις πάντων, the restoration of all things at the last day (comp. Acts iii. 21); in the latter it denotes in a narrower and more restricted sense *the new birth*, not of the whole creation, but of a single soul, "the free act of God's mercy and power, whereby He translates the sinner out of the kingdom of darkness into that of light, out of the state of nature into a state of grace." See Trench, *Synonyms*, p. 72, Ed. 1855. See also Tertullian, *De Bapt.* c. v.

we are born afresh into the Church and Family of God ; and we have His gracious promises signed and sealed to us. The corruption of our mortal nature is *buried*, as it were, *with Christ through baptism into death* (Rom. vi. 4), and by virtue of His Resurrection, the first germ of Covenant Grace is given unto us "to be newly formed unto a new life, and to obey the righteousness of God." Thus the baptized, whether infant or adult, by virtue of membership with Christ is born afresh into a new relationship other than any that nature could have bestowed. He is brought into a position, wherein he not only enjoys "the everlasting benediction of God's heavenly washing," but is by adoption and Grace made partaker of Christ's Sonship, and an inheritor of eternal life.

xiv. **Infant Baptism.** The last clause of the Article is concerned with the Baptism of infants. This it affirms is "in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ." It is true that those of whom we read in the New Testament as being baptized were for the most part adults, who had come to years of discretion, and therefore could not only promise repentance and faith, but also perform and keep that promise. But if "we regard Baptism as a holy cleansing, we cannot think any age superfluous for infants, considering how the human heart from the outset contains the germs of sin, however undeveloped¹." The arguments that may be advanced in favour of Infant Baptism are many and various, but for practical purposes they may be grouped under four heads: (i) The analogy of the Jewish Covenant² ;

¹ Mason's *Faith of the Gospel*, p. 295, 2nd Edit.

² The analogy of Circumcision with Christian Baptism is recognised both in Scripture, Col. ii. 11, and in early Christian writers, as Justin Mart.

Dial. cum Tryph. § 41. In S. Cyprian's time it was even doubted whether in view of "eighth day circumcision" any day earlier than the eighth was allowable for Christian Baptism. Cyprian *Epist.* lix.

(ii) The teaching of our Lord ; (iii) Apostolic custom ; (iv) Primitive practice.

xv. **Analogy of the Jewish Covenant.** Under the Jewish Covenant we find God distinctly commanding *every male among the Jews* to be *circumcised* (Gen. xvii. 10—14), and accordingly Jewish children were circumcised on the eighth day after birth (Levit. xii. 3). Under the same Dispensation we also find Moses engaging not only *their heads, their tribes, their elders, and their officers, even all the men of Israel*, but also *their little ones, that they shall enter into the covenant of the Lord their God* (Deut. xxix. 10—12), and enjoining that at the Feast of Tabernacles, and in the solemnity of the year of release, not only the men and women, but *the little ones* should be gathered together that they might *observe to do all the words of the law*¹ (Deut. xxxi. 12). We might naturally expect, therefore, that in Baptism, which takes the place of the Jewish rite of Circumcision (Col. ii. 11, 12), God would be willing to receive children into His new and better Covenant, unless He had expressly revealed otherwise to us².

xvi. **The Teaching of our Lord.** But, so far from revealing otherwise to us, His Blessed Son, who is one with Him in will and nature, when He was incarnate here on earth showed in a very special manner that children were the objects of His care and love. For on one occasion, when His disciples would have kept back certain children, who had been brought to Him by their mothers to receive His blessing³ (Matt. xix. 13), He blamed⁴ them

¹ Comp. also 2 Chron. xx. 13, and see Hooker, *Ecc. Pol.* v. lxiv. 3, 4.

² "Sith it is certain that the grace of God is both more plentifully found and more clearly declared in the Gospel by Christ, than at that time it was in the Old Testament by Moses, it were a greater indignity if

the same grace should now be thought to be either obscurer or in any part abated." Noell's *Catechism*, p. 209. Ed. Parker Society.

³ It was customary for Jewish infants to be taken to the synagogue to be blessed by the Rabbis.

⁴ Ἠγαράκτησεν (Mark x. 14) = He

severely for their interference; *He took the children in His arms¹, and blessed them, laying His hands upon them* (Mark x. 16). And if the "outward gesture and deed" of Him, whose slightest act was full of hidden meaning, be not enough, His words are decisive, for He proceeded to say, *Suffer the little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me: for of such is the kingdom of heaven* (Matt. xix. 14).

xvii. **Apostolic Custom.** Moreover, though there is no express mention in the New Testament of the Baptism of infants as such², yet we find S. Peter declaring to his hearers on the day of Pentecost that the promise of the Holy Ghost was *to them...and to their children* (Acts ii. 39); we find S. Paul speaking of the children of his Corinthian converts as *holy* (1 Cor. vii. 14)³; we find him baptizing Lydia *and her household* at Philippi (Acts xvi. 15), the gaoler *and all his* at the same place (Acts xvi. 33), as also *the household* of Stephanas at Corinth (1 Cor. i. 16), and it is difficult to believe that these families and households included no children.

xviii. **The Practice of the Primitive Church.** Though, however, there is no express mention of Infant Baptism in the New Testament, we have every reason to

was much displeased. The word expresses extreme indignation. It occurs three times in S. Matthew, xx. 24, xxi. 15, xxvi. 8; twice in S. Mark, x. 41, xiv. 4; and once in S. Luke, xiii. 14, but is not found in S. John. "The only time this strong word is used of our Lord," Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, ii. p. 336.

¹ *Ἐναγκαλισάμενος αὐτὰ* (Mark x. 16), even as He Himself had been taken into the arms (*eis τὰς ἀγκάλας*) of the aged Symeon, Luke ii. 28. The verb is only used by S. Mark here and in ix. 36.

² "When our Lord bade His Apostles make disciples or proselytes

of all nations (Matt. xxviii. 19), He was addressing persons who had been accustomed to enrol in the Jewish Church their own infants and proselytes of all ages, and who, *unless expressly forbidden*, would naturally interpret His words as implying that the practice was according to His will." Abp Whately *on the Sacraments*, p. 34.

³ S. Paul's assumption that sanctification is conferred upon children by even one Christian parent is, though indirect, perhaps the strongest evidence to be found in the Apostolic writings of the contemporary practice of Infant Baptism. Comp. Döllinger, *First Age of the Church*, ii. 185 sq.

believe that it prevailed from the most primitive times. S. Irenæus, who was born probably in the year A.D. 97, and who sat at the feet of S. Polycarp, the disciple of S. John, says that our Lord came into the world in order that "through Himself He might save all men, infants, and little ones, and children, and youths, and elders, even all who through Him are born again unto God¹." S. Justin Martyr, writing his First Apology, about A.D. 139, mentions persons who had been made disciples to Christ while children². Tertullian, again, who was of full age before the death of Irenæus, gives absolutely conclusive proof that the Baptism of infants was a common practice of the Church in his own time³. Origen, who was born probably in the year A.D. 186, and was a disciple of the famous S. Clement of Alexandria⁴, argues that infants must have original sin, asks why else they are baptized⁵, and goes on to affirm that the Church received from the Apostles the tradition to administer Infant Baptism. S. Cyprian asserts of a Council of sixty-six Bishops, held A.D. 252, that they had decided that the Baptism of infants ought not to be delayed beyond the second or third day after birth.

¹ "Omnes enim venit per Semetipsum salvare; omnes, inquam, qui per Eum renascuntur in Deum, infantes, et parvulos, et pueros, et juvenes, et seniores." Iren. *adv. Hær.*, ii. 22, 4. Ed. Bened.

² *Πολλοὶ τινες καὶ πολλὰ ἐξηγοντοῦται καὶ ἐβδομηγοντοῦται, οἱ ἐκ παίδων ἐμαθευέθησαν τῷ Χριστῷ, ἀφθοροὶ διαμένουσιν.* Just. *Apol.*, i. 15.

³ Tertullian asks, "Quid festinat innocens ætas ad remissionem peccatorum?" *De Bapt.*, c. 18. "With characteristic freedom he expresses his own opinion that the practice might wisely be altered, stating reasons for his opinion (*de Bapt.*, c. 18). But he nowhere says one word to imply

that the practice of his own contemporaries was an innovation upon the earlier usage of the Church." Smith's *Dict. Christian Antiq.*, i. p. 169.

⁴ This Father in a passage bearing on Baptism speaks of children "being drawn up out of the water," *τῶν ἐξ ὕδατος ἀνασπώμενων παιδίων.* *Pædag.* iii. c. 11.

⁵ See Origen, Hom. viii. on Leviticus, and his *Comment. in Ep. ad Rom.* v. 9, c. vi. 9, "Ecclesia ab Apostolis traditionem suscepit, etiam parvulis Baptismum dare. Sciebant enim illi, quibus mysteriorum secreta commissa sunt divinatorum, quod essent in omnibus genuinæ sordes peccati, quæ per aquam et Spiritum ablui deberent."

xix. **Conclusion.** Thus the analogy of the Jewish Covenant, our Lord's words¹, Apostolic custom, and primitive antiquity alike, tend not only to remove all doubt as to the propriety of admitting infants to Holy Baptism, but to make us earnestly believe that our Heavenly Father will "embrace them with the arms of His mercy; that He will give unto them the blessing of eternal life, and make them partakers of His everlasting Kingdom²."

¹ So far from infants being unfit for His Kingdom, our Lord says that grown men must become like them to be fit. He says that innocence, not intelligence, is the qualification; that

there is no virtue in belief, but that the barrier is disbelief. See Hooker, *Ecc. Pol.* v. lxiv. 5.

² See the Office for the Public Baptism of Infants.

ARTICLE XXVIII.

1563.

De Cœna Domini.

Cœna Domini non est tantum signum mutuæ benevolentiae Christianorum inter sese, uerum potius est sacramentum nostræ per mortem Christi redemptionis. Atque adeo ritè, dignè et cum fide sumentibus, panis quem frangimus, est communicatio corporis Christi: similiter poculum benedictionis, est communicatio sanguinis Christi.

Panis et vini transubstantiatio in Eucharistia, ex sacris literis probari non potest, sed apertis scripturæ verbis aduersatur, sacramenti naturam euertit, et multarum superstitionum dedit occasionem.

Corpus Christi datur, accipitur, et manducatur in cœna, tantum cœlesti et spirituali ratione. Medium autem quo Corpus Christi accipitur, et manducatur in cœna, fides est.

Sacramentum Eucharistiæ ex institutione Christi non seruabatur, circumferabatur, eleuabatur, nec adorabatur.

1571.

Of the Lordes Supper.

The Supper of the Lord is not only a signe of the loue that Christians ought to haue among them selues one to another: but rather it is a Sacrament of our redemption by Christes death. Insomuch that to suche as ryghtlie, worthyly, and with fayth receaue the same the bread whiche we breake is a parttakyng of the body of Christe, and likewyse the cuppe of blessing is a parttakyng of the blood of Christe.

Transubstantiation (or the change of the substaunce of bread and wine) in the Supper of the Lorde, can not be proued by holye writ, but is repugnaunt to the playne wordes of scripture, ouerthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath geuen occasion to many superstitions.

The body of Christe is geuen, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an heauenly and spirituall maner: And the meane whereby the body of Christe is receaued and eaten in the Supper, is fayth.

The Sacrament of the Lordes Supper was not by Christes ordinance reserued, caryed about, lyfted vp, or worshipped.

i. **Connection and Title.** From Holy Baptism we naturally pass on to the second of the two Sacraments of the Gospel, the Holy Eucharist. The title of the xxviiiith

Article, which treats of this subject, has never varied since the first draft.

ii. **The Form and Language** of the Article, however, differ in several respects from the shape in which it originally appeared. As we have it now, it consists of four clauses. The first and second of these are the same as in the draft of 1553, save that the expression, "overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament¹" was then wanting². The third clause was a new one composed in 1563³, and took the place of a long paragraph⁴, which was withdrawn as suggestive of interpretations favourable to the school of Zwingli, and savouring of his tenets. The fourth clause remains as originally drafted.

iii. **The Object** of the Article is twofold. It repudiates

- (i) The errors of the Zwinglian School, which taught that the Eucharist was merely "a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one towards another";
- (ii) The opposite dogma of physical transubstantiation of the Eucharistic Elements by consecration.

iv. **Analysis.** Like the preceding Article it begins

¹ "Sacramenti naturam evertit." The phrase, however, was not new. We find its equivalent "a natura sacramenti discrepat" in the Reform. Legum, *De Hæres.*, c. 19. Again, in the "Declaration of Christian Doctrine," drawn up in 1559, we have the same thought: "So dothe it utterly denye the nature of a sacrament."

² Hardwick, *Hist. Art.*, p. 130. Ed. 1859.

³ It was added on the motion of Bishop Guest, as is proved by a letter found amongst the State Papers from Guest to Cecil, Dec. 22, 1566. See below, p. 343.

⁴ The paragraph which was withdrawn ran: "Quum naturæ humanæ veritas requirat, ut unius ejusdemque hominis corpus in multis locissimul esse non posset, sed in uno aliquo et definito loco esse oporteat, idcirco Christi corpus, in multis et diversis locis, eodem tempore, præsens esse non potest. Et quoniam, ut tradunt Sacræ literæ, Christus in Cœlum fuit sublatus, et ibi usque ad finem sæculi est permansurus, non debet quisquam fidelium carnis ejus et sanguinis Realem et Corporalem (ut loquuntur) præsentiam in Eucharistia vel credere vel profiteri."

with negating the low conceptions of the Sacrament entertained by some, and

- (i) Lays down (a) negatively, and (b) positively, what is the true nature of the Holy Eucharist;
- (ii) It condemns the mediæval doctrine of a physical transubstantiation of the Elements;
- (iii) It sets forth the true doctrine of the Real Presence;
- (iv) It affirms, in opposition to prevalent practices, the true object for which the Sacrament was ordained by Christ.

v. **The Account of the Institution** of the Holy Eucharist is itself sufficient to remove a low conception of its nature and object. It comes to us from three Evangelists¹ and from the Apostle Paul. Our earliest authority is the great Apostle of the Gentiles, who in the year A.D. 57 reminds the Church of Corinth of what he had himself told them respecting the institution of the Holy Eucharist, even as he had received it by direct revelation from Christ, his Ascended Lord² (1 Cor. xi. 23). Combining the narratives together we learn that

- (a) The Holy Eucharist was instituted by our Lord on the eve of His Passion in an upper room at Jerusalem, during a Paschal Meal, for which He Himself had made special preparation, and

¹ Matt. xxvi. 26—29; Mark xiv. 22—25; Lk. xxii. 14—20.

² Ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν. The Apostle establishes on an immovable foundation the authority of his narrative. "It comes from the Lord, and without any other middle party than the Apostle himself. The ἐγὼ, 'I,' is put at the

head to give the readers an assurance of the truth of the narrative. This is what I hold, I from a good source, from the Lord Himself... If the account of the Institution of the Supper really came to Paul from the Lord, it could only be in the way of direct revelation." Godet on 1 Cor. xi. 23.

respecting which He had given the most minute instructions to His Apostles¹;

- (β) As part of the ceremonial of the Passover, it was the custom for each household to partake of, amongst other things prescribed, some flat unleavened Passover cakes, while four cups of red wine mingled with water were handed round at different stages of the feast²;
- (γ) On this occasion our Lord on reaching the upper room took the place of Celebrant, or Proclaimer of the Feast, and as the solemn meal proceeded, while we read nothing of any Paschal lamb being eaten, He took one of the unleavened cakes, that had been placed before Him, and, after giving thanks, He brake it, and then gave it to His Apostles, saying, *Take, eat³, This is My Body⁴, Which is given for you⁵; Do This in remembrance of Me⁶*;

¹ He reminds them of the approach of the Festival of the Passover (Matt. xxvi. 2); (ii) He sends two of the Apostles to make ready (Mk xiv. 13); (iii) He describes the guide who would direct them as *ἄνθρωπος κεράμιον ὕδατος βασιτάζων* (Mk xiv. 13; Luke xxii. 10); (iv) He prescribes the words they were to address to the owner of the house whither he would lead them (Matt. xxvi. 18; Mk xiv. 14; Lk. xxii. 11); (v) He even particularizes the size and aspect of the room which he would show them, *ἀνώγειον μέγα ἐστρωμένον* (Mk xiv. 15; Lk. xxii. 12).

² "Omnes in cœna Paschali oportet quatuor pocula bibere." Buxtorf *de Cœna Domini*, pp. 299, 300; Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* on Matt. xxvi. 27; Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, ii. p. 485.

³ *Λάβετε, φάγετε*, Matt. xxvi. 26. These words are peculiar to S. Mat-

thew. See R.V.

⁴ *Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου* (Matt., Mk, Luke, 1 Cor. xi. 24).

⁵ *Τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον* (Luke xxii. 19); *κλώμενον* (1 Cor. xi. 24), but *κλώμενον* is omitted by L. T. Tr. WH. R.V. *Διδόμενον* means *which is being, or, is on the point of being, given for you.*

⁶ *Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*, Luke xxii. 19, 1 Cor. xi. 24. *Ἀνάμνησις* in Classical Greek means "a calling to mind," "an act of recollection"; but in the LXX. it has the fuller sense of a "commemoration." Thus in Levit. xxiv. 7 we read of the shewbread *καὶ ἔσονται εἰς ἄρτους εἰς ἀνάμνησιν προκειμένα τῷ κυρίῳ*; again, in Num. x. 10, it is said of trumpets blown over the sacrifices, *καὶ ἔσται ὑμῖν ἀνάμνησις ἐναντι τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν*. In the N. T. the word only occurs in one other place Heb. x. 3, *ἀλλ' ἐν αὐταῖς (x. 1 ταῖς αὐταῖς θυσίαις) ἀνάμνησις ἁμαρτιῶν κατ' ἐναντίον*. Here there is

- (δ) Afterwards He took a cup of wine, probably the third cup, or "Cup of Blessing," and when He had given thanks, He gave it to them, saying, *Drink ye all of This¹; for This Cup is My Blood of the [New] Covenant², Which is shed for many for the remission of sins³; Do This, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of Me⁴.*

Thus calmly and deliberately, with His eyes fixed on His approaching death upon the Cross on the morrow, at one of the greatest historical Festivals of the Jews, our Lord instituted the Holy Sacrament of His Body and Blood. "What He was in no position to testify to the world on the following day, when the soldiers laid their rude hands upon Him, and bound Him—that His death was really an offering, a freewill surrender of Himself—that He testified now; 'What I give you to eat is My Body which is broken for you, what ye drink is My Blood which I shed for you⁵.'"

a contrast between the sacrificial commemoration of sins under the Law, and the Eucharistic commemoration of the Redemption wrought out for us by our Lord. The Vulgate renders it "hoc facite in meam commemorationem," and the Rhemish Version, following it, translates, "Do this for a commemoration of Me."

¹ *Πλερε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες*, Matt. xxvi. 27. These words again are peculiar to S. Matthew.

² *Τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου, τὸ τῆς διαθήκης* (Matt. xxvi. 28; Mark xiv. 24 (the best MSS. omit *καινῆς*); *ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματι μου* (Luke xxii. 20).

³ *Τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν*, Matt. xxvi. 28. S. Luke xxii. 20 has *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον*; S. Mark xiv. 24 has *ὑπὲρ πολλῶν*; *This is My Blood of the [New] Covenant, which is being, or, is on the point of being, poured out for you, for*

many, unto remission of sins.

⁴ *Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, ὡσάκις ἂν πλῆντε, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*, 1 Cor. xi. 25. This occurs only in S. Paul's narrative. Tyndale and Cranmer render the words, "This do as often as ye drink it, in the remembrance of Me." Thus, at this historic Festival, He enshrines in a unique and significant Rite the mysterious destruction of the temple of His Body, of which He had before darkly spoken, and not only recalls to the minds of His Apostles all that He had said respecting His Body as "true flesh," and His Blood as "true drink," but He actually supplies the mode of that mysterious eating and drinking, which He had before so marvellously demanded as essential to true life. See Maclear, *The Evidential Value of the Eucharist*, pp. 223 sq. 3rd Ed. S.P.C.K.

⁵ Döllinger, *First Age of the Church*, i. p. 53. E. T. ed. 1866.

vi. **The Eucharist no mere Sign.** If, then, we deem the Institutor of this unique and unexampled Rite to have been all that He is declared to be in the Second Article, "the very and eternal God¹," and as He is described in the Fifteenth Article, "the Lamb without spot, who, by sacrifice of himself once made, should take away the sins of the world²"; if we reflect on the solemn and unparalleled circumstances under which He ordained it, and the elaborate preparation He made for its Institution³ as the culminating point of all previous announcements, whether figurative or specific, respecting His coming Passion, it is impossible to regard the Rite as "only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another." The solemn words and actions, which accompanied the Institution, testify of themselves to the surpassing dignity of this Holy Mystery, and to His death as the source of an inestimable benefit to all mankind.

vii. **The Eucharist a Sacrament of our Redemption.** Having declared what the Holy Eucharist is not, the Article proceeds to affirm what it is. It states that it is "a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's death." The Passover, as often as it was celebrated by the Jews, recalled, as in a living drama⁴, the great story of the deliverance of the nation from cruel and oppressive bondage in Egypt (Deut. xvi. 2, 3)⁵; a deliverance, which elevated them from the condition of slaves to that of a ransomed people, and gave them the hope of entrance into the Promised Land of Canaan. So the Eucharist is the continued setting forth of the death of Christ as the means of the deliverance, not of a single nation, but of the whole world from the bondage of sin and Satan. In the Feast

¹ See above, p. 48.

² See above, p. 193.

³ See above, p. 332, n.

⁴ Compare Deut. xvi. 5, 6; 2 Chron. xxx. 16, xxxv. 10, 11.

⁵ See Stanley, *Jewish Church*, i. p. 104. Ed. 1870.

of the Passover the first place had been occupied by the lamb. It had been selected with scrupulous care (Exod. xii. 5). It had been slain with solemn ceremony. Its blood had been sprinkled on the brazen altar in the outer court of the Temple, and on the side posts and upper part of the door, and it had then been roast with fire and eaten by the Paschal company with thankful commemoration of redemption from degrading bondage in Egypt. But now that "the very Paschal Lamb" was come¹, and was about to offer Himself on the Altar of His Cross, no word is said of the Jewish Paschal victim. The Bread and Wine, hitherto subordinate, now take the first place. The lamb had been eaten as a type of Him. He now ordains the Elements of Bread and Wine to be taken and received in remembrance of Him, who,

"Himself the Victim and Himself the Priest,"

was about to offer the one "full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice...for the sins of the whole world."

viii. **The Inward Grace of the Sacrament.** So much for the outward part or sign of this "Sacrament of our Redemption." Respecting "the inward part, or thing signified²," the Article states that "to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith" receive the Elements ordained by Christ, "the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ; and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ." The truth of this state-

¹ As on the tenth day of Nisan the Paschal Lamb was selected to be kept till the fourteenth day, so our Lord had "taken care that His entry into Jerusalem should fall on the very day when, according to the ordinance of Moses, the Paschal Lamb was chosen." See Döllinger, *First Age of the Church*, i. p. 51. E. T. 1866.

² In the Holy Eucharist the outward part, the Sacramentum, or ex-

ternal "Signum," is an assured token of the presence of the inward part or "Res Significata," for it was ordained by Christ Himself as a *means* whereby we receive, and a *pledge* to assure us that we do truly receive, His Body and Blood. See the *Church Catechism*. The mysterious union of the outward and inward parts is brought about by the act of consecration.

ment is sufficiently confirmed by the words of our Lord Himself. For while, on the occasion of the first Passover of His Public Ministry, He had declared to Nicodemus that *as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up* (John iii. 14)¹, and on the occasion of the second Passover He had declared to the Jews in the synagogue of Capernaum that His Flesh was *true meat*, and His Blood *true drink*² (John vi. 55), at this last Passover He gathered up in action all that He had then expressed in words. For, when He gave the Bread to His Apostles, He said, *Take eat; this is My Body*, and when He gave them the Cup, He said, *This is My Blood of the Covenant*. Thus as the Jewish Passover was a feast of Redemption, so He made this transfigured Passover to be for His Church the Sacrificial Feast of an infinitely greater Redemption not of a single nation, but of the whole world³.

ix. **Feasts on Sacrifices** were common alike to the Jews and to the Gentile nations. They were means of ratifying covenants between God and man. They were especially characteristic of the peace-offerings of the Jews, and indicated that what had separated the sacrificer from

¹ At the same Passover He had uttered in the hearing of the deputation from the Sanhedrin, *Λύσατε τὸν ναβὸν τοῦτον, καὶ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερῶ αὐτόν*, John ii. 19. The sign is one of the most remarkable. As a Rabbi He answers the Rabbis. The words indicate a destruction, which comes from dissolution, from the breaking of that which binds the parts into a whole, or one thing to another. They "spring from an immeasurable depth. They illustrate domains then completely unexplored by any other consciousness than His own." Godet *in loc.*

² Ἡ γὰρ σὰρξ μου ἀληθὴς ἐστὶ βρωσίς, καὶ τὸ αἷμά μου ἀληθὴς ἐστὶ πόσις, John vi. 55. The words employed are such

as it is inconceivable that any mere man could have uttered. On the lips of any merely human teacher they have no meaning whatever. Nowhere in any literature, not even in the luxuriant imagery of the East, do we find an instance of a teacher speaking of the reception of his doctrine under so astounding a metaphor as "eating his flesh" and "drinking his blood."

³ "The communion of the Paschal lamb, as the characteristic offering of the Old Law, had formed the foundation and centre of the whole sacrificial system of the Old Testament." Döllinger, *First Age of the Church*, i. p. 58. E. T. 1877.

Jehovah was now covered and cancelled, that the Most High now welcomed him to His table, and in this feast gave him a pledge of reconciliation and restoration to His favour¹. So at this sacrificial feast of the New Covenant, our Lord assures us that He has become *our peace* (Eph. ii. 14; Col. i. 20), and invites us to receive "the spiritual food" of His own precious Body and Blood. At this Holy Table we are His guests, and receive Him under the earthly veils of Bread and Wine. The old Passover was a Feast upon a Sacrifice, the Holy Eucharist is a Feast upon a Sacrifice. "The one on the lamb; the other on the Lamb of God. The one true; the other true. The one carnally true; the other spiritually, and, therefore, even *more true*"². And thus in this holy Feast "we are one with Christ, and Christ with us," and "the Bread, which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ; and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ."

x. **Transubstantiation.** The exact way in which Christ is present at this sacred Feast, and gives His Body and Blood to the faithful communicant, has occasioned great controversy. The early Church³ did not attempt to explain the Mystery. The doctrine of the manner of Christ's Presence in the Holy Eucharist, and the precise

¹ Compare the scene on Sinai, when Moses and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu with the seventy elders, after the ratification of the covenant between Jehovah and His people by solemn sacrifices and sprinkling of blood, *ate and drank* in His presence at a covenant feast, and therein received a pledge of reconciliation and pardon (Exod. xxiv. 9—11; Heb. ix. 19, 20).

² Bp. Browne *On the Articles*, p. 713, ed. 1854.

³ The change in the elements through consecration was in the oldest times expressed by the simplest terms, "It is," "It becomes"; or in prayer

to God, "consecrate," "perfect," "appoint," "make." The Liturgy of S. Chrysostom, and others following it, use the words, "change by Thy Spirit." There are also other more emphatic yet rare words, occurring once or twice only in each Father who uses them, "transmute," "trans-element," "transfashion," "transfigure." *Μεταποιεῖσθαι* is once used by S. Gregory of Nyssa, and once by Theodoret, *μεταρρυθμίζειν* and *μετασκευάζειν*, each by S. Chrysostom; "transfigure," twice by S. Ambrose; "transfere," in the Gallican Sacramentary.

nature of the relation in which the consecrated Elements and the Body and Blood of Christ stand to one another, never came into serious debate, and thus never were the subject of authoritative definition. Men were content with the blessing, and did not care to define it. That Christ was present in the Sacrament, that in that sacred Feast He fed the faithful with the precious food of His own most blessed Body and Blood, in this all the Fathers of the Early Church were agreed¹. As yet however, there was but little speculation as to what was meant by this Presence.

xi. **Paschasius Radbert.** But matters could not always continue in this state, and in the ninth century Paschasius Radbert, a learned monk², afterwards Abbot of New Corbey, well skilled in all the theological learning of his age, put forth a treatise *On the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ*. In this he maintained that by virtue of the priestly consecration and the co-operation of the Holy Ghost, the material elements were so transformed as to retain no more than an appearance ("figura") of their natural substance, being truly, though invisibly, replaced by Christ Himself in every way the same as He was born and crucified³. This view was opposed by another monk of Corbey, Ratramnus⁴, who put forth a counter treatise at the request of the Emperor Charles the Bald. He favoured a real, while he disbelieved in a corporal, or material presence in the Eucharist. The controversy slumbered during the whole of the tenth century, but was revived by Berengarius, Archdeacon of Angers, A.D.

¹ See Abp. Trench, *Medieval Church History*, p. 182.

² He was born A.D. 786, and died A.D. 865. See Hardwick's *Middle Age*, p. 166.

³ Hardwick, *Middle Age*, p. 166;

Neander, iv. pp. 210 sqq., E. T. 1852; Gieseler, *Church History*, ii. pp. 284 sqq., E. T. 1859.

⁴ For his connection with the Predestinarian Controversy, see Hardwick, *Middle Age*, p. 163.

1040, who re-asserted the view expounded by Ratramnus. This exposed him to much opposition, and he was twice compelled to sign a formula of faith, in which the *physical* conversion of the Elements was stated in the most revolting terms¹. The view, to which he subscribed, that Christ's Body is "sensibly" present in the Eucharist, that it is broken by the priest, and this *not sacramentally only, but really and without any figure*, was the doctrine generally held by the people and also by many of the clergy at the era of the Reformation².

xii. **The Scholastic Doctrine.** On the overthrow of Berengarius the views he opposed gained complete possession of the leading teachers of the West. As years went on the exact intention of the phrase "transubstantiation"³ was much discussed by the Schoolmen. They taught that every object we can take cognizance of by the senses possesses two invariable properties (i) the "accidents"⁴ or

¹ In A.D. 1059 he subscribed to a formula which stated "verum corpus et sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu Christi esse, et *sensualiter* in solo sacramento, sed in veritate, manibus sacerdotum tractari, *frangi et fidelium dentibus atteri.*" Lanfranc, *Opp.* p. 233. The Formula which he signed in A.D. 1079 ran "Corde credo et ore confiteor, panem et vinum, quæ ponuntur in altari, per mysterium sacræ orationis et verba nostri Redemptoris *substantialiter* converti in veram et propriam vivificatricem Carnem et Sanguinem Jesu Christi Domini nostri, et post consecrationem esse verum Corpus Christi...et verum Sanguinem Christi, qui de latere Ejus effusus est, non tantum per signum et virtutem Sacramenti, sed in *propriate natura et veritate substantiæ.*" Lanfranc, *ut supr.*

² See the form of recantation framed by Cardinal Pole and signed by Sir John Cheke. Strype's *Life of Sir John Cheke*, p. 123.

³ Transubstantiation is formed from (a) trans, which=(1) *across, beyond*, and (2) in composition denotes a *change* from one state to another, as in the words "transform," "transfigure," and (β) *substantia*, which denotes not what we ordinarily understand by substance, but what is expressed by the Greek *ουσία, essence*. Hence the Greek word *μετουσίωσις* corresponding to transubstantiation. The word is first found in an exposition of the Canon of the Mass by Peter Damian, A.D. 988—1072, cap. vii. It first appears as a term accepted and recognised by the Church at the fourth Council of Lateran, A.D. 1215.

⁴ Accident, from *accidere to fall, to happen*, denotes (i) anything that happens, any *occurrence*, or *incident*; (ii) that which is present by chance, and therefore non-essential; a *property* or a *quality not essential to our conception of a substance; an attribute*; (iii) in Scholastic Theology the ma-

external properties, as shape, form, colour, size, material, and (ii) the "substance," the internal, invisible essence, the true reality, of which the "accidents" were the outward clothing. Their doctrine, a refinement of the theory of Paschasius, was that, after consecration, while the accidents remained the same as before, the invisible substance or essence of the bread and wine was transfigured or transubstantiated into the substance or essence of the Body and Blood of Christ¹. Thus transubstantiation was defined at the Council of Trent, and this is the definition of the Roman Church held now.

xiii. **The First Objection** which the Article makes to this refinement on the teaching of Paschasius is that it "cannot be proved by holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture." When He instituted the Sacrament, our Lord did not say "This represents My Body," or "This has the power and efficacy of My Body," but "This is My Body." Thus He indicates a deep mystery, whereby what was bread is called and is His Body, and what was the cup is called and is His Blood. And yet S. Paul uses the word "Bread" and the word "the Cup" to describe these Elements after consecration. He says to the Corinthians, *As often as ye eat this Bread and drink the Cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till He come* (1 Cor. xi. 26). The bread is still called "the Bread."

terial qualities remaining in the Sacramental Bread and Wine after consecration. Comp. Wyclif, A.D. 1380, *Eng. Wks.*, "No man durste seye til nou þat accident is Goddis body, for his newe worde may haue no ground"; Caxton, *Golden Leg.*, "Whan the breed is converted into the precious body of our Lord the accidents abyden"; Lydgate, *Pylg. Sowle*, A.D. 1483, "Quantite is an accident only appro-

pred to bodylie thynges."

¹ "Sancta hæc Synodus declarat, per consecrationem panis et vini conversionem fieri totius substantiæ panis in substantiam corporis Christi Domini nostri, et totius substantiæ vini in substantiam sanguinis Ejus; quæ conversio convenienter et proprie a sancta Catholica Ecclesia Transubstantiatio est appellata." *Concil. Trident.*, sec. xiii., cap. iv.

The cup is still called "the Cup." No annihilation of the outward sign is hinted at or indicated.

xiv. **The Second Objection** taken in the Article is that the doctrine "overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament¹." A Sacrament, as we have seen, consists of two parts, the outward visible sign and the inward spiritual grace. There must exist in a valid Sacrament the "signum," the sign, and the "res significata," or thing signified. Now if after consecration the outward form is virtually annihilated, and ceases to have any real existence, the thing signified alone remains, and the nature of a sacrament is overthrown, and the visible sign of that which is invisible vanishes.

xv. **The Third Objection** is that it has "given rise to many superstitions." This alludes to the superstitions, which a gross and material view of the physical change after consecration too often produced. Such, for instance, were the stories of the appearances of our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament as a little child²; of drops of blood flowing, when Odo, Archbishop of Canterbury, broke the Host; and other instances alluded to by Ælfric in his Homilies³. Such ideas were the result of a coarse and unguarded propagation of the views set forth by the teaching of Paschasius, which led to the idea that such appearances were appearances of the Body of our Lord under such conditions as were realized during His earthly life.

¹ "Naturam sacramenti evertit." Evertere = (i) *to turn out, to drive out*; (ii) *to overthrow*, as "silvis evertere pinum," *Virg. Georg.* i. 256; (iii) *to overthrow, completely destroy*, as "evertere funditus amicitiam," *Cic. Fin.* ii. 25; "evertere...disciplinam militarem," *Livy* viii. 30. The English translation "overthroweth" is

rendered in some MSS. "perverteth." See Hardwick, *Hist. of Articles*, p. 313, ed. 1859.

² As to Pleggils, a priest of the fifth century, see Blunt's *Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology*, Art. *Transubstantiation*.

³ Bp. Forbes *On the Articles*, p. 553.

xvi. **The View advanced in the Article.** In primitive times, as we have said, we trace no such subtle speculations as these, we find no exact statement as to the nature and extent of the change effected by consecration in the Holy Eucharist. Men were content to maintain a reverent reserve in respect to so great a mystery. They believed that in the words of S. Justin Martyr, the Eucharist is no longer "common bread or common drink"; that in this sacred Feast Christ feeds us with the precious food of His Body and Blood, but they did not attempt to define the mode or the manner of His Presence¹. Similarly cautious and guarded is the language of the Article. It states that the Body of Christ is "given, taken, and eaten in the Supper," and herein it agrees with the language of the Catechism². But repudiating the idea of a *corporal* presence of Christ's Flesh and Blood, it affirms that He is given and received "only after an heavenly and spiritual manner." Christ's Body is now a glorified Body³, and no longer subject to the conditions of its earthly state. *Flesh and blood, writes S. Paul, cannot inherit the kingdom of God* (1 Cor. xv. 50). Any Presence of Christ, therefore, in the Blessed Sacrament, must have reference to His glorified, heavenly, Body. But His Presence is not *less*

¹ "All things considered, and compared with that success which truth hath hitherto had by so bitter conflicts with errors in this point, shall I wish that men would more give themselves to meditate with silence what we have by the Sacrament, and less to dispute of the manner how?" Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* v. lxvii. 3.

² Compare the words of the Church Catechism, "What is the inward part or thing signified? The Body and Blood of Christ, which are *verily and indeed* (vere et reipsa)," i.e., truly and actually, not in a mere metaphorical sense, not only in a figure, "*taken and received* (sumuntur et percipiuntur)

by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." The use of the word "taken" implies that what is received has its existence apart from the recipient.

³ "His human substance in itself is naturally absent from the earth, His soul and body not on earth but in heaven only. . . . Yet as the manhood of Christ may after a sort be everywhere said to be present, because that Person is everywhere present, from whose divine substance manhood nowhere is severed; so the same universality of presence may likewise seem in another respect applicable thereunto, namely, by *cooperation* with Deity, and that in *all things*." Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* v. lv. 7, 8.

but *more* real¹ because it is spiritual and ineffable, and passes all human comprehension². The Article does not, to use the words of Bishop Guest³, "exclude the Presence of Christ's Body from the Sacrament, but only the grossness and sensibleness in the receiving thereof." It simply refuses to define what passes all definition, and what it finds a mystery it leaves a mystery under the shadow of God's throne⁴.

¹ The word "real" as applied to Presence is often confounded with the word carnal or corporal. It does not bear that meaning at all. Real, from the Latin *realis*, is derived from *res*, a thing. It denotes (i) *actually being* or *existing*, not fictitious or imaginary. Compare Milton, *Par. Lost*:

"Whereat I waked, and found
Before mine eyes all *real*, as the
dream

Had lively shadowed":

it denotes (ii) *true, genuine*, not artificial or counterfeit, as a *real* fact; (iii) as a law-term, *real* estate, *real* property, e.g. lands, tenements as opposed to personal or moveable property. A real presence denotes the presence of a reality, a true, actual presence as opposed to an untrue, counterfeit, unreal presence.

² That the compilers of the Articles did not reject the Scholastic theory of Transubstantiation because they shrank from a full belief in the Sacramental Presence is clear from many statements of the leading divines of the sixteenth century. Thus Bishop Ridley writes, "The true Church of Christ doth acknowledge a Presence of Christ's Body in the Lord's Supper, but yet sacramentally and spiritually, not carnally or corporally giving life, and in that respect really, that is, according to His benediction, giving life." Ridley's *Works*, *P. Society*, p. 236; again he writes "That heavenly Lamb is (as I confess) on the Table; but by a spiritual presence, and not after any corporal presence," *Works*,

p. 249; "Thus much we must be sure to hold," we read in the Second Book of the Homilies, "that in the Supper of the Lord there is no vain ceremony, no bare sign, no untrue figure of a thing absent"; First Pt. of the Sermon concerning the Sacrament, p. 378, ed. 1802. Again Bishop Jewel, the chief writer of the Second Book of Homilies, says, "Diserteque pronunciamus, in Coena credentibus vere exhiberi Corpus et Sanguinem Domini, carnem Filii Dei," Jewel, *Apologia*, Pt. II. xi. i.

³ Bishop Guest, who was chiefly concerned in penning this Article, writes, "I told the Bishop of Gloucester plainly that the word only in the aforesaid Article did not exclude the Presence of Christ's Body from the Sacrament, but only the grossness and sensibleness in the receiving thereof." Guest's Letter to Cecil, Dec. 22, 1566. So also Bishop Andrewes writes, "As to the Real Presence we are agreed; our controversy is as to the *mode* of it. The Presence we believe to be real as you do. As to the mode we define nothing rashly, nor anxiously investigate, any more than in Baptism we enquire how Christ's Blood washes us; any more than in the Incarnation of Christ we ask how the human is united to the divine nature in One Person." Bp. Andrewes, *Responsio*, p. 13; comp. his *Sermon on the Resurrection*, ii. p. 302.

⁴ One most powerful argument against Transubstantiation is found in the use made of the Blessed Sacra-

xvii. **The Last Clause** of the Article deals with various points connected with the celebration of the Eucharist, such as reservation, carrying about, elevation, and adoration of the Elements. These ceremonies it affirms are no parts of Christ's original institution. They may be omitted without breaking our Lord's enactment respecting the celebration of the Sacrament. He did not ordain it *in order that* they should be observed; they are not essential to the validity of the Sacrament; and their omission leaves the whole of the original institution untouched.

xviii. **Reservation** was allowed in primitive times for the sake of carrying a portion of the consecrated Elements to the sick. Thus Justin Martyr in his First Apology, describing the celebration of the Eucharist says, "The Deacons communicate each of those present, and carry away to the absent of the blest Bread and Wine and Water¹." Again Eusebius, near the beginning of the fourth century, tells of a man, who on his death bed sent at night for a priest to communicate him, and, the priest being ill, the Eucharist, which must have been reserved, was taken to him by a layman². S. Chrysostom relates how in a tumult at Constantinople soldiers entered the place, where the holy vessels were stored, and the most Holy Blood of Christ was spilt on their garments³. The practice was subsequently still further developed, and resorted to in the case of long journeys by land and by sea⁴. The custom,

ment by, e.g. Theodoret, S. Gelasius, and S. Chrysostom, as an illustration of the Catholic doctrine of the Two Natures of our Lord; if Transubstantiation had been the doctrine of their day it would have supported not the Catholic, but the Monophysite view.

¹ S. Just. Mart. *Apol.* i. 65.

² Euseb. *Ecl. Hist.* vi. 44.

³ S. Chrysost. *Epist. ad Innoc.* 3;

see Smith's *Dict. Christian Antiqq.* ii. 1787.

⁴ Travellers by sea had the body and blood of the Redeemer with them, Greg. Mag. *Dial.* iii. 36. "Becket carried the Sacrament round his neck on the occasion of his going in search of Henry II. When the ordeal by fire was proposed to decide whether the Pope was right in excommunicating Savonarola, his friend

however of reservation, is one of permission not of obligation, its observance forms no part of the original institution of the Sacrament, and each independent Church, as possessed of power "to decree rites or ceremonies," may adopt or disallow the practice as it may be judged to be expedient.

xix. **The Carrying about** of the Blessed Sacrament in solemn processions was a ceremony introduced into the Church during the Middle Ages. It does not exist in the orthodox Eastern Church, neither do any of the Eastern heretical Churches practise it. It is difficult to fix the date of its first¹ introduction. The Feast of Corpus Christi was instituted by Pope Urban IV. in 1264, and subsequently commanded by Clement V. in 1311, but it formed no part of the original institution or of Apostolic practice.

xx. **Elevation.** S. Paul in his Epistle to the Galatians speaks of Christ as being "placarded" or "visibly held up" as crucified before the eyes of the Galatians² (Gal. iii. 1). This passage has sometimes been regarded as an indication of the contemporary practice of the Elevation of the Sacrament. But the custom cannot be traced back to such an age. There is no allusion to it in the early Sacramentaries³ of Gelasius, Leo, or Gregory, or in the ancient writers⁴ on the ceremonies of the Church. It is

Fr. Dominic, who was to make the fiery trial, held the Sacrament in his hand." See Bp. Forbes, *Articles*, p. 570.

¹ S. Carlo Borromeo, in the Acts of the Council of Milan, puts restrictions on the public exposition of the Blessed Sacrament. The Feast of Corpus Christi did not become universal till after the Council of Vienne in 1311.

² Οὗς κατ' ὄφθαλμοὺς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς προεγράφη ἐσταυρωμένος. Gal. iii. 1.

³ In all early Oriental Liturgies an elevation of the Host by the celebrating Priest is prescribed contemporaneously with the proclamation

ἅγια ἄγιοις, and before the Fraction. Thus in the Liturgy of S. James, "then he elevates the gifts and saith 'Holy things to holy persons';" in the Liturgy of S. Chrysostom, "the priest, elevating the holy bread exclaims, 'Holy things for holy persons.'" But the rite took place without in the Bema, while the doors were closed and the curtains drawn. The original intention, therefore, was clearly not that the Host might be adored by the people. Smith's *Dict. Christian Antiqq.* i. 605.

⁴ Roman writers on ceremonial confess their inability to find any trace

not till we come to A.D. 1136 that we find any mention made of it.

xxi. **Adoration.** In reference to this point the Article is worded very carefully and with great moderation. As it is stated in Art. xxv. that the object for which Christ ordained the Sacraments was not that they might be "gazed upon" or "carried about," so here it is laid down that the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist was not by Christ's ordinance...to be worshipped or adored. The Article deals with the adoration of the Sacrament, that is, of the Sacramental Bread and Wine there *bodily* received, or of any *Corporeal* Presence of Christ's Flesh and Blood¹. It says nothing whatever about the adoration of Christ in the Sacrament. It deals with the adoration of the outward Elements, not of Him, Who is present under these earthly veils.

of the practice in the ancient Sacramentaries, or the codices of the *Ordo Romanus*, or in any of the writers on ritual, Alcuin, Amalarius, Walafriid. There is little doubt that the custom of Elevation owes its introduction to the spread of the tenets of Berengarius in A.D. 1050, against which it was regarded as a public protest. It had little or no authoritative sanction before the 13th century. See Smith's *Dict. Christian Antiqq.* i. 606; Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* xv. 5, 4.

¹ The "Black Rubric" or "Declaration of Kneeling" at the close of the Communion Service was introduced into the Second Prayer-Book of 1552, but it was removed from Q. Elizabeth's

Prayer-Book. The wording of it was altered at the Caroline Settlement. On its first appearance it ran thus: "We do declare (i.e. by kneeling) no adoration is intended...unto any real and essential presence there being of Christ's Natural Flesh and Blood." On its re-introduction at the Caroline settlement it was worded, "unto any Corporeal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood." Thus the words "Corporeal Presence" take the place of "real and essential Presence." Procter, *Book of Common Prayer*, pp. 122, 139. "We allow 'Christum in Eucharistia vere præsentem, vere et adorandum'." Bp. Andrewes, *Responsio*, p. 266.

ARTICLE XXIX.

1563.

*De Manducatione Corporis Christi et
impios illud non manducare.*

1571.

*Of the wicked which do not eate the
body of Christe in the use of the
Lordes Supper.*

Impii, et fide viva destituti, licet carnaliter et visibiliter (ut Augustinus loquitur) corporis et sanguinis Christi Sacramentum, dentibus premant, nullo tamen modo Christi participes efficiuntur. Sed potius tantæ rei Sacramentum, seu symbolum, ad iudicium sibi manducant, et bibunt¹.

The wicked, and suche as be voyde of a liuely fayth, although they do carnally and visibly presse with their teeth (as Saint Augustine sayth) the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ: yet in no wyse are they] partakers of Christe, but rather to their condemnation do eate and drinke the signe or Sacrament of so great a thing.

i. **Connection.** After stating in the preceding Article "that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ; and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ," the xxixth Article proceeds to speak of "the Wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith," who yet draw near to this Holy Feast. At a time when it was the great aim of those, who drew up the Articles, to emphasize the idea of Communion, it was natural to fear that people, "who would not part with their sins, would thrust themselves into holy things to their own hurt."

ii. **History.** The xxixth Article was altogether wanting in 1553, and did not appear in the early printed

¹ From the Parker Latin MS. of 1563.

copies of the draft of 1563. It owes its origin to Archbishop Parker, and we may conclude that it was probably composed in 1563¹, but was not absolutely and fully adopted till 1571. In drawing it up, the Archbishop took his statements almost word for word from a passage in S. Augustine's Commentary on the sixth Chapter of S. John's Gospel². But the Benedictine editors³ of that great Father's works deemed portions of the passage to be interpolated, and the fairness of the quotation was called in question by Cecil⁴, Elizabeth's minister, at an interview between him and Parker, and the passage was verified by reference to the treatise, out of which it was taken.

iii. **The Title.** Though the Title forms no part of the Article yet it deserves attention. It is, then, to be observed that it does not say that the wicked "receive not," but that they "eat not" the Body of Christ "in the use of the Lord's Supper." Now the expression "eat not the Body of Christ" is taken from the sixth Chapter of S. John's Gospel, and imports that the wicked eat not in such a way, that they "thereby dwell in Christ and Christ in them," they neither eat nor drink of the Bread and Wine

¹ It is found in the Parker Latin MS. of 1563, and in the Parker English MS. of 1571, also in the Latin edition of 1571, printed by John Day, and published by the Queen's authority.

² In the Latin Parker MS. there is a marginal reference "super Joann. Tract 26," and also in a unique copy of the English Articles of 1571. Hardwick, *Hist. Art.*, p. 315, ed. 1859.

³ The passage, as it runs in S. Augustine, is as follows: "Ac per hoc qui non manet in Christo, et in quo non manet Christus, procul dubio nec manducat (*spiritualiter*) Carnem Ejus, nec bibit Ejus Sanguinem (*licet carnaliter et visibiliter premat dentibus Sacramentum Corporis et San-*

guinis Christi), sed magis tantæ rei Sacramentum ad judicium sibi manducat et bibit." The parts deemed interpolations by the Benedictine edition are enclosed in brackets, and are put in italics. The clauses are found in the Commentaries of Bede and Alcuin on S. John.

⁴ Cecil's gentleness in dealing with the adherents of the Old Learning, whether Romish or Lutheran, is well known. For the letter to Cecil by Bishop Guest, May 1571, which may have occasioned this interview between the Minister and the Archbishop, see *Bishop Guest, Articles xxviii., xxix.*, by the Rev. G. F. Hodges, p. 24, quoted from *the State Papers, Domestic*, Elizabeth, 1571, Vol. lxxv., No. 36.

for any purpose or effect unto which Christ ordained these Elements to be received¹.

iv. **Analysis.** This consideration of the Title prepares us for the Article itself, which states that

- (α) "The Wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ;
- (β) But rather, to their condemnation, do eat and drink the sign or Sacrament of so great a thing."

v. **The Phraseology** here used is very important. It is *not* said that the wicked are not partakers of the Body and Blood of Christ; it *is* said that "in no wise are they partakers of Christ." The expression "partakers of Christ" occurs in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where the writer says, *We are become partakers of Christ*², if we hold fast the *beginning of our confidence firm unto the end* (Heb. iii. 14), and in another place he speaks of *those who were once*

¹ In S. John vi. 50, our Lord says, *This is the Bread, which cometh down out of heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die*; in vi. 51, He says, *If a man eat of this Bread, he shall live for ever*; and in vi. 54, *He that eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood hath eternal life*. R.V. "To eat, therefore, the Body of Christ is used of such eating, whereby a man dwelleth in Christ and Christ in Him; whereby he shall 'live for ever,' whereby he hath eternal life, and liveth by Christ, as Christ liveth by the Father." Pusey, *Real Presence*, p. 255. "Nowhere in Scripture do we hear of an eating and drinking of the true Body and Blood of our Lord which is not profitable. The Body and Blood are of that nature, that they are in the reason of

the case, by the simple fact of being eaten and drunk, beneficial; and no such thing is contemplated as a *real* eating of them, which is not a *beneficial* eating of them also." Professor Mozley, *Lectures and Theol. Papers*, p. 205.

² Μέτοχοι γὰρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ γέγοναμεν. *Participes Christi effecti sumus*. Vulg. "We have been united with Him and so we have been made now to partake in the fulness of His life." S. Chrysostom paraphrases it, *Μετέχομεν αὐτοῦ, φησὶν, ἐν ἐγενόμεθα ἡμεῖς καὶ αὐτός, εἴπερ, αὐτός μὲν κεφαλὴ σώμα δὲ ἡμεῖς, συγκληρονόμοι καὶ σύσσωμοι*. "In eo etiam participamus, quia Corpus et Sanguinem Ejus sumimus ad redemptionem nostram." Primasius, quoted by Bp. Westcott *in loc.*

enlightened and tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost¹ (Heb. vi. 4). To be a partaker of the Holy Ghost is to have a share of Him, Who is the gift of God, shed abroad in the hearts of all those, who are His by the Spirit; it is to be a partaker of Christ Himself. Now the impious and wilfully impenitent, so long as they remain such, are the enemies of the Cross of Christ, they belong to those who are said to crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put Him to an open shame (Heb. vi. 6). Clearly, so long as they remain impenitent and void of a living faith, they are not and cannot be "partakers of Christ." And there was much reason in the times of Archbishop Parker to warn those, who would thrust themselves into holy things, that to approach the Lord's Table in a spirit of unbelief, contempt and disobedience, was to expose themselves to grievous risk; that they might "carnally and visibly press with their teeth the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ²," but could not be "partakers of Christ." They might receive the "Sacramentum;" they could not receive the "Virtus Sacramenti³."

¹ Μερόχους γενηθέντας Πνεύματος ἁγίου. "The compound expression (μερόχους γενηθέντας), as distinguished from μερασχόντας (Heb. ii. 14), marks more than the simple fact of participation (Heb. vii. 13; 1 Cor. x. 17). It brings out the fact of a personal character gained; and that gained in a vital development." Bp. Westcott *in loc.*

² "The spiritual food of our Lord's Body and Blood, cannot be eaten except spiritually...But if it cannot be eaten except spiritually, how does the carnal man supply the spiritual medium and instrumentality of eating? The carnal man has only the natural mouth and teeth to apply; this is all he has; but this is totally irrelevant to spiritual

food." Professor Mozley, *Lectures and Theol. Papers*, p. 205.

³ It is the Virtus Sacramenti which the unworthy and impenitent do not receive. "Aliud est Sacramentum, aliud Virtus Sacramenti. Quam multi de altari accipiunt et moriuntur, et accipiendo moriuntur." S. Aug. *Tract. in Joann.* xxvi. 11. In theological language the word *Sacramentum* has two senses: it may mean (i) the "outward and visible sign," the bare *signum*, (ii) the *signum* together with the *res significata*, not the *Virtus Sacramenti* the "wholesome effect or operation." It is in the second and more comprehensive sense that the word is here used by S. Augustine.

vi. **The Words of S. Paul**, when he found it necessary to correct the disorders that had crept into the Church at Corinth as regards the celebration of the Lord's Supper, support the language of the Article. The Apostle writes, *Whosoever shall eat the Bread or drink¹ the Cup of the Lord unworthily², shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord,.....he that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh judgement unto himself, if³ he discern not the Body⁴* (1 Cor. xi. 27, 29). It is plain from this that the Apostle draws a distinction between a worthy and an unworthy mode of approaching the Blessed Sacrament, between a reverent recognition of the presence of the Lord in this holy Feast, and a profane and irreverent attitude, which fails by its "unhallowed sense⁵" to discern the inward part of the Sacrament. The just inference from the Apostle's words is that there can be no beneficial reception⁶ of the Sacrament by those who persist in living in a state of wilful sin, for to them Christ is present not to bless, but to judge.

¹ ἢ πινῆ "or drink," not "and drink," a translation not only erroneous but detrimental to the significance, of the warning. "Unworthy and irreverent partaking, whether of the one element or the other, involved the guilt of which the Apostle is about to speak,—guilt in regard of the whole blessed Sacrament; hence τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος in the clause that follows. Bp. Ellicott *in loc.*

² "Aliter quam dignum est tanta mysteria tractari." Beza.

³ The participle is here used with a hypothetical or conditional reference. See R. Version. It is μὴ διακρίνων not οὐ διακρίνων.

⁴ "Note these words, 'The Lord's Body.' It is not here said, 'The sign or Sacrament of the Lord's Body, nor the grace or fruit of the Lord's Body, nor the memory of the Lord's Passion, but plainly, 'The Lord's Body,' to teach us that the evil men

of the Church do receive Christ's Body." Bishop Guest's *Letter to Cecil, State Papers*, Elizabeth, 1571. "Corpus enim Domini et sanguis Domini nihilominus erat etiam illis quibus dicebat Apostolus, *Qui manducat indigne, iudicium sibi manducat et bibit.*" S. Aug. *De Baptismo contra Donat.* v. 9.

⁵ Martensen, *Christian Dogmatics*, p. 440, E. T.

⁶ "The thing offered to them is identical with that which is offered to the faithful, but they lack both the will and the power to assimilate it. Honest faith, however rudimentary, and right intention, however weak in practice, may count on receiving the Body of Christ; but the touch of positive unbelief and contempt and disobedience profanes the Sacrament." Mason, *Faith of the Gospel*, pp. 300 sq., ed. 1888.

ARTICLE XXX.

1563.

De Vtraque Specie.

Calix Domini Laicis non est denegandus: utraque enim pars Dominici Sacramenti ex Christi institutione et præcepto, omnibus Christianis ex æquo administrari debet.

1571.

Of both kinds.

The cuppe of the Lorde is not to be denyed to the laye people. For both the partes of the Lordes Sacrament, by Christes ordinance and commaundement, ought to be ministred to all Christian men alike.

i. **The Thirtieth Article**, like the preceding one, was wanting in the series of 1553, but was introduced by Archbishop Parker in the reign of Elizabeth, at the revision in 1563¹.

ii. **Object.** Its object is to vindicate for the laity a right to Communion in Both Kinds, to the Cup as well as to the Bread. The custom which had arisen in the Western Church of administering to the laity only the consecrated Host, while the Priest alone² partook of the Chalice, had given rise to much controversy long before the Reformation. It was indeed the cause of terrible wars, especially in Bohemia, where the people rose in a body and protested desperately against being deprived of a part of the Sacrament, which Christ had intended for all alike.

¹ See above, p. 20. Compare Article x. of the Eleven Articles of 1559, Hardwick, *Hist. Articles*, pp. 128, 396, ed. 1859.

² The Sacerdos *conficiens*, the Priest who consecrates and dispenses. Other Priests present were Sacerdotes *non conficientes*.

iii. **Analysis.** The Article brings out two main points:—

(i) *A statement;*

“The Cup¹ of the Lord is not to be denied to the Lay-people:”

(ii) *A justification of the statement;*

“For both the parts of the Lord’s Sacrament², by Christ’s ordinance and commandment, ought to be ministered to all Christian men alike.”

iv. **The Original Institution.** That the Chalice was intended for the laity may be proved, (i) from the original institution of the Sacrament as recorded in the New Testament, and (ii) from the writings of the early Fathers. In the account of the original institution we are told that the words of our Lord to His Apostles were

Drink ye all of this³;

and that they complied with His command is clear, for we read in the Gospel of S. Mark

And they all drank of it⁴.

Here we might suppose the argument was at an end. It is urged, however, that the Apostles, forming a consecrated body of Priests, might receive the Chalice, and so the command does not apply to the laity. But upon this it is to be observed that even if we assume that the Apostles were at the time all Priests, the account of the original institution is not that our Lord received the

¹ *Calix*, from the Greek κύλιξ, in classical writers denoted a *cup* or *drinking vessel*. In Ecclesiastical writers it is confined specially to the Chalice of the Holy Eucharist.

² With “Calix Domini” and “dominici sacramenti,” comp. 1 Cor. xi.

³ *Κυριακὸν δεῖπνον*, and the phrases Dies Dominica; Oratio Dominica.

⁴ *Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες*, Matt. xxvi.

⁵ See above, p. 332 n.

⁶ *Καὶ ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες*, Mark xiv. 23.

Chalice and none else, but that He received and they received. Thus there is no justification for withholding the Cup not only from the laity, but even from all the Clergy, except the officiating Priest¹.

v. **Apostolic Custom.** If we ask whether, as a matter of fact, the Apostles administered to themselves and their successors in Both Kinds, and to the lay-members of the Church in One Kind only, an answer is ready to hand from the Scriptures of the New Testament. For

- (α) In the Acts we find the members of the Church attending constantly on *the breaking of the bread from house to house*² (Acts ii. 42—46). This is a form of expression which can hardly be understood except as including lay persons;
- (β) Again, it is impossible to understand how the troubles at Corinth could have originated at all, had the chalice been denied to the laity. If they had no right to it at all, how came it to pass that excesses calling for such stern rebuke from S. Paul accompanied the administration³? Why, again, in rebuking them does he not say that they had done wrong in receiving the Species of Wine at all? Would not such have been a simpler and more obvious way of checking these excesses? Again, what force would there have been in his argument about the heathen sacrificial feasts, *Ye cannot drink the Cup of the Lord and the Cup of demons*⁴, except the laity were permitted to drink of the chalice?

¹ See Bp Browne *On the Articles*, p. 735.

² Ἦσαν προσκαρτεροῦντες... τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου, Acts ii. 42, and κλῶντες

κατ' οἶκον ἄρτου, ii. 46.

³ 1 Cor. xi. 17—34.

⁴ 1 Cor. x. 21, Οὐ δύνασθε ποτήριον Κυρίου πίνειν καὶ ποτήριον δαιμονίων.

Unless, therefore, we believe that the Church was mistaken from the very first, it is clear that the Apostolic administration of the Eucharist contemplated the reception of the Species alike of the Bread and of the Wine by all faithful communicants.

vi. **Patristic Testimony.** Thus Apostolic custom is opposed to reception in one kind only. What is the teaching of the Primitive Fathers? It is equally decisive. For

- (α) We find Justin Martyr saying in his *Apology* that "the Deacons gave to everyone that was present of the bread, over which thanks had been offered, *and of wine mixed with water, and that they carried them also to those not present*¹;"
- (β) Again, Cyprian speaks of the deacons as "offering *the Cup* to those present" at the Holy Eucharist without any intimation of a distinction of persons in so doing²;
- (γ) Once more S. Chrysostom in his Commentary on the first Epistle to the Corinthians writes, "whereas under the Old Covenant the Priests ate some things and the laymen others, and it was not lawful for the people to partake of those things of which the Priest partook, it is not so now, but one Body is blessed before all, *and one Cup*³."

¹ Διάκονοι διδδασιν ἐκάστῳ τῶν παρόντων μεταλαβεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐχαριστηθέντος ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος, καὶ τοῖς οὐ παροῦσιν ἀποφέρουσι, Just. Mart. *Apol.* i. cap. lxxv.

² "Solemnibus adimpletis *calicem* diaconus offerre presentibus cœpit." Cyp. *de Lapsis*, p. 189.

³ Καὶ θέμις οὐκ ἦν τῷ λαῷ μετέχειν ὧν μετείχεν ὁ ἱερεὺς, ἀλλ' οὐ νῦν, ἀλλὰ παντὶ ἐν σώμα προκεῖται καὶ ἐν ποτήριον. Hom. xiv. in 1 Cor. For other quotations from S. Chrysostom to the same effect, see Smith's *Dict. Christian Antiqq.*, Art. *Holy Communion*, i. 416.

These quotations, without multiplying others, sufficiently justify, so far as early custom is concerned, a practice which obtained in the Church without question for upwards of twelve centuries, and which the Greek Church still maintains, for she always does and always has communicated her many millions of believers in Both Kinds.

vii. **The Origin** of the practice of communicating in One Kind may be traced to the fear of spilling the Consecrated Wine at the time of administration. This led to the dipping of the Bread into the chalice, as was done in the early Church in communicating the sick, and as is still done in the Greek Church¹, or to the use of a fistula or tube, through which the Consecrated Wine might be drawn. Gradually, however, and especially in the twelfth century, the administration of the chalice began to be forbidden by many Bishops to avoid the risk of irreverence, and of spilling the Sacred Species. The change, however, was not brought about without much opposition, not only from eminent divines, but even from Ecclesiastical Councils. Thus in A.D. 1095 the Council of Clermont decreed that "all, who communicated at the altar, shall receive the Body and Blood of Christ under Both Kinds, if there be no provision to the contrary²." Moreover it is acknowledged by Cardinal Bona, one of the most eminent liturgical writers of the Roman Communion, that "the faithful always and in all places, from the beginning of the Church till the twelfth century, were used to communicate under the Species of Bread and Wine³." Nay, even the Council of

¹ See Article *Fistula* in Smith's *Dict. Christian Antiq.*

² Canon xxviii. Conc. Clermont. The Third Council of Braga, A.D. 675, condemns those who were accustomed "intinctam Eucharistiam populis pro complemento Communions porri-

gere."

³ "There is no gainsaying the 'Drink ye all of it,' especially as interpreted by the practice of twelve centuries." Bp Forbes *on the Articles*, p. 598.

Constance, which first decreed on June 15, 1415, the withholding of the Cup from the laity¹, allows that "Christ Himself administered in Both Kinds to His disciples, and that in the Primitive Church the Sacrament was received in Both Kinds by the people²." The responsibility for introducing so great a change must lie with those who chose to violate a custom, which has on its side a prescription of twelve centuries, and which was never disputed in the primitive ages of the Church³.

¹ "Semper enim et ubique, ab ecclesie primordiis usque ad sæculum duodecimum, sub specie panis et vini communicarunt fideles: cœpitque paulatim ejus sæculi initio usus calicis obsolescere, plerisque episcopis eum populo interdicens ob periculum irreverentiæ et effusionis." Bona, *Rer. Liturg.* ii. 18, n. 1, quoted by Bingham, *Ecc. Antiq.* xv., v. 1.

² Concil. Constant. Sess. xiii.

³ Even Pope Gelasius lays it down

that people "should either partake of the Sacraments in their entirety or be excluded from the entire Sacraments, because the division of one and the same mystery cannot take place without great sacrilege." See Gratian, *Corpus Jur. Can. Decr.* iii. pars; *De Consecr.* dist. ii. c. 12, quoted by Bishop Forbes, 596; Pope Leo the Great pronounces abstinence from the chalice to be a Manichæan heresy. Leo Magn. *Hom.* xli.

ARTICLE XXXI.

1563.

De unica Christi oblatione in Cruce perfecta.

Oblatio Christi semel facta, perfecta est redemptio, propitiatio, et satisfactio pro omnibus peccatis totius mundi, tam originalibus quam actualibus. Neque præter illam unicam est ulla alia pro peccatis expiatio. Vnde missarum sacrificia, quibus uulgo dicebatur, Sacerdotem offerre Christum in remissionem pœnæ aut culpæ pro uiuis et defunctis, blasphema figmenta sunt, et pernitiosæ imposturæ.

1571.

Of the one oblation of Christe finished vppon the Crosse.

The offering of Christ once made, is the perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sinnes of the whole worlde, both originall and actuall, and there is none other satisfaction for sinne, but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said that the Priestes did offer Christe for the quicke and the dead, to haue remission of payne or gylt, were blasphemous fables, and daungerous deceipts.

i. **Title and Connection.** The Latin Title of the Article has been uniform since 1553. The English Title then ran, "Of the perfecte oblacion of Christe made upon the crosse." It forms the conclusion of the Sacramental Articles, which have all been leading up to it¹, and it states what that is, independently of which the Sacraments have no value in themselves.

ii. **Origin.** The Article is derived from the Third Article of the Second Part² of the Augsburg Series of 1530. That Article begins by stating emphatically that

¹ F. D. Maurice *On Art. XXXI.*

² The Second Part of the Augsburg Confession is based on a Series called "the Torgau Articles," drawn up by

certain Lutheran Divines who met the Elector at Torgau early in 1530, in anticipation of the Augsburg Diet. See Hardwick, *Hist. Art.*, p. 22.

the Holy Eucharist, or the Mass, had never been abolished by the Lutherans, but was celebrated by them with the greatest possible reverence, only with some changes of ceremonial, and with the addition of some German Hymns for the instruction of the people¹.

iii. **Object.** The design of the Article is twofold:—

- (a) To urge with all possible emphasis and clearness the uniqueness and completeness of the Sacrifice, which our Blessed Lord offered upon His Cross²;
- (β) To refute a current form of misbelief as to *the repetition* of that offering in "the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said that the Priestes did offer Christe for the quicke and the dead, to haue remission of payne or gylt³."

iv. **Analysis.** This being its object, the Article may be thus analysed:—

- (α) It declares that the offering of Christ once made⁴ is "the perfect redemption, propitiation,

¹ "Falso accusantur ecclesiæ nostræ, quod Missam aboleant, retinetur enim Missa apud nos et summa reuerentia celebratur. Servantur et usitata ceremoniæ fere omnes, præterquam quod Latinis cantionibus admiscetur alicubi Germanicæ, quæ additæ sunt ad docendum populum." *Sylloge Confessionum*, p. 138.

² "If the Sacrifice of the Mass be the same with the Sacrifice of the Cross, we attribute more unto it than yourselves; we place our whole hope of salvation in it. If you understand another Propitiatory Sacrifice distinct from that as this of the Mass seems to be; if you think of any new meritorious Satisfaction to God for the sins of the

world; you must give us leave to renounce your Sacrifice indeed, and to adhere to the Apostle," *By one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified*, Heb. x. 14; Archbp Bramhall, *Works*, vol. i. p. 54.

³ "What the Article speaks of here is not 'the sacrifice of the Mass,' but the habit of trusting to the purchase of Masses when dying, to the neglect of a holy life, or repentance, and the grace of God and His mercy in Christ Jesus, while in health." Pusey, *Eirenicon*, i. pp. 25, 26.

⁴ "There is only one Christ, one offering for sin, one purchase of man's redemption." Bp Forbes, *On the Articles*, p. 618.

and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual”;

- (β) It affirms that besides this One Sacrifice there is “none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone”;
- (γ) It repudiates the idea that the priest repeated this one Sacrifice once made in “the sacrifices of Masses,” so that they could be propitiatory¹ for the quick and the dead.

v. **The First Clause** of the Article is noticeable for the number of words used to set forth the completeness and all-sufficiency of our Lord’s sacrifice of Himself “once made²” on the altar of His Cross. It is described as “the perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins³ of the whole world, both original and actual.”

- (1) **The Perfect Redemption.** The first of these three figures is borrowed from the redemption of a slave, and his deliverance from bondage. The idea of His Sacrifice being a ransom is one which our Lord Himself set forth. *The Son of*

¹ “The Article was directed against the errors of those, who, by rejecting the doctrine of a sacrifice *by way of commemoration and consecration*, and not literally identical with that on the Cross, and by their crude and objectionable mode of expression countenanced the vulgar error, that the sacrifice of the Eucharist or Mass was in every respect equal to that of Christ on the Cross; and that it was in fact either a reiteration or a continuation of that Sacrifice.” Palmer, *Treatise on the Church*, ii. p. 463.

² Or as one MS. has it “once made for ever.”

³ Observe the fulness of the expression “pro omnibus peccatis totius mundi, tam originalibus quam actualibus.” Compare the Augsburg Confession, *De Missa*, “Passio Christi fuit

oblatio et satisfactio, non solum pro culpa originis, sed etiam pro omnibus reliquis peccatis,” and the language of Article II. (above pp. 58, 59), where it is said that Christ came “ut esset hostia, non tantum pro culpa originis, verum etiam pro omnibus actualibus hominum peccatis.” So also in *The Institution of a Christian Man* we read, “Now I may boldly say and believe, as indeed I do perfectly believe, that by His Passion...Christ hath made a sufficient expiation or propitiation towards God, that is to say, a sufficient satisfaction and recompense as well for my original sin, as also for all the actual sins that ever I have committed, and from the everlasting pain due for the same.” *Formularies of Faith, Henry VIII.*, p. 35.

Man, He said, *came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many*¹ (Matt. xx. 28). S. Paul also frequently uses the figure. In one place he says that our Lord *gave Himself a ransom in behalf of all*² (1 Tim. ii. 6); in another he states that He is *our redemption* (1 Cor. i. 30); and in yet another, that in *Him we have our redemption through His Blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses* (Eph. i. 7). For man, having fallen into sin and become *the servant of sin* (John viii. 34), could not redeem himself from its guilt and consequences. He had no ransom, which he could offer to God for his sin. But what he could not pay himself, that of His “tender love towards mankind³” God the Father gave His only-begotten Son to pay for man, and out of the same “tender love” the Son consented to pay it for man, and constituted Himself man’s surety. To undertake this work of unimaginable condescension He Himself “became Man,” and in man’s nature lived a life of perfect

¹ Compare also Mark x. 45, ‘Ο υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθε διακονηθῆναι, ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι, καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν. This and the parallel in S. Matthew are the only two passages where the word *λύτρον* occurs in the Gospels. But several words group themselves round this idea of *λύτρον*, a *ransom*. Thus we have (i) the verb *λυτροῦν*=to *ransom* (Luke xxiv. 21); (ii) the substantive *λυτρωτής*=a *ransomer* or *redeemer* applied to Moses (Acts vii. 35); (iii) *λύτρωσις*=the *act of ransoming* or *redemption* (Luke i. 68; ii. 38), and this is applied in Heb. ix. 12, to the *eternal redemption* wrought out by Christ, *αιωνίαν λύτρωσιν εὐράμενος*.

² Δοῦναι ἑαυτὸν ἀντὶ λύτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων, 1 Tim. ii. 6, and compare 1 Pet. i. 18.

³ “To the Jews of our Lord’s day the idea of a ‘ransom’ was quite familiar, and the Law had regulated ransoms with much minuteness, whether for the redemption of a slave (Lev. xxv. 47—49), the life of the firstborn child (Num. xviii. 16), or the possession of an inheritance (Lev. xxv. 25—27). Ransoms were usually paid in money, but in a certain large class of cases the sacrifice of the life of one creature redeemed another from death (Exod. xiii. 13; xxxiv. 20; Num. xviii. 15).” Dr Dale, *The Atonement*, p. 76.

and absolute obedience to His Father's will, and offered up on the Cross that perfectly unblemished life as an all-sufficient "ransom" for many¹, and so redeemed all mankind alike from the power and from the consequences of sin.

- (2) **The Perfect Propitiation.** The second figure employed is that of a Sin-offering or Propitiation. The Greek word thus translated, ἱλασμός, only occurs in the writings of S. John. *Christ*, says that Apostle, *is the propitiation for our sins*² (1 John iv. 10). The term is specially applicable to our Lord's work upon the Cross, because it is He, Who, as the all-perfect sacrifice, has covered or expiated the sin of the world. The idea is brought out in several passages. Thus, when the Baptist sees our Lord coming up from the scene of His temptation, he exclaims, *Behold, the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world* (John i. 29, 36). When our Lord gives to His Apostles the Cup at the institution of the Holy Eucharist, He says, *This is My Blood of the Covenant, which is shed for many unto remission of sins* (Matt. xxvi. 28). By this He intimated that He was

¹ See the Collect for the Sunday next before Easter. "The freedom of the Father's gift of His blessed Son, and the freedom of the Son's self-oblation, are insisted on in Holy Scripture." Liddon, *University Sermons*, First Series, p. 243.

² Αὐτός ἱλασμός ἐστι περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, 1 John ii. 2; ἱλασμὸν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, 1 John iv. 10. The word ἱλασμός is formed from ἱλεως = *propitious* (Matt. xvi. 22;

Heb. viii. 12), whence come also (i) the verb ἱλάσκειν, which means (a) *to be propitious towards one* (Luke xviii. 13), (b) *to make propitiation for one* (Heb. ii. 17); (ii) the substantive ἱλαστήριον, which denotes (a) *the mercy-seat of the ark*, Χερουβιμ δόξης κατασκιάζοντα τὸ ἱλαστήριον (Heb. ix. 5), (b) *a propitiation*, ὃν προέθετο ὁ Θεὸς ἱλαστήριον διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι (Rom. iii. 25).

about to be a sin-offering, and His Blood was about to be shed for the remission of sins. The oblation He offered was not the arbitrary substitution of one innocent Man for a guilty race¹. He, the Eternal Son of God, Himself became Man, and so, when He suffered upon the Cross, our Nature suffered in Him², for all humanity was not only represented by but gathered up in Him. By the offering up of His sinless Self, *He bare our sins in His own Body on the tree* (1 Pet. ii. 24), and by the transcendent merit of His sacrifice He made expiation for the sins of entire humanity.

- (3) **The Perfect Satisfaction.** The third term employed in the Article is one which is not found in the Greek Testament. Satisfaction, from the Latin *satisfactio*, is a word used in the processes of Roman civil law³, and in Classical Latin denoted the liquidation of a debt, or the offering an apology for some wrong done⁴. Employed first as an ecclesiastical expression

¹ "Our Redeemer cannot be substituted for man; He *is* Man. One thing cannot be put in the stead of another unless it distinctly is another. But our Lord is not another. He has made Himself one with us. He has gathered us up into Himself." Mason, *Faith of the Gospel*, p. 208, Ed. 1889.

² When *He died for all*, then, in the words of S. Paul, *οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον*, *all died* in Him, 2 Cor. v. 15. "Though God is the Author of the Atonement, and without Him fallen humanity would have been unable to offer it, yet it was made by Man, acting in the true conditions of man's nature." *Ibid.* p. 209. "By offering Himself upon the Cross, He maintained, even through death, the fellowship of hu-

manity with God." Westcott, *Incar-nation and Common Life*, p. 377, Ed. 1893.

³ "Satisfactio pro solutione est." Ulpian, *Dig.* xlv. 3. 52.

⁴ Comp. *Cæsar Bell. Gall.* vi. 9, "Cæsar Ubiorum *satisfactionem* accepit"; *Bell. Gall.* i. 41, "Eorum *satisfactione* accepta." See also the first Exhortation in the Communion Service, "And if ye shall perceive your offences to be such as are not only against God, but also against your neighbours; then ye shall reconcile yourselves unto them; being ready to make restitution and *satisfaction*, according to the uttermost of your powers."

by Tertullian, it was afterwards greatly developed by S. Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury¹. He lays it down that either punishment or satisfaction must follow every sin; that man's sin was so great that God alone could pay the debt he owed; therefore One must pay it Who is God and Man. Hence arose the necessity for the Incarnation. But the Incarnation itself was not all. The life of spotless obedience which followed, and the Death, by which that life of obedience was crowned, paid in infinitely superabundant measure the debt, which man owed to the Justice and Holiness of God². Thus "the infinite worth of the Son of God³," dying for man and in man's nature, wrought out a perfect satisfaction for human sin, and availed to do that for man, which he alone and unaided could not have done for himself.

vi. **The Second Clause** of the Article asserts that besides this offering of Christ there can be none other satisfaction for sin. Offered by the Son of God Himself, this Sacrifice stands absolutely alone in the world. It is singular and unique as regards (i) *the Victim*, the spotless Lamb of God; as regards (ii) *the act*, His voluntary sub-

¹ The word "satisfaction" occurs in the Collect for the 4th Sunday in Advent, and in the Communion Office we assert that by His one oblation of Himself once offered our Lord has made "a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and *satisfaction*" for the sins of the whole world.

² "Ipse sponte sustinuit mortem, non per obedientiam deserendi vitam, sed propter obedientiam servandi iustitiam, in qua tam fortiter perseveravit ut inde mortem incurreret." S. Anselm, *Cur Deus Homo*, i. 9.

³ Compare the words of Hooker, "No person was born of the Virgin but the Son of God, no person but the Son of God baptized, the Son of God condemned, the Son of God, and no other person, crucified; which one only point of Christian belief, *the infinite worth of the Son of God*, is the very ground of all things believed concerning life and salvation by that which Christ either did or suffered as Man in our behalf." *Eccles. Pol.* v. 52, 3.

mission to death for man; and as regards (iii) *the result*, the accomplishment by Him of a perfect expiation of all the sins, both original and actual, of entire humanity. This one Sacrifice of the Son of God was offered once for all¹. This is the point, on which the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews insists so strongly, when he says that every priest under the Law *standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, the which can never take away sins*²: but He, when He had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God³ (Heb. x. 11, 12). These words make it clear that the Sacrifice of Christ was efficacious for ever, and through all time, and is incapable of repetition, that once made, it lives on in heaven, and our Ascended Lord pleads it, generation after generation, for each one of our sinful race. It cannot be denied that the language of this passage from the Epistle fully justifies the anxiety manifested in the Article that nothing should seem to overshadow, or interfere with, or supplement the meritoriousness of the One Sacrifice of our Lord upon the Cross, to the merits of which He Himself adds nothing⁴.

¹ It was the *oblato unica*, the offering of Christ *once made, semel facta*, "for all the sins of the whole world, and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone," *neque præter illam unicam est ulla alia*. "What ought to be more certain and known to all Christian people, than that Christ died *once*, and *but once*, for the redemption of the world?" Cranmer, *Answer to Gardiner*, p. 366, sect. 393, Parker Soc.

² *Αίτινες οὐδέποτε δύνανται περιελείν ἁμαρτίας, which are such that they can never take away sin*, Lat. *auferre peccata*. The expressive word *περιελείν* expresses the stripping off the terrible robe of sin, which man has woven round himself.

³ *Οὗτος δὲ μίαν ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν προσενέγκας θυσίαν, εἰς τὸ διηνεκές*, O. L.

una oblata hostia in sempiterno sedit; Vulg. hic autem unam offerens hostiam in sempiternum. "The sacrifice was efficacious for ever, through all time, being appropriated by each believer. The connexion of *εἰς τὸ διηνεκές* with the following *ἐκάθισεν* (*for ever sat down*) is contrary to the usage of the Epistle; it weakens the contrast with *ἔστηκεν*; and it imports a foreign idea into the image of the assumption (*ἐκάθισεν*) of royal dignity by Christ." Bp Westcott *in loc*.

⁴ Hence we can understand the emphasis with which Bullinger says in his *Decades of Sermons*, published in 1550, and dedicated to Edward VI., "Itaque relinquitur jam indubitatum Christum Dominum *plenariam* esse propitiationem, satisfactionem, hostiamque ac victimam pro peccatis (pro

vii. **The Third Clause.** It is natural that having dealt with this point the Article should proceed to treat of "the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt." It is to be noticed that the Latin is not "Missæ sacrificium," "the sacrifice of the Mass," but "Missarum sacrificia," "the sacrifices of Masses." The expression "sacrifices of Masses," generally meant in the language of the sixteenth century "private Masses," which were said for the sake of gain, and were a source of much profit¹. Respecting these "sacrifices of Masses" it is to be noticed that the Article is concerned with what was "commonly said" respecting them. "This," it has been truly observed, "is a strictly historical mode of speaking of what the authors of the Articles knew to have been in force in time past and saw before their eyes²." Now it was commonly held in the sixteenth century that the Body of Christ was once offered upon the Cross for original³ sin, but is continually offered on

pœna, inquam, et pro culpa) totius mundi, et quidem solam. Non est enim in alio quoquam salus." Quoted in Laurence's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 299.

¹ Thus Cranmer contrasts "the many Masses every day," "the daily private Masses," "the selling Masses," with the one common Mass in a day. *Defence of the Catholic Doctrine*, v. 16. "These private Masses," he writes again, "sprang of lucre and gain, when priests found the means to sell Masses to the people, which caused Masses so much to increase, that every day was said an infinite number, and that no priest would receive the Communion at another priest's hand, but every one would receive it alone." Cranmer, *On the Lord's Supper*, p. 353, Parker Soc.

² Newman, *Tract XC.*, p. 62.

³ This view seems to have been first

propounded by Albertus Magnus, who writes, "Secunda causa institutionis hujus Sacramenti est sacrificium Altaris, contra quamdam quotidianam delictorum nostrorum rapinam; ut sicut Corpus Domini nostri semel oblatum est pro delicto originali, sic offeratur jugiter pro nostris quotidianis delictis in altari, et habeat in hoc Ecclesia munus ad placandum sibi Deum, super omnia legis sacramenta vel sacrificia pretiosum et acceptum." *Sermo 1 de Sacramento Eucharistiæ*, Alberti Magni *Opera*, tom. xii., p. 250, quoted in Denny and Lacey's *De Hierarchia Anglicana*, p. 128. So also Ambrosius Catharinus, "inter doctores Tridentinos, eminentissimus," commenting on Heb. x., writes, "Apparet quod pro peccatis sub Novo Testamento post acceptam salutaris hostiæ in baptismo efficaciam commissis, non habemus pro peccato

the altar for *daily sin*, that is, that in the Mass the One Sacrifice is repeated, and that in such a sense the Mass was a propitiatory sacrifice for daily sins¹. It was also held that particular, special, Masses were more profitable to souls than "the one common Mass," and whereas the suffrages of the Church benefited those most, who most deserved to be benefited, those offered specially benefited those most for whom they were performed, specially the Masses, which were offered for departed souls². Thus the idea of a propitiatory sacrifice in the Mass, valid independently of the Sacrifice of the Cross, was accentuated by these private Masses, and they naturally became a potent source of gain to the priests who offered them. This is what the Article distinctly and energetically repudiates. It affirms that it is a "blasphemous fable" to

hostiam illam, quam Christus obtulit pro peccato mundi, et pro delictis baptismum præcedentibus." See *De Hierarchia Anglicana*, p. 130. Bp Jewel quotes Catharinus in his *Defence of the Apology, Works*, Vol. iii., p. 451, Parker Soc. See also the present Bp of Salisbury's pamphlet *De Validitate Ordinum Anglicanorum*, p. 9, Ed. 1894.

¹ For the preaching of this doctrine on the Continent compare the words of Luther, "Cur jam aperte concionentur, pro peccatis post Baptismum commissis Christum non satisfacisse, sed tantum pro culpa originali." *Conciones ad 16 Joann.* Comp. also the Augsburg Confession; "accessit opinio quæ auxit privatas Missas in infinitum, videlicet quod Christus sua passione satisfecerit pro peccato originalis, 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." *Sylloge Confessionum*, p. 139. That similar doctrine was taught in England is clear from Latimer's *Sermons*: "For whereas

Christ, according as the serpent was lifted up in the wilderness, so would He himself be exalted, that thereby as many as trusted in Him should have salvation; but the devil would none of that: they would have us saved by a *daily oblation propitiatory*, by a sacrifice expiatory or remissory." *Sermons*, pp. 72, 73, Parker Soc. And again in a Sermon preached before Convocation in 1536 he speaks of those, "Who preached to the people the Redemption that cometh by Christ's death to serve only them that died before His coming, that were in the time of the Old Testament, and that now since redemption and forgiveness of sins purchased by money and devised by men is of efficacy, and not redemption purchased by Christ." Latimer, *Sermons*, p. 36, ed. Parker Soc.

² Comp. the Augsburg Confession, "Hic cœptum est disputari, utrum una Missa dicta pro pluribus, tantundem valeat, quantum singulæ pro singulis. Hæc disputatio peperit istam infinitam multitudinem Missarum." *Sylloge Confess.*, p. 139.

teach that there is a sacrifice for sin other than the Death of Christ, and that Masses are that sacrifice¹, introducing a second and continually recurrent atonement, or, as Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, expressed it, a "new redemption²." It further affirms that it is a "pernicious imposture" to turn this doctrine into a means of making gain, into a source of emolument for those who celebrate these Masses.

viii. **Conclusion.** Thus the Article lays down with striking emphasis that the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross is "the perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction," "not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men." It affirms that the Eucharistic Sacrifice neither acquires nor possesses anything propitiatory *in itself* independently of that One Sacrifice; that it can only *apply* what was once and for all merited by that Sacrifice³.

¹ "Art. xxxi. rejects the vulgar idea of the priest's offering *Christ* at every celebration for the living and the dead, with a view to the remission of pain or guilt, and in his *repeating* the offering of Christ made once for all (as the first part of the Article declares) every time he offers Christ, and this as again procuring each time the grace of the one offering of Christ." Prof. Friedrich in Jan. No. of *The International Theological Review*, p. 11, 1895.

² Compare a Sermon of his preached on the Festival of S. Peter, 1548. "For when men add unto the Mass an opinion of satisfaction or of a *new redemption*, then do they put it to another use than it was ordained for." See Foxe, *Acts and Monuments*, pp. 772, 773; Dixon, *Hist. of Ch. of England*, iii. p. 264, Ed. 1893. Gardiner could write strongly in 1531 on the all-sufficiency of Christ's sacrifice of Himself: "This is agreed," he says, "and by the Scriptures plainly taught, that the oblation and sacrifice of our Saviour Christ was and

is a perfect work, once consummate in perfection *without necessity of reiteration, as it was never taught to be reiterate*, but a mere blasphemy to presuppose it." See Abp Cranmer's Works, *On the Lord's Supper*, P. S., p. 344. The teaching of the Bishop agrees with the statement agreed to at the Bonn Conference in 1874, "The Eucharistic Celebration in the Church is not a continuous repetition or renewal of the Propitiatory Sacrifice offered once for ever by Christ upon the Cross; but its sacrificial character consists in this, that it is the permanent memorial of it, and a re-presentation and presentation on earth of that One oblation of Christ for the salvation of redeemed mankind, which according to the Epistle to the Hebrews (ix. 11, 12) is continuously presented in heaven by Christ, who now *appears in the presence of God for us*" (ix. 24).

³ The idea condemned in the Article is that of the value of *many* Masses, as separate acts of sacrifice *independent of the Sacrifice of the Cross, the one*

As regards "the sacrifices of Masses" its language is to be understood as referring to the special doctrine which it is opposing¹, and, though strong, is not more strong than that of an Ultra-montanist Bishop of the 14th century, when he says, "Our Church is full and overfull of altars, masses, and sacrifices, and therewith in them that sacrifice it is full of homicides, sacrileges, uncleanness, and simonies, and other wickednesses, excommunications, and irregularities to the very utmost. For to this day so many masses are said for gain, or custom, or complaisance, or to cover wickednesses², or for their own justification, that both amongst priests and people the holy Body of the Lord is now held cheap. Whence also S. Francis willed that the brothers everywhere should be content with one Mass, foreseeing that the brethren would wish to justify them-

only-availing Sacrifice. Hence the force of the second clause, "*Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses...*" The One Sacrifice of our Lord and its all-sufficient merits live on as in our Lord's perpetual presentation of Himself in heaven. So in the Eucharistic Sacrifice "we have nothing apart from that One Sacrifice; our Eucharistic Oblation is not something in and for itself; something independent of that One Sacrifice, even while it pleaded it. Such is its union with that Sacrifice, that it is a perpetual application of its virtue; yet not as something distinct, but united with it through the oneness of that which is offered." Bp Forbes, *On the Articles*, pp. 615, 616. "What we dare not say," writes Bramhall, "is that the Holy Eucharist is a sacrifice propitiatory *in itself*, by its own proper virtue and expiatory efficacy. Whatsoever power it hath, is in relation to the Sacrifice of Christ, as a means ordained to apply that to true believers." Bramhall, *Works*, Vol. v. Oxford 1845.

¹ Compare the language of the Homilies, "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, as the world was made to believe at diriges, at months' minds, in trentalls, in abbeys and chantries." Homily *On Repairing and Keeping Clean of Churches*, p. 277, Cambridge 1850.

² The key to the meaning of "*Mis-sarum Sacrificia*" in the Article is to be found in the principle laid down by Catharinus "pro quotidianis delictis quotidianum sacrificium." "Nos," says Catharinus commenting on Heb. x. 18, "quoniam pro assiduis peccatis, quæ indies committuntur, offerimus sacrificium, nihil prohibet, immo necesse est assidue sacrificare, ac simul assidue litare; ut quæ assidue admittuntur assiduo sacrificio expiantur." *Speculum Hæreticorum*, fo. E iiiii, Cracoviz, 1540, quoted by Denny and Lacey, *Hierarchia Anglicana*, p. 129.

selves by Masses, and reduce them to a matter of gain¹ as we see done at this day²."

¹ "Why must a *solitary* mass, *bought for a piece of money*, performed and participated by a priest alone, in a private corner of a Church, be, not only against the sense of Scripture and the Primitive Church, but also against common sense and grammar, called a Communion, and be accounted useful to him that buys it, though he never himself receive the Sacrament, or but once a year; but for this reason, that there is *great gain*, but no godliness at all, in this doctrine?" Bp Bull's *Sermons, Works*, Vol. i. p. 13, Oxford 1846. "The world was made believe, that by the virtue of so many *masses, which were to be purchased by great endowments*, souls were redeemed out of purgatory, and scenes of visions and apparitions, sometimes of the tormented, sometimes of the delivered souls, were published in the places; which had so wonderful an effect, that in two or three centuries, endowments increased to a vast extent...the practices by which this was managed, and the effects that followed on it, we can call by no other name than downright *impostures*; worse than the making or vending false coin: when the world was drawn in by such arts to plain

bargains to *redeem* their own souls, and the souls of their ancestors and posterity, so many *masses* are to be said, and forfeitures were to follow upon their not being said: thus the *masses were really the price of the lands*," Bp Burnet *On Article XXII.*, p. 251, Oxford 1845.

² "Nostra autem Ecclesia plena et suppleta est altaribus, missis et sacrificiis, sed cum hoc plena in sacrificantibus homicidiis, sacrilegiis et immunditiis, et simoniis, et aliis sceleribus, excommunicationibus et irregularitatibus usque ad summum...Tot enim hodie dicuntur missæ quasi quæstuarie vel consuetudinariæ vel ad complacentiam vel ad scelera cooperienda vel propriam justificationem, quod apud populum vel clerum Sacrosanctum Corpus Domini jam vilescit... Unde et almus Franciscus voluit quod in quocunque loco fratres contenti essent una missa, prospiciens fratres se velle justificare per missas, et ad quæstum eas reducere sicut videmus hodie fieri." Alvarus Pelagius, *De Planctu Ecclesiæ*, ii. 5, quoted by Pusey, *Truth and Office of the English Church*, p. 30. Alvarus Pelagius was a Penitentiary of Pope John XXII.

ARTICLE XXXII.

1563.

De Coniugio Sacerdotum.

Episcopis, Presbyteris et Diaconis, nullo mandato diuino præceptum est, ut aut cœlibatum uoueant, aut à matrimonio abstineant. Licet igitur etiam illis, vt cæteris omnibus Christianis, vbi hoc ad pietatem magis facere iudicauerint, pro suo arbitratu matrimonium contrahere.

1571.

Of the marriage of Priestes.

Byshops, Priestes, and Deacons, are not commaunded by Gods lawe eyther to vowe the estate of single lyfe, or to abstayne from mariage. Therefore it is lawfull also for them, as for all other Christian men, to mary at their owne discretion, as they shall iudge the same to serue better to godlynesse.

i. **Connection.** At first sight it seems a violent transition from the subject treated of in the last Article to the question of the Celibacy of the Clergy. But the transition is not really so violent as it seems¹. The idea that Masses could be offered for the quick and dead for the remission of pain or guilt, went far to sustain the notion that the Priest was to be so far different from other men that family ties were incompatible with his position.

ii. **Title and Language.** Both the Title and Language of the Article have undergone a change. The original Latin title in 1553 was *Cœlibatus ex verbo Dei præcipitur nemini*, or, in English, "The state of single life is commaunded to no man by the worde of God." This was altered in 1563 to "De Coniugio Sacerdotum" "Of the

¹ See F. D. Maurice, *Sermon on the Articles*, Art. XXXII.; Cheetham, *First Six Centuries*, p. 135.

marriage of Priestes." Moreover whereas the Article originally consisted of a single clause containing a negative statement that the state of single life without marriage is not enjoined to be vowed by Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, nor are they by God's law compelled to abstain from Matrimony; this was strengthened in 1563 by the positive additional statement that it is lawful for them, as for all other Christian men, to marry at their own discretion, as it may seem to serve better to godliness¹.

iii. **Early History.** In the earliest and purest ages of the Church the idea of prohibiting Clerical marriage does not seem to have occurred to the minds of the holiest of men. Thus (a) S. Polycarp speaks of Valens, a Priest, and his wife, as though the fact was by no means strange². (b) Eusebius mentions Chæremon, Bishop of Nilus, a man of great age, as flying from the Decian persecution together with his wife³, and tells us how, during the Diocletian persecution, Bishops and Priests were urged to have pity on their wives and children, and for their sakes to offer sacrifice⁴. (c) Before long, however, an exaggerated esteem for celibacy crept into the Church, but it was opposed by Councils and Canons. Thus the Council of Ancyra, A.D. 314, decreed that those, who, at the time of Ordination as Deacons, declared their intention to marry, should be allowed to do so, and to remain in the Ministry, but it forbade the marriage of those, who at the time of Ordination bound themselves by vows of continence⁵. Again, the very important Council of Gangra, A.D. 314, anathematizes those who hold aloof from the ministrations at the Holy Communion of a married Priest⁶. (d) An attempt

¹ Hardwick, *Hist. Articles*, p. 128.

² *Epist. Polyc.*, c. xi.

³ Euseb., *Hist. Eccles.*, vi. c. 42.

⁴ Euseb., *Hist. Eccles.*, viii., c. 9.

⁵ *Concil. Ancyr.*, Can. x.

⁶ *Concil. Gangr.*, Can. iv. A Canon of the Spanish Council of Elvira, A.D. 305, is regarded as the earliest, which enjoined on the clergy to cease cohabitation with their wives.

was indeed made to enforce celibacy on the Clergy at the Council of Nicæa, A.D. 325, but it was frustrated by the firmness of Paphnutius, an eminent Egyptian prelate, himself unmarried, who earnestly protested against putting so heavy a burden on the Clergy, saying it ought to suffice that they should not marry after Ordination, and should not be required to separate from their wives¹.

iv. **Later Developments.** Gradually, however, the spirit which at first exhibited itself only to be condemned in heretical communities², stifled the healthier feeling, and at length the liberty not only of cohabiting with but of having wives was refused, so far as Bishops were concerned, in the East and West alike. In the case of Priests the practice of the two halves of Christendom became more and more divergent. In the East Bishops were required to observe celibacy, but Priests and Deacons might live with their wives. In the West the rule against Clerical marriage grew more and more rigid³, Spain leading the way. But there was a long struggle between the natural feelings of the Clergy and the increasing rigour of Church discipline. In 1074 Gregory VII. held a Council at Rome which condemned the marriage of Priests under the name of concubinage. Two years afterwards Archbishop Lanfranc held a synod of English Bishops at Winchester, which forbade Canons to have wives, and decreed that in future

¹ Socrat. *Hist. Eccles.*, i. c. 11; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.*, i. c. 23; Stanley's *Eastern Church*, Lect. v. 3.

² "The ascetic views of the Essenes, of the Montanists, of the Gnostics, and of other sects external to the Church affected more or less the Church itself." Bp Browne, *On the Articles*, p. 752.

³ Edicts of Innocent I. in the year A.D. 405, and of Leo I. in the year A.D. 443, enjoined the strictest con-

tinence. It was far however from receiving universal obedience. "The great Church of Milan, claiming the authority of its greatest bishop, S. Ambrose, and bearing the repute of having the best clergy in Italy, was content with the ancient rule which permitted only one marriage to a cleric": Cheetham, *First Six Centuries*, p. 351; see also Milman's *Latin Christianity*, Bk. vi., c. 3.

Priests should not marry; while such Priests as lived in the country and were already married, might retain their wives¹. Under Anselm, the successor of Lanfranc, it was finally decreed A.D. 1102 that in England no one should be ordained either Priest, Deacon, or Sub-deacon who did not profess celibacy, and this decree was confirmed by the Council of London, A.D. 1108².

v. **The Teaching of Scripture.** When we ask what is the teaching of Scripture on the subject we notice that in the Old Testament times the Priests were not only allowed, but encouraged to marry (Levit. xxi. 13, 14). Moreover the office even of the High-priest was made hereditary, and he was confined in the choice of a wife to a virgin belonging to his own people (Levit. xxi. 13)³. In the New Testament, whereas, considering the awfulness of His Mission, we might have expected that our Lord would have imitated the example of John the Baptist and inculcated the extremest asceticism, we find that He committed the keys of His Kingdom to S. Peter, who was himself a married man (Mark i. 30), and He was pleased to perform His first miracle at a marriage-feast in Cana of Galilee (John ii. 1—11). In Apostolic times we find S. Paul affirming that what was true of S. Peter was true

¹ Wilkin's *Concil.*, i. p. 367; Gieseler, *Church History*, iii. 205—207, n. 4. "The marriage of the clergy discredited on every hand, was gradually disused, and died away entirely at the middle of the thirteenth century." Hardwick, *Middle Age*, p. 241.

² *Ibid.* p. 387. The Council of Trent in one Canon condemns those who would permit the clergy to marry. Sess. xxiv. *De Sac. Matrimon.* Can. ix.

³ The priests were not so much restricted in their choice as the High-priest. They were only prohibited

from marrying prostitutes and divorced women (Levit. xxi. 7). According to the spirit of the Mosaic economy, marriage was regarded as the indispensable duty of every man, nor was it imagined that it involved any drawback to the attainment of a high degree of holiness. The Essenes were the first to propound any doubts as to the propriety of marriage. Some of them avoided it altogether, others availed themselves of it under special restrictions. Similar views were held by the Therapeutæ.

also of *the other Apostles and the brethren of the Lord*¹ (1 Cor. ix. 5). Further in his Pastoral Epistles he specially directs that *bishops and deacons* should be *the husbands of one wife* (1 Tim. iii. 2, 12; Tit. i. 6), and he lays down special rules concerning the conduct of their wives (1 Tim. iii. 11), and the management of the children and household (1 Tim. iii. 4). Moreover he makes the forbidding to marry a sign of the apostasy of the latter days, and as having its origin in *the hypocrisy of men that speak lies, seared in their own conscience as with a hot iron* (1 Tim. iv. 2, 3), while on the other hand he speaks of marriage as consecrated to "such an excellent mystery, that in it is signified and represented the spiritual marriage and unity betwixt Christ and His Church" (Eph. v. 23—32). Unless, then, we are to suppose that S. Paul was mistaken from the outset, it is clear that he did not consider that estate to be unfit for the Christian Priesthood, which Christ Himself had honoured with the glory of His first miracle².

vi. **Special Passages.** There are, indeed, passages of Scripture which appear to give a preference to the single rather than the married life. Thus after our Lord on one occasion had condemned the too common facility of divorce, and had declared the marriage tie inviolable, the disciples remarked that, this being so, *it was not expedient to marry*³ (Matt. xix. 10). In reply our Lord did not say it was not expedient. He simply remarked that *all men could not receive this saying* (Matt. xix. 11), and abstained from laying down any universal rule. And similarly S. Paul,

¹ "Licebat et Apostolis nubere et uxores circumducere." Tertull. *De Exhort. Castitat.*, c. 8.

² It must of course be remembered that the sacrifice of home made in obedience to Divine vocation, is a very strong recognition of the excellence of home-ties, for it is the essence of sacri-

fice to surrender by dedication what is best.

³ Nothing could more clearly prove the revolution in thought brought to pass by Christ than this. Even the disciples feel that such a principle would make the yoke of marriage unbearable.

while he tells the Corinthians that under certain circumstances it would be good for a man to remain unmarried (1 Cor. vii. 1), yet has no idea of imposing on whole bodies of men that which his Master said all men could not receive. He admits that every man *hath his own gift from God, one after this manner, and another after that* (1 Cor. vii. 7), and declares that he has no desire *to cast a snare on the conscience of any man, or to strain human nature beyond what it can bear* (1 Cor. vii. 35).

vii. **Conclusion.** The proposition, then, that the celibacy of the Priesthood is not commanded by God's Law is absolutely primitive and Catholic. "It has ever been regarded as a matter of pure discipline, varying with the different ages and the divers necessities of the Church¹." The Article claims for the Clergy the same freedom as is allowed the people, the same freedom as was conceded under the Jewish Law. But it by no means regards Clerical marriage as a matter of course. It leaves the ultimate decision to the individual conscience, and the question for each person to solve is whether marriage is likely or not to promote the spiritual life². Our Lord spoke of continence as a Grace given to a few, and it is clear that He would commend those, who embrace voluntarily whatever privation single life involves in order to yield themselves more effectually a living sacrifice to duty and to God³. What the Article plainly demands is that great care and prayerful forethought should be exercised before the married state is entered upon by those in Holy Orders, who are called to be an example unto the flock which "Christ purchased for Himself with His own Blood."

¹ Bp Forbes *On the Articles*, p. 627.

² Whether it will tend in the language of the Article "ad pie-

tatem."

³ See Mason's *Faith of the Gospel*, p. 342. 2nd Ed. 1889.

ARTICLE XXXIII.

1563.

Excommunicati uitandi sunt.

Qui per publicam Ecclesie denuntiationem rite ab unitate ecclesie praeclusus est et excommunicatus, is ab uniuersa fidelium multitudine, donec per poenitentiam publice reconciliatus fuerit, arbitrio Iudicis competentis, habendus est tanquam Ethnicus et Publicanus.

1571.

Of excommunicate persons, howe they are to be auoided.

That person whiche by open denuntiation of the Church, is ryghtly cut of from the vnitie of the Church, and excommunicated, ought to be taken of the whole multitude of the faythfull as an Heathen and Publicane, vntill he be openly reconciled by penance, and receaued into the Church by a iudge that hath auctoritie thereto.

i. **Source and Language.** The Thirty-third Article is based on the Fifth Article of the Augsburg Confession, and in language has undergone no change since the first draft in 1553.

ii. **The Object.** Its object is to settle questions which arose in the xvth century respecting internal discipline, a topic which excited the most vehement disputation in the reign of Edward VI¹. For several sects of disordered spiritualists, setting at naught the letter of Holy Scripture, professed to have reached such a stage of perfection, that they were beyond all need of discipline.

iii. **Analysis.** The question as to the right of the Church to exercise discipline is not raised in the Article. It is assumed, and the only point discussed is the way in which it is to be carried out. It affirms that:—

¹ See Hardwick, *Hist. Articles*, pp. 91, 104.

- (i) He who by open denunciation...is rightly cut off from the unity of the Church and excommunicated, "ought to be regarded by the whole body of the faithful as a heathen man and a publican; and that
- (ii) He is to be, so regarded, until he be openly reconciled by penance and received into the Church by a Judge that hath authority thereunto."

iv. **Jewish Excommunication.** Under the Jewish Law there were three kinds of excommunication:

- (a) One of the simplest description, involving exclusion from the congregation for a period of a month, or, in the event of impenitence, two or three months¹.
- (b) A second, or more severe kind, accompanied with imprecations from Deut. xxviii. and other places of Scripture²:
- (c) The third and heaviest form, involving total expulsion from the Synagogue, and handing over to the power of the Evil One³.

v. **In the New Testament** we find our Lord laying down three courses to be observed in the case of offences. He enjoins that if a brother sin against another, (i) The party, who deems himself offended, is to tell the other privately of the matter which has caused offence; (ii) If this fails, there is to be reprehension before two or three witnesses; (iii) In the event of continued refusal to be

¹ נִדְּוִי *Niddui*. See Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.*, Smith's *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*.

² חֶרֶם *Cherem*. With one under this sentence none might consort, *no, not to eat*. To this S. Paul is sup-

posed to allude in 1 Cor. v. 11.

³ אַנְתְּמָתָא *Shammata*; comp. John ix. 34, καὶ ἐξέβαλον αὐτὸν ἔξω; xii. 42, διὰ τοὺς Φαρισαίους οὐχ ὠμολόγουν, ἵνα μὴ ἀποσυνάγωγοι γένωνται.

reconciled, then the offended party is to tell the matter to the Church, and, if there be still no signs of penitence, the offender is to be no longer regarded as a Christian, but *as a heathen man and a publican* (Matt. xviii. 15—17).

vi. **Apostolic Practice.** In accordance with these regulations we find S. Paul in the case of the incestuous person at Corinth enjoining the members of the Church there to *assemble together in the Name of the Lord Jesus* (1 Cor. v. 4), and while he himself is with them in spirit, to deliver over the offender *to Satan for the destruction of his flesh, that his spirit might be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus* (1 Cor. v. 4, 5). And when the incestuous man repents, the same Apostle enjoins the Corinthians to restore and forgive him, and promises that whosoever they forgive he will forgive also (2 Cor. ii. 5—11). Again, he threatens to enquire judicially into the case of certain persons in the same Church, and to *deal sharply with them according to the power which the Lord had given him* (2 Cor. xiii. 10). Thus also he informs Timothy that he had himself excommunicated Hymenæus and Alexander (1 Tim. i. 20), and he gives directions to him and to Titus how they are to judge, rebuke, and reject wherever necessary (1 Tim. v. 19—21; Tit. iii. 10, 11).

vii. **Christian Excommunication.** That the example of S. Paul should be followed in the early Church was only natural, and we find that, as amongst the Jews, the exercise of discipline was carried out on a graduated scale: (a) The more lenient form consisted of separation from the Holy Eucharist and from the prayers of the faithful, but it did not exclude the offender wholly from the Church; (b) an intermediate form excluded the offender for a longer period than the first; (c) the great Excommunication, called "Anathema," involved a total

exclusion from all Church communion and from all Christian privileges¹. The Judge or Officer, who was empowered by the early Church to impose and remove² the penalties of Excommunication was the Bishop. But during the Middle Ages this power was claimed almost exclusively for the Popes, and in their hands acquired a new and terrible meaning. Of this we have prominent examples in the Excommunication of the Emperor Henry IV. by Pope Gregory VII., and the Interdict, under which all England was laid in the reign of John by Pope Innocent III.

viii. **The Reformers** generally recognised the power of Excommunication, as is proved by the statement contained in the Augsburg and Saxon Confessions. Calvin was a very strict asserter of this authority on the part of the Church, and divided it into (1) private monition, (2) reprehension before witnesses, (3) exclusion from the Holy Communion, humiliation before God, and open confession before the Church³. In our own Church we have in the Communion Service the recitation of the doom of wilful sinners as contained in Deut. xxviii. 11—26⁴, and the Rubric before the Holy Communion directs the Priest to repel notorious and evil livers from participation in that Holy Feast, provided that he at once acquaints the Bishop of the fact of his so doing. The Excommunication contemplated in the Article is that known as "the greater Excommunication." It can never be inflicted except by a Judge in a properly constituted Ecclesiastical court, and

¹ See Bingham, *Eccles. Antiq.*, Bk. xvi., Ch. ii. 7, 8; and Smith's *Dict. of Christian Antiquities*.

² For the form observed at such a solemn anathema, see the office in the Sarum Pontifical, Maskell, *Mon. Rit. Eccles. Angl.* II. clxv.

³ Calvin, *Instit.* iv. xii. 2. This

Reformer exempted no one, not even the sovereign, from such censures, and he quotes the case of Theodosius excommunicated by S. Ambrose as a precedent for rigour in all cases.

⁴ For the recitation of these dooms in the time of Joshua see Josh. viii. 33—35.

ARTICLE XXXIII.

this is implied by the words "rightly cut off," that is in a formal and regular manner, and even now the power of these courts to excommunicate, and even to order penance for living in incest, adultery, or fornication has not been entirely taken away¹.

¹ The extent to which it still remains is substantially defined by the Act 53 George III. c. 127. See Hook's

Church Dictionary, p. 339, new edition, 1887, and Phillimore's *Eccles. Law*, p. 1375.

ARTICLE XXXIV.

1563.

Traditiones Ecclesiasticae.

Traditiones atque cæremonias easdem, non omnino necessarium est esse ubique aut prorsus consimiles. Nam et uariæ semper fuerunt, et mutari possunt, pro regionum, temporum, et morum diuersitate, modo nihil contra uerbum Dei instituat.

Traditiones et cæremonias ecclesiasticas quæ cum uerbo Dei non pugnant, et sunt auctoritate publica institutæ atque probatæ, quisquis priuato consilio uolens et datâ operâ publicè uiolauerit, is, ut qui peccat in publicum ordinem ecclesiæ, qui quæ lædit auctoritatem Magistratus, et qui infirmorum fratrum conscientias uulnerat, publicè, ut cæteri timeant, arguendus est.

Quælibet ecclesia particularis, siue nationalis, auctoritatem habet instituendi, mutandi, aut abrogandi cæremonias aut ritus Ecclesiasticos, humana tantum auctoritate institutos, modò omnia ad ædificationem fiant.

i. **Origin.** The Thirty-fourth Article is derived from the Fifth of the Thirteen Articles of 1538¹, which contains many of the expressions incorporated in the former.

¹ "*Traditiones uero et ritus atque cæremonia, quæ uel ad decorem uel ordinem uel disciplinam Ecclesiæ ab hominibus sunt institutæ, non omnino necesse est ut eadem sint ubique aut*

1571.

Of the traditions of the Church.

It is not necessarie that traditions and ceremonies be in al places one, or vtterly like, for at all times they haue ben diuerse, and may be chaunged accordyng to the diuersitie of countreys, times, and mens maners, so that nothing be ordeyned against Gods worde. Whosoever through his priuate iudgement, wyllyngly and purposely doth openly breake the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnaunt to the worde of God, and be ordeyned and approued by common auctoritie, ought to be rebuked openly, (that other may feare to do the lyke) as he that offendeth agaynst the Common order of the Church, and hurteth the auctoritie of the Magistrate, and woundeth the consciences of the weak brethren.

Euery particuler or nationall Church, hath auctoritie to ordaine, change, and abolishe ceremonies or rites of the Church ordeyned onely by mans auctoritie, so that all thinges be done to edifying.

prorsus similes. Hæ enim et uariæ fuere, et variari possunt pro regionum et morum diuersitate, ubi decus, ordo, et utilitas Ecclesiæ uidebuntur postulare." Art. v. de Ecclesia. The follow-

ii. **Language.** As originally drafted in 1553 it consisted of only two clauses, the present first and second. The third clause was not added till 1563, after the Council of Trent had so far sought to annihilate the distinction of National Churches, as to introduce a uniformity, not only of doctrine, but also of ceremonial and of discipline throughout the West¹.

iii. **Object.** While, then, it asserts in opposition to the teaching of the Anabaptists that (1) Church traditions², ceremonies, rites and customs ought not to be violated at the impulse of man's private judgment, and that (2) private persons are not justified of their own will in breaking the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, so long as they are not repugnant to God's Word³, it stoutly affirms that

ing paragraph is written on a loose slip of paper, as if subsequently added: 'Hæ enim et uariæ fuere, et variari possunt pro regionum et morum diuersitate, ubi decus decensque ordo principibus rectoribusque regionum uidebuntur postulare; ita tamen ut nihil uarietur aut instituat contra uerbum Dei manifestum.' Hardwick, *Hist. of Articles*, Appendix II. p. 264.

¹ The question of "the indeterminate and ever-widening authority which the Popes asserted over the kingdoms and Churches of the West" had been submitted to the judgment of Western Christendom so early as the Council of Pisa in 1409. The national and conciliar or anti-Papal view had been boldly urged by such great Gallicans as Gerson and Peter d'Ailly, and it is interesting to note the strength of their position in the fact that at the Council of Constance in 1414 the votes of those present were given by nations and not individually; but at the Council of Basel in 1437 the position was reversed, "its method of procedure ran counter to the new direction which had been communicated to European federacy by the action of the

Constance congress," and thus the way was paved for the final triumph of Pontifical Absolutism at the conclusion of the Council of Trent in 1563. Compare Symonds, *Renaissance in Italy, The Catholic Reaction*, Pt. I. pp. 98 sqq.

² "The word 'tradition' in the sense in which the Article means it to be taken, is synonymous with the term 'consuetudo,' meaning such a custom as is produced by the simultaneous and frequent action of the greater part of a community." Bp. Forbes, *On the Articles*, p. 670. Compare the answer of Gregory the Great to the second Interrogation of S. Augustine, "Ex singulis ergo quibusque Ecclesiis, quæ pia, quæ religiosa, quæ recta sunt elige, et hæc quasi in fasciculum collecta apud Anglorum mentes in consuetudinem deponere." Bede *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 27.

³ "That paramount authority of Holy Scripture, which is so remarkable a characteristic of the Thirty-nine Articles, and which the Church of England inherited from the great teachers of the Middle Ages, supplies the limit to the diversity of the traditions of the

(3) every particular or National Church has authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority, provided only that all things be done to edifying.

iv. **The Teaching of Scripture** does not supply us with much reliable information for or against the first of these three statements. S. Paul lays it down as a general rule that *all things should be done unto edifying* (I Cor. xiv. 26), and that in church *everything should be done decently and in order* (I Cor. xiv. 40). These directions of the Apostle leave much liberty in the ordaining of the ceremonies and services of the Church.

v. **The Teaching of Church History** makes it plain that the different Churches, though wonderfully concordant in doctrine and Apostolical government, yet exhibited great variety in discipline and ritual. Thus

(a) The Eastern and Western Churches differed as regards the time of keeping Easter. The Western Churches keeping it as we keep it now, so that it always falls on a Sunday, while the Churches of Asia commemorated the Crucifixion on the fourteenth day of the month Nisan, after the manner of the Jewish Passover, on whatever day of the week it might fall, and the Resurrection on the sixteenth¹.

(β) The Church of Rome differed from the Church of Africa on the important question of the

Church." Bp. Forbes, *On the Articles*, p. 672. The limitations to the influence of such consuetudo is suggested by Cyprian's attitude towards Pope Stephen in respect of the re-baptism of heretics: "Proinde frustra quidem qui ratione vincuntur *consuetudinem* nobis opponunt; quasi *consuetudo* major sit veritate, aut id sit in spiritu-

alibus sequendum quod in melius fuerit a Sancto Spiritu revelatum." Cypr. *de Hæret. Baptiz.*, Ep. lxxiii.

¹ See the *Chronicon Paschale*, i. pp. 12—14, ed. Dindorf; Kentz, *Handbuch*, i. 243 ff. For the visit of S. Polycarp of Smyrna to Anicetus, Bishop of Rome, on the subject see Eusebius *H. E.* iv. 14. v. 24, § 16.

re-baptism of heretics. While Cyprian and the African Bishops maintained that those who had been baptized by heretics ought to be re-baptized¹, Pope Stephen and the Roman Church maintained that such Baptism was valid, and therefore could not be repeated².

(γ) Again, Churches differed as to the mode in which the Jewish Sabbath ought to be treated, some observing the Lord's Day only, others the Saturday and Jewish Sabbath also; some were wont to fast on Friday, the day of our Lord's Crucifixion, others on Friday and Saturday also, as the day on which the Lord lay in the grave³.

(δ) Once more, each Bishop was allowed to frame his own Liturgy⁴, and hence we have the Liturgies of Antioch, Alexandria, Constantinople, Rome, Gaul, and Spain, in which while certain characteristics remain constant,

¹ "The same view was held in Asia Minor, Alexandria, and many other Eastern Churches, and was sanctioned by a series of provincial Synods at Carthage, Iconium, and Synnada." Cheetham's *First Six Centuries*, p. 153.

² For Stephen's keen opposition to Cyprian on the point see Fermilian's letter to Cyprian, Cyp. *Epist.* 75, c. 28. The contest was an obstinate one and outlived both the principal combatants. Gradually the Roman practice prevailed, and was sanctioned at the Synod of Arles in the year 314. Hardouin's *Conc.*, i. 265.

³ Especially those of the Patriarchate of Antioch. There was a marked difference in manner between those who did observe the Saturday. In the East it was customary to observe it as a Festival, in the West as a

Fast. "Alii, sicut maxime populi Orientis, propter requiem significandam mallent relaxare jejunium, alii propter humilitatem mortis Domini jejunare, sicut Romana et nonnullæ Occidentis Ecclesiæ." S. Aug. *ad Casulam*, Ep. xxxvi.; cf. Bingham *Antiqq.* xx. (3) 5, 6.

⁴ Hence we have the statement of S. Augustine respecting the custom of S. Ambrose: "Cum Romam venio, jejuno Sabbato; cum hic sum, non jejuno. Sic enim tu, ad quam forte Ecclesiam veneris, ejus morem serva, si cuiquam non vis esse scandalo, nec quemquam tibi." S. Aug. *Ad Inquisitiones Januar.* i. Ep. liv. On the variety of customs in different Churches see Sozomen, *Ecc. Hist.* vii. c. 19,

there are many differences of detail and of arrangement¹.

Thus the action of the Holy Ghost within the Church of Christ illumines the minds of the different nations without destroying their national characteristics, and therefore we cannot be surprised to find many marked peculiarities in the services and ceremonies of the different Churches throughout the world. Forms of devotion and edifying rites will be ever profoundly modified by climate, by the history of thought, and by the degree of civilisation that may have been attained². Absolute uniformity of ritual and worship is not desirable. It may be gained, but it will be at the expense of customs, to which tradition imparts a peculiar value, and of that sense of largeness and freedom, which is so important an element, and so conducive to the health and proper action of the Body of Christ³.

vi. **The Second Clause** of the Article contains a caution against those persons, who, of their private judgment, wantonly break or neglect the traditions of the Church. For by such infringement (i) they "offend against the common order of the Church;" (ii) they "hurt the authority of the magistrate⁴;" (iii) they "wound the consciences of the weak⁵ brethren."

¹ See Archdeacon Cheetham's *First Six Centuries*, p. 380.

² Bp Forbes, *On the Articles*, p. 672.

³ For the moral bearing of the question comp. S. Aug. *ad Casulam*, Ep. xxxvi. "In his enim rebus de quibus nihil certi statuit Scriptura divina, mos populi Dei, vel instituta majorum pro lege tenenda sunt. De quibus si disputare voluerimus, et ex aliorum consuetudine alios improbare, orietur interminata luctatio, quæ labore sermocinationis, quum certa documenta nulla veritatis insinuet, utique cavendum est ne tempestate contentionis serenitatem caritatis ob-

nubilet."

⁴ The authority of the Church in these matters is placed first; and then the injury done to the authority of the magistrate. "For since, according to ancient custom, the magistrate gave a civil sanction to customs or 'the common order of the Church,' then, to infringe that, to which he had lent this sanction, was to lower his authority also. The wont of giving such civil sanction to the laws of the Church dates back to the earliest times of the converted Empire." See Bp Forbes, *On the Articles*, pp. 676—679.

⁵ "In Rom. xiv. 1 sqq., the ἀσθενής

vii. **The authority of Scripture** is strong against those who do this. Thus

- (α) Our Lord enjoined His disciples to obey the Pharisees, because they *sat in Moses' seat*¹ (Matt. xxiii. 2).
- (β) The Apostles in all things not unlawful adhered to Jewish observances and followed the customs of their own nation even after the Church of Christ had been established² (Acts ii. 46; xxi. 20, 26), and S. Paul specially exhorts his Thessalonian converts *to withdraw themselves from every brother that walked disorderly*³ (2 Thess. iii. 6), and while he bids the Christians of Rome *mark those who caused the divisions and occasions of stumbling contrary to the doctrine which they learned* (Rom. xvi. 17), he enjoins all to obey their spiritual rulers, and to submit themselves to them⁴.

viii. **National Churches.** The Article concludes with a vigorous assertion of the independence of National Churches. Obviously this independence in no way affects

contemplated by S. Paul is the man who has his own private rule, probably of Essenic origin, relative to the use of meats and the observance of days; he is free to frame and use such a rule, but not free to regard it as of universal obligation; the δυνατός on the other hand, who binds himself by no such rule, is not free to treat the ἀσθενής with contempt." Comp. Liddon, *in loc.*

¹ Ἐπὶ τῆς Μωυσέως καθέδρας ἐκάθισαν οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι πάντα οὖν ὅσα ἂν ἐπιωσω ὑμῖν ποιήσατε καὶ τηρεῖτε. Observe the tenses; ποιήσατε="do the special act enjoined"; τηρεῖτε="continue to observe."

² "God had not yet abolished the

synagogue; the Sanhedrin still asserted a rightful jurisdiction over the Jewish Church, and the believers submitted to it on all points but one, where they must obey God rather than man." Dollinger, *First Age of the Church*, pp. 72, 73.

³ Στέλλεσθαι ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ παντὸς ἀδελφοῦ ἀτάκτως περιπατοῦντος. 2 Thess. iii. 6. The literal meaning is *to take in your sails* (στέλλεσθαι τὰ ἱστία) so as to steer clear of a rock or reef. Here *to part company with, decline from, and avoid* a brother who walked disorderly.

⁴ Comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 16; 1 Thess. v. 12; Heb. xiii. 17.

the Faith. The Faith is one everywhere, and at all times. What the Article claims is only that "every particular or National Church¹ hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites ordained only by man's authority." Even under the Empire National Churches, like those of Africa, Spain, and Gaul, used each their own code, and were marked by variations of practice in things non-essential². And if this was so, much more is variation permissible in reference to inferior matters, such as discipline, ceremonies, and whatsoever tends to the edification of each local Church. This principle was fully admitted by Gregory the Great³, when he bade S. Augustine of Canterbury carefully select whatever he found in the Church of Rome, or Gaul, or in any Church whatever that was likely to please Almighty God, and introduce it into the Church of England, then new in the Faith, remembering that we must love not things for places, but places for things⁴. This direction of the great Bishop is in harmony with the position taken up in the present Article.

¹ See Bp Forbes, *On the Articles*, p. 684.

² Compare the Sixth Canon of the Council of Nicæa in reference to such a national independence in things non-essential, τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθνη κρατεῖτω, τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ Λιβύῃ καὶ Πενταπόλει, ὥστε τὰ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπίσκοπον πάντων τούτων ἔχει τὴν ἐξουσίαν, ἐπειδὴ καὶ ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπίσκοπῳ τοῦτο σύνηθές ἐστιν ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις ἐπαρχίαις, τὰ πρεσβεία σώζεσθαι ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις.

³ See Bede *Eccl. Hist.* i. 27. "Mihi placet, sive in Romana, sive in Galliarum, seu in qualibet ecclesia, aliquid invenisti quod plus omnipotenti Deo possit placere, sollicite eligas, et in Anglorum Ecclesia, quæ adhuc ad

fidem nova est, institutione præcipua, quæ de multis Ecclesiis colligere potuisti, infundas. Non enim pro locis res, sed pro bonis rebus loca amanda sunt."

⁴ At the Council of Florence, a Canon was made in the exact sense of this very Article, that everyone should observe the rites and customs of his own Church, which it is not lawful for anyone to change by his private authority. For the national character of our branch of the Church Catholic as "founded in the estate of prelacy within the realm of England," see Earl Selborne's *Defence*, pp. 9, 10; Aubrey Moore's *History of the Reformation*, pp. 35, 40.

GROUP V.

ARTICLES XXXV.—XXXIX.

The Articles in this group deal with certain points affecting the Church and the Realm of England.

- (a) They treat of the two Books of Homilies put forth in the Sixteenth Century (Art. XXXV.), and defend the Anglican Ordinal as containing all things really necessary to valid Ordination (Art. XXXVI.);
- (β) They define the limits of the Royal Supremacy, and assert its right to be free from all foreign jurisdiction (Art. XXXVII.);
- (γ) Lastly they touch on certain points put forward by the Anabaptists respecting capital punishment and the lawfulness of war (Art. XXXVII.), community of goods (Art. XXXVIII.), and the right of a Christian man to take an oath in a Court of Justice (Art. XXXIX.).

ARTICLE XXXV.

1563.

De Homiliis.

[Tomus secundus Homiliarum, quarum singulos titulos huic Articulo subiunximus, continet piam et salutarem doctrinam, et hijs temporibus necessariam, non minus quam prior Tomus Homiliarum quæ editæ sunt tempore Edwardi sexti. Itaque eas in ecclesijs per ministros diligenter et clarè, ut à populo intelligi possint, recitandas esse iudicamus.]

Catalogus Homiliarum.

De recto ecclesiæ usu.
 Aduersus Idololatriæ pericula.
 De reparandis ac purgandis ecclesijs.
 De bonis operibus.
 De ieiunio.
 In gulæ atque ebrietatis uitia.
 In nimis sumptuosos uestium apparatus.
 De oratione siue precatone.
 De loco et tempore orationi destinatis.
 De publicis precibus ac Sacramentis, idiomate uulgarî omnibusque noto, habendis.
 De sacrosancta uerbi divini autoritate.
 De eleemosina.
 De Christi natiuitate.
 De dominica passione.
 De resurrectione Domini.
 De digna corporis et sanguinis dominici in cœna Domini participatione.
 De donis spiritus sancti.
 In diebus, qui uulgo Rogationum dicti sunt, concio.
 De matrimonij statu.
 De otio seu socordia.
 De pœnitentia.

1571.

Of Homilies.

The seconde booke of Homilies, the seuerall titles whereof we haue ioyned vnder this article, doth conteyne a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessarie for these tymes, as doth the former booke of Homilies, whiche were set foorth in the time of Edwarde the sixt: and therefore we iudge them to be read in Churches by the Ministers diligently, and distinctly, that they may be vnderstanded of the people.

Of the names of the Homilies.

- 1 Of the right vse of the Church.
- 2 Agaynst perill of Idolatrie.
- 3 Of repaying and keping cleane of Churches.
- 4 Of good workes, first of fastyng.
- 5 Agaynst gluttony and drunkenesse.
- 6 Against excesse of apparell.
- 7 Of prayer.
- 8 Of the place and time of prayer.
- 9 That common prayers and Sacramentes ought to be ministred in a knowen tongue.
- 10 Of the reuerente estimation of Gods worde.
- 11 Of almes doing.
- 12 Of the Natiuitie of Christe.
- 13 Of the passion of Christe.
- 14 Of the resurrection of Christe.
- 15 Of the worthie receauing of the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christe.
- 16 Of the gyftes of the holy ghost.
- 17 For the Rogation dayes.
- 18 Of the state of Matrimonie.
- 19 Of repentaunce.
- 20 Agaynst Idlenesse.
- 21 Agaynst rebellion.

i. **The Title** of this Article was originally *Homiliæ*, "Homilies," and in 1571, *De Homiliis*, "Of Homilies." In 1563 the statement about the Homilies, without the Title, was appended to the preceding Article on Ecclesiastical Traditions. The *Catalogus Homiliarum*, so entitled, constituted the next Article, Art. XXXIV. of that year. In 1571 the Title *De Homiliis* and the text subjoined were introduced as an independent Article by Archbishop Parker.

ii. **The Word Homily**¹ denotes (1) a familiar or colloquial discourse², (2) an inartificial, popular address delivered to a congregation³. From the beginning of the Church's activity the preaching of Sermons and Homilies formed a very important department of its teaching office, and mainly took the form of comments on the Divine Scriptures, and expositions of large consecutive passages. These expositions and "teachings"⁴ lived on during the

¹ The substantive 'ὁμιλία occurs in 1 Cor. xv. 33, φθείρουσιν ἢθη χροῖσθ' ὁμιλίας κακάι. Here the word is used in the sense of "evil company," "Evil company doth corrupt good manners." The verb from which it is formed occurs more frequently in the New Testament. Thus in S. Luke xxiv. 14 we are told of the two journeying to Emmaus that *they communed* (ὁμιλοῦν) *with each other of all those things which had happened*; and in Acts xx. 11 we find S. Paul at Troas *talking* to those assembled (ὁμιλήσας) *a long while, even till break of day*; and it is said on another occasion that Felix *communed with Paul* (ὁμιλεῖ) Acts xxiv. 25.

² In Xenophon *Mem.* i. ii. 6 and 15 the word ὁμιλία is used for the instruction which a philosopher gave his pupils in familiar conversation.

³ The word did not pass into common use in this sense in Latin before the fifth century. Victor Vitensis towards the end of that century speaks of Augustine's popular addresses, "quos

Græci *homilias* vocant," as if 'homilia' were still somewhat strange to his Latin readers. Smith's *Dict. Christian Antiqq.* i. 781.

⁴ The most primitive types of Homilies are perhaps the discourses which accompanied the celebration of the Holy Eucharist (Acts xx. 7 *sqq.*). To these Justin Martyr refers as follows: *εἶτα πανσαμένου τοῦ ἀναγιώσκοντος ὁ προεστὼς διὰ λόγου τὴν νοουθεσίαν καὶ πρὸς κλησὼν τῆς τῶν καλῶν τούτων μμῆσεως ποιεῖται*, Apol. i. 67. Another instance is the instruction, which was delivered to the Catechumens at the Traditio Symboli, and of this S. Augustine's *Sermo ad Catechumenos* is a specimen. This instruction in subsequent times assumed a fixed form, and was termed in the Latin Church *Prefatio Symboli*. Exhortations from the Holy Scriptures form a great part of the writings of S. Cyril of Jerusalem, S. Chrysostom, S. Gregory of Nyssa, S. Gregory Nazianzen, and S. Basil in the East, of S. Ambrose, S. Augustine,

Middle Ages¹, and the habit of preaching varied with the fervour or languor of the Church. In the East it gradually died out, and at present hardly forms any part of the public worship of the Church. In the West it never entirely ceased even in the worst of times. Preaching at the time of the Reformation had greatly deteriorated. The practice had almost been abandoned by the parochial Clergy and left to the Friars. The Reformers, before the actual breach with Rome, had already begun to use this weapon for their own purposes, and when the breach had taken place, they saw plainly its great importance².

iii. **The First Book of Homilies** was the first book pertaining to the teaching of the Church of England which was put forth in the reign of Edward VI. Of the Twelve Homilies which it contained three at least, including that *Of the Salvation of all Mankind, Of the true and lively Faith, and the Exhortation to the reading and knowledge of the Holy Scripture*, appear to have been written by Cranmer himself, while those *Of the Misery of all Mankind and Of Christian Love and Charity* were the work of Bishop Bonner and his Chaplain³. Nine editions of this book were printed before the end of 1547, but they were

and S. Leo in the West. Bede's *Homilia de Tempore* were much used by those who were unable or unwilling to compose sermons. Charles the Great commissioned Paul Warnefrid to draw up a collection of Homilies from the Fathers. In A.D. 813 the Council of Rheims enjoined the Bishops to preach Sermons of the Fathers in the dialect of their several dioceses. The Collection of Ælfric was probably the successor of various other collections of English Homilies, some of which may have existed before the time of Charles the Great. See Smith's *Dict. Christian Antiq.* ii. p. 782.

¹ During the Middle Ages the

Sermons of S. Bernard, of eminent preachers belonging to the Dominican Order, of Savonarola, of S. Anthony of Padua exerted a great effect. For the names of authors of mediæval Sermons which were deemed most worthy of preservation after the invention of printing, see Bp Forbes *On the Articles*, p. 692.

² *Postils on the Epistles and Gospels* were, with Cranmer's sanction, edited and in part composed by Richard Taverner, Clerk of the Signet to Henry VIIIth, as early as 1540.

³ Hardwick's *History of the Reformation*, p. 211, n. 5.

received with scant favour. If the Priest disliked both them and the "Men of the New Learning," from whom they emanated, he read them unintelligibly. If the people objected to them, there was such talking and babbling in church, that not a word could be heard¹.

iv. **The Second Book of Homilies.** It was intended during the reign of Edward VIth to put out a fresh Book of Homilies, but this was prevented by his death and the accession of Queen Mary². When Elizabeth came to the throne, a second Book of Homilies was drawn up, and together with the Thirty-Nine Articles was submitted to Convocation in 1562. The queen took some time to consider them and they were not in the hands of the public till Aug. 1, 1563. These new Homilies, twenty in number, were, it is supposed, to a great extent the work of Bishop Jewel. But their authorship has not in every case been ascertained, and a considerable portion of the material, out of which the book was framed, is traceable to foreign sources³.

v. **Their Reception.** At first, as we have seen, it was necessary to enjoin the Clergy to read the Homilies distinctly, on account of the general dislike of the innovations they contained. In the course of time, however, the tone of feeling changed, and the Puritans were the chief

¹ Hence the necessity for the words of the Article, "eas in Ecclesiis per ministros diligenter et clarè, ut à populo intelligi possint recitandas esse judicavimus."

² Bonner, however, published some Homilies in Mary's reign.

³ Hardwick's *History of the Reformation*, p. 249, n. 4. Of Homily x., on "Certain Passages in Scripture," a few sentences were taken from a tract of Erasmus; Homily xi. "Of Almsdeeds" is greatly drawn from

S. Cyprian; Hom. xviii. "Of Matrimony, is derived half from Veit Dietricke of Nuremberg, and half from S. Chrysostom; Hom. xix. "Of Repentance," is translated to a great extent from Rudolph Gualther. The xxist "Against Rebellion" was added on the occasion of the rising in the North of England instigated with a view of restoring the Roman obedience by the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland.

party who disliked them¹, on the ground that nothing uninspired ought to be read in church. The Homilies were now enjoined to be read by way of stifling "the prophesyings²," and for this reason were appealed to by James I., who directed their use³. There is little danger in these days of the Homilies being esteemed by the people as of like authority with Holy Scripture, and the objection to them on this ground would equally apply to the use of Sermons and Hymns as part of public worship.

vi. **Their Authority.** The measure of the authority of the Homilies has been diversely estimated. While some would hardly attach to them any real value, others would elevate them almost to the position of a standard of doctrine. Their value is sufficiently expressed in the words of the Article itself, when it says that they "contain a godly and wholesome doctrine," necessary for the times in which they were drawn up. We are not required to express approval of every statement which occurs in them. The assent we are called upon to give to them is general,

¹ Hardwick *On the Articles*, p. 205; *History of the Reformation*, p. 232. Many of the exiles during the reign of Mary, unaccustomed for some years to such services as those of the English Church, no sooner returned than they lost no time in expressing their dislike of them. "Remove Homilies, Articles, Injunctions" was soon the cry.

² The "Method of Prophesying," especially rife in East Anglia, under the patronage of Parkhurst, Bishop of Norwich, was rigorously suppressed by Archbishop Parker in 1574. About two years later Archbishop Grindal though opposed by the queen, who held that the remedy would be found in great measure in the use of the Homilies, attempted to regulate "the Prophesyings." Strype's *Grindal*, p.

325 *sqq.*, 341 *sqq.*; Cardwell, *Doc. Ann.* i. pp. 389 *sqq.*

³ See his directions concerning "preachers," dated Aug. 4, 1622. They were due in part to the action of Knight, an Oxford Preacher, who had defended the right of the subject to arm against the sovereign. The king immediately "tuned the pulpits" by requiring Archbishop Abbott to issue, through his suffragans, six "Directions," to the Preachers, which limited the subjects to be treated of to such as were warranted by the formularies of the Church, and forbade the discussion of such matters as predestination, and the royal prerogative, and all this under penalty of suspension. Collier, *Eccles. Hist.* i. pp. 723 *sqq.*; Cardwell, *Doc. Ann.* ii. 198 *sqq.*

not specific. They were well adapted for the age which called them forth, and are of no little value as reflecting the views of those, who reformed our services and drew up our Articles, and as throwing light on documents more authoritative than themselves¹.

¹ Bp Browne, *On the Articles*, p. 777.

ARTICLE XXXVI.

1563.

De Episcoporum et Ministrorum consecratione.

Libellus de Consecratione Archiepiscoporum & Episcoporum & de ordinatione Presbyterorum & Diaconorum æditus nuper temporibus Edwardi sexti, & autoritate Parlamenti illis ipsis temporibus confirmatus, omnia ad eiusmodi consecrationem & ordinationem necessaria continet, & nihil habet quod ex se sit aut superstitiosum aut impium. Itaque quicumque iuxta ritus illius libri consecrati aut ordinati sunt ab Anno secundo prædicti Regis Edwardi, usque ad hoc tempus, aut in posterum iuxta eosdem ritus consecrabuntur aut ordinabuntur ritè, ordine, atque legitimè, statuimus esse & fore consecratos & ordinatos.

i. **The present Title** of the XXXVIth Article varies considerably from that in the original draft. In 1553 it ran, "Of the booke of Praiers, and Ceremonies of the Church of Englande¹." Thus it covered the whole Prayer-Book. But in 1563 the part of the Article relating to the Prayer-Book itself was omitted², and it was restricted to the Ordinal or the "Consecration of Bishops and Ministers."

ii. **The Ordinal.** On Jan. 31, 1550, six prelates and six other men of the realm, "learned in God's law," were

¹ Or as it ran in Latin, "De Libro Præcationum et cæremoniarum Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ."

² It was incorporated with the Preface to the Prayer-Book.

1571.

Of consecration of Bishops and ministers.

The booke of Consecration of Archbishops, and Bishops, and ordering of Priestes and Deacons, lately set fourth in the time of Edwarde the sixt, and confyrmed at the same tyme by auctoritie of Parliament, doth conteyne all things necessarie to suche consecration and orderynge: neyther hath it any thing, that of it selfe is superstitious or vngodly. And therefore, whosoever are consecrate or ordered accordyng to the rites of that booke, since the seconde yere of the aforesaid king Edwarde, vnto this time, or hereafter shalbe consecrated or ordered accordyng to the same rites, we decree all such to be ryghtly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered.

appointed to prepare an Ordinal as a companion to the first Prayer-Book of Edward VI.¹, and this with a few changes was added to the revised Prayer-Book of 1552. The Ordinal, thus drawn up, was again revised by Convocation in 1661², and has ever since been retained in the Church of England.

iii. **Object.** It was to confirm the authority of this Ordinal that the present Article was inserted by the Convocation of 1562 in place of the old XXXVth Article, which covered the whole Prayer-Book. The intention of those who drew it up was to confute the views of two opposite parties:—(α) the Mediævalists, who objected to the Ordinal on the ground that it lacked some, as they supposed, essential ceremonies; (β) the extreme Reformers, who took grave exception to it as containing some superstitious forms and phrases.

iv. **Analysis.** As against the first class of objectors the Article asserts that

- (α) The Ordinal set forth in the reign of Edward VI. contains all things necessary to both "Consecration and Ordering";
- (β) As against the second it affirms that it contains nothing "that of itself is superstitious and ungodly";
- (γ) It concludes by stating clearly and explicitly that "all such are rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered," who either have been or hereafter shall be consecrated or ordered according to the Rites of this Book³.

¹ See Procter on *The Book of Common Prayer*, p. 31.

² Lathbury, *History of Convocation*, p. 288.

³ The Puritans were ever clamouring against "that prescripte Order of service made out of the Masse-booke." They maintained that in addition to

v. **The First Objection** to the validity of our Orders on the part of Roman divines is founded on an alleged flaw in their derivation. They are derived through Matthew Parker¹, who was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury on Sunday, December 17, 1559. He was consecrated according to the Ordinal of the Church of England in the chapel of Lambeth Palace by William Barlow, who was Bishop of Bath and Wells before Mary's accession, and was then Bishop-elect of Chichester; by John Scory, formerly Bishop of Chichester, then Bishop-elect of Hereford; by Miles Coverdale, formerly Bishop of Exeter²; and by John Hodgkyns³, Bishop suffragan of Bedford. A story, invented some fifty years later, endeavoured to throw discredit on Parker's consecration by representing that it took place in a tavern in a ludicrous manner⁴. But no historical fact is more certain than the due and orderly performance of the

its ritual deformities, the Prayer-Book was "full of corruptions," that in the Ordinal there was one paragraph, which they never hesitated to condemn as "manifest blasphemy," and some, for this reason, steadily refused to sign the Articles in 1571, when called into the presence of the High Commissioners." Hardwick, *Hist. Art.*, p. 206.

¹ He had been chaplain to Elizabeth's mother and her father, and in king Edward's time, Dean of Lincoln. The queen had an especial affection for him, and he was held in high esteem by her leading ministers.

² Scory and Coverdale were consecrated at Croydon on Aug. 30, 1551, by Cranmer of Canterbury, Ridley of London, and Hodgkyns, Bishop suffragan of Bedford.

³ Hodgkyns was consecrated on Dec. 9, 1537, according to the Sarum Pontifical by Stokesley, Bishop of London, Hilsey, Bishop of Rochester, and Wharton, Bishop of S. Asaph.

⁴ "The 'Nag's Head' fable was not alleged till the beginning of the seventeenth century, and even Canon

Estcourt allows that it is very unfortunate it was ever seriously put forward; for it is so absurd on the face of it that it has led to the suspicion of Catholic theologians not being sincere in the objections they make to Anglican orders." Estcourt, *Question of Anglican Ordinations discussed*, p. 154.

"When the fiction was put forward the aged Earl of Nottingham, who (then being 23 years of age) had been, as a connection of Parker's, present at the actual consecration in Lambeth Chapel, when the story was told at the Privy Council, declared it to be false, and referred in confirmation of this statement to the account which had been drawn up at the time and given by the Archbishop to Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. The king thereupon sent for it, and it was found to corroborate the earl's statement. The chaplain to the earl's son also declared that his father had often heard from the old earl the same account of the consecration." See Burnet's *History of the Reformation*, vol. v. p. 553.

ceremony in the chapel of Lambeth Palace. Then it is objected that the evidence is insufficient to show that Bishop Barlow, who acted as the head of the Commission for consecrating Parker, was himself consecrated. This, however, would not amount to an insuperable defect, even if it were true, for *all* the Bishops *laid their hands* on Parker, and *all repeated the words*¹, and thus each performed the complete act of consecration. But, in point of fact, there is no valid ground for doubting the fact of Barlow's consecration. It is true that the record of it is absent from the Lambeth register. But this register was carelessly kept, and is acknowledged to be incomplete². It lacks the record of the consecration of Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, and Stokesley, Bishop of London, who were consecrated in the reign of Henry VIII., and of some six or seven prelates, who are known to have been consecrated during Cranmer's primacy. The omission, therefore, of Barlow's name in the record may be regretted, but it is no real defect as regards his consecration, and when it is considered that Parker was elected by the Chapter of Canterbury, and confirmed without opposition at Bow Church³; that he was consecrated by four bishops, all of whom laid their hands upon him; that no official or formal protest was made at the time against his consecration; that no rival claimant to the See was put forward⁴; and that for

¹ *Hierarchia Anglicana*, p. 14. This exceptional precaution was founded on the precedent of Archbishop Chichele's consecration. See Pusey's *Eirenicon*, i. p. 232.

² Thus in the register kept by Archbishop Warham there is no record of the consecration of Heath, who was the chief consecrator of Cardinal Pole, and whereas during his archiepiscopate there were 26 bishops consecrated, the records of 20 of these consecrations only are given, while 6 are

missing, viz. Blyth of Coventry, 1503; Penry of Bangor, 1504; Stanley of Ely, 1506; Stokesley of London, 1530; Gardiner of Winchester, 1531. Haddan, *Preface to Bramhall*, iii. p. 17; *Hierarchia Anglicana*, p. 30, n.

³ The certificate of his election at Bow Church was signed by his four consecrators, and is extant in Parker's Register, *Hierarch. Angl.* p. 14.

⁴ The mandate for Parker's enthronement was signed on Dec. 31, 1559; he was enthroned Jan. 1, 1560;

eleven¹ years the Roman Catholics in England did not formally withdraw from the jurisdiction of the Anglican Episcopate, it is difficult to see how any really valid objection can be made to the claim of Parker to have been rightly and duly consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury².

vi. **The Second Objection** is to the *form* and *matter* of Anglican Ordinations as lacking certain essential ceremonies. The essence, we are told, of valid Ordination, the necessary form and matter, includes at the consecration of a Bishop the delivery to him of the pastoral staff and ring, and at the Ordination of a Priest, the handing to him of the chalice and paten with the words, "Receive the power to offer sacrifice." This omission, it is urged, vitiates the Anglican Ordinal. But it may be replied without fear of contradiction that the delivery of the pastoral staff and ring to a Bishop cannot be traced back further than the eighth century, and the porrection, as it is called, to the Priest of the sacred vessels³ was unknown to the

and was admitted to the temporalities of his See on March 21 by Royal letters after homage had been made to the queen in the usual manner. See *Patents*, 2 Eliz. p. 14; Strype, *Parker*, Bk. ii. ch. i.

¹ The Diary of Archbishop Parker, preserved in the Library of Corpus Christi College contains the following entry:—"17. Decembr. Anno 1559. Consecratus sum in Archiepiscopum Cantuar. Heu! Heu! Domine in quæ tempora servasti me? Jam veni in profundum aquarum et tempestas demersit me. O Domine vim patior, responde pro me et Spiritu Tuo principali confirma me." Strype, *Parker*, Appendix, p. 15, gives extracts from this Diary.

² "When," writes Dr Lingard, "we find Barlow during ten years, the remainder of Henry's reign, constantly associated, as a brother, with the other consecrated Bishops, discharg-

ing with them all the duties, both spiritual and secular, of a consecrated Bishop, summoned equally with them to Parliament and Convocation, taking his seat among them, according to seniority, and voting on all subjects as one of them; it seems most unreasonable to suppose, without direct proof, that he had never received that sacred rite, without which, according to the laws of both Church and State, he could not have become a member of the episcopal body." See Lingard, *History of England*, vol. vi., pp. 329, Appendix; Dalbus, *Les Ordinations Anglicanes*, p. 18. "The result of my investigation," says Dr Döllinger, "is that I have no manner of doubt as to the validity of the Episcopal succession in the English Church." *Bonn Conference 1874*, p. 51.

³ The delivery of the paten cum oblatis and the calix cum vino followed the chrism, or the anointing of the

Western Church for a thousand years, and is still unknown to the Eastern Church¹. If, therefore, these ceremonies constitute "the essential matter and form of orders," all the Ordinations of the first thousand years and all those of the Eastern Church also are vitiated. The argument, therefore, from omission proves too much, and it is certain that the further back we go, the simpler do we find all the forms of ordination in all parts of the world, while the real essentials of ordination in Apostolic times were (1) imposition of hands² and (2) prayer³.

vii. **A Third Objection** is that, if the laying on of hands is sufficient matter, the words "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," without specification of the office of Bishop or Priest, do not constitute a sufficient formula for the validity of the Consecration or Ordination. But neither Scripture nor the Church has prescribed any particular form of words to be used on such occasions, and the introduction of the phrase "for the Office and Work of a Bishop," in the

hands of the priest. The chrism, however, was not in general use till the 9th century, and there is no mention of the porrection of the sacred vessels in the oldest Ordinals. See Smith's *Dict. Christian Antiquities*, ii. p. 515; Gore, *The Church and the Ministry*, p. 68, note. The delivery of the chalice and paten and pastoral staff was retained in the first Prayer Book of Edward VI., but laid aside in that of 1552.

¹ In the Eastern Church the delivery of the sacred vessels takes place after Ordination, and no formula for the delivery is prescribed. The great Roman theologian Morinus in the latter part of the seventeenth century allows that the rite was unknown in the Church for a thousand years. See Walcott's *English Ordinal*, p. 260.

² See 1 Tim. iv. 14, and 2 Tim. i. 6. Even Bellarmine allows that the

imposition of hands is the essential part of Ordination, and he cites the decree of the Council of Trent, Sess. iv., c. 3, concerning Extreme Unction, where it says that the minister of extreme unction is a Bishop or Priest duly ordained *per manus impositionem*. *De Hierarchia Anglicana*, p. 64.

³ See Palmer, *Orig. Lit.* ii. p. 304; Collier, *Eccles. Hist.* v. pp. 366 sq. As He ascended, our Lord *lifted up His hands and blessed His Apostles* (Luke xxiv. 50), and this significant action was adopted afterwards by them at Ordinations. Thus Paul and Barnabas were ordained with prayer and laying on of hands (Acts xiii. 3); thus Timothy was consecrated (1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6); thus the Bishops, ordained by the Apostles (Acts xx. 28); thus Deacons were ordained (Acts vi. 3), and Priests (1 Tim. v. 22).

service for the consecration of Bishops, and of the phrase "for the Office and Work of a Priest" in that for the ordering of Priests, which took effect in 1661, removes any objection, at all events, to our present Ordinal. Moreover the form of ordination does not consist merely in the words of consecration¹. The whole service forms part of it, and the other prayers, which occur therein, distinctly determine the meaning of the action. Furthermore it is to be noticed that the Bishops consecrated according to the Ordinal as it was in the reign of Elizabeth, were in no worse case than were their predecessors. In none of the English Pontificals, except that of Exeter, is there any determining word at the time of the imposition of hands, and the occurrence in the English Ordinal of the charge of S. Paul to Timothy as Bishop (1 Tim. iii. 1—6), shews that it was in the minds of the consecrators of Archbishop Parker to confer on him the authority of a Bishop.

viii. **A Fourth Objection** urged that admitting the imposition of hands and prayer to be sufficient matter and form, the English forms of ordination do not confer the power of offering sacrifice, and are therefore null. But the offering of sacrifice is not, strictly speaking, the *chief end* of the Christian Ministry. When S. Paul has occasion to dwell on the end of the Christian Ministry, he says, *Christ gave some to be Apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, unto the work of ministering, unto the building up of the body of Christ, until we all attain..... unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ*² (Eph. iv. 11—13). The Apostle does not mention the

¹ "The form which accompanies the imposition of hands in Episcopal Ordination in the Roman Pontifical itself, is merely this: 'Receive the Holy Ghost'; and the prayer which

follows does not directly mention the Episcopal Office." Palmer, *Treatise on the Church*, ii. p. 345. Ed. 3, 1842.

² Comp. Acts xx. 28.

offering of the Eucharistic Sacrifice as *the* "end" of the Ministry. Moreover we do not find that all the ancient forms of Ordination expressly convey this power. There is no mention of it in the Ethiopic Ordination rites, in the ancient Coptic forms of Ordination, in the rite of the Syrian Jacobites, or in several of the most ancient Latin Sacramentaries a thousand years old¹. The functions of the Priesthood are expressed in the Apostolic Constitutions² in very general terms, and even Morinus allows that there is no express mention of this power in the most ancient formularies³. If it is further objected that the Church of England had no idea of conferring such power because she substituted the present form of Ordination in place of others which expressly mentioned it, it may be replied that the power of sacrificing was only expressly referred to in connection with the *modern* rite of "the porrection of the instruments," which with many other modern rites was discontinued by those who drew up our present Ordinal. The omission, however, certainly did not arise from any denial of the Eucharistic Sacrifice⁴ in the primitive and Catholic sense⁵.

¹ Palmer, *Treatise on the Church*, ii. p. 346. Ed. 3, 1842.

² Const. Apost. Lib. viii. c. 16, quoted in *Hierarchia Anglicana*, p. 115.

³ See *Hierarchia Anglicana*, p. 115.

⁴ "Les erreurs de l'Église Anglicane, surtout celles qui ont pour objet le sacerdoce et le sacrifice eucharistique, n'ont-elles pas déteint sur la rédaction de l'Ordinal au point d'en compromettre l'efficacité? Il me semble que, sur ce point, la présomption est en faveur de la thèse anglicane. Il n'y a pas d'hérésies positivement énoncées dans l'Ordinal; tout ce qu'on peut reprocher à ses auteurs est d'en avoir écarté toutes les expressions qui supposent un véritable sacerdoce sacri-

ficateur et un véritable sacrifice eucharistique. Mais c'est là chose plutôt négative; l'Ordinal n'en devient pas positivement hérétique." Review of "De Hierarchia Anglicana" in *La Correspondance Catholique*, 23 Mai, 1895, by Neuter.

⁵ As regards the doctrine of Intention, see above pp. 313, 314. Barlow was required to consecrate Parker, and he did so, and we cannot but believe that he really intended to do and to say what he actually did and said in the matter of consecration. The fact that each one of the Bishops present pronounced the consecrating words shews that the whole subject had been cautiously and seriously considered.

ix. **The Objections of the Puritans** are of a very different kind. The Puritans were opposed to the use of the words in the Ordination of Priests, "Receive the Holy Ghost...Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained." They alleged that the power of remitting and retaining sins was miraculous, confined to the Apostles, and not to be expected by other Ministers, and further that as man cannot bestow the Spirit of God, it is profane to claim the power to do so. Now the formula "Receive ye the Holy Ghost" is grounded on the words of our Lord to His Apostles on the evening of the world's first Easter-Day, when He said to them, *As the Father hath sent Me, even so send I you*¹, and when *He breathed on them*² and said *Receive ye the Holy Ghost*³ (John xx. 21, 22). The words in the original indicate that the gift spoken of was not the personal sanctifying Grace of God in their hearts, nor the miraculous baptism of the Spirit, afterwards bestowed on the day of Pentecost⁴, but it was the Grace of Ordination, the right to exercise that Ministry of Reconciliation, which He had rendered effectual by His Resurrection from the dead⁵.

¹ On the force of these words, see above under Art. xxiii. pp. 283, 284.

² *Ἐνεφύσησε*. "The breath (*πνεῦμα*) is an emblem of the Spirit (John iii. 8); and by 'breathing,' as S. Augustine observes, the Lord shewed that the Spirit was not the Spirit of the Father only but also His own. The act is described as one (*ἐνεφύσησε*), and not repeated. The gift was once for all, not to individuals but to the abiding body." Bp Westcott *in loc.*

³ The words in the original Greek are *λάβετε πνεῦμα ἁγίου*. Here it is to be noticed that the definite article is altogether wanting. The words, therefore, might be translated *Receive ye Holy Spirit*, which would imply not the Holy Spirit in His fulness,

but "a gift of the Holy Spirit."

⁴ "The Spirit which the Lord now imparted to them was His Spirit, or, as it may be expressed, the Holy Spirit as dwelling in Him. By this He first quickened them, and then sent, according to His promise, the Paraclete to be with them, and to supply all power for the exercise of their different functions. The relation of the Paschal to the Pentecostal gift is therefore the relation of quickening to endowing. The one answers to the power of the Resurrection, and the other to the power of the Ascension (Godet); the one to victory and the other to Sovereignty." Bp Westcott *in loc.*

⁵ For, as S. Paul says to the Corin-

Ministry, the right to minister, is one of the gifts of the Spirit (Rom. xii. 7). This, including all that it involves, our Lord bestowed upon the Apostles, and, as we have seen¹, upon all who should come after them. Hence, when the hand of the Bishop is laid upon the head of him whom he ordains, we need not doubt that the *charisma* of God's Spirit is given for the Office and Work of a Priest in the Church of God.

x. **Absolution.** As to the Ministry of Reconciliation no one will dispute that God alone can forgive sins and that no Priest can claim a power, which must obviously belong to Him alone. No one again will dispute that even God cannot forgive all sins, but only the sins of those who truly repent and unfeignedly believe, for these conditions of pardon are inexorably laid down by God Himself. But God is pleased to work through men upon the world of men, and He uses a human Ministry to declare and convey His forgiveness to those, who fulfil the prescribed conditions of that forgiveness, just as He uses the instrumentality of men to preach the word, to teach, to edify, and to comfort. Hence every Bishop, who has authority to ordain, has also authority to declare that "the Ministry of Reconciliation" is committed to the person whom he ordains, and the newly-ordained Priest receives by Christ's own ordinance a divine commission to minister, and at the same time a divine commission duly to exercise the power of pronouncing the absolution of sins on the prescribed conditions of faith and repentance being observed by the recipient².

thians, *If Christ be not raised, ye are yet in your sins* (1 Cor. xv. 17). See Bp Ellicott *in loc.*

¹ See above, p. 284.

² As regards the whole subject see

a Sermon of Bp Andrewes on S. John xx. 23, preached before the Court in 1600, *Works*, vol. iii. p. 82 ff. Oxford, 1843.

ARTICLE XXXVII.

1563.

De ciuilibus Magistratibus.

Regia Maiestas in hoc Angliæ Regno ac cæteris eius Dominijs, iure summam habet potestatem, ad quam omnium statuum huius Regni siue illi ecclesiastici sunt siue non, in omnibus causis suprema gubernatio pertinet, & nulli externæ iurisdictioni est subiecta, nec esse debet.

Cum Regiæ Maiestati summam gubernationem tribuimus, quibus titulis intelligimus animos quorundam calumniatorum offendi: non damus Regibus nostris aut uerbi Dei aut sacramentorum administrationem, quod etiam Iniunctiones ab Elizabetha Regina nostra nuper æditæ, apertissime testantur: sed eam tantum prærogatiuam, quam in sacris scripturis à Deo ipso omnibus pijs Principibus, uidemus semper fuisse attributam, hoc est, ut omnes status atque ordines fidei suæ à Deo commissos, siue illi ecclesiastici sint, siue ciuiles, in officio contineant, & contumaces ac delinquentes, gladio ciuili coercant.

Romanus Pontifex nullam habet iurisdictionem in hoc regno Angliæ.

Leges Ciuiles possunt Christianos propter capitalia et graua crimina morte punire.

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

1571.

Of the Ciuill Magistrates.

The Queenes Maiestie hath the cheefe power in this Realme of Englande, and other her dominions, vnto whom the cheefe government of all estates of this Realme, whether they be Ecclesiasticall or Ciuile, in all causes doth apparteine, and is not, nor ought to be subiect to any forraigne iurisdiction.

Where we attribute to the Queenes Maiestie the cheefe government, by whiche titles we vnderstand the mindes of some slaunderous folkes to be offended: we geue not to our princes the ministring either of God's word, or of Sacraments, the which thing the Iniunctions also lately set forth by Elizabeth our Queene, doth most plainlie testifie: But that only prerogatiue whiche we see to haue ben geuen alwayes to all godly Princes in holy Scriptures by God him selfe, that is, that they should rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be Ecclesiasticall or Temporall, and restraine with the ciuill sworde the stubberne and euyll doers.

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

The lawes of the Realme may punishe Christian men with death, for heynous and greuous offences.

It is lawfull for Christian men, at the commaundement of the Magistrate, to weare weapons, and serue in the warres.

i. **Title and Language.** The Title of Article xxxvii. has remained uniform since the original draft in 1553, but the language has undergone considerable modification. As it was first drawn up it began, "The King of England is supreme head in earth, next under Christ, of the Church of England and Ireland¹." This language is nearly identical with that of the Act of Supremacy passed in 1534 in the reign of Henry VIII., in which Henry is acknowledged as "Protector and only Supreme Head of the Church and Clergy of England," but with the important proviso, "so far as is permitted by the Law of Christ²."

ii. **Alteration under Elizabeth.** On the accession of Mary the Acts of Henry VIII. and Edward VI. were repealed. When Elizabeth came to the throne, her first act was to restore to the Crown "the ancient jurisdiction over the State ecclesiastical and spiritual, abolishing all foreign power repugnant to the same." The title, however, "Supreme Head of the Church," was never revived, and for it was substituted that of "Supreme Governor of the Church." In an Admonition appended to her injunctions of A.D. 1559 the Queen explained that nothing was meant by this, other than what was acknowledged to be due to "the most noble kings of famous memory," her father and brother³, and which was of ancient time claimed by the

¹ "Rex Angliæ est supremum caput in terris, post Christum, Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ et Hibernicæ." To this one MS. added, "Neque in universo orbe ullum seipso majorem agnoscit a quo sua potestas et autoritas pendeat." Hardwick, *Hist. Art.*, p. 34², n.

² "It is plain from the recitals in that and also in another Statute of the same year, and from other proofs, that the King did not mean to claim any spiritual office or character, or any power different in its nature from

what had often before been asserted as belonging of right to the English Crown." Earl Selborne, *Defence of the Church of England*, p. 32.

³ "The legislation of Henry VIII. th's reign against the Pope's pretensions to jurisdiction in this kingdom did but carry to their full consequences, under the circumstances of that time, principles admitted in Anglo-Saxon times, for which Norman and Plantagenet kings had contended, which had been embodied in the acts of their Councils and Parliaments, and in which the

imperial crown of this realm,—“that is, under God, to have the sovereignty and rule over all manner of persons born within these her realms, dominions, and countries, of what state, either ecclesiastical or temporal, soever they be, so as no other foreign power shall or ought to have any superiority over them¹.”

iii. **Analysis.** The present Article, therefore, (i) commences with the assertion that “The Queen’s Majesty hath the chief power in this realm of England and other her dominions,” and then (ii) goes on to state that to the Sovereign appertains the chief government of all estates of the Realm, whether they be ecclesiastical or civil, and that she is not, nor ought to be, subject to any foreign jurisdiction. (iii) Moreover to silence objections, it defines the limits of the government of the sovereign as not extending either (a) to the performance of any spiritual function, or (b) to the exercise of any prerogative other than that allowed to godly princes in Holy Scripture by God Himself². (iv) It declares that the government of the sovereign extends to that coercive power, which alike in the Old and the New Testaments is placed in the hands of princes³. (v) This done, the Article proceeds to lay down the following points:

Ecclesiastical authorities of the realm had either actively concurred or at least practically acquiesced.” Earl Selborne, *Defence of the Church of England*, pp. 8, 9.

¹ Cardwell’s *Doc. Annals*, pp. 199—201. See the comments of Sir Matthew Hale on the *Royal Supremacy*, quoted by Earl Selborne, *Defence of Ch. of England*, pp. 13, 14.

² See Palmer, *Treatise on the Church*, vol. i. p. 200. 3rd ed. 1842.

³ Thus it is carefully provided that

the civil magistrate is not the source of spiritual as well as civil jurisdiction, and the Church of England “claims to have a spiritual mission and authority, a ministry of the Word and Sacraments, neither derived from nor communicable to the State; and she acknowledges in the Head of the State that power only, over ecclesiastical persons and causes, which she believes to be within the rightful province of all Christian Governments.” Earl Selborne, *Defence of the Church of England*, p. 35.

- (a) That the Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm:
- (β) That no Foreign jurisdiction can interfere with the right of the national sovereign either to (1) inflict capital punishment, or (2) claim the assistance of his soldiers in war.

iv. **The Civil Supremacy** in temporal matters is the foundation of all settled government, and Scripture alike in the Old and the New Testament sanctions the extension of this power, under due and proper limits, to matters ecclesiastical. Thus (a) *In the Old Testament*:—(1) Aaron is subject to Moses (Exod. xxxii. 21, 22); (2) Saul is declared by Samuel to be head of the tribes including Levi (1 Sam. xv. 17); (3) David distributes the priests into twenty-four courses, and makes various regulations as regards the Temple Services (1 Chron. xxiii. 6)¹; and (4) it is distinctly said that *the priests and Levites departed not from the commandment of Solomon concerning any matter* (2 Chron. viii. 15)². Again (β) *in the New Testament*:—(1) Our Lord directs that all alike are to *render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar’s* (Luke xx. 25); (2) S. Paul bids *every soul be subject to the higher powers* as being ordained of God (Rom. xiii. 1); (3) S. Peter writes to the Christians of the Dispersion, *Be subject unto every ordinance of man for the Lord’s sake: whether it be unto the king, as supreme; or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by Him for vengeance on evil doers, and for praise to them that do well* (1 Pet. ii. 13, 14).

v. **The Royal Supremacy.** These passages guide

¹ Similar directions concerning sacred matters are given by Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. xx. 3—13); Hezekiah (2 Chron. xxix. 3—19); and Josiah (2 Chron. xxxiv. 1—13 ff.).

² But the king was not allowed to

intrude upon the sacred offices of religion, as was shewn by the punishment of Saul (1 Sam. xiii. 8—14), and the punishment of Uzziah for intruding into the Holy Place to burn incense (2 Chron. xxvi. 16 ff.).

us to a right conception of what is meant by the royal supremacy. (i) We do *not* mean, (a) a *spiritual* headship, for that belongs to Christ alone; nor (b) an *ecclesiastical* headship, such as would empower the sovereign to teach or preach, or administer the Sacraments, or consecrate persons and things, or impose ecclesiastical censures¹; nor (c) an *arbitrary* and *unlimited* supremacy, so that we should be supposed to put our consciences under the uncontrolled guidance of the sovereign. (ii) What we *do* mean is (a) that the sovereign must hold some position in the Church and this can only be the highest; (b) that for coercive purposes and to preserve the peace of the realm he is over all persons and in all causes supreme; (c) that legally and constitutionally he can do nothing concerning the doctrine and discipline of the Church, unless it has received the consent of the clergy and laity, as represented in Convocation and Parliament respectively; (d) that he is entitled to those ancient privileges, which belonged to kings and princes in Scripture, to Christian Emperors in primitive times, and to the ancient sovereigns of England, and which empower them "to 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."

vi. **The Papal Jurisdiction** in the realm of England is claimed on various grounds. It is urged that (i) S. Peter had a supremacy given him over the rest of the Apostles, and over the universal Church; that (ii) he exercised this supremacy as Bishop of Rome for upwards of twenty-five years; that (iii) this supremacy is inherited by the

¹ "It was during the primacy of Archbishop Warham (not Cranmer) that the Convocations of both provinces of Canterbury and York for-

mally acknowledged the king's 'Supreme Headship' of the Church of England." Earl Selborne, *Defence of the Church of England*, p. 32.

Bishops of Rome as his successors; that (iv) England was converted to the Christian Faith by Missionaries from Rome and therefore owes allegiance to the Roman See.

vii. **The Supremacy of S. Peter.** We do not deny that a certain *priority* was conceded to S. Peter by our Lord. We cannot read the New Testament without noticing that (1) his name is placed first in all the catalogues of the Apostles¹; that (2) he takes the lead in speaking and acting for the rest²; that (3) he is peculiarly honoured in conjunction with S. James and S. John³; that (4) our Lord makes to him a special promise as regards His Church⁴; that (5) after the Ascension he is

¹ Matt. x. 2; Mark iii. 16; Luke vi. 14; Acts i. 13.

² Matt. xix. 27; Luke xii. 41; Matt. xvi. 16; Mark viii. 29.

³ Mark v. 37; Luke viii. 51; Mark ix. 2; Luke ix. 28.

⁴ "And I say unto thee (καὶ γὰρ δέ σοι λέγω) that thou art Peter (ὅτι σὺ εἶ Πέτρος), and upon *this rock* (ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ) I will build My Church, and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it, and I will give thee (δώσω σοι) the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven" (Matt. xvi. 18, 19). Amongst the Fathers there is no fixity of interpretation as regards the meaning here of the Rock. Different interpretations are given by many in different parts of their works. Some apply it to S. Peter himself; others to the faith he confessed; others to Christ, acknowledged by the Apostle to be God and Man. S. Augustine himself varies in his interpretation. In his earlier expositions he acknowledges he had applied the words to S. Peter, but in his later ones to Christ (S. Aug. *Retract.* i. 21). It is noticeable that our Lord does not say ἐπὶ σοὶ

οικοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν but ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ. The expression points, not so much to the person of the Apostle himself, as to something to which his name (Πέτρος) bore witness, and which had evinced itself in his glorious confession. This much at any rate seems clear;—(α) The Apostle obviously could not be the Rock in any sense which trrenched on the prerogative of Christ Himself, Who is the *foundation stone*, θεμέλιος (1 Cor. iii. 11), *the chief corner stone*, ἀκρογωνιαίος (Eph. ii. 20), binding the parts of the building of His Church together; (β) still S. Peter by virtue of his faith and confession had a primacy, not the primacy of *absolute sovereignty*, but "the primacy of historical inauguration," as Bp Lightfoot terms it: (γ) and so in the Apostolic records he appears using the keys and opening the gates at each successive stage in the progress of the Church. The same courageous faith, which prompted this confession and called forth the promise of Christ, enables him to receive into the Church the three thousand on the day of Pentecost (Acts ii. 41); to open the gates to the Samaritans (Acts viii. 14, 16); to admit the Gentile Cornelius to Christian Baptism (Acts x. 46, 47).

signally prominent in the founding of the Church. But *priority of order* does not involve *preeminence of jurisdiction*. Had it been so, we surely should have found in the New Testament some traces of such preeminence being asserted and claimed. But so far from it,

(a) *In the Gospels,*

- (i) We never find our Lord giving S. Peter himself apart from the rest of the Apostles any title of special honour;
- (ii) On the contrary we find Him protesting against any claims to preeminence, and saying, *Whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant* (Matt. xx. 27); *Be not ye called Rabbi, for one is your teacher, and all ye are brethren* (Matt. xxiii. 8);
- (iii) Again in the solemn delegation of ministerial authority after His resurrection, He says to the whole Apostolic body in general, *As the Father hath sent Me, even so send I you* (ὡμᾶς, John xx. 21)¹.

But then, as though to shew that the Church was not founded on the personality of S. Peter, he vanishes from our sight, and another assumes the chief place in his stead, of whom, not of S. Peter, S. Augustine says "Ipse (Paulus) caput et princeps Apostolorum" and again "(Paulus) tanti Apostolatus meruit principatum." See S. Aug. *De Pecc. Meritis et Remissione* ii. 20; Bp Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, Pt. i. Vol. ii., pp. 487 sqq.

¹ *Again He says Whose soever sins YE forgive, they are forgiven unto them, whose soever sins YE retain, they are retained* (John xx. 23); *Go YE, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them...teaching them* (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20). There is nothing here

to indicate that what the Apostles had, they had not directly from Christ, but indirectly from Christ through Peter. See Gore, *Rom. Cath. Claims*, p. 74. "Our Lord's words were addressed to all the Apostles; no distinction was made; all were alike addressed, and all were therefore given the same Apostolical authority...Every Apostle was sent as *Jesus Christ was sent by the Father*; that is with the plenitude of supreme power; every Apostle was authorized to remit sins, and to teach all nations. Nothing conceivable by human imagination can surpass the grandeur and the magnitude of this Mission and these powers." Palmer, *Treatise on the Church*, ii. p. 480.

(β) *In the Acts,*

- (i) We find S. Peter actually *sent* with S. John by the other Apostles to Samaria (Acts viii. 14—16);
- (ii) The appeal made at the Council of Jerusalem is not made to S. Peter, but to *the Apostles and elders* (Acts xv. 13, 19);
- (iii) S. Peter did not preside at the Council, but this position was occupied by James *the Lord's brother*, and first bishop of Jerusalem (Acts xv. 19)¹;
- (iv) S. Peter retires after this altogether into the background of the sacred history, while S. Paul becomes the prominent figure.

(γ) *In the Epistles,*

- (i) S. Paul instead of going up after his conversion to S. Peter as the supreme head of the Church², waits some time, and only after a considerable interval receives from him *the right hand of fellowship* (Gal. ii. 9);
- (ii) The same Apostle on one occasion actually *withstands S. Peter to the face*, because *he stood condemned*³ (Gal. ii. 11), and he severely re-

¹ See Appendix to Bp Lightfoot's *Commentary on the Galatians*, "S. Paul and the Three."

² Consider again the words of the great Apostle of the Gentiles, *Paul an Apostle, not from man, neither through man* (Gal. i. 1); *I did not receive it (the Gospel) from man, neither was I taught it* (Gal. i. 12); *they of repute (i.e. the pillar Apostles, James and Cephas and John) imparted nothing to me* (Gal. ii. 6); *the Gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me, as the Gospel of the circumcision was*

unto Peter (Gal. ii. 7). "There is no sort of dependence of S. Paul on S. Peter which these words do not exclude." Gore, *Rom. Cath. Claims*, p. 80, n.

³ Κατεγνωσμένος ἦν not "reprehensible," but "condemned." His conduct carried its own condemnation with it. Comp. John iii. 18; Rom. xiv. 23. "The condemnation is not the verdict of the bystanders, but the verdict of the act itself." Bp Lightfoot *in loc.*; see also Bp Ellicott's *Commentary* on the passage.

bukes as schismatics those who said, *I am of Cephas* (1 Cor. i. 12);

- (iii) Moreover in his own Epistles S. Peter himself never claims preeminence or superiority over his fellow-Apostles or the Church. He calls himself an *elder* amongst elders (1 Pet. v. 1); an *Apostle* amongst other Apostles (1 Pet. i. 1; 2 Pet. i. 1); he gives no hint that he stands in any special relation to *the chief Shepherd* (1 Pet. v. 4) beyond that in which the other Apostles stood, any more than S. John does, when he speaks of the *twelve foundations* of the Church, equal and coordinate, as *the twelve Apostles of the Lamb*¹ (Rev. xxi. 14).

We conclude, then, from these four lines of argument that though it cannot be disputed that our Lord promised to build His Church upon S. Peter, as the great Confessor of His Divinity, there is no warrant for the notion that this gave the Apostle preeminence of jurisdiction over the others, and so over the Universal Church.

viii. **S. Peter's Bishopric at Rome**, which is said to have lasted upwards of twenty-five years, really involves an appeal to history, and to history we can go. The martyrdom, then, of S. Peter at Rome, which may be accepted as authentic², cannot have taken place before A.D. 68, when Nero was Emperor. Now twenty-five years³ subtracted from this date brings us to A.D. 43 as the com-

¹ Καὶ τὸ τεῖχος τῆς πόλεως ἔχον θεμελίους δώδεκα, καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῶν δώδεκα ὀνόματα τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τοῦ ἀρχίου, Rev. xxi. 14. Observe the studied repetition of the word δώδεκα.

² Tertullian, *De Præscript.* 36, *Scorp.* 15, and also Origen in Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.*, iii. 1, refer to the tradition that he was crucified at Rome

with his head downwards, and that S. Paul suffered also at the same time.

³ It is in Jerome's version of the *Chronicle* of Eusebius, Lib. ii. anno 43, that we find the first distinct statement that S. Peter went to Rome in the year A.D. 43, and remained there for 25 years as Bishop of the Church in that city.

mencement of the Petrine episcopate¹; and we have a history of the period from A.D. 30—60 in the Acts of the Apostles, but there is nowhere to be found a single hint in it of the Apostle's presence in the capital of the West. In A.D. 58 S. Paul wrote his Epistle to the Church of Rome², but he preserves an absolute silence as to the episcopate there of his brother Apostle³. Between A.D. 60 and A.D. 66 he wrote at least five Epistles from Rome, but in none of these does he allude to the presence of S. Peter. In the two Epistles written by that Apostle himself he lets fall no word, which indicates any episcopal jurisdiction at Rome. The only passage which can be alleged to have any possible reference to the Eternal City is the verse, in which the Apostle writes, *There saluteth you she that is in Babylon, elect together with you; and so doth Marcus my son* (1 Pet. v. 13)⁴. But, even if "Babylon" here means Rome,

¹ "I cannot find," writes Bp Lightfoot, "that any writers of the first two centuries and more speak of S. Peter as bishop of Rome.....The language of Irenæus (iii. 3. 3) is explicit. He describes the Church of Rome as founded by the Apostles S. Peter and S. Paul, who appointed Linus bishop".... "After him came Linus; after Linus, Anencletus; after Anencletus in the *third* place from the Apostles Clement is elected to the bishopric, and the others, when any numbers are given, are numbered accordingly." *Apost. Fathers*, Pt i. Vol. ii. pp. 501, 502.

² In this Epistle S. Paul obviously takes for granted that no Apostle had yet reached Rome (Rom. xv. 20).

³ "If silence can ever be regarded as decisive, its verdict must be accepted in this case. S. Paul could not have written as he writes to the Romans (i. 11, sq., xv. 20—24) if they had received even a short visit from an Apostle, more especially if that Apostle were S. Peter." Bp Light-

foot, *Apostolic Fathers*, Pt i. Vol. ii. p. 491.

⁴ Ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτή, καὶ Μάρκος ὁ υἱὸς μου = *the fellow-elect in Babylon greeteth you, and so doth Marcus my son* (1 Pet. v. 13). The interpretations of the words are various. Some would understand them to refer to some sister or Christian lady, well known to S. Peter's converts. But the context Ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτή is unnatural as the description of a person, and several early authorities (including N) add Ἐκκλησία. If a "fellow-elect Church" is intended, the mention of S. Mark, S. Peter's "companion and interpreter" (Eusebius *H. E.* iii. 39), points to Rome, where S. Mark composed his Gospel, and where the latest notices in the New Testament represent him either as staying or invited to visit (Col. iv. 10; Philem. 24; 2 Tim. iv. 11). Moreover the Crucifixion of S. Peter (John xxi. 18) is always connected by tradition with Rome, and with no other place. Bp Lightfoot considers

there is no allusion to any jurisdiction in that City¹. While, then, it is probable that the Apostle found his way to the Capital of the West and there received the martyr's crown², the supposition that he remained for twenty-five years bishop of the Church of Rome involves insuperable chronological and historical difficulties.

ix. **The Supremacy of the successors of S. Peter** is seriously involved in the doubts respecting the Apostle's bishopric at Rome³. For if the permanence of S. Peter's privilege was recognised in early times, it is difficult to account for several historical facts. Thus

- (α) In A.D. 95 Clement of Rome writes to the Corinthians, and does not give the slightest indication of this privilege;
- (β) In A.D. 108 S. Polycarp consults Anicetus about the keeping of Easter, but he does not consider himself bound to defer to his authority as conclusive on the point⁴;

this to be supported by the Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians c. 5, and by that of Ignatius to the Romans c. 4. *Apostolic Fathers*, Pt i. Vol. ii. pp. 491, 492.

¹ Irenæus says that S. Peter and S. Paul preached at Rome, and laid the foundation of the Church there, and after so doing "committed into the hands of Linus the office of the episcopate." But the Greek word here used cannot be made to mean "handed on" or "handed down," as if Linus succeeded either or both of them after they died.

² Bishop Lightfoot considers that S. Peter arrived at Rome in the latter part of A.D. 64, during S. Paul's absence after his first imprisonment. The Neronian persecution broke out soon afterwards, and he would be one of the most prominent victims. Ancient tradition states that S. Peter was buried in the Vatican, S. Paul on the

Ostian Way. "The Vatican gardens were the scene of the hideous festivities, in which the victims of the fire suffered, and amongst these (we may assume) was S. Peter, A.D. 64. On the other hand an isolated victim who was put to death some years later (say A.D. 67), as was presumably S. Paul's case, might meet his death anywhere." *Apostolic Fathers*, Pt i. Vol. ii. pp. 497, 498.

³ There is not a syllable in the three texts alleged to embody the Petrine Privilege (Matt. xvi. 18, 19; Luke xxii. 31, 32; John xxi. 15—17) which empowers S. Peter to convey the privilege, whatever be its nature, to any other person, and there is no evidence producible that he ever did confer and transmit his peculiar privilege and authority.

⁴ Eusebius *Hist. Eccl.* iv. 14; v. 24. Neither bishop would yield to the other, but the two parted in peace.

- (γ) In A.D. 196 Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, disputes with Victor, Bishop of Rome, on the same point, and as they cannot agree, Victor excommunicates him, and for so doing, although Bishop of the capital of the West, he is rebuked by a number of bishops, and amongst them by Irenæus himself¹, "Victor stood reprov'd. His excommunication failed²."
- (δ) In A.D. 255 Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, and other African bishops come into collision with Pope Stephen on the question of heretical baptism, and when the latter refuses to recognise them, and renounces communion with the African Churches, they stoutly express their disapproval of his attempt to make himself a "bishop of bishops";
- (ε) In A.D. 424 the bishops of Africa, with S. Augustine at their head, write strongly to Pope Celestinus, denying his right to interfere with their jurisdiction, and complaining that he had violated the Canon of the Council of Nicæa, which directed that causes between bishops and clergy shall be heard by their own metropolitan, and not carried elsewhere³;
- (ζ) Above all, Pope Gregory the Great vehemently protested against the bishop of Constantinople⁴,

¹ It is important to observe that Eusebius recognises no special "Petrine privilege," on the strength of which Victor was justified in taking the course he did. *Hist. Eccl.* v. 24.

² Gore, *Rom. Cath. Claims*, p. 91.

³ See Laud, *Conference with Fisher*, p. 166; Crackanorpe, *Def. Eccl. Angl.* p. 176; Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* VII. xii. i.

⁴ As S. Cyprian had done before him; "Neque enim quisquam nostrum *Episcopum se Episcoporum* constituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem collegas suas adegit, quando habeat *omnis Episcopus* pro licentia libertatis et potestatis suæ arbitrium proprium." S. Cyprian in *Concil. Carthag.* vii.

for claiming the title of "universal bishop," and not only declares such an assumption to be arrogant, indeed, and schismatical, but affirms that he who made it was *a forerunner of Antichrist*¹.

x. **Decisions of Councils** speak with no less certain voice on the same subject. The sixth Canon of the Council of Nicæa, A.D. 325, places the Roman Bishop on a level with those of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria. The eighth Canon of the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, forbids any bishop to invade another's province, which had not been from the beginning under his authority². The twenty-eighth Canon of the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, confirms the decrees of the Council of Constantinople, and gives in the West privileges to "Old Rome" as the seat of Empire, and to the see of "New Rome," or Constantinople, because that city was acknowledged as the seat of Empire in the East³. Evidently the Roman patriarch was considered to have no more authority given to him than the patriarchs of Antioch, Alexandria, and Constantinople; the first place was assigned to Rome as being the imperial City; next came Constantinople as being "New Rome"; and every bishop was expressly forbidden to invade any Diocese, which had not from the first been subject to him and to his predecessors. Of any divine right of the Roman See to

¹ "Ego autem fidenter dico quia quisquis se universalem sacerdotem vocat, seu vocari desiderat, in elatione sub Antichristum præcurrit, quia superbiendo se cæteris præponit." Greg. Magn. *Epist.* vii. 33; "Si unus Patriarcha universalis dicitur, patriarcharum nomen cæteris derogatur." Ibid. v. 43.

² See Dr Bright's *Notes on the Canons*.

³ Gore, *Rom. Cath. Claims*, pp. 97, 98. "Nothing can be more certain

than that the Bishops, who enacted this Canon, did not regard the privileges of Rome as part of the divine and essential constitution of the Church; nothing is more clear than that the primacy of Rome is a 'primacy of honour,' and that the claims of Rome to supremacy were not regarded by the Eastern Church as part of the Catholic faith." Dr Bright, *Waymarks in Church History*, pp. 223, 224.

special preeminence and authority over other Churches the Councils give no hint. Political causes chiefly led to the preeminence of the Roman Church and its bishop. All the roads in the world led to Rome; all nations were represented there; the early bishops of Rome possessed the instinct of government more strongly than their contemplative brethren of the East; and the majesty of the eternal City exercised a mysterious spell over the minds of men, as the one apostolic See of Western Europe.

xi. **The Conversion of England.** Another claim, however, to direct rights of jurisdiction over England is based on the fact that Pope Gregory the Great won over the country to the Christian Faith. But to this it may be well replied that there is no precedent in early Church history for such an argument. It nowhere appears that a Church, which succeeded in any Missionary effort, acquired permanent jurisdiction over the country it converted¹. If this was the case, Jerusalem would be the Mistress, as well as the Mother of all Churches. Again, there was an ancient and flourishing Church in England long before the arrival of S. Augustine², and after his arrival the British succession³ continued for some time side by side with the Roman. While it is true that S. Augustine won over the

¹ "The African Church was according to Tertullian, *De Præscr. Hæreticorum*, xxxvi. and Cyprian, *Epist.* xlv. both high authorities on the subject, planted from Rome, yet the Church formally repudiated the authority of the Bishop of Rome in A. D. 253, and again in 419—422. Moreover, the Churches of Gaul were certainly founded by Missionaries from Asia Minor, yet the Churches of Asia Minor never claimed jurisdiction over them." Denny, *Anglican Orders*, S.P.C.K., p. 222.

² Tertullian speaks of "Britannorum

inaccessa Romanis loca, Christo vero subdita." Eusebius, *Præp. Evang.* iii. 7, speaks of Britain joining in the worship of the true God, while S. Alban was martyred at Verulam under Diocletian 300 years before the landing of Augustine. Bede, *Hist. Eccl.* i. 6, 7.

³ At the Synod of Arles, A.D. 314, three British Bishops were present, and British prelates were also present at the Council of Sardica, A.D. 347. See Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils and Documents*, Vol. i.

Saxon inhabitants of Kent and some other portions of the country, the conversion of by far the largest part was brought about by Scotch and Irish Missionaries, who received no Mission for this purpose from Rome at all. To these missionaries, indeed, the Christianising of all the north, west, and centre of England is due¹, and as Rome never gave mission to these bodies of teachers, she cannot claim jurisdiction over regions which they won over to the Faith.

xii. **Capital Punishment.** Having thus justified the position that it is not within the right of the sovereign to make over the liberties of the people or the Church to any foreign power, the Article proceeds to assert the right of every independent Christian state, (i) to inflict capital punishment, and (ii) to engage in just and righteous wars. Capital punishment was deemed by some in the sixteenth century, as it is by not a few now, to be inconsistent with the spirit of Christ's Sermon on the Mount, wherein He forbids men *to resist him that is evil*², and directs *whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also* (Matt. v. 39), and again says, *All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword*³ (Matt. xxvi. 52). But here undoubtedly our Lord is dealing with the behaviour of indi-

¹ See Bright, *Early English Church History*, pp. 94—96; Bp Lightfoot, *Leaders in the Northern Church*, p. 11. "Augustine," the Bishop writes, "was the Apostle of Kent, but Aidan was the Apostle of England." We may perhaps not form the highest estimate of the success of S. Augustine's Mission, but still it effected much. "Practically his landing had renewed the union with the western world which that of Hengist had destroyed. The new England was admitted into the older commonwealth of nations. The civilisation, art, letters, which had fled before the sword of the English Con-

quest, returned with the Christian Faith." Green's *History of the English People*, i. p. 42.

² Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, μὴ ἀντιστῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ. Here the words τῷ πονηρῷ may be translated "him that is evil," as in the R.V., or "evil" as in the Margin.

³ Οἱ λαβόντες μάχαιραν. They who take the sword "of their own motion, without authority from God, who alone gives commission to bear the sword (Matt. xxvi. 52), shall perish by the sword of divine retribution." Bp C. Wordsworth *in loc.* See also Lange's Comm. *in loc.* (T. & T. Clark).

vidual Christians, not with states or communities or the magistrates of any country¹. Under the Patriarchal Dispensation we find capital punishment was enjoined. *Whoso sheddeth man's blood, we read, by man shall his blood be shed* (Gen. ix. 6). This commandment, applicable to the whole human race, was not repealed under the Mosaic Law, and under the New Dispensation we have S. Paul upholding the authority of the magistrate to inflict the penalty of death. *He beareth not the sword in vain, he writes to the Romans, for he is the minister of God, an avenger for wrath to him that doeth evil* (Rom. xiii. 4). If this was true of heathen magistrates, much more is it true of Christian authorities. Violations of justice differ in kind and degree. It is only reasonable that penalties should differ also. The extreme violation of justice is wilful murder. The corresponding extreme penalty is capital punishment, which is necessary for the protection of society.

xiii. **The Right of War.** As with capital punishment, so with the right of war, some of our Lord's words seem decisive against its lawfulness. But again it is to be noticed that He is dealing not with nations or governments, but with individuals, and laying down general principles of action. War is a necessary evil to be entered upon for the averting of greater evils². Wars for revenge and for mere glory are unquestionably unworthy of

¹ "The administration of justice is not only of importance to individuals whose rights are thus personally secured, but to the whole civil community. For this reason, legal institutions must be absolutely maintained against all caprice and despotism.... Its penal legislation, and the recognition and validity given thereto, is a nation's clearest expression of its consciousness of justice, and therewith

of its moral consciousness of the authority of law, of duty and responsibility, of accountability and guilt." Martensen, *Christian Ethics*, ii. p. 176. E. T.

² "The true vocation of war is to serve as a means of preventing injustice and violence by physical force and of extorting what justice demands." Martensen, *Christian Ethics*, ii. 231.

Christian states and Christian men¹. But wars for the assertion of national independence, wars for the protection of people's life and liberty, are not opposed to the will of God, unless we are to believe that the Gospel was designed to condone the supremacy of the violent and unscrupulous. The testimony of Scripture seems to be clear on this point. For in the Old Testament we find the Jews² constantly engaged in war, and that often by the direct command of God³. And in the New Testament we find John the Baptist, so far from ordering the soldiers, who came to his baptism, to lay down their arms and quit their profession, bidding them *do violence to no man, neither exact anything wrongfully, and be content with their wages* (Luke iii. 14). Again our Lord heals the servant of the heathen centurion, and instead of ordering him to give up his calling, commends his faith as exceeding any he had found in Israel (Matt. viii. 10). S. Peter again instructs and baptizes Cornelius, but does not demand of him either before or after his baptism that he shall quit the army or give up his profession (Acts x. 34—45). Lastly S. Paul not only draws a parallel between the armour of the soldier and the panoply of the Christian, without any hint that the soldier's calling is wrong in itself (Eph. vi. 10—17), but he actually commends the prudence and self-denial of the soldier to the imitation of Timothy himself (2 Tim. ii. 4).

¹ It is to be observed that the Latin of the Article has "*justa bella administrare*," but there is no equivalent for *justa* in the English translation.

² On the exterminating wars of the Old Testament see Mozley, *Lectures on the Old Testament*, Lect. iv.

³ "If a one-sided pessimist view regards only the many terrors and devastations of every war, the horrors of the battle-field, the sorrows brought upon families, the towns burnt, the cornfields trampled on, and the demoniacal passions let loose, we must

not overlook the fact that war has also its arousing and purifying effects. It arouses a slumbering patriotism, and calls citizens from the luxurious enjoyments of peace, and from petty and selfish interests, to sacrifices and self-denial for the common cause. It awakens in many a lively consciousness of the perishableness and insecurity of human affairs, teaches many to pray, and humbly submit to the Lord of Hosts, whose just judgments may be executed upon earth even by means of war." Martensen, *Christian Ethics*, ii. p. 233, 4.

ARTICLE XXXVIII.

1563.

Christianorum bona non sunt communia.

Facultates & bona Christianorum non sunt communia quoad ius & possessionem, vt quidam Anabaptistæ falso iactant. Debet tamen quisque de hijs quæ possidet, pro facultatum ratione, pauperibus eleemosynas benigne distribuere.

1571.

Of Christian mens goodes which are not common.

The ryches and goodes of Christians are not common, as touching the ryght, title, and possession of the same, as certayne Anabaptistes do falsely boast. Notwithstandyng euery man ought of suche thinges as he possesseth, liberally to geue almes to the poore, accordyng to his habilitie.

i. **Connection.** The previous Article dealt with the Anabaptist objections to capital punishment and the right of Christians to carry arms. The present Article deals with another erroneous doctrine of the same sect¹, who held that the goods of Christian men were common to all alike, and pushed their peculiar doctrines so far as to leave no man anything which he could call his own².

ii. **Analysis.** The Article asserts two things:—

(1) That the riches and goods of Christian men are not common, as touching the right, title, and possession of the same;

¹ "Excludetur etiam ab eisdem Anabaptistis inducta bonorum et possessionum communitas, quam tantopere urgent, ut nemini quicquam relinquunt proprium et suum." *Reformatio Legum, De hæresibus*, c. 14, "With them the doctrine was a source, not so much of personal self-denial, as of efforts to subvert civil government and the whole framework of society; and it was not therefore to

be treated as an innocent enthusiasm, but to be denounced as a dangerous error." Bp Browne *On the Articles*, p. 830.

² "The idea of property has been challenged in modern times by such communists as St Simon, Fourier, and Proudhon, who boldly stake the matter on the apparent paradox that it is property that is the theft." Bp Forbes *On the Articles*, p. 791.

- (2) That nevertheless every man ought to give liberally of such things as he possesseth to the poor, according to his ability.

iii. **The Teaching of Scripture.** It is true that our Lord in several passages of the Gospels dwells on the danger of riches, and exhorts His disciples to a renunciation of worldly wealth¹. And it is beyond doubt that in the earliest ages of the Church, the first believers *had all things common* (Acts ii. 44, 45), and *sold their possessions and goods, and brought the prices of the things that were sold, and laid them at the Apostles' feet, and distribution was made unto each according as anyone had need* (Acts ii. 45; iv. 34, 35)². But on the other hand it is to be borne in mind that this community of goods was not even then absolute or compulsory. S. Peter says to Ananias respecting the piece of land he pretended to have sold, *while it remained, did it not remain thine own? and after it was sold, was it not in thy power³?* (Acts v. 4). His sin lay not in the retaining of his goods, but in pretending to give all while he kept back a part. Again, Mary, the mother of John Mark, had a house at Jerusalem, and practised no little hospitality (Acts xii. 12)⁴.

¹ Comp. Matt. v. 42, *Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away*; vi. 19, *Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon the earth, where moth and rust doth consume, and where thieves break through and steal: but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven*; and see the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, Luke xvi. 19—25.

² Comp. for the state of things somewhat later Justin Mart. *Apol.* i. 14, 67; *Didache*, i. 4; Hermæ *Pastor*, *Vis.* iii. 9.

³ "Si nolles vendere, quis te cogeret? Si velles offerre dimidium, quis exigeret totum?" S. Aug. *Sermo* 148.

⁴ There was no formal community of goods and abolition of private property in the early Jerusalem Church. There was a common purse for supporting the needy, into which many rich persons put the proceeds of the sale of their estates (Acts iv. 34 *sqq.*), while everyone was allowed to possess his own property (Acts xii. 12). There was also a community of the daily use of all worldly possessions (Acts iv. 32), and when the Church assumed a larger scale, this community of use developed into the active charity and hospitality upon which S. Paul insists (Rom. xii. 13; xv. 26), and the existence of which is quite evident from the

iv. **A Strict Community** of goods would render the sixth and eighth commandments superfluous, and would be in direct opposition to many exhortations of our Lord and His Apostles. Thus

- (i) Christ bids us *give alms* (Matt. vi. 4; x. 42); *make friends by means¹ of the mammon of unrighteousness* (Luke xvi. 9); *call the poor, the maimed, the lame, and the blind to our feasts* (Luke xiv. 13), *feed the hungry and clothe the naked* (Matt. xxv. 35);
- (ii) Again, S. Paul bids us *as we have opportunity, work that which is good* (Gal. vi. 10); *be given to hospitality* (Rom. xii. 13); *communicate to the necessity of the saints* (Rom. xii. 13); *lay by in store as God hath prospered us* (1 Cor. xvi. 2);
- (iii) And S. Peter exhorts his converts *to use hospitality one to another without murmuring* (1 Pet. iv. 9).

v. **The Right of Property.** Now all these exhortations acknowledge the strongest obligations to abundant and liberal almsgiving. But it would be impossible to obey them, if a strict and absolute community of goods was enforced. By the very terms, in which they are expressed, they presuppose the existence of distinct possessions in the hands of members of the Church, and leave to the conscience of each man the extent to which he shall give liberally in alms to the poor and needy.

writings of the early Christian Fathers, or, to put it otherwise, it was the application to very simple and exceptional circumstances of the distinctively Christian virtue of *ἀγάπη*. Comp. Döllinger, *First Age of the*

Church, ii. pp. 240, 241; Shirley, *The Church in the Apostolic Age*, p. 7.

¹ Ποίησατε ἑαυτοῖς φίλους ἐκ τοῦ μαμωνᾶ τῆς ἀδικίας. Ἐκ here may be rendered either (1) *by means of*, or (2) *out of*. See R.V. *in loc.*

ARTICLE XXXIX.

1563.

Licet Christianis Jurare.

Qvemadmodum iuramentum uanum & temerarium à Domino nostro Iesu Christo, & Apostolo eius Iacobo Christianis hominibus interdictum esse fatemur: ita Christianorum religionem minimè prohibere censemus, quin iubente Magistratu, in causa fidei & charitatis, iurare liceat, modò id fiat iuxta Prophetæ doctrinam, in iustitia, in iudicio, & ueritate.

1571.

Of a Christian mans othe.

As we confesse that vayne and rashe swearing is forbidden Christian men by our lord Jesus Christe, and James his Apostle: So we iudge that Christian religion doth not prohibite, but that a man may sweare when the Magistrate requireth, in a cause of faith and charitie, so it be done accordyng to the prophetes teaching, in iustice, iudgement, and trueth.

i. **Connection.** The Thirty-ninth Article, like the previous one, is aimed at the fanaticism of the Anabaptists, who, after the example of the Waldenses of the Middle Ages, and the Quakers of modern times, had such scruples on the subject of taking oaths, that they denied the propriety of their being exacted even in a court of justice.

ii. **Oaths.** When the early Christians were called upon to swear before heathen magistrates, they were naturally required to use idolatrous oaths. This was abhorrent to them and produced a dread of swearing altogether¹. Still, as we learn from Tertullian, while they abhorred idolatrous oaths, they would occasionally swear by "the safety of the Emperor," though not by his genius,

¹ Περὶ δὲ τοῦ μὴ ὀμνῆναι ἕλως, τάληθῆ δὲ λέγειν ἄει, οὕτως παρεκελεύσατο, Μὴ ὀμῶσθε ἔλως. Just. Mart. *Apol.* i. 16.

deeming the genii no better than demons¹. Later, about A.D. 390, Vegetius informs us "that they were wont to swear by God, and Christ, and the Holy Spirit², and the Majesty of the Emperor³." There was, however, without doubt much scruple amongst the early Christians on the subject of swearing. Clement of Alexandria⁴ considered it an indignity for a Christian to be put upon his oath, as disparaging his fidelity, and says that he ought to avoid swearing, saying only "Yea and Nay." To this we may add the testimony of Lactantius, who says that a Christian will never perjure himself, lest he mock God; nor indeed will he swear at all, lest he fall by accident or carelessly into perjury⁵. Still in matters of great moment it was not thought wrong to take an oath; and even S. Athanasius⁶ required of the Emperor Constantius that his accusers should be put upon their oaths⁷.

iii. **Idle and Vain Swearing.** What Scripture is specially directed against is idle and vain swearing⁸. Such

¹ "Sed et juramus, sicut non per genios Cæsarum, ita per salutem eorum, quæ est augustior omnibus geniis. Nescitis genios dæmonas dici?" Tertull. *Apol.* c. 32.

² "Jurant autem per Deum, et per Christum, et per Spiritum Sanctum, et per Majestatem Imperatoris." Veget. *Institutio sui Militaris*, i. 5. See Smith's *Dict. of Christian Antiquities*, sub voce Oath, ii. 1416.

³ Compare the oath of Joseph, Gen. xlii. 16, "By the life of Pharaoh," νῆ τὴν ὕληϊαν Φαραῶν, LXX.

⁴ Clem. *Stromat.* vii. 8, p. 861, ed. Oxon. 1715.

⁵ "Hic non perjurabit, ne Deum ludibrio habeat; sed ne jurabit quidem; ne quando, vel necessitate, vel consuetudine, in perjuriam cadat." Lactant. *Epitome*, c. 6.

⁶ Athanasius mentions the oath, ὑπὲρ τῆς σωτηρίας τοῦ εὐσεβεστάτου Ἀθγουστόου, *Ep. ad Monachos*, i. p. 866.

⁷ *Apol. ad Constant.* i. p. 678. "In the conference between the Catholics and Donatists in the time of Honorius the emperor's delegate swore to judge impartially by the marvellous mystery of the Trinity, by the Sacrament of the Incarnation, and by the emperor's safety." Harl. *Conc.* i. 1052. Smith's *Dict. of Christian Antiquities*, ii. 1416.

⁸ The use of oaths in ordinary conversation was so common at Antioch that of the twenty-one homilies, which S. Chrysostom preached to the people of Antioch after the imperial statues had been thrown down, there is not one in which allusion is not made to this evil practice. "We shall preach to you," he says, "the whole week respecting oaths," and in one of his sermons he threatens to exclude all swearers from partaking of the Holy Mysteries. *Ad Pop. Antioch.* Hom. iv. 6; vi. 7.

swearing is forbidden alike by our Lord and by S. James. The Jews in our Lord's time seem to have thought they might swear as much as they chose, so long as they did not forswear themselves. But He, going deeper than the mere letter of the Commandment, bids His disciples abstain from swearing, either by heaven, or earth, or Jerusalem, or the Temple, or their heads. *Let your speech*, He says, *be Yea, Yea; Nay, Nay* (Matt. v. 33—37), and S. James (James v. 12) almost repeats in his Epistle the words of his Master, and he evidently regards rash and profane swearing in ordinary conversation as being thoroughly opposed to the Gospel of Christ.

iv. **An Oath in a Court of Justice.** But while vain and rash swearing is thus forbidden, it is allowable on solemn and important occasions, and especially in a court of justice, to take an oath. For

- (α) When Caiaphas solemnly adjured our Lord to state whether or no He was "the Son of the Blessed," He did not refuse to plead to such an adjuration, but answered at once (Matt. xxvi. 63, 64)¹;
- (β) S. Paul frequently in very weighty matters calls God to witness, which is essentially the same thing as taking an oath. Thus he writes to the Corinthians, *I protest by that glorying in you², which I have in Christ Jesus our Lord, I die daily* (1 Cor. xv. 31), and again, *The God and Father of the Lord Jesus, He who is blessed for evermore, knoweth that I lie not* (2 Cor. xi. 31)³;

¹ "This one argument seems to be a host in itself. Our Lord consented to be put upon His oath. Oaths therefore before a civil tribunal cannot be forbidden to His disciples." Bp

Browne *On the Articles*, p. 837.

² *Νῆ τὴν ὑμετέραν καύχησιν ἣν ἔχω ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν.* See the R.V. translation of this verse.

³ Compare also Rom. ix. 1; 2 Cor.

- (γ) Again, in the Epistle to the Hebrews the Almighty Himself is represented as swearing (Heb. iii. 11), and the writer of the Epistle compares this with the swearing common among men, saying, *Men swear by the greater: and in every dispute of theirs the oath is final for confirmation* (Heb. vi. 16¹).

v. **Conclusion.** These examples justify on solemn and important occasions, and especially in a court of justice, the legal confirming of an assertion by a solemn attestation in the sight of God. The Article itself quotes the words of a prophet in justification of such a course. *Thou shalt swear*, we read in Jeremiah, *the Lord liveth, in truth, in judgment, and in righteousness* (Jer. iv. 2). Three conditions are here stated to be requisite to a legitimate oath, *righteousness, judgment, and truth*. *Righteousness*, that the thing be lawful and honest, and so the Name of God be not adduced in confirmation of injustice or sin; *judgment*, in that the oath be not taken without necessity or grave cause; and *truth*, that the thing be true, or at least on reasonable grounds and *bonâ fide* believed to be true, so that the Holy Name be not brought forward to testify to a lie, which were perjury and a great sin². An oath so taken is not only no sin but a religious act. *Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God*, said Moses, *and by His Name shalt thou swear* (Deut. x. 20).

xi. 10; xii. 19; Gal. i. 20; Phil. i. 8. Such solemn appeals were usual in the earliest times. God Himself *sware unto Abraham* (Gen. xxii. 16); Abraham swears by God to deal kindly with Abimelech (Gen. xxi. 23, 24); so also does Isaac (Gen. xxvi.

31); and Jacob swears solemnly to Laban (Gen. xxxi. 53).

¹ *Καὶ πάσης αὐτοῖς ἀντιλογίας πέρας εἰς βεβαίωσιν ὁ ὄρκος*, Heb. vi. 16. See R.V. translation.

² See Bp Forbes *On the Articles*, p. 803.

APPENDIX.

I.

THE LAMBETH ARTICLES.

i. DURING the Marian persecutions many English divines sought refuge on the Continent and there became associated with the leading Swiss reformers, who were strongly addicted to the predestinarian views of Calvin. On their return to England in Queen Elizabeth's reign they propagated widely the system of Geneva, and entrenched themselves firmly in the University of Cambridge, where they enlisted the services of not a few zealous, able, and determined men in opposing the whole system of the English Church. Of this party Thomas Cartwright, fellow of Trinity, became the acknowledged leader, and his appointment to the Margaret Professorship of Divinity in 1569 increased his influence. After some little time another pronounced advocate of predestinarian views was found in Dr Whitaker, a keen polemic and Regius Professor of Divinity, and under his influence and that of others holding similar opinions, Puritanism found at Cambridge a strong centre for disseminating Calvinistic opinions.

ii. The exertions of Archbishop Whitgift had secured in the Elizabethan statutes of the University a formidable preponderance of influence for the Heads of Colleges, and he and some other bishops were inclined to take part with the Heads, and espousing the popular side which was

inclined to predestinarian tenets, to condemn the late band of orthodox divines, who wished "to raise their scheme of divinity upon the noble foundations of the Fathers, the Councils, and the ecclesiastical historians¹." In 1595 the archbishop, who was a strong disciplinarian and regarded conformity to the law, ecclesiastical and civil, as the first duty of an English subject, thought by assimilating the doctrines of the English Church to the doctrines of Calvin, who had become what the "Master of the Sentences" had been in the palmy days of the Scholastic philosophy, to reconcile the Puritan party, and render them innocuous to the Government. Accordingly he got together at Lambeth Palace Dr Fletcher, Bishop of London; Dr Vaughan, Bishop of Bangor, and Dr Tyndall, Dean of Ely, and the Calvinistic divines from Cambridge, and drew up what are called "The Lambeth Articles."

iii. These Articles were nine in number, and they laid down the following propositions:—

i. Deus ab æterno prædestinavit quosdam ad vitam, et quosdam ad mortem reprobavit.

i. God hath from eternity predestinated certain persons to life, and hath reprobated certain persons unto death.

ii. Causa movens aut efficiens prædestinationis ad vitam non est prævisio fidei aut perseverantiæ, aut bonorum operum, aut ullius rei quæ insit in personis prædestinatis, sed sola voluntas bene placiti Dei.

ii. The moving or efficient cause of predestination unto life is not the foresight of faith, or of perseverance, or of good works, or of anything that is in the persons predestinated; but the alone will of God's good pleasure.

iii. Prædestinatorum præfinitus et certus est numerus, qui nec augeri nec minui potest.

iii. The predestinate are a predetermined and certain number, which can neither be lessened nor increased.

iv. Qui non sunt prædestinati ad salutem, necessario propter peccata sua damnabuntur.

iv. Such as are not predestinated to salvation shall inevitably be condemned on account of their sins.

¹ The expression of Young, Bishop of Rochester, in 1600, when he ordained the future Archbishop Laud.

Le Bas, *Life of Laud*, p. 6, quoted in *Hardwick's Reformation*, p. 242.

v. Vera, viva et justificans fides, et spiritus Dei sanctificans non extinguitur, non excidit, non evanescit in electis, aut finaliter aut totaliter.

vi. Homo vere fidelis, id est, fide justificante præditus, certus est plerophoria fidei, de remissione peccatorum suorum et salute sempiterna sua per Christum.

vii. Gratia salutaris non tribuitur, non communicatur universis hominibus, qua servari possint, si voluerint.

viii. Nemo potest venire ad Christum nisi datum ei fuerit, et nisi Pater eum traxerit. Et omnes homines non trahuntur a Patre ut veniant ad filium.

ix. Non est positum in arbitrio aut potestate uniuscujusque hominis servari.

iv. These Articles, asserting the extremest views of the Calvinistic system, were too pronounced for the Queen or statesmen like Burghley to accept, and were abhorrent to the rising school of theologians represented by Andrewes and Overall¹. To Andrewes the statements contained in the first and last of the Articles seemed to be a direct incentive to lawlessness. "They were charging God with cruelty," said Burghley, "and might make men desperate in their wickedness." Moreover the prelates, who drew them up at Whitaker's suggestion acted without authority, for they were not assembled in synod. The meeting was a mere private conference, and the Articles had no synodical authority. Whitgift was severely censured afterwards by Elizabeth for the whole proceeding, and so,

¹ See Wakeman, *The Church and the Puritans*, p. 51.

v. The true, lively, and justifying faith, and the Spirit of God sanctifying is not extinguished, doth not utterly fail, doth not vanish away in the elect, either finally or totally.

vi. A true believer, that is, one who is endowed with justifying faith, is certified by the full assurance of faith that his sins are forgiven, and that he shall be everlastingly saved by Christ.

vii. Saving grace is not allowed, is not imparted, is not granted to all men, by which they may be saved if they will.

viii. No man is able to come to Christ, unless it be given him, and unless the Father draw him; and all men are not drawn by the Father, that they may come to His Son.

ix. It is not in the will or power of every man to be saved.

finding himself in opposition to the Court, he was content to let the matter drop¹, and promised to write to Cambridge that the Articles might be suppressed².

¹ See Strype, *Whitgift*, p. 462. For Hooker's view of the Lambeth Articles, see his *Works*, i. p. cii. *et passim*; Saravia's in Strype, *Whitgift*, Bk. iv. Append. xxiv.; Bishop

Andrewes in his *Minor Works*, pp. 289—300, *Lib. Anglo-Cath. Theol.*

² They were, however, again brought forward and rejected at the Hampton Court Conference in 1604.

II.

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES.

ENGLAND.

THE CONTINENT.

- 1516 Erasmus publishes the Greek Testament, with a Latin translation.
- 1517 Luther nails up his ninety-five Theses at Wittenberg.
- 1520 Luther appeals to a General Council.
- 1521 Edict of Worms.
- 1522 Luther publishes his German translation of the New Testament.
- 1529 Conference of Luther and Zwingli at Marburg. Publication of the Schwabach Articles.
- 1530 An Act of Parliament forbids application to Rome for Dispensation from English Laws.
- 1530 June 25, Diet of Augsburg. June 30, Confession of Augsburg drawn up by Melancthon. Aug. 3, Refutation of the Confession read.
- 1531 All money payments claimed by the Roman See forbidden.
- 1533 All appeals to Rome from the English Courts forbidden. Cranmer pronounces the divorce between Henry VIII. and Catherine. Revision of the Sarum Missal.
- 1534 Convocation requests the authorisation of an English Bible. The Papal Supremacy rejected by the English Church.
- 1535 Second Edition of Marshall's Primer. Coverdale's Bible.
- 1536 Publication of the Ten Articles.
- 1537 Publication of the "Institution of a Christian Man" or "The Bishops' Book." Publication of Matthew's Bible. Culminating point of the Reformation under Henry VIII.

- 1536 First Helvetic Confession. Publication of Calvin's *Institutes*.
- 1537 Articles of Smalkald.

ENGLAND.

THE CONTINENT.

- 1538 The Thirteen Articles published. Excommunication of Henry VIII. and England.
- 1539 Publication of the Six Articles. The "Great" or Cranmer's Bible.
- 1540 The order of the Jesuits constituted by the Pope.
- 1542 Use of Sarum ordered to be observed in the Province of Canterbury. The reading of the New Testament forbidden to all below a certain rank.
- 1542 May 22, Council of Trent summoned.
- 1543 Publication of "A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man" or "The King's Book."
- 1543 July 6, The Council prorogued.
- 1544 Litany in English.
- 1545 King Henry's Primer.
- 1545 Diet of Worms. Dec. 13, Opening of Council of Trent. Discussion of order of proceedings.
- 1546 Death of Luther. Feb. 4, Decree concerning the Nicene Creed. April 8, Decree concerning the Canon of Holy Scripture. July 17, Decree concerning original Sin.
- 1547 Jan. 13, Decree concerning Justification. March 3, Decree concerning the Sacraments.
- 1547 Death of Henry VIII. Accession of Edward VI. Publication of The First Book of Homilies.
- 1548 The Order of the Holy Communion published. Cranmer's Catechism.
- 1548 Council of Trent suspended.
- 1549 First Prayer-Book of Edward VI.
- 1549 Publication of the English Ordinal.
- 1550 Revision of the Prayer-Book.
- 1551 Oct. 11, Decree of Trent respecting the Eucharist. Nov. 25, Decree concerning Penance and Extreme Unction.
- 1551 The Forty-five Articles. Second Prayer-Book of Edward VI.
- 1552 The Forty-two Articles. Poynt's Catechism.
- 1552 The Würtemberg Confession. Jan. 25, Hearing at Trent of the envoys from Würtemberg. April 28, War in Germany, suspension of the Council. Publication of Calvin's book *De Prædestinatione*.

ENGLAND.

THE CONTINENT.

- 1553 Death of Edward VI.
Accession of Mary.
- 1558 Accession of Elizabeth.
- 1559 Publication of the Eleven Articles.
- 1562 Jewel's Apology.
- 1563 Nowell's Catechism.
Publication of the XXXIX Articles.
Publication of the Second Book of Homilies.
- 1571 The XXXIX Articles revised in Convocation.
The English Edition revised by Bp Jewel.
The Ratification.

- 1561 The Pope invites the Queen and the English Bishops to the Council¹.
- 1562 Jan. 18, Re-assembly of Council of Trent.
July 16, Decree concerning Communion under both species, and the Communion of Infants.
Sept. 17, Decree concerning the Sacrifice of the Mass.
- 1563 July 15, Decree concerning the Sacrament of Orders.
Nov. 11, Decree concerning Marriage.
Dec. 3, 4, Decrees concerning Purgatory, the Invocation of Saints, Veneration of Relics and Sacred Images, and Indulgences.
- 1564 Pius IV. sends the Acts of the Council to Mary Queen of Scots, requesting her to publish them in Scotland.
- 1566 Catechism of the Council of Trent.
- 1570 Issue of Pius Vth's Bull deposing Queen Elizabeth.

and its decisions should be accepted in England if they were in harmony with Holy Scripture and the first four General Councils. But he assumed—as if it was a point on which no difficulty could be raised—that the English Bishops, having been apostolically ordained, and not merely elected by a congregation like Lutherans or Calvinists, would be admitted to sit with the rest." Froude, *Hist. of England*, p. 482. London, 1870.

III.

GENERAL INDEX.

- Absolution, words of in the Ordinal, Article xxxvi. Objected to by the Puritans, 404; defence of, 405
- Anglican Orders, Article xxxvi. Validity of defended against objections, 398; (1) on the ground of the invalidity of Parker's consecration and Barlow's, 398, 399; (2) the form and matter of the consecration, 400, 401; (3) the words employed, 401, 402; (4) no power of sacrifice conferred, 402, 403
- Apocrypha, Article vi. Derivation of word, 112; gradual formation of Apocryphal Books, 112; use of promoted by Septuagint Version, 112; and the Vulgate, 113; judgment of English Church respecting, 113, 114
- Articles, origin of, 1; need of, 1; the danger they aimed at averting, 4; the Schwabach Articles, 6; their relation to the Augsburg Confession, 6, 7; importance of this Confession, 8; the Ten Articles, 10; their features, 11; the Thirteen Articles, 12; the Six Articles, 13; compilation of the Forty-two Articles, 15, 16; their contents, 16; additions as compared with the Thirty-Nine, 16, 17; omissions, 16; the Eleven Articles, 18; revision of the Forty-two Articles, 19; its effect, 19; the changes made, 19; adopted by Convocation, 20; the Queen's Ratification, 20, 21; revision of 1571, 21, 22; ratification analysed, 22 n.
- Ascension of Christ, Article iv. Scripture doctrine respecting, 82; how related in the Gospels, 82 n.; evidential value of this, 82 n.; importance of the doctrine insisted on in the Epistle to the Hebrews, 82; and by S. John, 83
- Authority of Holy Scripture in matters of faith, Article vi, 99; of the Church, Art. xx, as regards (1) rites or ceremonies, 248—250; (2) controversies of faith, 250; (3) as a witness and keeper of Holy Writ, 251, 252
- Baptism Holy, Article xxvii. Source of Article, 315; object, 316; analysis, 316, 317; alteration of clause respecting Infant Baptism, 317; use of water for ceremonial purification amongst (a) the Gentiles, 318, (b) the Jews, 318; the baptism of proselytes, 318, 319; the baptism of John, 319; the baptism of our Lord, 319, 320; Apostolic baptism, 320; the grace of holy baptism, 321; baptismal regeneration, 323; infant baptism defended by (1) the analogy of the Jewish Covenant, 325; (2) the teaching of our Lord, 325, 326; (3) Apostolic custom, 326; (4) the practice of the primitive Church, 327; conclusion, 338
- Both kinds, reception in, Article xxx. Object of Article, 352; analysis of, 353; comparison of account of the Original Institution, 353; Apostolic custom, 354; Patristic testimony, 355; origin of practice of communicating in one kind only, 356; conclusion, 357

¹ F. Paolo Sarpi, *Historia del Concil. Trident.*, p. 423, ed. 1619. As regards this invitation Froude quotes Cecil's answer—"If the Council was held in a place which the Kings of France and Spain considered satisfactory the Queen of England, Cecil said, could not reasonably object; she would not refuse to allow the presidency of the Pope, provided it was understood that the Pope was not above the Council but merely its head;

- Canon, the, Article vi. Origin of word "Canon," 106; Canon of the Old Testament, 107; Hebrew Canon, 108; Canon of the New Testament, 109; testimony of Eusebius respecting, 111, 112
- Ceremonies, authority of Church to decree, Article xx, 249, 250. *See* Church
- Chastity, obligation of vows of, 13
- Church, the, Article xix. Connection of Article, 236; source of, 237; origin of the word Church, 237, 238; the visible and invisible Church, 238; the Church as a visible society, 240; marks of the Church: first mark, 241, 242; second mark, 242; claim of Roman Church to inerrancy, 243, 244; how refuted in the Article, 244, 245
- Clerical Celibacy, Article xxxii. Position of Article, 371; change of wording of Article, 371; importance of, why attached to clerical celibacy, 371; early history of, 372; later developments, 373; increasing rigidity of rule in the West, 373; enforced at Synods of Winchester and London, 373, 374; teaching of Scripture respecting, in Old Testament, 374; and New, 374, 375; passages of Scripture which seem to give the preference to single life, 375, 376; conclusion, 376
- Communion in Both Kinds. *See* Both Kinds, 352—357
- Consecration of Bishops and Ministers, Article xxxvi. Alteration of Title of Article, 396; publication of the Anglican Ordinal, 397; object of Article, 397; objections to Anglican Ordinal, 397; (a) (1) objections of mediævalists' insufficient evidence of Parker's consecration, 398, 399; (2) the lack of certain essential ceremonies, 400; (3) absence of sufficient formulæ, 401; (4) lack of conferring power to offer sacrifice, 402; (b) objections of the Puritans to (1) the Ordination formula, 404; (2) the claim to exercise the ministry of reconciliation, 405
- Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, Article xx. Parker MSS in Library of, 247
- Corpus Christi, Festival of, Article xxviii. When introduced, 345; no part of the original institution of the Eucharist, 345
- Councils, Article xxi. Title of Article and language, 255; object and analysis, 256; New Testament precedent for Church Councils, 256; Diocesan and Provincial Councils, 256, 257; the first Œcumenical Councils of Nicæa, Constantinople, Ephesus, Chalcedon, 260; power of the Emperor to summon General Councils, 258; this power claimed by the Pope, 258, 259; "Councils may err," meaning of expression, 259; relation of Councils to Holy Scripture, 260; binding force of Conciliar Decrees, 260, 261 *n.*
- Creeds, Article viii. Origin of, 133; gradual formation, 134; Eastern and Western Creeds, 134; Nicene Creed, its antiquity, 134; origin of, 134; constant repetition of, 134; Athanasian Creed, its authorship, 135; a Canticle or Creed Hymn, 135; its structure, 135, 136; Apostles' Creed, gradual growth of, 136; meaning of the name, 137; ground of reception, 137, 138
- Delivery of the Instruments, Article xxxvi. Meaning of, 400; date of the ceremony, 400; not essential to valid Ordination, 401
- Descent into Hell, Article iii. Connection of Article, 60; Language and History, 60; object of Article, 61; not found in the earliest Creeds, 61, 62; meaning of word Hell, 62 *n.*; what it is not, 62; what it is, 62; other words with which it is not to be confounded, 62; the fact of the Descent proved from Scripture, 63; practical lessons deducible from, 64; doctrinal importance of Article, 64, 65; issues of the Descent, 65, 66
- Diary, Archbishop Parker's, 400 *n.*
- Döllinger, Dr, on Parker's consecration, 400

- Election, Article xvii. View of in the Old Testament, 219, 220; Election in the New Testament, 220, 221
- Eucharistic Sacrifice, Article xxxi. Mediæval corruptions of the doctrine of, 367, 368
- Excommunication, Article xxxiii. Source of Article, 377; object, 377; analysis, 377, 378; Jewish Excommunication, 378; teaching of our Lord, 378; Apostolic practice, 379; Christian Excommunication, 379, 380; Excommunication in the Middle Ages, 380; teaching of Reformers respecting, 380; form of, contemplated in the Article, 380, 381
- Extreme Unction, Article xxv. Unction with oil for medicinal purposes in the Old Testament, 305 *n.*; in the New, 305 *n.*; view of the Article concerning, 306 and *n.*
- Faith and Works, Article xii. Relation of, 176, 177
- Faith, relation of to Justification, Article xi, 166, 167
- Final Perseverance, Article xvi. By whom taught, 209; objections to doctrine, 208; angels not incapable of falling, 209; teaching of our Lord respecting, 209, 210; teaching of S. Paul and S. Peter, 210; doctrine of the Prayer-Book on the subject, 210, 211; true doctrine, 211 *n.*
- Free Will, Article x. Peculiarity of title of Article, 155; object of Article, 156; analysis, 156; the problem of Free Will, 157; crippling of the will by sin, 157; the Gospel remedy for, 157—159
- God, Article i. Source and object of Article, 24, 25; the existence of God, 25; lines of evidence in proof of, 25—39; summary of the argument, 31; the unity of God, 32; Scripture proofs, 32, 33; the attributes of God, 33—38
- Goods, Community of, Article xxxviii. Connection of Article, 423; analysis, 424; teaching of Scripture, 424; the right of property, 425
- Grace, Article x. The Latin and Greek equivalents, 157; meaning of the word, 157, 158; prevenient Grace, 158; cooperating Grace, 159; teaching of the early Fathers respecting Grace, 160, 161; teaching of the Prayer-Book respecting Grace, 161
- Guest, Bishop, his connection with Article xxviii, 343
- Hades, Article iii. Meaning of, 62; our Lord's descent into, 63; its practical lessons, 64; its issues, 65
- Hell. *See* Descent into Hell, p. 63
- Holy Ghost, of the, Article v. Connection of the Article, 87; source and object, 87, 88; analysis, 88; characteristic of the Holy Ghost, 88; His procession from the Father, 88, 89; His procession from the Son, 89, 90; His procession from the Father and the Son, 90, 91; His consubstantiality with the Father and the Son, 91, 92; His true Deity, 92, 93
- Homilies, Article xxxv. Title of Article, 391; meaning and derivation of word "Homily," 391 and *note*; preaching in the early Church, 391 and *note*; decline of at period of Reformation, 392; First Book of Homilies, 392; authors of some of the Homilies, 392, 393; reception of the First Book, 393; Second Book ascribed to Bp Jewel, 393; objections of the Puritans to the Homilies, 394; the assent required by the Article, 394, 395
- Images, Adoration of, Article xxii. Feeling about images in the early Church, 272; the Iconoclastic Controversy, 272; development of image-worship in Middle Ages, 272, 273; warnings against image-worship in the Old Testament, 274
- Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, Article xv. Development of the doctrine, 196; silence during the first four centuries, 196; scruple expressed by S. Augustine, 196; development of doctrine during Middle Ages, 197; opinion of Bern-

- ard of Clairvaux, 197; different views of the Dominicans and Franciscans, 197, 198; compromise at Council of Trent, 198; Bull of Pope Pius IX., 198; teaching of the Church of England, 198, 199
- Incarnation of the Son of God, Article ii. Connection of Article, 44; title, source, and object, 45; the Deity of the Son of God, 46; the Word of the Father, 46, 47; begotten eternally of the Father, 47; very and eternal God, 48, 49; consubstantial with the Father, 49, 50; His Incarnation, 50; foreshadowings of it, 51; fulfilment, 51, 52; the union of the two natures, 52, 53
- Intention, Doctrine of, Article xxvi. Defined, 313; remarks of Hooker on, 313; and Bp Jewel, 314; dictum of S. Thomas Aquinas, 314
- Invocation of Saints, Article xxii. Prayers for the dead, 275; origin of practice, 275; development in the Middle Ages, 276; decision of Council of Trent respecting, 276; teaching of Scripture, 277; opinion of Launcelot Andrewes, 278
- Jewel, Bishop, on doctrine of "Intention," 314
- Jurisdiction, Papal, over England, question of, Article xxvii, 410, 411
- Justification, Article xi. Connection of Article, 162; source and history, 162, 163; object, 163; analysis, 163; derivation of the word Justification, 163, 164; the moving cause of, 164; the meritorious cause, 165; the efficient cause, 165, 166; the instrumental cause, 166; province of faith in respect to Justification, 167; the office of faith, 167, 168; patristic teaching as regards Justification, 168, 169; conclusion, 169, 170
- Lambeth Articles, 430—433
- Lingard on Parker's consecration, 400 *note*
- Lord's Supper, Sacrament of the, Article xxviii. Form and Language of Article, 330; object, 330; account of the institution, 331, 332; no mere sign, 334; a Sacrament of our Redemption, 334, 335; the inward grace of the Sacrament, 335, 336; its relation to the ancient sacrificial feasts, 336, 337
- Marriage of Priests, Article xxxii. Connection of Article, 371; title and language, 371, 372; question of celibacy of Clergy, 372; not enjoined in early times of the Church, 372; gradual growth of esteem for celibacy, 373; proposed enforcement of clerical celibacy at Nicæa, 373; its rejection, 373; gradual extension in the West, 373; laid down for the English Clergy, 373, 374; not enjoined under the Jewish dispensation, 374; nor in the New Testament, 375; special passages, 375, 376; opinion of the Articles respecting, 376; conclusion, 376
- Ministering in the Congregation, Article xxiii. Working of Article, 280; object, 280; principle of order in the Old Testament, 280; in the New Testament, 281, 282; the three orders during our Lord's life on earth, 282; in Apostolic times, 282; in the Sub-Apostolic Church, 283—285; view of the English Church, 286, 287
- Oaths of a Christian, Article xxxix. Scruples of early Christians respecting, 426, 427; swearing as condemned by our Lord, 428; by S. James, 428; justification of oaths in a court of justice, 428; example of our Lord, 428; practice of S. Paul, 429; the conditions requisite for a legitimate oath, 429; quotation respecting, from Jeremiah, 429
- Old Testament, the, Article vii. Connection with the New denied by early heretics, 115; and the Anabaptists, 115; object of Article respecting, 116; analysis of Article, 116; testimony of the Scriptures concerning, 117—122; testimony of the early fathers, 123; proof that the old fathers did not look only for transitory promises from

- (1) the language of our Lord, 124, 125; (2) that of the Epistle to the Hebrews, 125, 126; (3) from the Old Testament itself, 127—129; the Mosaic law, its triple division, 129; the ceremonial law, 129; civil law, 130; the moral law of permanent obligation, 130, 131
- One oblation of Christ upon the Cross, Article xxxi. Uniqueness of Christ's sacrifice, 360; title and connection of Article, 358; object and analysis, 359, 360; the perfect redemption, 360, 361; the perfect propitiation, 362, 363; the perfect satisfaction, 363, 364; for all the sins of the whole world, 364, 365; its completeness, 364; incapable of repetition, 365; relation of masses to, 366; efficacious for actual as well as original sin, 367; conclusion, 368, 369
- Orders, Anglican, matter and form of, Article xxxvi. Objections to, 400, 401
- Orders in the English Church, Article xxiii. *See* Ministering in the Congregation, 280—287
- Ordinal, *see* Consecration of Bishops and Ministers, Article xxxvi.
- Papal Supremacy in England, Article xxxvii. Grounds on which claimed, 410, 411; their refutation, 418—420
- Pardons, Article xxii. Latin term for, 269; original meaning, 269; by whom originally granted, 269; extension of, 269; sale of by Tetzel, 269, 270; origin of the doctrine concerning, 270; teaching of Scripture respecting, 270, 271
- Parker, Archbishop, Article xxxvi. Consecration of, 398; date of, 398; diary of, 400 *note*; proof of his consecration, 398, 399
- Passion of our Lord, the, Article ii. Statements of Articles compared with the Creeds, 54; reality of the Passion, 54, 55; proofs of from Scripture, 55; from Tacitus, 56; object of the Passion, 56; to effect a reconciliation, 56, 57; to offer a sacrifice for all sins, original and actual, 58, 59
- Peter, S., supremacy of, Article xxxvii. Grounds on which claimed, 411; examination of them, 412; position of S. Peter in the Gospels, 412; in the Acts, 413; in the Epistles, 413, 414; his true priority, 411 *n.*; in what sense the Church built upon, 411 *n.*; question of his bishopric at Rome, 414; his relation to S. Paul, 415; his martyrdom, 416
- Predestination, Article xvii. Connection of Article xvii with preceding Article, 213; object of Article, 213, 214; origin of difficulties concerning, 214; view of S. Augustine, 214, 215; teaching of mediæval divines, 215, 216; views of Calvin, 217; of Arminius, 217, 218; teaching of the primitive fathers respecting, 218, 219; election and predestination in the Old Testament, 219, 220; in the New, 220, 221; teaching of the Article respecting, 221—225; ignores doctrine of reprobation, 225; lays down two canons of interpretation of Scripture respecting the doctrine of predestination, 226—228
- Punishment, Capital, Article xxxvii. Objections to, 420; commanded in Old Testament, 421; not repealed in New, 421
- Purgatory, Article xxii. Title and contents of Article, 262, 263; object and analysis, 263, 264; origin of doctrine, 264; at first a probability, 265; developed by (1) Gregory the Great, 265; (2) by legends and dreams, 265; (3) by poets, 266; teaching of Scripture respecting, 267, 268
- Regeneration, Article xxvii. Origin of term, 323; classical usage of word, 323 *n.*; use in the New Testament, 323; meaning of explained, 323, 324
- Register, Warham's, 399; Gardiner's, 399; Parker's, 399 *note*
- Relics, Article xxii. Growth of reverence for, 273; development in Middle Ages, 274; Scripture teach-

- ing respecting in Old Testament, 275; in New Testament, 275
- Reservation of Blessed Sacrament, Article xxviii. Meaning of term, 344; growth of practice in Middle Ages, 344 *u.*; how far defensible, 345
- Resurrection, the, of Christ, Article iv. Early heresies respecting, 70; non-Christian explanations of, 72—75; refutation of these explanations, 75, 76; refutation of theory of visions, 76; the Resurrection Body of Christ, 79; followed by the Ascension, 82, 83
- Rites, power of Church to decree, Article xx. Denied by the Puritans, 247; controversy concerning clause, 246, 247; justified from the analogy of the Jewish Church, 249; from the practice of Primitive Church, 249, 250
- Sacraments, Article xxv. Source and object of Article, 296; changes in form and language, 296, 297; origin of the word *Sacramentum*, its classical, ecclesiastical, and later usage, 297—299; sacraments defined in the Article (*a*) *negatively* and (*b*) *positively*, 299, 300; material things used by God as *signs* and *pledges*, 301; as supernatural means of Grace, 301, 302; Sacraments combine all these methods, as *testimonia*, *signa*, *pignora*, *media*, 302, 303; the five so-called Sacraments, 304; the fixing of the number seven, 304; why they are not of like nature with "the Sacraments of the Gospel," 304—306; the right use of the Sacraments, 306, 307
- Sacrifice of Death of Christ, Article xxxi. Its efficacy, 359; the one perfect redemption, 360, 361; propitiation, 362, 363; satisfaction, 364; for the sins of the whole world, original and actual, 364, 365
- Saints, Invocation of, Article xxii. See pp. 275—278
- Salvation, Eternal, of obtaining, Article xviii. Title and language of Article, 229, 230; object of Article, 230; analysis, 230, 231; indirect proof of the position taken up in, 231, 232; direct proofs, 232—234; what the Article does and does not assert, 234
- Scripture, Holy, sufficiency of for salvation, Article vi. Connection of Article, 97; history and language, 97, 98; object, 98; analysis, 98; the plenary authority of the Scriptures of the Old Testament accepted (1) by our Lord, 99; (2) by the Apostles, 99, 100; gradual growth of the New Testament, 101, 102; books of New Testament, 102; their authority recognised by the Apostles, 102, 103; relation of the Scriptures to tradition, 103, 104; teaching of the Fathers on this point, 104, 105; the Canonical Scriptures, 106; the Canon of the Old Testament, 107, 108; the Canon of the New Testament, 109, 110; early versions of the New Testament, the *Peshitto*, the *Vetus Itala*, 110, 111; the testimony of Eusebius, 111, 112; the Apocrypha, gradual formation of, 112; use of promoted by the Septuagint version, 112; and the Vulgate, 113; how far the English Church accepts, 113, 114
- Sin after Baptism, Article xvi. Connection of Article, 200; variations of title, 200, 201; early errors respecting Post-Baptismal sin, 201; these errors reproduced by the Anabaptists, 201, 202; analysis of Article, 202; the remissibility of sin after Baptism deduced from (1) the teaching of our Lord, 203; (2) the Apostles, 204, 205; passages of Scripture urged against this view, (*a*) Matt. xii. 31, 32, 205, 206; (*b*) Heb. vi. 4—6, 206, 207; (*c*) Heb. x. 26, 27, 207; (*d*) Heb. xii. 16, 17, 208, 209
- Sin, Christ alone without, Article xv. Need and object of Article, 189, 190; analysis, 190; proofs of our Lord's sinlessness from the Gospels, 191, 192; from the Epistles, 192, 193; His sinlessness qualifies Him to be "the Lamb without spot,"

- 193, 194; herein He differs from all the rest of mankind, 194; apparent exceptions, 194—198
- Sin, Original, Article ix. Connection and origin of Article, 140, 141; object, 141; the teaching of Pelagius, 141; revived by the Anabaptists, 142; original sin, negative definition, 142; positive definition, 142, 143; the result of the Fall, 145, 146; effects as traced in the Old Testament, 147, 148; as taught by our Lord, 148; and by S. Paul, 148, 149; original sin and the doctrine of heredity, 149, 150; original sin as taught by the Early Fathers, 150, 151; taint of, remains even in the regenerate, 151; proof of this from S. Paul, S. Peter, and S. John, 152, 153; concupiscence, its relation to actual sin, 153, 154
- Supererogation, works of, Article xiv. Connection of Article, 183; derivation of word "supererogation," 184; origin of doctrine, 184, 185; passages of Scripture supposed to support, 185—187; doctrine respecting laid down in the Article, 187; contradicted by our Lord's words, 187, 188
- Supremacy, Royal, Article xxxvii. Definition of, 409; what it is not, what it is, 409, 410
- Tongue, unknown, use of in services of the Church, Article xxiv. Object and wording of Article, 288; analysis of Article, 289; teaching of Holy Scripture in the Old and New Testament, 289, 290; custom of the Primitive Church, 291; testimony of the early Fathers, 291, 292; origin of use of the Latin tongue, 292, 293; custom of the Eastern Church, 293, 294
- Traditions of the Church, Article xxxiv. Language of Article, 383; object, 383; meaning of word Traditions here, 383 *note*; the teaching of Scripture, 384; the teaching of Church history, 384—386; traditions not to be absolutely uniform, 386; nor to be wantonly broken or neglected, 386, 387; teaching of Scripture, 387; rights of national Churches, 388
- Transubstantiation, Article xxviii. Derivation of word, 339 *note*; origin of doctrine, 337; teaching of the early Church, 337, 338; teaching of Paschasius Radbert, 338; teaching of Ratramnus, 338; controversy revived by Berengarius, 338, 339; the Scholastic Doctrine, 339; definition by Council of Trent, 340; objections of the Article to the doctrine, 340, 341; view sustained by the Article, 342, 343
- Trinity, the, in Unity, Article i. First occurrence of the word Trinity in ecclesiastical writers, 38 *note*; intimations of a Trinity in the Old Testament, 39, 40; clearer revelation in the New, 40, 41; the Persons in the Trinity, 41; their respective characteristics, 42, 43
- Uction, Extreme. See Extreme, pp. 305, 306
- Unworthiness of Ministers, Article xxvi. Connection and object of Article, 308, 309; analysis, 310; teaching of our Lord respecting, 311; unworthiness of Ministers does not vitiate the Sacraments, 311, 312; side of warning of the Article, 312; need of ecclesiastical discipline, 312, 313; doctrine of Intention, 313, 314
- War, right of States to declare, Article xxxvii. Object of Article, 421; right of war denied, 421; by whom and on what grounds, 422; objections answered, 422; righteous and unrighteous wars, 422 *u.*
- Wicked, the, and the Lord's Supper, Article xxix. Connection of Article, 347; history of, 348; title, 348, 349; analysis, 349; phraseology, 349, 350; passages of Scripture examined, 350; words of S. Paul in 1 Cor. xi., 351; deduction from these words, 351
- Will, Free, Article xi. See under Free Will, pp. 155—159

Works before Justification, Article xiii. Connection and Title of Article, 178; object, 179; analysis, 179, 180; doctrine repudiated by the Article, 179; Scripture teaching respecting the subject, 180; with whom the Article deals, 181, 182; with whom it does not deal, 182 Works, Good, Article xiii. Connection

of Article, 171; history and object, 172; analysis, 172; our Lord's teaching as regards good works, 172, 173; connection of good works with justification, 175; good works imperfect, 175; but not therefore to be deprecated, 175, 176; teaching of S. Paul and S. James respecting good works, 176, 177

IV.

INDEX OF GREEK WORDS EXPLAINED IN THE NOTES.

- | | |
|----------------------|----------------------|
| ἀγαλλιᾶσθαι, 124 | θέαμα, 82 |
| ἀγανακτεῖν, 325, 326 | θειότης, 48 |
| ἀγεννησία, 88 | θεότης, 48 |
| ἀληθινός, 34 | θηρσκαία, 277 |
| ἀμαρτία, 145 | ιδιώτης, 290 |
| ἀμαρτίαν ἔχειν, 153 | ιλασμός, 362 |
| ἄμεμπτος, 195 | ιλαστήριον, 362 n. |
| ἀναζωπυρεῖν, 305 | καλεῖν, 223 |
| ἀνάμνησις, 332 n. | καταλλαγὴ, 56 |
| ἀνωθεν 321 | κατεργάζειν, 160 |
| ἀπεβλέπειν, 126 | κατέχειν, 57 |
| ἀπεκδέχεσθαι, 64 | κατήχειν, 290 |
| ἀποκαταλλάσσειν, 57 | κηρύσσειν, 63 |
| ἀπόκρυφος, 112 | κύλιξ, 353 |
| ἀπόστολος, 284 | λήρος, 77 |
| ἀταραξία, 224 | λόγια, 252 |
| βάσανοι, 267 | λογίζεσθαι, 167 |
| γέννησις, 88 | λόγη, 55 |
| γραφή, 100 | λύτρον, 361 n. |
| δικαίωσις, 164 | λυτρωτής, 361 n. |
| δοκιμος, 225 | λύτρωσις, 361 n. |
| ἐκκλησία, 237 | μετανοίας τόπος, 202 |
| ἐκουσίως, 207 | μορφὴ, 48 |
| ἐκπορεύεσθαι, 89 | μυστήριον, 298 |
| ἐλκύειν 158 | ὁμλία, 391 |
| ἐναγκαλέσασθαι, 326 | ὁμοούσιος, 49 |
| ἐπιγινώσκειν, 48 | ὄνειδισμός, 126 |
| ἐπίγνωσις, 207 | παιδαγωγός, 118 |
| ἐπιθυμία, 153 | παλιγγενεσία, 323 |
| ἐρευνᾶν, 117 | |
| ἐξομολόγησις, 319 | |

παράδεισος, 62
 παραπεσείν, 206
 παρεπίδημος, 125
 πατρίς, 125
 περιελείν, 365 *n.*
 περμποήσις, 221
 πιστός, 194
 ποιῶ, 152
 πύλις, 126
 πράσσω, 152
 προγινώσκω, 222
 προορίζειν, 222
 στέλλεσθαι, 387

συνεκλεκτή, 415
 σύρειν, 158
 σχῆμα, 48 *n.*
 ὑπόστασις, 39
 φθανεῖν, 232
 φυλακή, 63
 φωτισμός, 206
 χειροτονεῖν, 313
 χρηστότης, 37
 χωρίς, 159

V.

INDEX OF LATIN WORDS EXPLAINED IN THE NOTES.

æternus, 34
 anathematizandi, 230
 bonitas, 37
 calix, 353
 certus, 300
 confictus, 264
 congruus, 179
 conservator, 38
 consuetudo, 383
 curiosus, 224
 depravatio, 143
 efficax, 300
 erogare, 184
 evertere, 341
 fidelis, 239
 futilis, 263
 generaliter, 225
 gratia, 157
 gratia efficax, 176
 gratia sufficiens, 176
 homilia, 391
 immensus, 35
 immolatio, 190

impartibilis, 34
 impassibilis, 35
 incorporeus, 34
 indulgentia, 269
 inniti, 264
 inserere, 317
 instrumentum, 316
 integritas, 79
 justificatio, 163
 massa, 215
 missæ, 366
 peccatum a traduce, 141
 per fidem, 163
 persona, 39
 præcipitium, 224
 prædicare, 231
 pravius, 142
 principaliter, 90
 propitiatio, 362
 propter fidem, 163
 quam longissime, 143
 ratio peccati, 154
 redemptio, 360
 regeneratio, 323
 resipiscere, 202
 res sacramenti, 335, 337

Romanenses, 263
 sacramentum, 297, 298
 satisfactio, 363
 secta, 231
 securitas, 224
 supererogatio, 184

supplicium, 55
 unus, 40
 verus, 34
 virtus Sacramenti, 350
 vivus, 33

VI.

INDEX OF ENGLISH WORDS EXPLAINED.

accidents, 339
 anywise, 317
 Apocrypha, 112
 Church, 239
 congruous, 179
 consubstantial, 49
 eternal, 34
 fond, 263
 general, 225 *n.*, 226
 generally, 225 *n.*
 goodness, 36

hell, 62
 homily, 391
 in anywise, 317

lively, 172
 living, 33

œcumenical, 257
 Paradise, 62
 porrection, 400
 preserver, 38
 propitiation, 362

real, 343
 rechelesnesse, 224
 redemption, 360
 regeneration, 323

satisfaction, 363
 set out, 231
 Sheol, 62
 substance, 339 *n.*

Trinity, 38
 transubstantiation, 339
 true, 34

without body, 34
 without parts, 34
 without passions, 35