

ARTICLE XXVI

Of the Unworthiness of the Ministers, which hinders not the effect of the Sacraments.

De vi Institutionum Divinarum quod eam non tollat malitia Ministrorum.

Although in the visible Church the evil be ever mingled with the good, and sometimes the evil have chief authority in the ministration of the Word and Sacraments; yet forasmuch as they do not the same in their own name, but in Christ's, and do minister by His commission and authority, we may use their Ministry, both in hearing the Word of God, and in the receiving of the Sacraments. Neither is the effect of Christ's ordinance taken away by their wickedness, nor the grace of God's gifts diminished from such as by faith and rightly do receive the Sacraments ministered unto them; which be effectual, because of Christ's institution and promise, although they be ministered by evil men.

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

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

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

IMPORTANT EQUIVALENTS.

Of the unworthiness of Ministers, which hinders not the effect of the Sacraments
Have chief authority
In receiving
From such as
Rightly

= *De vi institutionum divinarum, quod eam non tollat malitia Ministrorum.*
= *præsint.*
= *percipiendis.*
= *quoad eos qui.*
= *rite (not recte).*

THIS subject has exercised the Church at different ages, especially at the Reformation. If the Sacraments are associated with grace the question arose whether efficacy in any way depended on the one who administered them. The Article is derived from the Eighth Article of the Confession of Augsburg, with merely verbal alterations made in 1563 and 1571. The fact that this subject is included in both documents shows that the question was one of importance at the Reformation, and, as we shall see, the Article is directed definitely against the view which obtained at that time.

I.—THE TEACHING OF THE ARTICLE

Before looking at the precise purpose of the Article in the light of Church History it seems essential to consider its actual teaching.

1. The fact of evil in the Church is clearly recognised.—“Although in the visible Church the evil be ever mingled with the good, and sometimes the evil have chief authority in the ministration of the Word and Sacraments.” The term “visible Church” is found here, as in Article XIX. This is a sad confession, not merely of evil being mingled with good, but even of evil sometimes having chief authority in the ministry of the Church. It seems impossible to doubt that this is a significant reminder of the state of the Church at and before the Reformation.

2. The assurance is given that grace is independent of personal character.—“Yet forasmuch as they do not the same in their own name, but in Christ’s, and do minister by His commission and authority, we may use their ministry, both in hearing the Word of God, and in the receiving of the Sacraments. Neither is the effect of Christ’s ordinance taken away by their wickedness, nor the grace of God’s gifts diminished from such as by faith and rightly do receive the Sacraments ministered unto them; which be effectual, because of Christ’s institution and promise, although they be ministered by evil men.” As ministry is exercised in the Name of Christ we may use it even though it be evil in character, and grace is not lost by reason of an evil ministry since the ordinances are effectual because of Christ’s institution and promise whatever may be the instrumentality of administration.

3. The assertion of the duty of discipline is maintained.—“Nevertheless it appertaineth to the discipline of the Church, that enquiry be made of evil ministers, and that they be accused by those that have knowledge of their offences; and finally being found guilty, by just judgment be deposed.” This shows that an evil ministry is not to be tolerated even though grace is rightly regarded as independent of it.

II.—THE PURPOSE OF THE ARTICLE

1. The Article is clearly against the Anabaptist view that the ministry was not effective because of the bad lives of the priests. Reformation changes were often ostensibly accepted by Roman Catholics, and this led to some frank speaking on the part of Protestants, especially because of the prevalence of ignorance and immorality. The subject will best be understood by a brief review of the circumstances of earlier ages.

There had been sects in the Church from early times who maintained that the efficacy of the Sacraments depended upon the priest or minister. Tertullian said that heretics did not minister Baptism because they did not worship the same God as Christians. In Tertullian this view was associated with the error of Montanism, which was an attempt to realise in the external Church that which is only found in the invisible. Montanists believed themselves to be subjects of a special revelation of the Holy Spirit, and looked upon the visible Church as an impure and corrupt body. Cyprian soon afterwards, together with the African Bishops, denied the validity of Baptism by heretics and also by schismatics. It

seems not unreasonable to think that Cyprian was misled on this subject by his great reverence for Tertullian, whom he called "Master." His principle was that Baptism by heretics was Baptism into another Gospel, and he urged that no man could have God for his Father who did not have the Church for his mother. He pressed this so far as to say that such Baptism begat children to the devil and not to God. He was opposed by Stephen of Rome, and although he found strong support in the African Church and parts of the Eastern Church, his views were quietly but completely over-ridden by the Church in general.

The next similar question, but one to be distinguished from it, was associated with the Donatists in the fourth century. The seeds were first sown by opposition to particular Bishops. A certain Cæcilianus was elected to Carthage, and his recognition was opposed on the ground of the person by whom he had been consecrated being a *Traditor*, one who had handed over his sacred books under pressure of persecution. As such, he was regarded in deadly sin and therefore could not convey the grace of Ordination. Donatus was the leader, and the result was a large sect, having four hundred Bishops. They refused all communion with the African Church, and rebaptised all who came from it to their own faction. This, therefore, is different from the former question as being concerned with the moral disqualification, while the former was official, and it goes beyond the question of our two Sacraments, for it refers to the grace of Orders, and meant that no grace was conferred by the Word and the Sacraments.¹

The result of this controversy was to elicit from Augustine in particular a thorough treatment both as to moral and official disqualification, and he laid down in the broadest possible terms that the grace associated with ministerial functions is independent of the character of those who administer. He even says that it matters not how much worse the man is who administers. Chrysostom makes a similar pronouncement.

After that the question slumbered until it was revived in the Middle Ages by the gross lives of many of the Roman priests. This had such an effect that the reactionists are now often blamed, but wrongly. It was this that led to Wycliffe falling into the error of Cyprian, and the Council of Constance in denouncing him condemned his error of saying that nothing was valid unless morally sound. The great divines of the Roman Church maintained that the validity of the Sacraments did not depend on the validity of the officiating minister. Thomas Aquinas says that the minister acts instrumentally and not in virtue of his own authority, so that it is not required for the performance of the Sacrament that the minister should be in a state of charity; indeed, it is not necessary that he should have faith, since the ministration of an unbeliever would be valid. At the same time there was a difference among Roman divines as to whether *Intention* was not needed on the part of the priests. But Aquinas decided against it, saying that a due performance of the words

¹ Harold Browne, *Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 604.

and acts was sufficient. He taught that sacramental grace is directed chiefly to two objects; first, the removal of the defect in the soul left by past sins in so far as guilt remains, and, secondly, the perfection of the soul in those things which relate to the service of God in the Christian life.

The rigid view of personal morality as a condition of ministerial validity was asserted by several extreme Protestant sects at the Reformation. The Anabaptists revived a sort of Montanism, alleging that the Sacraments were not to be ministered by unworthy men.¹ The rise of this view led to great danger, and one of Hooker's controversies with Travers was as to salvation in the Roman Church, and so great was the feeling on both sides that many were disposed to deny salvation to any outside their own pale. It was this that led to the question being considered as early as the Confession of Augsburg.² The *Reformatio Legum* refers to the Anabaptist error.³ Thus, the Augsburg Confession and our Article were substantially Articles of peace, that we do not "unchurch" anyone, but establish a principle of mutual charity.

It is impossible to avoid noting the truth that underlies these earnest protests. It is, or ought to be, spiritually intolerable to listen to and to receive Sacraments from those who are known to be living in any form of deliberate sin.

2. The question has been raised whether the Article was also intended to oppose the Roman doctrine of Intention. We have seen that the question of ministerial validity was touched upon in the Middle Ages, and it is thought that our Reformers may possibly have had reference to it. How far is the intention of the minister necessary to the validity of the Sacraments? Bishop Gibson is of opinion that our Article is not against the Roman doctrine of Intention. He states in most unequivocal terms that this idea is a mistake: "The language of the Article in no way bears on the doctrine, and it is difficult to see how it could ever have been thought to do so."⁴ On the other hand, there is no little

¹ "The scandal was great in the eyes of many to find the law depriving them of the ministers they trusted, and commanding them to attend the Parish Church, served perhaps by a man who had conformed to every change of Henry, Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth, and whose morals and learning they equally held cheap. The Zurich Letters, published by the Parker Society, or the lives of Archbishops Parker and Grindal, will fully illustrate the intensity of this feeling. To such feelings the present Article might offer an answer theoretically and theologically true; but it could not control those instincts and sympathies which really govern the majority of mankind in such matters" (Boulton, *The Theology of the Church of England*, p. 222).

² "Quoniam ecclesia proprie sit congregatio sanctorum, et vere credentium; tamen, cum in hac vita multi hypocritæ et malè admixti sint, licet uti sacramentis, quæ per malos administrantur, juxta vocem Christi: Sedent Scribæ et Pharisei in cathedra Mosis, etc. Et sacramenta et verbum propter ordinationem et mandatum Christi sunt efficaciac, etiamsi per malos exhibeantur. Damnant Donatistas et similes, qui negabant licere uti ministerio malorum in ecclesia, et sentiebant ministerium malorum inutile et inefficax esse."

³ "Deinde ab Ecclesiæ corpore se ipsi segregant, et ad sacrosanctam Domini mensam cum aliis recusant accedere, seque dicunt detineri vel ministrorum improbitate, vel aliorum fratrum" (*De Hæresibus*, c. 15).

⁴ Gibson, *The Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 617.

authority for believing that Intention was in view.¹ It is known that the decree of the Council of Trent on Intention dates from 1547, and Jewel argued on the subject against the Jesuit Harding. Harold Browne, while thinking that the Doctrine of Intention was probably not aimed at, holds that the Article virtually and effectually meets it.² Generally speaking, the principle of the Roman Church is that this Intention is necessary. Thus, Aquinas says that if a man does not intend to minister the Sacrament and only does it in mockery the validity is at an end. The Council of Trent anathematises those who say that the intention of the minister to do what the Church does is not required.³ Subsequently a subtle distinction arose between internal and external Intention. The external Intention is the intention of the priest to administer the Sacrament in the customary form; the internal Intention is the intention to administer it in the sense of the Church. The only vital difference is as to the internal intention, and on this there is a difference in the Roman Church itself. The Ultramontane party has maintained the necessity of the internal intention, while the Gallican school have denied this. The difficulty was founded in the practice of the Middle Ages, when Hildebrand, in order to carry out his strict rules as to celibacy, said that the Eucharist administered by married priests was invalid. And another Pope (1691) expressly said that Baptism is invalid, however complete its form, if the priest has no intention to carry out the doctrine of the Church. This has been justly described as the most dreadful of all the Roman doctrines, for it makes a man uncertain whether he has received the grace for which he came. The doctrine was a weapon forged by Roman subtlety to neutralise agreement with the liberal doctrine of Stephen against Cyprian. Thus, they say in the case of our Anglican Orders that they cannot tell whether the one who consecrated Parker intended to do so. So that this Article which was perhaps originally meant solely as a protest against extreme Protestants at the Reformation, now really stands as a protest against the Roman doctrine of Intention. It is easy to see the necessity of this doctrine from the standpoint of the Church of Rome. If Sacraments work *ex opere operato* with no condition required; if in private Masses there is no communicant; since in infant Baptism there is no conscious reception, where is the spiritual value except as rites only? Consequently intention is needed since moral fitness in the ministry is not required by either side. But, as we have already seen, if Sacraments work *ex opere operato* they are mechanical only, and on the question raised by Rome as to the intention of

¹ This is held by Boulton (ut supra, p. 223); Litton, *Introduction to Dogmatic Theology* (Second Edition), p. 427; Maclear and Williams, *Introduction to the Articles of the Church of England*, p. 313; Tyrrell Green, *The Thirty-nine Articles and the Age of the Reformation*, p. 203; the last-named points out that while previously to Trent the doctrine was merely a scholastic opinion it has Papal sanction as early as 1539.

² Harold Browne, ut supra, p. 608.

³ "Si quis dixerit, in ministris, dum sacramenta conficiunt et conferunt, non requiri intentionem saltem faciendi, quod facit Ecclesia: anathema sit" (Concil. Trident., Session 7, Canon 11).

doing what the Church does, the words of Hooker have often been quoted :—

“What a man’s private mind is, 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.”¹

The principle of our Article agrees with the line taken in the Augsburg Confession—that the Scribes sat in Moses’ seat, and St. Paul refers to the Gospel as the power of God, not of man. The whole question largely depends upon our reason, for unless it is proved that God does not confer the grace Himself none of us can be certain if grace is received. We avoid all this by insisting on faith. Rome could not do this, and so required intention, attaching to the priest an inward requirement or qualification to do what the Church intended. In this way he becomes indispensable to the Sacraments.

We must, therefore, carefully distinguish between official unfitness and moral unworthiness, between public officers and private individuals, between ministerial duty and spiritual efficacy. It is essential to exercise discipline in regard to everything connected with evil, and yet it is equally necessary to remember that personal moral unworthiness cannot debar a soul from grace, or else we shall never have anything but uncertainty in view of our ignorance of the human heart. While, however, we maintain very strongly the fundamental principles laid down in the Article, yet it is equally true that unless the personal life of the clergy be exemplary it is scarcely possible to expect blessing in the Church.²

¹ Hooker, *Ecol. Pol.*, Bk. V, Ch. LVIII, p. 3.

² “God may honour His own Sacraments and Word in spite of man’s guilt; but it is contrary to reason, to experience, to history, to Scripture, to suppose that an ungodly, still less a vicious, ministry can issue in anything but an ungodly and corrupt state of the people. No conspicuous work of grace has shown itself apart from a faithful, devoted, prayerful administration of the word and ordinances of Christ” (Boulton, *ut supra*, p. 222 f.).

ARTICLE XXVII

Of Baptism.

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

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

De Baptismo.

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

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

IMPORTANT EQUIVALENTS.

From other that be not christened	= <i>a non Christianis.</i>
Of Regeneration or New Birth	= <i>Regenerationis.</i>
Whereby	= <i>per quod.</i>
As by an instrument	= <i>tanquam per instrumentum</i> = legal advice.
Rightly	= <i>recto.</i>
Are grafted into the Church	= <i>Ecclesia inseruntur.</i>
To be the sons	= <i>in filios.</i>
Are visibly signed and sealed	= <i>visibiliter obsignantur.</i>
By virtue of prayer unto God	= <i>vi divina invocationis.</i>
In any wise	= <i>omnino.</i>
As most agreeable	= <i>ut qui optime congruat.</i>

THIS represents the Article of 1553, with only slight verbal alterations. The last paragraph at that time was thus worded, "Mos Ecclesiæ baptizandi parvulos et laudandus est, et omnino in Ecclesia retinendus" — "The custom of the Church to christen young children is to be commended, and in any wise to be retained in the Church." In 1563 the Article had "sign and seal of our new birth," which was changed in 1571 to the present phrase, "sign of regeneration or new birth."

I.—THE MEANING OF BAPTISM IN SCRIPTURE

It is essential to consider this, first of all. What is the primary and original idea of Baptism as distinct from any results arising out of it? As Scripture does not state or define this meaning we must derive it from usage. Three Baptisms are mentioned in the New Testament: Jewish (Heb. ix. 10); John the Baptist's; Christian. There must, therefore,

be some common characteristic of all three with specific differences. Two Greek words are found in this connection: *βάπτισμα*, and *βαπτισμός*. The former is used for John's Baptism and Christian Baptism; the latter for the Jewish "washings" or "Baptisms" (Mark vii. 4; Luke xi. 38, 39; Heb. ix. 10). This word is never employed to describe the ordinance of Baptism in the Christian Church. Then, too, the English words "Baptism" and "Baptise" are literal renderings of the Greek, and require proper interpretation. Another difficulty is that one Greek preposition is associated with Baptism and yet has four renderings in English: *into* (Rom. vi. 3); *unto* (Matt. iii. 11); *for* (Acts ii. 38); *in* (Matt. xxviii. 19). The true idea of *εἰς* is "with a view to." In Acts ii. 38 we have *ἐπί* as well. It must be noted also that the verb *βαπτίζω*, *baptise*, in reference to the individual who is to be baptised, is always found in the middle or passive voice, never in the active. "What doth hinder me from being baptized" (Acts viii. 36); "Repent and be baptized" (Acts ii. 38); "Arise, and be baptized" (Acts xxii. 16). From this it is clear that the Divine side of Baptism is primary, the minister being the representative of God. Baptism is thus fundamentally and primarily something from God to us, not from us to God.

But what is the common and what is the characteristic feature of each of these three New Testament "Baptisms"?

1. In general, the idea is purification, or washing, a symbolical or ceremonial purification (Luke xi. 39; John iii. 25; 1 Pet. iii. 21).

2. Then each of these has a specific purpose in the washing, it is "with a view" to something (*εἰς*). The Jewish Baptism was with a view to Temple membership and worship; the Baptism of St. John was with a view to repentance and the coming of the Messiah; Christian Baptism was with a view to relationship with God in Christ.

3. A further characteristic is that of separation or designation for a specific purpose. Thus, the Jews used washing for the purpose of hallowing or consecrating their priests and Levites (Exod. xxix. 1, 4; Num. viii. 14), and so we read of "the water of separation" (Num. xix. 9). In the same way, the Israelites are said to have been baptised, that is separated, designated, separated for Moses (1 Cor. x. 2).

4. Thus, blending the word "Baptism," "washing," and the preposition, *εἰς*, "with a view to," we arrive at the thought of "washing with a purpose." The general idea is purification, the specific idea is designation.

When this is applied to Christian Baptism we see exactly what Scripture intends. "Whereunto then were ye baptized?" (Acts xix. 3). "Baptizing them with a view to the Name" (Matt. xxviii. 19). So that Baptism is a Divine designation with a view to (a) remission (Acts ii. 38); (b) union (Matt. xxviii. 19). It is also noteworthy that Baptism always looks forward, not backward, and is connected with God's promises. It always possesses the element of futurity, "with a view to."

Thus, we observe that there is nothing in Scripture about the pro-

fession of faith in connection with Baptism; the Divine side is fundamental, and it must be kept so and made perfectly clear. Baptism implies Divine designation. Confession of Christ is obviously not by Baptism only, but throughout the entire life, and whenever there is confession in Baptism it is accidental and no part of the essential meaning of the rite. The soul can be designated for and consecrated to God altogether apart from any profession before men. This will be found to be the case in every instance in the New Testament, for nowhere is confession before men taught, still less required.

II.—THE MEANING IN THE ARTICLE

It is clear from the foregoing consideration of Baptism that the statements in the Article are secondary rather than primary, referring to the ecclesiastical rather than the purely personal aspects of the ordinance.

1. Baptism is a sign of Christian profession.—“A sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened.” This idea of Baptism as the Divine mark of Christians is an elementary view accepted by all, and it is seen in our Baptismal Service, where the statement is made that “Baptism doth represent to us our profession.”

2. Baptism is a sign of regeneration.—“A sign of Regeneration or New Birth.” The word “sign,” *signum*, has the same meaning as in Article XXV, a pledge or seal. Circumcision was thus the seal of Abraham’s faith (Rom. iv. 11). Regeneration is explained as “New Birth” and everything depends on the meaning of this word.¹ Attention should specially be called to the idea of birth, which is invariably associated with Baptism. Much turns on the distinction between life and birth, with the former of which Baptism is never connected either in Scripture or in the Prayer Book.

3. Baptism is the instrument of introduction into the Church.—The word “Whereby” has in the Latin the equivalent, *per quod*, i.e. *signum*; it does not refer to the regeneration nor is anything implied as to this. *Per* is also important, referring to instrumentality, not direct agency. This has reference to the doctrine that God confers grace and not that the Sacrament works *ex opere operato*, and the Latin is also important in showing that *per quod* governs the whole of the remaining section down to “God.” The word “instrument,” *instrumentum*, gives the idea of “a legal instrument,” “a deed of conveyance,” so that Baptism “gives as a deed gives, not as an electric wire gives.”² The word *instrumentum* was frequently used in the sixteenth century to express the Sacraments.³

¹ The subject can be studied in Dimock, *The Doctrine of the Sacraments*; Goode, *Infant Baptism*; Mozley, *The Baptismal Controversy*.

² Bishop Moule, *English Church Teaching*, p. 98; cf. pp. 91, 95.

³ Quotations can be seen in Hardwick, *History of the Articles of Religion*, p. 39.

III.—THE CONDITION OF BAPTISM

The Article speaks of receiving Baptism “rightly,” and the Latin equivalent is important, *recte*, not *rite*. Comparison may be made with Article XXVIII on the Lord’s Supper, which is to be received “rightly (*rite*), worthily, and by faith.” The word *rite* refers simply to the outward ceremony, while *recte* includes inward dispositions as well. Jerome’s words are sometimes quoted in this connection; “They that receive not Baptism with perfect faith receive the water, but the Holy Ghost they receive not.”¹ This principle can be illustrated from the Catechism: “What is required of persons to be baptized?” “Repentance, whereby they forsake sin; and Faith, whereby they steadfastly believe the promises of God made to them in that Sacrament.” So that in accordance with the teaching of Article XXV the efficacy of Baptism is conditional on true, that is, trustful reception. No view of this Sacrament can be satisfactory which does not account fully for the Baptisms recorded in the Acts. Thus, in chapter ii. 38, we read: “Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the Name of Jesus Christ with a view to the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost.” In chapter viii. 13, Simon Magus was baptised apparently without receiving the Holy Spirit. In chapter x. 47, Cornelius was baptised after he had received the Holy Spirit. It is clear from a careful consideration of these and other instances that Baptism is associated with the promises of spiritual blessing and the introduction of the recipient into the sphere of the Christian Church where those blessings become available.²

IV.—THE EFFECTS OF BAPTISM

The Article then proceeds to show what precisely is accomplished by Baptism.

1. “Grafted into the Church.”—This of course refers to those who receive Baptism rightly (*recte*), and does not apply merely to Baptism as a rite, because admission into the visible Church is not conditional on the necessity of spiritual qualification but only on its profession. The word *recte* corresponds with the teaching of Acts ii. 38; i Cor. xii. 13; Gal. iii. 26, 27. If, however, the visible Church is to be understood it makes the Baptism the rite of admission.

2. The promises of forgiveness and adoption are signed and sealed.—“The promises of the forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed.” This connection of Baptism with promise is another illustration of the principle laid down in Article XXV, that the Word of God as a Divine revelation

¹ Quoted in Goode, *ut supra*, p. 253.

² “Baptism, being a sacrament of the New Covenant, can effect nothing more than that which is promised by the Covenant; and the revealed Covenant blessing of new life is conditioned by repentance and faith” (Tait, *Lecture Outlines on the Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 184).

intended to be met by the response of faith is the great underlying principle of all Sacraments (Acts ii. 38, 39; xxii. 16).¹ Special emphasis is evidently to be placed on the thought of visibility, "visibly signed and sealed," thereby giving the outward assurance by means of this ordinance that our sins are forgiven, and that we are adopted to be sons of God by the Holy Ghost. The words, "by the Holy Ghost," were first inserted in the English Version in 1563, though corresponding words were in the Latin text of 1553. In 1563 the clause was printed with a comma after "Ghost," so as to show that the reference was to the preceding adoption. This is the truth associated with Rom. viii. 14-16; Gal. iv. 5, 6. Some think, however, that the words "Holy Ghost" are to be taken in close connection with what follows. "By the Holy Ghost are visibly signed and sealed." But the English punctuation seems conclusive, to say nothing of the fact that the thought of the Holy Spirit doing a visible work is impossible and incredible. This latter view would therefore seem to be altogether unnatural.²

3. Faith is confirmed.—This shows that the faith is assumed to be already in existence before the ordinance, and the whole statement is another illustration of the necessity of faith for the purpose of receiving spiritual blessing.

4. Grace is increased.—"Grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God." Again it is to be observed that grace is presumably in existence before the administration, since increase alone is here mentioned. This corresponds exactly with the Latin of Article XXV, which speaks of Sacraments stirring up faith (*excitat*). The prayer in the Baptismal Service shows the same truth: "Increase this knowledge, and confirm this faith," referring to the recipients of the ordinance.

So we may say the Article affirms three things: (1) that Baptism is a sign of difference between Christians and other men; (2) that it is a sign of regeneration or new birth; (3) that it is an instrument of regeneration under five aspects; (a) Incorporation with the Church; (b) ratification of the promise of remission; (c) ratification of the promise of adoption; (d) strengthening of faith; (e) increase of grace.

The doctrine of Baptism is best understood when we remember that God has made with man a covenant. This is the starting point of everything, for it not only implies that God has established a definite relation with Christians, but also that there are pledges of that covenant, the latter giving the Divine assurance, since without them there would only be on God's part an intention of goodwill and on ours an intention of trust. So that the Sacraments remain proofs and pledges of God's goodwill, and as personal covenants they are living witnesses of the Divine action of God in Christ. There can be no doubt that Baptism is the

¹ Dimock, *ut supra*, p. 44 ff.; Bishop Moule, *ut supra*, p. 101.

² For this question of punctuation see Gibson, *The Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 629 f.; Tyrrell Green, *The Thirty-nine Articles and the Age of the Reformation*, p. 211; Tait, *ut supra*, p. 181.

initiatory part of that covenant. On God's side it involves what is necessary for our life here and hereafter; pardon, adoption, the Holy Spirit, and everlasting life. These blessings are offered spontaneously and freely by God without any previous merit of ours, and are offered in themselves absolutely and not conditionally, though their nature is such that they cannot operate mechanically, and therefore require a response from us if they are to be enjoyed. There is a vital difference between offering a thing conditionally, and offering it absolutely while needing response to enjoy it. Following the Divine offer and pledge, we may regard Baptism as the formal act by which we embrace God's covenant, and it is the engrafting into that Church to which the promises belong. This is the meaning of our becoming or being made "members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven." Baptism introduces us into a new and special relation to Christ. It provides and guarantees a spiritual change in the condition of the recipient, but we must carefully distinguish between a change of spiritual relationship and a change of moral disposition. The words "new birth" suggest that Baptism introduced us into a new relation and new circumstances with the assurance of new power. But it is important to distinguish between this relation itself, which is regeneration, and the result of the relation, which is sanctification. Waterland says that regeneration is a renewal of the spiritual state at large, while renovation is a particular kind of renewal, namely, of the inward frame. Regeneration is therefore to be distinguished from renovation, and this distinction, though always observed in fact, has not always been observed in terminology, for men like Jeremy Taylor and Beveridge, while upholding what they believe to be Baptismal grace, yet spoke of the baptised as unregenerate, meaning that they were without renovation. This doctrine therefore involves the fact that the condition of the baptised is different from and superior to those who are unbaptised. It may be difficult in modern degeneracy to say that the baptised are better than the unbaptised, but speaking broadly it is so, for Baptism at least introduces the recipient to the sphere of the Church which on any view is decidedly higher and better than any sphere outside. In the case of adults repentance and faith are necessary prerequisites, and without these we must not expect the blessings of regeneration. But the reasons why they are requisite is not that they are necessary to contribute to the blessings, since God gives these unconditionally. They mean that our impenitence and unbelief can act as obstacles to God's grace. In regard to infants, while faith is personally impossible, they are accepted on the faith of their sureties, and it is on this ground that they are accepted just as are adults. But this subject will call for fuller consideration at a later stage.

V.—THE SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM

There is no question as to adults since they constitute the normal case, as seen in the New Testament from the Day of Pentecost onwards.

The Article therefore concentrates attention on the Baptism of children, and its carefully balanced and cautious statement calls for special notice. "The Baptism of young children is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ." We have already seen that in 1553 this paragraph was worded somewhat differently: "The custom of the Church to christen young children is to be commended, and in any wise to be retained in the Church." This general, cautious, and yet definite statement is particularly valuable in view of modern teachings and tendencies in the direction of indiscriminate Baptism, and its position is in thorough harmony with the teaching of the Church through the ages.

"Is there any rule of the Universal Church compelling Infant Baptism? When we consider that St. Augustine, son of a Christian mother, was not baptised until he was of full years, may we not accept the principle of freedom as regards Infant Baptism, especially in Missionary districts. There are many who are doubtful even of the advisability of indiscriminate Infant Baptism in some districts of England. Although we do not agree with them, it must be recognised that there is no Catholic rule compelling Infant Baptism."¹

There are two questions which must be kept in view: (a) Why are Infants baptised? (2) What are the results of Infant Baptism? The Article is concerned with the former, and it is necessary to endeavour to justify the statement that the Baptism of young children is "most agreeable with the institution of Christ." We have seen that the meaning of Baptism is God's designation or consecration of the recipient for the purpose of entering into union with Him in a life of discipleship. Our Lord's commission (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20) was, "Go ye and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them . . . teaching them." A disciple is a learner, and as all disciples were to be baptised all the baptised were regarded as learners. So that the one question is whether children can be disciples or learners, whether the term is elastic enough to include them. There is nothing absurd or impossible in baptising an unconscious infant "with a view to" (*eis*) something unless profession of faith is an essential characteristic of Baptism, which, as we have seen, it is not. There is not a single passage in the New Testament which connects Baptism with the confession of Christ. Baptism, let it be said again, symbolises and expresses God's act to us. Assuming, therefore, that children can be disciples or learners, the following reasons may be adduced why young children should be regarded as fit subjects of Baptism, and their Baptism considered as "most agreeable with the institution of Christ."

1. There is, first of all, a much deeper question than the fitness of infants for Baptism. It is as to the exact relation of unconscious child-

¹ Article by Dr. Headlam, *Church Quarterly Review*, Vol. LXXVII, p. 418 (January 1914); see also *English Church Manual* on "Baptism," by Principal Grey.

hood to the Atonement of Christ. Whether we think of children dying or living, the fact is the same: what is the spiritual position of these infants in relation to our Lord? Surely the truth is that all children are included in the great atoning sacrifice, and belong to Jesus Christ until they deliberately refuse Him. This is the great spiritual fact at the root of the practice of Infant Baptism. It is our testimony to the belief that childhood belongs to Christ and has its share in the great redemption. We baptise a child not in order to make it Christ's, but because it already belongs to Him by the purchase of His Sacrifice on Calvary. It would surely be strange if our Lord had no place for unconscious childhood in His plan of mercy and love for the race, for in view of the fact that so many die in infancy, perhaps at least half of the human race, it is surely impossible to think that they can be ignored entirely, and attention concentrated not on children but adults, with, it may be, experience of sin and wandering before receiving His love and grace.

2. In harmony with this we find the relation of God as the Father of unconscious childhood declared as early as the time of Abraham (Gen. xvii. 7). God then pledged Himself to be the God of Abraham and his seed, and this attitude of Divine Fatherhood has never been altered or modified through the centuries.

3. Another proof of this attitude is the ordinance of circumcision given to Abraham as a pledge of the Divine word. While circumcision was naturally used first of all of adults in the person of Abraham, and, as such, was the seal of an existing faith (Rom. iv. 11), it was also used for unconscious childhood when obviously it could not be the seal of faith. This modification of meaning when applied to children shows the position of childhood in the Abrahamic covenant of grace. It is entirely inadequate, and, indeed, inaccurate to speak of circumcision as merely the mark of Israelitish nationality, for in the case of pre-Mosaic circumcision, it is distinctly alluded to in connection with the Abrahamic covenant of grace. In the same way, Baptism to an adult Christian is the seal of an already existing faith, but to the little children of such an adult it is the pledge and seal of covenant blessings assured to the believer and his seed. The analogy is thus exact and complete.

4. In entire harmony with the foregoing we find little children entering into covenant with God, thereby showing the possibility of child-life having a true relation to God (Num. iii. 28; Deut. xxix. 10-12).

5. The attitude of our Lord to little children supports all that has been adduced. It is evident from His words and action (Mark x. 13-16) that little children are capable of spiritual blessing. His Divine words are the great charter of childhood. "Of such is the Kingdom of God" must mean in view of the context, "*such little children*," not, as is sometimes suggested, "*such childlike natures*," for this is the truth taught to the adults in the next verse. Our Lord first tells those around Him what children are in relation to things spiritual, and then solemnly tells the

adults that they too must become like little children if they would enter the Kingdom.

6. It is impossible to overlook the existence of households in the record of the early Church (Acts xvi. 15, 32-34). Household Baptisms were prominent in the New Testament times, and although of course it is impossible to prove the existence of children, yet so general and inclusive a term was hardly likely to have been employed if the reference had been only to the Baptism of adults. If we should read nowadays of household Baptisms in the Mission Field it would be a fair inference that children were included. A study of the verses mentioned shows that there is a real unity between the head of the household and the members of it, and in the case of the jailer we are only told of his own personal faith (Acts xvi. 34, Greek) though all his house were immediately baptised. To the same effect are the words of St. Peter on the Day of Pentecost (Acts ii. 39), showing that children were still one with their parents in covenant blessings and promises.

7. The references to children in the Epistles are all along the same line of thought. St. Paul teaches plainly (1 Cor. vii. 14) that the children of Christian parents are in some way hallowed by reason of their parents' faith in Christ: "Else were your children unclean; but now are they holy." There is no possible reference here to illegitimacy, but to what has been called relative or derived holiness, which would be changed in due course to personal holiness. The Apostle states the precious fact of the father's or mother's faith hallowing the little child as belonging to God.¹ Then, too, St. Paul's counsels to children (Eph. vi. 1-4; Col. iii. 20) assume their existence in the membership of the Church and their inclusion in "the saints and faithful" to whom the Epistles are addressed.

These are the grounds on which our Church finds her warrant for retaining the practice of Infant Baptism as in thorough harmony with the spirit and genius of Christianity, and when these considerations are given due weight, it is possible to see the futility of any argument urged on the ground that we have no command to administer Baptism to infants, an objection which would apply equally well to several other important and vital matters for which we have no command, though we have undoubted inferences which warrant the practice. So also the objection that repentance and faith are required for Baptism does not affect the question of childhood, for while they are required for adult salvation apart from Baptism, no one would think of applying these conditions to the salvation of unconscious childhood. Those who bind up faith with Baptism in so absolute a way are curiously inconsistent in the case of adults who profess faith when they are baptised and are afterwards seen to have had no real trust in God. These are not baptised over again

¹ Lightfoot, *Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul*, says: "It enunciates the principles which lead to Infant Baptism; viz. that the child of Christian parents be treated as Christian."

when the real faith shows itself, and in such a case the person would be taught to enter spiritually into what his Baptism was intended to mean. This is exactly similar in principle to the position contended for in the case of children baptised in infancy, and then taught the spiritual meaning of their Baptism. It is sometimes argued that Infant Baptism necessarily implies infant participation in the Holy Communion, but this does not follow. There is such a thing as infant membership, as distinct from adult, and Holy Communion requires intelligence for the remembrance of Christ in a sense which Baptism certainly does not.

We therefore conclude that the practice of admitting infants into the visible Church of Christ with a view to their becoming possessed of all spiritual blessings is in accordance with the Word of God and with the revelation of His will. To the child Baptism is a constant reminder of God's attitude and covenant, and the designation of it in Baptism can be pressed as a motive to life and service. To the parent the Baptism of the child is a seal and pledge of God's acceptance, and this will elicit faith in the parent, and lead to the instruction of the child concerning Christian discipleship. The Kingdom of God is essentially a Kingdom of Promise, and every child introduced into the fellowship of the Church is introduced in virtue of the promise of God made to the children of believers. So that children are capable of relationship to Christ and of spiritual blessings. Baptism introduced them to the sphere where such opportunities are given while it also expresses a belief in the fact and possibility of blessing. On the basis of this assurance everything connected with the child is associated, and in due course the full realisation through faith in Christ will lead to all the blessings of the Christian covenant.¹

VI.—THE EFFECTS OF INFANT BAPTISM

All the effects of Baptism mentioned in the Article are clearly applicable to adults only, for such statements as receiving "rightly," "forgiveness of sins," "adoption by the Holy Ghost," "faith confirmed," "grace increased" are all associated with adult, conscious life. And to grasp the doctrine of the Sacraments in its completeness we must view them as though all the conditions were present. This makes it essential to study the subject in the adult first of all. It is hardly without significance that nothing is mentioned in the Article as to the precise effects of Baptism on young children. But in view of the Baptismal services and the universal practice of Infant Baptism it is essential to consider the subject. Articles XXV, XXVI, XXVII are all clearly against the *opus operatum* theory, and yet the Baptismal Service has, "Seeing now that

¹ On the subject of Infant Baptism, see Litton, *Introduction to Dogmatic Theology* (Second Edition), p. 249; *English Church Teaching*, p. 103 f.; T. D. Hall, *Is Infant Baptism Scriptural?*, Barnes-Lawrence, *Infant Baptism*; D. H. D. Wilkinson, *Baptism: What saith the Scripture?*; Hubert Brooke, *Who, How, and Why Baptized?*. Although the Article does not discuss the method of Baptism, the subject will be found treated in an Additional Note, p. 521.

this child is regenerate"; and the Catechism also speaks of, "My Baptism, wherein I was made a member of Christ," etc. How are these to be reconciled? The question largely turns on the interpretation of the word "Regeneration," and differences of opinion are almost wholly due to its ambiguity. There are three main views. They are difficult to describe in simple terms, but a consideration in detail will enable us to realise the distinctions.

1. Sacramental.—This interprets "I was made" as "I became," as in John i. 14, *ἐγένετο*. On this view grace enters the soul unless a bar is placed against it, and thus it is not the presence of our repentance and faith, but the absence of their opposites which constitutes fitness for grace. An adult may resist, but a babe cannot, and so the germ of life is planted in the child and this will develop if not stifled and abused. Now as this view is virtually identical with the *opus operatum* theory the following considerations need attention.

(a) Such a position is not only nowhere found in the Prayer Book and Articles as qualifying for Baptism, but it is virtually, if not actually, denied by the emphasis laid on the necessity of spiritual conditions.

(b) If it be said that at the Savoy Conference the Bishops in opposing the Puritans endorsed the theory of grace apart from the placing of a bar,¹ it should be pointed out that fifty years before that Conference the view was opposed by leading theologians of the day.²

(c) A mere negative condition cannot be regarded as the equivalent of a positive living faith.

(d) The Catechism, on the contrary, requires repentance and faith by the sureties, and it is on this ground, not on the absence of a bar, that the infant is allowed the Sacrament.

(e) Indiscriminate Baptism has never been allowed, although on this view it would be perfectly justified.³

2. Hypothetical.—This interprets "I was made" as "I was considered," as in 2 Cor. v. 21 (*ἐποίησε*); 1 John i. 10 (*ποιοῦμεν*). This gives "regeneration" its full spiritual meaning of a moral change of nature (2 Cor. v. 17), but regards the language of the service as that of

¹ Gibson, *ut supra*, p. 612.

² Abbott, Regius Professor of Divinity, Oxford, and Bishop Carleton of Llandaff.

³ Bishop Gore in his Introduction to *Pastors and Teachers*, by the Bishop of Manchester, says:

"The Church does not baptise infants indiscriminately. She requires sponsors for their religious education; and the sponsors represent the responsibility of the Church for the infants who are being baptised. It is not too much to say that to baptise infants without real provision for their being brought up to know what their religious profession means tends to degrade the Sacrament into a charm. On this point we need the most serious reflection."

And an article in the *Church Times* (February 1908) entitled "Fencing the Font," says: "Those who advocate the indiscriminate Baptism of all children who can be gathered to the administration of the Sacrament have lost touch with the most essential feature of the Church's discipline. If they are to grow up in ignorance of Christianity, they had far better grow up unbaptised. Conversion will then be for them a more definite thing: how much fuller and richer than if they had a forgotten Baptism in their past, is known to those who have dealt with souls so placed."

faith and charity. All the conditions are assumed to be fulfilled, and so the blessings are assumed to be bestowed. In support of this position the following arguments are used.

(a) The whole Prayer Book is based on this assumption of sincerity.

(b) The Baptismal Service consists of two parts, or sides, involving covenant blessings: (1) offered (exhortations); (2) accepted (questions and answers); (3) sealed (act of Baptism); (4) followed (post-Baptismal prayers and exhortations).

(c) This view carefully emphasises the great principles connected with the Reformation position, that the ordinances are conditional, and that if children have a right to them they too must fulfil the conditions.¹

3. Covenantal.—This interprets “I was made” by “I was put into a condition or sphere,” as in Rom. v. 19, *κατεστάθησαν*. This means a change of covenant-head from Adam to Christ, and the acknowledgment of an already existing change of covenant head (1 Cor. vii. 14). The main arguments may be thus stated.

(a) This interprets “regeneration” by distinguishing life from birth. Birth is not life, but the introduction of a living being into a new state or world.

(b) Regeneration occurs twice in the New Testament. In St. Matt. xix. 28 it clearly means a new state or new circumstances. In Titus iii. 5 it is obviously distinguished from the renewing of the Holy Ghost. In the same way, St. John iii. 3 refers to birth, *γεννηθῆναι* (Latin, *generatus*, conceived; *natus*, born). Nicodemus seems to have understood the idea in this way. “How can a man be *born*?” And in Article IX, where the Latin is *renatis*, the English word is “regenerated,” while the English “believe and are baptised” finds its Latin equivalent in *renatis et credentibus*. According to this interpretation, therefore, regeneration is not equivalent to spiritual conversion.

(c) Baptism is always associated in the New Testament with birth, not with life. Birth is not a germ or seed of life, but the entrance of life into a new sphere, to enjoy privileges and to fulfil the functions of a life already possessed.

(d) If Baptism means the implantation of life for the first time, how are we to explain the existence of repentance and faith in an adult beforehand, since these are the marks of an existing life? Yet this very person is prayed for at Baptism in regard to regeneration by water and the Holy Ghost. In harmony with this, this Article speaks of faith being confirmed and grace increased. So that “born of water,” if it refers to Baptism, must mean the introduction into the Society of the visible Church, just as “born of the Spirit” means introduction into the spiritual Church (1 Cor. xii. 13).

(e) The only question is whether these two are always and necessarily

¹ This is the view declared in the well-known Gorham case, and in Goode’s great work, *The Effects of Infant Baptism*. See also Mozley, *The Review of the Baptismal Controversy*, and *The Primitive Doctrine of Regeneration*. Cf. *English Church Teaching*, p. 104.

coincident. The Spirit is sovereign and cannot be tied to any outward rite depending on man for its performance. So that it is not necessarily the case that a man is introduced into the spiritual realm simply because he is introduced into the visible realm by Baptism.

(f) We can judge of the presence of spiritual life only by its manifestation, and the germ-theory of Baptism, which on the *opus operatum* view means the implantation of a seed of life that may lie dormant and then die or grow, is clearly inaccurate, since birth is not hidden or dormant life, but life visible and manifested. So that whether born of water or of Spirit, the effects must be perceptible. Hence, the grace may be imparted before, or at, or after the outward rite. We may charitably and hopefully presume its existence, but time alone will show whether in the adult or the child.

Reviewing these three interpretations, it is clear that the first is ruled out of our formularies as entirely opposed to the Church of England position, and the true view will probably blend the second and third; the one for the sponsors and the other for the child. This meets all the needs, for even if the parents have no faith the child does not suffer entire loss because of the visible opportunity in the Church to which it is introduced.

If it should be asked why infants are baptised privately in view of death, the answer is to (a) insure Christian burial, (b) to assure of membership in the Christian Society. As to personal salvation, that depends on the Atonement of Christ. Baptism, as we have seen, looks towards introduction into a new world of fellowship, not towards eternal salvation. It is impossible to think that the Reformers would accept the *opus operatum* view here after denying it always elsewhere.

This general position can be justified on three grounds:—

(1) The views of the Reformers.—They undoubtedly held a doctrine of “Baptismal Regeneration,” but it was not identical with that of Rome. The controversy which is now called “Baptismal Regeneration” they waged under the name of the “*Opus Operatum* Theory.” They all believed Baptism to be the Sacrament of regeneration, but this was not so by the rite itself, but always as conditional and associated with the Gospel. An illustration of this is seen in the corresponding Sacrament of the Holy Communion. No Roman Catholic believes in the transubstantiation of water, or of the indwelling of the Spirit therein, and so the Holy Communion is exalted in that Church out of all proportion to Baptism. But the Reformers treated both Sacraments exactly in the same way. They used sacramental language, that is, they employed interchangeably the name of sign and thing, teaching that while all received blessing sacramentally, not all received it really. They thus distinguished between sacramental and spiritual regeneration. This is a well-known principle of Scripture which our Prayer Book follows in speaking of the sign and the thing signified in the same terms. St. Paul can speak of “the laver of regeneration,” and St. Peter can say, “Baptism doth now save us,” though both mean much more than the water. In illustration

of this view it may be pointed out that the leading Puritans never objected to the words, "Seeing now that this child is regenerate," nor did Baxter later on, because Whitgift had said that the Reformers taught that Sacraments did not contain, but only sealed grace. They never meant to declare dogmatically anything as to what is really received besides those signs which represent and bear the name of inward grace, and so the due administration of the Sacrament meant a formal and sacramental grant of privileges which make the recipients children of grace.

What, then, is the relationship of the sign to the thing signified? First, it is related to doctrine, as may be seen from the definition of the Homily already quoted, that Sacraments are visible signs "to which are annexed promises." The doctrine of the Gospel represents a written deed of conveyance, of which the Sacraments are the signs and seals. Second, the sign is related to grace as a pledge and seal, thereby correcting the view that the elements "contain" grace. Faith is, therefore, to exercise itself on the remembrance of Baptism. Parents are to make Baptism the starting-point for instruction in discipleship, reminding children of the pledge and seal. There would be no objection to this position if our faith were not so low, for to the Reformers these things were realities. We do not occupy ourselves sufficiently with the promises of God, although the Catechism speaks of "steadfastly believing the promises of God made in that Sacrament."

(2) Our Formularies.—Both the Articles and the Baptismal Service are intended to bring out the relation of Baptism to God's gift in the Gospel.¹ The word "mystical" always means "sacramental," "symbolical," and not necessarily "real," though, of course, the seal carries with it the promise and responsibility of grace. "Mystical" never means our modern idea of "mysterious," but always and only "figurative," though in such a way that the figure bodies forth a reality, as "the mystical Body of Christ." "Mystical" means "a figure to illustrate what is obscure, not to darken what is plain."²

There are thus two questions to be faced: (a) the meaning of "Wherein I was made," etc.; (b) "All the elect people of God." We must find some principle which will explain and resolve both. The assumption of universal spiritual regeneration in the full sense would explain the former phrase, but not the latter. The only principle that will meet both sides is that which regards Baptism as introducing us to a new relation, as a seal of the covenant, and implying that the child will stand to the promise of the covenant. So that "Wherein I was made," etc., refers to privilege promised and sealed for the acceptance of faith. This is shown by the words, "Faith, whereby we steadfastly believe," etc., implying the ratification of a covenant grant. This is far more than any mere ecclesiastical sense and involves a real relation between sacramental and spiritual reception, a consecrated relationship of seals to the gift of grace. This view was approved of by English Reformers, by Foreign Reformers,

¹ Dimock, *ut supra*, p. 28.

² So, Boulbee.

by early Puritans, and was never questioned for fifty years after the Reformation. On 14th June 1552, just after the publication of the Second Prayer Book, Peter Martyr wrote to Bullinger that everything had been removed from the Prayer Book which could nourish superstition. This has an important bearing on the meaning of our Baptismal Service as finally settled in 1552.¹ It is, therefore, incorrect to say that our Service was imperfectly reformed, especially since the words, "Seeing now that this child is regenerate," date from 1552, which is usually regarded as the high-water mark of English Protestantism.² Nor is there any inconsistency between the teaching of the Prayer Book and the Articles.³ The main point is the true relation of the Sacraments to the covenant of grace. Sacraments are not associated with the Gospel as unique channels of grace through the application of material elements, but are seals of the promises of the Gospel, the promises being restricted to those in whom the Spirit works. It must never be forgotten that the promises connected with the Sacraments are not different from the rest of the promises, but are the warp and woof of the New Testament revelation.

(3) The teaching of Scripture.—Each term in the Catechism is used in the Bible in a twofold sense: outward and inward; ecclesiastical and spiritual. We see this in regard to Israel (Rom. ii. 29; ix. 6). This twofold idea of membership in Christ can be seen in 1 Cor. xii. 27 compared with 1 Cor. vi. 15-18. The reference to children of God is equally clear. In the Old Testament all Jews were circumcised, and even Dives can speak of "Father Abraham" (Luke xvi. 24). Yet our Lord does not hesitate to associate them with their "father, the devil" (John viii. 44). To the same effect, the phrase, "Inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven," has its earthly as well as its heavenly side, and so we have the twofold sense of opportunity and actuality. In the same way, Baptismal Regeneration is twofold. Regeneration is birth into the visible Church; conversion is birth into the Church invisible; death is birth into the Church of Paradise; resurrection is birth into the Church of Eternity. So that Baptism is the introduction of the recipient, whether adult or child, into a new condition or relation. It must not be overlooked that since the Puritan age Regeneration has come to mean renovation or conversion. But this was not the meaning of the Reformers, nor has the idea been changed in the Prayer Book. Israel as circumcised was a separate people, but within this area there was a smaller circle, the spiritual Israel, yet the former was always held responsible because of being in covenant relationship. Even without faith the seal of circumcision was a call to believe the act, so that a circumcised Jew was not merely a member of a visible community, but was in such a covenant relationship to God as ought to have been made into a spiritual reality.

¹ Dimock, *ut supra*, pp. 38, 42.

² Dimock, *ut supra*, pp. 33, Note, 35, 37.

³ Dimock, *ut supra*, pp. 66, 157, Note.

And when Gentile proselytes were admitted they were called "regenerate," because they were introduced to the covenant and baptised. Thereby they obtained a relationship which the man was to accept in faith and make his own.

There is the same distinction between the visible and the invisible Church. The Epistles assume a spiritual position for the readers, and yet often utter warnings as to their actual condition. In the same way, Baptism represents a formal donation of a gift, which has to be appropriated by faith. How can a washing committed to the ministry of a man be a washing of regeneration in the full sense of spiritual blessing? The whole question of grace and sacramental grace needs thorough consideration. Grace is not something infused or poured into the soul at certain times. Such a quasi-materialistic idea is not found in Scripture. Grace, as we have seen, is relationship to God, and the Sacraments imply the establishment of a relationship which did not exist before. When looked at in the light of the New Testament, Sacraments are perfectly simple. They rest on the authority of Christ, and it is striking, perhaps it is also significant, that no promise of grace is actually attached to either, nor is the word "grace" ever found connected with Baptism or the Holy Communion.¹ Spiritual realities are due to believing obedience to whatever Christ enjoins. It is this, and this alone, that involves blessing.

It will be seen from this that the principle of Sacraments is that they *signify* something. The material element cannot produce a spiritual effect, which is only wrought by an agent of the same nature as itself, so that water is an agent for the body and not for the soul. This is doubtless why it is possible for St. Paul to speak as he does about Baptism (1 Cor. i. 14-17), since otherwise baptising would have been his highest ministerial function. It is untrue to say that God's appointment alone makes them efficacious unless we can show what that appointment really means. Even the blood of bulls and goats, though of Divine appointment, could not put away sin. Moral effects are only produced by moral means. The terms "channel" and "convey" are figures of speech only, unless we are to understand grace as like a material substance, conveyed through a material medium. Once again, we must remember that to "convey" is legal only, and involves no spiritual change apart from the act of him who is to be changed. When, therefore, we realise that grace is God's attitude of favour towards us we see that obviously it cannot reside in the material element.

The key to the right interpretation of the sacramental service is that the terms are to be understood in a sacramental sense, just as legal terms are to be understood in a legal sense. Baptismal regeneration means regeneration as related to Baptism. We have only to substitute "sacramental" to see this quite clearly. But to make it mean spiritual regeneration is to overlook the fact that the adjective is "Baptismal." And to be

¹ This could easily be proved by a reference to Bruder's or Moulton's *Concordance*.

sacramentally regenerate is to be regenerate *in foro ecclesiae*, while to be spiritually regenerate is to be regenerate *in foro caeli*. So that "Wherein I was made" means sacramentally put into possession of the privileges of the Christian Church, and this is exactly what the Article says when it speaks of Baptism as "a sign of regeneration or New Birth."

It is, therefore, clear that the Reformers in their own books and also in the Formularies for which they are responsible, did not intend to condemn all doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, but only the sense it has come to have to-day. They put the doctrine of Baptism into its true position in relation to the grace of the Gospel. They saw in it the seal of that gift, the real covenant donation of Divine grace, and they knew faith's acceptance of that gift as the beginning of the believer's new life. So that in the theology of the Reformation the controversy did not turn on the question whether there was or was not a true doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, for the Reformers never hesitated to admit that Baptism is the Sacrament of Regeneration. The controversy hinged on the question whether there was or was not an inward and spiritual efficacy in the *opus operatum*, an administration apart from its connection with the Gospel of Christ, with the reconciliation of the soul to God, and the conversion of the heart to Christ. To this question the theology of the Reformation answered with a very decided negative.

This negative in denying universal, spiritual, inward efficacy in the mere administration can be proved by the following considerations:—

- (a) By the word *recte* in Article XXVII.
- (b) By the conditional doctrine of the Catechism, "Why, then, are infants baptised?"
- (c) By the conditional character of the Baptismal Service.
- (d) By the clear doctrine of the Homilies.
- (e) By the spiritual dangers, as seen in Jewish history (Rom. ii. 25-29).
- (f) By the refusal to assume necessary connection between sign and grace. This is not held in Holy Communion, or found in adult Baptism, or seen in such a case as that of Simon Magus. The fallacy as to the *opus operatum* view, which is now often called Baptismal Regeneration, is that those who hold it emphasise right administration, while our Church emphasises right reception.
- (g) By the facts of the case. Our national life to-day is a positive proof that the spiritual efficacy does not invariably attach itself to Baptism.

ARTICLE XXVIII

Of the Lord's Supper.

The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another, but rather it is a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's death: insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ; and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ.

Transubstantiation, or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.

The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith.

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.

De Cæna Domini.

Cæna Domini non est tantum signum mutuae benevolentiae Christianorum inter sese, verum potius est Sacramentum nostræ per mortem Christi redemptionis: atque adeo rite, digne, et cum fide sumentibus, panis, quem frangimus, est communicatio corporis Christi; similiter poculum benedictionis est communicatio sanguinis Christi.

Panis et Vini Transubstantiatio in Eucharistia ex sacris literis probari non potest; sed apertis Scripturæ verbis adversatur, Sacramenti naturam evertit, et multarum superstitionum dedit occasionem.

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

Sacramentum Eucharistiæ ex institutione Christi non servabatur, circumferrebat, elevabatur, nec adorabatur.

IMPORTANT EQUIVALENTS.

The Supper of the Lord	= <i>Cæna Domini.</i>
Ought to have	= [no Latin].
Rather	= <i>potius.</i>
Insomuch that	= <i>atque adeo.</i>
Rightly	= <i>rite.</i>
To such as receive	= <i>sumentibus.</i>
A partaking	= <i>communicatio.</i>
Or the change of the substance	= [no Latin].
In the plain words	= <i>apertis verbis.</i>
Is repugnant	= <i>adversatur.</i>
[Is] eaten	= <i>manducatur.</i>
Of the Lord's Supper	= <i>Eucharistia.</i>
Was not reserved	= <i>non servabatur.</i>
Was not carried about	= <i>non circumferrebat.</i>
Was not lifted up	= <i>non elevabatur.</i>
Was not worshipped	= <i>non adorabatur.</i>

HISTORY

THE present Article is in some respects materially different from the corresponding Article of 1553, and the changes call for special attention.

Article XXIX of 1553 did not contain the clause "overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament," which was added in 1563 and translated into "perverteth the nature of a Sacrament." The word "perverteth" was changed to "overthroweth" in 1571.

The third paragraph, "The Body of Christ is given," etc., was inserted in 1562 in place of a different one which was contained in the Article of 1553. This will need special attention at the proper place. According to Bishop Harold Browne, the clause was omitted and a new one substituted in Queen Elizabeth's reign, "lest persons inclined to the Lutheran belief might be too much offended by it; and many such were in the Church whom it was wished to conciliate."¹

Several equivalents in the English and Latin Versions need special attention. (a) Paragraph 1. "Ought to have" is not in the Latin. (b) Paragraph 1. "Rightly, worthily, and with faith" is, "*rite, digne, et cum fide.*" (c) Paragraph 1. "Partaking" is "*communicatio.*" (d) Paragraph 2. "Or the change of the substance" is not found in the Latin.

I.—THE MEANING OF THE LORD'S SUPPER IN SCRIPTURE

1. This is the true starting-point, the discovery of what the Holy Communion means at its source, by a minute study of all the places where it is found. There are five passages: three records of the institution in the Synoptic Gospels, and St. Paul's references in 1 Cor. x. and xi. There is no other clear or even likely passage where the subject is mentioned or implied. Two titles may perhaps be regarded as scriptural; the Breaking of Bread (Acts ii. 42), and the Lord's Supper (1 Cor. xi. 20). Later on the word "Communion" (1 Cor. x. 16) and "Eucharist" are found, the latter being traced to Ignatius. But these are not found in Scripture as titles.

2. The Supper was instituted on the eve of our Lord's death, and was given only to disciples. This necessitates the enquiry as to what the disciples knew beforehand of that death. Generally, they knew the fact and a little of its meaning (Matt. xvi. 21).

3. But the main question is as to the interpretation of the great passage in St. John vi., which is often associated with the Holy Communion. What is the precise relation of this passage to the ordinance? The following points need consideration:—

(1) The discourse was spoken to unbelievers, not disciples, and at least a year before our Lord's death.

(2) The references to His death are all in absolutely universal terms, emphasising the necessity of participation by all without the slightest qualification (*vv.* 51, 53, 54, 56, 58).

(3) Our various bodily functions are treated as the best means of explaining our spiritual functions. These are not merely figures, but

¹ *Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 707.

analogies, like birth, sustenance, assimilation of food. We are taught that it is not sufficient merely to trust Christ, but there must be something in the spirit which corresponds to eating in the body, a reception of Him in our inmost soul until His will and nature become a part of ours, and, like food, strengthen all our faculties. There is nothing in our nature that so closely corresponds to this assimilation of Christ and our union with Him as eating and drinking, and it is, therefore, used here. If, then, we would feed on the Saviour and be in union with Him it is not enough to regard Him as our Teacher, or Master, or God; we must accept Him in the great act of His sacrifice as well. So that in the reception of Christ is included every part of His work for us. Primarily, it means spiritual feeding on the Atonement, since we must first be reconciled before we can do anything else. The result, fruit, or effect of our participation in the Atonement is fellowship with Him in union with His Body, and the outcome is a gracious vital presence of His Divine nature abiding in us. This general view is held by most of the ancient writers, however differently they may express it. They taught that Christ was primarily and properly our Bread of Life.¹ Of the Reformers Cranmer is the best representative, and he taught that the passage is not to be interpreted of oral eating in the Eucharist or of spiritual eating confined thereto, but of spiritual eating, whether in or out of the Eucharist. It means feeding on Christ's death and passion with the result that we have a mystical union with Him. Such spiritual eating is a privilege belonging to the Eucharist, so that the chapter is not foreign to the ordinance, but bears the same relation to it as the outward sign to the inward reality.

(4) In view of these facts a direct interpretation of the chapter in relation to the Holy Communion is obviously impossible, as the leading commentators agree. The relation is really one of universal to particular. It is not that the chapter refers to the Holy Communion, but the Holy Communion refers to it, or still better, both refer in different ways to the Cross. If the chapter is interpreted primarily of the Holy Communion, then the universal terms imply and require the necessity of participation in the Holy Communion by everyone for the purpose of receiving eternal life. As this is manifestly impossible and unthinkable, the interpretation which meets all the necessities of the case is the absolute requirement of participation in the Atoning Sacrifice of Christ. This admits of no exception or qualification, and there can be no doubt that the passage has in view the Atoning Sacrifice for the life of the world, and the necessity of individual and universal participation therein.²

4. The Passover associations with the institution of Holy Communion must be carefully studied. Whatever may be decided as to the exact date of the institution there is no doubt of the close association of the Lord's Supper with the Passover. Consider the following resemblances:—

¹ For the Fathers on St. John vi., see Waterland, *On the Eucharist*.

² See Bishop Moule, *What does John vi. mean?*

(1) The Passover was the memorial of a great deliverance from temporal bondage. The Eucharist was a memorial of spiritual redemption.

(2) The Passover prefigured the death of Christ before it was accomplished. The Eucharist was intended to look back upon the death as accomplished.

(3) The Passover was a covenant or federal rite between God and man. The Eucharist was associated with the New Covenant.

(4) No one was to eat of the Passover before circumcision. The Lord's Supper was only for disciples.

(5) The Passover was to continue as long as the Jewish law. The Eucharist is to continue "until He come."

(6) Total contempt of the Passover cut off a man from Jewish communion. No one can lightly ignore a Divine command of Christ.

(7) The Jew needed ceremonial cleansing for proper participation. The disciple at the Lord's Supper should be right with God and man.

(8) The Passover in our Lord's time was a feast only so far as individual houses were concerned, the actual sacrifice of the lamb having been made at the Temple. So with the Lord's Supper, the covenant action with the Passover refers to the feast only, since based on the Atonement of Christ our whole life is to be one continual festival (1 Cor. v. 7, Greek).¹

5. The language used in the New Testament of the Lord's Supper must be studied with the greatest possible care.

(1) "He took bread and blessed."—God is the Object of this blessing, not the element, as the corresponding words "gave thanks" clearly show. Westcott points out that the word "bless" is never used directly of material objects as though conveying some special force. The blessing, therefore, was an acknowledgement of God as the Giver, the full phrase being to "bless God for the thing."²

(2) "This is My Body which is given for you."—The word "is" when used as a copula has no meaning apart from its context. It must be either literal or symbolical. This language corresponds exactly with that used at the Passover. "This is the bread of affliction which our ancestors ate in the land of Egypt."³ It would be wise if writers remembered the language of Bishop Gore on this subject.

"It is, I venture to think, useless to argue with too great exactness about the word *is*. It describes very various kinds of identification. It is a sufficient warning against laying too much stress on it, that in one report our Lord is made to say, This cup is (not 'My Blood,' but) the new covenant in My blood. The copula, therefore, is clearly indeterminate."⁴

The words "which is being given on your behalf" must always be closely connected with the following phrase, "This is My Body," and

¹ *English Church Teaching*, p. 122 f.

² Westcott, *Hebrews*, pp. 203-205.

³ Girdlestone, *Four Foundation Truths*, p. 57. ⁴ Gore, *The Body of Christ*, p. 246.

"give" means "sacrificially to God," the reference obviously being to Calvary, not to the elements. The present tense is used for a future that is regarded as certain; is to be.

(3) "This cup is the New Covenant in My Blood."—No one ever thinks of taking this literally, since such an interpretation would be senseless.

(4) "Which is shed for you and for many," that is "poured out on the Cross on your behalf."¹

(5) "The New Covenant," that is, "claiming a part in the New Covenant which by My death I shall ratify." See Jer. xxxi. 31.

(6) "Remembrance."—The word (*ἀνάμνησις*) always means an act of the mind recalling and never an objective memorial (*μνημόσυνον*). The two Greek words for "remembrance" and "memorial" are never identical, but always carefully distinguished.²

(7) "Do this."—The force of the present tense in the Greek is "Do this again and again," *i.e.* "perform this action." It cannot possibly mean "Offer this."³

(8) "Fellowship" (1 Cor. x. 16).—The word is never used of participation (*μετοχή*), but partnership or fellowship. It refers to communion of persons with persons in one and the same thing, several persons all enjoying the same (1 John i. 7). The phrase "communion of the blood" is like "fellowship of the Spirit," referring to our partnership with one another in the same blessed reality.

(9) "Ye do shew" (1 Cor. xi. 26).—The word *καταγγέλλειν* means quite literally "pronounce" or "proclaim," and the indirect object of the verb is always man, never God. It cannot possibly mean "exhibit before God."⁴ Attention has been called to the curious fact of misquotation of the English Version as "Shew forth the Lord's death." This is done in a well-known hymn, but the Apostle's allusion was evidently to the custom associated with the Passover which was "pronounced" or "proclaimed" in the sense of commemoration (Exod. xii. 26).

¹ Westcott, *Life and Letters*, Vol. II, p. 352, says: "'This is' must be taken in the same sense in 'This is My Body' as in 'This cup is the New Covenant.' It cannot be used of material identity. Cf. John xv. 1; the Lord is most really and yet not materially the True Vine."

² "A 'memorial' is something *exterior* to the person, which can generally be perceived by the senses; whereas the word translated 'remembrance' is a *mental act*, performed in, or by, or upon the mind. A 'memorial' may produce a 'remembrance,' but it is certainly *not* the mental effect or act itself" (Soames, *The Priesthood of the New Covenant*, p. 28). Readers of Marriott's *Correspondence with Carter*, and of his *Memorials*, will recall the strong plea made for a grammatical exegesis. The best authorities are perfectly clear against rendering the Greek term by the former word. Bishop Gore also admits this (*The Body of Christ*, (First Edition), p. 315).

³ "To render the words 'Sacrifice this' is to violate the regular use of the word 'δο' in the New Testament, and to import polemical considerations into words which do not in any degree involve or suggest them" (Bishop Ellicott on 1 Cor. xi. 25).

See also Plummer on *St. Luke*, p. 497 f.; Bishop Gore, *ut supra*; Westcott, *Life and Letters*, Vol. II, p. 353. This is also the rendering of the writers of the early Church and the compilers of the Ancient Liturgies.

⁴ Perowne, *The Doctrine of the Lord's Supper*, p. 8; Marriott, *Memorials*, p. 207.

(10) "Unworthily . . . guilty . . . not discerning."—The verb *διακρίνειν* is the same as in verses 29-31, implying a lack of true commemoration. There was no charge of idolatry, but by irreverence they were guilty of offence against God.

(11) In 1 Cor. x. "table" is used for the Lord's Supper, though in the same context "altar" is used for heathen sacrifices.¹

(12) In Heb. xiii. 10, "We have an altar," the context is quite against the idea of the Holy Communion.²

(13) In all the references to the Lord's Supper the two parts are kept separate, implying the idea of Body and Blood separate in death. The sole thought is the death of Christ. Blood could not enter into the glorified humanity, so that the Holy Communion is always associated with Christ's death, never with His glorification.³

(14) No distinction is drawn in the New Testament between the institution and later occasions of the Holy Communion. Scripture regards the first Communion as "a true Communion,"⁴ and in no respect did subsequent celebrations possess any spiritual difference, unless it be by the power of Pentecost in degree of spiritual reception and realisation. The gift of our Lord at the original institution was not different from

¹ "Some interpreters, from a comparison of 1 Cor. ix. 13, with x. 18, have inferred that St. Paul recognises the designation of the Lord's table as an altar. On the contrary, it is a speaking fact that in both passages he avoids using the term of the Lord's table, though the language of the context might readily have suggested it to him, if he had considered it appropriate. Nor does the argument in either case require or encourage such a reference. In 1 Cor. ix. 13, 14, the Apostle writes: 'Know ye not that they which wait at the altar are partakers of the altar? Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel?' The point of resemblance in the two cases is the holding a sacred office; but the ministering at the altar is predicated only of the former. So also in 1 Cor. x. 18, *e.g.* the *altar* is named as common to Jews and heathens, but the *table* only as common to Christians and heathens, *i.e.* the Holy Eucharist is a banquet, but it is not a sacrifice (in the Jewish or heathen sense of sacrifice)" (Lightfoot, *Philippians*, "Essay on the Christian Ministry," p. 13).

² "In this stage of Christian literature there is not only no example of the application of the word 'altar' to any concrete, material object as the Holy Table, but there is no room for such an application" (Westcott, *Hebrews*, pp. 456, 458).

"The writer of the Epistle speaks of Christian sacrifices and of a Christian altar, but the sacrifices are praise and thanksgiving and well-doing, the altar is apparently the Cross of Christ. If the Christian ministry were a sacerdotal office, if the Holy Eucharist were a sacerdotal act in the same sense in which the Jewish priesthood and the Jewish sacrifice were sacerdotal, then his argument is faulty and his language misleading. Though dwelling at great length on the Christian counterparts to the Jewish priests, the Jewish altar, the Jewish sacrifice, he omits to mention the one office, the one place, the one act, which on this showing would be their truest and liveliest counterparts in the everyday worship of the Church of Christ" (Lightfoot, *ut supra*, p. 265).

³ "One grave point I am utterly unable to understand—how 'the Body broken' and 'the Blood shed' can be identified with the Person of the Lord. I find no warrant in our Prayer Book or ancient authorities for such an identification." "The circumstances of the Institution are, we may say, spiritually reproduced. The Lord Himself offers His Body given and His Blood shed. But these gifts are not either separately (as the Council of Trent) or in combination Himself. It seems to me vital to guard against the thought of the Person of the Lord in or under the form of bread and wine. From this the greatest practical errors follow . . ." (The elements) "represent His human nature as He lived and died for us under the conditions of earthly life" (Westcott, *Life and Letters*, Vol. II, p. 351).

⁴ Ellicott on 1 Cor. x. 16.

that bestowed by Him since. What He gave then He gives now, through His Body and Blood as shed in their spiritual force and efficacy, a gift offered to and received by faith alone.¹

Thus, in the Holy Communion we may be said to have the whole Gospel in miniature: Christ for us, in us, with us, coming again. We recall Him, appropriate Him, confess Him, expect Him. The Gospel Supper appeals to intellect, heart, conscience, and soul.

As we review the place and meaning of the Lord's Supper in the primitive Christian life, we can readily understand its general conception and proper position. The very fact that so much of the teaching is incidental is a specially significant testimony to the proper interpretation. We may be sure that nothing that is not found in the New Testament can be regarded as essential, and we have only to remember some of the circumstances to realise what the Holy Communion meant. The place of institution was a house, not a Temple; the persons were ordinary Jews, not of the priestly line; the circumstances were associated with a family meal, a family gathering at the Passover time. It is surely impossible to imagine anything being of vital importance to the interpretation and administration of the Lord's Supper, which is not found plainly taught or clearly implied in the New Testament.²

III.—THE MEANING OF THE LORD'S SUPPER IN THE ARTICLE

In the first clause of the Article three aspects of the Lord's Supper are mentioned.

1. A sign of Christian love.—The social aspect of the Holy Communion ought to be carefully noted (1 Cor. x. 17), though, of course, by itself it is inadequate.

2. A Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's death.—As we have observed already, *sacramentum* in the Articles always refers to the outward part, including word and action, as the *signum*. The Lord's Supper is thus a sign or symbol of Calvary. The Communion Service similarly speaks of "Holy mysteries, pledges of His love." The Lord's Supper is to the eye what the Word is to the ear.

3. A means of grace.—"Insomuch 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 Lord's Supper "conveys" as in Article XXV. It is like a title-deed to those qualified to receive, for it is an opportunity for the appropriation of the spiritual efficacy. The teaching

¹ Plummer, Article, "Lord's Supper," *Hastings' Bible Dictionary*.

² For fuller consideration of the New Testament teaching, see Plummer on *St. Luke*, and Article, "Lord's Supper" in *Hastings' Bible Dictionary*; Ellicott, *Speaker's Commentary*, and *International Critical Commentary* on 1 Cor. x., xi.; two Articles on the "Lord's Supper" in *Hastings' Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*; Barnes-Lawrence, *The Holy Communion*; the present writer's *A Sacrament of our Redemption*, Chs. I-V.

of the Catechism is in harmony with this statement: "What are the benefits whereof we are partakers thereby? The strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the Body and Blood of Christ, as our bodies are by the Bread and Wine."

III.—THE DOCTRINE OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION

1. The Definition.—Transubstantiation is explained in the English of the Article as "the change of the substance of Bread and Wine in the Supper of the Lord." It is necessary, therefore, to see how far this accords with the official teaching of the Roman Catholic Church.

(a) The Council of Trent teaches as follows:—

"Canon 1.—If any one shall deny that the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and, therefore entire Christ, are truly, really, and substantially contained in the Sacrament of the most holy Eucharist; and shall say that He is only in it as in a sign or in a figure, or virtually, let him be accursed. Canon 2.—If any one shall say that the substance of the bread and wine remains in the Sacrament of the most holy Eucharist, together with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; and shall deny that wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, the outward forms of the bread and wine still remaining, which conversion the Catholic Church most aptly calls Transubstantiation, let him be accursed. Canon 3.—If any one shall deny that in the venerated Sacrament of the Eucharist, entire Christ is contained in each kind, and in each several particle of either kind when separated, let him be accursed. Canon 4.—If anyone shall say that, after consecration, the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ is only in the wonderful Sacrament of the Eucharist in use whilst it is taken, and not either before or after; and that the true body of the Lord does not remain in the hosts or particles which have been consecrated, and which are reserved or remain after the communion, let him be accursed."¹

(b) The Creed of Pope Pius IV is in accordance with the above.

"I profess likewise, that in the Mass there is offered to God, a true, and proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and for the dead. And that in the most holy Sacrifice of the Eucharist, there is, truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ: and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood: which conversion the Catholic calls Transubstantiation."²

(c) In exact agreement with the above Canons and Creed the Catechism of the Council of Trent teaches thus:—

"But now the pastors must here explain, that not only the true body of Christ, and whatever appertains to the true mode of existence of a body, as the bones and

¹ Session 13.

² Fifth Article.

nerves, but also that entire Christ, is contained in this Sacrament. . . . Because in the Sacrament of the Eucharist the whole substance of one thing passes into the whole substance of another, the word 'transubstantiation' was rightly and wisely invented by our forefathers."

2. The History.—This calls for careful consideration.

(a) The wording of the Nonconformist Doddridge, "My God, and is Thy table spread," shows what liberty of language is possible when no thought of precise doctrine is in question. The language of the early Fathers was similarly free, inexact, and rhetorical, because there was no controversy. It is, therefore, necessary to take their statements with care because of the tendency of Oriental symbolism.¹ Their standpoints differed according to the needs of the times. On the other hand, it is equally necessary to be on our guard against minimising the teaching of the Fathers, especially because the heathen outside the Church were under a good deal of misapprehension as to the Sacraments.

(1) Ignatius stands alone in using the Lord's Supper against the Docetæ as a proof of the reality of our Lord's Body, but to show that we cannot take him literally the following words will suffice: "Renew yourself in faith, which is the Body of Christ, and in love, which is the Blood."²

(2) Irenæus spoke of a spiritual nature united to the elements and thus giving a power for resurrection.

(3) Clement of Alexandria and Origen speak of spiritual nourishment by spiritual food, but there is no sort of transubstantiation.

(4) Cyprian marks a change by the use of "priest" and "altar," and later on sacrificial terms were freely used.

(5) Athanasius shows himself in harmony with Clement and Origen, and after Nicæa we have one witness who is sufficient alone to carry the argument against transubstantiation in Theodoret in the fifth century.

(6) But as time went on the symbolism became transformed into literalism in growing ignorance of and real inability to enter into the spirituality of pure Christianity.

(b) The doctrine that the Bread and Wine are not figures, but the very Body and Blood of Christ was taught at the Second Council of Nicæa,

¹ "Several of the Fathers have spoken so strongly of eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ, that it is easy for an ingenious partisan to select passages from their works that shall seem to favour this doctrine; though others positively reject it as a preposterous conclusion. . . . I will merely refer to a decisive passage in Augustine, which must be taken as qualifying and explaining away any high-flown tropes and metaphors, which he may have used in his devotional works. 'If a passage be a precept either forbidding a crime, or enjoining an useful or charitable act, it is not figurative; but it is figurative if it seems to command a crime, or to forbid an useful or charitable act. When our Lord says, *Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, ye have no life in you*, He appears to enjoin a crime. It is therefore a figure, teaching that we participate in the passion of the Lord, and we must sweetly and passionately treasure up in our memory, that His flesh was crucified and wounded for us'" (Macbride, *Lectures on the Articles*, p. 478 f.).

² *Ep ad Trall.*, Ch. VIII.

787, and by writers in the eighth and ninth centuries, but the full doctrine of corporal presence was first put forth by Paschasius Radbertus, 840, and after this time learning declined and superstition grew. He was much opposed by Ratramnus, or Bertram, to whom Bishop Ridley later on was largely indebted. The doctrine was also opposed by Berengarius in the eleventh century, who, however, did not maintain his opposition against the penal threats of Rome. The doctrine was introduced into England by Lanfranc in 1066, and at last it was decreed by the Lateran Council, 1215, the word "Transubstantiation" being either invented, or adopted from Peter of Blois. The decree of the Lateran Council was :—

"There is one universal church of the faithful, out of which no one at all is saved, in which Jesus Christ Himself is both Priest and Sacrifice, Whose body and blood are truly contained under the shapes (*sub speciebus*, kinds), of bread and wine in the Sacrament of the altar, having by the power of God been transubstantiated, the bread into His body and the wine into His blood, so that, for perfecting the mystery of union, we ourselves might receive of Him what He Himself received of us."

The Council of Trent finally established the doctrine, as stated above, and this continues to be the authorised and official doctrine of the Roman Church, and all study must, therefore, recur to the statements of the Council of Trent.

(c) This doctrine was one of those which was strongly and fundamentally opposed at the Reformation.

(1) Luther began by emphasising the truth of a Divine promise being attached to the Sacrament, necessitating faith for right reception. This emphasis on faith was his great point, but he never overlooked the real presence of Christ. He said that transubstantiation was a mere sophistical subtlety, and he thought nothing of it. This was the first stage of the Reformation, namely, that our Lord is present without defining the mode of the presence. But the matter could not remain thus, for all reference to the human body of Christ necessitated reasoning and argument. Luther urged that as Christ is on the right hand of God, and the right hand of God is everywhere, so Christ must be in or with the bread and wine, but he struggled against attaching any local relation of the body to the bread. Out of these conflicting statements two views prevailed among the Lutherans: one approached transubstantiation, and some phrases in the Augsburg Confession can hardly be said to differ from the Roman doctrine. Later on came consubstantiation, which it is difficult to define. It was associated with Luther's view of the ubiquity of our Lord's body, that as He is everywhere He must be given with the bread and wine, according to the literal interpretation of His words. But Lutheranism teaches that this occurs only at the moment of actual reception, that it is not so by virtue of consecration, and that it does not

continue after the reception. Nor is there any sacrifice of the Mass in the Lutheran view. It will be seen from the history of Articles XXVIII and XXIX that this Lutheran doctrine is no part of the English teaching.¹

(2) Then other Reformers, like Carlstadt, Ecolampadius, and Zwingli, broke away from this literalism to the allegorical view. The name of Zwingli is generally regarded as expressing the commemorative view only, though it is a matter of real question whether Zwingli held it himself.² In any case, the view is not Anglican.

(3) The doctrine associated with Calvin is distinct from the other two extremes, and teaches a presence which is such as does not involve attachment to the elements, or inclusion, or circumscription. According to this the Spirit uses the elements through faith to unite us to Christ. By many representative Churchmen this view is regarded as practically identical with Anglican doctrine. It was certainly the view of Hooker, but Bishop Moule makes one criticism, that Calvin associated the feeding of the soul with our Lord's glorified humanity, which is not what our Lord taught at the original institution.³ Hooker's words are often quoted: "The real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not therefore to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament."⁴ And although in recent times attempts have been made to show that these words do not represent the whole of Hooker's belief, the result has not been convincing. Hooker's view is sometimes described as that of a "virtual" presence only in the heart of the faithful recipient.⁵ But the word "virtual" is ambiguous and misleading. In modern phraseology it implies, "almost, but not really," but in connection with the Lord's Supper, as taught by Calvin and Hooker, it refers to the "virtue," or "*virtus*," that is, the force of it.

(4) In the English Church to-day a view is held, though without the word "Transubstantiation," that is practically identical with the teaching of the Roman Church, and representative writers claim that there is no essential difference between us and Rome on the Holy Communion.⁶ This makes it all the more important to consider with the greatest possible care the reason why our Church rejects the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation. Later on it will be necessary to enquire whether

¹ In 1892, Archbishop Temple, in his *Primary Charge*, said that it was difficult, if not impossible, to distinguish between a doctrine held by certain extreme Anglicans and the Lutheran doctrine of consubstantiation. But this view is now universally rejected since those who hold the doctrine in the English Church deny any association with consubstantiation, and the history of our Articles is, as we shall see, plainly opposed to any identification of the Anglican and Lutheran doctrines.

² "The great Swiss Reformer, Zwingli, or Zwingel (who died 1531), is commonly credited with having been a mere 'commemorationist.' The charge is baseless. He held substantially the doctrine taught in the English Article (XXVIII). But writing early in the history of the controversy on the Eucharist, he expressed himself sometimes incautiously" (see *Expositor*, Sixth Series, Vol. VIII, p. 161 f.; Bishop Moule, *The Supper of the Lord*, p. 50, Note).

³ Bishop Moule, *The Supper of the Lord*, p. 42 f.

⁴ *Ecl. Pol.*, Bk. V, Section 67.

⁵ Gibson, *The Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 663.

⁶ Dr. Darwell Stone, *The Holy Communion*, p. 186.

there is any Catholic doctrine which, while not Roman, is distinct from the Reformed doctrine of Calvin and Hooker, involving a presence of our Lord as somehow attached to the elements by consecration.

3. The Rejection.—Transubstantiation is rejected by the Article on four grounds.

(a) It cannot be proved by Scripture.—This is clear from such passages as “that Rock was Christ” (1 Cor. x. 4); “I am the door” (John x. 7). As already seen, the interpretation which insists on the literalness of “This is My Body” defeats itself, especially when the full words are remembered, “This is My Body, which is given for you,” thus clearly referring to the sacrifice of Calvary.

(b) It is repugnant to Scripture.—Christ was present at the time of the institution, and He spoke afterwards of “the fruit of the vine” (Matt. xxvi. 29). St. Paul similarly speaks of “bread” (1 Cor. x. 17; xi. 26). The only case of transubstantiation in the Gospels is the change of water into wine (John ii. 1-11), but the word in connection with the Holy Communion is “is,” not “becomes.”

(c) It overthrows the nature of a Sacrament.—The outward sign has gone, the doctrine of transubstantiation rests on a distinction between substance and accidents, between internal essence and visible properties. But this is impossible, since accidents are essentially characteristic.¹ In the case of digestion and corruption Aquinas said that the consecrated element was no longer the Body of Christ, but this really refutes the theory and involves a view practically equivalent to our own.

This phrase in the Article was adopted for the first time in 1563, after the Council of Trent had put forth its decree on Transubstantiation, and it was retained in 1571, doubtless with direct reference to it, for while it is untrue to say that Roman Catholics ever taught that the outward sign completely disappeared, nevertheless, the theory of Trent bids us disbelieve our senses and believe that in spite of them the bread has ceased to exist. Bishop Thirlwall² pointed out the fallacy, for “if a substance and its accidents are correlatives, it can no more be possible for the accidents to exist without the substance than the parts without their whole.” It is impossible to conceive of a thing which neither senses nor imagination can realise. The word “there” is an adverb of place.

(d) It has been the cause of many superstitions. A large number of stories are associated with this doctrine, including cures, legends, processions, etc. The Festival of Corpus Christi dates only from the thirteenth century. It is a singular phenomenon in the Roman Catholic Church that the importance of the Ascension is minimised, and from the standpoint of transubstantiation this is consistent, for the early Church emphasised Ascension Day as being “the boundary of the dispensation of

¹ “The philosophy which holds that ‘substance’ has an existence of its own independently of its manifestations was never undisputed, and is now wholly out of date” (B. J. Kidd, *The Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 233).

² *Charge*, 1869.

Christ," and it was only when the theory of transubstantiation came in that the Festival of Corpus Christi was instituted. A nun dreamt of a breach in the moon through no Feast to the Sacrament being included in the Christian Year.¹

IV.—THE DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER

The third clause, which embodies this teaching, was changed in 1563 from that which was found in the Article of 1553. The question is whether this change was intended as an alteration of doctrine. It is urged by some that this was undoubtedly the case.² By others it is argued with equal force that no such change was intended.³ The question is one of historical fact, and it is important that nothing should be overlooked which will help towards arriving at the true meaning. But, first of all, it is essential to see what the paragraph itself contains when properly interpreted.

1. The fact of spiritual blessing.—“The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper.” The phraseology is important, because the word “given” is sometimes used to support the view of a presence of Christ in the elements.⁴ But the entire sentence must be considered in the light of what immediately follows.

2. The manner of spiritual blessing.—“Only after an heavenly and spiritual manner.” The word “only” clearly refers to the entire statement that precedes, “given, taken, and eaten.” The Body of Christ is not only taken and eaten after an heavenly manner, but is given in the same way. The gift must therefore surely be given by our Lord Himself, and this is implied not only by Cranmer and Jewel, but also by men who hold views similar to Calvin. Further, the very phrase of the Article is found in the smaller *Catechism* of Nowell, of whose doctrinal character and position there is no question.⁵ These are the words of Nowell's *Catechism* :—

“The body and blood of Christ, which in the Lord's Supper are given to the faithful and are by them taken, eaten and drunken, only in a heavenly and spiritual manner, but yet in truth.”

3. The channel of spiritual blessing.—“And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith.” This is in agreement with the teaching of clause one, already considered, and it may be illustrated by the rubric in the Service of the Communion of the Sick.

“But if a man, either by reason of extremity of sickness . . . or by any other just impediment, do not receive the Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood, the

¹ Faber, Bk. III: “The Catholic Faith . . . does not rest on the Ascension but goes on to Corpus Christi.”

² Gibson, *ut supra*, p. 644 f.

³ Dimock, *Papers on the Eucharistic Presence*, p. 732.

⁴ Gibson, *ut supra*, p. 661.

⁵ Dimock, *ut supra*, pp. 732-740.

Curate shall instruct him, that if he do truly repent him of his sins, and steadfastly believe that Jesus Christ hath suffered death upon the Cross for him, and shed His Blood for his redemption, earnestly remembering the benefits he hath thereby, and giving him hearty thanks therefore, he doth eat and drink the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ profitably to his Soul's health, although he do not receive the Sacrament with his mouth."

Article XXIX also emphasises the same principle.

After considering the actual wording of the clause the historical circumstances call for careful study.

(a) Reference is frequently made to the statement that Bishop Geste was the author of it.¹ This is intended in support of the view that the presence is there, in the elements, independent of us, and Bishop Geste suggested that the word "only" should be removed and the word "profitably" be inserted, though this was not done. It may be rightly asked whether the attempt by a Bishop to get the Prime Minister to alter the Articles after failing to get Convocation to listen to his own arguments is a reason why we should accept such a writer as our guide to the true interpretation. But the question is whether Geste was, after all, the author, for we have this very sentence in Archbishop Parker's own handwriting quite complete in that original draft which Parker (who is well known as opposed to the Lutheran view of the "real and bodily presence") brought with him to the Convocation of 1563, as Dr. Lamb shows, and Geste tried in vain to alter this very wording. Further, the Supreme Court in the trial, *Sheppard v. Bennett*, rejected Geste's statement as being no evidence at all.² Besides, as we shall see, Article XXIX was inserted in 1571 against Geste's wish, and for some time he refused to subscribe to the Articles, though afterwards he yielded. Another Bishop, Cheney of Gloucester, being a Lutheran, could not subscribe at all. Geste's views were in many respects peculiar, if not contradictory, and they certainly were not representative of the English Church of his day. He failed on every point, and had to subscribe to the very expressions which he had privately denounced in his correspondence with Cecil. It would seem as though his one object was to thwart Archbishop Parker's determination to exclude consubstantiation from the teaching of the

¹ Gibson, *ut supra*, p. 661 f.

² "Gheast does not say that he was the 'compiler' of the Twenty-eighth Article, all but one sentence of which had been in the Articles of 1552; and the context shows that he used the word 'Article' only of this sentence, which, he says, was 'of mine own penning.' Upon the faith of this letter, genuine or not, avowedly written for a personal purpose ('for mine own purgation') is founded an exposition of the words 'only after a heavenly and spiritual manner,' as meaning that though a man 'took Christ's Body in his hand, received it with his mouth, and that corporally, naturally, really, substantially, and carnally . . . yet did he not for all that see it, feel it, smell it, nor taste it.' Upon this alleged exposition their Lordships feel themselves free to observe that the words, 'only after a heavenly and spiritual manner,' do not appear to contain or involve the words 'corporally, naturally, and carnally,' but to exclude them; and that it is the Article, and not the questionable comments of a doubtful letter written for personal motives, which is binding on the clergy and this Court" (From the Judgment).

Church of England, a determination which, as we shall see on Article XXIX, the Archbishop effectively accomplished.¹

(b) The importance of this enquiry about Geste lies in the fact that in certain sections of the English Church to-day it is taught that the Body and Blood of our Lord are present in the Holy Communion by virtue of consecration,² and that therefore Christ our Lord present in the most holy Sacrament of the altar under the form of bread and wine is in it to be worshipped and adored.³ In support of this view it is urged that the Anglican doctrine underwent some definite and fundamental changes between 1551 and 1604, that Cranmer in 1551 had become influenced by the Zwinglian school, that the Second Prayer Book of 1552 was intended to teach a merely figurative presence, and that in 1563 this Article, and in 1604 the addition to the Catechism so completely changed the Anglican doctrine that "they were now at the lowest estimate, patient of a Catholic interpretation, and contained nothing under cover of which the Zwinglianising party could honestly shelter themselves. Moreover, they have since been supplemented by the clear teaching of the Church Catechism." The conclusion drawn from all this is that "the opinions of the Edwardian Reformers, such as Cranmer and Ridley, on the subject of the Holy Communion, have nothing more than a historical interest for us . . . nor have their writings any claim to be regarded even as an *expositio contemporanea* of formularies, which, in their present form, belong to a later date, and to a time when much greater respect was shown to the ancient teaching of the Church."⁴

It ought to be said, however, that this summary almost wholly misrepresents the actual state of the case. The matter is easily verifiable on historical grounds, and it is simply a question of fact. In 1548, as seen in the Great Debate, Cranmer had already expressed a view of the Holy Communion identical with that which is now found in our Articles, and this was three years before he is said to have come under the influence of the Zwinglian school. Consequently, it is inaccurate to say that he taught, or that the Prayer Book of 1552 taught, a merely figurative presence. We have already seen that the change of the Article in 1563, made by one of Cranmer's disciples,⁵ Archbishop Parker, did not involve any essential change, and the same thing is true of the addition to the Church Catechism, 1604, for the very answers now used to prove what is called "Catholic doctrine" are found in a longer form in Nowell's Catechism, which was of the definitely Reformed type. Bishop Jacobson

¹ Goode, supplement to his work, *On the Eucharist*; Heurtley, *The Doctrine of the Church of England, touching the real objective Presence*; Dimock, *ut supra*, p. 665.

² Gibson, *ut supra*, pp. 661, 672.

³ Declaration of English Church Union, 1900.

⁴ Gibson, *ut supra*, pp. 642-647.

⁵ It is also common knowledge that the views of all the Elizabethan Bishops, with the exception of the (Lutheran) views of Cheney and Geste, were identical with those of Cranmer.

says that "the additions made at the Hampton Court Conference were evidently abridged from it."¹ It is difficult, if not impossible, to understand how otherwise the teaching of our Church concerning a definite spiritual presence and blessing could be expressed in order to distinguish the "Reformed" from the Lutheran view.²

We shall see still more clearly in Article XXIX that this doctrine of a presence of our Lord's Body and Blood by reason of consecration is no part of the doctrine of the English Church; indeed, it is absolutely opposed to the "Black Rubric," or "Declaration on Kneeling" that "the natural body and blood . . . are in heaven and not here."³

V.—ERRONEOUS USES OF THE LORD'S SUPPER

The Article closes by calling attention to certain observances which are regarded as incompatible with the ordinance of Christ.

1. Reservation.—In the time of Justin Martyr, the Lord's Supper was reserved for the absent and sick, the elements being taken at once to the houses; an innocent and beautiful expression of unity and fellowship. But our Article has something very different in view. The decrees of the Council of Trent were promulgated in October of 1551, and to this the paragraph in the Article is certainly due. It has been said that the Article is "worded with the utmost care and with studied moderation. It cannot be said that any one of the practices is condemned or prohibited by it. It only amounts to this: that none of them can claim to be part of the original Divine institution."⁴ But in view of the mediæval doctrine associated with the presence of Christ in the elements the clear statements of this Article, together with the equally clear order in the Rubric about the consumption of all the remaining consecrated elements,

¹ Preface to Nowell's *Catechism*, pp. 35, 36.

² "This answer in the Catechism makes no declaration whatever about the body and blood of Christ being verily and indeed contained or present under the forms of bread and wine at all, *i.e.* in the elements apart from reception. It does declare that the body and blood are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper; it affirms a real and true, *i.e.* not imaginary or fictitious, reception, but only by the faithful. It is in exact accordance with the Twenty-eighth Article, that 'to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the Sacrament, the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ, and the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ.'

"It has been abundantly shown by Dean Goode, in his work on the Eucharist, that all the accredited expositions of the Catechism interpret this answer as an assertion that the body and blood of Christ are received in this Sacrament by the faithful only, meaning by 'the faithful,' communicants who with a true penitent heart and lively faith receive the Holy Sacrament" (Ince, *Letter on the Real Presence*, p. 24 f.).

³ The Invocation of the Holy Spirit on the Elements (included in the Scottish and American Prayer Books but deliberately omitted from the English Book) is sometimes said to indicate a belief in a Presence of Christ somehow attached to the Elements. But quite apart from the significant absence of any such Invocation from the formularies of the English Church, it is now known beyond doubt that the primitive form of this Prayer was that the Holy Spirit might come upon the Communicant rather than upon the Elements (Woolley, *Liturgy of the Primitive Church*, pp. 93-120; Upton, *Outlines of Prayer Book History*, pp. 12-21).

⁴ Gibson, *ut supra*, p. 665.

show that there can be very little question as to the meaning of our Church. The view that reservation is both condemned and prohibited was taken by all representative English theologians up to the time of the Tractarian movement; and even in the case of illness and the necessity of haste the occasions when there would be real need of reservation instead of the usual Service would be exceedingly rare.¹ The danger of any such reservation of the consecrated elements is too manifest to need much notice, for the inevitable tendency is to adore and worship Christ regarded as present therein.² Moreover, any cases of Communion in which the person would not be able to enter into even a shortened form of the Service would seem to imply the impossibility of the actual reception of the bread and wine, the case coming under the rubric in the Office of the Visitation of the Sick, dealing with the assured spiritual Communion of those who cannot partake of the elements.

2. Processions.—The Sacrament is not to be “carried about” or “lifted up.” Elevation dates only from the eleventh century, and the Festival of Corpus Christi was removed from the Calendar in 1549.³

3. Adoration.—Nor is the Sacrament to be “worshipped.” The elevation of the Host for adoration arose in the twelfth or thirteenth century, and, like the Festival of Corpus Christi, grew out of the doctrine of Transubstantiation. It is sometimes said that the adoration of Christ

¹ In the *Parish Magazine* of St. Martin's, Brighton, for October 1910, the vicar, Mr. Nugent, who practises Reservation in one kind for the sick, published a sermon on “The Real Presence,” in which these words occur:

“Wherever the Holy Sacrament is, whether It is on the Altar at the time of Communion, or whether It is in the Tabernacle reserved for the sick, It is Jesus Christ Himself under that lowly form. As God He is everywhere, but as God-made man, He is in Heaven and in the Blessed Sacrament on the Altar. So you and I must adore Him in the Sacrament. We cannot do otherwise.”

Another Brighton vicar, the Rev. Arthur Cocks of St. Bartholomew, resigned his living because he could not observe the Bishop's directions as to the reservation of the Sacrament, one of which was “that in the manner of reservation there is no encouragement of adoration or worship of the Sacrament.” Mr. Cocks considered that this direction would involve “a dishonour to our Blessed Lord.” Mr. Cocks subsequently left the Church of England for the Church of Rome with four other clergy and over one hundred lay people.

The decision of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York (Archbishop Temple and Archbishop Maclagan) was given in May 1900. They sat to consider the matter which had been referred to them for decision by three dioceses. The case of reservation was presented, witnesses were examined, and arguments advanced in support of the practice. The Archbishops took some nine months to consider the question, and they ruled absolutely that reservation is not legal in the Church of England. Archbishop Temple's words were these:

“I am obliged to decide that the Church of England does not at present allow reservation in any form.”

Archbishop Maclagan: “I can come to no other decision than that it was deliberately abandoned at the time of the Reformation, and that it is not lawful for any individual clergyman to resume such practice in ministering to the souls committed to his charge.” The late Bishop of London, Dr. Creighton, took the same line, and expressed the opinion that reservation was meant to be prohibited by the present rubrics (*Life*, Vol. II, pp. 310-313).

² See Meyrick, *Doctrine of the Holy Communion*, pp. 125, 133.

³ Meyrick, *ut supra*, pp. 134-138; Bishop Drury, *Elevation in the Eucharist*.

present in the Sacrament cannot be prohibited,¹ but, of course, everything turns upon the meaning of the word "Sacrament," which in the Articles refers to the outward part of elements and word alone. It has been pointed out by a leading authority that no Eucharistic adoration existed for a thousand years after Christ, and while no Christian disputes the necessity of Christ's being adored wherever He is, yet when it is said that He is to be adored in the Sacrament "the question returns upon us whether 'Sacrament' means the visible symbols of His body and blood, or the whole rite in which He is undoubtedly present to the faithful communicant. In the latter sense we all adore Him."²

¹ Gibson, *ut supra*, p. 667.

² Canon Trevor, quoted by Dimock, *ut supra*, p. 136; see also p. 133; Meyrick, *ut supra*, pp. 139, 154.

ARTICLE XXIX

Of the Wicked which do not eat the Body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper.

The Wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth, as Saint *Augustine* saith, the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ: but rather to their condemnation, do eat and drink the sign, or Sacrament, of so great a thing.

De Manducatione Corporis Christi, et impios illud non manducare.

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 bibunt.

IMPORTANT EQUIVALENTS.

<p>Of the wicked which eat not the Body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper</p> <p>The wicked</p> <p>Are partakers</p> <p>Sign</p> <p>To their condemnation</p>	<p>= <i>de manducatione corporis Christi, et impios illud non manducare.</i></p> <p>= <i>impii.</i></p> <p>= <i>participes efficiuntur.</i></p> <p>= <i>symbolum.</i></p> <p>= <i>ad iudicium sibi.</i></p>
---	---

THERE was nothing corresponding to this Article in 1553. It dates from 1563, and its history is so vitally important as to call for close study.

I.—THE HISTORY

It was introduced by Archbishop Parker in 1563 and accepted by Convocation, but subsequently struck out by the Queen. It is generally supposed that this was part of her policy to endeavour to conciliate the Lutherans. It certainly harmonises with the treatment of the "Black Rubric," and of the Ornaments Rubric in the Prayer Book of 1559. But in 1571 the Archbishop reinserted this Article, and then it was accepted by the Queen as well as Convocation. Parker evidently felt that Article XXVIII by itself was insufficient to meet the Lutheran view, and this will account for his insistence in making the point clear so as to exclude the Real Presence in the Lutheran sense. Bishop Geste, who, as we have seen, had evidently endeavoured to get an alteration in Article XXVIII, was now compelled to admit the fundamental difference between the Anglican and Lutheran doctrine.¹

¹ Dugdale, *Life of Geste*, pp. 116, 147, 148; Dimock, *Papers on the Eucharistic Presence*, pp. 670-674. See also two articles in the *Churchman* for January 1920 and 1921 by W. Prescott Upton on the connection and significant contrast between our Articles and the Wurtemberg Confession.

II.—THE TEACHING

The statements of the Article do not admit of any doubt as to their meaning.

1. The wicked eat and drink the sign or Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ.—“The wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as Saint Augustine saith) the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ.”

2. They do not partake of Christ Himself.—“Yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ.” The Latin is particularly forceful, *nullo modo*.

3. They eat and drink the sign or Sacrament to their spiritual condemnation.—“But rather, to their condemnation, do eat and drink the sign or Sacrament of so great a thing.” Thus, the Article is a corollary to Article XXVIII, because the teaching of the Church of Rome is that all receive, but all do not benefit. Efforts have been made to show that there is a distinction between the title and the Article, the title saying that the wicked do not eat the Body of Christ in the use of the Supper, while the Article says that the wicked are “in no wise partakers of Christ.” It has, therefore, been suggested that the title does not say “receive not,” but “eat not,” and that the Article does not say the wicked are not partakers of the Body and Blood of Christ, but that they are not “partakers of Christ.” This is an endeavour to show that while the wicked might receive the *sacramentum*, and what is called the *res sacramenti*, they could not receive the *virtus sacramenti*.¹ But this distinction between the inward part, *res*, and the benefit, *virtus*, of the Sacrament finds no place in Anglican theology; and, indeed, it would involve the fact of three parts in a Sacrament, which is contrary to our Catechism. The “thing signified” includes both the spiritual blessing and its benefit by participation.² This distinction between *signum*, *res* and *virtus* was the ordinary teaching of the Roman Catholic Church, as it is to this day, and it is obvious that the Article is not likely to maintain here what it so definitely denies, and even denounces, in Article XXVIII.³ In view, therefore, of the circumstances of the introduction of the Article there is no reasonable doubt as to its meaning and purpose.⁴ Proof of this can be adduced from representative writers of the time.⁵ The Article is also directed specifically against Lutheranism, and in 1577 the *Formula Concordiæ* deliberately condemned its teaching almost in our very words.⁶ It is also significant that the Anglican Articles have no place in the list of Lutheran Symbolics.⁷

¹ Maclear and Williams, *Introduction to the Articles of the Church of England*, pp. 348–350.

² Simpson, *The Thing Signified*, pp. 22–26.

³ Dr. Kidd rightly says that this view is open to serious objections on three grounds: (a) From the history of the Article; (b) from its connection with Article XXVIII; (c) from other expressions in the Article itself. He adds that if it had been the natural interpretation Bishop Geste would have made no effort to get rid of the Article (Kidd, *The Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 237).

⁴ Dimock, *ut supra*, pp. 615–617.

⁵ Dimock, *ut supra*, pp. 618–640.

⁶ Goode, *On the Eucharist*, p. 647; Dimock, *Vox Liturgiæ Anglicanæ*, p. xxii.

⁷ So Schaff, quoted in Dimock, *ut supra*, p. xxiii.

As the Article quotes from St. Augustine and the true meaning has been questioned, it is important to have the facts of the case in view. The passage is from *Super. Joann.*, Tract 26: "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 sanguinis Christi* sed magis tantæ rei sacramentum ad iudicium sibi manducat et bibit." The portions in italics are rejected by the Benedictine editors, and much controversy has been waged as to them. Archbishop Parker maintained his point and adhered to them, and certainly it is unlikely that they were added in the Middle Ages, though they might easily have been omitted. They are as old as Bede and Alcuin, and even if spurious they do not affect our Article.¹

The one and only consideration is the proper interpretation of the wording of the Article, whether these statements came from St. Augustine or not.²

III.—THE DOCTRINE OF " PRESENCE "

The Church of England has avoided the term "Real Presence," because it is ambiguous and misleading. It does not date earlier than the Middle Ages, and the Church has shown its wisdom in not using the term, because it is difficult to conceive of a Real Presence of what is locally absent. Presence is a relative word, expressive of a relation between an object which is called present and the subject which is present. It means "the application of the object to that faculty which is capable of apprehending it." So that it has a twofold meaning according as the thing referred to is corporal or spiritual. Corporal presence means presence to the senses and spiritual presence means presence to the soul. All presence is, therefore, "real," and a spiritual presence is none the less real because it is spiritual. The crux of the question now at issue is as to a presence in the elements by virtue of consecration, and in regard to this the Church not only does not teach it, but teaches that which implies the very opposite.³ There is no need of a thing to be present in order to be received, for the sun is present in efficacy though so far away. It is the same with property, or even money. In like manner, the Atonement is efficacious to-day although wrought centuries ago. We must, therefore, estimate things in relation to their ability for enjoyment.

¹ Dimock, *Papers on the Eucharistic Presence*, pp. 676-686.

² "To affect the interpretation of the Article, it must be shown, not only what St. Augustine's views are, but that at the time of the Reformation they were universally felt, and by all confessed, to be clearly and unmistakably against what we contend for as the natural meaning of our Article" (Dimock, *ut supra*, p. 681).

³ "It will, perhaps, be said that the Church of England does not deny 'The Real Presence'; but this is nothing to the purpose. She does not teach it: and if it were her belief she would not have left a doctrine of such moment to be inferred by a very doubtful process from statements which at best do not necessarily mean it" (Vogan, *True Doctrine of the Eucharist*, p. 254).

So that the question is not one of the fact of a presence but of the mode ; not one of spiritual presence, but of local nearness (propinquity) ; not one of spiritual eating, but of oral eating (manducation). Bishop Gore considers that the question of a presence in the elements was "evaded" by those who drew up our formularies,¹ but in view of the profound differences between 1549 and 1552 it does not seem likely that the Reformers were men to "evade" such a question. It was far too acute and pressing to be overlooked, and it seems far truer to say that they avoided it and taught just the opposite.

Bishop Gibson² speaks of the necessity of the Body being "there" in order to be discerned. But can this mean to discern a presence in the elements? What was the error against which St. Paul was writing? If he had formerly taught them the presence of Christ in the elements, would they have been likely to turn the Service into a common meal in two or three years? Would not the sin of idolatry have been far more likely? If this had been his meaning, how much easier it would have been to say something like "This is sacrificial." The view of Bishop Gibson, as usual with a certain type of Churchman,³ is marked by the fallacy of assuming that there can be no presence apart from attachment to the elements. Then, too, all this says nothing of the strict meaning of "discern," as used in the context.⁴ The supreme test is as to what the wicked eat, and the view that Christ's Body being "there" is "offered" to the wicked, who is thus "brought in contact with it," but is unable to receive the food offered through want of faith is only another way of endeavouring to distinguish in mediæval fashion between *signum*, *res* and *virtus*. The teaching of the Article is plain, for it is absolutely impossible to conceive of anyone partaking of Christ without receiving spiritual benefit.⁵

Bishop Gibson also refers to Cranmer and Ridley admitting that "in some sense" the wicked may be said to "eat the Body." But the use of the term "sacramental" obviously means symbolical only, as many testimonies from the writings of Cranmer and Ridley amply prove.⁶ For this reason no stress can be laid on the Prayer of Humble Access, as though it were possible "so to eat . . . that our sinful bodies" might

¹ Gore, *The Body of Christ*, p. 231.

² Gibson, *The Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 672.

³ "If the Consecrated Bread and Wine are only in some relative symbolical sense the Body and Blood of Christ, it is a little difficult to see where the benefit of communicating or offering comes in" (Rev. T. I. Ball, *English Church Review*, Vol. V, p. 497).

⁴ All the above is argued on the assumption that the text of the Authorised Version is correct, but if the Revised Version is read, and the words, "Not discerning the Body" are interpreted of the Church, the matter is quite clear. For an able treatment of this view see Barnes-Lawrence, *The Holy Communion*, pp. 137-213, and Simpson, *The Sacrament of the Gospel*, p. 52.

⁵ No such eating is contemplated as a real eating which is not a beneficial eating also (Mozley, *Lectures, with other Theological Papers*, p. 205).

⁶ "As for the ungodly and carnal, they may eat the bread and drink the wine, but with Christ Himself they have no communion nor company; and they neither eat His flesh nor drink His blood" (Cranmer, *The Lord's Supper*, p. 203).

not receive benefit.¹ It has been shown with abundant illustration that this interpretation of the phrase is meaningless and unwarranted. It is extraordinary that several authors should have pressed this view and made so much depend upon it, but Bishop Dowden is much nearer the historical truth when he says that, "It is plain that it is, to say the least, very hazardous to base a theological argument on the expression."²

It is sometimes said that modern teaching involving a presence of our Lord in some way attached to, or associated with the elements, is in the direct line of succession from the teaching of the Caroline divines. But this is not true to historical fact, as a reference to the work of these divines conclusively proves. Thus, one of the most representative of them, Bishop Cosin, speaks of the outward sign and the inward part as "united in time, though not in place."³ And he also emphasises the great Reformation truth that apart from the proper use the sacramental signs are not Sacraments at all.⁴ The whole subject may be summed up in the following words:—

"One thing is absolutely certain: It is no part of the doctrine of our Church that there is an adorable presence of Our Lord's body and blood *in* or *under* the forms of bread and wine. Such language is undiscoverable in the doctrinal standards of our Church, and wholly unknown to the Church of the early Fathers."⁵

¹ Gibson, *ut supra*, p. 675.

² Dowden, *Furber Studies in the Prayer Book*, pp. 336-343; Dimock, *ut supra*, pp. 436-439.

³ Cosin, *History of Popish Transubstantiation*, Ch. IV, Section 4.

⁴ "We also deny that the elements still retain the nature of sacraments when not used according to divine institution, that is, given by Christ's ministers, and received by His people; so that Christ in the consecrated bread, ought not, cannot be kept and preserved to be carried about, because He is present only to communicants" (Cosin, *ut supra*, Ch. IV, Section 5).

The teaching of the Caroline divines was made clear in a series of valuable letters from the late Bishop of Edinburgh, Dr. Dowden, in the *Guardian*, for July, August, and September 1900, than which nothing could be more convincing as to their Eucharistic doctrine.

⁵ Bishop Dowden, *Define Your Terms*, an address to the Diocesan Synod, 1900, p. 21.

By way of comparison, these words of a well-known Presbyterian divine may also be quoted, showing essential agreement between the doctrine of Calvin and Hooker, as represented by our Articles.

"There is, therefore, a most Real Presence of Christ in the Sacrament of the Supper on the pure Protestant view. . . . This view, to sum all up, knows of a symbolical Presence of Christ in the elements, a proclaimed Presence in the world, a mystical Presence in the ineffable union between Christ and the members of His spiritual body, and a gracious Presence in the power and plenitude of the gifts of His Spirit. Beyond this it will be difficult to show that Scripture recognises any other" (Orr, *The Real Presence*, p. 16).

ARTICLE XXX

Of both kinds.

De utraque Specie.

The Cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the Lay-people: for both the parts of the Lord's Sacrament, by Christ's ordinance and commandment, ought to be ministered to all Christian men alike.

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

IMPORTANT EQUIVALENTS.

Of both kinds	=	<i>de utraque specie.</i>
Both parts	=	<i>utraque pars.</i>
By Christ's ordinance	=	<i>ex Christi institutione.</i>
Alike	=	<i>ex æquo.</i>

IN July 1562, when the Council of Trent reassembled, efforts were made to obtain sanction for Communion in both kinds, but instead Decrees and Canons were drawn up confirming the mediæval practice of Communion in one kind, and anathematising those who taught the opposite.

“(i) If any one shall say that by the precept of God, or by necessity of salvation, all and each of the faithful of Christ ought to receive both kinds of the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist: let him be anathema.

“(ii) If any one shall say that the holy Catholic Church was not induced by just causes and reasons to communicate under the species of bread only, laymen and clergy when not consecrating; or has erred therein: let him be anathema.

“(iii) If any one shall deny that Christ, whole and entire, the fountain and author of all graces, is received under the one species of bread, because, as some falsely assert, He is not received according to the institution of Christ Himself under both kinds: let him be anathema.”¹

This Article was our reply. It dates from 1563, and was due to Archbishop Parker. It was an interesting illustration of the increasingly strong Protestant attitude adopted at that date. Some modern writers

¹ “Si quis dixerit, ex Dei præcepto, vel necessitate salutis, omnes et singulos Christi fideles utramque speciem sanctissimi Eucharistiæ sacramenti sumere debere: anathema sit.

“Si quis dixerit, sanctam Ecclesiam Catholicam non justis causis et rationibus adductam fuisse ut laicos, atque etiam Clericos non conficientes, sub panis tantummodo specie communicaret, aut in eo errasse: anathema sit.

“Si quis negaverit, totum et integrum Christum omnium gratiarum fontem et auctorem, sub una panis specie sumi, quia, ut quidam falso asserunt, non secundum ipsius Christi constitutionem sub utraque specie sumatur: anathema sit” (Council of Trent).

favour the idea that during the first ten years of her reign Queen Elizabeth did her utmost to win the Roman Catholics. But several strong forms of expression in other Articles, including the insertion of an Article like this, are convincing proofs to the contrary. Elizabeth never really attempted or even expected to conciliate the Romanists, but she certainly did her utmost to unite Protestants in support of her Throne by taking every step to conciliate the Lutherans. This can be seen from her action in regard to the "Black Rubric" and the Ornaments Rubric in the Prayer Book of 1559, and in connection with Articles XXVIII and XXIX in 1563. But there is no historical proof of any ecclesiastical or doctrinal movement to win Roman Catholics.

I.—THE HISTORY OF THE PRACTICE

It is generally thought that the withholding of the cup from the laity arose from the carrying home of the elements in a superstitious way, but the general rule of Communion in both kinds was so firmly established that by the fifth century Decrees of Popes made the withholding of the cup heretical. Leo the Great informs the Bishops how to know the Manichees who attend the Communion and yet refuse the cup. Pope Gelasius said that if any abstained from the cup they must abstain entirely. But towards the end of the eleventh century the custom of withholding the cup began to be observed very gradually, and Thomas Aquinas justified it for fear of irreverence through spilling. It is still more curious that the custom of communicating in one kind was definitely condemned by a Council in the eleventh century and by a Pope in the twelfth. But in the course of the next two centuries the custom gradually spread through the West, and the Council of Constance, while stating that the custom was not primitive, actually claimed power to refuse the cup, and even the Communion in both kinds to the laity. It is frankly admitted by leading Roman Catholic authorities that Communion in both kinds was universal until the twelfth century. Cardinal Bona¹ admits that :—

"The faithful always and in all places, from the first beginnings of the Church till the twelfth century, were used to communicate under the species of bread and wine, and the use of the chalice began, little by little, to drop away in the beginning of that century, and many bishops forbade it to the people to avoid the risk of irreverence and spilling."

All the ancient Liturgies are quite clear on this subject, and the restoration of the cup was associated with the Reformation in Germany and England. We have seen the attitude of the Council of Trent on this subject.

II.—ROMAN CATHOLIC REASONS FOR THE PRACTICE

While it is sometimes argued that fear of accident is an important reason for the practice, there is no doubt that the chief reason is con-

¹ Quoted by Bingham, XV, v. 1.

nected with the doctrine of Transubstantiation. It is held that by the doctrine of "Concomitance" Christ is received in His entirety under the species of bread. This, as will be seen above, is the main line adopted by the Canons of Trent.

The other argument used is the claim of the Church to decree rites or ceremonies, urging that the power extends to this also.

"Holy Mother Church, knowing this her authority in the administration of the sacraments, although the use of both kinds has, from the beginning of the Christian religion, not been unfrequent, yet in process of time that custom having already been widely changed—has, induced by weighty and just reasons, approved of this custom of communicating under one kind, and decreed that it should be held as a law, which it is not lawful to reprobate or change at pleasure, without the authority of the Church itself."¹

III.—THE ANGLICAN POSITION

We take our stand on the institution of Christ, and both in the Catechism and in the Articles this is emphasised. It is impossible to argue that the custom is permissible from Scripture because the context of St. Paul's words is conclusive in support of Communion in both kinds (1 Cor. xi. 26, 27). The answer in the Catechism is as follows: "Bread and Wine, which the Lord hath commanded to be received." This simple statement is a striking illustration of the way in which our Church safeguards the true position by teaching young people positively apart from the controversy, as well as in the Article, that our Lord's ordinance and commandment settle the question.

Nor can we for a moment allow that the Church's power suffices to alter a Divine command. We fully recognise that the Church has "power to decree rites and ceremonies" (Article XX), but this cannot be extended to authorise anything "contrary to God's Word written," and Holy Scripture is too clear on this point to admit of any question (Matt. xxvi. 27).

The Council of Trent promised a further consideration of the matter at the earliest opportunity with a view to possible relaxation. It is sometimes said that the bread is often "dipped" now in the Roman Church, as it is in the Eastern Church, by the practice known as "intinction." But the Roman Church is officially bound by the decrees of Trent up to the present time, and nothing has been done by authority to relieve or modify the Tridentine decrees. It may be said without any hesitation that there is no practice in the Roman Catholic Church which is so difficult to defend.²

¹ "Quare agnoscens Sancta Mater Ecclesia hanc suam, in administratione sacramentorum auctoritatem, licet ab initio, Christianæ Religionis non infrequens utriusque speciei usus fuisset; tamen progressu temporis latissime jam mutata illa consuetudine, gravibus et justis causis adducta, hanc consuetudinem sub altera specie communicandi approbavit, et pro lege habendam decrevit: quam reprobare, aut sine ipsius ecclesiæ auctoritate prohibito mutare non licet" (Cap. II).

² See further Article, "Communion in one kind."—*Protestant Dictionary*.

ARTICLE XXXI

Of the one Oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross.

De unica Christi Oblatione in Cruce perfecta.

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

Oblatio Christi semel facta, perfecta est redemptio, propitiatio, et satisfactio pro omnibus peccatis totius mundi, tam originalibus quam actualibus; neque præter illam unicam est ulla alia pro peccatis expiatio. Unde Missarum sacrificia, quibus vulgo dicebatur, sacerdotem offerre Christum, in remissionem pœnæ, aut culpæ, pro vivis et defunctis, blasphema figmenta sunt, et perniciosæ imposturæ.

IMPORTANT EQUIVALENTS.

Of the one oblation	= <i>de unica oblatione.</i>
Once	= <i>semel.</i>
Satisfaction	= <i>satisfactio.</i>
Satisfaction for sin	= <i>pro peccatis expiatio.</i>
The sacrifices of Masses	= <i>missarum sacrificia.</i>
To have remission of pain or guilt	= <i>in remissionem pœnæ aut culpæ.</i>
Priest	= <i>sacerdotem.</i>
Dangerous deceits	= <i>perniciosa impostura.</i>

THIS Article dates from 1553 with certain verbal alterations made in 1563 and 1571, which Bishop Gibson regards as “insignificant and immaterial,”¹ but which are considered by other authors to be both significant and material. This is a point that will demand special attention.

I.—THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT

Although the mention of our Lord’s sacrifice is made here with special reference to the second part of the Article, yet it is important in itself as one of four or five explicit statements in the Article on the subject. A careful comparison of these will give the Anglican doctrinal view of the Atonement. Article II: “Who truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile His Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men.” Article III: “Christ died for us.” Article XV: “He came to be the Lamb without spot, who, by sacrifice of Himself once made, should take away the sins of the world.” Article XXVIII: “Our redemption by Christ’s death.” The present Article: “The offering of Christ once made is that perfect

¹ Gibson, *The Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 687.

redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone." Of these, the statements in Articles II, XV, and XXXI, are the most important.

1. The Nature of the Atonement.—"The offering of Christ once made." The force of "once" should be particularly noted as meaning "once for all" (*semel*), answering to the New Testament words *ἄπαξ*, and *ἐφάπαξ* (Rom. vi. 10; Heb. vii. 27; ix. 12, 26, 27, 28; x. 10; 1 Pet. iii. 18).

2. The Purpose of the Atonement.—"Perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual." With this should be compared the statement of the Consecration Prayer in the Communion Office. "Who made there (by His one oblation of Himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world." The words "offering," "redemption," and "propitiation" come from the New Testament, while "satisfaction" is a Latin term expressing an important aspect of the Atonement. It was first used by Anselm to indicate that the claims of Divine justice were met and satisfied in the Death of Christ. The distinction is again drawn, as in Article II, between original and actual sins (see also Articles IX and XV).

3. The Uniqueness of the Atonement.—"There is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone." It is important to observe the force of "alone" which in the Latin is *unica*, not *una*, indicating the absolute uniqueness of our Lord's death in relation to sin.

II.—THE DOCTRINE OF MASSES¹

1. Their Nature.—The Article describes what is to be condemned in these words: "The Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt." The word "pain" means "punishment" (*pœnæ*).

2. Their Description.—These sacrifices of Masses are said to be

¹ "Mass" or *Missa* is sometimes thought to be a corruption of *missio*. Originally it was the name for every part of Divine Service. The Service at which Catechumens were invited to be present was called *Missa Catechumenorum*, and that at which the communicants were permitted to be present was called *Missa Fidelium*. As used by Roman Catholics, the word Mass denotes a Service of Holy Communion in their meaning of the Ordinance. The following words come from a recent book:

"*The Mass*" or "*The Holy Mass*" is the name used by the Roman Church and comes from the Latin *Missa*, which means 'dismissal—*Ite, missa est*,' being an intimation that those of the congregation who are not communicating may withdraw. Judged by itself, apart from its historical connection, little exception might be taken to its adoption, as a title, and yet for several reasons it ought not to be used by English Churchmen. In the first place, it is etymologically so unworthy as a description of the Lord's holy service. Secondly, it is historically condemned by our Church, in that it was definitely excluded in the Second Prayer Book (A.D. 1552). Thirdly, it is doctrinally confusing to many people as suggesting that the teaching of the Anglican and Roman Churches on the Holy Communion is identical, which, of course, it is not" (Bishop Denton Thompson, *The Holy Communion*, p. 9).

“blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits.” The Latin in its literalness is also noteworthy; “blasphemous figments and pernicious impostures.”

3. Their Rejection.—“Wherefore.” This word shows that the sacrifices of Masses are set aside because of the Atonement. The reference is evidently to some practices which were thought to be connected with the Atonement, and to imply the imperfection of Calvary.

III.—THE INTENTION OF THE ARTICLE

Bishop Gibson¹ argues that the Article does not refer to “the sacrifice of the Mass,” but to “sacrifices of Masses,” in connection with a current theory rather than with the formal statement of a doctrine. This contention is based on two grounds: (a) the words, “in which it was commonly said” (*vulgo dicebatur*), referring, it is urged, to some popular practice; (b) the decrees of Trent on “the sacrifice of the Mass” could not have been present to the minds of the revisers of 1553, since the subject was only considered at Trent in the autumn of 1562, nearly ten years later. For these two reasons it is maintained that the Article refers to popular teaching alone which was associated with very grave abuses.

The question at once arises whether this view is correct. It certainly is not the general Roman Catholic view, which holds that our Article is directed against their official “sacrifice of the Mass.”² Dimock takes a view entirely opposed to Gibson, and the question is one of historical evidence and probability. The following points call for special consideration.

1. It will help towards a decision if the actual teaching of the Church of Rome is first of all stated. It is set out in full in Session XXII of the Council of Trent, where in chap. ii dealing with the sacrifice of the Mass this is said to be “propitiatory for the quick and the dead” (italicised words should be noted).

“And since in this divine sacrifice, which is performed in the Mass, *the same Christ is contained*, and is *bloodlessly immolated*, who *once* offered Himself bloodily upon the Cross; and the holy council teaches that this sacrifice is *propitiatory*, and that by its means, if we approach God contrite and penitent, with a true heart, and a right faith, and with fear and reverence, we may obtain mercy, and grow in seasonable succour. For the Lord, *appeased by the oblation of this sacrifice*, granting grace and the gift of repentance, *remits even great crimes and sins*. There is *one* and the *same victim*, and the *same person*, who *now offers* by the *ministry* of the priests, who *then offered Himself upon the Cross*; the *mode* of offering only being *different*. And the fruits of that bloody offering are *truly most abundantly received* through *this offering*, so far is it from derogating in any way from the former. Wherefore, it is properly offered according to the tradition of the Apostles, not only for the *sins, punishments, satisfactions*, and other *wants* of the living, but also for the *dead* in Christ, who are not yet fully purged.”

¹ Gibson, *ut supra*, pp. 691-694. This is also the assertion of Newman in Tract XC.

² Moyes, *London Eucharistic Congress*, pp. 40, 46.

Canon 3.—“If any one shall say that the sacrifice of the Mass is only a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, or a bare *commemoration* of the sacrifice made upon the Cross, and that it is not *propitiatory*, or that it profits only the receiver, and that it ought not to be offered for the *living* and the *dead for their sins, pains, satisfactions, and other wants—let him be accursed.*”

Canon 4.—“If any one shall say that *blasphemy* is put upon the most holy sacrifice of Christ accomplished on the Cross by the sacrifice of the Mass, or that anything is detracted from the former by the latter, let him be anathema.

Canon 5.—If anyone shall say that it is an *imposture* to celebrate Masses in honour of the saints and for the purpose of obtaining their intercession with God, as the Church intends, let him be anathema.”

This Session was held in 1562, when the Latin form of this Article had been in existence nearly ten years, and it may have been known to the Members of the Council, for both in the Article and in the Canon quoted above the word “imposture” (deceits) is found. But the true position of the Church of England is quite independent of any such assumption, however natural it may be.

2. In view of the foregoing statements of Roman doctrine it is hardly likely that popular opinion could have been so far astray in 1553, and that so definite a change of view was made between then and 1562, as is suggested in the wording of the decrees and canons of Trent. The phraseology is much too close to that of our Article to imply that our statements are directed only against some vague, floating and extreme notions.

3. In 1553 there was no authoritative Roman statement of the doctrine, though the general position was almost universally held. Under these circumstances the Article could not state it otherwise. It has been suggested that the past tense is used in the possible hope of some Roman reform.

4. At that date the question was whether the Council of Trent would condemn what our Article condemned, or uphold it. At the present time the question is whether Trent has, or has not, set its seal on the doctrine which our Article condemns.

5. The use of the plural cannot be said to possess much weight, since the Church of Rome frequently uses the plural of the Mass, and the Council of Trent does the same thing without any idea of making a doctrinal distinction. Masses (in the plural) are merely several instances of the same thing, Mass.¹

¹ “The quibble which tries to distinguish between the terms ‘sacrifice of the Mass’ and ‘sacrifices of Masses’ on the ground that the Anglican article is directed against some mediæval *abuse*, and not against the use of the Mass in any sense whatever, has no foundation in history. The term ‘sacrifices of Masses’ was in common use then as now. It occurs in the decree of Union signed at Florence, A.D. 1438, both by Eastern and Western Bishops, which says, speaking of those who depart this life in venial sin, ‘that their souls are cleansed after death by purgatorial pains; and in order that they may be relieved of these pains the suffrages of the faithful living profit them, namely, “the *sacrifices of Masses*,” prayers, alms, and other works of piety.’ The reform party were not ignorant of this decree, and if we compare it with the Anglican Article,

6. Nor can much, if anything, be argued from the phrase "commonly said," which can be found several times in the Prayer Book to denote ordinary popular practices and usages : *e.g.* "Commonly called Christmas Day."¹

7. The first division of the Article teaching the all-sufficiency of the Atonement of Christ is clearly connected with the conclusion introduced by the "Wherefore" of the second part. So that the Article condemns all teaching inconsistent with the uniqueness and completeness of the sacrifice of Christ. The language of the first sentence of the Article clearly excludes even the possibility of any other propitiatory sacrifice than that which was offered once for all on Calvary, and in the light of what has been said of the decrees of Trent it is obvious that our Article rules out the sacrifice of the Mass. Further, the conclusion drawn in the second part of the Article actually uses the very words that were afterwards employed by the Council of Trent to describe the Mass, and it pronounces "sacrifices of Masses" to be "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits." The Article, following Scripture, says, Christ was offered on the Cross "once for all"; the Council of Trent teaches that there are as many offerings of Christ as there are Masses celebrated. Scripture and our Article say that Christ's offering is the one and all-sufficient propitiation for sin; Trent says that every Mass is a propitiatory sacrifice for sin. Surely nothing can be clearer than the condemnation of the sacrifice of the Mass by our Article, and its use of the plural is evidently intended to cover all the instances of celebration which are continually occurring, and to put them in contrast with and opposition to the uniqueness of Calvary. If words mean anything at all the Church of Rome by its teaching at Trent does derogate from the sufficiency of the Atonement of Christ on Calvary. All the Reformers were united in believing that she did, and succeeding writers are in agreement on this point.

8. If it be said that the language is so strong that it can only refer to gross corruption and not to the doctrine itself, it may be replied that, granted the belief of the Reformers, the language is not at all too strong, since three things are mentioned in connection with the sacrifices of Masses : (a) an offering of Christ ; (b) for the living and the dead ; (c) for remission of punishment or guilt. The question is whether the Council of Trent teaches this. It must be admitted that it does so, and for this reason "sacrifices of Masses" can be rightly described as

which says, 'Wherefore 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, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits,' there can be no doubt it was drawn up to deny explicitly the faith defined at Florence, both by East and West, and to assert instead the Lutheran teaching of Augsburg, from which are borrowed not only doctrines, but even the very words of the Anglican Articles. The true meaning of this Article, as a rejection of the ancient faith of the English Church, is made clear from the words of the *Homily concerning the Sacrament*: 'Take heed lest of the memory it be made a sacrifice, . . . Thou needest no other man's help, no other sacrifice, no sacrificing priest, no Mass'" (Father Breen, *The Church of Old England*, p. 47).

¹ See Tomlinson, *The Prayer Book, Homilies, and Articles*, p. 288.

“blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.” They are “fables” (Latin, *figmenta*, “inventions”), because they find no warrant in the Word of God, and come merely from man’s device. They are “blasphemous,” because they necessarily detract from the uniqueness and perfection of our Lord’s Atonement. They are “deceits” (Latin, *imposturæ*, “cheats”), because they deceive men by professing to make a propitiation which they cannot possibly do. And they are “dangerous,” because they encourage spiritual confidence in much that is untrue and impossible.

9. If the Article referred only to some gross error, why was it not referred to clearly in distinction from “the sacrifice of the Mass”? It is hardly likely that our Reformers would trouble to denounce mere popular and extreme errors which had been denounced even in the Roman Church itself.¹

10. Cranmer and Ridley died for denying the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation and the Mass; yet this was before the Council of Trent.

11. The word “altar” was omitted in the Prayer Book of 1552 and has never been replaced. This fact, together with the omission of the gift of the sacramental instruments and of the corresponding words from the Ordinal, seems to show that there was no intention of retaining a sacrificial element in connection with priestly acts and words.

12. As early as December 1551 certain Articles were submitted to the Council of Trent for discussion, dealing with Protestant denials on this very subject which it was expected were about to be condemned. It is possible that news came to our Reformers in 1553, but in any case the Council of Trent in 1562 clearly knew our Articles and also Jewel’s Apology.²

13. The following facts should be carefully studied.

(a) In 1553 the Latin used the word “*figmenta*” and “*imposturæ*.”

(b) In 1562 the Council of Trent denounced the denial of the “sacrifice of the Mass” as “*blasphemia*,” and anathematised those who speak of Masses as an “*imposture*.”

(c) In 1563 our Article added “*blasphema*” to “*figmenta*.”

(d) In 1571 the English Version added “blasphemous.”

14. In support of these contentions many quotations could be adduced from theologians of the Reformed Church. The following, by Cranmer, is of special importance by reason of his association with the Articles of 1553.

“The greatest blasphemy and injury that can be done against Christ, and yet universally used through the Popish Kingdom, is this, that the priests make their Mass a propitiatory sacrifice, to remit the sins as well of themselves as of others, both quick and dead, to whom they list to apply the same. Thus, under pretence of holiness, the Papistical priests have taken upon them to be Christ’s successors,

¹ Dimock, *Dangerous Deceits*, p. 38.

² Dimock, *ut supra*, p. 67.

and to make such an oblation and sacrifice as never creature made but Christ alone, neither He made the same any more times than once, and that was by His death upon the Cross."¹

To the same effect are the words of Cranmer's associate, Bishop Ridley, who calls the Mass:—

"A new blasphemous kind of sacrifice, to satisfy and pay the price of sins, both for the dead and the quick, to the great and intolerable contumely of Christ our Saviour, His death and passion; which was, and is, the only sufficient and everlasting, available sacrifice, satisfactory for all the elect of God, from Adam the first, to the last that shall be born to the end of the world."²

15. These points all arise in connection with the actual history of the Prayer Book and Articles, and in confirmation of the position Newman's view should be carefully observed. It is well known that he endeavoured to make out in Tract XC a view similar to that propounded by Bishop Gibson, but he entirely gave it up afterwards, and stated that our Article all along was directed against the central Roman doctrine of the Mass.³ This is also the general view of the Church of Rome.⁴

Is it possible to regard these points as without significance? Surely they prove beyond all question that our Article refers, and can only refer, to the Roman doctrine of the "sacrifice of the Mass."

IV.—THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE

It remains to consider what is meant by the phrase "Eucharistic Sacrifice." It is evidently intended to mean some sacrifice which can be offered only at the time of the Holy Communion.

There seems to be no doubt that almost from the first the Holy Communion was spoken of under the name of an "offering," or "sacrifice." This is found either stated or implied in Clement of Rome,⁵ and Justin

¹ Cranmer, *The True and Catholic Doctrine and Use of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper* Bk. V, Ch. I.

² Ridley, *A Piteous Lamentation*, Works, p. 52.

³ "The reasoning (viz., in Section 9 of his own Tract XC) is unsatisfactory. . . What the Article abjures as a lie is just that which the Pope and Council declare to be divine truth . . . nothing can come of the suggested distinction between Mass and Masses. . . . What, then, the Thirty-first Article repudiates is undeniably the central and most sacred doctrine of the Catholic religion, and so its wording has ever been read since it was drawn up." . . . "Masses for the quick and dead are not an abuse, but a distinct ordinance of the Church herself. . . . I do not see how it can be denied that the Article calls the sacrifice of the Mass itself, in all its private and solitary celebrations—to speak of no other—that is, in all its daily celebrations from year's end to year's end, *isto orbe terrarum*, a blasphemous fable" (Newman, *Via Media*, Vol. I, pp. 351-356).

⁴ See Moyes, as above.

⁵ "Those who were responsible for it (Article XXXI) showed well enough by their actions—the destruction of altars, the cutting up of vestments . . . and their loathing of 'massing priests'—that subtleties of this kind never even entered their minds. They hated the whole thing root and branch and said so" (R. H. Benson, *Non-Catholic Denominations*, p. 34).

⁶ For a fuller discussion of this point given in summary above, see Dimock, *Missarum Sacrificia, Dangerous Deceits*; Tomlinson, *ut supra*, p. 284.

Martyr, A.D. 190, the latter associating the Eucharist, as an oblation or sacrifice, with the passage in Malachi i. 10, 11. In Irenæus there are frequent references to the word, and Tertullian speaks of *panis oblationem*, and uses *offero* as signifying the whole ceremony. But during the second century we only hear of the oblation of gifts, not of the Body and Blood of Christ, which is of later date. Cyprian first gives a different meaning to the word and plainly speaks of the offering of Christ's blood, which must be understood as something subsequent to consecration. But what the early Fathers called the Memorial of Christ, Cyprian calls the Offering. Later Fathers adopted Cyprian's language, only explaining that they meant a solemn commemoration. Even Cyprian's language is not uniform.

The use of the word "altar" is not found associated with the Lord's Supper earlier than Tertullian,¹ and Westcott points out that such a usage would have been impossible during the second century.² This interpretation of the use of "offering" and "sacrifice" is also given by Bishop Harold Browne, who says that during this time "we find no certain reference to any offering in the Eucharist, except the offering of the bread and wine in the way of gifts or oblations to the service of God." And he also points out that the change of view in regard to the Eucharistic Sacrifice "does not expressly appear before the time of Cyprian," adding that if it had been believed before "it is certainly a most extraordinary example of silence and reserve that, for two centuries after Christ, they should never once have explained the sacrifice of the Eucharist in any manner, but either as an offering of first-fruits to God, . . . or else as an offering of praise and thanksgiving and spiritual worship."³

After the time of Cyprian, however, there is no doubt that writers frequently speak of the Eucharist as a sacrifice in the sense of our Lord's body and blood being commemorated and present and even offered. The Roman Catholics claim these statements in support of their own doctrine, though it is not at all clear that the meaning is identical. Certainly there is absolute silence among leading Church writers until the middle of the third century, and nothing in the writings after that date supports the view that a literal offering up of a literal sacrifice on the altar was contemplated. What seems quite clear is that the Eucharist was regarded as commemorative of the death of Christ and in this sense a commemorative sacrifice. The idea of gifts of bread and wine by the faithful and a sacrifice of prayer, and praise, and the offering of the communicants themselves, were of course kept in view, and then the thought of the Holy Communion as a memorial of Christ's sacrifice was made specially prominent. Beyond this it does not seem possible to go on any fair inter-

¹ "Tertullian, in whom we find both 'ara' used for the Holy Table, and 'summus sacerdos qui est episcopus'. Perhaps it would be impossible to find distinct earlier authority for either word" (Wordsworth, *The Ministry of Grace*, p. 133).

² "In this first stage of Christian literature there is not only no example of the application of the word *θυσιαστήριον* to any concrete, material object as the Holy Table, but there is no room for such an application" (Westcott, *Hebrews*, pp. 456, 458).

³ Harold Browne, *Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 738 f.

pretation of the language of the Fathers of the first six centuries at least. Waterland has subjected the language of the Fathers of the early centuries to a thorough and most careful examination, and his conclusion is as follows :—

“The Fathers well understood that to make Christ’s natural body the real sacrifice of the Eucharist would not only be absurd in reason, but highly presumptuous and profane ; and that to make the outward symbols a proper sacrifice, a material sacrifice, would be entirely contrary to Christian principles, degrading the Christian sacrifice into a Jewish one, yea, and making it much lower and meaner than the Jewish, both in value and dignity. The right way, therefore, was to make the sacrifice spiritual ; and it could be no other on Gospel principles.”¹

All this gives point to the important words of Boulton that the student should be warned

“of the utter insecurity of relying upon isolated quotations from the Fathers, apart from an acquaintance with their phraseology, their habits of thought, and their mode of reasoning.”²

And yet the modern and frequent use of the term “Eucharistic Sacrifice” calls for definite enquiry as to its meaning and character. In the Church of Rome the Eucharistic Sacrifice means the Mass.³ When the doctrine of Transubstantiation had been set forth and defined it was easy to read into the new doctrine of the “sacrifice of the Mass” the language of the Fathers concerning the sacrifice and offering, and the definition of the “sacrifice of the Mass” in the Canons of the Council of Trent clearly states that the meaning is identical with Calvary and carries propitiatory effects : (1) for the whole Church ; (2) for the payee ; (3) for the priest. But this is not to be understood as a repetition, only a continuation of Calvary.

“If anyone shall say that in the Mass a true and proper sacrifice is not offered to God, let him be accursed.”⁴

This view of Rome met with the strongest opposition from the Reformers of the sixteenth century, because they regarded it as detracting from the one perfect and sufficient sacrifice of our Lord on the Cross. German and English Reformers alike spoke in the plainest terms against this view, and it may be said, without any question, that in the sixteenth century the “sacrifice of the Mass” was the only Eucharistic Sacrifice really known.⁵ And it can readily be understood why the Article uses

¹ Waterland, *On the Eucharist*, Ch. XII.

² Boulton, *The Theology of the Church of England*, p. 272.

³ Dearden, *Modern Romanism Examined*, p. 141.

⁴ Council of Trent, Session XXII, Canon 1. See other Canons quoted above.

⁵ “The whole substance of our sacrifice, which is frequented of the Church in the Lord’s Supper, consisteth in prayers, praise, and giving of thanks, and in remembering

such plain language in speaking of what was universally regarded as a contradiction of the uniqueness of Calvary.¹

It is, therefore, not surprising to read that "it must be admitted that the sacrificial aspect is not the prominent aspect of the Holy Eucharist dwelt upon in our Communion Office."² And the statements of Bishop Gore agree with this admission.

"No doubt there is some justification at first sight for saying that the New Testament does not suggest that the Eucharist is a sacrifice."

"On the subject of the Eucharistic sacrifice our Thirty-first Article only excludes any treatment of it which in any way suggests the insufficiency of the one offering of Christ. . . . Beyond this our formulas are silent."³

The dislocation of the Communion Office of 1549 in the Prayer Book of 1552, which still remains in our present Prayer Book, by which the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving was put in a post-communion Collect instead of in the Consecration Prayer, is another proof of the way in which our Reformers did their utmost to dissociate the minds of the people from the mediæval sacrifice of the Mass. The omission of the word "altar" is, of course, another indication of the same purpose.

But notwithstanding all these facts the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice is often taught in the English Church, a doctrine which, while rejecting the Roman view of associating the sacrifice with Christ's death, endeavours to connect it with our Lord's heavenly priesthood.⁴ It is some-

and showing forth of that sacrifice once offered upon the altar of the Cross; that the same might continually be had in reverence by mystery, which, once only and no more, was offered for the price of our redemption" (Ridley, *Disputations at Oxford Works*, Parker Society, p. 211).

¹ "It is readily acknowledged that there is a more favourable side on which the doctrine may be viewed. But I regret that I can by no means concur with Dr. Sanday in thinking it not impossible that the most favourable view may be reconciled with truth (see *Conception of Priesthood*, p. 87). However the sacrificial doctrine of the Mass may be minimised (and it is sometimes minimised to an extent which it is not easy to harmonise with Tridentine teaching), it is always a doctrine which requires the faith of a Real Presence of Christ on the altar, under the species, to be in some sense really offered as a sacrificial oblation (see *Eucharist considered in its Sacrificial Aspect*, p. 7; *Dangerous Deceits*, pp. 72, 73, 120-125; and *Doctrine of Sacerdotium*, p. 25). No heavy indictment brought against gross conceptions of the later mediæval doctrine of the sacrifice (see Gibson, *On Articles*, pp. 692 *et seq.*) can avail to turn away the condemnation of our Article XXXI from the doctrine itself to parasitical superstitions which were found adhering to it. Indeed, this truth stands confessed by one who once laboured hard to withstand it. It is Cardinal Newman who said, 'What the Thirty-First Article repudiates is undeniably the central and most sacred doctrine of the Catholic religion' (see *Missarum Sacrificia*, pp. 52, 58). And it is instructive to notice how Dr. Sanday's *airenica* are regarded from the Romish point of view. Of his 'conception of sacrifice' it is said, 'this seems to us to be seeking peace through a confusion rather than through a clearer statement of contrary beliefs. . . . It might please the Protestant to know that he could use Catholic language without holding anything new; but for the Catholic it would be a retention of the ancient words with an abandonment of the ancient truth' (*The Month*, January 1899, p. 98). (Dimock, *The Sacerdotium of Christ*, p. 99, Note 2).

² Tyrrell Green, *The Thirty-nine Articles and the Age of the Reformation*, p. 258.

³ Gore, *The Body of Christ*, p. 261.

⁴ So Dr. Bright, in Bishop Gibson, *ut supra*, p. 691, and *Church Quarterly Review*, Vol. XLII, pp. 46-49.

what difficult to obtain a precise definition of this idea of the Eucharistic sacrifice, though it is intended to mean something associated exclusively with the Holy Communion. Various writers speak in different terms. One says that "it is the continual offering up to God of the Person of Jesus Christ in His body and blood. . . . We display to Him that precious body and blood. . . . Such an act is most truly a sacrifice."¹ Another defines it as "the presentation of the one holy sacrifice of Christ."² All that Bishop Gore can say is that it is "a feast upon a sacrifice, but the feast upon the sacrifice is the culmination of the sacrifice."³ It is difficult, however, to see in what respect a feast can be even the culmination of a sacrifice, since in a sacrifice we give and in a feast we receive.

The problem, therefore, is as follows: (a) the Church of Rome is right in associating the Holy Communion with the death of Christ and wrong in making the Mass the continuation of Calvary. (b) Those in the English Church who teach as above are wrong in associating the Holy Communion with Christ in heaven, for everything in Scripture and the Prayer Book associates the Lord's Supper with the death of Christ, never with His life in heaven. The following considerations should be weighed in the study of this modern Anglican view:—

1. There is no trace of any such idea in the Ante-Nicene history.
2. Everything turns on what Christ is actually doing in heaven, and nothing in the New Testament gives the slightest warrant for believing that He is presenting before God the sacrifice once offered on the Cross. No such doctrine is to be discovered either in the New Testament or in the Prayer Book, and surely if Christ is offering Himself and His sacrifice in heaven, so important a fact would occupy a position of very definite prominence in the teaching of our Church. But it is nowhere to be found.⁴

3. What sacrifice is thus associated with our Lord above? Definition is absolutely necessary on so vital a point, and yet nothing can be found either in the New Testament or in the Prayer Book. The only language that can be adduced in this connection has already been considered in the Article on the Lord's Supper, and so it must suffice to say that *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε* cannot be rendered "offer this,"⁵ or *ἀνάμνησις*, cannot be understood as a "memorial before God," and *καταγγέλλετε* cannot be rendered otherwise than "proclaim," with man, not God, as the object. It is therefore essential to discover what is our Lord's sacrificial act

¹ Mason, *The Faith of the Gospel*, pp. 327, 328.

² Hon. and Rev. J. G. Adderley, in *Goodwill*.

³ Gore, *ut supra*, p. 261.

⁴ Dimock, *The Christian Doctrine of Sacerdotium*, p. 13 f.

⁵ It is surprising in the face of the best and almost the whole of modern scholarship that anyone can argue that these words mean "Make this your offering" (Tyrrell Green, *ut supra*, p. 255), or that another can say, "We do not see that any other explanation of the sacrificial view of the Eucharist is forthcoming" (*Church Quarterly Review*, July 1886, p. 328).

above, and what is really offered. There is only one answer from the New Testament and the Prayer Book: Nothing.

4. It is also essential to distinguish between sacrifice and sacrament. In the former God is the *terminus ad quem*, and in the latter He is the *terminus a quo*. The vital part of the sacrifice is the living will of the offerer (Heb. x. 10), and it is for this reason that sacrifice is associated with Christ's death, never with His life. If it should be said that Holy Communion is sacrificial at the moment of saying, "This is My Body," these words were not words of consecration at all and were uttered while the distribution or administration was proceeding. It has been shown that no "Catholic" form of consecration has ever existed,¹ and every particle of the bread and wine is intended to be consumed by man, not presented as a gift to God.

5. It may be said without any question that nowhere in Scripture is the idea of our Lord offering or pleading in heaven to be found.²

The Prayer Book, following the New Testament, has three sacrifices only. Those of ourselves (Rom. xii. 1); our gifts (Heb. xiii. 16); and our praises (Heb. xiii. 15). There is not even an oblation of the unconsecrated elements, as a comparison of the Rubric concerning these and the elements significantly shows.³

All this does not in the least set aside the primitive idea of sacrifice as applied either to the presentation of gifts to God or to the whole service of Communion. But the modern view is by no means identical or satisfied with these interpretations. So far as the English Church is concerned, no better expressed truth can be found than in the words of Bishop Bilson:

"Neither they nor I ever denied the Eucharist to be a sacrifice. The very name enforceth it to be the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, which is the true and lively sacrifice of the New Testament. The Lord's Table, in respect of His graces and mercies there proposed to us, is a heavenly banquet, which we must eat, and not sacrifice; but the duties which He requireth at our hands, when we approach His Table, are sacrifices, not sacraments. As namely, to offer Him thanks and praises, faith and obedience, yea, our bodies and souls, to be living, holy, and acceptable sacrifices unto Him, which is our reasonable service."⁴

¹ Wordsworth, *ut supra*.

² "The modern conception of Christ pleading in heaven His Passion, 'offering His blood' on behalf of men, has no foundation in this Epistle. His glorified humanity is the eternal pledge of the absolute efficacy of His accomplished work. He pleads, as older writers truly expressed the thought, by His Presence on the Father's throne. Meanwhile, men on earth in union with Him enjoy continually through His Blood what was before the privilege of one man on one day in the year" (Westcott, *Hebrews*, p. 230).

³ "The words 'Still . . . His prevailing death He pleads,' have no apostolic warrant, and cannot even be reconciled with apostolic doctrine. . . . So far as the Atonement in relation to God is spoken of in any terms of time, the Bible seems to me to teach us to think of it as lying entirely in the past—a thing done 'once for all'" (*Life and Letters of F. J. A. Hort*, Vol. II, p. 213).

⁴ Bishop Dowden, in an exhaustive Paper on "Our Alms and Oblations" in *Further Studies in the Prayer Book*, is conclusive on this point.

⁵ Quoted in Waterland, *On the Eucharist*, p. 427.

This exegesis of the New Testament and the teaching of the Prayer Book are both clearly opposed to the Roman, and also to the modern Anglican, views of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. In the Lord's Supper Christ is neither offered to God, nor for man, but He is offered to man in all the efficacy of His atoning sacrifice, to be received by faith. It would be well if we could avoid ambiguous terms. Even such a phrase as a "commemorative sacrifice" is ambiguous, for strictly, it is not this, but the commemoration of a sacrifice.¹ If, however, the words "Eucharistic Sacrifice" mean some sacrifice which is offered only in and at the Lord's Supper, it is clear that no such idea is found either in the Bible or in the Prayer Book.²

¹ "You may as well call the Waterloo Banquet a memorial battle, as call the Lord's Supper a memorial sacrifice" (quoted by Bishop Moule, *The Supper of the Lord*, p. 37).

² For a fuller discussion of this subject reference may perhaps be permitted to the author's *A Sacrament of our Redemption*, Ch. XI, and his English Church Manual, *Our Lord's Work in Heaven*.

IV. THE HOUSEHOLD OF FAITH.—*continued*

CORPORATE RELIGION

D. CHURCH DISCIPLINE (ARTICLES XXXII-XXXVI)

32. THE MARRIAGE OF PRIESTS.
33. EXCOMMUNICATE PERSONS, HOW THEY ARE
TO BE AVOIDED.
34. THE TRADITIONS OF THE CHURCH.
35. THE HOMILIES.
36. CONSECRATION OF BISHOPS AND MINISTERS.

ARTICLE XXXII

Of the Marriage of Priests.

De Conjugio Sacerdotum.

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

Epicopis, Presbyteris, et Diaconis nullo mandato divino præceptum est, ut aut cœlibatum voveant, aut a matrimonio abstineant. Licet igitur etiam illis, ut cæteris omnibus Christianis, ubi hoc ad pietatem magis facere judicaverint, pro suo arbitratu matrimonium contrahere.

IMPORTANT EQUIVALENTS.

Of Priests	= <i>Sacerdotum.</i>
Priests are not commanded by God's Law	= <i>Presbyteris nullo mandato divino præceptum est.</i>
The estate of single life	= <i>cœlibatum.</i>

SEVERAL questions of Church discipline naturally follow those on the Church, Ministry, and Sacraments. It is probable that the subject of this Article is to be closely connected with that of Article XXXI, because the duties of the priest in regard to Masses, etc., was thought to be incompatible with the position of marriage.

The corresponding Article of 1553 consisted of the first clause only of the present Article with the following title: *Cœlibatus ex verbo Dei præcipitur nemini*, "The estate of single life is commanded to no one by God's word." The Article itself was as follows: *Episcopis, Presbyteris, et Diaconis non est mandatum ut cœlibatum voveant, neque jure divino coguntur matrimonio abstinere.* "Bishops, Priests, and Deacons are not commanded to vow the state of single life without marriage; neither by God's law are they compelled to abstain from marriage." The second clause was added in 1563, giving a positive assertion instead of a merely negative argument in favour of the practice.¹ It has been suggested that this second clause was added because Queen Elizabeth, who was prejudiced against clerical marriages, had by the Twenty-ninth Injunction of 1559 put impediments in their way by alleging that

"There hath grown offence and some slander to the Church, by lack of discreet and sober behaviour in many ministers of the Church, both in choosing of their wives, and indiscreet living with them."²

¹ Hardwick, *History of the Articles of Religion*, p. 130.

² Cardwell, *Documentary Annals*, Vol. I, p. 192.

This wording may suggest the defence made in 1563 by means of this clause on clerical "discretion." In November 1563 the Council of Trent anathematised

"Whosoever shall say that clerks in holy orders, or regulars having solemnly professed chastity, can contract matrimony, and that the contract is valid notwithstanding the ecclesiastical law, or the vow."

I.—THE PURPOSE OF THE ARTICLE

It was, of course, directed against the Roman Catholic law of the celibacy of the clergy. It is curious that Rome should make marriage a Sacrament and yet deny it to priests. The application to Rome is probably the explanation of the word *sacerdotum* in the title of the Latin Version, though the Article itself includes all three Orders. It is sometimes urged that the use of this word proves the sacerdotal character of the ministry, that the Prayer Book term "priest" is intended for *sacerdos*.¹ But it ought to be obvious that the argument has no real weight. The Article includes Deacons under the general name of *sacerdotes*, but no one would argue from this that Deacons possess sacerdotal powers. It seems clear, therefore, that the term *sacerdotum* in the title is used in a general sense, and the Latin of the Article is clearly against the argument in its use of the term *presbyteris*, which is used to designate the second order of the ministry. In the same way, in Article XXXVI, the word "priests" is found in the Latin as *presbyterorum*. No argument can be drawn from Article XXXI, for the simple reason that the reference there is to Roman Catholic priests. One other point may perhaps be mentioned. This title, "*De Conjugio Sacerdotum*," actually occurs in German Reformed documents,² where the reference obviously cannot be to the sacerdotal character of the ministry.

The Article makes two statements: (a) there is no prohibition of clerical marriage in Scripture; (b) it is lawful, if considered desirable, on proper grounds. Thus, our Church avoids the Roman error of forbidding clerical marriage altogether, and the Greek rule which requires marriage in the case of Presbyters as distinct from Bishops.

¹ "The use of the word *sacerdotum* shows how entirely the English Reformers repudiated the idea of a mere minister, and assumed that of a *ιερεὺς* or *sacerdos*. Had the word stood alone we might have supposed it to be a slip, but bearing in mind the employment of it in Article XXXI, we may suppose that it was no *incuria*, but intentionally done. If so, we have the identity of the priesthood before and after the Reformation asserted, just as actually we find maintained in the amended Statutes of Corpus Christi College, where it is held that the Fellows, 'though discharged from massing,' were still of necessity to be Priests" (Forbes, *Explanation of the Thirty-nine Articles*, Vol. II, p. 264).

B. J. Kidd, *The Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 247, also says: "Note the retention of *sacerdos* as indicative of what is meant by 'priest.'"

It is interesting that Bishop Gibson, Maclear, and Tyrrell Green do not use this argument.

² *Augsburg Confession*, Part II, Section 2; Melancthon's *Apology*, Section 11; Schmalcald, *Articles*, No. 11; see Von Hase, *Handbook to the Controversy with Rome*, pp. 21, 262, 334.

II.—THE HISTORY OF THE ARTICLE

It is clear that clergy married during the first three centuries, but there was a tendency quite early to prohibit marriage after Ordination, though so far as the West is concerned there seems to have been little or no difference in regard to marriage before or after Ordination.¹ By reason of persecution these early centuries constituted the heroic age of the Church, and the custom of celibacy grew, probably intensified by Gnosticism and Manicheism, so that men left their wives after Ordination. It is significant, therefore, that the origin of clerical celibacy was heathen, not Christian, or Jewish. In 305 the Council of Elvira prohibited marriage for the first time, and when this was suggested at the Council of Nicæa, 325, it was objected to by Paphnutius, himself a celibate. Even in the fifth century, when it became customary for Bishops on appointment to cease living with their wives, the Bishop of Ptolemais would not leave his wife and was allowed to continue with her by his Metropolitan. The Council of Gangra, 350, anathematised all those who separated from their wives. The Trullan Council, 692,² made a distinction, and said that Bishops could not marry, but that priests might. This has had a bad effect on the Eastern Church, exalting the one position and depressing the other. This is substantially the law of the Greek Church to-day, which orders Priests to marry, but forbids Bishops. Priests may not marry a second time, and if a man marries after Ordination he has to forfeit his Orders.³

In the West the tendency was always towards celibacy, and Pope Siricius in the fourth century deposed those who claimed the right to marry. But concessions had to be made from time to time, and this went on up to the time of Hildebrand. In the Middle Ages he reorganised the Priesthood and found many Priests really married, and yet that grave abuses existed through the general rule of celibacy. His idea of supreme power made it essential for the clergy to be free of the Emperor, and so celibacy was insisted upon as the universal law. The Pope went so far as to say that if a Priest was married he could not administer a valid Sacrament. The result was that for five centuries there were great confusions and complications, mainly from financial matters, as a man came to the Church simply to live. Even Pope Pius II, 1464, admitted the need of alteration, but the reasons of Hildebrand continued most powerful. He opposed the idea of married Prince Bishops, since if they were married their Sees would tend to become heirlooms. He also urged that celibacy gave greater freedom from the world.

Clerical celibacy was introduced into England by Lanfranc, 1066, and Anselm, 1102, but it was impossible to enforce it, and clerical concubinage

¹ Wordsworth, *The Ministry of Grace*, p. 227.

² So called because held in the Trullan Hall of the Imperial Palace in Constantinople.

³ Knetes, *Ordination and Matrimony in the Eastern Orthodox Church* (*Journal of Theological Studies*, April 1910).

became common. Wordsworth says that "at no time before the Reformation of the sixteenth century were the mass of the English clergy unmarried, though the position which their wives enjoyed was generally by no means an enviable one."¹ The Reformers saw the necessity of a change. Cranmer married his second wife just before his Consecration as Archbishop, but the Six Articles of 1539 were against it. In 1547 came a change introducing freedom. One of the Articles of Inquiry from the Archbishop of Canterbury was, "Whether any do contemn inmarried priests, and for that they be married, will not receive the communion or other sacraments at their hands."² This position was confirmed by the Article of 1553, as stated above. In 1553, the first year of Queen Mary's reign, a letter reversed this rule and deprived all married Priests of their livings and commanded them to bring their wives within a fortnight in order that they might be divorced.³ During this reign there were several Inquiries and Injunctions on the subject.⁴ In 1559 came Elizabeth's Injunction, requiring every clergyman before marriage to obtain proper assurance from the Bishop and two Justices of the Peace,⁵ and, as already noted, it is probable that this requirement led to the stronger statement inserted in the present Article.⁶

The Council of Trent, as we have seen, anathematizes those who say that the clergy can marry, but it is significant that the Church of Rome yields on this point in connection with Uniate congregations.⁷

III.—THE CASE STATED

It is, of course, well known that Jewish priests married, and this was especially necessary in the case of the High Priest in order that his office might be continued in his family as an hereditary work. Our Lord's attitude to marriage carries a clear approval in regard to all His followers. St. Paul honours marriage, St. Peter was himself married, and the teaching of the Apostles is clearly that "marriage is honourable in all" (Heb. xiii. 4). Clerical marriage is obvious from such passages as 1 Tim. iii. 2, 12; Tit. i. 6; 1 Cor. ix. 5. Tertullian was married, and so were Hilary of Poitiers, Gregory of Nyssa, and others. Our complaint is against the universal imposition of celibacy; its expediency

¹ Wordsworth, *ut supra*, p. 230.

² Cardwell, *ut supra*, Vol. I, p. 59.

³ Cardwell, *ut supra*, Vol. I, p. 120.

⁴ Cardwell, *ut supra*, Vol. II, Index (p. 447), s.v. Married Priests.

⁵ Cardwell, *ut supra*, Vol. I, p. 224 f. The Queen never seems to have conquered her dislike to married clergy; see Cardwell, *ut supra*, Vol. I, p. 307.

⁶ Ball (*The Orthodox Doctrine of the Church of England*, p. 241) is responsible for the following statements:

"The strong dislike of Elizabeth for wedded priests, combined with her desire to conciliate the reforming party, caused a very strange state of things to prevail during her reign; the clergy were allowed to marry, but their children were not accounted, legally, to be legitimate! This stigma on the offspring of the priesthood was not repealed until the reign of James I."

⁷ Wordsworth, *ut supra*, p. 255.

in certain cases is fully admitted, and the Article lays down the principle that clergymen are to consider the question in the light of "godliness." It is not to be merely a matter of convenience or personal preference, but that which shall serve the better to further their position as servants of God. In the light of the Roman Catholic prohibition of marriage the words of the Apostle are particularly significant (1 Tim. iv. 3). The great rule of Scripture is that "it is not good for man to be alone," and a celibate clergy tends to become a separate class away from the interests and feelings of the people. Celibacy is sometimes favoured, and urged as more excellent for spiritual work.¹ But not only is this without Scriptural support, it has also against it the facts of history, which tend to show that for spiritual and pastoral work in the New Testament sense the nature of man is properly developed ordinarily through the influence of womanhood, and thereby he is enabled the better to do his work. It is, therefore, impossible to avoid the conclusion that compulsory celibacy is "a constant blot and one of the most dangerous errors of the Roman Church."²

¹ Gibson, *The Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 655.

² Wordsworth, *ut supra*, p. 251.

The present state of South America amply confirms this position. For a valuable, historical, and practical statement of this subject the whole section in Bishop Wordsworth's *The Ministry of Grace*, pp. 206-256, should be studied. See also Lea, *Sacerdotal Power in the Christian Church*; Hobhouse, *The Church and the World in Idea and in History* (Bampton Lectures, pp. 69, 121); Hatch's Bampton Lectures, p. 159.

ARTICLE XXXIII

Of excommunicate Persons, how they are to be avoided.

De excommunicatis vitandis.

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

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

IMPORTANT EQUIVALENTS.

Of excommunicate persons, how they are to be avoided	= <i>de excommunicatis vitandis.</i>
Rightly cut off	= <i>rite præcisus.</i>
Heathen	= <i>Ethnicus.</i>
Penance	= <i>per pœnitentiam.</i>
That hath authority thereto	= <i>competentis.</i>

THE subject of Church discipline was the cause of great discussion and difference of opinion in the reign of Edward VI.¹ It was, therefore, natural that it should be included in the Articles, and this dates from 1553, with merely a change in the title which then read: "Excommunicate Persons are to be avoided."

I.—THE PURPOSE OF THE ARTICLE

It was felt necessary and wise to assert the right of the Church as a Society to exercise discipline and to exclude those who violated its laws. To be excommunicated was, of course, to be separated from the Communion of the visible Church.

II.—THE TEACHING OF THE ARTICLE

Various points are included in the claim made on behalf of the Church as a community.

1. The Fact of Discipline.—This is naturally assumed and is inherent in the existence of any Society.

2. The Method of Discipline.—Reference is made to "open denunciation of the Church," emphasis being placed upon the publicity of the action and its connection with the entire Society.

¹ Hardwick, *History of the Articles of Religion*, pp. 93, 105.

3. The Effect of Discipline.—The person thus dealt with is said to be “rightly cut off from the unity of the Church and excommunicated.” The Latin equivalent for “rightly” is “*rite*,” referring to due order and emphasising the proper manner of doing the work, according to the judgment of the Church.

4. The Attitude to Discipline.—The rest of the Church is to regard the excommunicated person as “an Heathen and Publican,” that is, one who is outside the privileges of the Christian community. The allusion is, of course, to our Lord’s words in St. Matt. xviii. 17. The publican was regarded as an offender then, but our Lord’s attitude to the men as a class suggests the true spirit of dealing with such cases.

5. The Purpose of Discipline.—This excommunication is intended to produce reconciliation. “Until he be openly reconciled by penance, and received into the Church by a Judge that hath authority thereunto.” Once again emphasis is laid on publicity, for the man is to be as openly reconciled as he had been openly denounced. Penance (Latin, *pœnitentiam*) includes both the feelings of the offender, as he repents of his wrongdoing, and the discipline required by the community as a condition of his reinstatement. It will be observed that there is no definite statement as to the officer by whom the offender is to be restored. He is merely described as “a judge that hath authority thereunto,” the Latin equivalent being “a competent judge.” In the ordinary course of events this would be a minister of the Church, though it is possible that the Civil power is contemplated in connection with an Established Church.

III.—THE TEACHING OF SCRIPTURE

The subject of Christian discipline in Holy Scripture is one of importance. It may first be considered in the light of our Lord’s teaching in St. Matt. xviii. 15-18, where three principles are laid down: (a) in the case of trespass between brethren the fault is first to be told between the two parties with the hope of amicable arrangement (ver. 15); (b) if this proves impracticable an effort is to be made in company with one or two others, so that the situation may be clearly understood (ver. 16); (c) then if this proves impossible the community in general is to be informed of what has happened, and if the offender will not listen to the Society of God’s people he is to be regarded as excommunicated, put outside the pale of fellowship and privilege. These three proofs are confirmed by the solemn statement which vests Church discipline in the community, “Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven” (ver. 18). These words are practically identical with those spoken to St. Peter a little time before (Matt. xvi. 19). “Binding” and “loosing” were familiar Jewish terms for “prohibiting” and “permitting,”¹ and refer to the power of the Christian community to

¹ John Lightfoot, *Hora Hebraica*, on St. Matthew xvi. 19.

make regulations for its own life.¹ Similar teaching connected with Christian discipline is found in St. Paul's Epistles, and refers both to doctrine and practice (Rom. xvi. 17; 1 Cor. v. 2-7; 2 Cor. ii. 5-11; 1 Tim. i. 19, 20; 2 Thess. iii. 14; Tit. iii. 10; 2 John 10; 3 John 10). When St. Paul speaks of delivering someone to Satan (1 Tim. i. 20) he is doubtless referring to specific Apostolic power (cf. Acts xiii. 10); he implies something more than mere excommunication, and yet something less than death. It is natural that discipline would be considered more necessary while the Church was unformed, but at all times human nature needs some such influence.

IV.—THE HISTORY

As the Jewish religion was theocratic there was no difference between ecclesiastical and civil discipline. In the Old Testament discipline often involved death by God or man (Gen. xvii. 14; Exod. xxxi. 14). Later on the Jews exercised the power of excommunication (Numb. xii. 14, 15; Lev. xiii. 5, 6; Ezra x. 8), making distinctions between various offences. (a) The lightest sentence was separation for a month (יָרַד, ἀφορισμός); (b) the next severe form was excommunication from the assembly (קָרָה, ἀνάθεμα); (c) the severest of all was permanent separation from the community (אֲפָרַדְתָּ). It is sometimes thought that our Lord's words in St. Luke vi. 22 correspond with these three stages, but according to a modern authority this is erroneous, for there were only two kinds of excommunication: temporary exclusion and permanent separation.²

The early Church naturally took over the idea of excommunication from the Jews (Luke vi. 22; John ix. 22; xii. 42; xvi. 21). In the early centuries the punishment was of three kinds: (a) admonition; (b) lesser excommunication from prayers and Eucharist, but not from the Church (ἀφορισμός); (c) greater excommunication (παντελής ἀφορισμός). There were also four orders of penitents: *flentes*, mourners; *audientes*, hearers; *substrati*, kneelers; *consistentes*, bystanders.³ It was natural, with the New Testament before it, that the Church should emphasise discipline, and so the system grew up, though in its completeness it was apparently very seldom enforced.

The first to deal with the Church as a whole was Victor, Bishop of Rome, who took upon himself to excommunicate all those who did not observe Easter according to his rule. Tertullian refers to the exclusion of the Gnostic Valentinus, and of the heretic Marcion. The Council

¹ It is clear that the reference in this passage is to a power concerning things, not persons, a power given to the Society to make rules. See Bishop Wordsworth, *Letter to the Clergy of the Diocese of Salisbury*, p. 49 (Longmans, 1898).

² Schurer, *The Jewish People in the Time of Christ* (Second Edition), Vol. II, p. 60. Quoted in Bishop Gibson, *The Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 706, Note 2.

³ Article, "Penitence," *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, Vol. II, p. 1591.

of Nicæa promulgated a decree excluding from Church fellowship for ten years, but giving Bishops the power of shortening the time. When a person was excommunicated by one Church he was regarded as excommunicated by all, for notices were given, and if any Church received him it was considered schismatical. But such excommunication did not annul his baptism or take away his civil or national rights, though the present Roman Catholic use is contrary to this. The trouble, of course, was that the early Church had no coercive power inherent in ecclesiastical authority, and the result was that before the Church became national the State had to be called in in the case of Paul of Samosata.

As superstition increased the Church was regarded as possessing some mysterious power which was worse than death itself. In the later centuries Papal interdicts were pronounced on nations for the fault of one individual, but these were unknown in the early Church and only began to be common in the twelfth century (*e.g.* King John's in 1206). They became weakened in the fourteenth, especially by the action of men like Wycliffe, and this was no doubt the reason why the Council of Trent guarded against their abuse. But the Roman Catholic doctrine of Penance renders the need of this general form of discipline very much less.¹ Private confession had superseded all other discipline.

Our Article has to do with Protestant opinion in the sixteenth century, and is not against the Church of Rome, except so far as emphasis is placed upon discipline being open. The Rubric after the Nicene Creed orders excommunications to be publicly read out in Church at that point. The Office for the Burial of the Dead is not to be used for those that die excommunicated, and there are similar Rubrics in regard to discipline connected with the Holy Communion. Canon 65 of 1604 provides directions for public denunciation of excommunicate persons, and Canon 85 includes in the duties of Churchwardens the keeping out of the Church of all such persons.²

The term "Erastianism" is often used to-day. It is derived from Erastus, a German physician, who died 1582. He said that the Church could only persuade, not enforce, and for this reason all ecclesiastical offences were to be dealt with by the civil authority, since the Church had no independent power. The Puritans went to the other extreme and taught that all power was spiritual. In 1645 a strong effort was made by the Presbyterians to exclude men from the Sacrament without any interference from the State, but Parliament saw the danger and refused to establish this *imperium in imperio*. The Anglican position recognises the Church as having no power over persons and property, and if the Church is independent of the State discipline would seem to be impracticable so far as these questions are concerned. The Church can frame any laws she likes, but the enforcement without the civil power

¹ For the history of discipline see Articles, "Excommunication" and "Penance," *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*.

² See also Canons 2-8, 9-12, 109.

will naturally be difficult. All that a Church can do is to exclude from ecclesiastical privileges and social intercourse. Beyond this a spiritual community is necessarily impotent apart from any question that involves the law of the land. It was the consciousness of this that led the Church to feel the need of some understanding for mutual assistance and control. Yet even when excommunication was enforced it was always intended for spiritual benefit and not for mere punishment. In principle a Church is and must be independent of the State, and yet if that Church holds property it can only be by the laws of the State.

At the Reformation, when auricular confession was abandoned, public discipline was felt to be essential, and its absence is regretted in the Communion Service. There is a wide feeling that more disciplinary power is necessary than we have at present. We lost it by our own fault and by the terrible errors of former days. Discipline was often regarded as one of the Notes of the Church. Owing to the peculiar relations of Church and State in England Ecclesiastical Courts have practically no jurisdiction over the laity, and are therefore virtually obsolete.¹

¹ Boulbee, *The Theology of the Church of England*, p. 278. For the views of the Reformers on Church Discipline, see Harold Browne, *Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 766.

ARTICLE XXXIV

Of the Traditions of the Church.

De Traditionibus Ecclesiasticis.

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

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

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

Traditiones atque Cæremonias easdem non omnino necessarium est esse ubique, aut prorsus consimiles: nam et variæ semper fuerunt, et mutari possunt, pro regionum, temporum, et morum diversitate, modo nihil contra verbum Dei instituat.

Traditiones, et cæremonias Ecclesiasticas, quæ cum verbo Dei non pugnant, et sunt auctoritate publica institutæ atque probatæ, quisquis privato consilio volens, et data opera, publice violaverit, is, ut qui peccat in publicum ordinem Ecclesiæ, quique lædit auctoritatem Magistratus, et qui infirmorum fratrum conscientias vulnerat, publice, ut cæteri timeant, arguendus est.

Quælibet Ecclesia particularis sive nationalis auctoritatem habet instituendi mutandi, aut abrogandi cæremonias aut ritus Ecclesiasticos, humana tantum auctoritate institutos, modo omnia ad ædificationem fiant.

IMPORTANT EQUIVALENTS.

[No English]	= <i>omnino.</i>
Through his private judgment	= <i>privato consilio.</i>
Purposely	= <i>data opera.</i>
Openly	= <i>publice.</i>
Ought to be rebuked	= <i>arguendus est.</i>
Common order	= <i>publicum ordinem.</i>

THE first paragraph of this Article was evidently derived from the fifth of the Thirteen Articles of 1548 (The Concordat),¹ with the word "times" (*temporum*), added in 1563 for greater comprehensiveness. The last paragraph of the Article (referring to national Churches) was not in

¹ "Traditiones vero, et ritus, atque ceremoniæ, quæ vel ad decorem vel ordinem vel disciplinam Ecclesiæ ab hominibus sunt institutæ, non omnino necesse est ut eadem sint ubique aut prorsus similes. Hoc enim et variæ fuere, et variari possunt pro regionum et morum diversitate, ubi decus, ordo, et utilitas Ecclesiæ videbuntur postulare.

"Hæ enim et variæ fuere, et variari possunt pro regionum et morum diversitate, ubi decus decensque ordo principibus rectoribusque regionum videbuntur postulare; ubi tamen ut nihil varietur aut instituat contra verbum Dei manifestum" (Gibson, *The Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 717).

See Hardwick, *History of the Articles of Religion*, p. 264.

that of 1553, but was added in 1563. It is substantially (almost verbally) the same as the proposition laid down by the Reformers in their Debate with the Roman Marian Bishops in 1559.

This is a corollary of Article XX as to Ceremonial, and is a special application of it to the position of the Church of England in view of the attitude adopted by the Council of Trent to national Churches. It is also plainly directed against the excessive individualism of the extreme Protestant party. The Article still expresses the essential and fundamental position of the Anglican Church, as viewed from modern stand-points corresponding with those against which the Article was originally directed.

I.—THE TEACHING OF THE ARTICLE

1. The first principle laid down is that Traditions and Ceremonies need not be always alike. The reference is to practices just as Article VI applies to doctrine. The wording of the Article, expressing that "it is not necessary for Traditions and Ceremonies to be alike," is carefully guarded and suggests the desirability of uniformity wherever practicable. The teaching of the Article can be well illustrated by the prefatory matter of the Prayer Book. The third of the introductory addresses, "Of Ceremonies, why some be Abolished, and some Retained," is a full statement of the claim of the Church of England to change where necessary. Our Reformers could hardly help remembering the uniformity of the Western Church for centuries, and they doubtless regretted the necessity for change. The desirability of uniformity wherever possible is equally illustrated from the "Preface," and "Concerning the Service of the Church." It is a matter of simple fact that Traditions and Ceremonies have never been alike, and it is not going too far to say that they never will be. The history of the Church, as we shall see, has been, again and again, marked by change, according to differences of place, occasions, and circumstances. The one standard is Holy Scripture, for nothing is to be "ordained against God's Word." This, as already seen several times, was the great principle laid down at the Reformation.

2. At the same time the Article teaches with equal plainness the need of individual conformity. Wilful individualism is first described in very frank terms and then strongly deprecated on three grounds. No one through his private judgment is willingly, purposely, and openly to break Church traditions which are not unscriptural and are in common use. Any such deliberate breach constitutes a threefold offence: (a) against the common order of the Church; (b) against proper authority; (c) against weak consciences, leading them to do the same. The only question is as to what is scriptural, or "not repugnant to the Word of God," and at the same time supported by existing Church authority. All such breaches are to be subject to severe rebuke in order that others

may be prevented from doing likewise and causing untold confusion in the community.

3. Then the Article in its last clause proceeds to claim the right and power for national Churches to make such changes. There was of necessity no national Church in primitive times, and up to the sixteenth century the only real division was that of East and West.¹ But the exigencies of the Reformation necessitated national severances from Rome, and as a result Churches sprang up in the various nationalities which protested against the Roman dominion. In harmony, therefore, with the Reformation movement the Article claims that each such Church can "ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church, ordained only by man's authority." Thus so long as they are only human and not divinely binding they can be altered, the one requirement being that of edification, "so that all things be done to edifying" (Rom. xiv. 19). This will mean that we are neither to adhere obstinately to anything ancient simply because it is ancient, nor rashly to introduce anything novel because it is new. In everything connected with ceremonies or rites the ruling principle of spiritual edification is to be kept in mind.

II.—THE HISTORY

The principles laid down in the Article can be amply justified by an appeal to primitive Church history, for diversity is clearly seen in the early Church. We know this from the story of Polycarp and Victor as to the date of the observance of Easter. The language of the great Liturgies is another illustration of the same diversity. Writers can also be adduced in support of this contention. Thus Tertullian (*De Corona Militis*) refers to many ceremonies formerly used, but subsequently discontinued, as, for example, the use of honey. To the same effect St. Augustine writes (*Ad Januarium*) about things which vary according to countries and places, like daily Communion, the Sabbath Fast, the Pax. Perhaps posture in prayer is the most notable instance of this principle of diversity. The Canons of Nicæa require standing in prayer, and to this day this custom is observed in the Eastern Church. So that after all the Puritans were really right, though perhaps they did not know that they were insisting upon what had been ordered by the Nicene Canon. As a further illustration of the way in which extremes meet, it may be mentioned that the Pope of Rome and Presbyterian Christians receive the Holy Communion in the sitting posture.² But as time went on uniformity became more and more the rule in the Western Church, although

¹ "Now that the Roman Empire is gone, and that all the laws which they made are at an end, with the authority that made them, it is a vain thing to pretend to keep up the ancient dignities of *Sees*, since the foundation upon which that was built is sunk and gone. Every empire, kingdom, or state, is an entire body within itself" (Burnet, *Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England*, p. 451).

² Gibson, *ut supra*, pp. 517-519.

in England there was some diversity, as seen in the Sarum use. The Council of Trent has fixed the Roman use, though anciently there was a good deal of national liberty, with Gallican formularies in France, and the Ambrosian use in Milan.¹ The tendency to uniformity is useful, and should be encouraged as far as possible, and yet it contains its own perils which need to be watched. It is certainly incompetent for the Church of Rome to complain of variety, since, as Burnet says :—

“Of all the bodies of the world, the Church of Rome has the worst grace to reproach us for departing in some particulars from the ancient canons, since it was her ill conduct that had brought them all into desuetude.”²

It was not surprising that at the Reformation there should be an inevitable rebound and reaction in Puritanism by an exaltation of rules to the position of principles. It was this difficulty that led to the great work of Hooker in which he showed the true nature of law, natural and spiritual, the place of Scripture in the Divine economy, and the particular application of these principles in the law of the Church of England.³ In regard to matters of outward form, Hooker lays down four simple propositions. (1) Anything that can be shown to set forward godliness is to be accepted, notwithstanding slight inconveniences that may accrue. (2) In matters which do not suggest in themselves fitness, the judgment of antiquity may rightly weigh in their acceptance and retention. (3) Apart from Divine law, clear argument, and public inconvenience, the authority of the Church should rightly weigh with true followers of Christ. (4) If necessity or usefulness require, certain ceremonies may be dispensed with from time to time.⁴ It would be difficult to deny the inherent reasonableness of this position as laid down by our great Church writer. The one thing to remember is that the Bible is essentially a book of principles, not of rules, and the supreme requirement is that amidst the varied and complex needs of life and worship no Church rule shall contravene a Bible principle. Apart from this there must necessarily be full liberty to “ordain, change, and abolish.”

The wording of the Article on one point may naturally seem to be not only archaic, but altogether out of harmony with the freer conditions of life that obtain now as compared with the times when these formularies

¹ Maclear and Williams, *Introduction to the Articles of the Church of England*, p. 383, Note 1.

² Burnet, *ut supra*, p. 452.

³ “The several societies of Christian men, unto every one of which the name of a Church is given, with addition betokening severalty, as the Church of Rome, Corinth, Ephesus, England, and so the rest, must be endued with correspondent general properties belonging unto them as they are public Christian societies. And of such properties common unto all societies Christian, it may not be denied that one of the very chiefest is Ecclesiastical Polity. . . . To our purpose the name of Church-Polity will better serve, because it containeth both government, and also whatsoever besides belongeth to the ordering of the Church in public” (Hooker, *Ecol. Pol.*, Bk. III, Ch. I). See also Hooker, *ut supra*, Bks. I–V.

⁴ Hooker, *ut supra*, Bk. V, Ch. VI–IX.

were drawn up. It will suffice to show the true bearing of the Article on present-day life by quoting the wise words of one of our most able and thoughtful modern writers :—

“ It need scarcely be observed to those who have read the history of the Church of England under the Tudor Sovereigns that the Thirty-fourth Article was very far from acknowledging the liberty of sects to organise themselves. The liberty which was claimed for the English State to organise the English Church was freely granted to Scotland, Saxony, or Geneva ; but more licence than this was not recognised in that age. Accordingly the *open rebuke*, as interpreted by the practice of the Tudors and Stuarts with regard to schismatics, included certain very severe personal results. Happily the Article itself is no warrant for these proceedings, and without difficulty adapts itself to the usage of a more tolerant age.”¹

III.—THE RELATION OF NATIONAL CHURCHES TO THE CHURCH CATHOLIC

This is a point of great importance at the present time. It is said by many to be impossible for a National Church to set aside anything that is truly “ Catholic.” It is, therefore, necessary to define as clearly as possible what we mean by a “ National ” Church and the Church “ Catholic.” What is a National Church ? In the general acceptation of the term it means a people organised for Christian worship under the Head of the State, or within the limits of the State. It is, of course, well known that the term “ National ” Church has never been anything else than nominal, for no Church has ever been literally coterminous with the nation. But for practical purposes the term is adequate to express the Christianity of England at the time of the Reformation, when the nation and the Church were virtually co-extensive, Convocation representing the clergy, Parliament the laity, and the two bodies together constituting the representation of the nation for ecclesiastical purposes. There is no question as to Faith, for, as we have seen, the supreme authority for the individual and the community is Holy Scripture (Article VI). What is often called in question at the present time is the right of a National Church to vary any tradition or ceremony which is regarded as “ Catholic.” But what is “ Catholic ” in reference to tradition ? One writer distinguishes between three kinds of tradition. (1) Divine Tradition, that is, some doctrine or ordinance, not recorded in Scripture, and yet believed to rest on Divine authority. The New Testament as a collection of divinely inspired writings is used to illustrate this point. (2) Apostolic Tradition, that is, doctrines or ordinances handed down “ from the unwritten teachings of the Apostles.” Instances of this are given, as the observance of the Lord’s Day instead of the Sabbath, and the keeping of Lent. (3) Ecclesiastical Tradition, that is, doctrines or ordinances dating from post-Apostolic times, which rest solely on the authority of particular Churches. These may concern dogma, ritual, or morals. It

¹ Boulton, *The Theology of the Church of England*, p. 173.

is urged that the Article is concerned with the third of these, Ecclesiastical Tradition, since "Divine Tradition is changeless," and the Anglican Church "has always strenuously repudiated any claim to interfere with Apostolic Tradition." Then, as to the third, it is said that its value will depend upon the extent to which it is in accordance with the well-known canon, *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*, i.e. "That which has been accepted always, everywhere, and by all." It is added that a tradition which can fully stand this test can hardly be less than Apostolic in origin. One instance is given as an example of a tradition which will fully stand this test, the use of ecclesiastical vestments.¹

It is necessary to state this position at length in order to give it proper consideration. The Church of England nowhere distinguishes tradition in this threefold way, nor does it regard acceptance of the New Testament as an instance of Divine Tradition. On the contrary, the way in which Scripture is treated in the Articles shows that it is considered to be our supreme authority received direct from our Lord and His Apostles. Then, too, there is no trace of any association of terms of equality of the observance of the Lord's Day and the keeping of the Lenten Fast as both due to "Apostolic Tradition"; while as to the third distinction, the question at once arises whether the Vincentian Canon can possibly be applied to any "Tradition" or "Ceremony," such as is referred to in the Article. The very fact of ecclesiastical vestments being adduced in support of this Canon is a striking testimony to the impossibility of applying it, because it is a simple matter of history that these vestments have not been accepted "always, everywhere, and by all," but, on the contrary, they date from a period long after the time of the New Testament or the age of the primitive Church. It would seem, therefore, that this effort to distinguish between "National" and "Catholic" finds no warrant either in history or in the formularies of the Church of England.

Another attempt was made to elicit the true meaning of those who make this distinction when a question was asked of Lord Halifax at the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline how he would distinguish between what is "Catholic" and what is "National"? All that he was able to say was that Reservation being a matter of general consent was necessarily unchangeable, while Communion in both kinds was a matter on which change was possible.² It is obvious, however, that this does not carry us very far, nor does it give any clear principle by means of which "Catholic" and "National" may be distinguished.

Yet again an effort was made to arrive at a proper distinction. The Rev. Leighton Pullan expressed the opinion that if a Liberal Pope of Rome offered Anglican Churchmen terms there would inevitably be disruption unless it were declared that the Articles were not against any doctrine universally accepted at the time of the Great Schism, 1054, and

¹ Ball, *The Orthodox Doctrine of the Church of England*, pp. 247-250.

² *Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline*, Vol. III, p. 369.

that the practices of the Prayer Book could be legitimately identified with those of the Church of the eleventh century.¹ But here again, as it will be seen, there is a definite disregard of the events of the sixteenth century, which on any showing meant something in the way of a deliberate break with Rome. There seems to be no doubt that the reason why the last clause of the Article was added in 1563 was the attitude of the Papacy towards the English Crown and Church of that day.

It would, therefore, seem perfectly clear that this attempt to distinguish between what is "Catholic" and what is "National" is certain to fail, and that the only safe, indeed, the only possible ground, is to adhere closely to the teaching of the Article as it expresses and reflects the position of the Church of England at and since the sixteenth century. The wise words of Gregory the Great to Augustine are often quoted, and they express the great and eternal principle that customs may vary with "countries, times, and men's manners," the fundamental necessity being that "nothing be ordained against God's Word."²

All this makes it essential to consider with great care the frequent appeal to "Hear the Church." What does this mean? In the Church of Rome the answer is clear. The authority is obvious and available. The Church is concentrated in the Pope, and everything required is an application of his authority. But there are those who reject the Pope, and yet emphasise the Church as no less authoritative. The Church is claimed to be the authority for doctrines and practices for life and ceremonial which are still said to be "Catholic." But, again, it must be asked what "Catholic" means? No such authority exists. The Church as a whole has spoken in regard to very few points, and these are easily obtainable. For the first four centuries it was probably within the power of Christian men to obtain a true idea of general Church doctrines and practices, and our great Reformer, Jewel, issued his famous challenge in favour of our Church and against the Church of Rome, by appealing to the first six centuries, claiming that none of the distinctive Roman doctrines could be supported by the authority "of any old Catholic orator or father, or out of any old General Council, or out of the Holy Scriptures of God, or any one example of the primitive Church."³ This, of course, does not mean that everything held and practised in the sixth century is binding now, for much has become impracticable and much has become universally disused. Still more, the Western Church since then has even

¹ *Ut supra*, Vol. II, p. 185.

² "Your fraternity know the custom of the Romish Church, wherein they remember that they have been brought up. But it is my decree, that what you have found in the Church of Rome, or the Gallican or any other that may more please Almighty God, you carefully choose the same: and the best constitutions that you can collect out of many Churches, pour into the Church of England, which is as yet new in the faith. For the customs are not to be loved for the country's sake, but the country for the customs' sake. Out of every particular Church, do you choose the things that are godly, religious, and good, and deposit them as customs in the minds of the English" (quoted in Kidd, *On the Articles*, p. 296).

³ Jewel, *Apology*.

dared to add a clause to the Creed. But beyond this there is now no "Church" to which we can appeal. Dr. Sanday has said that :—

"From the date A.D. 451 onwards, the Christian world came to be so broken up into its several parts that the movement of the whole has practically lost its containing unity. Although the formal separation of East and West was delayed, the development of each was continued on more and more divergent lines."¹

Since then there have been other divisions, and if we are to have a union that is truly "Catholic" it is impossible to stop short with the views of the Greek, Roman, and Anglican Churches; we must appeal also to "some of the most vigorous and devoted Communion which the whole history of Christianity can show."² The conclusion is that :—

"This supposed Catholic Church, to which appeal is made by the extreme High Churchmen of our day, is, except so far as it can be identified with the primitive Church, a phantom of the imagination."³

We return, therefore, to the true Anglican position of a constant and final appeal to Holy Scripture as the supreme rule of faith and practice, while heartily accepting everything that our Church prescribes in regard to traditions and ceremonies in the light of the principles set forth in this Article.

¹ Quoted in Wace, *Principles of the Reformation*, p. 241.

² Wace, *ut supra*, p. 243.

³ Wace, *ut supra*, p. 243; see also p. 244. The entire section on "Church Authority in Matters of Christian Faith and Practice" should be carefully studied, pp. 236-252.

ARTICLE XXXV

Of the Homilies.

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

De Homiliis.

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

Of the Names of the Homilies.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Of the right use of the Church.</i> 2. <i>Against peril of Idolatry.</i> 3. <i>Of repairing and keeping clean of Churches.</i> 4. <i>Of good Works : first of Fasting.</i> 5. <i>Against Gluttony and Drunkenness.</i> 6. <i>Against Excess of Apparel.</i> 7. <i>Of Prayer.</i> 8. <i>Of the Place and Time of Prayer.</i> 9. <i>That Common Prayers and Sacraments ought to be ministered in a known tongue.</i> 10. <i>Of the reverend estimation of God's Word.</i> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 11. <i>Of Alms-doing.</i> 12. <i>Of the Nativity of Christ.</i> 13. <i>Of the Passion of Christ.</i> 14. <i>Of the Resurrection of Christ.</i> 15. <i>Of the worthy receiving of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ.</i> 16. <i>Of the Gifts of the Holy Ghost.</i> 17. <i>For the Rogation-days.</i> 18. <i>Of the state of Matrimony.</i> 19. <i>Of Repentance.</i> 20. <i>Against Idleness.</i> 21. <i>Against Rebellion.</i> |
|--|---|

IMPORTANT EQUIVALENTS.

Book	= <i>Tomus.</i>
Godly and wholesome	= <i>piam et salutarem.</i>
As doth	= <i>non minus quam.</i>

THE corresponding Article XXXIV of 1553 necessarily recognised only the First Book of the Homilies, the Article being headed, "Homilies," and worded as follows: *Homiliæ nuper Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ per injunções regias traditæ atque commendatæ, piæ sunt atque salutares, doctrinamque ab omnibus amplectendam continent: quare populo diligenter, expedite, clareque recitandæ sunt.* "The Homilies of late given, and set out by the king's authority, be godly and wholesome, containing doctrine to be received of all men: and therefore are to be read to the people diligently, distinctly, and plainly." The Article in its present form is not found before the edition of 1571.

I.—THE HISTORY OF THE HOMILIES

Although preaching was one of the direct and immediate results of the Reformation it was difficult to obtain satisfactory preachers, owing to

the incapacity of some, and the attachment of others to the mediæval religion. It was for this reason that sermons were provided which might be read to congregations, and these were called "Homilies." It would seem from an address of Cranmer to the Convocation of 1541 that even then there was an intention to provide Homilies for the purpose of instruction and to safeguard against error, but it is generally thought that if the book was prepared it was suppressed until after the death of Henry.¹

The First Book was dated 31st July 1547, and was ordered to be read by clergymen to the people until further notice from the King. In connection with the Prayer Book of 1549 it was resolved to divide each of the Homilies into two parts, and to read one at a time, and a Rubric was accordingly placed in the Service. They were twelve in number : five doctrinal, and seven practical, and were probably in the main by Cranmer, and perhaps Ridley, though others have been suggested, including Bonner and Becon. The Second Book of the Homilies was published in 1562, having been referred to in the Injunctions of 1559. This was probably by Jewel, though the authorship is uncertain. The last Homily was due to a rebellion in the North of England in 1569, and was incorporated with the Second Book in 1571. The First Book of the Homilies was reprinted from time to time in separate form, and it was not until 1623 that the two books were incorporated in one volume.

It is not generally known that certain changes were made in the Homilies by Queen Elizabeth, the most important of them being the extension of the meaning of the word "Sacrament" in the Homily of Common Prayer, and another, the omission of a Declaration similar to that in Article XXIX denying that the wicked partake of Christ in the Lord's Supper.² But these changes were not sanctioned by Convocation, for this Article was subscribed in January 1563, while the Homilies, as altered by the Queen, were not published for several months afterwards.³

II.—THE TEACHING OF THE ARTICLE

1. The word "Homily" is derived from the Greek, *ὁμιλία*, meaning "conversation," "intercourse," from *ὄμιλος*, "a crowd." (See Luke xxiv. 14; Acts xx. 11; xxiv. 25; 1 Cor. xv. 33.) It was first used by writers of the fifth century to signify a simple discourse for people when there was no sermon.

¹ Tomlinson, *The Prayer Book, Articles, and Homilies*, p. 232.

² Mr. Gladstone (quoted in Tomlinson, *ut supra*, p. 253) remarks on this: "The point on which Elizabeth stands alone as far as I know is this, that she pursued her work from first to last mainly in opposition to the Church's rulers."

It is certainly interesting to realise that every one of the passages in our formularies on which modern extreme teaching has been based was due to the arbitrary and unconstitutional interference of Queen Elizabeth in opposition both to Convocation and Parliament. See on this action in reference to the Homilies, Tomlinson, *ut supra*, pp. 246-253.

³ For the full history of the Homilies see Tomlinson, *ut supra*, Chs. IX, X, and Article, "The Homilies," *Protestant Dictionary*.

2. The character of Homilies is described as "godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times." The two reasons alluded to above warrant this statement. There were some clergy who were thought to favour the Church of Rome, and at the same time there was not a little illiteracy among the clergy. Thus, it was difficult to find competent preachers.

3. The direction given is that these Homilies were to be read "diligently and distinctly, that they may be understood of the people." The insertion of this requirement is due to the fact that if the doctrine of the Homilies was disliked they were read unintelligibly or while murmuring or some other noise went on in Church.¹

Later on, objections were raised to the Homilies by the Puritans,² but it would seem very slightly on doctrinal grounds. The main objection was to reading rather than preaching.³ The only vital objection to doctrine, which came later than the last revision of 1571, was in connection with the subject of Predestination and falling from grace.⁴

4. The question of the obligation of the Homilies to-day is naturally raised by the Article, and it would seem correct to speak of this as general, not specific. But they are certainly valuable as illustrating the minds of the Reformers and the Revisers, and as such, they may be rightly called "semi-authoritative."⁵ It has been very fairly argued that if the Article has any force at all "it must imply a general approval of the doctrines, as distinguished from any particular arguments used by the writers, or special illustrations or ideas adapted to those times."⁶ Certainly in regard to the doctrine of Article XI there is the highest possible and most direct obligation as to the Homily of Justification.⁷

One question has been raised in connection with the obligation of the Homilies: What are we to understand as the true attitude of clergy to the Church of Rome? It is curious that opponents of and sympathisers with that Church both endeavour to find a warrant for their positions in the Article. With regard to the general attitude towards the Church of Rome, it is impossible not to agree with the opinion that the Homilies

¹ "The point of this order lies in the fact that the Homilies were resented by many of the old-fashioned clergy on the score of doctrine, who took their revenge by reading them unintelligibly" (B. J. Kidd, *The Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 256).

² Hardwick, *History of the Articles of Religion*, p. 209.

³ Rogers, *On the Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 326.

⁵ Harold Browne, *Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 777.

⁶ Boulton, *The Theology of the Church of England*, p. 282.

⁷ "The Homilies I consider to have a peculiar value, as authorised Commentaries upon the Articles by those who formed and revised them, and who could not have been ignorant of their real meaning. To us of this distant age, they may be, from their brevity, sometimes obscure; and we must be aware of the tendency of preconceived opinions to distort the judgment, and to discover in a document which commands assent, a sense that was never intended. Cranmer puts this clue into our hands in summing up the short Article on Justification, with the hint, that 'it is more largely expressed in the Homily.' They also instruct the preacher rightly to *divide the word of truth*, and make the profound truths which unite in the accomplishment of man's salvation promote the edification of the least educated of his congregation" (Macbride, *Lectures on the Articles*, p. 516).

are valuable in throwing light upon sixteenth-century documents, "and may be useful for the instruction of our clergy and people in the doctrines of the Reformation."¹ It is well known that Bishop Burnet expressed the view that since "there are so many of the Homilies that charge the Church of Rome with idolatry, no man who thinks that that Church is not guilty of idolatry can with a good conscience subscribe this Article."² To which it has been replied that

"Perhaps we may agree with Dr. Hey, rather than with Bishop Burnet, and hold that a person may fairly consider the Homilies to be a sound collection of religious instruction, who might yet shrink from calling the Roman Catholics idolaters."³

But certainly these words of Burnet are as timely and forcible to-day as ever :—

"If the nation should come to be quite out of the danger of falling back into Popery, it would not be so necessary to insist upon many of the subjects of the Homilies, as it was when they were first prepared."⁴

Another contention is that the Homilies actually teach the doctrine of the Real Presence in the Holy Communion, and that on this account we have no right to insist upon their Protestantism.

Newman made a great point of this in Tract XC, and in 1900 the Declaration made by the English Church Union quoted from the First Book of Homilies, "Of the due receiving of the Body and Blood of Christ under the form of bread and wine." This was adduced in proof that the Church of England teaches the presence of Christ in the Sacrament under the form of bread and wine. It is certainly surprising that a statement of this kind should have been made, because it has been shown again and again that this sentence is no part of a Homily. It occurs in a Note appended to the First Book, promising that hereafter there would follow certain sermons, one of these being "Of the due receiving of Christ's blessed Body and Blood under the form of bread and wine." It should be remembered that this First Book was published in July 1547, when the Act of the Six Articles was still in force, and while the Lord's Supper was described as "High Mass." But this announcement was only a Royal Declaration and seems to have had no ecclesiastical sanction, and two years after, when the First Prayer Book of 1549 was issued, the name "High Mass" was changed for "The Celebration of the Communion" in this very Homily. When the Second Book of Homilies was published in 1563 no sermon under the promised title was contained, but instead a sermon entitled, "On the Worthy Receiving and Reverent Esteeming of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ," teaching

¹ Harold Browne, *ut supra*, p. 777.

² Burnet, *On the Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 453.

³ Harold Browne, *ut supra*, p. 777.

⁴ Burnet, *ut supra*, p. 454.

which is directly opposed to that of the Declaration of the English Church Union. Cranmer himself shows that the expression found in the Note of 1547 is no part of the proper language of the Reformed Church, for he writes, "As concerning the form of doctrine used in this Church of England in the Holy Communion, that the Body and Blood of Christ be under the form of bread and wine—when you shall show the place where this form of words is expressed, then shall you purge yourselves of that which in the meantime I take to be a plain untruth." This was written in 1550.¹ It will be seen from this how impossible is the view set out in the Declaration of the English Church Union, and not the least testimony to its error and impossibility is the fact that the question is not referred to in most representative books on the Articles.

Reviewing the whole question of the character and obligation of the Homilies, it may at least be said that their study would be of value to the clergy for instruction in doctrine, while even their occasional and partial use would not be without profit even to-day.²

¹ Prebendary Meyrick's *Scriptural and Catholic Truth and Worship*, p. 206, from which the substance of the above explanation is taken, adds that the use of this formula as expressing a doctrine sanctioned by the Church of England, was brought in by Dr. Pusey, and still prevails in some quarters. Prebendary Meyrick adds a reference to a verse of a children's hymn where these words occur, and says that it is a translation from a hymn which called forth from Bishop Andrewes an indignant exclamation, "Let them 'worship the Deity hiding there under the species' made from a flour mill. Zion would shudder at that and utterly repudiate it."

² "The language of the Homilies is quaint, and the argument often tedious enough, but it is quite open to question whether the modern sermon is always an improvement on these old-fashioned but pertinent compositions" (Lightfoot, *Text Book of the Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 240).