# RITUALISM

*&c.*

*Works by the same Author.*

BAMPTON LECTURES. (Parker, 1857.)

WHITEHALL SERMONS. (Parker, 1848.)

MARIOLATRY AS EXHIBITED IN BOOKS AT PRESENT USED IN THE ROMISH COMMUNION. (Rivingtons, 1869.)

QUOUSQUE. (Longmans, 1873.)

SECESSION TO ROME. (Longmans, 1871.)

GRAMMAR OF THE GREEK LANGUAGE, Fourth Edition. (Parker.)

ARISTOTLE'S ETHICS, with English Notes. (Parker, 1856.)

CONFESSION. (Longmans, 1875.)

# RITUALISM, ROMANISM

AND THE

# ENGLISH REFORMATION

BY THE LATE

WILLIAM EDWARD JELF, B.D.

SOMETIME CENSOR OF CH. CH.

BAMPTON LECTURER 1853; WHITEHALL PREACHER 1846

LONDON

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

1876

LONDON : PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
AND PARLIAMENT STREET

# PREFACE.

In deciding to publish the following pages, I am aware that I am undertaking a great responsibility, for the subject is one which my husband felt to be of such momentous importance at the present crisis, that I know each argument would have been again tested, each expression reconsidered; and had it pleased God to spare him to finish the work, it would have been offered to the public in a far more perfect state.

I am aware, too, that it has many of the defects of a posthumous work left unfinished by its author. Arguments are only alluded to which were intended to be more fully worked out. In the section on Confession and Absolution there would probably have been more particular reference to the Author's work on 'Confession.' A section was apparently intended to have been devoted to the Adoration of the Elements. I have tried where I could to supply these deficiencies by passages taken from private note-books, which will be found either in the Appendix or at the end of the chapter to which they refer. The march of events since the pages were written has robbed of its interest the previsions of the effects of the

Public Worship Bill, and perhaps it might have been better to have omitted the passages referring to it; but as the work was in the press before Lord Penzance's judgment was given, I must apologise for leaving them as they stand.

It is a hard task for a wife to publish what she knows may not improbably call down perhaps unfriendly criticism on the loved name she would shield from the slightest breath of censure; and to me the decision has been peculiarly hard, for I have heard my husband remark, on reading posthumous publications, how unfair they were to an author's reputation; still, as he taught me, both by precept and practice, that where there was a hope that by God's blessing some good might be done, all personal feelings were to be cast to the winds, I feel that I should be unfaithful to the trust which has devolved upon me did I allow these fears to prevent my giving to the public thoughts and arguments which he humbly hoped might be of use.

For the arrangement of the different subjects, and for the slight verbal alterations that were occasionally needed, when from the ready flow of ideas and language in dictating, a sentence had become too long or slightly involved, I am much indebted to the friendly aid of a clergyman, who is himself an author, and to whom I take this opportunity of expressing my grateful thanks.

Those who knew my husband well, can estimate how peculiarly fitted he was to take an impartial view of the subjects which are agitating different parties. Leading a retired life, he watched from a distance the development of the movement which began at Oxford during the dis-

turbed period of his arduous work there. He watched what I think he would have called the advance in retrogression, and saw each foreboding realised; and as years went on, and the subject took more and more hold on his mind, his most earnest endeavours were devoted to stem the torrent. Though he felt that as a High Churchman he was working almost alone, his contemporaries can testify that this was no wilful isolation, but that he appealed to them to help in the work. I can only add a fervent hope, or rather prayer, that if the following pages can further the cause of true religion among us, they may be blessed to that effect; and that though he who penned them has passed to his rest, he may yet speak in works, and his words bring conviction.

M. K. J.

HASTINGS LODGE, HASTINGS:
*April* 3, 1876.

# CONTENTS.

## CHAPTER V.



## CHAPTER VI.



## CHAPTER VII.

# RITUALISM, ROMANISM

AND

# THE ENGLISH REFORMATION.

## CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS ON THE CAPEL-LIDDON CORRESPONDENCE IN THE 'TIMES,' FROM DECEMBER 24, 1874, TO JANUARY 17, 1875.

THE echoes of the Capel-Liddon controversy have almost died away, and have left behind them little else than a vague impression that the Ritualistic Champion met with an overthrow from which he will not easily recover, and which has destroyed much of the prestige with which his utterances have of late years been received. And as far as his utterances were directed against infidelity, it might well be wished that the encounter which has diminished his influence as a defender of the faith, might pass away into oblivion; it can only be remembered with regret. To acquiesce in this, however, would be to treat it merely as a matter of passing interest, and this it cannot really be—as a mere passage of arms between two gladiators, one of whom was worsted—and this is scarcely possible, even if it were wise.

The points on which the controversy turned—the facts advanced—the principles set forth—the opinions detected,

avowed, defended—the arguments whereby these were either maintained or opposed—all these are of a lasting interest, or rather of such vital importance to our Church, that I do not think that it will be time thrown away on my part, and, I venture to hope, not on the part of my readers, if I so far recall these matters from the oblivion into which they have dropped, as to submit to the attention of the thinking public the conclusions and inferences which may be drawn from them on matters, not merely of ecclesiastical, but of national interest. I say national interest, because the Church is so interwoven with our constitutional system, and our traditional policy, that what touches it vibrates through the whole body politic. It is a matter of national interest whether our Church maintains its reformed character, or relapses, or rather is drawn by crafty teaching and steady evasion into Mediævalism.

What is above all things wanted at the present day, is that those on whom Ritualistic arguments are pressed should test them; and it is with a view of illustrating and facilitating such a method of dealing with them that I purpose, in the following pages, to subject to this process the reasonings advanced in this controversy.

It may be said that it is a misuse of such controversy to make it so long afterwards the ground of serious deductions, as to the deliberate policy or conduct of an individual or a school. I venture to think the contrary. It seems to me that what is thrown out off-hand in the heat of such a controversy very often reveals views, motives, principles, points, and grounds of belief more truly than a more laboured publication; just as a moment's anger betrays a secret which passionless lips have long concealed. At such moments it is out of the abundance of the heart that the pen writeth as well as the mouth speaketh.

It may be said that the time is past for criticism on

so ephemeral a matter. I venture to think the contrary. It is by a calm, quiet, leisurely survey that important materials for reformation and reflection, may be safely and effectually drawn out of what at the time seemed mere froth; such a criticism is most likely to be worth something if we give ourselves time to chew the cud, to reflect upon, and make sure of, and, if necessary, correct first and hasty impressions; to trace out what may have escaped our hasty glances. It is in consequence of acting on this principle that I am better satisfied as to the soundness of what I am putting forth than I could have been had I obeyed my first impulse, taken up my pen, and rushed into the question before either my own mind or that of the public had somewhat cooled.

I confess, too, that this delay has been partly owing to my reluctance to undertake the work, which ought to be done by somebody, and yet which nobody has done, from a fear that it would so necessarily savour more of personality than I like, especially towards one to whom, from old associations, I should always wish to stand in friendly relations. But as time went on, and the silence of others seemed to impose the work on me, I gradually realised the fact that Canon Liddon may fairly be looked at, or rather cannot help being looked at, as a representative of a certain school of Ritualists, and that in this controversy he assumed a representative position, by constituting himself their patron and apologist. Therefore my observations may fairly be considered as observations on the defects and follies of a class, tinged possibly here and there by some slight extravagances of his own, but so lightly that their general colour is not affected; and though it is the reasoning of Canon Liddon with which I am personally dealing, I can avoid almost all direct reference to him. The only point in which he need be personally introduced is contained in the observation that

one result of this controversy must be, that it is not safe or wise to put our trust in his apologetic assurances in favour of Ritualism, however confidently, dogmatically, and emphatically expressed. He can no longer hope, as one cannot help fancying must have been the case when he wrote his first letter[1] in answer to Mr. Capel, that his *ipse negavit* can stifle all suspicion and repel all attacks on the system to which he has—I must be allowed to say—most unfortunately attached himself.

The most immediate and palpable result of the controversy on the public mind was the confirmation, beyond doubt or denial, of that which most thinking men have reluctantly and slowly—too reluctantly and too slowly—been compelled to admit; namely, that the Ritualistic schools of clergy are disseminating, with all their zeal and energy, Romish doctrines and notions (see page 18). This had been asserted by alarmed Churchmen, who were held to be mere alarmists; denied indignantly by Ritualists, as untrue and uncharitable. It is now definitely asserted by those who ought to be judges on the matter—Romanists themselves; it is again denied point blank by one of the leading men of the movement, and proved against him[2] in the teeth of his denial, point by point, over and over again, in such a fashion that he who denies it, with the expectation of his denial finding acceptance, must either believe that mankind have lost their senses, or have lost his own! It is unnecessary to go through all the details of the controversy; the salient points—the charges adduced, first denied point blank—again specified, then explained away or excused—once more substantiated; finally admitted, deplored and repudiated—till at last the Ritualistic war cry died away into a melancholy refrain, *True 'tis, 'tis pity; pity 'tis, 'tis true.* All this must have impressed

[1] Capel-Liddon Correspondence, No. II. [2] *Ib.* No. VIII. XVI. XXIX.

itself on the apprehensions and memories of the most cursory reader.

And this all the more from its having been from beginning to end a chapter of surprises. Men were surprised, as well they might be, at Mr. Capel's vigorous and almost vicious onslaught upon the Ritualists, the gist of the accusation being that they were doing, consciously or unconsciously, his master's work. Then Canon Liddon, as the champion of Ritualism, rushing forward with an absolute and indignant denial of the charge, took the world by surprise, as the impression of ninety out of a hundred thinking men had long been that these Ritualists were, rightly or wrongly, doing the very thing which was alleged against them; and this surprise was increased when Mr. Capel returned to the charge with handfuls of quotations from Ritualistic books, of which the world in general had been comparatively in ignorance. It was a wonder how Dr. Liddon should have rushed forward so ill prepared and ill equipped, in the face of such an array of facts; while it was incomprehensible, inconceivable, and therefore again surprising, that 'the main stay of the Ritualistic cause,' as Mr. Orby Shipley styles him, could have been ignorant of the contents of these books, especially as in the editing and publishing of some of them he had taken part. Still greater was the surprise at the answer, or excuse, or apology, which was put forth by the Ritualistic champion, that the words quoted were used by their authors carelessly,[1] or in obedience to the necessities of rhyme. Men were not surprised when Mr. Carter came forward with an indignant denial[2] of the somewhat soft indictment, and an emphatic assertion that he meant what he said; they would scarcely have been surprised if a similar voice had come forth from Dr. Neale's grave; but the surprise was that such a plea could gravely be used by

[1] Capel-Liddon Correspondence, No. XIII. XXV. [2] *Ib.*, No. XXIV.

a thinking man, without his perceiving the damaging slur which he was casting, not only on the theological character of these two eminent Ritualists, but on the genius and character of a theology which seems not only to be at the mercy of every wind of doctrine, but even exposed to the accidents of drowsiness and fancy—in which reason is overborne by rhyme. But most of all men were surprised at the total defeat, sustained in a fair field, by a divine who had measured pens with the Romanists. They could not understand how a man who had fairly won his spurs could possibly have sustained an overthrow in such a tournament. Some, indeed, were spared this surprise by remembering that a splendid rhetorician is apt to be a bad logician; that a man who by his gifts of language and delivery makes the best of a good case, very often does but make a bad case worse, owing to a logical defect arising from his strong points being rhetorical temperament and rhetorical training.

But besides these general impressions there are other matters less ephemeral, more substantial, which may help us in forming an accurate judgment of the nature, the objects, the tendency, the present development, and, unless it be checked, the results of this Ritualistic movement, on which the eyes of all sober-minded men are fixed in suspicion and anxiety; and it is observing this which makes me think it worth while to invite my readers to the almost forgotten correspondence, and which will guide me in my treatment of it.

On this principle then I pass by what were at the time its most exciting and salient points, and leaving to the memories of my readers the disastrous overthrow which Canon Liddon sustained, and the unaccustomed triumph which Mr. Capel enjoyed, I shall turn my attention at once to points lying more beneath the surface, in which there will, I think, be found indications and evidence:

1st, of the inherent unsoundness of Ritualism; 2nd, of the little confidence which can be placed in, or rather the great distrust which must be felt towards, even able men, as divines or logicians, when the spell of Ritualism has fallen on them; 3rd, of the unsatisfactory position in which these men, good though they may be in many, or even in most points, stand towards our Reformed Church. The first point, the inherent unsoundness of Ritualism, betrays itself in the nature of some, I might say of most—I am not sure whether I might not say all—of the reasonings put forth, the arguments relied upon, the pleas pleaded, the shifts made use of by the Ritualistic champion. The second point, the distrust intellectual and moral which these men have earned for themselves, is brought home to us by the same facts. For the positions, the reasonings, the pleas, the shifts which are placed before us, as commonplaces and canons of Ritualism, indicate if they be advanced in a *bonâ fide* belief in their solidity, a softening of the intellectual faculties; if only as stop-gaps and make-believes, a softening in the moral sense of those who use them. And the last point, the relation in which these men stand to our Church, will be seen in the views, doctrines, practices which are admitted points of the Ritualistic creed, and which can easily be compared by my readers with their knowledge, or even their impressions of the views, doctrines, practices established by the Reformation, or sanctioned by the continuous usage of our Reformed Church.

With regard to the first point, the defects and mistakes which illustrate and demonstrate the inherent unsoundness of Ritualism, I may as well go at once *in medias res*, and say that I do not remember ever in my life having seen so tangled a skein of blunders, or one from which it was more difficult to wind off, even in fragments, the perpetually breaking threads: and it is

fortunate that the high place which Canon Liddon holds in public estimation as a controversialist will induce most people, or at least his admirers, to acquiesce in my creed, that the failure is owing to the rottenness of the cause; and this rests on logical as well as on sentimental grounds. It is, or ought to be, or might be, an axiom in controversy, that a sound cause will never lack sound arguments in the hands of an able man. The absence of such arguments, or still more the presence of unsound ones, indicates weakness in the theory advanced, and hence we may justly infer, from this correspondence, the feebleness of the Ritualistic system in its foundations as well as its superstructure. It is not my intention, for it is foreign to my purpose, to weigh each argument in its logical relation to the refutation of the charge which called it forth. It will be sufficient cursorily to bring forward a few points in support of my position—such, for instance, as the way in which the charge of disseminating Romish teaching on the doctrine of the Incarnation, was met, or rather evaded, by assuming, without a word of explanation, that 'our doctrines' in the mouth of a Romish controversialist meant merely the primitive teaching on the subject, which is Anglican as well as Roman[1]—merely the cardinal truths held by both—and did not refer to certain modern notions and devotions to our Lord's humanity, which occupy so prominent a place in the Romish services, and find no place in our own. Again, this assumption has colour given it by referring to what is justly called 'an exploded fallacy' that this or that is Romish because it exists in the Romish communion; leaving it to be inferred that this is the case here, that as far as the doctrine of the Incarnation goes, Mr. Capel's charge only applied to those primitive points which cannot be fairly called Romanism, and that no further charge can be

[1] See Capel-Liddon Correspondence, No. II.

alleged or adopted without admitting what is commonly scouted. We find the same protest repeated again, supposing that prayers for the dead are Romish because they are used in Rome. In both cases the reference to this exploded fallacy is as fallacious as the fallacy itself; in the former case, because the terms of Mr. Capel's charge expressly exclude any doctrines held in common, especially as he carefully draws a distinction between Ritualists and High Churchmen,[1] to the effect that what he speaks of is held by the former—is not held by the latter. In the second case, because such an abstract principle, be it true or false, cannot cancel or outweigh the definite evidence of certain matters which are retained by Rome, revived by the Ritualists, having been chopped off and expunged at the Reformation. 2nd. If it were desirable or necessary to refer to the principle at all, it would have been more consistent with sound logic to distinguish between the cases in which it is 'exploded' and those in which it maintains its ground as reasonable and conclusive.

Nor must we pass over the unequivocal denial that Ritualists use language on the Mystery of the Eucharist, identical, if not in intention, at least in expression, with the Romish doctrine of a change in the elements. The utter ignoring of, or unacquaintance with, passages occurring in books published by leaders of the party whose social relations with each other were, and are, most intimate; and revised by, and published with, the approval of the very divine from whose pen this absolute denial proceeded; and sanctioned by the bishop whose chaplain and biographer he was, seems incomprehensible. And when charges were sustained by quotations from Ritualistic books, universally accepted by, and circulated under the auspices of the school, in a fashion which made denial impossible, and an explanation necessary; it was surely futile

[1] See Capel-Liddon Correspondence, No. XVI.

to attempt to explain them away by saying that though such words are calculated to inculcate Romanism, they need not necessarily do so; when it is argued that such prepositions as *in* and *beneath* are not to be taken in local force, because it is possible to conceive their being used in some other force; it seems to be forgotten that the genius of the Ritualistic theory, and their Eucharistic language, point to the local relation as the only one in keeping with the one, and practically implied in the other. I have already alluded to the extraordinary apology that one author was careless, and that in the other rhyme misled reason.[1] The requisites of rhyme induced Mr. Carter to use an expression conveying, in the ordinary intelligible meaning of the words, a doctrine very nearly, if not quite identical with the Romish one on the subject. One is lost in astonishment at the propounding such an excuse, which, if it is valid, betrays an amount of carlessness and indifference in dealing with this solemn subject, which does not give a favourable idea of the tone of mind in which Ritualists approach it; and which, if it is not valid, at least betrays the opinion of the divine who suggested it as to the spirit in which these mischievous works are rattled off. It seems hard to conceive the intellectual training and state of mind of a man who can think that he has escaped from such a difficulty by such a method of dealing with it, or to form an adequate notion of the theological training and teaching which has silenced the protests with which the instincts of reason, as well as of common sense, condemn such a dogma. Such an apology, too, is somewhat out of keeping with the assurance that Ritualistic writers adhere, with the most scrupulous exactness, to the formularies of our Church. Again, a controversialist must be very hard put to it when he meets such a charge by the allegation that Dr. Neale's Romanising teaching

[1] See Capel-Liddon Correspondence, No. XIII.

cannot have been Romanising, because he died a member of the English Church;[1] or that these charges fail because Dr. Pusey has not gone over—when the very gist of the charge is that, abiding in the English Church, they are teaching Romanism and Romanisms. On this point it will be necessary to say a few words hereafter.

Again, it is passing strange that this rhyming apology is offered by Canon Liddon seemingly in utter unconsciousness of the imputation which it throws on the character of one of his friends, and the memory of another. To say that Mr. Carter used the indefensible terms for the sake of the rhyme is like excusing a nurse's giving a wrong medicine by suggesting it was done for a joke. To say that Dr. Neale offended through carelessness is like excusing a chemist giving poison instead of a tonic owing to being half asleep. One of these writers is gone to a place where such injurious imputations reach not. Had it not been so, I doubt not he would have indignantly repudiated the excuse made for him—that in a matter of so deep moment, when he was not only expressing the emotions of his own soul, but seeking to mould the religious belief of others, he could have written without thought or care words which were to be wiped out with the sponge Canon Liddon applies to them. The other is living, and speaks thus for himself:—'It would be a serious wrong, and would make me unworthy of trust as a teacher, thus to authorise important devotions without carefully weighing them, and I desire to state that special care was taken by me in overlooking the "Treasury of Devotion," and that I am prepared to justify what it contains as true, and what I believe to be the teaching of the Church of England.'[2] What sort of opinion can Canon Liddon have of Mr. Carter? How is it that he did not see the insult he was offering, or the slur he was casting on the Ritualistic

[1] See Capel-Liddon Correspondence, No. IX. [2] *Ib.*, No. XXIV.

controversy? Nor does it mend the matter much to plead that such notions of the Real Presence as those expressed by Mr. Carter are nowhere actually forbidden by the Church of England, unless we are prepared to admit that the absence of prohibition is equivalent to permission—a position which it would be easy to disprove by facts and by analogies. I shall probably have occasion to touch on this point again; suffice it for the present to remark that this kind of defence unconsciously admits the fact that what is objected to is not recognised by our Church. At present it is sufficient to observe that the terms of the promise made by the clergy at their ordination, the promise 'to administer the Word and Sacraments as this Church and Realm hath received the same,' is *positive*; and *not forbidding* is hardly the same as *receiving*, especially in reference to points which were deliberately and unequivocally dropped. Can it be pretended that the Church received the sacrifice of the Eucharist when the terms expressing, and passages embodying it, were struck out? There may be some way of eluding this argument. I confess I do not see it, nor can I conceive, or even imagine it.

Again: the charge of Romanising Saint-worship is professedly met by stating carefully enough the limits within which the sober reverence of the English Church is confined, leaving it once again to be inferred that the Ritualistic view does not go beyond this into Romish peculiarities; a notion which—directly contradicted by facts—cannot be here, any more than before, sustained by a vague reference to the possibility of agreeing with Rome without Romanising; or by pleading any individual's personal practice in the matter, unless it is contended or admitted that this person is the impersonation of Ritualism, and therefore is compromised by the extreme ultraisms, a notion which he who uses the argument

indignantly repudiates. The notion, too, that these prayers to the saints are, in reality, only prayers to God that He will hear their prayers for us, absurd in itself, implies the still further absurdity of converting our prayers to the saints into prayers for them.

And to add to all this the continually recurring misapprehension or evasion of Mr. Capel's points, sometimes answering him by alleging that he does not hold so and so, or that there can be no intention of doing what Mr. Capel alleges as done, though that gentleman carefully excludes the charge of intention. Add to this, that all these fallacies and evasions are gravely and even triumphantly put forward, seemingly without the least consciousness of their being what they are. Take it all together, and I think my readers will hold me justified in speaking of it as a tangled skein of blunders; and as I have gone through them without any design of making it out a case personally against Canon Liddon, so I hope my readers will keep them in their memories, not as telling against him, or as memorials of his defeat, but as evidences—very strong evidences—of the inherent unsoundness of a system of theology, the defence of which has drawn, or rather driven, him into the use of arguments such as one can hardly imagine an able man having recourse to on any other subject. It is not, I think, too much to hope that these considerations will not only strengthen the convictions and opinions of the friends of the Reformation, but also induce some who have hitherto accepted Ritualism on the warrant of the confident language and bearing of its professors, and the impressive verbiage of their commonplaces, to look a little more deeply into the foundations on which it rests. Another result may perhaps be, that it puts an extinguisher on the balmy persuasion wherewith some of our optimists soothe apprehension and counsel inaction, by saying that the evil

and the danger are confined to a few young or extreme men. The passages quoted by Mr. Capel from Dr. Neale and Mr. Carter are not the writing of young or extreme men. Mr. Carter writes to the *Times* as a Moderate, blaming, and deprecating ultraism; and Mr. Capel's antagonist in this correspondence, though younger than Mr. Carter and Dr. Neale, is not what would commonly be termed a young, or rash, or extreme man.

There are other evidences of the same kind contained in other parts and passages of this correspondence in which the same logical defects betray the same inherent weakness. These are partly incidental utterances scattered up and down the letters, partly definite replies to the assailants, whom certain statements and assertions about our Church and its doctrines call forth from among Churchmen; and these last put the subject before us in so much more important a point of view, that I shall no longer call definite attention to the logical mistakes which my readers will be at no loss to detect for themselves, but pass on to the indications, or rather the definite information, which the Correspondence furnishes as to the opinions and views held on matters of the utmost moment by that section of Ritualists of which Canon Liddon may be taken to be—and, indeed, of which he has come forward as—the representative; and I think it will generally be felt that no more favourable representative could be found. He is on the whole as moderate as any—more moderate than most. He has as much dialectic skill as any. The cause, then, will suffer neither injury nor injustice by being identified with him; whether he does himself justice by identifying himself with it is another question, for it will probably be recollected—it was too strange not to have made an impression at the time—that all the denials and apologies ended in an emphatic

and indignant repudiation of all sympathies with, and all complicity in, the ultraisms quoted by Mr. Capel. It is perhaps somewhat unusual to hear the recognised leader of a party, in whose defence he comes forward, say, that to be identified with some of its most zealous advocates is an insult he indignantly resents.

I am willing to accept this repudiation as sincere; but it entails upon us the necessity of ascertaining as exactly as may be what this section of the school does hold, and consequently what is *their* position in the Church of England, and what should be our attitude towards them. It seems to me that the school to which Canon Liddon belongs trusts a good deal to this policy of repudiation.

## CHAPTER II.

ON CANON LIDDON'S REPUDIATION OF SOME POINTS OF RITUALISTIC DOCTRINE.

To a right understanding of the present controversy there is nothing more important than a due perception of the distinction to be made between *doctrinal* and *ceremonial* Ritualists; between the so-called 'Moderate' section and those to whom some of this section (by fastening on them the name of extravagants) endeavour to direct exclusively public attention and indignation, and so to make them their 'scapegoats.' This policy has been pursued both in and out of Parliament ever since the Public Worship Bill loomed into view. And, indeed, it is true that there *are*, among Ritualists, excesses and extravagances which outwardly approach nearer to Romanism, and disseminate a Romanism of a more ultra and *prononcé* type than that of the 'Moderate' party—excesses which the 'Moderates' are content to see condemned and repressed, on condition that *they* be allowed to escape with impunity. But, passing by the painful moral aspects of such a policy, is it not clear that these outward differences do not really exonerate the 'Moderates' from Mr. Capel's charge, or make them less culpable and less dangerous? For, first of all, these ceremonialist ultraisms are but the fruit of seed sown by doctrinal Ritualists, with increasing boldness and tenacity, during the last thirty years; nor has any one of them, so far as I know, found it necessary or convenient hitherto

to disown or discourage these excesses by any open protest or remonstrance; so that no present repudiation, disapproval or disavowal can be permitted to obliterate their former complicity and co-operation. While the masters impeach their scholars, public opinion needs only to be awakened to the real state of the case, for it in turn to impeach the masters. And hence the repudiation made by Canon Liddon in this Correspondence, leads us directly to the most interesting and important part of our subject. It does not now matter much to us whether Mr. Capel is able or not to substantiate his charges by quotations from ultraist books, or whether Canon Liddon is or is not responsible, more or less, for what is found in these books; nor, indeed, whether that divine is or is not justified, logically and morally, in repudiating the acts and opinions of his followers. These ultra practices have been already condemned by public opinion, and will soon be, if not punished, repressed and extinguished in the English Church by the Act in which Parliament last year[1] embodied (imperfectly, mercifully, perhaps weakly) public opinion. These Ritualists are every day disclosing themselves more and more to the public eye; the paint is dropping off in their excitement; they are simply partizans of a sacerdotal triumph, not the ministers of God's Truth and scheme of salvation. It matters not, therefore, whether Mr. Capel is or is not right; or, at most, it is only of secondary importance. The real point at issue is, whether the views and opinions, which the Moderate party themselves hold and propagate in their official pastoral capacity, and which they claim their right to hold and propagate, as not exceeding the limits of the legitimate comprehensiveness of the English Church, are or are not what they are represented to be; or, rather, whether they are not themselves definite approaches to the distinctive teaching of the

[1] Written in September 1875. (Ed.)

Church of Rome. The real question we have to put to ourselves is, whether these 'moderate' views and opinions are or are not, in their own essence and nature, and independently of the ultraisms to which they have given rise, contrary to the spirit of the English Reformed Church; when judged by the standard to which Canon Liddon himself appeals, the authorised formularies of that Church, and still more when estimated and characterised by the instincts and usages of past generations, as common sense as well as reason would naturally estimate them; whether, in short, they are, not merely seeds of error, but errors themselves. We shall find much to enable us to form a sound judgment on this question in the Correspondence before us, especially in those parts of it where Canon Liddon replies to the charges of his English assailants. I am very much mistaken if it will not be found that there are several points in which the *soi-disant* moderate section, as represented by Canon Liddon, have drawn quite as near to the doctrines, if not to the practices of Rome, as those on whom they now cast all the blame. It will be found that there are many Romanisms—such as, to take a definite instance, the adoration of Christ in the elements—which they have actually or virtually incorporated into their theological teaching.

## CHAPTER III.

### *DOCTRINAL RITUALISM.*

IDENTITY OF ROMISH AND RITUALISTIC TEACHING CONCERNING (A) THE INCARNATION; (B) INVOCATION OF SAINTS AND PRAYERS FOR THE DEPARTED; (C) ABSOLUTION AND AURICULAR CONFESSION; (D) SACERDOTALISM; (E) THE REAL PRESENCE AND THE SACRIFICE.

#### (*A*) THE INCARNATION.

. . . . It was a somewhat shallow device for meeting Mr. Capel's charge against the Ritualist clergy that they were disseminating doctrines peculiarly and distinguishingly Romish, to suppose or assume that this charge was founded on a line of teaching as much Anglican as Romanist, and that the points referred to by Mr. Capel were merely instances of ordinary High-Church teaching on the subjects in question. Mr. Capel clearly recognised the broad distinction between High-Churchmen and Ritualists,[1] and excluded the one party from the charges brought against the other. Take, as an instance, the first doctrine referred to in the Correspondence before us. When Mr. Capel asserted that the Ritualist clergy teach the dogma of the Incarnation in the same form as the Church of Rome, it was surely wide of the point in question to take for granted that nothing more was meant than the ancient doctrine of the Creed, as set forth in its simplicity by the English Church,[2] and not rather certain later developments embodied in special devotions to our Lord's Humanity, and to the several parts of His sacred

[1] See note I. at the end of this chapter.

[2] See Capel-Liddon Correspondence, No. II. and No. XII.

Body, to which so prominent a position is now given in the modern Romish system, as to throw His Divinity rather into the background. In the Romish doctrine of the Incarnation, as thus developed, the grand Scriptural Truth of our Lord's having assumed our whole human nature, is frittered away in contemplation of, devotion to, and trust reposed in each several limb and bodily attribute, and in deification of the several parts of his Corporeal Frame, and even of the instruments of His human Passion, while the glorious Mystery of his 'tabernacling in the flesh,'[1] and walking as perfect God in human shape among men, is hidden or obscured for the popular belief by perpetually holding Him up before the people as a helpless Infant, an obedient Child, a suffering Hero, or a lifeless Corpse. Surely it was a mistake on the part of the Anglican Controversialist to ignore the existence of similar notions and teaching among ourselves, or of guilds incorporated for the purpose of practically exhibiting the same peculiarities. Not even a novice in Ritualism can now be ignorant that we have in our own Church such 'Confraternities' as that of 'the Sacred Heart,' with the practice of 'Devotions' to 'the Precious Blood,' 'the Five Wounds,' &c. &c.

. . . . . .

(*B*) INVOCATION OF SAINTS AND PRAYERS FOR THE DEPARTED.

Postponing for the present a discussion of the doctrine of the Eucharist, I pass on to another point—the Invocation of Saints and Prayers for the Dead. In the former of these dogmas or practices, as held by Ritualists, there is a distinct approximation towards, if not identity with, that of the Church of Rome. The difference, if any, is in degree only, not in kind. In both it is held per-

[1] St. John, i. 14. σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν.

missible and beneficial to address departed Souls (who have been invested with the privilege of Intercession by Ecclesiastical usage or Papal decree) in order to obtain blessings spiritual or temporal. In both there is the same explanation, viz. that the direct invocation is meant to procure us the benefit of their prayers to God for us. The only difference is that in Rome the form and matter of the Invocation utterly contradict the explanation, while in Ritualism the explanation is refined to a point beyond human comprehension by the notion propounded by Canon Liddon, that these direct Prayers to the Saints are Prayers to God that He will vouchsafe to hear their prayers for us. The practice is in kind the same in both, presupposes the same conditions, and looks for the same results. In Rome the Invocation of Saints is intelligible though untenable; in Ritualism it is both unintelligible and untenable. But this one point of difference does not destroy the identity of practice and of theory in all other points. Neither can it be proved that the Church of England sanctions this practice of Invocation by a doubtful interpretation of a single passage of Holy Scripture, which is certainly not recognised in our Church, inasmuch as, if it were so recognised, the practice founded on the interpretation would certainly have retained its place among us. Nor yet can any solid proof be drawn from the alleged opinion of Bishop Andrewes, who is no more than Hooker (to use Canon Liddon's expression) 'one of the Formularies of our Church.'[1] And even could it be supposed that these two arguments might create a sort of presumption in favour of our Church's sanction of the practice, this would surely be more than counterbalanced by the fact that these Prayers to the Saints, wherever they existed in the old Service Books, have all been carefully expunged.

[1] Capel-Liddon Correspondence, Nos. IX.; XIII. pp. 22 and 23; No. XVIII. p.

Again, as regards the kindred matter of praying for the departed, there is in Ritualism the same definite approach to what Rome holds and teaches on this point, the same departure from what the Church of England has received and retains. It is true that the phrase *Requiescat in pace* may express no more than a pious hope or wish, such as our Burial Service expresses, with regard to our departed friends, that they *are* resting already in God's peace. It *may* mean no more than this, but is at the best a phrase of doubtful import. For if, on the other hand, it be spoken, written, or thought of as a prayer designed or fitted to alter or secure the future state of one whom Death has sealed for good or for evil, *then*, in the case of a believer whom we know to have departed in the faith of Christ, *requiescat* (instead of *requiescit*) is simply an act of *disbelief* in the revelations, pledges, and promises of Almighty God as to the assured and final rest of all who to the last hour put their trust in Him; while in the case of another whom we are constrained to think of as having died impenitent, this *requiescat* is again an act of disbelief in the revealed fact that as the tree falls so must it lie—a disbelief which, above everything else, has created the figment of purgatory and its accompaniments, masses for the departed, indulgences to the living and the dead, and the hopes founded thereupon. The use of such prayers is irrational in the religious sense of the word, unless it implies a belief in purgatory.

I am aware, of course, that the dilemma thus stated is sometimes evaded by the assertion that we pray only for the final consummation and bliss of our departed friends, and that they may obtain mercy in the day of judgment. But what Christian would dare to doubt that all those who now die in the Lord shall be hereafter raised by Him and placed by Him, at that day, on His own right hand? So long as our friends are in the flesh and liable to fall,

the prayers which we offer on their behalf may be suggested by doubts, not of God's faithfulness and mercy, but of their ability to continue steadfast to the end, or of their constancy in praying for themselves; but when once the day of their probation is over, and Death has put his seal on their faith or their impenitence, *then* prayers for their resurrection to glory could but imply doubts concerning the faithfulness of God and Christ; and such doubts, or any practice founded upon them, our Church has never recognised, much less sanctioned, still less encouraged.

It is, moreover, very remarkable that these prayers are generally 'for the soul,' whereas before the final judgment body and soul will be reunited. Hence it is clear that the prayers refer, not to the time after the trumpet has sounded, when the body no less than the soul would need to be prayed for, but to the space between death and the trumpet, during which the soul continues separate from the body. And this, too, is implied by the word *requiescat*, for 'rest' is not the state of the departed one after the trumpet, but before it. The prayer ought, therefore, at least to be worded differently. *Requiescat* ought to be changed into *resurgat* and *in pace* into *ad gloriam*. But the soul of the believer, according to God's promise, both *rests in peace* and 'shall rise to glory;' and therefore prayers for the dead express, as I have said, a doubt concerning, or a disbelief in, the revelation of God —disbelief more fully developed in the doctrine of purgatory and its associate superstitions, masses, and indulgences for the dead, &c. &c.[1]

The practice is, moreover, a departure from that of the Church of England; for, admitting it to be true that prayers for the dead are nowhere so formally and expressly condemned as to justify an incumbent in refusing to allow an inscription involving such prayers to be

[1] Capel-Liddon Correspondence, No. IX. and note A.

placed in the churchyard, yet the Church of England is hardly to be compromised by graveyard inscriptions; if it were so, our theology would be of the strangest description. The advocates of the practice would be puzzled to point out a single passage in the Prayer-Book which can be regarded as authorizing it. The Prayer 'for the Church Militant' is strictly limited to those who are 'here on earth.' This very phrase, when contrasted with that in the First Prayer-Book of 1549,[1] would settle the question, even if the present form of the prayer itself, which contains such a variety of petitions for the living, did not so conspicuously change its note when it comes to speak of the departed. It does not pray for them in any way, but only blesses God on their behalf.

The well-known, oft-cited practice of Dr. Johnson[2] cannot do more than show that to pray for the departed is the reasonable impulse of a mind which thinks of them as still living in the spiritual world. Nor can the decision of an Ecclesiastical Court do more than exempt the minister who uses such prayers from the temporal penalties of disobedience; it cannot alter the plain fact that our Church does not receive them, and that the use of them by members of our Church is a definite approach on their part to Rome; with, however, this difference, that in Rome the belief in purgatory makes the practice, though unscriptural and mythical, yet logically and rationally tenable; whereas the *non-reception* of the doctrine of purgatory by our own Church renders any such practice among her members both absurd and illogical, as well as unscriptural and superstitious. It is, in fact, a subtle form of scepticism, clothing itself with an appearance of piety; of infidelity in the garb of religion, infidelity of the most dangerous kind—the infidelity of the Romanist and his Ritualistic imitators.

[1] See note B. [2] See Capel-Liddon Correspondence, No. IX.

(*C*) ABSOLUTION AND AURICULAR CONFESSION.

On the subject also of priestly absolution it appears plainly from this Correspondence that the view of these Ritualists differs only in degree from that of Rome. The doctrine of both is virtually the same; both holding that a priest *quoad* priest has the power, by pronouncing a certain formula of words, of conveying to the soul of the sinner an actual forgiveness of sins, and that of such forgiveness the sinner cannot be made so certain in any other way. This is evidently quite a different thing from the Church of England view (as expressed in our formularies), viz. that the priest has committed to him (*by* the Church and *through* the Church) a simple authority to declare and pronounce the Gospel Message of God's pardon and absolution to all those who truly repent; and that this Message he is empowered to deliver either generally or personally, that is, in such a fashion as it may best be laid hold on by the penitent sinner according to his circumstance.

And further, the virtual identity of the Ritualist view with that of Rome on priestly absolution, is exhibited in the fact that in all cases where they use this power, the Ritualist clergy require previously a private confession of secret sins as a necessary part of their sin-forgiving ordinance, and assign moreover to penance and direction (which must be carefully distinguished from repentance and counsel) the same places as those they hold in that Romish system which was rejected by our Church at the Reformation. In fact the very term which is now coming into vogue for one of these Confessing Priests, 'Father Confessor' or 'Father so and so' is an unmistakable proof of Romanizing tendencies, or rather development, in this particular. The only difference between 'moderate' Ritualists and Rome upon this subject appears to be that *they*

hold this confessional ordinance to be of occasional and not of universal obligation, and so would add to the flaws inherent in the Romish system a palpable logical inconsistency. For if such an ordinance for the forgiveness of sins exist at all, it must be applicable to all cases in which sins exist, that is everywhere. The only case in which it could be dispensed with is where there is no sin, that is, *nowhere*.[1]

### (*D*) SACERDOTALISM.

That Ritualists hold what is called *Sacerdotalism*, and regard it as one of the essential points of their position, is admitted or implied in the Correspondence before us. The term *sacerdotalism* is somewhat vague, but I think I shall not misrepresent its adherents if I assume that, as used by them, it involves the following points:

1. That the second order of the clergy (the Presbyterate) have, on admission to their ministerial office, the power conferred upon them of working a miracle in the Consecration Prayer at Holy Communion, whereby the Lord himself is incorporated in, or associated with the sacramental elements of bread and wine.

2. That they also then receive the further privilege of offering up to God in those consecrated elements, and by the very words of consecration, a sacrifice of our Lord, or of His sacred body, or a sacrifice of His sacrifice (even those who hold and teach the doctrine find it difficult to express it intelligibly); and that by this official act of him who administers the Holy Communion, and whom they erroneously style the Celebrant, our Lord's oblation on the cross is virtually consummated, by being applied with all the accompanying benefits of His passion to each individual Christian present at the service.

[1] See Confession, Chaps. iv. and x.

3. That each of these sacrificing priests has, as a representative of our Lord on Earth, the power above mentioned of forgiving sins *jure sacerdotali* (*i.e.* in virtue of his priestly office) by pronouncing over the confessing penitent a certain formula of absolution.

4. That these priests are not only authorized ambassadors of the Gospel from God to man, but also mediators between man and God, having an especial prerogative of intercession not given to the laity, and also that of fixing the terms on which the Divine forgiveness may be obtained by sinners according to the degrees of guilt incurred.

And 5. That they also have, *jure divino*, an inalienable right to judge and teach and guide the laity, without the laity in their turn having any right to question their sentences, repudiate their guidance, or dispute their teaching.

That the above is an exhaustive explanation of the term *Sacerdotalism* is not pretended; but I think it includes all the most important elements of Ritualistic doctrine on this subject; and I also maintain that just so far as any or all of these propositions are accepted or acted on by any clergyman of the Church of England, he is so far drawing nearer to the Church of Rome, and in the same degree departing further from his own Church. And this is the case whether we measure his actual position by the formularies of our Church, or by the abstract teaching of even the highest High-Churchman of the last generation,[1] or by the pastoral teaching and practice of the clerical body in our Church since the Reformation.

Nor can we allow any one or all of these points of sacerdotalism to be bolstered up by a mere vague reference to the sacramental and other occasional offices in the 'Book of Common-Prayer;' for this would be a mere begging of the question at issue. *We* deny, what Ritu-

[1] See note I. at the end of this chapter.

alists affirm, that these services in our Prayer-Book sanction any such *sacerdotal* acts and theories as are now in vogue; and it is only the assertion or assumption of this truth of the sacerdotal theory that gives to the language and directions of the Prayer-Book a sacerdotal colouring. It is manifestly reasoning in a circle to say that the services contain sacerdotalism because sacerdotalism is true, and then that sacerdotalism is true because the services are sacerdotal.

To complete my argument it is necessary for me to say that it must not for a moment be supposed that the denial of this sacerdotal theory of the priesthood involves or necessitates the denial of the real priesthood of the Christian Church, or the divine origin of its ministerial commission. As a High-Churchman, I always held and still hold a *presbyteral* (though not a *sacerdotal*) priesthood, the individual members of which are πρεσβύτεροι, ministering presbyters, (not ἱερεῖς, sacrificing priests,) holding a divine commission and exercising a divinely-appointed office. At the same time I do not see that such a conviction need compel me to deny or doubt that God himself may work, has worked, and does work by other agencies and instruments at His own good pleasure.[1]

### (*E*) THE REAL PRESENCE AND SACRIFICE.

I now address myself to a point which I have purposely reserved to the last, not only on account of its intrinsic importance, but also because it is on this doctrine of our Lord's 'Real Presence in the consecrated elements' and the cognate dogma of the Sacrifice that the approach of doctrinal Ritualists to Rome is the most marked, as well as their departure from the Church of England. On these two points especially

[1] For further remarks on Sacerdotalism see note C.

essential differences manifest themselves between the High-Churchman and the Ritualist, which do not exist between a Ritualist and a Romanist—such a Romanist, for instance, as Mr. Capel himself.

Let us take, in the first place, the teaching of Ritualists on the Real Presence, namely, that our Lord is present in and with the consecrated bread wherever it may be, on the altar, in the hands of the priest, or in the hands or mouth of the recipient. Those who thus believe are surely separated by an almost impassable gulf from those who hold that our Lord is really present to and in the soul[1] of the worthy recipient of the consecrated creatures of bread and wine (though, as a High Churchman, I hold to a purely subjective presence resulting on the eating the bread by faith as little as I do to a purely objective presence in the bread irrespective and independent of faith). But the very movement which has placed this gulf between the Ritualists and the genuine English High-Churchman has, so far as *they* are concerned, bridged over the really impassable gulf between the Church of England and the Church of Rome. On this point Ritualists differ from Rome only in what is accidental; in *essentials* there seems to be little or no difference. The Romanist believes our Lord and God to be incorporated by the words of consecration in the sacramental sign; so does the Ritualist.[2] The Romanist believes our God to be present on the 'altar;' so does the Ritualist; that He is moved about from place to place by priestly hands as the sacramental sign is moved, so virtually changing His locality with it; so does the Ritualist. The Romanist worships Him as present in the sign; so does the Ritualist; nor do I deny that on this theory worship ought to follow. The very fact of this necessary consequence is one of the arguments against the theory.[3]

[1] See Hooker. E P. Book V. Chap. xlvii. 6.

[2] See note D. 1.

[3] Note D. 9.

What difference, then, exists on this all-important point between Dr. Liddon's doctrine and that of Mr. Capel! The only difference is in the accident or mode of our Lord's presence, as to whether the bread remains bread or not; Mr. Capel maintaining that the bread, after consecration, exists no longer but in its outward appearance or accidents; Dr. Liddon believing that it continues to exist as the vehicle, shrine, or receptacle of our Lord's body, or the *substratum* with which it is associated. The difference between them is not as to the Lord's presence in the sacramental elements or signs, as it is between the English High-Churchman and the Romanist, but simply as to the continuous existence of the natural substances of bread and wine.[1]

And yet it is denied that these Ritualists are either Romanists or Romanisers, and that with a vehemence and indignation which may argue either conscious guilt or conscious innocence. This denial is, in the first instance, based on the abstract plea that identity with Rome in certain respects is not necessarily Romanising, and that not all doctrines held by Rome are Romanisms. It is said, as in the Correspondence before us, that if we are to reject whatever is held by the Church of Rome, we must give up half our Prayer-Book;[2] a plea which, as thus used, has a strong family likeness to the other argument condemned by Canon Liddon as an exploded fallacy —that if we agree with Rome on some points, we cannot differ from her in others. The plea is, nevertheless, true enough in itself, nor have I any intention or inclination to deny it; but, like all similar truths, it admits of being so used and applied as to turn into untruth. In the present application it involves a transparent fallacy. The

[1] If the adoration is a legitimate necessary result of the Real Presence, then the absence of the former in the Early Church is evidence against the latter. Our Lord did not say Worship this in memory of me.

[2] Capel-Liddon Correspondence, No. IX.

fallacy lies in arguing from a particular to a universal: because there are some points which we hold in common with Rome without Romanising, therefore (it is argued or implied) no identity with Rome can sustain the charge of being Romanisers, even when brought against these Ritualists. To clear up this point and to rebut this fallacy a very brief analysis of the terms Romanism and Romanising will suffice.[1]

*Before* the Reformation the Church of England, in common with the rest of Western Christendom, had many erroneous doctrines and many superstitious practices and ceremonies enjoined by and incorporated into the public service-books, and therefore into the Church's authorised and accepted teaching. *At* the Reformation these old service-books were *culled* for materials for new ones; what was scriptural was taken, what was unscriptural was left behind; or, taking the reverse metaphor, we may say of our Liturgy that the old service-books were *weeded*. What was unscriptural was rooted out; what was scriptural, retained. *Since* the Reformation, and especially since the Council of Trent, the doctrines and practices thus repudiated and expunged by the Reformers of our Church, together with various later developments which from time to time have grown out of the errors retained by Rome, have formed that *corpus* of spurious Christianity which of late years has been termed *Romanism*, as retained by Rome, or *Mediævalism*, as belonging to the middle and corrupt ages of the Western Church. Now what is charged against even 'Moderate' Ritualists is not the fact of their identity with Rome in those points in which features of primitive Christianity still linger within her, and which have been retained by our own Church, but a decided though gradual return to Rome in those points which our Reformers rejected, *i.e.*

[1] See note II. at the end of this chapter.

in her *Romanisms*. This revival of, this return to pre-Reformation Romanism, is the essence of modern Ritualism. Those who are thus returning or sinking or inclining towards such a return are *Ritualists*, and it is this which distinguishes them from High-Churchmen properly so called. They might indeed be called Mediævalists with as much, perhaps even with more, propriety than Ritualists, were it not that the former term does not express the fact that *Ritual* is the method to which they mainly trust for bringing about that change in doctrine and practice, that *development backwards* (*re-velopment*, it might be called) which they want, and which *we* sound Churchmen do *not* want, and, what is more, *will not* have. This backward development is called by them, in the jargon of their school, 'the recovering or restoring of our Catholic inheritance.'

Nor, again, do we assert or mean to imply that all Ritualists have drawn towards Romanism in exactly the same points or by exactly the same methods. Some go nearer in points *essential*, such as the doctrine of Transubstantiation; some in points *accidental*, such as the childish mummeries in which the ultra-ceremonialists indulge. But this fact, so far as it is a fact, that the 'Moderate' doctrinal section of the Ritualist party has not made approaches to Rome in the same external points, or not in the same degree as the ceremonial section, does not clear them from the charge of Romanising in other points of deepest significance and importance—points indeed far more significant and important than any mere details of ceremonial can be, as changing directly and not merely by inference or interpretation the inward being, and not merely the outward features of our common Christianity. On such points these 'Moderate' men have gone the wrong way as really as, perhaps even more so than many others, to whom in their present not very honourable

policy of self-exculpation they are now endeavouring to confine the blame.

Once again: in charging the Ritualists, both doctrinal and ceremonial, with being Romanisers, we do not mean to assert or imply that they embrace or favour all the additions which modern Rome has made even to her old Mediæval self, such as the dogmas of the Immaculate Conception, the Infallibility of the Pope, and the like. On the contrary, these additions are the very points which keep them back from openly and altogether becoming Romanists, and for this very reason the Romanists hate them. The Romanism which our Ritualists teach is not the Romanism of the Ultramontanes; and that is what they mean when they profess, with so much apparent vehemence, their own detestation of the Church of Rome, and steadfast determination never to submit to her claims. They know quite well that Rome would not accept their submission on the only terms on which they would offer it, and it is by this conviction of theirs that all their vehement protestations and acts of defiance must be interpreted and measured.

Another ground on which the 'moderate' Ritualists dispute the charge of being Romanisers is that those particular points on which the charge is made are NOT Romanisms, were NOT left behind or repudiated at the Reformation, but are and always have been held and taught, with more or less distinctness, in the Reformed Church of England. To this is often added now the still vaguer plea already referred to, that the matters of doctrine and practice complained of are 'legitimate portions of our Catholic inheritance,' which nothing, they say, shall induce them to surrender. This party cry is spread from mouth to mouth with vehement confidence, as if it had something real and substantial in it. And so, indeed, it *has*, but *against* those who use it, not *for* them. For,

first, they do not see that the statement itself is false; and next, that the determination appended to it proves them unfaithful to the Reformation of their own Church. Observe again, they do not plead that these 'parts of our Catholic heritage' have been received by them from the Church of the Reformation. Most of the changes then introduced they hate, ignore, disown, repudiate. The claim, therefore, is like that of the Irish Celts to the properties which passed from their own ancestors to those of the present owners of land under the Act of Settlement, and simply implies a *non*-recognition of the Act which its concession would set aside. The mere making such a claim goes a long way to substantiate the charges brought against those who make it, that they ignore and would fain set aside the Reformation settlement, and cannot, therefore, honestly (I should say *conscientiously*) continue to hold their ministerial commission, and enjoy the religious prestige which it gives them in the Reformed Church of England.

Nor does the mere rhetorical assertion of the claim make good any rights which are solely based upon it. This Ritualist plea is like that of a man who thinks to prove his right of 'free common adjoining' by the simple assertion that it is part of his inheritance. *He* must *prove* that it is so, and so must *they* prove that nothing has occurred or nothing been done by lawful authority to estop the claim. And when looked into it is easily seen that this claim of the Ritualists has no solid basis, that the doctrines and practices which they call their inheritance have been *cut off* from that inheritance by an act and an authority which ordained ministers of the Church of England can neither gainsay nor object to.

This plea, therefore, is simply contradictory to the recorded judgment of our English Reformers, the Acts of our Church and her essential characteristics—contradic-

tory also to the actual language as well as the pervading spirit of our 'Book of Common Prayer.' It is, indeed, perfectly true that our Church had at the era of the Reformation received an *inheritance* from Mediæval times, but that inheritance was not a *purely* 'Catholic' one. It was by long, and cautious, and anxious inquiry that our forefathers at length convinced themselves that this Mediæval inheritance was so adulterated as to have well nigh ceased to be an inheritance from primitive Christianity. They regarded it as part of their Church's birthright to eliminate (at once and, as they hoped, for ever) those very adulterating elements and Mediævalisms which our Pseudo-Catholics are now endeavouring to revive and replace, and so to assimilate themselves more and more in essentials, if not in externals, to the Church of Rome. But clergymen of our Church are bound to accept their *Catholic inheritance* as that inheritance was restored and purified by the Reformers, and as it has been accepted by this Church and realm—bound, not only by obligations arising from their very position, but also by an express undertaking and promise made when they were ordained. They have no other Catholic inheritance than that which is comprised in the formularies of their own Church, and what has been expunged from those formularies can continue to form no part of it.

Putting, then, aside this vague plea, the question on which all really turns is this—what is the genius and language of our formularies, interpreted not by the *possible* meaning of certain words and phrases, or by modern glosses put upon them by a few speculative divines, but by the usage of centuries and the actual practical acceptance of them in this Church and realm?

And here it would seem at first that our task in meeting these Ritualists, especially if they are clergymen, would be simple and easy, inasmuch as we on both sides

profess to have a common standard of appeal in our Articles and Prayer-Book; a standard which (*we* contend) must be regarded (*not* as permitting or authorising whatever is not expressly condemned, but) as a definite guide and limit, both for teaching and practice.

This standard our Ritualist brethren are bound to accept and abide by, nay, *do* profess to abide by, religiously, and yet, unhappily, a very few words with them are enough to show that our standard after all is only nominally the same; *we* interpreting its language and provisions in their natural obvious meaning (a meaning confirmed by the records of history and the usage of the Church till within the last five and thirty years), while *they* set all this coolly aside, as we shall presently see, when we come to examine the arguments based on the language of the Prayer-Book and formularies, which the ablest of their sophists urge on their behalf. And so we return to, and shall for the present confine our attention to this one definite point of Ritualist teaching—the Real Presence of Christ in or with the eucharistic elements. No one can, I think, fail to be struck by the total absence of anything like a direct proof of this their main position, the entire lack of any passage alleged from Scripture or the Prayer-Book which asserts the doctrine in anything like the simple, plain, unequivocal way in which we find the true doctrines of Primitive Christianity set forth in our formularies—*e.g.* the sacrifice of Christ once offered on the cross, or the real reception of the Body and Blood of Christ by the faithful communicant. All is mere deduction and inference based on the squeezing and twisting of some single word or phrase into some *possible* meaning which is straightway assumed to be the certain actual meaning, or on the bare assumption of the very doctrine which it is proposed to prove, or on some possible *arrière pensée* of a possibly disingenuous divine [1] who

[1] Bishop Gheste. See Capel-Liddon Correspondence, No. XIII. and XX.

possibly penned the clause in question with an intention and purpose which passed unnoticed at the time either by those who would have accepted it, or those by whom it would have been declined, and so has lain hid unrecognised, unheard of, till the exigencies of our innovating theologians drove them to appeal to it.

The very having recourse to such a mode of reasoning ought, as I have remarked already, to awaken suspicions as to the system which requires it, and the writers who condescend to it.

Nor can the point be carried—and this should be particularly observed—by any rhetorical flourish as to 'the dignity of the Blessed Sacrament.' The question is not about putting this Holy Ordinance on the highest step of our human ladders, but simply where God himself has placed it. Wherever that may be, *there* we may be sure it will have all the *dignity* of which it is capable, the very humblest and meanest, humanly speaking, of revealed truths being infinitely above the grandest conceits of man's imagination. Many and many a time have the truths of God been debased and dishonoured by being elevated as men thought on the pedestals of superstition. The question for us is not how we may invest the Lord's Supper with most dignity, but what are the attributes and powers with which it has pleased God Himself to invest it.

Nor, again, can we recognise any argumentative force or validity in rhetorical condemnations of those who make of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper 'a mere lifeless sign,' as if these were the people with whom the Ritualists are arguing, or as if those who reject the Ritualistic theory do of necessity, or in fact, detach the sacramental gifts entirely from the sacramental signs; as if there were no possible shades or degrees of difference between the Ritualistic and the Puritan Creed, or as if those who

do not make the Sacrament a lifeless form must accept the doctrine of a Real Presence in the *elements*. The same may be said of vague quotations made from writers of our Church who assert a 'Real Presence in the *Holy Communion*' (as for instance Bishop Andrewes—'we hold a presence not less true than yours—') without specifying what is meant, whether it be the presence of Christ at and in the sacramental action (which hardly any Christian would, I think, deny), or whether it be the presence of Christ in the soul of the faithful communicant (which no sound Churchman would deny), or finally the presence of Christ in the sacramental elements, which no sound Churchman would *not* deny.[1]

Setting then on one side as utterly valueless these baseless assumptions and illogical arguments, we turn to the Correspondence in order to discover what less valueless arguments the ablest of their champions can produce. And here we find in the very forefront an argument which puts the matter on so very narrow and tangible a ground that we shall have no difficulty in comprehending and testing it. Beginning with the familiar statement in the Catechism (as expressing a fixed doctrine of the Church of England), that 'the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper,' Canon Liddon goes on to argue that this would be impossible, unless Christ Himself be really present *in the Sacrament*.[2] Was ever so vague and impotent conclusion tacked on to so true and certain a premiss? For first—be it well observed—no definition is offered of what is meant by the word 'present'—and yet on that meaning the whole controversy turns. He does not tell us whether he means that Christ is present in the sacramental action, or present in the soul of the faithful

[1] See note D 2.

[2] See Correspondence, No. II.

communicant, or present in the elements of bread and wine. The first two points are not those which he has to prove, and the third is not proved at all. And yet the whole line of his reasoning commits him to this third and last sense. In a later part of the Correspondence[1] he makes it perfectly clear that the point which he is maintaining is that our Lord is present in, or locally associated with, the bread and wine consecrated by a priest. But to assert that Christ's presence cannot be communicated to the soul unless He be present in the elements[2] is a fallacy which we should scarcely have expected from a man of note in the theological world, though perfectly familiar to any one acquainted with the commonplaces which pass current among the rank and file of Ritualism. The fallacy has been advanced and refuted a thousand times, as, in the present Correspondence, it was straightway refuted by a Church dignitary, who urged in reply to Canon Liddon's interpretation that it is God by whom the blessing of the Sacrament is 'given' not the priest, and that it is the soul of the communicant and not his mouth by which it is 'taken and received.'[3] It is, moreover, as conceivable that God should attach his gift to the outward signs after they have left the hands of the priest as that He should do so before—and so the *impossibility* urged against us vanishes away into thinnest air.

There is, moreover, another flaw in this reasoning, which would scarcely need to be pointed out had not Canon Liddon himself apparently overlooked it; for if it may be legitimately argued that what is received by the worthy communicant must be 'given' him by the priest, as already existing in the bread by virtue of consecration, the further conclusion is no less legitimate, that what

[1] See Capel-Liddon Correspondence, XIII. XXIII. [2] See note D 3.
[3] Art. XXVIII. and *Church Catechism* and Correspondence, XIX.

thus exists *in* the bread must be received by *every* communicant, whether faithful or unfaithful—a conclusion expressly repudiated by Art. XXIX., which denies the partaking of Christ by the wicked[1] as well as inferentially by the Church Catechism, which limits the taking and receiving to 'the faithful.' The argument, therefore, refutes itself.[2]

But suppose, for a moment, that it were otherwise—that the divine gift were, indeed, given in reality and fulness by the hand of the priest—that to receive the consecrated elements with the mouth were identical with receiving the Lord's body and blood, that no act of the soul were needed to consummate the giving—is it not strange that anyone can use the argument by which Dr. Liddon thinks to prove this without at once discerning its *rationalistic* character?

I proceed to the other main *proof* offered us of the Ritualistic position, that the Real Presence of Christ in the elements is recognised by the Church as part of the doctrine which her clergy are commissioned to set before their congregations in their preaching, and to symbolise in their services.[3]

This proof, which figures in the Correspondence before us as a main support of the position, is derived from a passage in the Collect immediately preceding the Prayer of Consecration, and commonly called (on what sufficient warrant I cannot tell) the 'Prayer of Humble Access:' '*Grant us so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ and to drink His blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His body and our souls washed through His most precious blood.*' From this it is argued that there must be a way

[1] Note D 4.

[2] The writer appears not to have thought it worth while to notice the subterfuge of some controversialists who explain 'faithful' in the *Catechism* as meant to include merely nominal Christians.

[3] See note D 5.

in which the flesh of Christ may be eaten and his blood drunk without any reaping of their spiritual benefits. This argument, however, is very easily disposed of. It depends entirely upon the assumption that the words '*so that*' are necessarily *modal*, expressing one of two or more modes in which the same thing may be done and followed severally by different results, and not *consequential*, expressing the invariable result of the act to which they apply. Anyone who knows anything of English idiom (not grammatically merely but practically) knows that there is no necessity whatever for insisting on the *modal* sense here, and that the words 'so that' are quite as often used in the *consequential* sense; *so that* the Ritualist plea completely fails. And this it may be shown to do in yet another way, by logical proof that in the case before us the interpretation offered is actually *impossible*; for it presupposes *two* alternative *modes* of receiving the body and blood of Christ—one *with faith*, which we are supposed to pray for, the other *without faith*, which we are supposed virtually to deprecate. But the Catechism, as I have observed already, does in the very passage on which the Ritualist theory is made to rest, expressly limit reception to 'the faithful,' that is, to those who receive with faith, and Art. XXVIII. lays down that faith is the mean whereby our Lord's body is received and eaten in the Holy Supper. So that where there is not faith there is no reception—*i. e.* no 'eating the flesh of Christ or drinking His blood'—the alternative suggested does not exist—and the formula 'so that' in the clause of which we are speaking cannot have a *modal* force; the whole Ritualist reasoning therefore on this point also falls to the ground.[1]

And yet, again, another passage in the same Article excludes as decisively the Ritualistic alternative: '*The*

[1] See note D 6 for further development of this argument.

*body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner.*' Surely from this indisputably follows that as reception of the outward elements without faith is neither heavenly nor spiritual, so there cannot be, in such a case, *any* reception of the Lord's body. That this is the natural interpretation of the word 'only,' is shown by the persistent efforts made by Ritualists to get rid of its obvious meaning. For which purpose it is their fashion to appeal to a certain letter of Bishop Gheste, who claims to have himself penned the passage in question;[1] and in reference to another bishop, who had taken the words in their natural sense, delivers it as his opinion that they do not exclude a presence of the Lord's body in the elements, which would be independent of the faith of the recipient. But to establish this and make it possible to recognise a real reception without faith, he is obliged to interpolate the word 'profitably' before the word 'received,' an interpolation plainly inconsistent with and expressly excluded by the following Article (XXIX.), which insists that 'the wicked and such as be devoid of a lively faith are in no wise partakers of Christ;' *i.e.* do not receive Christ in any sense, even unprofitably, but 'only eat and drink the sign or sacrament of so great a thing.' Here, again, there is a definite exclusion of one of the *alternative* modes of reception which the Ritualists contend for. Of the outward sign there may be an unprofitable reception, but not of the thing signified—the body and blood of Christ. Nothing can be clearer, stronger, more precise, or more decisive.

This, again, is confirmed by our Church's language in the Exhortation before Holy Communion: 'For as the benefit is great, if with a true penitent heart and lively faith we receive that Holy Sacrament, for then we spiritu-

[1] See Capel-Liddon Correspondence, No. XIII. and XX.

ally eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood.' This indisputably confines the 'spiritual' eating to 'lively faith;' and as the only way of taking or eating the body of Christ is a spiritual way, and those who do not eat with faith do not eat spiritually, it follows that those who do not eat with faith do not eat at all. Adopting Canon Liddon's method, we may formulate our argument thus: 'The body and blood of Christ are not and cannot be in or essentially associated with the elements before reception; for if they were they would of necessity be received by the faithful and unfaithful alike.' [1]

A kindred point to the doctrine of the Real Presence in the elements is that of the sacrifice offered by the priest in the Holy Communion. This doctrine is not touched upon in the Capel-Liddon Correspondence, but there are sufficient utterances coming from indisputable leaders and authorities among the Ritualists to show that here likewise there is a definite approach to Rome, a definite departure from the Church of England. [2]

It is unquestionably a doctrine held and taught by Ritualists, that a sacrifice other than that of praise and thanksgiving offered by the whole congregation is offered by the priest in the act of consecrating the bread and wine. But this is the very essence of the pre-Reformation and Romish doctrine which was repudiated and left behind by our Reformers. It matters not much what the sacrifice so offered is actually supposed to be, whether of Christ Himself or of His body (as say the Romanists and some Ritualists), or [3] of Christ's supernatural Body (as other Ritualists say), or a sacrifice of Christ's presence, or, strangest of all, a sacrifice of Christ's sacrifice. These are but the accidents of the

[1] See note D.

[2] See note E for a few quotations from the *Treasury of Devotion.*

[3] See note D 8.

doctrine, as may be seen by the way in which its advocates shift about. The essential point is this, that a sacrifice performed by a priest other than our Divine High Priest is still needed to reconcile God to us (so that without it the propitiation made for us all by our Lord upon the cross is no propitiation for us individually), and that this sacrifice is regarded as being either identical with or supplementing or applying that which the Church of England defines as in itself 'a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world.' This sacrifice of Christ may indeed be said to be applied by and accepted in the Sacrament of Baptism and other means of grace, and by acts of faith, but this without admitting the notion of any other sacrifice, inasmuch as none of these acts are sacrificial. I have not mentioned the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, because, to assume that this is only a sacrament and not a sacrifice of application would be begging the question between us. It is quite clear that one of the sacraments is no sacrifice. The question is whether the Ritualists are right in asserting, contrary to the nature of a sacrament and the analogy of Baptism, that the other Sacrament is a sacrifice; and to this point I will now address myself, as my case against the moderate Ritualists would be imperfect without it.

And here, again, there is a total absence of anything like definite or direct proof. There is in Scripture nothing which can be reasonably interpreted as a direct command to offer sacrifice or any institution of a sacrificial priesthood; on the contrary, the word which signifies 'sacrificing priest' is never applied to the Christian ministry, but the term used is one which has not a trace of any such signification. There is no direct proof; nothing but shaky inferences from still more shaky interpretations. Nor is there in our Prayer-Book the smallest trace of any

sacrifice, the same in kind as that of Christ on the Cross, which these men would have us receive, nor of any sacrifice in any other sense than that in which any and every religious act may be so termed, except the offering by the congregation of the unconsecrated bread and wine, which cannot therefore be a sacrifice offered by the priest in consecration. It is not even termed in the Prayer-Book a *sacrifice* of remembrance, and the remembrance itself is attached *not* to the act of the priest, but to our 'receiving these Thy creatures of bread and wine' in exact harmony with St. Paul's words, that the showing the Lord's death till He come consists in the eating the bread and drinking the cup, and not in the blessing the bread or blessing the cup. There are five several acts directed to be performed by the consecrator, no one of which has the slightest approach to a sacrifice offered, or even an oblation made to God. The taking the bread has not—nor the breaking the bread, nor the laying hands on the bread, nor the taking the cup, nor the laying hands upon it. What is done is simply in performance of the command to do what Christ did at the institution; nor is there the slightest hint of a sacrifice in the Catechism. The word altar, and the word *sacrifice* in the sense which 'altar' would throw upon it, have been struck out of the Prayer-Book, and the sacrificial power which was formerly conferred in express terms upon the priest at ordination, and is so still in Rome,[1] finds no longer any place in our Ordination Service. Everything points the same way.[2]

. . . . . .

In their views, then, of the Real Presence in the elements, in the sacrifice of the altar, in the worship of the

[1] The ordaining bishop, according to the Roman Pontifical, after anointing the head of the candidate for the priesthood, delivers to him the paten and chalice with the words: 'Receive thou power to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate masses both for the quick and the dead.'

[2] See note F 3 for further remarks on this subject.

sacrament, in prayers for the dead, in auricular confession as an ordained means or sacrament of pardon—to take the most salient points—the men of whom I speak are departing from the Church of England. To these points perhaps may be added their general view of Christian worship, which, under their auspices, is daily becoming more and more a matter of cultе, of music, decoration, painting, vestments, processions, attitudes, banners, in short, external appliances and exhibitions, rather than the expressions of a contrite heart, the upliftings of a craving and grateful mind. Some of the details of this system, indeed, if not the whole system itself, may be matters in which a divergence of opinion may be allowed; matters in which a Church may allow those who hold to one system and those who hold to another to co-exist within its pale without endangering the loss of its candlestick; they are matters of argument rather than of law or right; but in what I have above called the salient points, no such differences of opinion, or at least of teaching, are admissible, and what we have to deal with at the present moment is not opinion but teaching, not probability but law. They are, too, departures not merely from the Church of England but from the genius of Christianity and the requirements of that belief which we call faith; for I cannot think *that* a sound theology which looks upon these views as merely errors of excess, errors in believing too much, insignificant and excusable, perhaps even pious and praiseworthy. Those who think or speak of them as errors on the safe side (if it is possible for error ever to be on the safe side), forget the danger which attaches to them both logically and practically; for such is the symmetry and completeness of Christ's revelation, that it is impossible in any material points to believe anything which is not revealed without falling either actually or by implication into an act of unbelief,

more or less grave, in what is revealed. Thus the theory of the Real Presence in the elements, however much in harmony it may be with human conceptions, throws into the background God's gift to our souls, the presence of Christ, and fixes the mind rather on the contemplation of God's presence on the altar in time present, than a thankful remembrance of his passion in time past. Faith in the sacrifice performed by the priest is an act of disbelief in the one sacrifice offered by our great High Priest; prayers for the dead imply a disbelief in God's promises of present rest and future glory to the faithful departed. Auricular confession is such a mass of disbeliefs that it would take us too long to go through them; the worship of Christ on the altar is a disbelief of what God has taught us of his own nature and attributes. There may be those to whom these disbeliefs seem matters of little moment, to my mind unless we are to hold that it matters not what we believe or what we do not believe, these misbeliefs or disbeliefs, call them which you will, are full of sin and danger, and no Church can admit or permit them without running the risk of forfeiting the charter of its incorporation, and sinking down to the level of a mere human society. This is more especially true of a Church from which these things have been, by God's blessing, so completely cast out, that in order to gain any pretence or colour for re-introducing them, it was necessary to force upon our formularies a non-natural interpretation. For a Church thus situated to re-admit them is, to my mind, an act of sin, as well as an act of madness. To my mind we owe no more sacred duty to our Church, I had almost said to our Lord, than the contending manfully, steadily, perseveringly, hopingly against the designs of these men. That which is the duty of a patriot towards his country is now the duty of a Churchman towards his Church.

# NOTE I.

## *DIFFERENCES BETWEEN HIGH CHURCHMEN AND RITUALISTS.*

[The following are passages from manuscripts and note-books which bear reference to the subjects in the foregoing chapters. It may have been the intention to work them into the text, but it seems best to print them in a separate form.]

The Ritualists claim to represent the High Church Party, and thus to have a *locus standi* among the recognised sections in our Reformed Church. We true High Churchmen have reason to be grateful to Mr. Capel for having drawn the line so clearly between Ritualists and High Churchmen; and his testimony is all the more valuable because lookers-on see more of the game than the players themselves. It may be doubted whether there has been a more decided attempt at imposition, or rather personation, than the way in which these men have sheltered themselves under the name of High Churchmen; and if we have reason to wonder at the boldness which claims, there is at least as great reason to wonder at the blindness which concedes the claim. The point is so easily tested. Let any Ritualist of the moderate school, the past years of whose ordained life carry him back some five and thirty years, compare himself as he is, his views, practices, aims as they are, with what he and they were when first he took orders, and I am very much mistaken if he will not find in himself such definite advances towards Romanism, or rather retrogression towards Mediævalism, that he cannot be held to be a sound and loyal minister of the Reformed Church in the sense in which he was so when he first entered on his office, or indeed in any satisfactory or sufficient sense at all. Compare what these men hold and teach with what were the highest of the high held previously to the Oxford movement, and it will be seen that they differ, not in mere accidents, but in essence. How many of the practices which now form a Ritualistic clergyman's everyday life were in use then? how many of the doctrines taught symbolically by these practices, or more definitely by sermons, lectures, tracts, were then accepted?

# NOTE II.

## *PRINCIPLES OF THE REFORMATION.*

It not unfrequently happens that a Mediævalist will sneeringly ask, 'What are the Principles of the Reformation? I cannot understand them.'

A rapid answer may be given to such a sneer.

The Principles of the Reformation are a protest against and the rejection of the Mediæval notions and practices which you are moving heaven and earth to re-introduce into our Church. This is the negative phase.

Positively, the Principle of the Reformation is a return to the faith delivered to the saints as we find it in Scripture.

The acceptance of Scripture as the sole rule and foundation of the Christian teaching.

The acceptance of the Primitive Church as alone of any value in determining, or helping us to determine, the doctrine conveyed by any doubtful passage of Scripture; the comparatively speaking rejection of the glosses introduced into the Christian faith by Heathenism, or Judaism, or Scholasticism, or Romanism, pure and simple.

The rejection of such notions of Christian duty or the Christian life as were unknown to early Christianity, but gradually engrafted on the parent stock by the imaginations of so-called pious men, who thought they could improve Apostolic teaching and practice.

Particularly, the Reformation protested against and rejected—

1. The usurpation of the Church of Rome in claiming to be the Mistress and Guide of all Churches.

2. The usurpation of the Bishop of Rome in claiming to be the Vicar of Christ, the Lord of the World, in things both spiritual and temporal.

3. The Temporal power of the Bishop of Rome, as embodied in the words Sovereign Pontiff.

4. The doctrine of Indulgences.

5. The doctrine of Purgatory.

6. Justification by Good Works.

7. The power and status of the clergy, as a distinct order of Christians, besides and beyond their ministerial office.

8. The power of the priest to forgive sins, *suo arbitrio et potestate.*

9. The doctrine of a *real* Sacrifice being offered by the priest in the consecration of the Elements in the Lord's Supper.

10. The presence of Christ or God in the Elements and the consequent adoration of the Elements, and sundry other superstitious usages and observances towards the Elements necessarily resulting from this view.

11. The Monastic system, as the higher religious Christian life, and as a means of pleasing God more surely than the active discharge of the duties of everyday life.

12. Self-inflicted pains and austerities as means of pleasing God.

13. The subjugation of the female mind, whether in male or female brain, to the influence of the clergy, by means of auricular confession and direction.

14. The substitution of confession to the priest for confession to God.

15. The celibate state as the higher state or mode of life, and more particularly the celibacy of the clergy, as appertaining to their nearer relation to God and their higher sanctity.

16. The use of elaborate and histrionic services in public worship.

17. The worship of the Virgin Mary, or the assigning to her the position of patroness or protectress of the human race; her sovereignty, mediation, intercession, impeccability—the sole mediatrix of Christ.

18. The adoration of images, relics, &c.

19. The exemption of ecclesiastics from the civil power.

20. The talismanic efficacy of assisting or being present at the Holy Communion without receiving.

21. The undue prominence given to the Holy Eucharist as an act of ceremonial worship, on the notion of its being a daily sacrifice.

These are the points rejected at the Reformation. These are most of them things which the Mediævalists are trying to re-establish. I do not mean that they are in every case planting them in their developed state, but they are sowing the seeds of them. The enemy did not plant full-grown tares.

## CHAPTER IV.

CEREMONIAL RITUALISM—POSITION OF THE SEMI-RITUALISTS.

THERE is another phase of Ritualism, another sort of Ritualists—semi-Ritualists they might perhaps be called—which we must not pass over; those who adopt in their services what is called a 'high ceremonial,' intoning, chanting, excessive ceremonial, artistic accessories, and the like; differing, however, so far from the Ritualists proper that they do not hold the doctrines, the symbolising of which makes ceremonial valuable to the latter. These men value the ceremonies for their own sake, agreeing, however, very much with the Ritualists in the external character of their services, and undoubtedly doing their work and playing their game; inasmuch as it is under the shelter of this ceremonial that the enemies of the Reformation hope to introduce their Mediævalisms of doctrine. With these semi-Ritualists it is impossible to deal by any legal process, except so far as in their services they introduce ornaments or vestments adjudged to be contrary to law; and, indeed, even were it possible, there would be a very grave doubt whether it would be desirable, inasmuch as this is one of the points in which variety might be held to be admissible, and where we may agree to differ, except where there is an attempt to re-introduce, either in form or substance, that which was dropped at the Reformation. Where this is the case our motto must be *principiis obsta.*

This must be our principle of action, our rule of policy; for the most part we must meet and counteract such innovations by truth sufficiently distinct, and arguments sufficiently strong, to convince men that those who would introduce them are not to be listened to. The fundamental error of these religionists, the great danger of their system, is that it is based on a very grave misconception of the nature and object of Christianity. This misconception, as distinctly and succinctly set forth by Bishop Abraham in a sermon preached in an ultra-Ritualistic Church at West Bromwich, is that all prayer is selfish, and that the essence of Christianity is *worship*; or, in the words of a clergyman to whom Dean Goulburn has been pleased to award a laurel crown, but whose errors and mistakes have been relentlessly shown up by Canon Swainson, that 'Worship is the *raison d'être* of the Church's existence.' Well may Canon Swainson ask whether 'the Bishop has ever felt the plague of his own heart? or whether Mr. Morton Shaw has forgotten the terms of his Saviour's mission in the final words of St. Matthew's Gospel, or His no less momentous words in the parallel passage of St. Luke (xxiv. 47)?' It would take us too long now to enter into an examination and refutation of this theory; it is sufficient to remind my readers that the aim and end of Christianity was the redemption of mankind, and not the abstract worship of God; that our Lord came down from heaven, not to establish an elaborate scheme of worship, but rather to do away with one which was already established. The essence of Christianity as regards God is, that He has redeemed us from our sins by the death of His Son, that He has given us the gift of eternal life, that He has given us a new morality (a new philosophy it may almost be called), and the gift of the Holy Spirit to enable us to realise it in our hearts and lives. The essence of

Christianity as regards ourselves is, that we accept the gift of God by faith, with prayer for future and thanksgiving and praise for past gifts; and I venture to submit to my readers that such prayer and praise and thanksgiving differ in more respects than one from the abstract adoration, the ceremonial worship, the barren *culte* which forms the essence and the marrow of these men's ideas of Christian life. It would not be difficult to draw out at length these differences, and to show that our Reformed Church has clearly recognised them, both in the language and the rubrical directions of her various services; but I pass this by for the present, in order not to distract my reader's attention from the main question before us.

This all-serious question resolves itself at the present moment into the seemingly trifling points of the eastward position symbolising a sacrifice, and the distinctive vestments symbolising a Real Presence in the bread. To these two points the most moderate of the Moderates have nailed their colours, and have declared that they will stand or fall by them, and not without reason. At present, if these doctrines are preached from the pulpit or circulated in tracts, they are absolutely ignored in our services; in these nothing of the sort can be found. Are the people taught that at the words of consecration God descends from heaven and enters into or settles on the bread? there is nothing of the sort in the service; or, that the priest offers a sacrifice for sin? there is not a word or a trace of it in the service. The eastward position and the vestments are designed—whether irrelevantly and foolishly it matters not—*they are* designed to neutralise this damaging witness by making the services present to the eye what they do not present to the ear. I do not intend to carry my readers into the question so fully and ably discussed, whether our rubrics and formularies were framed with a laxity sufficient to admit by a side wind that which

had expressly been expunged and repudiated; whether these innovations or retrogressions can be squeezed into our services without actual violation of the law, or whether they can be squeezed out of them without setting at defiance all rules of interpretation, logic, common sense, and usage; all these points have been so sufficiently and exhaustively argued, as to need no further notice here. The questions immediately before us are, whether there are any pleas or reasons whereby the bishops would be justified in exercising their discretionary powers in favour of the Ritualists, by refusing to allow the Public Worship Bill to be put in force against them, and whether Churchmen would be justified in acquiescing in such a course; or whether, supposing the question to be somehow or other, by hook or by crook, decided in their favour, we should, as children of the Reformation, be justified in allowing this laxity of expression, these possibilities of interpretation, these legal technicalities, to leave the way open for the retention of these practices, and the doctrines which they symbolise and establish?

[1] Supposing the Courts should admit the possibility of interpretation to be such as practically to exclude any interpretation at all, or supposing that, as in the Bennett case, they laid down a definite interpretation, but required that the offence alleged should be couched in words admitting of no other sense; then the question is whether we can acquiesce in such vague legality, which requires such an impossible amount of proof as to the meaning of the law and as to the character of the offence, as to render conviction almost impossible? Or whether we should demand such a definite explanation of the subject as may place both the law and the offence beyond the possibility of being explained away? or, to state the matter more shortly, whether there are any reasons why those who

[1] See note F.

persist in the eastward position and distinctive vestments should escape the operation of the law?

. . . . . .

Nor ought the beauty or effectiveness or attractiveness of the Ritualistic services to be allowed to bias our judgment on these points, or the numerous congregations which are brought together by these characteristics; no, not even if they believe and tell you that their religion is deepened and quickened; not even if you see crowds at their devotions. If these things—music, decorations, tableaux—are really helps, and not hindrances, to their devotion and to their religious feelings, to their power of prayer; then these will exist when the helps are removed. Instead of this, you will find among the *habitués*, or rather *habituées*, of these places, that these things have destroyed all healthy appetite for prayer and devotion; they have no taste for prayer without this *sauce piquante*; that where the services are plain—but little singing or decoration, the fabric well cared for and scrupulously clean, but no pseudo-altar, no reredos, no millinery, no gorgeously-clothed priest—there they cannot pray; their supposed heightened excesses of prayer are found out to be bubbles. They cannot pray where their fathers and mothers prayed, and yet they pretend that their powers of prayer have been strengthened and increased, they say that these things have brought them nearer heaven; while, when tried, they are found to be less able to rise, less able to walk without crutches.

I am no puritan, and I rejoice to see a church well cared for and clean, without a single sign or trace of carelessness unbecoming a building set apart for such a service; but there is a wide distance and wide difference between such a building and one of our Ritualistic churches, brilliant with colour, gaudy with the triumphs of human art and woman's taste. I believe that the bearing and demeanour of those who minister in the congregation in

any part of the service should be such as to befit and to betoken their sense of the solemnity of what they are about. But I do not believe that earthly pomp, processions, banners, cross-bearers, and all the other *dramatis personæ* of a Ritualistic exhibition, form any part of the worship of God, as doing Him honour or promoting His glory.

I quite agree in the fitness of music as a vehicle of praise, whether it come forth in the untrained voices of a whole congregation, rude perhaps in melody, but not for that the less expressive of the heart's melody, not the less devotional, none the less worthy of God's glory for that; no—or, whether it be of a more mechanical sort, led, and perhaps inspired, by pealing note or touching cadences, but not, perhaps, more devotional or more to the glory of God for that; but I confess I think that the present view of music, in the Ritualistic as in the Romanist churches, to be anything but a sign or a nurse of true religion or true devotion.

To make music into religion, or religion into music, to make devotion a matter of music, or to clothe music in the garb of religion, so that the one may be mistaken for the other, seems to me neither to promote the glory of God or the edification of the Christian soul; it seems to me rather to savour of Pagan *culte* than of Christian worship, and to my mind there are parts of our service in which music is utterly out of place, others in which musical histrionisms are quite out of place, others where they are absolutely taking God's name in vain. To see a congregation professing to approach God with a humble confession, and then to listen to the solemn words profaned by being subjected to the caprices of musical science, mechanically trilled forth as a task, or as an amusement, as a work of art or a work of habit, the thoughts which should fill the soul at that time, the sorrowful signs of a contrite heart, the burning impatience of the bond of sin,

the earnest craving for, the grateful certainty of pardon, all swept away in the ravishing cadences of some musical magician. Take it at the best, to leave out of view the fact that a great number of the congregation are not so gifted as to be able to join or follow in the performance that is going on, it seems to me that neither in principle nor in detail is this the way in which sinners should confess their sins to God; and the school which promotes or encourages such things, though it may be able to find specious explanations or defences for the system, cannot be allowed to plead them as a make-weight against what appears to me a most serious objection, for to my mind nothing can be much worse than this turning the most solemn acts of confession into unrealities, if not into something worse. And as for the attractiveness of these services, the question will, I think, to many of my readers, appear to be settled by what has been said above. It may attract the masses, but to what? It may attract them as the theatre does—and we might, if we liked, go a good deal lower in the scale than the theatre; it attracts them as the theatre does, by music, lights, decorations, effects, processions; but these are not the things which can bring a person profitably to church, nor can it give them any true or edifying notions of what Christianity really is in its nature and genius. And if to this we add the consideration that in the majority of cases these attractions do but usher men and women of simple, and therefore of impressible minds, into superstitious errors laid aside at the Reformation, and unknown to our fathers, do but prepare and attune their minds for the reception of these errors; then to those who value the Reformation this attractiveness is not a power for good in the Church, but an active and most dangerous power for evil; in fact it is by the æsthetical attractiveness of their services

that some men and more women have been brought, litt
by little, within the net of Ritualism; the numbers of ea
being about in the same proportion in which the weak
influences of passion and the stronger energies of reas
are combined in the respective temperaments of t
sexes.

## CHAPTER V.

### INADMISSIBILITY OF RITUALIST PLEAS.

Nor can their claims that these services have prescriptive right in their favour be for one moment allowed. It is in fact a misrepresentation so gross that it almost amounts to something worse; and it is, moreover, so easily met by facts and witnesses that it is strange that men of common sense should have adopted it, unless we suppose that the Ritualists had been so long allowed to float quietly along without much notice or contradiction, that they fancied they might say anything they liked, without its correctness being challenged. The Dean of St. Paul's himself acknowledged, in a letter to the 'Times,' that they were innovations, and anyone whose experience or whose memory carries him back to times anterior to the pseudo-Catholic movement has not an atom of doubt as to Dean Church being right. It was a thing perfectly unknown for the minister to stand with his back to the people in the prayer of consecration, except possibly (and I only mention the possibility to guard against its being used against me) where the position of the Communion Table was such as to render the north end unavailable. There was no single case of a clergyman having clothed himself in a distinctive vestment for the administration of the Holy Communion, though the Canon speaks of such a vestment as to be used in Cathedral churches 'by Bishops,

Deans, or Prebendaries,' a provision which at once excludes it from Parish churches, and marks that the use is prescribed with regard to the dignity of the person or the place rather than of the rite.

I cannot at this moment recollect that anyone has ever yet ventured on a definite statement, in so many words, that the eastward position and distinctive vestments have from time immemorial formed part of our Church system; nevertheless, the case of many of their apologists rests on the supposition that those who are trying to stop the Ritualists are the aggressors and transgressors. They wish to have it taken for granted, without perhaps committing themselves to a definite assertion of it, that no new school of theology has risen up within the last thirty years—that the notion of the Real Presence (not the Real Presence in the soul, not the Real Presence where two or three are gathered together in His name, but the Real Presence in the elements) has been stamped unmistakably on our Church services—that the notion of a sacrifice by the priest in the acts and words of consecration has been continuously familiar to us in our personal and public religion—that in these days a party has sprung up which they choose to call Puritan, asking that these notions shall be struck out, and that all *they* ask for is to be allowed to retain what their fathers had received and handed down to them, without question and without doubt. Sometimes they speak as if these things had been going on for centuries, without any scruple or any objection, and that all of a sudden we had attached a doctrinal significance to them, which, though used for centuries, they had never had. They either lose sight of the fact, or shut their eyes lest they should see it, and by a stranger delusion still suppose that others will submit to be blindfolded too. They lose sight of the fact that it is not till within these few years that anything

like an organised or systematic recognition of these notions has been imported into our services, first by the disgraceful principle of the non-natural interpretation, and next by every artifice of thought, every trick of language, whereby doubt could possibly be thrown on the significantly exclusive absence of such notions from our formularies.

Nor, again, can the plea—the most popular of all pleas—that of toleration in matters of religious opinion, be allowed any weight in the present case. Mr. Stanton is reported to have said, at St. Alban's, that they must wait until the English people had learnt to bear with one another in matters of religious opinions. They may wait till doomsday, but unless the English people are less clear-sighted than they usually are in such matters, they will wait in vain. It will be a long time, I take it, before the English people fail to see that toleration has reference to the attitudes assumed by the Church or by any other religious body towards those whose doctrinal views or ecclesiastical polity are different from one's own; it does not refer to the introduction into the Church itself—of doctrines or practices which have been systematically excluded, nor to the revival of notions deliberately discarded; it does not contemplate the ministers of any religious body teaching what is contrary to the fundamental character and frame of its own Church. For instance, it would be not toleration, but revolution, if in the Kirk of Scotland a party were to advocate a return to Episcopacy. It might be right, or it might be wrong, but the party which opposed it could not be charged with a violation of the principle of toleration. To talk of toleration in such a matter would be, and is, simple nonsense.

Nor does any theory about the comprehensiveness of the English Church make their position less equivocal. It may be—nay, I will say it is—perfectly true that the

Church of England framed her formularies on as comprehensive a principle as possible; that is, as far as is consistent with the preservation of truth and the exclusion of error; but, first of all, this does not imply that the formularies were framed so as to include or to provide for the re-introduction of what had been excluded or left behind: and next, no one will, I should think, deny that there must be a practical limit to this principle of comprehensiveness; a limit on either side; and in our Church, as a Reformed Catholic Church, the limit on the one side is fixed by Catholic truth. By Catholic I do not mean that which these men call Catholic, those perversions and distortions of the truth which gradually threw their withering influence round the truth as it was once held by the Church universal in primitive times—not the deductive speculations of human reason applying itself presumptuously to the subject-matter of Revelation—not that mass of superstitions which, in ever-increasing fertility, clothed the tree which Christ had planted, in seemingly brighter and richer colours, but in reality with a more stifling and destructive grasp—the greener, the richer the ivy, the more sapless is the tree, the more certain is the tree to fall, and the nearer it is to falling—not this pseudo-Catholicity, which marks the decadence of Christianity into Mediævalism, but the Catholicity of the Apostles and the Bible. This, on the Catholic side of the Church, is the limit under which Mr. Voysey fell, and which the Ritualists, in a spirit which they, when applied to themselves, call persecution, have tried to draw as tightly as possible against their opponents; and the limit on the other side, which our Church, as a reformed Church must draw, is the continual exclusion of doctrines and practices which the Reformation got rid of, and the prohibition of any attempt to resuscitate and reproduce them. Thus the principle of comprehensiveness stands

unquestioned, but the enemies and depravers of the Reformation are not only not benefited, but absolutely excluded by it.

Nor, again, can they be allowed to shelter their unfaithfulness to the Reformation under the plea that the principles on which our formularies were drawn up was that of compromise. It may be perfectly true, and for the sake of argument we will assume that it is true, that among our Reformers themselves there were some who wished to go further from the old system, some to go less far; and there were so far concessions on either side, that some things were retained which some men wished to see struck out, and some were struck out which others wished had been retained. But these concessions did not go as far as they must have gone if they are to justify our modern school in their innovations; it does not follow that those things, in the repudiation or discontinuance of which this compromise had resulted, were to be viewed either as never having been struck out and discontinued, so as to be restored on the first convenient opportunity. Nor can it be supposed that the language of the Prayer-Book was framed to admit any such restoration. It may be perfectly true that, in order to satisfy the scruples and consciences of those whose affections still clung to the system which the legitimate exercise of their reason had compelled them to abandon, there was, of some things, no express condemnation conveyed in our services, or required of those who attended them. The object was to make the changes sit as lightly on men's consciences as possible. But we may not argue from this that the changes themselves were either incomplete in their nature or doubtful in their expression; these changes had been carried out with sufficient certainty and expressed with sufficient clearness by the very fact of the omissions and alterations; and to suppose that the

abstinence from express condemnation was intended to signify that what had been done after compromise was to be undone contrary to that compromise; that what had been changed was to be changed back again, is simply to overset the theory of compromise altogether.

An illustration sometimes sets an argument in a clearer light. Let us suppose two parties in past years laying claim to an estate, and their claims settled by a compromise, whereby certain parts of the claims on each side were abandoned; what would be thought of a descendant of one of the parties who, some generations later, claimed his right to what had then been given up, and founded his claims on the ground of certain words having been inserted in the deed drawn by the lawyer on the other side, in order to admit of the adverse claims which had been settled by this compromise being re-asserted and re-established when convenient?

I have already pointed out how the moderate Ritualists hope to escape under the wing of the 'scape-goats,' but this is not the only shelter to which they look for safety. There is another class of clergy, from whom with good reason they expect, and indeed have received, most effectual aid and protection. I mean certain clergymen, few in number and not especially distinguished for talent or zeal, who, without putting any symbolical value on vestments or position, or having any leaning towards the symbolisms which they are supposed to symbolise, have imbibed somewhat crotchety notions of its being their duty to abide by them; either from a confused idea that they are enjoined in the Rubrics, or that they may be in some way or other fitting and proper; and to this scruple of conscience is often added the fact that, having imbibed these notions and adopted these practices when they were first started by the innovating Ritualists, before they had acquired their present significance and importance, they are now

unwilling to relinquish what they have hitherto contended for; to do so would be to confess that they had acted unwisely and inconsiderately—the hardest thing a parochial clergyman could bring himself to do; and we all know how this sort of self-love and self-respect strengthens the back-bone of conscience, sometimes perhaps distorts it into an unreasonable stiffness. There is no doubt that the declaration of these practices being illegal has given offence to these men, and that the refusal to interpret or alter the law might possibly induce some of them to relinquish their preferment sooner than yield.

But if we are to take a statesmanlike view of the question, we must consider whether their scruples are founded on a reasonable view of the matter; if not, it seems to me that however much we may respect their adherence to what they believe to be their duty, however much we may regret the possible consequences, yet such idiosyncrasies of conscience must not be allowed to interfere with the stern necessities of the case and the actual interests of the Church at this crisis. To do so would be much the same as if the scruples of the non-juring bishops had induced the legislature to abstain from requiring the oath of obedience to William and Mary. I cannot help thinking that if a man chooses to indulge in these peculiarities in either politics or faith or morals, he must be prepared to take the consequences of being so unlike his fellow-citizens or fellow-Churchmen; and to act on any other principle seems to me at the present crisis alike unwise, unstatesmanlike, and unsafe.

Nor may we leave out of consideration that among these men there are probably, or rather certainly, some who, though they profess not to give any doctrinal value to these practices, yet nevertheless do teach the doctrines which other Ritualists use them to inculcate, and thus

practically the insignificance which they personally place on them does not prevent their furthering the cause of Ritualism; it is as if a cowardly trumpeter in a battle were to sound a retreat when he ought to sound a charge, and then to excuse himself by saying that he held that the sounds in themselves had no significance either one way or the other.

Again: besides the notions of personal prestige, which may prevent some from abandoning a practice which they have for a part, or even the whole of their ministry adopted, it is very possible that there may be in others a deeper principle at work, and that is a belief in sacerdotal infallibility, throwing around obstinacy a semblance of duty. It is clear that in either of these two last cases they might almost be called accessories and accomplices in the work of the Ritualists, if not co-conspirators.

It is curious to remark how the date of the commencement of these practices, even in individual cases, synchronises with the movement at Oxford which has since developed itself into the pseudo-Catholic anti-Reformation School. Doubtless in the early days of that movement there was much to arrest the attention and attract the sympathies of thinking, earnest men; much that would induce men to adopt what was recommended, much to excuse their doing so. There were few men sufficiently far-sighted to see what all this was leading to, but few men sufficiently clear-minded to realise the fact that those who followed were but blind-followers of the blind; but even for men less gifted with discernment, less endowed with a power of seeing the end in the beginning, there was enough in the earliest developments of the system to make them—I speak from my own experience—shrink back from the path these men were treading. And those who now find themselves in the dilemma of turning back or going on would have been saved their

present embarrassment, if they had allowed themselves to be alarmed and deterred by some of the repulsive features which alarmed and deterred others. To my mind, the hideous theory of a non-natural interpretation, the substitution of a *peut-être* theology for the definite teaching of the Bible and our Church, the placing patristic utterances practically if not formally on a level with or even superior to the inspired books, the want of honesty and straightforward dealing which from time to time peeped forth from beneath the cloak of self-devotion—these were sufficient to alarm any man, as they did many men; and if the result of any having blindly followed has been to place them in an embarrassing position, surely, however much we may sympathise with them, there is nothing either in reason or in religion, in sympathy or in duty, to induce or justify us in sacrificing the Reformation to get them out of their embarrassment. No, not even those amongst them most innocent of all complicity with the Ritualists. I mean the men who adopted these practices on their own personal judgment of what was most fitting or most in harmony with the literal words of the Rubrics, either from a love of innovation, or from a love of singularity, or from a morbid desire to realise their own existence by the energies of their own will. They probably did not consult their Bishops or their elders in the ministry; they thought themselves wiser than the aged, more learned than their forefathers; they certainly did not respect the usage of Churchmen around them, or of Churchmen before them; they acted on the impulses, it may be, or on the dictates of private judgment, on a point on which they had deliberately resigned the right to judge privately, when they promised at their ordination to 'minister the doctrine and sacraments as this Church and realm hath received the same;' and though we may feel regret and sympathy for them, yet there is nothing in

religion or reason, in duty or in sympathy, to justify us in sacrificing the Reformation to get them out of the embarrassment in which their self-will has placed them.

Nor will, I think, any prudent man be tempted by the prospect of peace which is held out as an inducement to leave the Ritualists alone. The only way in which peace could be produced by this method would be, if it resulted in the utter extinction of the Reformation party. In this way, perhaps, unanimity would be secured; but it would be like getting rid of the foot and mouth disease by letting it have its own way till there were no cattle left for it to attack. They utterly miscalculate the future who suppose that the conceding to the Ritualists the points they claim would be followed by peace in the Church. Some indeed might possibly cease to struggle, and go over in disgust to Dissent; but by far the greater number would struggle to the very last, and hand down to their children, with their dying breath, the sacred duty of contending for that which their fathers handed down to them. Let them not misinterpret the fact, if fact it be, that at present there seems to be no inclination to proceed to extremities; the matter of fact is that people are either indulging in the hope that these men will be wise in time, or waiting with what, after so much provocation, must be called much forbearance till it shall have been ascertained that the law has been wrongly expounded, or that the Bishops are willing to make it a dead letter. Let the Purchas judgment be reversed even to the extent of deciding that the law technically does not forbid what they want—a possibility which has been forced upon us, not as Mr. Gladstone supposes in the case of the Dean of Bristol, by any misgivings on our part—let there be a case of a Bishop refusing to entertain a well-founded complaint, and I am very much mistaken if there will not be both in the House of Commons and the country a

storm which will sweep these men out of their position. It is true that a compromise would suit them well enough; their object of tampering with the Reformation as a theological movement would be gained, just as in the judgment of Solomon the false mother would have gained her object by bringing her companion to the same childless state as herself, if the compromise had been adopted whereby the wise king found out the true mother. As long as Ritualists, whether moderate or ultra, continue to disturb our parishes, endanger our Church, imperil the continuance of our children in the faith, there can be no peace; and therefore no compromise that would leave them in possession of the ground they have gained could possibly end in peace.

Would you not then, it may be asked, acquiesce in the reversal of the judgment? I do not think that I am misinterpreting the feeling of the great body of Churchmen when I answer, 'No.' We will acquiesce in nothing which places the Reformation—how much shall be retained, how much shall be got rid of—at the tender mercies of these men.

How then, they may ask, can *we* be justly called lawless, for not abiding by the law, when *you* declare your intention of not doing so yourselves? The answer is perfectly clear. It is quite a different thing to decline patiently to accept a newly-devised interpretation of a Rubric, contrary to the usage of the centuries which have passed since the framing of that Rubric, contrary to the services which that Rubric was designed to regulate,[1] contrary to the authentic formularies in accordance with which that Rubric must be supposed to have been framed, but undoubtedly in accordance with doctrines which have been carefully expunged from the service-books and formularies. To refuse to abide by such an interpreta-

[1] Note H.

tion is one thing; it is another to refuse to obey a long-standing interpretation of the law, in harmony with those services, that formulary, and that usage, on the ground that it is not in harmony with the system which had passed away.

The topic of peace, however, has been used to work upon the apprehensions of a class peculiarly liable to apprehensiveness on a point on which they are peculiarly sensitive. The parochial clergy had dandled before them the prospect of vexatious suits, of officious churchwardens, and troublesome parishioners, prosecuting them for non-compliance with Rubrics so obsolete, that compliance with them would almost be a breach of the law, which in the absence of opportunities of legislation is created by common usage. There is nothing which a parochial clergyman more fears and detests than a parishioner interfering with his prerogative, and there is little doubt no small number of Incumbents regard the Public Worship Bill with misgivings, if not with dislike.

It was to meet this point of vexatious prosecutions that that discretion was given to the Bishops which some hope, others fear, will be by some of their Lordships misused to the securing the Ritualists in their entrenchments. But even if there had been no such discretion given, the apprehension created cannot be regarded as anything else but a bugbear. Vexatious retaliation on the part of the Ritualists would produce a legislative revision of the Rubrics which many wise persons now shrink from, feeling that it is not wise to begin pulling about an old house.

The assumed necessity that all Rubrics must be enforced alike will soon be disposed of; there will be no difficulty, logical, legal, or moral, in recognising the line that exists between those who violate a Rubric with the malice prepense intention of introducing doctrines which the

services were framed to exclude and those who, without any such malice prepense, have followed their fathers in the non-observance of certain Rubrics which have no relation to doctrine whatever.

But, in matter of fact, this point of obsolete Rubrics has only been imported into the question as a make-weight on the side of the Ritualists, for it has really no practical bearing on the issue between us and them. The accusation against the Ritualists of disloyalty to the Church and of lawlessness, and the necessity for opposing them, do not rest on any allegation of a refusal on their part to comply with obsolete Rubrics, but on their attempt to revive mediæval doctrines and errors by law abolished. This is one point of lawlessness. They attempt this partly by the pretended warrant of certain Rubrics interpreted unnaturally and disloyally, and in a sense contrary to that affixed to them by continuous usage—partly by certain loopholes which they pretend to have found in some obscure corners of our Prayer-Book, and even by endeavouring to cast a doubt on the good faith of those who compiled it. We hold them to be lawless because, when it has been decided by the courts of law that their interpretation cannot be legally maintained, they either refuse to obey the law so laid down, or evade it whenever they can. This is another point of lawlessness; this is the essence of the moral habit which constitutes a lawless man and inconvenient citizen. In fact they are trying to revive Rubrics which—even supposing them ever to have had the force which they give them—are obsolete, obsolete in the sense in which they use them; for even supposing that these Rubrics were in their letter still more favourable to Ritualism than they are, yet their practical sense and bearing would have been so fixed by continuous usage that the attempt to revive them in their original meaning would have been little less an

offence against the peace and law of the Church than if their original language had been less distinct; for I think most people would recognise the soundness of the principle that continuous usage defines and limits the operation of ancient laws, and especially where the language of the laws is doubtful, and still more where that doubtfulness has been created by the tricky sophistry of unquiet revivalists; and if, as I have before shown, the at present crucial questions of the eastward position and distinctive vestments are tested by continuous usage, the question is settled, or rather settles itself in a few moments.

This principle of ancient law being fixed and defined by usage, is still more evident in cases where the legislation has been superseded for a long period. In this case usage not only fixes the law, but makes it; and whenever in such a case circumstances admit a recurrence to legislation, the office of the legislators is to embody the results of opinion and usage. If Convocation, instead of attempting to put life again into dead Rubrics, had recognised usage as a practical guide to what was wanted, they would have done more towards securing the peace of the Church than they have now done towards putting it off for ever, and that is saying a good deal.

If, indeed, the Ritualists had usage on their side, it might have been necessary to enter on several points which present themselves for discussion, such as, whether a usage clearly out of keeping with the spirit of the Church's constitution, or one at least of the essential characteristics of the Church's existence, can be supposed to have the force which it is clear that it would have had had it been in harmony and keeping therewith—whether a usage implying the revival of pre-Reformation doctrines and practices can justify loyal sons of the Church of England in acquiescing in it—whether change or innovations on established usage are permissible—whether a usage

which supersedes essential doctrines, essential principles, and essential acts of the Church, can be maintained when attention is called to the fact of its doing so. Upon these and other questions of a like interesting nature it is not necessary to enter, because usage is not on the side of the Ritualists, but against them.

## CHAPTER VI.

PERSONAL CLAIMS MADE ON BEHALF OF THE RITUALISTIC CLERGY.

THE ground in this controversy is sometimes shifted from doctrines to persons, and a contrast is drawn between the fox-hunting parson of bygone days and the men who are now spoken of, and that truly, as devoting their energies and sacrificing their amusements and enjoyments—or at least what other people value as such—to work; the deduction intended to follow from the plea being, that these men ought not to be disturbed in the work to which they have devoted themselves and the good they are doing. It is easy in this reasoning to detect more fallacies than one.

I have, in a former publication, considered the question, how far the energy and devotion and success of these men entitle them to the license and the impunity which they claim; I have neither seen nor heard anything to make me doubt the logical and moral soundness of what I there advanced, and therefore I need not now do more than observe that even if I am wrong—if hard work and success in attracting congregations be admitted as a plea for allowing them to go on undisturbed—it applies with as much if not with more force to the ultras than to the moderates; the congregations *they* draw are as large or perhaps even larger, show as much interest in the strange things they see and hear, or, as it is now the fashion to call it, are quite as devout.

Nor can these men be allowed to reap any benefit

from the extravagant tone of self-laudation which they adopt, savouring perhaps more of the pagan vice of pride than of the Christian grace of humility.

It is assumed that, previously to what they call the Catholic revival, the mass of the clergy were of the self-indulgent, self-seeking class, whereas this is far from being the fact. Those whose memories reach back to the times before the troublers of Israel's peace arose, need not be told that the fox-hunting parson was the exception, and not the rule; that by far the majority of parishes in England were occupied by men who were embued with a no less measure of faith, hope, and charity, and devoted themselves no less to the work of their posts, though in a less ostentatious, less self-extolling and self-asserting, less bustling fashion. They did not consider themselves as formed in a different mould, or belonging to a different caste, whose prerogative it was to command, while the laity had the privilege of obeying. There was less stress laid on, less time given to external *culte*, daily services, functions, processions, decorations, confessions; in short, religious practices, of which we find very little either in scriptural or primitive Christianity. These mark the decadence of gospel truth, and attain their highest perfection in proportion as superstition takes its place; but in the ordinary services of the congregation, in the schools, in the houses of the sorrowing, by the bed of the dying, there was quite as much energy displayed by the majority of the clergy of the last generation as in this, and perhaps with intentions more entirely devoted to God's work. There may have been mannerisms in the teaching, the consolations, the preaching, but there was not, I think, the same endeavour to use all these things as means and opportunities of increasing the number or consolidating the influence of a party or a school. And even if there was, the attempt was not made in the direc-

tion of Mediævalism; and we must never lose sight of the fact, that if the Reformation is a good, Mediævalism is an evil; that no efforts in the direction of Mediævalism can be encouraged or permitted in the Church of England without repudiating and endangering the Reformation.

But take the fox-hunting parson and his time at their worst. I am not, and never was, an admirer or champion of such men, even though it is recorded of Juxon that he followed the hounds. It is true that they were not deep theologians, but neither are our modern priestlings. There is nothing in which the proverb of little knowledge being a dangerous thing is more truthfully illustrated than in the sermons and the conversations and the speeches of the scions of our Catholic revival, who, having taken in at second-hand some stereotyped scraps of Mediæval theology, or rather priestology, from some half-taught teacher, are unable to give their flock any more nutritious diet than a perpetual *rifacciamento* of these fallacies. I am old enough to recollect the somewhat meagre discourses which some of the least able of the men of the last generation were accustomed to read us, sometimes agreeably varied, after the fashion of Sir Roger de Coverley's chaplain; but I am sure that they were far less temper-trying, far more edifying, than the wonderful nonsense which sounds forth as the quintessence of pulpit instruction in Ritualistic churches, even in the metropolis. But take the hunting parsons at their worst, and there is one advantage which the Church had then which it has not now—*they* did not get hold of the really religious-minded people. In proportion as their lives may have been full of scandal and offence, in that same proportion their teaching and their example had no influence on the really religiously disposed. Pious men and women in those days did not, and were not taught or required, to hang upon their clergyman as they are now. His teaching may have been

erroneous or meagre, his manner possibly irreverent, his example evil; but pious men and women of those days had their Bible and their Prayer-Book to cling to, and cling to them they did, and not to their priest; and as long as they clung to them there was not much danger of their being mistaught or misled.

The non-natural interpretation had not yet been invented, to make the Prayer-Book give an uncertain sound, or to mean exactly the contrary to what it seemed to mean. But now it is very different. If the Mediævalistic clergy are misleading, then it is the religiously disposed people who are misled; it is the salt of the nation whom they are tainting with errors both of faith and practice. Formerly, it is true, there was darkness in the land, and it may be—at least for the sake of argument, we will admit that it was the case—that the clergy of the day were indifferent to it, or unable to cope with it; but if now the light that should be in us be darkness, if in religious people superstition has taken the place of faith, then how great is that darkness, how wretched the state and the prospects of such a country! Once more: take the times of the fox-hunting parsons. It is true that there was less bustle and fuss made about religion than there is now; there were, generally speaking, fewer services, no processions or processionials to attract and amuse; people were not taught genuflections and prostrations, or trained to rise at the entrance of the clergy, or to adore God as supernaturally present in the bread or to receive the bread after the fashion in which there is more superstitious awe than decent reverence; but then, on the other hand, those who had the real spirit of prayer were not disturbed nor distracted by the notes, true or false, of a chorister's voice, or led to suppose that the sacrifices of prayer and praise were offered in the keen relish for beautiful music, or any such stimulants.

It is true that there was less of personal intercourse between the pastor and his flock; but, on the other hand, the purity of a young girl's conscience was not sullied by the breath of a confessor, nor was it thought necessary to warn a parish priest against indulging himself in over-long interviews with his female penitents, lest penitence should lead both to evil, and confession be the finger-post to ruin.

## CHAPTER VII.

CONCLUDING REMARKS ON THE PRESENT AND FUTURE POSITION OF THE RITUALISTIC CLERGY.

ALL this brings us face to face with a very serious and a very important question, from which I fear many would gladly turn, but which I am convinced we must sooner or later look in the face; and the sooner the better. It is this—What is the relation of these men towards the Reformed Church of England? What is their position as *Clergymen?* What should be our attitude towards them? I say as clergymen, because I am sure no one entertains the least wish to interfere with their opinions or practices or crotchets, as individuals; that would be an infringement of the right of private judgment. We have to deal with them as clergymen holding commissions from the Church, and through the Church from Christ, to feed His sheep with the pure doctrines and ordinances which He in His Testament has left behind Him.

It is, I think, quite certain that those who are called the Ultras, or extravagant Romanisers, or Ritualists (call them which you will), will have to go. They are handed over even by their own friends and patrons and masters, to be dealt with as the law directs—in fact, as 'scapegoats.' But as for these 'moderate men,' who repudiate extravagant practices and deprecate extravagant language—can sound members of the Reformed Church, staunch friends of the Reformation as a doctrinal as well as an ecclesiastical movement, be content, with any

prudence or safety, to see them remain as teachers and masters among us? Is there anything which can be urged for them which can warrant us in thinking that we shall be justified in being content with the secession—call it removal if you will—from their pastoral offices, of the men upon whom they have contrived to turn the greater part of the public indignation and impatience?

And first, we must observe that the mere name of moderation does not exonerate the moderates. It is a plea put forward by those who are most immoderate. Mr. Carter himself writes to the 'Times,' as a 'moderate;' and what sort of moderation his is, Mr. Capel's quotations from his books sufficiently prove. In fact, every plea which is urged by the moderates and their friends as a reason for allowing them to go on their way rejoicing is pleaded by the ultras for their also being untouched; so that the name and the character which they claim for themselves can have little or no weight in the matter. We must look beyond the name into the circumstances.

And, after all, in reality there is not much to choose between the moderates and their 'scapegoats'; the moderation is only by comparison, the difference one of degree, not of kind; in doctrine they go as far as the furthest, and it is the doctrines which *they* teach which give the sting and poison to the puerilities of the ceremonialists; the one is the scholar and dupe, the other the master and oracle. And if we look at the essential characteristics of the two, the answer must be that there are no essential reasons for dealing with the one which do not also make it necessary to deal with the other. If they remain as teachers in the Church of England, and teach as they have taught, and lead as they have led, the real substantial danger to the Reformed Church will be but little if at all diminished by the exodus of the ultras. The danger lies in the doctrines, not in the childish exhibitions

thereof. Without the former, the latter would be as harmless, though as deplorable, as the peculiarities of the Irvingites or the Shakers. Remove the latter, and the former are as dangerous and as fatal as before, perhaps even more so.

We have now to consider whether any of the pleas which were and are urged for leaving them both alone are sufficiently strong and real to induce us to act upon them.

. . . . .

It is curious to see how both inside and outside the House continual efforts were made to carry out the same policy, by endeavouring so to manipulate the proposed measure that it should not touch the doctrinal Ritualists, and that the ultras should only be dealt with in exceptional cases. Speaker after speaker, in both Houses, but more especially in the Lords, endeavoured to place the matter on a false issue, so as in certain cases to leave the real evil untouched, and in all cases the real point passed over. Sometimes the evil to be remedied was spoken of as a violation of the peace of the Church, and the remedy proposed was that each party should be allowed to go its own way, and exhorted to dwell in peace one with another. This, of course, would have been to give the Ritualists all the license that they demanded; as if evil would be cured by sanctioning its continuance. Sometimes the evil was the disturbance of the peace of single parishes. The remedy proposed was that the Ritualistic practices should only be allowed where they were agreeable to the majority of the parishioners; the results of which would have been that not only throughout the kingdom, but in each several diocese, there would have been totally different services and different Christianity, not only set forth from the pulpit by individual preachers, but recognised and symbolised in the services; and the English Church might

have been justly saddled with the damaging reproach of having no fixed system or doctrine. Nor would even this have met the case; for the minority who, having, as members of the Church of England, a right to services as free from Mediævalism as the Reformation had left them, would have been obliged to give place to the innovations of the Ritualists, and to seek in other churches that which their forefathers had enjoyed in their own, or to set up services for themselves as Dissenters. It would have been pouring new wine into old bottles, and the bottles would most certainly have burst. Sometimes the evil is represented as merely the grumbling of aggrieved parishioners, and the remedy suggested was to let them grumble on in peace. Sometimes the evil was represented as disobedience to the law, and the remedy suggested was either to alter the law, so as to make it no longer disobedience, or leave it to the discretion of individual bishops, whether they would not get rid of the disobedience by not requiring the rebels to obey. These false issues were sedulously put forth, the several evils skilfully exaggerated, and the respective remedies speciously recommended, not merely by the open advocates of the doctrinal Ritualists and the secret apologists of the ultras, but by men of sounder views and principles, who might have been supposed to be sufficiently lynx-eyed to see that none of these placed the point on its real issue, and that none of the remedies proposed were more than mere makeshifts and evasions; that neither the peace of the Church, nor of parishes, nor the grievances of single parishioners, nor the disobedience of the clergy to the laws, represented the real point at issue. It was long, especially in the House of Lords, before anyone ventured to lay down that it was the maintenance of the Reformation which was at stake. That Reformation which, irrespective of any other considerations, however plausible or

even true they might be, it was the bounden, nay the sworn duty of the English clergy—and, if the clergy failed, the bounden duty of the English Parliament—before God and the nation, to maintain in its full integrity, against all impugners, all innovators, all aggressors; and this, I would beg my readers to remember, is the real issue before the country at the present moment.

. . . . . .

But though the Ritualistic partisans tried, by these side winds, to secure for the doctrinal Ritualists a certain amount of recognition of their doctrines, and for the ultra-Ritualists a certain amount of impunity in their practices, yet this was very far from being the amount of advantage which the former hoped to reap from their repudiation policy. Disjoining themselves, as I have above said, from the extremes of their schools—sometimes finding fault with them, sometimes even suggesting means of gentle repression and punishment—they hoped to gain for themselves, in the way of compromise, that their own doctrines should be expressly exempted from the operation of the Act. The effect of this measure, and the way in which it would have affected ultimately the position of the ultra-ceremonialists, seems to have utterly escaped notice.

The ground on which certain ceremonies had been declared illegal was that they symbolised doctrines not recognised by the Church of England; and it seems to me that if these doctrines had been recognised by the proposed compromise, the ceremonies could no longer have been held to be illegal. It is almost incredible that they could have supposed that this compromise would have been accepted; it is almost incredible that they should have thought to make it acceptable by offering in exchange for their concessions to themselves the relaxation on certain other points of not the least doctrinal or

symbolical importance, on many of which nine-tenths of their opponents were perfectly indifferent. Deliberately to make such a proposal, in hopes of its being accepted, savours somewhat of the simplicity of a simpleton; but still they were very near succeeding—thanks to a certain Iro-English prelate, who, from motives which it would be unbecoming to speculate upon, and perhaps impossible to discover, actually embodied it in the House of Lords. It is true that he quickly withdrew his proposed motion; and that, though hinted at from time to time by others, it never assumed the substantial form of a definite motion; yet it is clear that the delay till June, conceded in a weak moment by Mr. Russell Gurney, had for its object the increase of the chance of some means being found to secure to the doctrinal Ritualists at least the optional use of the distinctive vestments and the eastward position. This hope has been so far realised that Convocation, in its last Report, after a long debate, recommended that permission should be given to use the black gown; and then, as if under an irresistible pressure of a sense of equity, conceded to the Ritualists ALL that they asked. Not only were they unconscious of the inherent absurdities of such a proposition, but they seem to have flattered themselves that it would be accepted.

Since the passing of the Bill unceasing efforts have been made by divines, or at least by clergymen, by statesmen, by politicians—all with the same aim, or at least, as far as they have succeeded, with the same result of misleading the laity—to produce in the public mind an impression that it would be just and wise to allow the Bill to remain a dead letter as far as regards the moderate Ritualists. The pleas in favour of this course have been put forward so artfully and so sophistically, so diluted with a flow of words, that they have had all the more chance of obtaining currency because their own weakness

and the danger of the course they advocated has been kept out of view. It will therefore be necessary for my case to subject the most prominent of these reasons to an analysis, which may enable my readers to judge of their sufficiency and relevancy.

*The Tri-decanal Declaration* puts forward, with somewhat of a flourish, that rigid uniformity in the services is not desirable as a ground for the concessions of the liberty demanded. But who would deny that rigid uniformity—that is, uniformity without variation—is not desirable or even possible? Who denies that uniformity in some points is both possible and desirable? Who denies that it is in some points essential to the faith, and to the very maintenance of the Church? Who would hesitate to demand that in these points it should be maintained and enforced? Certainly not the Ritualists. Supposing an incumbent, or several incumbents of known heterodox opinions on the subject of the Holy Communion—as heterodox we will say on the one side as the Ritualists are on the other, and that is saying a good deal, avowedly with the object of inculcating their views—were systematically to refuse to kneel when, as officiating ministers, they received the elements themselves, and were to urge that it is not distinctly commanded in the Rubric, and that rigid uniformity in the services is not desirable, would either the one plea or the other be admitted? Canon Selwyn[1] (of whom not only *de mortuo* but *de vivo nil nisi bonum*) exempted from this tri-decanal axiom about uniformity 'points subversive of real unity, or contrary to Anglican, principles;' and another way of stating the same notion may be, points which are negations of doctrine or expressive of errors or superstitions. The axiom is only applicable in points immaterial, and certainly the Ritualists cannot say the points they demand are immaterial, for

[1] Note I.

they declare they would rather die than relinquish them. The fact is that these Deans, from complete uniformity in the services being undesirable, argue to its being in these points undesirable—a fallacy into which I could hardly have conceived my old friend the Dean of St. Paul's to have fallen.

The position, then, of the moderates in the Church to which they nominally belong is, I think, sufficiently ascertained. The next points I think are, what we can reasonably expect them to do; what should be the attitude of sound Churchmen towards them, if they do not do it; and what is the proper, just, and reasonable way of dealing with them. It must always be recollected that the struggle is not between two parties in a reformed Church, on points which imply no hostility to or repudiation of the Reformation, but between the friends of the Reformation on the one side, and on the other those who by treachery, either in themselves or in the patrons of the livings they hold, have obtained possession of some of our parishes, and retain them—like squatters on another man's land—by the force of the nine points of the law, backed up by their own lawless obstinacy and the difficulties of ejectment. The case is like, not two parties, each supporting rival claimants to the monarchy, but a party of loyalty on the one hand and anarchy and revolution on the other.

And first of all we must take the possibility of their being willing to conform to the law in case it is enforced against them. At first sight it would seem as if it were scarcely possible, or scarcely desirable, that men, with any sense of religion, or sense of honour, with the peculiar responsibilities of the clerical office upon them, should condescend—perhaps I ought to have said, can dare—to hold positions of dignity, influence, and emolument on condition of their ceasing to teach that which they honestly believe to be true; nay, it is scarcely possible for

us to wish them to do so. It would be impossible for us to trust them, without at the same time distrusting them; it would be impossible to believe that their teaching would not in some way or other be leavened with the doctrines and the notions, the outward expression of which, in symbolical acts and symbolical garments, they had reluctantly relinquished. The peace which would be thus restored to the Church would be only skin deep; everything they did or said would be looked at with suspicion; and if this be the case, the only course which seems to me to be open to them—the only thing which we can wish them, for the sake of themselves and the Church, to do is to imitate the example and to assume the position of the nonjurors, men who perhaps we may think to be mistaken, but whose nobility of purpose, whose firm sense of religion and honour, whose loyalty to conscience, no noble, no honourable, no religious, no loyal mind can doubt. As laymen, holding no office in the Church, they will be free to think, and act, and even to teach as they will; by their Master's judgment they will stand or fall; they will not compromise or distract the Church by their opinions or teachings or doings, whatever they may be. If the worst then comes to the worst, those who are now drawing near to Rome and farther from the Reformation will exist among us as nonjurors, with whom perhaps we may have a controversy, but not a civil war, from whom we may differ without ceasing to respect them. But, for myself, I confess that I have a brighter prospect than this, for surely it may be allowed us to hope—nay, in spite of all that has passed, it is scarcely possible not to hope—that when these men are forced by the pressure of circumstances, by the alternative which must come upon them of having to resign their livings or conform to the law, to weigh their position more accurately and reasonably and honestly than they have perhaps hitherto done, they may

be led to take a truer view of the matter than they have hitherto done. And surely when they thoroughly, logically, and rationally weigh and consider the various points of the controversy, on what a quicksand of conjecture Ritualism rests, the absence of any direct proof of the points to which they most firmly cling, the entire absence of any direct recognition thereof by the Church, the direct evidence against them, the inherent weakness and untenableness of their views, evidenced as it is by the feebleness, and inaccuracy, and inconsistency, by the mistakes, misinterpretations, misconclusions, fallacies, sophistries, equivocations, of which is formed the staple, not merely of the commonplaces current among the rank and file, but of the arguments deliberately and solemnly advanced by the ablest of their controversialists—when all these things are taken into their consideration, I am inclined to hope that many of those who have been ensnared in the mesh will break loose from it and return to the safer pale of their Church's definite teaching, especially perhaps those who have been ensnared by the agency of their captive daughters—screwed up by the worrying zeal of their mistaught curates. I cannot but hope that they will be content to return to their Church's definite and distinct teaching instead of racking their brains, and racking the Prayer-Book, for indications of an intention on the part of our Reformers to leave loop-holes for a return to Mediævalism, which in the nature of the men they could not possibly have entertained.

It is possible that they will be content to accept the general spirit and current of religious thought which pervades the whole book, instead of catching up a single word here and a single word there, upon which this or that equivocal meaning can possibly be fastened, and allowing these to outweigh, or rather insisting that they must outweigh, line after line, passage after passage, page

after page, in which their views are not only ignored but disowned.

It is possible that they may bring themselves to be contented with the Church's recognition of a presbyteral and not a sacerdotal priesthood, to be regarded as presbyteral and not as sacerdotal priests, invested according to our Lord's commission to His Church with ministerial and not sacerdotal functions, authorised and commissioned and commanded to preach the Gospel of the remission of sins by setting forth God's unchangeable purpose and promise to forgive sins on repentance and faith; to declare by virtue of their ambassadorial authority, and not by any sacerdotal prerogative, that man's sins, whatever they may be, do not bind him; not to arrogate to themselves a power of absolute forgiveness of sins, which the Apostles themselves never dared to exercise, and which our Church never in any single case recognises. They may be content to tell the sinner that if he confesses his sins to God, He is faithful and just to forgive his sins, and not to represent confession to themselves as the condition of God's forgiveness, or represent it as identical with confession to God. They may content themselves with being the teachers, the trainers, the guides, the examples of their flocks, without binding even those who are not unwilling to be bound, in the iron grip of the confessional. They may be content with the influence which their teachings, their lives, their conversation, may be able to give them, without seeking to create or increase or confirm their influence by a knowledge of the secrets of each man's heart, extorted from him on the plea of its being the will and ordinance of God.

It is possible they may learn to content themselves, in some cases I might say, content themselves again with being the advisers, or if need be even the confidants of the weaker sort of minds, without being the lords of their minds, souls, and homes. They possibly may be content

to exercise the noble office of leading men, women, and children to seek and love the Lord with all that is within them, without making it an act of religion, a *sine qua non*, or even a condition of, or even a means to the higher religious life, that they should crush their wills and reasons, and thus instead of the living and breathing temples of the Holy Ghost, as God intended them to be, become merely religious automatons, moving and thinking as it pleased the priestly hand to pull the strings. It is possible that they may at length content themselves with a service in which, due regard is had to decency and order, and to the wisdom, or rather obligation of placing our common acts of prayer and praise before the eyes of men as matters of deep solemnity and importance, while yet the notion of worship offered to God is kept in due subordination to the more prominent features of the Christian scheme—a service in which we may seek by acts of real and personal confession and prayer, and accept by personal though common acts of humble faith, what God has given to us through His Son—a service in which even in outward guise we can approach God as being what we profess to be, miserable sinners, unworthy servants, and not a service clothed in the glories of triumphant music, or painting, or sculpture, or architecture—a service the motives to which are a sense of our own sins, a sense of our own danger of falling away, an earnest longing for God's promised mercy to forgive the one, and God's promised grace to avert the other, and not the prospect of passing an hour of excited feeling or æsthetic enjoyment, whichever it may be.

It is possible that they may be content with that which both our Bible and our Prayer-Book tell us—be content to believe that Christ has been pleased to communicate to the souls of those who receive the creatures of bread and wine, with faith and repentance, and a thankful remembrance of His death and passion; His personal

presence, without pretending to bring the mystery within the limits of human comprehension by turning it into a simple miracle wrought by thousands of priests at the same moment, without producing any visible or tangible change on the matter on which they profess to work it. They may be content to believe that Christ's minister, in the act of consecration, by doing what Christ commanded to be done, sets apart and consecrates God's creatures to this sacred purpose, without accepting the idolatrous notion that it is necessary for Christ thus conveying Himself to the soul, that He should, body, soul, divinity, be incorporated or 'impanated' or associated with the elements. They may be content with Christ thus giving Himself to them, without pretending to offer Him to God. They may be content with recognising Him as to be worshipped in their heart, without worshipping Him on the 'altar' as present in the bread and wine. In the acts and words of consecration, they may be content to recognise an obedience to God's commands, necessary, as our Church believes, to the ordinance. In the reception of the bread and wine they may be content to recognise the inestimable gift given by God to us, but not, in either the consecration or reception or both together, an act of worship given by us to God.

One might almost be inclined to hope that the lesson of this correspondence will not be thrown away on the men whom it most peculiarly concerns. One might almost venture to hope that the considerations which I have put into formal language in the foregoing pages—but which probably have been floating, vaguely or definitely, as the case may be, in the minds of thinking men—may have their weight with those to whom I cannot but think they furnish, in more ways than one, an occasion for serious reflection. It would be well if those who have hitherto followed somewhat blindly the guidance of leading men,

should realise for themselves and weigh with themselves whither it is that these leaders are leading them; what it is to which they are committing themselves; what notions they are admitting as sound premisses for Christian controversy, sound foundations for Christian doctrine; what elements they recognise as parts of the Christian scheme; what sort of scheme they are making Christianity to be; what sort of theology they are importing into our Church; what is the real meaning, what the tendency, what the result of the controversial commonplaces, the formulated arguments which they repeat, parrot-like, by rote. Take, for instance, the materialism on which, as I have shown, Canon Liddon professes his belief to turn. The principle *e nihilo nihil fit* it is not because it cannot be; it must be because it cannot be otherwise; it must exist in the breast, because otherwise it could not be received. Whither do these principles lead, but to infidelity and scepticism? Or, again, the theory that the Divine Being takes his abode in portions of inanimate matter, in thousands and ten thousands of pieces of bread, in millions and tens of millions of drops of wine every day. Whither does this lead, and what is it? As He is moved about in this inanimate matter, as human agency pleases to move it. What sort of God is this, that He is thus to be worshipped wherever He is thus moved about in their material shrines of bread and wine? Whither does this lead, and what is it?

These and such as these are the questions to which men who have attached themselves, or are thinking of attaching themselves to this following, should put to themselves, and demand an answer from their reason and their conscience—from their natural religious instincts and their acquired religious knowledge. And such questions may be multiplied as infinitely as the system with which they are dealing is manifold and varied. Every

peculiarity of Ritualism, as every peculiarity of Romanism, more or less, contains or implies a negation of some cardinal points of Christianity, the removal or absence of which makes the Gospel a different thing from that which Christ brought down from heaven; and over and over again it must be repeated that the dreams of the philosophers of Laputa were energies of soundest wisdom compared with the attempt to alter Christ's Gospel.

Again, one might almost be inclined to hope that the controversial champions of Ritualism may possibly be led to suspect the theories which have no better ground to rest upon than those which Canon Liddon has advanced in support of the theory of the Real Presence of Christ in the elements, God existing in matter to be worshipped therein as God—no ground in Revelation for that which nothing but the most distinct revelation could justify a rational being with natural religion in believing; nothing but a coarsely-spun deduction, redolent of infidelity; nothing but arguments—if it be not a misuse of the word to call them so—which crumble to pieces in the presence of facts, at the merest touch of logic; nothing to sanction them, save the image and superscription of the religious system which for many years of the world seized upon Christianity, and out of it carved and moulded an image of human mould; not, indeed, without some of the graces and the powers, some of the features of the Divine system breaking through the superstition and error in which it was encased and imprisoned, but marked still more unmistakably with the lineaments of degraded humanity; nothing to rest upon but that their theories form part of, are identical with, this image which man thus set up, an identity or resemblance which, instead of being a ground for their revival or acceptance, furnishes an overwhelming reason for exactly the reverse.

Would that these men would take these things into their serious consideration, not as partisans, not as controversialists, but as entrusted by God—by the talents and opportunities which God has given them—with the solemn duty of going right themselves, and the solemn duty of leading others right.

# NOTES.

[*Notes A, C, D, F, G, H contain extracts from the author's manuscript note-books; note B, extracts from Edward VI. Prayer Book*, 1549; *note E, extracts from the 'Treasury of Devotion,' marked by the author, probably for quotation. Note I, 'Canon Selwyn's Reply to the Memorial of the Three Deans on the Eastward Position.'*]

## NOTE A, PAGE 23.

### *SUPERSTITIONS.*

THE corruptions of Christianity did not grow up all at once They were some of them the inventions of dreamy visionaries, who, not content with what God had revealed, thought it piety to invent or adopt from heathenism certain notions about the invisible world which recommended themselves to their imaginations as either showing reverence towards God, or love towards the dead. These were adopted and intensified and multiplied by those who came after them—good, active, zealous men, anxious for success, impatient of failure—partly from the natural love of influence, partly because they were conscious that they were influencing men towards, at least, seeming good; and under this consciousness they were induced to use these suppositions and fictions as means of increasing their influence and impressing it upon the popular mind.

## NOTE B, PAGE 24.

'We commend unto thy mercy (O Lord) all other thy servants, which are departed hence from us with the sign of faith, and now do rest in the sleep of peace: grant unto them, we beseech thee, thy mercy and everlasting peace.'—*First Prayer Book of Edward VI.*, 1549.

## Note C, Page 28.

### *ON SACERDOTALISM.*

An argument for sacerdotalism is sometimes put forward as follows:—

'As my Father sent me, so send I you.' The Father sent Christ to be a Priest, therefore the Apostles and their successors are priests.

It is full of fallacies.

First, after the death of the original Apostles the number was never filled up. The Apostolic College disappears; therefore it does not follow that other orders of the ministry had the same powers and functions as the Apostles.

But next, *as* does not denote necessarily the *result* (nature), but the *mode* of the mission. It does not denote the result in some cases, therefore it is not universal; for Christ was sent to be a sacrifice, his Apostles were not; so that the promise must be taken with a limit—and this limit is in this point fixed by the word ἱερεύς never being applied to the Presbyters—though the word Priest is accidentally, in our modern phraseology, used for both Priest and Presbyter.

But, it may be said, 'Spiritual sacrifices are offered.' True, and for this purpose the whole Church is a Royal Priesthood, and each individual a Priest.

But this denomination, Royal Priesthood, does not exclude the possibility of a Sacerdotal Priesthood, for the Jews were called a nation of Priests, and yet had a Priesthood; true, but neither does it do away with the necessity for a definite institution of Priests [under the New Testament, as there was under the Old], but this is wholly wanting in the sense of sacrificers or ministrants at an altar. The commissions given to the Apostles, of baptizing and preaching, are not sacrificial functions. All we know is that the word Priest, which is a translation of ἱερεύς is, in our modern terminology, also a translation of πρεσβύτερος.

The transferred use of the Jewish and Pagan term Sacerdos to the Christian Presbyter, in consequence of the latter holding partially the position and performing the functions of the former, may be illustrated and defined by the use of the word βασιλεύς at Athens and Rex at Rome after the kings, to denote the priestly office which formerly appertained to the kingly dignity and function.

The essential part of the office ceased; the term was continued to express that which had been an adjunct of the office; so the essential part of the office of Sacerdos having ceased, the non-essential sense of it is used to denote that which remains to the ministers of the new covenant.

## NOTE D, PAGE 29.

## *FRAGMENTARY OBSERVATIONS ON THE DOCTRINE OF THE REAL PRESENCE.*

It seems to me that one of the lessons read us by the history of theology is, to guard against the incautious use of terms for rhetorical purposes, where the terms are such as easily in the progress of thought step into their proper meanings and introduce with them notions which found no place in the minds of those who originally used them.

### NO. 1, PAGE 29.

### *Real Presence.*

There is scarcely any question between us and the Mediævalists as to any actual change in the elements, but whether there is any revealed warrant for the presence of Christ in the unchanged elements. The Words of Institution themselves are compatible with either an actual change, or a symbolic presence, *i.e.* the elements having power, as symbols, to convey the Presence to the soul. This is St. Paul's view, 1 Cor. x. 16.

Do the early Fathers go further than to say that the bread and wine are the body and blood of Christ? Do they say that Christ is present in the bread and wine? In the Sacrament He is, inasmuch as He is communicated to the soul of the faithful recipient.

It would not be more unreasonable for a man to become a fire worshipper on the ground of the text 'Our God is a consuming fire,' than for a man to assert, on the ground of 'This is my body,' that God veils Himself in a piece of bread.

The Romanists profess to eat Christ actually as man; we profess to feed on Him spiritually as God.

In the words 'given,' 'taken,' and 'received,' the word 'given' does not refer to the Priest, but to God. The words used in our formularies when speaking of the Priest are *deliver* and *minister*.

The exact phrase in the Catechism is 'verily and indeed taken

and received,' not verily and indeed present. 'Given,' in the other formula (Art. XXVIII.) is the correlative of 'received.'

The Priest is not said to give, but to deliver (Rubric, after Consecration Prayer), as of something coming from another person, nor yet to give the *body*, but the Communion.

## No. 2, Page 38.

As if there were no degrees or standing-point between this theory and that in which, as I have already shown, the moderate Ritualist differs from the Romanist only in accident. I, as an old High Churchman, in common with all who have not outgrown the name, believe what I learned as a child from my Catechism, and what as a man I find in my Bible, that worthy communicants, receiving the consecrated creatures of bread and wine according to our Lord's institution (that is, having been solemnly taken, broken, and blessed, and being eaten and drunk) are partakers of that which, in the Primitive Church as well as in our own, are termed His Body and Blood. Nor do we believe, as the Ritualists imply, that this Sacrament is merely a lifeless sign, nor yet that the result to the recipient of the worthy reception of these sacramental elements is merely a moral effect on the inner man, but that Christ our Lord is received into the soul, and fed upon by faith in a way which must ever be a mystery to us—a mystery which no miracle can reduce to the level of our comprehension.

## No. 3, Page 38.

The Eucharist consists of all that our Lord did or bade them do: 1. A thankful presentation of the elements. 2. Blessing, &c. 3. Eating and drinking—together forming one act of praise. The doing what our Saviour did had the same effect which what He did had, viz. making the elements into the signs whereby the grace was conferred; just as the clay was made, by our Lord's treatment of it, into the channel by which sight was conveyed to the blind man. The means whereby we receive a thing are not identical with the thing itself.

'My word is life' means conveys life. Why may not 'This bread is my body' mean conveys my body?

## No. 4, Page 40.

The Ritualistic theory about the wicked is that Christ is in the elements, but they have not sufficient faith to receive Him.

In this, of course, they differ from the Romanist proper. The Church's theory is that the elements can convey the presence of Christ to the soul, but that the wicked have not the faith for receiving Him, or recognising experimentally the power in the elements.

## No. 5, Page 40.

Some of our divines, who deny unmistakably the presence of Christ in the elements, speak of His body being fed upon by the soul, substantially, &c.; which they explain away in various ways. They seem to have been anxious to retain the ancient phraseology, without admitting the error which Mediævalists have fastened on that phraseology; and from a fear of being supposed to deny what the old Fathers held and of asserting what the old Fathers did not hold, they seem to have sought to give the words 'verily and indeed' a verbal sense which the old Fathers would never have given them and never did give them.

It is possible that His sinless humanity, abstracted from all matter, may in the reception of what is termed His body and blood, be incorporated in our humanity, and thus His body be said to be substantially present to our souls.

It may again be that the passion of His crucified body may be herein appropriated to us as a personal possession, and that in this sense His body may be said to be substantially present to us. To such a proposition sense can object nothing, nor yet reason; but I confess such notions seem to me to be somewhat rationalistic in their method, using reason, that is, where it is excluded. It is better to take the words 'verily and indeed' as asserting the reality of what is communicated to us, as opposed to a mere imagination, or to any effect or feeling produced in the inner man.

## No. 6, Page 41.

### *Mediævalistic Sophisms.*

The Mediævalists pretend that in the words '*so* to eat the flesh of Thy dear Son,' &c., '*that* we may be partakers of His most blessed body and blood,' it is implied that there is a way of eating it without partaking of His body and blood.

But the words 'so,' 'such,' 'that' are not always or even generally modifications of the verb (eat in this way, rather than in some other), but apply to the whole sentence, expressing the rela-

tion of antecedent and consequent, cause or effect, between the two clauses. Thus 'grant us such love towards Thee, that we, loving Thee above all things, may obtain,' &c., does not mean that there is some other sort of love for God which would not be thus blessed. 'So make haste to help us in this world, that we may live with Thee,' &c., does not mean that there is some other sort of the Divine help we are praying for, which is not followed by life everlasting, but simply represents the Divine help and Divine love as necessary antecedents of the blessings in the other clause; so, to argue that the passage before us implies that there is some other way of eating His body, leading to condemnation and not to life, has no logical foundation in the ordinary rules of interpretation; it does not necessarily have this force—it might have it: whether it has or not depends on the subject matter, and to argue that it has this force because the subject matter admits of it, after having adduced this force as the solitary proof that the subject matter does admit of it, is one of the *petitiones principii* in which the Mediæval school delight.

The way in which the Mediævalists insist upon a possible sense of a word or a passage, and make it weigh against all the actual proof to the contrary, is as if a jury were to give their verdict on a loose point of circumstantial evidence against all the facts on the other side.

## No. 7, Page 42.

The notion of spiritually feeding on the body and blood of Christ does not, in the opinion of the Church, of itself necessitate the notion of Christ's presence being actually and really communicated to us; for there are other ways of feeding spiritually on Christ, which have no such sacrificial efficacy. The doctrine of the Real Presence of Christ in the soul by virtue of the faithful reception of the holy elements rests on the text 'He dwelleth in Me and I in Him.'

If anyone asks, 'What is the Holy Communion?' the answer is plain. It is what Christ made a source of spiritual life—what St. Paul declared to be the Communion of His body and blood. The public remembrance of His death—the public renewal of the profession of belief in His death.

The Mediævalists urge the words 'the body of Christ' is only given, taken, and received after a heavenly and spiritual manner as proving that the presence thus spiritually given must be held to be in the elements whereby they are given. The fallacy lies in

treating the word *whereby* as if it were *wherein*. It is not true that an effect cannot be conveyed, that a state cannot be produced, that a principle cannot be infused, unless it is *in* that whereby it is conveyed. If it were true, then a new birth unto righteousness would be in the water—for grace is given to the baptized by the baptizer when the water is sprinkled and the words spoken—death would be in the poison whereby death is conveyed to the person poisoned.

No. 8, PAGE 43.

What the Ritualists call our Lord's supernatural body might be termed His metaphysical body—subjective body. Our Lord's body was not either supernatural, or metaphysical, or subjective.

It sometimes seems as if by 'supernatural body' they meant a body supernaturally localised by an act of God's power, which does not neutralise the tests of its being a real body.

'*Me* ye have not always.' This refers to His body, to which the woman had been showing special honour for His burial, and is clearly against the notion of the Romanists, that they have His body in their tabernacle.

No. 9, PAGE 29.

The supposition or assumption that the Deity is present in any matter does not prevent the adoration of that matter being idolatry. Is it not the adoration theory that, the bread being the body of Christ, it ought to be worshipped, as implying the presence of the Divinity of Christ?

The adoration of matter as containing God is idolatry. The adoration of God as existing in matter is so too.

The Fathers never say, 'Adore Christ present in the bread.'

No. 10.

A distinguished theologian of our time, writing to me, used the following words:—

'Neither the Church of England, nor the Church of Rome, nor the Church of Scotland, has a uniform and perfectly consistent doctrine on the Sacraments.'

It seems to me that this needs modifying. It is true as regards the positive doctrine, and as regards the opinions expressed by divines. It is not true as regards negative doctrine, and the view expressed by the Church formularies. The Church of England is definite as to what it does not hold, *e.g.* Transubstantiation,

External Presence, Sacrifice of Christ, Adoration, and in the positive phase confines herself to the words of Scripture, guarded as it were by the negations. Individual divines, trying to define the positive side, have doubtless said things which are inconsistent with this, and with each other, and with themselves; but this does not bind the Church, nor affect the duty of those who accept the office of teachers in the Church. It has struck me that the divines who thus transgress on the positive side, mostly the Laudian School, depended a good deal on the negative phase, to prevent their expressions being misunderstood.

It is easy to say what a thing is not, very clearly and definitely—very difficult to say what such a mystery is; and those who try to do so will fall into inconsistencies with the negative phase, and with themselves, especially if their theological tendency is to go as near to the negatives as possible.

## NOTE E.

### *PASSAGES FROM THE 'TREASURY OF DEVOTION.'*

### No. 1.

PAGE 6.—Soul of Christ, sanctify me!
Body of Christ, save me!
Blood of Christ, inebriate me!
Water from the Side of Christ, wash me!
Passion of Christ, strengthen me!
O Good Jesus, hear me!
Within Thy Wounds hide me!

PAGE 40.— . . . Grant us, we beseech Thee, so to *venerate the Sacred Mysteries of thy Body and Blood*, &c.

PAGE 84.—*Hail, most Holy Flesh* of Christ!

PAGE 85.—I adore Thee, O Lord my God, whom I now *behold veiled beneath these earthly forms*. Prostrate I adore Thy Majesty, and because, sinful and unworthy as I am, I cannot honour Thee as I ought, I unite myself with *Thy Saints and Angels in their more perfect adoration*.

PAGE 110.—Jesu, our Wonderful God, who vouchsafest to be Present upon the *Altar when the Priest pronounces the words of Consecration*.

PAGE 111.—Who . . . coverest Thy Glory under the familiar forms of Bread and Wine, and so givest Thyself to miserable sinners.

. . . Jesu, our Merciful God, who concealing the brightness of Thy Majesty under these low and humble Veils, invitest us to approach unto Thee. . . .

PAGE 113.—That, as by faith we adore *Thee Present beneath the Sacred Veils*, we may hereafter behold Thee Face to face.

PAGE 118.—Humbly I adore Thee, hidden Deity, which beneath these symbols are concealed from me.

No. 2.

*Sacrifice.*

PAGE 71.—I, an unworthy sinner, desire to offer up to Thee, by the hands of this Thy Minister, the *mystical and commemorative Sacrifice* of the Body and Blood of Thy Son Jesus Christ, in *union with the One True Sacrifice* which He offered up to Thee upon the Cross. I desire to offer It first, for Thine own honour, praise, adoration, and glory, &c. . . . fourthly, for obtaining pardon and remission of all my sins, and those of all others for whom I ought to pray; and lastly, . . . *and that such as are dead in the Lord may rest in peace and hope*, and rise in glory; . . . Grant, O Lord, that we may be truly prepared for the *offering of this great Sacrifice* to Thee this day . . .

Prayer for the Priest: . . . The Lord accept this Holy *Sacrifice at thy hands* . . .

PAGE 85.—Accept this Pure, *this Holy Sacrifice at the hands of Thy Priest*, in union with that All Holy Sacrifice which Thy Beloved Son, &c. . . .

PAGE 91.— . . . and may this Holy Sacrifice which I, though unworthy, have joined in offering up in Thy sight, be accepted by Thy Divine Majesty, and through *Thy mercy plead the pardon of my sins and those of all for whom it has been offered* . . .

PAGE 113.—That by this adorable Sacrifice we may acknowledge our perpetual dependence upon Thee . . .

No. 3.

*Of the Saints.*

PAGE 20.—May the intercessions of the holy Mother of God, of the Prophets, of the holy Apostles, of the Martyrs, help me! May all the Saints and Elect of God pray for me. . . .

PAGE 39.—O Lord, we beseech Thee, mercifully regard our infirmities, and do Thou avert from us all the evils which we justly deserve, for the intercession of Thy Son, and in Him of all Thy Saints. . . .

## NOTE F, PAGE 43.

### *ON THE SACRIFICE.*

A sacrifice is not an act of acceptance of God's mercy, but of causing it. It is analogous to Moses striking the rock.

In our Service there is—

1. A Sacrifice of thanksgiving, as (*a*) for fruits of the earth; (*b*) for the gift of Christ's body and blood conveyed by reception of the elements.

2. A commemoration.

There are two mistakes in the Romanist notion of the Eucharist, which the Ritualists seem inclined to follow.

1. The nature thereof as a sacrificial offering.

2. The result as intercessory or impetrative; neither of them find any sanction from our Church.

It is said possibly, 'the offering of the Eucharistic sacrifice is according to God's will.' What if it is not? In what position does it place him who offers it?

'Draw near with faith;' and do what? Not plead the sacrifice of Christ; not worship God in the bread; but 'take this Holy Sacrament to your comfort.'

A daily sacrifice for the application of the results of Christ's sacrifice is a return to Judaism; a formal sacrifice for the getting rid of our sins is a return to Paganism.

The theory, so to say, of the Christian sacrifice is not that Christ puts into our hands a price to be paid by us to God, so as to reconcile Him to us, but that He has paid the price to God *for us*; so that all we have to do is to accept the pardon and privileges purchased, so as to reconcile ourselves to Him.

The Jewish sacrifices were expiatory and propitiatory, as being ordained by God till the true sacrifice should be performed; the sacrifice had its only effect in these forerunners; but the sacrifice being performed, then its effects exist *ipso facto*; it needs no commemoration or repetition to make it effectual.

## Note G, Page 53.

### *ON A SECULAR COURT BEING JUDGE IN SPIRITUAL MATTERS.*

The following is extracted from one of the wiseacre letters with which the papers are filled :—

'My own opinion is, that the question is fast becoming this—whether our Liturgy be primitive or not? and I fear the question may be decided by the highest legal tribunal in the negative.'

Here is the usual misconception of the functions of the Ecclesiastical Courts, whether Arches or Privy Council. The question before them is not as to whether this or that teaching is theologically true or false; whether this or that point of practice is primitive or Mediæval; but whether this or that teaching or ritual is or is not in agreement with the doctrines and practices of the Church of England, as it is embodied in our recognised formularies and confessions. This consideration really destroys the plausible objection against a secular Court being judge of spiritual matters.

All that the Privy Council does is to interpret what the law of the Church is, and to give the Church the aid of the law in enforcing it on the clergy. St. Peter had never accepted the aid of the law, and therefore the plea whereby he expressed his determination to disobey the civil power cannot be used by those who have accepted their position and sphere for the exercise of their office from the civil powers. Let them resign their office, and then they may use the plea.

## Note H, Page 60.

### *RUBRICS.*

The line taken by the Mediævalists (and patronised by Bishop Selwyn), is that the Mediævalists cannot be prevented from introducing novelties, in spite of the Rubrics hitherto observed, without the Low Church being compelled to carry out every Rubric, whether obsolete or not. The question is really not one of the observance

of Rubrics, but whether the Mediævalists shall be allowed by the Bishops to re-Mediævalise the Church, in defiance of certain Rubrics expressly framed to meet the retention of these Mediævalisms.

## Note I, Page 85.

### *CANON SELWYN AND THE THREE DEANS, ON THE 'EASTWARD POSITION OF THE MINISTER.'*

A Memorial in favour of the Mass Vestments, &c., has been issued by the Deans of York, St. Paul's, and Manchester, and has been widely circulated among the clergy throughout the country. It has called forth a reply from the Rev. Canon Selwyn, D.D., Margaret Professor of Divinity, Cambridge, and Canon of Ely.

Both documents deserve the careful attention of the reader.

#### *Memorial.*

'We, the undersigned Bishops and Priests of the Church of England, desire to express our solemn conviction that any attempt to enforce a rigid uniformity in the performance of Divine worship would tend rather to confusion than to the peace of the Church and the edification of the flocks committed to our charge.

'Further, we desire to submit that it is expedient, in order to allay existing dissensions, that a canon should be enacted, or other steps taken, to protect clergymen from interference in respect of the position which they may conscientiously feel it their duty to take at the holy table during the Communion Service; and that some liberty may likewise be conceded for the adoption of a distinctive Eucharistic dress, and of other ornaments and forms not inconsistent with the spirit of the Church of England, at early celebrations of the Holy Communion, or under such other limitations as Convocation may think fit to recommend, in cases where the minister and congregation may desire the same.'

#### *Reply.*

'Cambridge, May 22, 1874.

'My Very Reverend Brethren,

'I am honoured by your selecting me as one "known for attachment to Anglican principles," but those principles forbid my signing the paper you have sent me.

'With the first part I entirely concur, and have published my

conviction that in Divine worship not "rigid uniformity," but real unity is to be desired. *In necessariis unitas; in non necessariis libertas; in omnibus caritas.*

'From the second part I am constrained to dissent. You submit "that a canon should be enacted, or other steps taken, to protect clergymen from interference in respect of the position which they may feel it their duty to take at the holy table during the Communion Service."

'This involves a point (1) subversive of real unity; (2) contrary to Anglican principles.

'1. Subversive of real unity.

'It is notorious that the position, facing eastward, is the expression of the belief that the consecrated minister performs a sacrificial act; "by it is signified and expressed the solemn oblation and sacrificial presentation made by the celebrant, after the example of Christ."

'There can be no real unity while some of the clergy hold and express this belief, and others celebrate the Lord's Supper as "a continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ," and a communion of his body and blood.

'2. Contrary to Anglican principles.

'Before the Reformation, the office of Mass implied the offering up of a sacrifice; *Hostia*, the Host. The words of the office and the position of the priest, *stans ante medium altaris*, expressed this.

'At the Reformation (1549) the office was changed into a Communion of both kinds; the order speaks of Christ's "one oblation once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world;" it speaks of "our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving;" and "here we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto thee."

'In pursuance of this change, altars were removed, tables placed in the churches; it was ordered (1552), "there shall be no celebration of the Lord's Supper except there be a good number to communicate with the priest, according 'to his discretion;'" and the position of the priest was changed from

| '1549. | to | 1552. |
|---|---|---|
| '. . . *standing humbly afore the middes of the Altar* . . . | | . . . *standing at the north side of the Table* . . . |

'The words of the office, and the position of the minister, declare the mind of the Church of England, that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is not a sacrifice of Christ then offered.

'At the Revision of 1661 came the change in the rubric before the Consecration, from

| '1552. | to | 1661. |
|---|---|---|
| *'Then the Priest standyng up shall saie as followeth.* | | *'When the Priest, standing before the Table, hath so ordered the Bread and Wine, that he may with the more readiness and decency break the Bread before the people, and take the cup into his hands, he shall say the prayer of Consecration as followeth.* |

'Now, is it maintained that this rubric, coming after the Savoy Conference, approved and subscribed by the whole Convocation, and sanctioned by Parliament, was intended as a reversal of the rubrics of 1552, which fixed the minister's place throughout at the north side?

'If so, why did not the general practice of the Church follow that reversal?

'Or is it alleged that it was intended to leave the minister free to take which of the two positions he might think right—*i.e.* to return to the direction of the Mass office in this point, retained in 1549; or to follow the rule of the reformed office of 1552?

'Then let the rubric of 1661 be considered and revised, that the Church of England may be clearly determined: *Sacrifice* or *Sacrament?*

'I cannot but feel that the position which hides from the communicants the breaking of the bread, the blessing of the cup, and the minister's own partaking; and makes the words of the office less audible; is a departure from the example of our Lord at the Last Supper, and at Emmaus, where "He was known of them in the breaking of the bread;" makes a mystery where the Church ordains a public witness and showing forth of the Lord's death before the people; and casts doubt on the belief of the Church of England expressed in her Reformed office.

'I am, my very Rev. Brethren,

'Yours very faithfully,

'WILLIAM SELWYN,

*'Canon of Ely Cathedral.*

'To the Very Rev. the Deans of York, St. Paul's, and Manchester.'

# ANALYSIS OF CAPEL-LIDDON CORRESPONDENCE.

I. Article in the *Times* (24 Dec. 1874) referring to Mr. Capel's charges of Romish tendencies in Ritualism.

II. Dr. Liddon to the Editor of the *Times*, Dec. 24–25, 1874, repelling Mr. Capel's charges in four particulars: the doctrine of the Incarnation, the Real Presence, Absolution, and Reverence for the Saints.

III.–VII. Mr. Savory, Dr. Liddon, 'An English Dignitary,' and Mr. W. A. Scott Robinson on the meaning of the words in the 28th Article:—'The Body of Christ is given only after an heavenly and spiritual manner.'

VIII. Mr. Capel quoting 'Vade Mecum' on Reverence to the Saints; 'Treasury of Devotion,' 'Hymnal Noted,' and 'Vade Mecum,' on the Real Presence; 'Treasury of Devotion' and 'Vade Mecum,' on the need of Absolution; and Dr. Neale's Catechetical Notes on Transubstantiation and Confession (Jan. 7–8, 1875).

IX. Canon Liddon defending 'Vade Mecum's' Invocation of Saints and Prayer for the Dead, and apologising for expressions used by Dr. Neale in the 'Hymnal Noted,' about the Real Presence, as well as for direction in 'Vade Mecum,' about Confession (Jan. 8–9, 1875).

X. 'An English Dignitary' asserting that Canon Liddon has 'surrendered' on the essential point in what is known as the doctrine of the Real Presence, 'apparently without perceiving it.' (Jan. 1875.)

XI. Mr. Savory repeating former references to Jeremy Taylor and Hooker, and quoting the Primate's words: 'There is a large minority of the clergy who would subvert the doctrines of the Reformation.' (Jan. 8–9, 1875.)

XII. Article in the *Times* (Jan. 9, 1875) reviewing the controversy and exposing the suspicious character of Dr. Liddon's advocacy—his vehemence against other errors, his scrupulous tenderness for Ritualistic Superstitions.

XIII. Canon Liddon in reply to 'An English Dignitary' (No. X.), Mr. Savory (No. XI.), and the Article in the *Times* (No. XII.), hoping to close the controversy. (Jan. 9–11.)

XIV. 'Another English Dignitary' cavilling at Mr. Savory's interpretation of the words 'after a spiritual manner.' (Jan. 8.)

XV. 'A Churchwarden' appealing to Scripture against Mr. Savory, 'the wonderfully clear words of Richard Hooker,' and the 25th, 28th, and 29th Articles. (Jan. 9–11.)

XVI. Mr. Capel reiterating his charges against the Ritualistic clergy—quoting the 'Night Hours of the Church,' 'Devotions, edited by a Committee of Clergymen, 26th thousand,' and 'Hymnal Noted,' and showing the inadmissibility of Canon Liddon's explanations. (Jan. 11–12.)

XVII. Mr. Carter defending the expression 'Bread into His Flesh is turned,' for which Canon Liddon had apologised on his behalf. (Jan. 11.)

XVIII. Canon Liddon renewing self-defence against Mr. Capel, and acknowledging that some things he quotes are indefensible. He promises to promote the excision of the *fungi* pointed out by Mr. Capel, and ridicules the notion that Dr. Pusey is 'a Ritualistic Leader.' Repudiates the charge of being himself the leader of a party—quotes Andrews and Casaubon. (Jan. 12–13.)

XIX. 'An English Dignitary' setting forth the doctrine of the Church concerning the Holy Communion against Canon Liddon. (Jan. 13.)

XX. Mr. Droop on Bishop Gheste's Letter to Cecil, concerning Article XXVIII., which had been quoted by Canon Liddon (No. XIII.) as 'determining the true sense' of the Article. Quotes Nowell's Catechism in proof of the doctrine of the Church of England in the time of Queen Elizabeth and James I. (Jan. 12.)

XXI. 'Oxoniensis' on Canon Liddon's indirect attack on Archbishop Tait (No. XIII.). (Jan. 11–13.)

XXII. Crushing Article in the *Times*, reviewing the previous controversy. (Jan. 13.)

XXIII. Canon Liddon replying to 'Oxoniensis' and 'An English Dignitary.' Evades the arguments of the latter, and maintains that the Consecration Prayer in the Communion Service implies a Presence —*extra usum Sacramenti*. (Jan. 13–14.)

XXIV. Mr. Carter's second letter defending the expression 'Bread into His Flesh is turned,' and citing several Patristic authorities.

XXV. 'Ridley Redivivus' quoting several Ritualistic writings in confirmation of Mr. Capel's position.

XXVI. Mr. P. V. Smith urging the Church's doctrine of Baptism against Canon Liddon's of the Presence *extra usum Sacramenti* in the Holy Communion. (Jan. 12.)

XXVII. Author of 'Vade Mecum' replying to Mr. Capel's charges in detail. (Jan. 15.)

XXVIII. Mr. Savory referring to Bishop Wilberforce's last words in the House of Lords, and quoting an interpretation given by him some years before of Article XXVIII. (Jan. 14.)

XXIX. Mr. Capel in reply to Canon Liddon, quoting the Canon's own book, 'Priest to the Altar,' and asserting that his 'objective Presence' means a 'local Real Presence.' Concludes his part of the correspondence with other quotations proving the Romish doctrines held and taught in Ritualistic schools. (Jan. 15.)

XXX. Canon Liddon's final reply to Mr. Capel. (Jan. 16.)

XXXI. Mr. Capel making a verbal correction in his last letter.

XXXII. Prebendary Irons quoting Aquinas against Mr. Capel's identification of 'objective' with 'local' presence.

[*The foregoing pages were suggested by the following Articles and Letters to the Editor of the 'Times,' which appeared in December* 1874 *and January* 1875. *They are here annexed, not only for convenience of reference, but also on account of their intrinsic importance, and their bearing on the whole of the Ritualistic controversy.*]

## I.

*Article in the 'Times,' December* 24, 1874.

A Reply to Mr. Gladstone's Political Expostulation has just been issued in the form of a pamphlet by Monsignor Capel. The title-page, however, informs us that it is reprinted, with additions, 'from the *Weekly Register and Catholic Standard*.' It was therefore written rather for the consolation of Catholics than for the conviction of heretics, and we are disposed to think, after perusing it, that Monsignor Capel chose his audience with discretion. He is, no doubt, a very good judge of the kind of pleading which is effectual with his own flock, and of the strength of the mental food which they are capable of digesting. We do not doubt, accordingly, that the kind of milk provided in this pamphlet will be very acceptable to those to whom it is addressed; but we are really surprised to find that a preacher who enjoys such a reputation in his own communion is so totally incapable of appreciating the issue before him, or of grappling with an argument. Mr. Gladstone lays himself open to some retorts on minor points, and on these Monsignor Capel shows himself at home. But these are the trivialities of a great controversy, and, except to please Roman Catholics, were scarcely worth notice, and certainly not worth being placed in the front of a 'Reply.' There is more value in some interesting and candid remarks in which Monsignor Capel discusses Mr. Gladstone's statement that the majority of 'converts or captives' are to be found among women and among the wealthier classes. He tells us that 'at least 2,000 persons' are received every year in England into the Roman Catholic Church; and of these, as he says, perhaps not more than a dozen are ever heard of beyond their own immediate circle. Canon Oakley states, as the result of his experience, 'that the wealthy converts are to the poor in the proportion of one to a hundred;' and, bearing in mind

the admirable organisation which the Roman Catholic Church possesses for work among the poor, it seems not improbable that Mr. Gladstone has in this respect overstated his case. As to the total relative change in the proportions of Catholics and Protestants of late years, Monsignor Capel does not profess to know exactly how the case stands. 'Some priests of experience among us are of opinion that, taking one thing with another, our numerical gain is not considerable.' But, be this as it may, he has ground for asserting that in general position and organisation the Roman Catholic Church has considerably advanced. One other preliminary statement deserves notice. Monsignor Capel is obliging enough 'distinctly to state' that such persons as Dr. Pusey, Dr. Liddon, and Mr. Machonochie, are not 'intentionally moving towards the See of Rome.' But, on the other hand, 'if we look not to intentions but to facts, then we are obliged to declare that beyond doubt these men are unintentionally, but not the less assuredly, disseminating several doctrines of the Roman Church.' The inherent power, he adds, of these 'truths' cannot do otherwise than produce fruit; 'and our experience bears witness to the fact that a steady and ever-increasing current has set in from the Ritualistic party to the Catholic Church.' Such experience is a very good test of the real tendency of the extreme High Church School.

But, passing from these subsidiary matters, what has Monsignor Capel to say in answer to the charge that a Roman Catholic has 'forfeited' his mental and moral freedom, and has placed his loyalty and civil duty at the mercy of another? He indulges in a great many assertions in contradiction of this allegation, and he quotes a great many assurances, especially from ardent converts, to the effect that they were very happy, and were quite unconscious of their servitude. What, however, have such utterances to do with the question? Mr. Gladstone himself guarded against such a sophism when he preferred to state that converts had 'forfeited,' rather than that they had surrendered, their freedom. The question is not whether the birds are in a large and airy cage, but whether there is somebody who is able to shut the door whenever he pleases, and to limit the extent of their flights. As to Monsignor Capel's own assertions, he really must excuse our saying, without any personal disrespect to him, that they are too preposterous to be seriously dealt with. For instance, at the very outset, desiring to enlighten his readers on the contents of the Vatican decrees, he states 'that those decrees treat of God the Creator, of revelation, of faith,' &c.; 'but of civil allegiance and the rela-

tions of Church to State not a word, directly or indirectly, is said.'

Had he stopped at 'directly,' we might have passed the statement; but when he adds 'or indirectly,' the most respectful supposition we can entertain is that he fancied himself in the pulpit. But the most astonishing of all his statements is his account of the 'new political system' which has been introduced in place of the Catholic civilisation which has been discarded by the greater part of European nations. This system, he says—and we do positively assure our readers that we are quoting his own words—'emancipates power not only from the authority of the Church or the Pope, as the father and chief of the Christian republic, but from all the restraints of the moral order. The new political system holds itself entirely independent both of religion and morality, and recognises in the political order no law for Sovereigns or people but reasons of State or simple expediency. It rejects all moral basis for society, and founds politics on the simple law of force. It rests on the principle that might gives right, or that right is always on the side of the strongest, and takes it for granted that the weak are always in the wrong. This system,' he concludes, 'was always more or less acted on in practice; but it is now adopted in principle, deliberately and theoretically, by both Sovereigns and people.' If ever Uncle Toby's reply of a loud, prolonged whistle was an appropriate relief to one's amazement, it would be after reading this statement, with its concluding sentence. Monsignor Capel, as we said at the outset, has written for Catholics. We are writing for persons in possession of their ordinary senses, and we must leave them to wonder in what unheard of world Monsignor Capel's unfortunate lot has been cast.

After this, perhaps, our readers' appetite for Monsignor Capel's argument will be somewhat dulled; but they will not, perhaps, be surprised to learn that, in the end, it is reduced to a very frank and innocent re-assertion of the precise principles of which Mr. Gladstone accused it. He devotes a great deal of space to the question, which may be interesting to members of his communion, whether the Infallibility of the Pope was really a new dogma, and he is very careful to state the exact meaning of an *ex cathedrâ* definition. We shall not intervene in a controversy on which Roman Catholic theologians themselves have disagreed. But at last, after two-thirds of the Pamphlet are over, Monsignor Capel does come to the question of 'Civil Allegiance,' on which, as he had observed, 'not a word, either directly or indirectly, is said' in the Vatican decrees. We will leave Monsignor Capel to speak

on this point for himself. He proceeds to explain, in a succe
of formally numbered paragraphs, 'the principles on which
allegiance of Catholics is founded,' and one of them stan
follows :—'The Spiritual Power is not only pre-eminent o
count of its nobler end and its greater empire, but also in its
nature; for having the supreme authority to instruct indivi
and societies of men in the law of God, and to judge o
morality and justice of all actions, it is manifest this power i
only exercised directly in its own sphere, but likewise indi
*over the actions* of the other two Powers. In this sense, then
supreme, and the other Powers are subordinate to it.' Again
Church does exercise indirectly her power *over*, though not *i*
State, by taking cognizance of the morality of its laws and
The italics are Monsignor Capel's, and they relieve us of the
sity of pointing out the significance of these candid assura
If anything were needed to illustrate them, it would be fou
his not less innocent remarks on the deposing Power. Mr.
stone's assertion that this Power has been exerted by Popes
Councils is, he says, freely admitted by Catholics. But he
ceeds to explain its nature, and, after quoting authorities, he
formally enunciates the result as follows :—'That the Pope is
*divino* supreme Judge of Christendom in all things spiritual,
consequently, that he has the power of pronouncing on the
character of any action done by individuals or nations; th
consequence of this divine and indefeasible right, in the days
all the States of Europe were Catholic, they appealed to the
to be the Supreme Judge and Arbiter in civil matters. Thu
the Holy See acquire a right over the nations *jure humano*.'
says Monsignor Capel, 'the direct and indirect powers which
acquired *jure divino* still continue in full vigour;' but that
was given by human right can alter. As a matter of fact,
Powers of Europe no longer appeal to the Pope to compose
differences; his office of arbiter is at end, or, at least, in abeya
There is only one mode of expression which could convey
meaning of these statements more plainly. The Pope, says
signor Capel, ought to have a deposing power, but nations
to let him exercise it. 'Nations,' says Monsignor Capel, 'seek
arbiters or resort to force of arms to settle their disputes.
will not affirm that the world is the happier or the better fo
change.' We cannot congratulate the Roman Catholic autho
in England on their skill in selecting their controversial champ

## II.

*Canon Liddon repelling M. Capel's charges.*

SIR,—It is, as you observe, very obliging of Monsignor Capel distinctly to state that I and others whom he names are not 'intentionally moving towards the See of Rome.' As far as I am concerned, the Monsignor has had private as well as other opportunities of ascertaining this fact; and, when he proclaims it, I thank him for a candour to which some controversialists who do not belong to the Church of Rome are not always equal.

But you proceed to quote Monsignor Capel as saying that 'these men are unintentionally, but not the less avowedly, disseminating several doctrines of the Roman Church.' In the hope of discovering what these doctrines may be, I have referred to the 'Reply' to Mr. Gladstone, and I find the Monsignor writing at page 6 :—

'Our doctrines of the Incarnation, the Real Presence, of the need of Absolution, and of reverence for the Saints, are now to them as household words.'

1. The doctrine of the Incarnation as held by the Church of England is stated in the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, and in the second of the Thirty-Nine Articles. So far as I know, it differs in no respect from the doctrine of the Incarnation as held by the Roman Catholic Church. But we did not learn this doctrine from the Church of Rome, nor is it any peculiarity of her Creed.

2. Believing as we do that 'the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper,' we necessarily believe in the real presence of Christ in that Sacrament, since unless He was really present, He cannot be taken and received at all. But we reject the Roman explanation of His presence. Transubstantiation 'cannot be proved by Holy Writ,' and, as annihilating the outward part, it 'overthroweth the nature' of a Sacrament.

We believe, too, that God has given 'power and commandment to His ministers to declare and pronounce to his people, being penitent, the absolution and remission of their sins.' At his general Ordination in St. Paul's, last Sunday, the Bishop of London said to each candidate for the priesthood, 'Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God, now com-

mitted unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive they are forgiven.' And when a sick man humbly and heartily desires it, every priest of the Church of England is instructed to say, 'By His (our Lord Jesus Christ's) authority committed unto me, I absolve thee from all thy sins.' Accordingly, taking this public language of the Church of England in its natural sense, we do believe in the reality of absolution. But the Church of England leaves it entirely to the discretion of her individual members to seek this absolution or not, while the Church of Rome makes private confession and absolution obligatory on all communicants. We do not, therefore, hold the Roman Catholic 'doctrine' of the 'need of absolution.' As to 'reverence for the Saints,' the Church of England has appointed special days for honouring the memory of Our Lord's Virgin Mother, of His Twelve Apostles, of the Apostle of the Gentiles and his companion, of His forerunner, of His first martyr, and of the innocent children who were slain by Herod. She devotes one day in the year, the 1st of November, to celebrating the memories of all the Saints collectively. Clearly this practice implies high reverence, since human society does nothing on a similar scale for its great men. But the Roman 'doctrine of reverence for the Saints' includes the practice of invoking them, and not unfrequently of addressing to them prayers, which, in point of form, are undistinguishable from those we address to God. As I never invoked any saint in my life, Monsignor Capel would consider the 'reverence' I pay them very inadequate, and I should equally insist that his doctrine of reverence for the saints was practically a very different thing from mine.

It is impossible, therefore, to admit that we are 'unintentionally, but not the less assuredly, disseminating several doctrines of the Roman Church.' If in anything that I have written or said publicly I have ever done this, I shall be glad to be set right; but I do not concede that doctrines which are common to the Churches of Rome and England are, in Monsignor Capel's sense, Roman doctrines. The old retort, 'If you believe in the Trinity, you ought to believe in the Pope,' is a trick of controversy which has been sufficiently exposed and ought to be abandoned. Certainly, I plead guilty to believing the Athanasian Creed in its integrity, and all of those precious words in the sacramental and occasional services of the Church of England which are now denounced as 'Sacerdotalism.' But, at any rate, this belief, however unpopular just at present, is morally respectable in a clergyman; nor can I allow that it has a 'real tendency' to make converts to

the Church of Rome. The Church of Rome finds its most efficient ally, not in 'the extreme High Church School,' not even in its own highly-disciplined corps of proselyters, but in the restless, faithless, fatal policy which, at one moment would rid us of our Creeds, at another would ignore our Orders, at a third would invite a Parliament, consisting of men of any or no religious belief, to regulate our worship of Almighty God. Too many, alas! have been my opportunities of knowing how these things tell upon the most earnest and devoted members of the Church of England; but I must not enter upon a subject which would carry me beyond the purpose of this letter. After the liberty which has been taken with my name, I shall trust, Sir, to your wonted justice for an opportunity of explaining myself thus far.

I am, Sir, your most obedient servant,

H. P. LIDDON.

3, Amen Court, St. Paul's, Dec. 24.

## III.

SIR,—Dr. Liddon, in his letter to *The Times* of the 24th inst., by omitting the restrictive words in the sentence quoted from the 28th Article, reverses the meaning; no doubt unintentionally. The words are: 'The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper *only after a heavenly and spiritual manner*.' The italicised words are omitted in Dr. Liddon's letter.

With these agrees our beautiful Communion Service: 'Take and eat this (the bread) in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on Him in thy heart, by faith, with thanksgiving.' Bishop Jeremy Taylor says: 'They, the Roman Catholics, mean by spiritually, after the manner of a spirit.' 'We mean by spiritually, present to our spirits only.'

Between these two probably rests the whole question of Ritualism.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

JOSEPH SAVORY.

Buckhurst Park, Sunning Hill, Dec. 30.

## IV.

*Canon Liddon on the 28th Article.*

SIR,—When discussing a statement of Monsignor Capel's, I quoted only so much of the formularies of the English Church as was necessary for my immediate purpose. I had to show that

certain doctrines which I understood the Monsignor to claim as peculiarities of the Roman Catholic Creed had a recognised place in the English Prayer Book, although, if we accept the Divine Incarnation, in a sense different from the Roman sense. Accordingly, as regards the Holy Communion, it was enough to say that, on the one hand, the Church Catechism teaches the Real Presence, while the Articles, on the other, reject Transubstantiation. There was no more reason for quoting that proposition of Article 28 to which your correspondent, Mr. Savory, appeals, than for quoting several other propositions which bear with at least equal effect and authority upon the subject; and I could not forget that there must be limits even to the columns of *The Times* and to the patience of its editor.

Nevertheless, you will, I trust, allow me to point out to your correspondent that the particular interpretation of the word 'spiritually,' which he borrows from Taylor, is not that which would be suggested by the natural sense of the proposition which he quotes from the 28th Article. If 'spiritual' means only 'present to our spirits,' it is difficult to see how 'the body of Christ' can be 'given' as well as 'taken' and 'eaten,' after a heavenly and spiritual manner. To be 'given' at all, the body of Christ must already be there, in some manner independent of the mind or spirit of the recipient. The Article says that this 'giving' is a 'heavenly' and 'spiritual' process; and an old Johnson's Dictionary tells me that 'spiritually' means 'without corporeal grossness,' and appeals to Taylor for its authority. We are agreed that the bread and wine remain in their natural substances, and that the body of Christ can profit a man only so far as it is 'present to the spirit.' But the real presence of Christ's body does not depend upon our uncertain moods of mind and feeling respecting it, any more than the truth of the Atonement depends on our apprehending its efficacy, or the inspiration of Holy Scripture on our capacity for appreciating it. For all serious believers, the spiritual world is a solemn reality, warranted by God's word and promise, be our individual subjective relations to it what they may; and if I may modify your correspondent's terminology, I should agree with him in thinking that the appreciation of this fact is a main point of difference between sound English Churchmen on the one hand, and the happily illogical Puritanism and fatally logical Rationalism which surrounds us on the other.

Those who know Bishop Taylor know that he may be cited on more than one side of more than one controversy. He is not the only man the versatility of whose genius has imperilled his theo-

logical consistency. If your correspondent agrees with Taylor's remark in his 'Life of Christ,' part iii. disc. 19, sect 3, I can have no serious quarrel with him. Let me quote a sentence which is not altogether foreign to the matter in hand: 'I suppose it to be a mistake to think whatsoever is real must be natural; and it is no less to think spiritual to be only figurative.'

I am, Sir, your most obedient servant,

P. H. LIDDON.

January 1.

## V.

SIR,—I am sorry the quotation from Bishop Jeremy Taylor does not please Dr. Liddon.

In his former letter Dr. Liddon says, and in his rejoinder he repeats, 'to be "given" at all, the body must be there.'

The 'judicious' Hooker says: 'As for the sacraments . . . . they are not really, nor do really contain in themselves, that grace which with them or by them it pleaseth God to bestow.'

This passage from one of the highest authorities in the Church of England brings us back again to the words of the 28th Article, and to our incomparable Communion Service.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

J. SAVORY.

Buckhurst Park, Sunning Hill, Berks, Jan. 4.

## VI.

SIR,—Canon Liddon's argument founded on the word 'given' in the 28th Article is a favourite just at present with those who hold his opinions; but it will not bear examination. Let him apply it to the other Sacrament. He holds that a gift is given in baptism; does he hold that this gift is first infused into the baptismal water?

The teaching of the Catechism and of the 28th Article is clear and consistent, and there is no trace of the doctrine of the Real Presence in either. The priest gives, the hand of the communicant receives, the mouth of the communicant eats, the consecrated bread —that is, the outward and visible. God gives, the spirit of the communicant receives, the spirit of the communicant spiritually eats, the Lord's body—that is, the inward and spiritual. But

God, when He gives, does not need first to insert His gift into the bread, nor would that be a giving after a heavenly and spiritual manner.

Yours faithfully,

AN ENGLISH DIGNITARY.

January 4.

## VII.

SIR,—The most learned of our ecclesiastical lawyers has shown how groundless is the difficulty opposed by Dr. Liddon to Jeremy Taylor's view respecting the words 'given . . . . only after an heavenly and spiritual manner.'

Dr. Stephens thus pithily explains the teaching of this clause of the 28th Article, respecting the body of Christ :—'Given by God, not by the priest; taken by faith, not by the hand; eaten by the soul, not by the mouth.'

W. A. SCOTT-ROBINSON.

Sittingbourne, Jan. 5.

## VIII.

*M. Capel repeating his charges.*

SIR,—In my 'Reply to Mr. Gladstone's Pamphlet' I have stated that the Ritualistic clergy 'are unintentionally, but not the less assuredly, disseminating several of the doctrines of the Roman Church,' and I then instanced four of such doctrines. To this statement Canon Liddon takes exception in *The Times*, and tries to overthrow it by an explanation of these doctrines. Absence from London and the difficulty of obtaining certain Ritualistic books of devotion prevented me replying at once to the Canon's letter. But now that I have been able to obtain the necessary *data* for a response, I trust you will give it a place in your columns.

1. The Canon says on the question of reverence for the Saints: 'As I never invoked any Saint in my life . . . . his (Monsignor Capel's) doctrine of reverence for the Saints was practically a very different thing from mine.' In contrast to this I find in the 'Vade Mecum'—a High Church Prayer Book, already in its fourth edition, edited by a priest and published by Palmer—Litanies of the Saints and Angels, and for the faithful departed; prayers for the protection of the Angels, and for the intercession of the Saints; and language used on this doctrine precisely the same as I have used from my childhood. At page 133, among the prayers

recommended to be said by the sick is the following: 'Let thy holy angels defend me from all the powers of darkness, and let Mary, Mother of God, pray for us now and at the hour of death; let all the blessed Angels and Saints of God pray for me a poor sinner.'

2. On the doctrine of the Real Presence Canon Liddon admits a real presence, but rejects the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation.

In the 'Treasury of Devotion,' edited by the Rev. Mr. Carter, in the third edition of this book, published in 1870, at page 115, the words of the 'Lauda Sion' are thus given:—

> Wondrous truth by Christians learned,
> Bread into His flesh is turned,
> Into precious Blood the Wine.

To these lines others are added in the 'Hymnal Noted.' I cite from the sixth edition, published in 1874, by Palmer:—

> Here beneath these signs are hidden
> Priceless things to sense forbidden,
> Signs, not Things, are all we see:
> Blood is poured and Flesh is broken,
> Yet in either wondrous token,
> Christ entire we know to be.

And in the 'Vade Mecum,' already quoted from, I find a Litany to the Blessed Sacrament, wherein it is called (p. 72) 'Never-ceasing Sacrifice,' 'True Propitiation for the Quick and the Dead,' 'Unbloody Sacrifice,' 'Priest and Victim.' And elsewhere (page 54), 'I believe that under this outward form of bread Thou art here present as truly Thou art in heaven:' and again, 'I believe that Thou now sitting at the right of Thy Father in heaven . . . yet art verily present in this Sacrament.'

In these and scores of other passages from such books are our doctrines of the Real Presence, the Eucharistic Sacrifice and Transubstantiation, expressed in our own very words.

3. 'We do not hold the Roman Catholic doctrine of the need of absolution.' 'The Church of England leaves it entirely to the discretion of her individual members to seek this absolution or not.' So writes Canon Liddon. Yet in the books I have been taking extracts from there are set forms of devotion and examinations of conscience to prepare for confession, as well as our formulæ unaltered for use in the confessional. At page 121 of the 'Treasury of Devotion,' referred to above, penitents are told: 'Then search into your life, call up your sins since your last confession, and

accuse yourself of them one by one, note them down in order that your confession may be full and faithful. If you are preparing to make a first confession, you will find it well to divide your life into periods.' The 'Vade Mecum,' p. 11, places among the precepts of the Church 'to confess our sins to our pastor or some other priest each time our conscience is burdened by mortal sin;' and at page 37, in the words of the prayer to be said 'after confession, if absolution is deferred,' the penitent is plainly taught sin has not been forgiven. 'How dreadful is this,' are the words of the prayer, 'that I am not fitly prepared for the pardon of my sins.'

But it is not only in High Church devotional works that the doctrines of the Eucharist and penance as taught by the Roman Church are to be found. In the catechisms and theological books of the same, the same teaching is more calmly and precisely taught. The 'Catechetical Notes' of the late Rev. Dr. Neale, of St. Margaret's, East Grinstead, published in 1869, contains the following declarations concerning the real presence and the need of absolution: 'The Holy Eucharist is a sacrament instituted by our Lord, in which, under the forms of bread and wine, the body and blood of our Lord are received;' and three pages later (129), 'All matter is divided into the accidents and the substance. Accidents of matter are those which make a thing appear to be what it is. Substance is that which makes a thing to be what it is. The accidents remain; the substance is changed.' Canon Liddon cannot but admit this is a clear exposition of Transubstantiation, taught by an eminent High Church divine.

At page 139 Dr. Neale teaches: 'Mortal sin cannot ordinarily be forgiven without absolution. But the priest cannot loose what he has no knowledge of. Therefore mortal sin must be confessed.' He had, at page 138, already said: 'When a penitent, perfectly contrite, cannot confess, either through physical inability or impossibility of obtaining a confessor, mortal sin is remitted by the mercy of God, anticipatorily.'

I can only assure Canon Liddon that all this and no more is what we Catholics are practically taught from childhood; and so deeply has this sunk into the minds of the Ritualists who join us, that now it is rare to find that they have not been in the habit of confessing frequently and at regular intervals.

Fourthly and lastly, as to the doctrine of the Incarnation it finds its expression in Devotion to the Precious Blood, to the Five Wounds, and even to the Sacred Heart—devotions familiar to Catholics, but in all probability strange to members of the Established Church.

Now, I do not enter into the truth of these doctrines, nor into the advantages of these devotions, nor do I pass an opinion whether such devotions can logically be used by members of the Anglican Communion. It may possibly be Canon Liddon's duty to raise his voice against such practices of piety and such devotional expressions of doctrine. All that I contend for is that practical teaching of this kind is assuredly, though unintentionally, spreading our doctrines.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

T. J. CAPEL.

Catholic University College, Kensington, Jan. 7.

## IX.

*Canon Liddon defending 'Vade Mecum.'*

SIR,—Perhaps I may be of opinion that Monsignor Capel, before writing the letter which appears in your impression of to-day, would have done well to ascertain that I am personally responsible, either as author or as editor, for any one of the sentences upon which he comments. It would not be difficult to present him in turn with a long list of *curiosa*, collected from Roman Catholic books of controversy and devotion, the explanation or justification of which, even in skilful hands, would take up more space than you could allow. But, as he will say that he is justifying his attack upon English High Churchmen, I pass this by ; and I thank him for the opportunity he has afforded of a more thorough discussion of the issue which he has thought fit to raise.

1. Let me begin with what he terms in his 'Reply,' 'our "doctrine" of Reverence for the Saints.' 'In contrast' to my disclaimer of invoking the saints, Monsignor Capel refers to 'the Litanies of the Saints and Angels' in a book called the 'Vade Mecum.' Before reading the Monsignor's letter I had never seen this book, and on procuring it I find that the litany to which he refers is not, as his language might seem to imply, addressed to the saints, but to God. It differs, therefore, in a vital particular from the litanies of the saints which occur in Roman Catholic books of devotion, although it contains prayers addressed to God, in which He is asked that the saints may be heard on behalf of the petitioner. Such prayers may be justified—within limits—by the revelation of Holy Scripture as to the occupation of the blessed in another world, and, among ourselves, by the practice of Bishop Andrewes. As to 'prayers for the faithful departed,' addressed to

God, Monsignor Capel is probably not aware that they have been formally decided to be legal in the Church of England, and that they have been used by a long line of English worthies, including Dr. Samuel Johnson. As to 'prayers for the protection of the angels,' addressed to God, we have an admirable one in the Prayer Book Collect for St. Michael's Day. Monsignor Capel does not quote, even from page 133, any invocation of the saints, although there is language in the 'Vade Mecum' bearing on this subject which I could not defend, such as the suggested use of the 'Hail! Mary,'—I presume, only of the words of the angel, and as an apostrophe. But I am dealing for the moment, not with the unknown author of that book, but with Monsignor Capel.

2. Monsignor Capel's quotations on the subject of the Real Presence are, I admit with regret, better calculated to sustain his indictment. I waive the point whether the language of poetry should be pressed as he presses it. But the line,

Bread into His flesh is *turned*,

appears to me to be indefensible, at any rate without explanations, which the context does not supply. So in the next quotation, the prepositions 'beneath' and 'in' must be abandoned if they are supposed seriously to define a local relation between the consecrated elements and the Eucharistic gift. Once more, of the explanation of the Real Presence which Monsignor Capel quotes from the 'Catechetical Notes' of the late honoured Dr. Neale, I can only say that

Aliquando bonus dormitat Homerus.

It may be that the direction of Dr. Neale's studies would have made him less alive than some of us to the enormous difficulties of the philosophical theory, which is assumed to be true by the distinction which he makes between 'substance' and 'accidents.' Anyhow, I cannot, in this matter, defend him; and he would have been the last man in the world to maintain his own infallibility. But he gave the best proof a man can give of his judgment as to the claims of the Church of Rome by dying, as he had lived, in the Church of England.

On the other hand, let me observe that protestations of belief in the Real Presence, as quoted by Monsignor Capel, do not involve Transubstantiation. Nor has the rest of the language which he cites, however important with regard to other aspects of the Eucharist, any bearing upon this issue. Some of it appears to me to be, at any rate, open to misunderstanding; while I may remark

that the epithet 'unbloody sacrifice,' as applied to the Eucharist, was familiar to the ancient Church, and has given its name to a well-known work in English divinity.

3. The 'directions for making a confession,' which are quoted by Monsignor Capel from these books, do not appear to conflict with my assertion that 'the Church of England leaves it entirely to the discretion of her members to seek absolution or not.' It does not follow that because when I go to a doctor he tells me what to do, I am, therefore, obliged to go to him whether I think he can help me or not. Certainly the 'precept of the Church,' which is quoted from the 'Vade Mecum,' appears to be without warrant from the Church of England. And, for the rest, I do not know any English Churchmen who would not own that God's pardoning grace for His dear Son's sake is by no means tied to absolution, and that thousands upon thousands go to Heaven who have never sought it at all. It is a medicine, ready for those who feel that they want it; it is not food necessary for all. No doubt in some cases a medicine must be taken at regular intervals in order to be efficacious, and this may explain some of the language referred to by Monsignor Capel. But it may interest him and others to consult Jeremy Taylor ('Holy Dying,' secs. 3, 4), who deals with the whole matter at once more fully and more wisely than some of our modern advisers.

4. Could I have imagined that by 'our doctrine of the Incarnation' Monsignor Capel meant nothing more than certain modern devotions to our Lord's Humanity which were unheard of when that great truth was defined and vindicated in the ancient Church, I should not have referred to the subject. To claim the incarnation of our Lord as a peculiar doctrine of the Church of Rome appeared to me as reasonable as it would be to say that the sun is the private property of the new Roman Catholic College at Kensington.

Monsignor Capel will have done us English Churchmen a good service if he leads any of our brethren to abandon language or practices unauthorised by the Church of England, and tending to bring about a result that we must all unfeignedly deplore, however desirable he may think it. He has succeeded, as I cannot but think, in putting his finger upon some expressions which I would respectfully ask the writers and editors of devotional books to reconsider in the light of the public formularies of the Church of England. It is no argument against devotional language that it is used by the Church of Rome, because this is true of about two-thirds, at the least, of the Book of Common Prayer; but it is

another matter to be in real or apparent conflict with any part of our own authoritative Church language. Here is a line which men do not often pass—consciously, at any rate—without the gravest risk, even in minor matters. We must feel that we have nothing to gain by exchanging our simple faith in the Real Presence for a philosophical speculation about it that is weighted with the difficulties of centuries; or our loving reverence for God's glorified servants for the practice of saying prayers to them, perhaps undistinguishable in form from those which we address to Him; or our privilege of claiming Christ's absolving power at the hands of His ministers, when conscience may suggest it, for a strict ecclesiastical obligation to submit to a discipline periodically which may or may not help us to live closer to God. And in the two great additions which the Church of Rome has made to her creed within the lifetime of the present generation we have, as the late Mr. Keble said of that which dates from December 8, 1854, a 'warning against her system for which our forefathers were not responsible.' The Vatican Council has taught us that her claim of *semper eadem*, unwarranted before, can only now be admitted by those who close their eyes to the plainest facts of Church history.

But with these convictions we shall not, I trust, make the advance of Rome in our country easier by abandoning Catholic truth which we have received to hold, and which is taught in our Church formularies, when they are fairly interpreted. Not for the first time in our history Rome and Puritanism, forgetting their irreconcilable hostility, appear willing to play into each other's hands, if only they can silence the voice of true Catholic teaching within the walls of the Church of England. But, if we are resolutely true to the guidance which God has given in our English Prayer Book, with its appeal to Scripture, as interpreted by Catholic antiquity, we need not fear for the result.

I am, Sir, your most obedient servant,

H. P. LIDDON.

January 8.

## X.

SIR,—It would not be difficult to answer Canon Liddon's letter, forcible and valuable as it is, point by point. But it is needless to do so for the present purpose, for Canon Liddon, apparently without perceiving it, has surrendered. He has learnt, he says from Bishop Andrewes, 'that no preposition (trans, con, in) avails to express the relation which subsists between the sacra-

mental gift and the consecrated elements. Then why, if this be so, does he say that the gift is 'there'? What is the word 'there' but a preposition of this very kind turned into an adverb? Let Canon Liddon keep within the lines marked out by Bishop Andrewes and observed by the Church of England, let him content himself with a coincidence in time instead of a coincidence in space, let him be content to teach that when God's minister is giving the bread God is giving the Lord's body; he will then find no true son of the Church of England to contend with him, but he will not be teaching the doctrine commonly known as that of the Real Presence.

Yours faithfully,

AN ENGLISH DIGNITARY.

## XI.

*Mr. Savory on the 28th Article.*

SIR,—I ventured a few days since to direct your attention and that of the public to the fact that Dr. Liddon, in his reply to Monsignor Capel had, probably unintentionally, omitted the restrictive words of the Twenty-eighth Article, and thus reversed its meaning. In his reply Dr. Liddon admitted his omission of these important words, and expressed the hesitation he had felt in so extending his letter as to give the sentence in full. With this explanation might I not give Dr. Liddon credit for accepting the words of the Twenty-eighth Article?

If, on the other hand, Dr. Liddon does not agree with the Twenty-eighth Article, after quoting the definition of Bishop Jeremy Taylor as to the meaning of 'spiritually,' which, he says, 'is used both by the Roman Catholic and by us—they, the Roman Catholics, mean by spiritually after the manner of a spirit, we mean by spiritually present to our spirits only;' and those wonderfully clear words of Richard Hooker, 'As for the Sacraments . . . they are not really, nor do really contain in themselves, that grace which with them, or by them, it pleaseth God to bestow.' I do not wish further to carry on any controversy in this matter, only adding the words of the Primate, that 'there is a large minority of the clergy who would subvert the doctrines of the Reformation,' of which this is one of the most important, being one of those in the support of which our Reformers willingly suffered death at the stake.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

JOSEPH SAVORY.

Buckhurst Park, Sunninghill,
Berks, Jan. 8.

## XII.

*Leading article in the 'Times' reviewing the controversy, January 9, 1875.*

Canon Liddon, in the letter we print this morning, enables us to draw a practical conclusion from the controversy which, in reply to Monsignor Capel, he raised in our columns. The public, we think, have much reason to thank both these authorities for the light they have thrown upon their respective positions, and for their readiness to respond to the challenges addressed to them. It would be striking to enumerate the number of confessions, declarations and explanations Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet has evoked. Whatever may be thought of its wisdom or practical use in other respects, it has at least had the effect of compelling people, so to speak, to arrange themselves, and to let the world understand, even if they fail to understand for themselves, where they are and whither they are going. Whether from a controversial point of view it is quite prudent of the disputants to be so forward in self-justification may, perhaps, be doubted; but if Monsignor Capel likes to caution against their danger the Ritualists, who, he tells us, are daily swimming into his net, or if Canon Liddon is thankful, as he says to-day, for the opportunity afforded of making a practical admission that Monsignor Capel was not far wrong in what he said of the extreme High Churchmen, it is certainly not for the public to complain. It would add to the charm of this communicativeness if it could be attributed entirely to an irrepressible dislike of ambiguity. But, strongly as this motive may operate, it is too evidently assisted by an imperfect appreciation of the light in which these revelations will appear to the public mind. Perhaps it is unkind to disturb this equanimity, but it is impossible to abstain from turning to the best account the information so liberally afforded to us.

Let us, accordingly, remind the reader of the point from which the controversy started. Monsignor Capel, while allowing that Canon Liddon and some other English clergy whom he named are not intentionally moving towards Rome, asserted nevertheless that a section of the clergy with whom they are associated are 'unintentionally,' but not less assuredly disseminating several of the doctrines of the Roman Church. He mentioned in particular—a point which Canon Liddon omitted to notice—that they encouraged the use of devotional language and practices which are distinctly Roman Catholic, both in spirit and in form. To this statement—

or rather, as we have said, to the former part of it—Dr. Liddon replied in a letter of which the only fault was that it altogether missed the point at issue. He showed with great felicity that the doctrine, for instance, of the Incarnation 'as held by the Church of England' could in no way be justly claimed as a distinctive possession of the Church of Rome. As he says to-day, it would be as reasonable to claim the sun as the private property of the new Roman Catholic College at Kensington. He similarly went on to explain to what extent 'the public language of the Church of England in its natural sense' supported Confession and Absolution. But all this, however satisfactory as clearing Canon Liddon personally from the imputation of Roman Catholic sympathies, had no real bearing on the assertion of his antagonist. Monsignor Capel was not speaking of the doctrines of the Church of England. For the purpose of his argument it was indifferent what they really are. But what he alleged was that in the practice of the Ritualistic clergy, and in the books of devotion used by them and their followers, an interpretation was placed upon those doctrines which practically disseminated the teaching of the Church of Rome. It is of no importance to this argument how effectually the Canon may prove that such interpretations need not be involved in High Church teaching and ought not to be. The question is whether they are; and this is evidently a question to be answered by mere reference to facts. That the Church of England and the Church of Rome accept in great measure the same creeds needs no elaborate proof, for it is the starting-point on both sides. But it is perfectly certain that they believe them with a difference which, however subtle it may be made to appear in argument, leads, beyond question, to momentous differences in practice. It is unnecessary, therefore, however interesting, to enter into the minute verbal controversy in which Canon Liddon defends against 'An English Dignitary' a view of the Real Presence which, as he himself says, no tongue can express. He has shown, as 'An English Dignitary' this morning points out, that his own tongue is not more than usually successful. But Monsignor Capel yesterday brought the discussion back to its real issue. Passing by Canon Liddon's exposition of the doctrines of the Church of England, he proceeded to quote passages from the devotional books he referred to which exhibit the view of those doctrines encouraged among their followers by the Ritualistic clergy. From a High Church Prayer Book in its fourth edition, from a 'Treasury of Devotion' edited by no less typical a member of the extreme High Church party than Mr. Carter of Clewer, and from formal 'Catechetical Notes' by so

distinguished and influential a man among them as the late Dr. Neale, he quoted a series of passages of which the least that could be said is that they abundantly justify the general character he had affixed to them. Even with respect to the doctrine of the Incarnation, on which Dr. Liddon was so well satisfied, he pointed to the introduction of such practices as devotions to certain external marks of the Passion which embody a manner of regarding that doctrine which most Protestants must feel to be painfully alien from their thoughts and sentiments. But we need not argue the case; for on this matter, too, as in that to which 'An English Dignitary' refers, Canon Liddon surrenders. As to the Invocation of Saints and Angels, the book quoted uses, at all events, language which the Canon 'could not defend;' the quotations with respect to the Real Presence 'are indefensible.' Of the teaching sanctioned by 'the late honoured Dr. Neale,' Canon Liddon can only say that he was not infallible, but he owns he cannot defend him, and the directions quoted with respect to Confession contain a precept 'which appears to be without warrant from the Church of England.' Could anything more be needed to establish Monsignor Capel's point? 'He has succeeded,' as Canon Liddon cannot but think, in putting his finger upon some expressions which need reconsideration by their authors. When this is the admission of an antagonist, there can be no doubt the case has been made out.

In point of fact Monsignor Capel has done the Church of England the unintentional service of making it perfectly clear that, consciously or unconsciously, the ecclesiastical party in whose defence Dr. Liddon is so zealous teach and practise superstitious interpretations of Christian doctrine which, in the hands of indiscreet and ill-educated clergymen, if not in those of more skilful and cautious divines, and above all in the mass of uninstructed adherents, develope into nothing short of even modern Roman Catholic teaching and practice. Monsignor Capel's letter, it is not denied, gives a true account of the language and the habits which are being widely disseminated by the Ritualistic Clergy, and it is this which has evoked the strong antagonism which has reluctantly been aroused among the public at large. Canon Liddon's letter, moreover, illustrates another fact which excuses Monsignor Capel's original reference to him, and which has the most important bearing on some practical questions now before the Church. Judging by the commendable indignation with which Canon Liddon first advanced to the defence, might we not have expected some similar vehemence in his repudiation of these abuses of the true doctrine? But the reader cannot fail to be struck by the scrupulous tender-

ness with which, on the contrary, he admonishes the authors of these superstitious publications of the risk they run in employing unauthoritative language. Canon Liddon does not revolt from such extremes; he views them as an amiable weakness, dangerous but pardonable. Now, it is this kind of tone which, morally speaking, renders the more distinguished leaders of the High Church party responsible for the extravagances of their more reckless disciples. Active and vehement in opposition to other errors, they are ready to cast a veil over any amount of superstition, and they have no right to complain if the public revulsion from it recoils upon themselves. It is greatly to be lamented in the interests of peace within the Church; but so long as High Churchmen excuse instead of decisively denouncing such abuses as those of which Dr. Liddon this morning concedes the existence, it is impossible for a Protestant public to place much confidence in their theology.—Leading Article, *Times*, Jan. 9, 1875.

## XIII.

*Canon Liddon in reply to No. X. XI. XII.*

Sir,—In assuming that I have 'surrendered,' 'An English Dignitary' is too sanguine to be accurate. All that I have admitted is that no preposition avails to define the relation of the sacramental gifts to the consecrated elements in the Holy Communion. That such a relation does exist prior to and independently of the act of reception is a truth far too certain and too precious to be 'surrendered' to your correspondent or to anyone else. If I cannot define the connection between my soul and my body, I do not therefore take refuge in materialism; and my adverb 'there,' which occasions your correspondent so much embarrassment, was designed to express in a general and popular way the independence or objectivity of the Sacred Presence, while avoiding any attempt at specific local definitions respecting it. Your correspondent's criticisms may probably serve to show that, as a popular expedient, this was not successful, and he is welcome to my phrase, if he likes, although the truth which it aimed at expressing is not mine to give him. But, on thinking over the language of my adviser, I have been trying to make out what he can mean by 'the body of Christ' as distinct from 'the benefits which we receive thereby.' Does he mean anything real at all, or only a phrase or a conception? I hope the former, because he says that Christ's body is given by God when God's minister gives the bread.

But, if I am so far right, another question meets us here. Is the gift of the bread the actual means whereby the Lord's body is given, or is the Lord's body given quite independently? If the former, he and I are not likely to differ much; if the latter, what exact sense does he attach to the Church's statement that the outward sign in the Sacrament is a 'means whereby we receive the inward grace,' as well as a 'pledge to assure us thereof'? How is the outward sign a means of receiving the inward grace if the 'English Dignitary' is right in warning me to be 'content with a coincidence in time' between the reception of the sign and the reception of the inward grace 'instead of a coincidence in space'? In his earlier days, before reaching some unknown point of elevation in the Church, the 'English Dignitary' may have given attention to the laws of thought, and it would be instructive to learn from him how, as applied to such a subject-matter, the one 'coincidence' is possible without the other.

The point at issue is no mere scholastic subtlety. 'So long as I believed that Christ is present only in the heart of the communicant, I never could be certain that I communicated at all. I know too much of my own heart to have felt any such certainty.' These were the words of one of the best men who have lived in our time, and it is the independent reality of the promised gift in the Holy Sacrament which alone lifts really humble souls out of the reach of these distressing uncertainties. Christian experience is here in accord with the conclusions of scientific theology; and the doctrine of the Real Presence, unembarrassed by the mediæval conception of a transmuted substance, has too assured a place in these heights and these depths to be affected in the long run by present controversies.

Let me assure Mr. Savory that, had I ventured to make so large a demand upon your space, I would have quoted Article 28 from beginning to end with the greatest pleasure. I still venture to think, however, that he does not rightly apprehend its meaning, and that he is not going to work in the best way when he quotes fragments of sentences from Hooker. Hooker, no doubt, in the matter of the Eucharist, inclines largely, although not unreservedly, to the side of Calvin, which is also, I apprehend, the side of Mr. Savory. When Hooker wrote, the genius of Calvin still cast its spell over the greatest part of Reformed Europe; Hooker would have written differently half a century later. Waterland repudiates Hooker's language on the subject of the Eucharistic Sacrifice with some approach to warmth; and other divines have excepted to the one-sided subjectivity of his concep-

tion of the Eucharistic gift. Hooker, with all his titles to our love and admiration, is, after all, not the Bible, nor yet an authorised formulary of the Church; and when Mr. Savory has considered Hooker's opinions as to the superiority of a virgin life to wedlock, as to the advantages of pluralities, and other points which I could name, we shall still, I hope, agree to honour him as 'judicious,' but, it may be, to use that epithet in a less unmodified sense than your excellent correspondent at present would suggest.

It so happens that we have at hand a means of determining the true sense of Article 28, which, in any subject-matter less obscured by passion and prejudice than theology, would be regarded as decisive. In a letter from Geste, Bishop of Rochester, to Sir William Cecil, dated December 12, 1566, and preserved in the State Paper Office, he writes as follows :—

'I suppose you have heard how the Bishop of Glocester found himself grieved with the placing of this adverb *only* in this Article, "The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper after an heavenly and spiritual manner only," because it did take away the presence of Christ's body in the Sacrament; and privily noted me to take his part therein, and yesterday in mine absence more plainly vouched me for the same. Whereas, between him and me, I told him plainly that this word *only* in the aforesaid Article did not exclude the presence of Christ's body from the Sacrament, but only the grossness and sensibleness in the receiving thereof. For I said unto him, though he took Christ's body in his hand, received it with his mouth, and that corporally, naturally, really, substantially, and carnally, as the doctors do write, yet he did not for all that see it, feel it, smell it, nor taste it. And therefore I told him I would speak against him therein, and the rather because *the Article was of mine own penning*. And yet I would not, for all that, deny thereby anything that I had spoken for the presence. And this was the sum of our talk.'

Mr. Savory's reference to Smithfield requires a word of notice. He cannot hate the Marian persecutions more heartily than I do. I only hope that the spirit which prompted them will not imitate them in our day, as closely as our higher civilization permits, in the interests of a different theology. Of those who suffered, some were burnt for denying error, some for denying truth as well as error; some denied Transubstantiation, others the Real Presence as well. Had they been all dogmatic Atheists, the conduct of their persecutors would have still been a crime against humanity; but Mr. Savory will agree with me in thinking that a doctrine is not therefore proved to be false because a man has been officially

murdered for denying it. Servetus, for instance, was burnt to death by Calvin; but his opinions are probably as little in accord with Mr. Savory's convictions as they are with my own.

And now, Sir, may I ask your permission to add a few words on the general subject?

It was my misfortune to understand the point of Monsignor Capel's language, in the first instance, differently from yourself. I understood him to say virtually something to this effect: 'You English High Churchmen are preaching and writing about the Real Presence, about Absolution, about Reverence to the Saints, about the Incarnation. These are admirable and precious truths; but they do not belong to you in your schismatic isolation; they are the proud monopoly of the Catholic and Roman Church.' To this I thought it enough to say: 'Look at our official documents; they were not drawn up in this generation, or by the school of writers and workers whom you are criticising; they are, with some few significant changes in 1662, the bequest of the Reformation. It is true they are largely forgotten, or ignored, or even decried by persons or parties who professedly adhere to our Communion. But every one of her ministers, from the Archbishop of Canterbury downwards, is responsible before God and man for their substantial truth; and, if they are to be construed naturally, our Ordinal, our Service for Visiting the Sick, our Church Catechism—to say nothing of other services—show that these doctrines are just as much a part of our inheritance as of your own. Certainly we hold them in a different, and, as we maintain, in a purer and better sense than you; but we have not, as you would imply, broken away from Christian antiquity, and invented a new Christianity with which the early ages of our faith would have had little in common.' This, as I conceive, might have closed the controversy; because, as you will remember, I was careful to express myself, not in self-chosen language, but almost entirely in that of the public documents of the English Church. But when you suggested that Monsignor Capel meant, not that the doctrines in question belong exclusively to the Church of Rome, but that the Roman conception of them, as I must deem it, was being imported into the Church of England, he naturally made the most of so suggestive a hint. So he presents me with a little collection of inexact or exaggerated phrases, which I have to sort out and say what I think of it, bit by bit, as an English Churchman. In doing so I have to criticise mistakes or oversights on the part of men some of whom I unaffectedly revere; but I do not surrender to Monsignor Capel, unless he can show that the great doctrines

and principles which private writers have thus distorted or exaggerated have themselves no real place in the English Church. It may be true that some High Churchmen have used language which exceeds the fair limits of English Church doctrine. Monsignor Capel meant that the whole characteristic High Church teaching was of this description, whereas, in the main, I believe it to be based with scrupulous exactness on the formularies. All religious schools are liable to be weighted with excrescences, which zeal insufficiently balanced by knowledge or by wisdom is apt to produce. But these parasitical growths are not fairly chargeable upon the whole body. No one would make the Archbishop of Canterbury or Dean Stanley responsible for a work on 'Literature and Dogma' which the accomplished son of their great teacher has lately written. Yet, whatever they may think of the book, so far as I know, neither of them has gone out of his way to say a word upon the subject of it, although they would speak from positions which would command universal attention. Such an illustration more than covers the case before us; and some of the mistakes on which you comment rather severely are in all probability due to inadvertence. Mr. Carter may never have noticed an expression which was probably determined by the necessities of rhyme, and which occurs in a manual that has sought the high sanction of his name; in any case, his life and mind as a whole are altogether out of the reach whether of my criticisms or my apologies. You complain of my tenderness towards language which exaggerates or misrepresents my own belief and principles, and you contrast it with what I feel and say about theories which reduce the Sacraments of Christ to lifeless and worthless forms, and the Bible to something little better than a mass of legendary error. I cannot help it; and I should despise myself, both as a man and as a Christian, if, because I deeply regret exaggerations of devotional language and ceremonial practice on the part of the so-called 'Ritualists,' I could forget that many of them are in every way my superiors; that they are doing a work among the poor and the suffering which puts me, at any rate, to shame; and that the cynical injustice with which, for the moment, they are assailed by an earnest but uninstructed public opinion is certain, sooner or later, to be followed by a revulsion, dictated by the generosity and the honesty of our national character, which may bring with it more real perils than their present unpopularity. For the rest, all honest men are agreed that the personal consequences of our moral judgments must take care of themselves; and that no private ease can compensate for the misery of conscious cowardice, when conscience has spoken.

If I do not reply again to my various assailants, Popish and Puritanical, it will be from no want of respect for those gentlemen, nor will my silence necessarily mean that I accept either their facts or their judgments. My time and hands are not disengaged; and your columns, sir, must be claimed, I should suppose, by other and larger interests.

I am, Sir, your most obedient servant,

H. P. LIDDON.

January 9, 1875.

## XIV.

SIR,—When Mr. Savory interprets the words 'after a spiritual manner' to mean that our Lord's body is given to and taken by our spirits, and when he excludes the sense of the gift being after the manner of a spirit, he contradicts the black rubric at the end of the Communion Service, which says that it is 'against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one.'

The words of the 28th Article are as follows:—'The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten . . . only after a heavenly and spiritual manner.' Now, if 'spiritual' means 'in to, or by our spirits,' by parity of reasoning 'heavenly' must mean 'in heaven.' But it is our Lord's human body that is in heaven.

Therefore Mr. Savory would teach us that our Lord's human body is given to and taken by our spirits in the same sense that it is in heaven, which is irrational, or Transubstantiation, or both.

Moral—Beware of metaphysics in theology.

ANOTHER ENGLISH DIGNITARY.

January 8.

## XV.

*'Churchwarden' answering Mr. Savory.*

SIR,—As a layman of Evangelical principles, I have been pained and perplexed upon reading the discussions between Canon Liddon and 'A Dignitary of the Church' and others, which have appeared in *The Times*, upon the most sacred of subjects. In my perplexity I referred for guidance to the Articles of the Church of England, as I had subscribed to them, and on them, legally interpreted, I believed that the Church would have to rely for the suppression of new doctrines, if promulgated by a minister of her Communion.

As all know, His Majesty's Declaration (prefixed to the Articles) states :—

'We will that all further curious search be laid aside, and these disputes shut up in God's promises, as they be generally set forth to us in the Holy Scriptures, and the general meaning of the Articles of the Church of England according to them ; and that no man hereafter shall either print, or preach, to draw the Article aside any way, but shall submit to it in the plain and full meaning thereof ; and shall not put his own sense or comment to be the meaning of the Article, but shall take it in the literal and grammatical sense.'

Bearing in mind this declaration, I referred to the Articles bearing upon the discussion—viz. Articles 25, 28 and 29—and I failed to obtain comfort from them, so far as regards the pending controversy. I then turned (as I submit all should do) to the Holy Scriptures, which never fail us, and there I found recorded in the Gospels three historical accounts of the institution of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and, in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, an inspired doctrinal commentary by St. Paul upon them. I was satisfied ; and I would ask, What more can any man require? Let every disputant read and judge for himself.

St. Paul says, in the 11th chapter of the Epistle quoted :—

'Wherefore whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body. For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep.'

Now refer to the 29th Article, which says :—

'The wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as St. 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.'

I know no 'sayings' of St. Augustine, or the judicious Hooker, or any Church dignitaries, past or present, nor even of the Articles, upon which I can rely in preference to the sayings of St. Paul, who nowhere says anything about eating and drinking 'the sign or Sacrament of so great a thing.' He says that he that eateth and

drinketh unworthily eateth and drinketh κρῖμα ('damnation' the word is rendered in our translation) to himself, not discerning (διακρίνων) what, I would ask? Why, 'the Lord's body.' Where? In the bread that he eats and the cup that he drinks. And then comes the sentence, 'For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep.' What, then, in effect says St. Paul? I venture to think this: that the 'unworthy' recipient, owing to his unworthiness, does not discern in the bread and wine that which the 'worthy' recipient does discern—namely, the body of the Lord. Now, I would ask, how can the worthy recipient discern that which is not there, or the unworthy recipient be judged and punished for not discerning that which is not there?

This discussion has thus led me to the Articles, and these to the Bible, and I leave it to the 'Church Dignitary' to say whether the two do or do not agree. I do not think they do. His letter in *The Times* of the 5th inst. may be good logic, but to me it seems at variance with St. Paul, as also does Mr. Savory's quotation of the wonderfully clear words of Richard Hooker.

If the disputants in this controversy would, while studying St. Augustine, Hooker, and Taylor, take the inspired writings more into consideration, they would, I think, come to an evangelical conclusion. As St. Paul has left it, so am I content to accept it, without any endeavour either to enlarge it or to explain it away.

Unhappily, it seems to me, the clergy are bound hand and foot to the Thirty-nine Articles, and upon these they must, or must be content to argue, trying to fit the Scriptures to the Articles, not the Articles to the Scriptures. I am thankful that I can go behind the Articles to the fountain head—the Holy Scriptures,—as I am not a dignitary of the Church, but,

Your obedient servant,

A CHURCHWARDEN.

London, Jan. 9.

## XVI.

*M. Capel making further quotations.*

SIR,—Canon Liddon's letter in this morning's issue of *The Times* obliges me, though very reluctantly, to trespass once more on your space. If the Canon will examine my 'Reply to Mr. Gladstone's Expostulation,' he will see that I have not once referred to High Churchmen. Of Ritualistic clergy and the Ritualistic party alone have I spoken.

For the Canon to say that I have presented him 'with a little

collection of inexact or exaggerated phrases,' and that in these he has only to 'criticise mistakes or exaggerations,' will not, I am sure, be accepted by the public as a satisfactory reply, when in the 'Night Hours of the Church,' a book used in Anglican Sisterhoods, we find, as at page 128, 'Holy Mary, Virgin Mother of God, intercede for us;' and at page 130, 'Rejoice, O Virgin Mary; thou alone hast destroyed all heresies throughout the world. Suffer me to praise thee, Blessed Virgin: give me strength against thine enemies.' Nor will such remarks be deemed a sufficient explanation of prayers used by the 'priest' as indicated in the 'Form of Reception' of girls into the Guild of S. Mary the Virgin, established in the parish of St. Alban's, Holborn. 'The priest, having given to the member a cross, a veil, and a wreath, shall say (page 19), "O Lord Jesus Christ, we beseech Thee of Thy mercy to grant that by the intercession of Blessed Mary Thy Mother, and of the Blessed Michael, and all Thy Holy Angels, this Thy child may be enlightened."'

It is still more unsatisfactory to find so distinguished a clergyman as Canon Liddon excusing the line 'Bread into His flesh is turned' on the plea that it is 'in all probability due to inadvertence. Mr. Carter may never have noticed an expression which was probably determined by the necessities of rhyme.' Had the Canon examined a few of the advanced books of devotion he would have found that it is the usual way to express, as in Mr. Carter's book, the doctrine of Transubstantiation:—

Word made flesh, the bread of nature
By His word to flesh He turns,
Wine into His blood He changes.
('Devotions for those who are present at the Eucharistic Sacrifice.' Edited by a Committee of Clergymen. Twenty-sixth thousand. 1869.)
Bread His flesh in truth and spirit,
(Christians this high lore inherit),
And the wine becomes His blood.
('Paradise of the Christian Soul,' with Preface by Pusey. Printed in 1845.)
This the truth each Christian learneth,
Bread unto His flesh He turneth,
Wine to His most holy blood.
('The Hymnal Noted,' sixth edition, 1874.)

All these are but varieties of translation of the words of the 'Lauda, Sion:'—

Dogma datur Christianis,
Quod in carnem transit panis,
Et vinum in sanguinem.

It is not to be imagined that these expressions are limited to verse. In the 'Night Hours of the Church' the doctrine of Transubstantiation is stated at page 173 in the plainest way :—'What is more wonderful than this Sacrament? for in it bread and wine are substantially changed into the body and blood of Christ. . . . The accident subsists without a subject that faith may have her place while a visible thing is invisibly received, hidden under an alien form, and the senses are set free from deception, in that they decide upon accidents which are familiar to them.' Indeed, these are the very words of St. Thomas Aquinas.

When I see our prayers transferred wholesale to Ritualistic books of devotion; when authors like Mr. Orby Shipley publish the 'Ritual of the Altar' according to the use of the Church of England, and I find therein the whole of our Mass; when convert clergy and laity from the Ritualistic party assure me they have been in the habit of confessing and receiving absolution; have constantly prayed to the Saints and Angels, and have neither added to nor taken away from what they believed as Ritualists concerning the Blessed Sacrament, I cannot, notwithstanding Canon Liddon's explanations, do otherwise than assert that the Ritualistic clergy are assuredly disseminating our doctrines.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

T. J. Capel.

Catholic University College, Kensington, Jan. 11.

## XVII.

*Mr. Carter defending the 'Treasury of Devotion.'*

Sir,—Not having seen Monsignor Capel's letter of Friday last when it first appeared, my reply is unavoidably delayed; but I trust to your candour and kindness to allow me to defend myself and the book for which I am responsible from what appears to me to be an unfair and unfounded charge.

Among the books to which the Monsignor refers I am only responsible for the 'Treasury of Devotion,' and to this, therefore, my remarks will be confined. He considers that this manual teaches Roman doctrine on two points—Confession and Transubstantiation.

With regard to the first point, Monsignor Capel professes to show that the Roman doctrine of the indispensable necessity of Confession before Holy Communion is taught among us, and, in order to substantiate this charge against the 'Treasury of Devotion,' quotes a passage which merely teaches how to prepare for Confession when it is to be made, without any mention of its

necessity, and when under the head of 'Doctrine and Instruction' at the commencement of the book, as a guide to those who use it, Bishop Cosin's well-known rule is given, that 'for better preparation thereunto (*i. e.*, to receive Holy Communion), *as occasion is*, to disburden and quiet our conscience . . . . to a learned and discreet priest,' &c.

As to the second point touching the Real Presence, the words of the 'Lauda, Sion,' as used in the 'Treasury,'

> Bread into His flesh is turned,
> Into precious blood the wine,

are quoted, as though they implied Transubstantiation. But the word 'turned' may imply various kinds of change, such as moral change, or change of condition, not necessarily a physical change; and it is here intended to imply a sacramental change. The term is thus used on the same principle that, in the prayer of our Communion Office immediately before receiving the consecrated elements, we ask that 'we may so eat the flesh of Christ and drink His blood,' &c.; or, in the old well-known hymn, say 'Rich banquet of His flesh and blood.' That the term in question is a legitimate expression, according to established English use, may be shown by a reference to Thorndike, to whose authority an English Churchman will hardly take exception. He thus writes:—

'As it is by no means to be denied that the elements are really changed, translated, turned, and converted into the body and blood of Christ (so that whoso receiveth with a living faith is spiritually nourished by the same, he that with a dead faith is guilty of crucifying Christ), yet is not this change destructive to the bodily substance of the elements, but cumulative to them, with the spiritual grace of Christ's body and blood.' ('Of the Laws of the Church,' chap. v. sec. 45, Oxford Edition.)

That the language of the verse of the hymn 'Lauda, Sion,' as it stands in the 'Treasury,' does not satisfy the Roman mind, is evident from the fact that the version of the words in question prevailing in Roman Catholic manuals (I quote from the well-known 'Golden Treasury') is as follows:—

> Hear what Holy Church maintaineth
> That the bread its substance changeth
> Into flesh, the wine to blood;

while yet there is no allusion to 'substance' in the original, which simply runs thus:—

> Quod in carnem transit panis,
> Et vinum in sanguinem.

So that our version really stands as a witness for the simpler form of the original, as against identifying the sacramental change with a change of substance—*i. e.* the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

High Churchmen cannot afford to sacrifice language employed in harmony with such authorities as Andrewes, Thorndike, &c., to guard primitive truth, and this at the call of Roman controversialists who would arrogate to themselves all language wearing a Catholic aspect, importing into it modern Roman doctrine, as though there were no Catholicity but their own.

The 'Treasury of Devotion' was compiled with the careful desire of preserving Catholic devotional doctrine and phraseology clear of anything distinctively Roman, nor has any such imputation been cast, as far as I am aware, on the passages alluded to. Certainly, if any expressions in the book can be shown to be fairly open to such a charge, I should be the first to desire to change them.

I am, yours faithfully,

T. T. Carter.

Clewer Rectory, Jan. 11.

## XVIII.

*Canon Liddon renewing his self-defence.*

Sir,—Monsignor Capel's additional quotations do not really modify the conditions of the controversy. None of the language which he quotes is mine. If English Church writers provide Prayer Books teaching Invocation of the Saints, or Transubstantiation, or the obligation of Confession upon all Christians, I have nothing to say for them. When I feel it to be a duty to do these things myself, I shall retire from the ministry of the English Church. But your correspondent again blends with some indefensible quotations others of a different character, although the difference might not be obvious to readers who are unfamiliar with theological language. If English Church writers provide books in which God is asked that the prayers of His servants, whether in this or the other world, may help the petitioner; in which the Real Presence, as distinct from Transubstantiation, is taken for granted; in which, under certain circumstances, confession and absolution are recommended as a healthful medicine for the Christian soul, although not obligatory upon all Christians as such, then they are, as I contend, demonstrably within the lines of English Church doctrine. That the Church of Rome teaches a doctrine is no objection to our teaching it too, unless it can be

shown that the Church of England has repudiated this particular doctrine in terms. That devotional language in use among us has been composed by Roman Catholics is no objection to the use of such language, unless it can be proved to be inconsistent with the public documents of the English Church. People talk, I know, about the spirit of the Church of England; but that is a vague, intangible sort of thing, varying in different times and at different places; and it cannot be usefully employed as a test of legitimate doctrine. When doubts arise as to the legitimacy of a given expression or proposition, the only question for us is, what do the authorized standards of doctrine in the English Church say about it? Mr. Carter has shown in *The Times* this morning that my conjectural explanation of a word which claimed his sanction was unnecessary; he meant it in a sense which I may think is not unlikely to be missed, but which is perfectly legitimate. On this head, therefore, I beg to retract my previous criticism, and of Monsignor Capel's other quotations I can say little, as I should wish to examine their contexts and have not the books at hand; but his citation from Dr. Pusey's adaptation of the Paradise of the Christian Soul does not appear to me to establish his point. However, he may depend upon it that I will do my best to promote the excision of the fungi to which he has called attention from the devotional literature which is current among us; and any additional matter with which you may permit him to furnish me through your columns will only add to my opportunities of doing so, and will receive my careful attention.

But I have a question to ask Monsignor Capel. He says that in his reply to Mr. Gladstone he has 'not once referred to High Churchmen.' 'Of Ritualistic clergy and the Ritualistic party alone have I spoken.' These are his words. Yet together with my own name he couples that of my dear and venerated friend Dr. Pusey as of 'well-known leaders;' and he certainly does not except us when he proceeds to say that 'beyond doubt these men are unintentionally, but not the less assuredly, disseminating several doctrines of the Roman Church;' that is to say, doctrines of the Roman Church which the English Church has expressly repudiated. Now, Sir, Dr. Pusey's name has been before the world for nearly fifty years. He needs no apologies of mine; but to those who really know what he really feels and thinks on the particular matter in hand, this description of him as a 'well-known Ritualistic leader' will seem to be only less ludicrous than it is offensive. And unwilling as I am to refer to myself in such a connection I will yet say this—that while from time to time I have been obliged,

like other clergymen, to come forward in the defence of what I believe to be true, the idea of being a party leader is one which I view with the utmost repugnance, and I resent the liberty which Monsignor Capel has taken with my name. If his language means anything, it means that I am personally responsible for 'unintentionally, but not the less assuredly, disseminating several doctrines of the Roman Church.' As an English clergyman I can only treat this language as a gross insult. And I must therefore ask him either to prove his charge from what I have myself written and preached, or to consult the demands of his own honour, as doubtless he will, by making me a public apology in your columns.

He will say, perhaps, 'You are mixed up with the Ritualists; you befriend them.' Certainly, I do not mean to promote Monsignor Capel's schemes for making converts by helping to isolate a body of men, some of whom may have said or done that which I cannot defend, but the bulk of whom I believe to be devotedly loyal to the English Church. Monsignor Capel, apparently, is gifted with a very fine sense of the exact distinction between a High Churchman and a Ritualist; for me, all who desire to be loyal to the Prayer Book, whether they make mistakes or not, are brethren, whose friendship and co-operation I desire; and, if they make mistakes, they can afford to confess it; they are happily not weighted with any presumed necessity for keeping up a dramatic show of infallibility. It is of course, perfectly natural that Monsignor Capel should wish to break us up; like others before him, he would divide and conquer; and I cannot refuse to him the tribute of a certain sort of admiration for the skill with which he manipulates the lower passions of the popular Puritanism in the controversial interests of the Church of Rome. But, when he has done his best or his worst in this direction, he will still be, for educated people at any rate, a long way from success. He must show that the infallibility of 'Honorius the heretic' is compatible with the infallibility of the successor and of the Councils who anathematized him; he must convince us that the language to which the whole Roman Church was committed at Constance is not utterly irreconcilable with the more recent language which is now being imposed on it from the Vatican. He may not wish to bring these questions to the front, but there they are, and the last word has not yet been said about them.

To a 'Mere Layman,' who puts the case of a devout communicant, partaking of bread and wine which the priest, unknown to the communicant, had omitted to consecrate, I can only reply, as I fear to his disappointment, that I do not certainly know. On

the one hand, in such a case, the conditions of a valid Sacrament would not have been complied with ; and therefore the chartered gift of Christ could not be claimed. On the other, our Lord's grace is not 'tied to Sacraments,' although ordinarily it is given through them, and much may be hoped from His abundant mercy to supply a technical defect, even of a very serious kind. Probably the result would depend upon the degree in which the communicant was responsible for his ignorance of the invalidity of the Sacrament. Our Lord cannot be expected to make up for disadvantages which those persons incur who do not take the trouble to ascertain the conditions under which He is ready to bless and feed them ; but a party of devout lay Christians, thrown by shipwreck on a desert island, I cannot but believe, although they could not partake of the Sacrament itself, would not be allowed really to incur spiritual loss as a consequence of a misfortune which they could not control.

May I add, by way of postscript to a previous letter, that when 'An English Dignitary' bids me 'keep within the lines marked out by Bishop Andrewes,' I have every wish to obey him ? When answering Cardinal Bellarmine, Andrewes says, 'Præsentiam credimus non minùs quam vos veram ; de modo præsentiæ nil temerè definimus.' And soon afterwards, 'Nobis vobiscum de objecto convenit ; de modo lis omnis est. De Hoc est, firmâ fide tenemus quod sit ; de hoc modo est, ut sit Per, sive In, sive Cum, sive Sub, sive Trans, nullum inibi verbum est.' Hallam, who quotes these passages from Casaubon's Epistles, is certainly not a writer who has shown any disposition to consult the prejudices of High Churchmen ; and he paraphrases Andrewes as follows :—

'This is, reduced to plain terms, We fully agree with you that Christ's body is actually present in the sacramental elements in the same sense as you use the word ; but we see no cause for determining the precise mode, whether by transubstantiation or otherwise.' ('Hallam's Constitutional History of England,' vol. ii. p. 63, note c., 9th edition, 1857.)

For myself I should desire to modify this paragraph in one or two particulars in order to be strictly accurate : but as it stands, it shows what Hallam thought about Andrewes, and it is more than sufficient for my purpose.

I am, Sir, your most obedient servant,

H. P. Liddon.

January 12.

## XIX.

*'English Dignitary' on the Doctrine of the Church concerning the Holy Communion.*

SIR,—Canon Liddon is an admirable controversialist. When he cannot defend his words he takes refuge in his meaning, and since his meaning can only be reached through his words, his position is impregnable. As, however, he now challenges me with questions on my own belief, and it is of some importance that the teaching of the Church should not be misrepresented, I hope you will permit me to show what that teaching really is.

The Church unquestionably teaches that the gift given in the Lord's Supper is real. The body and blood of Christ is not a mere phrase or conception, but a solemn reality; objective, independent not only of the reception of the elements but of their consecration also. So, too, the Church teaches that the connexion between the elements and that body and blood is real. But there is not a word in any of the formularies to imply either directly or indirectly that that connexion is in any sense whatever local.

In interpreting the 28th Article I cannot allow that we are simply to take the meaning which the writer of it intended. The authority for the Articles is not that of the writers but that of the Church, and we are bound not by the sense in which the writer wrote them, but by the sense in which the Church adopted them. And to find that sense we must look first to their plain grammatical meaning. Now if the word 'given' in the 28th Article meant given by the priest, Canon Liddon would be right in inferring that the body of Christ must be previously 'there' or the priest could not give it. But the very next sentence asserts that the gift is received by faith, and as the priest cannot know whether the recipient has faith or not, the word 'given' must mean given by God, and as God can give what is not previously 'there' Canon Liddon's inference fails him.

When we turn to the Catechism we find the connexion between the sign and the thing signified in the Lord's Supper defined by the words to which Canon Liddon refers. The sign is the means whereby we receive the thing signified and a pledge to assure us that we have received it. But these words apply to both Sacraments alike. As to be baptized in water in the name of the Trinity is the means whereby we receive the grace of baptism, so

to receive the bread and wine is a means whereby we receive the body and blood of Christ. And a real presence or local connexion is no more implied in one case than in the other.

The fact is that the Church of England, warned by past experience, has deliberately refused to do what was previously done, and what Canon Liddon wishes us to do again, and that is to break up the Lord's Supper into two parts—the consecration and the reception, and to assign to each its special effect. The Church of England treats the Lord's Supper as a whole. The outward sign is defined in the Catechism not as simply bread and wine, nor as bread and wine which the Lord hath commanded to be blest, but bread and wine which the Lord hath commanded to be *received*. And as the Lord's commands in such a matter is everything, the words imply that until reception the sign is not complete. So again the thing signified is not simply the body and blood of Christ, but the body and blood of Christ which are verily and indeed *taken and received* by the faithful in the Lord's Supper. So again the Prayer of Consecration in the Communion Office is so worded that the one purpose of the consecration is made to be the reception, and every other is excluded. For the same reason nothing intervenes between the consecration and reception. And for the same reasons, also, everything which implies some other purpose than reception, as, for instance, elevation, adoration, reservation, is deliberately abandoned. If the doctrine of the Real Presence is not in express terms condemned, yet certainly everything short of that that could be done has been done to exclude it from the circle of the Church's teaching. Let Canon Liddon ask himself why it is that those who hold the doctrines are making every effort to revive the above-named abandoned practices. Let him ask himself how it is conceivable that a truth which he holds to be so certain and so precious should nowhere be stated in simple words, but left on his own showing to inference, and to inference so difficult (I maintain impossible) to establish.

I am well aware that as there are men who in their uncertainty what to believe find a comfort in the thoughts of an infallible Pope, so there are others who in their uncertainty about God's gifts find a comfort in the thought of a real presence. But how they can find this comfort in the Church of England I fail to see. For the Church plainly tells them that the mean whereby they can receive the Lord's body is faith, and even, therefore, if the Lord's body were present, their reception of it must still depend on their own hearts, and be as uncertain as before.

I readily express my gratitude to Canon Liddon and his friends

for what they have done to deepen our sense of the reality of God's gift in the Lord's Supper. But when they go further and localise that gift, and bring it under the conditions of material things, they seem to me to undo, and far more than undo, all the good that they have done. That such a doctrine degrades the gift, and is contrary to the whole tenor of our formularies, I cannot doubt.

Yours faithfully,

AN ENGLISH DIGNITARY.

January 13, 1875.

## XX.

*Mr. Droop on Bishop Gheste's letter.*

SIR,—The letter from Bishop Gheste, which Canon Liddon quoted yesterday, as 'determining the true sense of Article 28,' proves at the utmost only that the words 'after a spiritual and Heavenly manner only,' were not intended by Gheste to negative and exclude any presence whatever in the consecrated bread. I say 'intended by Gheste,' because if the words had been generally so understood by the Bishops and members of Convocation in 1562, Gheste would hardly have communicated the interpretation to Cheney as a secret, 'between him and me,' in 1566. The letter does not either affirm or suggest that either Gheste or anyone else intended the Article to assert as a doctrine of the Church any presence in the consecrated elements; and there is another contemporary document which conclusively proves that this could not have been intended either by the 28th Article or by the Church Catechism. I refer to Nowell's Catechism, which, after being revised by the Convocation of 1562, was again revised by Archbishop Parker before it was published in 1570, and which both the Canons of 1571, and the 79th Canon of 1603–4, passed and ratified by James I. a few months after the explanation of the sacraments, was added to the Church Catechism, ordered to be used by all schoolmasters. Nowell's Catechism (Norton's Translation, p. 215) contains the following questions:—

'Why dost thou not grant that the body and blood of Christ are included in the bread and wine, or that the bread and wine are changed into the substance of his body and blood?'

This is a distinct denial of anything like a real presence in the consecrated elements. Is it credible that the Convocation of 1571

and 1603–4 and James I. would have enjoined schoolmasters to teach a doctrine directly opposed to the Articles and the Church Catechism?

The following passage, also from Nowell's Catechism, p. 214, may be usefully compared with those which Canon Liddon relies upon in the 28th Article and the Church Catechism:—

'So when we rightly receive the Lord's Supper with the very divine nourishment of His body and blood, given unto us by the work of the Holy Ghost, and received of us by faith as the worth of our soul.'

If 'given' refers to the Holy Ghost in Nowell, why should it not do so also in the Article?

To return to Gheste's letter. What has made it such a favourite weapon of controversy since it was exhumed from the State Paper Office a few years ago, is the phrase, 'Though he took the body of Christ in his hand,' which is not at once seen to be, as I believe it is, part of the phraseology, adopted from the Doctor's, or else Cheney's phraseology. It may therefore be worth while to point out that in the only full and detailed statement of Gheste's views as to the Lord's Supper which has come down to us—the Treatise on the Privy Mass, published in 1548, the second year of Edward VI.—he uses such language as the following:—

'So that it is full open that the priest can neither consecrate Christ's body, neither make it. Howbeit this is always grantible. The minister both consecrateth and maketh, though not Christ's body and blood; yet the allotted bread and wine, the sacraments exhibitive of the same.' (Dugdale's 'Life of Gheste,' p. 79.)

'Albeit the consecrated bread is named Christ's body; yet it is not the said body, nor changed into the same, but so called in consideration therewith, the said body is both signified, presented, and exhibited.' (P. 84.)

'Christ, both God and man, with his Father and the Holy Ghost, is present at the baptism of faithful infants, where they become embodied and incorporate thereto—it is, to wit, when they eat His body and drink His blood as really as we do at His Supper.' (P. 116.)

He does not, however, altogether deny any presence of Christ's body in the bread; and when arguing against praying to Christ in the bread seems to admit it, but compares it to the presence of God the Father in each creature, and to Christ's presence in each religious assembly.

I have above used the phrase 'presence' in the consecrated bread, because it is the most intelligible translation of presence in the Sacrament in the sense in which it is used in Gheste's letter. I have no wish to tie Canon Liddon down to the preposition 'in.' I observe that among the prepositions to express the relation between the Sacramental gifts and the consecrated elements, Andrewes mentions he places 'per' first, which, as well as Canon Liddon's 'by means of,' seems to me quite in accordance with the views of the original framers of our Articles and Catechism.

Yours obediently,

H. B. Droop.

January 12.

## XXI.

Sir,—It is impossible to watch without admiration the courage and pertinacity with which Canon Liddon parries the home thrusts of his Romish adversary. But it is to be regretted that the champion of the High Church section of the Anglican Church cannot face an external foe without spending half his strength on members of his own communion. He is nothing if he is not aggressive. He cannot throw his shield over the extreme wing of his own adherents without the usual side blow at two personages whom they and he seem to hold in equal disfavour—the Dean of Westminster and the Archbishop of Canterbury. The Dean can protect himself, and will suffer little from the implied taunt which the Canon, following in the footsteps of a speaker at the Brighton Conference, has launched against him for not denouncing a book written by the 'son of his great teacher.' But in introducing in the same context, and for the second time in a single letter, the name of the 'Primate,' the Canon has been guilty of an error, not only of taste, but in a matter of fact. His argument is that if he (Dr. Liddon) ought to have rebuked the undoubted Romish tendencies of the advanced wing of his own party, many of them young men formed under his own influence and that of his colleagues in the Oxford Professoriate, the Primate was at least equally bound to use his high position to censure a book written, not by a friend, or a pupil, or a member of the same party in the Church, but by the 'son of his great teacher.' It is strange that an Oxford resident of Dr. Liddon's standing should have been ignorant of the fact that the Archbishop, whose Oxford career was no less distinguished than his own, was neither a pupil of Dr. Arnold nor bound by any tie of party or other connexion to read, praise, blame, or

criticise a book called 'Literature and Dogma.' It is still more to be lamented that so fine an intellect and so sympathetic a nature should have learnt, while it repels with genuine dislike some of the characteristic features of Rome, to lose no chance of expressing something more than dislike for the Puritan, for the Evangelical, for the Latitudinarian, and for the Moderate parties in our own Church. It is hardly less to be lamented that an Oxford Professor and a Canon of St. Paul's should, while speaking in defence of a party only too given to kick against their ecclesiastical superiors, persistently set an example of attacks, aimed not the less openly because indirectly, at one whose very position renders reply impossible.

Your very obedient servant,

OXONIENSIS.

January 11.

## XXII.

*Article in the 'Times,' January* 13, 1875.

Canon Liddon does not find it so easy as he supposed to withdraw from the controversy into which he plunged, and he again endeavours this morning to divert from himself and his friends the force of Monsignor Capel's allegations. What he says of his opponent's additional quotations is not less true of his own reply—that they 'do not really modify the conditions of the controversy.' But the continuation of the dispute is none the less instructive, as showing that the broad facts which it at first presented cannot really be explained away. Monsignor Capel's second quotations were, if possible, stronger than his first; but we need not rely on our own judgment of them. Canon Liddon again has to avow his inability to undertake the defence of the passages adduced, and can only plead that the indictment, like most others, does not hold equally good on all points. 'Your correspondent,' he says, 'again blends with some indefensible quotations others of a different character, though the difference might not be obvious to readers who are unfamiliar with theological language.' In other words, some of the passages go beyond all admissible limits, and others approach so near the edge, that it requires special theological training to observe the fine distinctions which protect them. What extraordinary acumen is needed is, indeed, sufficiently shown by the comparison of Dr. Liddon's letters with that which was addressed to us by Mr. Carter, of Clewer. In a book edited by

Mr. Carter, the elements were said to be 'turned into' certain sacred substances. It appeared to Dr. Liddon that this expression passed the line which divides Transubstantiation from the Real Presence, and he considerately apologised for it as due to an inadvertence on the Editor's part. But Mr. Carter has written to say that there was no inadvertence in the matter, but that the word 'turned' is used with a fine shade of meaning which makes all the difference between Catholic and Roman Catholic. It may imply, he says, 'various kinds of change, such as moral change or change of condition, not necessarily a physical change; and it is here intended to imply a sacramental change.' If Mr. Carter's idea of defining the change effected in the Sacrament by describing it as a sacramental change be original, he deserves great credit for it, and the expression may be recommended to the disputants on all sides as a perfectly neutral term on which they can all agree. It is hard to see how the stanchest Roman Catholic could object to this explanation. But in Canon Liddon's eyes it is sufficient to excuse the use of the expression in question. Mr. Carter, he says, 'meant it in a sense which I may think is not unlikely to be missed, but which is perfectly legitimate.' So that the degree of familiarity with theological language necessary to protect a reader against a Roman Catholic interpretation of Mr. Carter's language is one degree greater than that of Canon Liddon. If this be the case, what is likely to be the general effect of such language upon the mass of Ritualistic congregations? It is to be remembered, as Monsignor Capel justly observes, that these are not one or two casual expressions inadvertently dropped. They are embodied in books sold in edition after edition, and they exhibit the devotions and the ideas which men of Mr. Carter's authority deliberately invite English Sisterhoods, English congregations and English children to follow. Canon Liddon has at length been aroused by Monsignor Capel to recognise such doctrines as 'fungi,' and to promise his best efforts 'to promote their excision from the devotional literature which is current among us.' It is a pity he did not discover the growth of such 'fungi' in the current literature of the Ritualists until people of feeble constitution all over the country had been poisoned and strong men disgusted by them.

From this point of view we regret that we cannot modify the reprehensions we formerly expressed, and to which Canon Liddon took exception, of the conduct of the High Churchmen for whom he speaks in this matter, and they can only escape from it by admitting to the full the justice of Monsignor Capel's charge against them. Either Canon Liddon does consider these excrescences on the teaching

of clergymen to be as noxious as his image suggests, or he does not. If he does not, what is that but to say that he is inclined to judge tenderly of Roman Catholic perversions of the truth, and does not see much harm in devotions which actually put into the mouths of Churchmen distinctively Roman Catholic language—in other words, that the tendency of his opinion leads him, however unconsciously, to countenance Roman superstitions? But if he does think such abuses poisonous, what are we to say of the supineness or lack of vigilance which has permitted men of his influence to delay interposition until a Roman Catholic ecclesiastic can almost claim the Ritualists as his own? The public have been protesting for years against the spread of these very superstitions, but the voice of the High Church leaders has rarely, if ever, been heard except in deprecation of such protests. Even now Canon Liddon complains of 'the cynical injustice' with which the promoters of these abuses are assailed 'by an earnest but uninstructed public opinion,' and has scarcely a word of real rebuke for the men who have brought this discredit on the English Church and on his party. When he admits as sufficient Mr. Carter's justification of a questionable phrase, he affords us a measure of the severity with which he would apply the 'excision' he promises; and it is difficult to feel much confidence in the result. The indignation he expresses in his present letter at Monsignor Capel's use of his name appears, in fact, a little out of place. It is so far from being 'a gross insult' to tell him that he is 'unintentionally, but not the less assuredly,' disseminating some of the doctrines of the Roman Church, that, on the contrary, if he would take the warning, it might be of real service to him. The public will fully accept his own disclaimer of being disposed to disseminate such doctrines, nor had Monsignor Capel alleged such a charge against him. But it is a mere matter of fact, on which he must submit to the verdict of experience, whether the party for which he pleaded the other day with so much earnestness, and over which even now, therefore, the protection of his distinguished name is thrown, is doing this work. That this is the case has now been made perfectly plain, and the High Church leaders are gravely responsible for the result.

The truth, we fear, as this whole controversy tends to show, is that they approach such questions from an entirely different point of view from the English people in general. To a large number of serious men there must be something inexpressibly melancholy in this spectacle of two or three of the most eminent religious teachers of the day exerting their whole strength in verbal subtleties, and disputing as if the whole significance and weight of

the most solemn ordnance of the Christian religion depended on a preposition, an adverb, or a scholastic inference. There may be far more reverence in the silence of uncertainty than in the ruthless dissection of language which, however profound in its original solemnity, becomes even distressing by vulgar repetition. But it seems as if Roman Catholics and High Churchmen regarded the whole world as necessarily wavering, with the exception of mere sceptics, between the arms of Popery and Anglicanism. From their controversial spectacles the whole English world is mainly divided by this controversy, and they contend with zealous fanaticism which shall be the most successful in absorbing the wavering crowd into their net. Monsignor Capel loses no opportunity to snatch at the Ritualists, and Canon Liddon instantly rushes forward to reassert his rival claim. All the while they seem both to be ignorant that the great mass of thoughtful public opinion is occupied with questions which go far deeper than their ecclesiastical premisses, and that men and women are earnestly seeking solutions of questions with which disputes about the exact nature of the presence in the Sacrament have no more to do than the old scholastic discussions respecting the nature of substance and accident. The excrescences upon which Canon Liddon looks so tenderly are to them a reactionary revival of noxious superstitions, and betoken a habit of mind in which all real thought and vigour are extinguished. The world at large is turning to the light, without fear of the divisions it must at first create, while High Churchmen and Roman Catholics are endeavouring to retreat once more into the gloom of the past. Cannot English Churchmen find some better work to do than to contend with Roman ecclesiastics for the privilege of affording us shelter in the dim and deserted caverns of the past.—*The Times*, Jan. 13, 1875.

## XXIII.

*Canon Liddon's answer to XXI. and XIX.*

Sir,—To argue with you is to argue with the master of thirty legions; but you will be generous enough, I feel assured, not to misconstrue my silence.

May I explain to 'Oxoniensis' that he altogether misapprehends the purpose of my illustration? The idea of an indirect attack on the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Dean of Westminster never for a moment entered into my head. I wished to show that no party can fairly be made responsible for everything

that may be popularly associated with its tendencies; and so far am I from criticising the silence of the distinguished persons to whom I venture to refer, that I can well conceive that had I, *per impossibile*, been where and what they are, I should, at the risk of misunderstanding, but for some obvious reasons of religious prudence, have endeavoured to imitate it.

To answer 'An English Dignitary' is not, I think, impossible, but it would require a pamphlet to do so satisfactorily. I thank him for admitting that 'the body and blood of Christ is not a mere phrase or conception, but a solemn reality.' Admitting this, he cannot mean to brand the expression 'Real Presence' as entirely illegitimate. Bishop Andrewes' sentence is there, 'Præsentiam credimus, non minus quam vos, veram.' 'An English Dignitary' believes with me that Christ's body and blood are really received by faith; and he thus does admit, at any rate, a real presence in the heart of the believer, which, unless the believer's heart or soul be omnipresent, must be also, one would suppose, in some sense, a determinate presence. Faith receives, it does not create, this presence; and the question is whether the presence is in any way whatever associated with the consecrated elements before being received. There, I fear, 'An English Dignitary' and I must part company. Looking to the great feature of our Communion Service, the Prayer of Consecration—looking to its historical significance—looking to the fact that in the Roman office itself there is the same anticipatory reference to a reception by the people as in our own service ('ut nobis corpus et sanguis fiat dilectissimi Filii Tui')—I cannot follow your correspondent in his estimate of the intentions of the framers of our Prayer Book. Had they, indeed, swept this Prayer of Consecration utterly away, there would have been no question about the matter. But, in that case, the Church of England would have parted company, on a point of capital importance, with the Primitive Church of Christ. That at the Reformation all other aspects of the Eucharist were steadily subordinated to that of Communion I, of course, allow; but the Consecration Prayer—if it is to be more than an unmeaning, and therefore, under such circumstances, an irreverent form—must surely imply a presence which is, in a phrase, familiar to our great Caroline divines—*extra usum sacramenti*.

I am, Sir, your most obedient servant,

H. P. LIDDON.

January 13, 1875.

## XXIV.

*Second letter from Mr. Carter defending 'Treasury of Devotion.'*

SIR,—As Monsignor Capel has taken advantage of a remark of my friend Dr. Liddon, fixing on me the supposed carelessness of allowing a manual of devotion to go forth under my authority without weighing the expressions used on such a momentous subject as that of Holy Communion, I request you to allow me to make some remarks on a matter so nearly concerning me.

It would be a serious wrong, and would render me unworthy of trust as a teacher, thus to authorise important devotions without carefully weighing them, and I desire to state that special care was taken by me in overlooking the 'Treasury of Devotion,' and that I am prepared to justify what it contains as true to what I believe to be the teaching of the Church of England. After what has passed I feel it simply a matter of honesty to make this public avowal in regard to a book which is now in very extensive use.

With reference to the particular expression which has become the subject of so much discussion, 'Bread into His flesh is turned,' as Monsignor Capel repeats the assertion, with fresh extracts to the point, that the words imply Transubstantiation, I beg respectfully, but most deliberately, to deny that such is the case. I have already quoted Thorndike as one instance of an avowedly orthodox member of our own communion affirming the expression with a disclaimer of its having any such meaning. I would add a few extracts from Fathers to whom we are accustomed to look as among the highest authorities for purely Catholic truth.

S. Cyprian says (de Cœnâ Domini, cap. 9) :—'Panis iste, quem Dominus discipulis porrigebat, non effigie, sed naturâ, mutatus omnipotentiâ Verbi factus est caro.' S. Cyril (Cat. Myst.).—'Aquam mutavit in vinum, et non erit dignus cui credamus quod vinum in sanguinem transmutavit?' S. Gregory Nyssen (Oratio Catech.).—'Recte Dei Verbo sanctificatum panem in Dei Verbi corpus credimus immutari.' And again, Cyril of Alexandria (Ep. ad Calosyrium)—'Convertens ea (se oblato) in veritatem propriæ carnis.'

Such expressions were in use long before Transubstantiation was heard of; nor is it possible to express the high mystery we believe without such expressions. Is the bread before and after consecration in all respects the same? Bread still, no doubt; but consecrated bread, and, by virtue of consecration, the Lord's body.

For as surely as Christ said to His Disciples, 'This is My body,' so surely does the minister pronounce the bread when consecrated to be His body. What is this but that bread has become His body? Does it offend to say that, being His body, it is His flesh? What, then, do we mean when we pray, in anticipation of receiving the consecrated elements, 'Grant us so to eat the flesh of Thy dear Son.' That which we pray to receive rightly is the body or flesh of Christ; and, if so, there has been a change—a conversion or turning of the Elements into what they were not before.

I entirely repudiate the doctrine of Transubstantiation, understanding by the term the removal of the substance of the bread and its replacing by the substance of our Lord's body. I believe the co-existence of the two substances—that of the bread and that of the body—in a sacramental union, by the grace of consecration, is a mystery transcending all human intelligence. It is most important to bear in mind that the charge of Transubstantiation turns on the question whether the bread remains bread still; and to impute the doctrine of Transubstantiation to expressions implying change in the Elements without being specifically a change of substance, is simply to throw dust in people's eyes.

If this unhappy discussion leads to a clearer understanding of the distinctions dividing the Church of England from the Church of Rome, and so a clearer view of our own, good will result, and there will be less opportunity of misrepresenting and hindering the efforts that are being made honestly and loyally to restore and extend among us primitive Catholic truth.

Permit me to correct an error in my letter which appeared on Tuesday. For 'Golden Treasury,' read 'Golden Manual.'

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

T. T. CARTER.

Clewer Rectory, Jan. 12.

## XXV.

*'Ridley Redivivus' quoting Ritualistic writers.*

SIR,—In your admirable leading article of the 9th inst. you have shown conclusively that Monsignor Capel has made out his case, if not as against Dr. Liddon personally, against those whose cause he undertook to plead. But I venture to remark that the Monsignor's quotations were by no means the best that might have been chosen, and consequently that the case might have been proved much more completely. In a pamphlet recently edited by

a well-known member of the Ultra High Church party respecting the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, we read as follows :

'Whatever be the mistakes on either side'—*i.e.* on the side of the Church of Rome or the Church of England—'we have every reason to be thankful to God Almighty for His wonderful protection in preserving the doctrinal statements of the Church on both sides free from grave error. Drawn up by divines with sympathies on different sides in the controversies that then stirred men's passions so deeply, it is a remarkable circumstance that there is no statement in the formularies of either Communion which is not perfectly consistent with entire soundness in the faith. It is true that when placed side by side the statements at first sight look almost contradictory. But when more closely examined it will be found, without any violence done to the language, that the definitions on the one side are perfectly consistent with those on the other.' ('Studies in Modern Problems,' second series, No. 3, p. 2, &c.)

The same writer, at p. 12, refers with approval to the charge of a Scotch Bishop, delivered in 1858, which would have no particular interest for us in England if it were not for the fact that it had previously received the *imprimatur* of some of the leaders of our modern High Church party, and especially of—I must not say the author of the 'Christian Year,' but—Mr. Keble, as he was in his latter years; who took an active part in the controversy raised at the time, and was present at the trial in Edinburgh, in 1860, when the author of the charge underwent a sentence from the Synod of his Episcopal brethren—a sentence of personal acquittal, but of condemnation of his doctrine—very similar to that which was passed upon Mr. Bennett by the Committee of Privy Council in 1871. This charge, which passed through three editions, and the 'Defence' of which by the author is among the books recommended in that well-known Ritualistic manual, 'The Priests' Prayer-book,' 4th edition, contained passages which would have been more to Monsignor Capel's purpose (especially considering the eminence of the sponsor for their publication) than any, perhaps, which he has selected. For example :—

'In the sense that the sacrifice is the victim, it is evident, as a consequence of the Real Presence, that that of the Holy Eucharist and of the Cross are substantially one. . . . What is received by the faithful is that which was pierced by the soldier's spear. . . . Our Lord said, "This is My body;" and no words of man can strengthen the absolute identity of the two sacrifices—or rather, as I should prefer to say, of the one sacrifice in its two aspects.' (2nd edition, p. 42.)

It is doctrine such as this, put forth with authority and under sanctions so well calculated to recommend it to our younger clergy, which has given an impulse which now appears almost irresistible to the Ritualistic use of the eastward position in the administration of Holy Communion—a use to which Dr. Liddon attaches so much importance that rather than submit to the judgment of our highest ecclesiastical tribunal which condemned it, he publicly announced, in writing first to the *Guardian*, and afterwards to the *Times*, March 20, 1871, that he himself and 'the High Church party,' would 'to a very great extent find relief in co-operation with the political forces which are working towards Disestablishment.'

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

RIDLEY REDIVIVUS.

## XXVI.

*Mr. P. V. Smith against Canon Liddon.*

SIR,—If your columns are still open to a continuation of this controversy, will you allow me, as a layman, to point out an important inconsistency between the position adopted by Dr. Liddon, in the letter which appeared in the *Times* of the 7th inst., and an argument used by him in his letter which appeared on the 11th inst.?

In the earlier letter he affirms that there is 'an objective element in the Eucharist, to which nothing corresponds exactly in the sacrament of Baptism. . . . The difference between the two cases is that, in accordance with the original institution of these sacraments, in the one our Lord's words are pronounced over the recipient, in the other over the element, which by His appointment is thus associated with the conveyance of His gift; and hence, in the Lord's Supper, there is an antecedent relation established between the gift and the element, to which nothing corresponds in baptism.' In his later letter, Dr. Liddon re-asserts the existence of 'a relation of the sacramental gifts to the consecrated elements in the Holy Communion prior to and independently of the act of reception;' and appeals to the Church's statement that the outward sign in the Sacrament is a 'means whereby we receive the inward grace,' as well as a 'pledge to assure us thereof.' 'How,' he adds, 'is the outward sign a means of receiving the inward grace, if the "English Dignitary" is right in warning me to be "content with a coincidence in time" between the reception

of the sign and the reception of the inward grace "instead of a coincidence in space"?'

Without entering into the question whether one thing or one act may not be the means of another without a coincidence between the two either in space or in time, I wish to point out that the statement of the Church to which Dr. Liddon refers is made in the Catechism respecting both sacraments alike, and, therefore, cannot consistently be used by him as an argument in favour of an objectivity in the Eucharist to which, by his own confession, there is nothing corresponding in baptism.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

P. V. SMITH.

Stone Buildings, Lincoln's Inn, Jan. 12.

## XXVII.

*Compiler of 'Vade Mecum' in self-defence.*

SIR,—I have not the honour of being personally acquainted with Monsignor Capel, but from much which I have heard about him I had gathered that, although an elegant and popular preacher, he was not a skilled theologian, and consequently not a fair controversialist. He has now himself confirmed this impression. It is a pity that such a one should enter upon theological controversy; no doubt unintentionally, his deficiencies betray him into entire misrepresentation of those whose opinions he undertakes to state. Such has certainly been the case with a letter from Monsignor Capel which appeared in the *Times* of the 8th inst., and which I have only just seen, in which he identifies expressions in one book for which I am wholly, and in another for which I am partially, responsible with forms of doctrine which they do not really imply. In support of his original statement that 'Ritualists' are disseminating distinctly Roman doctrines, Monsignor Capel is pleased to quote certain passages from 'The English Catholic's Vade Mecum,' compiled by myself, and from the (Appendix to) 'The Hymnal Noted,' of which I was a co-compiler. I will proceed to examine the use Monsignor Capel makes of these quotations.

1. The Roman doctrine of the Invocation of Saints teaches that it is right and useful to address to the saints themselves petitions and requests. To show that the 'Vade Mecum' inculcates this, Monsignor Capel refers to and quotes prayers addressed to God, asking him to grant the petitioner the help of the prayers

of the saints. It is, of course, open to anyone to doubt whether this distinction is of any practical value, but a distinction there is, and a scientific theologian is bound to respect it. Whether the prayers in the 'Vade Mecum' are the same as those used by Monsignor Capel when a little boy has, I apprehend, little real bearing on the general question. That the saints do pray for us is a traditional doctrine of the old-fashioned High Anglican School; in confirmation of this let anyone turn to the section on All Saints' Day in such a household companion as Nelson's 'Fasts and Festivals.'

2. Theologians know that the hinge on which the doctrine of Transubstantiation turns is the belief that at Consecration there is a change of the substance of the bread and wine. Any doctrine of the real presence which comes short of this is not the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation, whatever else it may be. Did Monsignor Capel know this it is surprising that he should have quoted words from the Appendix to the 'Hymnal Noted' and 'Vade Mecum,' none of which say anything about any change of the substance of the Eucharistic bread and wine one way or another. Again, I say that no doubt many persons might exclaim, 'If you believe in the real objective presence in the Sacrament, I do not see that it makes much difference what you do or do not believe about the substance of the bread and wine.' Very likely; but the Church of Rome does not say this. To her the real presence *minus* transubstantiation and the real presence *plus* transubstantiation are two very different things, and a theologian speaking in her name is bound, in honesty, to make this clear. It would be easy to parallel the extracts from the 'Vade Mecum' with quotations from the devotional writings of standard Anglican divines, but I will not encroach on your space. Nor is it necessary, for the question before us is not what is or what is not consistent with Anglican tradition, but what is or is not distinctively Roman teaching.

3. The Romish doctrine about Confession and Absolution is that the sacrament of penance is a sacrament generally necessary to salvation; that mortal sin cannot (speaking ordinarily and generally) be remitted in any other way. No theologian would for a moment consider the extracts from the 'Vade Mecum,' given by Monsignor Capel under this head, as equivalent expressions of such doctrine as this. I may add that the 'precept of the Church,' quoted from the 'Vade Mecum,' is merely a recast of Bishop Cosin's words in his celebrated 'Manual of Devotions.'

To sum up, I may add that in compiling the 'Vade Mecum,' I,

of set purpose, deliberately and consciously worded the devotions so as to exclude the distinctively Romish aspects of the doctrines of the Invocation of Saints, the Real Presence, and Sacramental Confession. And I maintain that any scientific theologian will agree that I have succeeded in doing so. No Roman theologian would accept my work as adequately expressing Roman Catholic belief and practice on these points. That it does so partially he would no doubt allow, and the same has been allowed of the Book of Common Prayer. Were I to appear before a competent Roman Catholic theologian, and request admission to the communion of his Church, declaring that I believed no more in the doctrines named above than is expressed in the 'Vade Mecum,' he dare not admit me. And, more than this, were a Roman Catholic, for whom the plea of 'invincible ignorance' could not be alleged, to declare that he accepted my little book as an adequate expression of his faith, the very points of difference which I have excluded, his spiritual guide would be bound to refuse him absolution and communion as a formal heretic and to warn him that he was in danger of everlasting damnation.

To make use of popular ignorance of real theological distinctions and differences in order to serve a controversial end is so unworthy a trick that I prefer to assume that Monsignor Capel's theological competency, rather than his moral perceptions, is in fault.

In justice to the late Dr. Neale's memory, it ought to be pointed out that the 'Catechetical Notes' from which Monsignor Capel quotes are a very mixed affair indeed. The first fourteen pages only were prepared by Dr. Neale himself for the press before his death. The remainder (of a volume of 220 pages) was compiled, after his decease, from recollections of his teaching, from 'extremely slight' notes found among his papers, from 'books used by him' (!), and other miscellaneous sources, by the earnest and self-denying ladies who form the religious community founded by the reverend Doctor. Apparently, their work was never submitted to any responsible theologian. Of the prudence displayed by these ladies in adopting this course I will say nothing. But I would ask Monsignor Capel, or any other clergyman of any denomination, would he be content that the tone of his teaching should be judged of, after his decease, from a publication consisting of fourteen pages of his own writing, and 206 compiled by the ladies of his congregation from their own memories of what they imagined they had heard him say, and from a free use of the notes and books found in his library or among his papers? Yet from such a publi-

cation Monsignor Capel calls on the public to judge not only of Dr. Neale's teaching, but of that of 'Ritualistic' clergymen in general! I have been at least twenty years associated, as teacher and taught, with what is supposed to be the 'extreme' section of High Churchmen; but I never, so far as I can recollect, once heard the phrases supposed to be allowed by Dr. Neale about Transubstantiation used by an Anglican clergyman in his public or private teaching, nor have I ever used them myself.

As I consider that by the use he has made of extracts from it, Monsignor Capel has aspersed the character of my book, I trust to your justice to insert this letter, and subscribe myself,

Your obedient servant,

THE COMPILER OF THE ENGLISH CATHOLIC'S 'VADE MECUM.'

*Times*, Jan. 15, 1875.

## XXVIII.

SIR,—Bishop Wilberforce in his last words in the House of Lords used the following sentence:—'I hate and abhor Romanising teaching in the Church of England.'

In the year 1868 I had occasion to refer to the Bishop respecting the 28th Article, and he replied in these words:—

'It is most certainly the doctrine of our Church that there is a real spiritual presence of Christ vouchsafed to His people in the partaking of the consecrated elements, and by no one is this more strongly affirmed than by Ridley.'

These words are not so clear, but do not disagree from those by Richard Hooker. As for the sacraments used they are not really, nor do really contain, in themselves that grace which with them or by them it pleaseth God to bestow.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

JOSEPH SAVORY.

Buckhurst Park, Sunninghill, Berks, Jan. 14.

## XXIX.

*M. Capel quoting 'Priest to the Altar,' and other Ritualistic books.*

SIR,—Throughout the correspondence between Canon Liddon and myself he appears aggrieved that I should have mentioned his name. I did so thinking that no better authority could be cited to deny the popular opinion, which pretty generally obtains, that

Ritualists are deliberately and aforethought leading people to Rome. Having called him as witness to the contrary, I went on to say that the Ritualistic clergy were unconsciously, though unintentionally, 'disseminating our doctrines.' The Canon thereupon imagined I attributed in part this work to him. He resented, and calls upon me to apologise for what I neither said nor intended to imply. This has compelled me to make a further examination of the subject under discussion, the results of which I now beg to bring under your readers' notice.

1. The letters of the Canon in *The Times* amply show that he believes in an objective, and therefore local Real Presence. This being the case, to Christ there present he is bound to offer gold, frankincense, and myrrh. Admit the actual presence of Christ, and the richest and most gorgeous ritual is but a consequence.

2. In 1865 a book was published under the title of the 'Priest to the Altar.' I am informed by a brother of the 'Brotherhood of the Holy Trinity,' to which the Canon is said to have belonged, as well as by some Oxford ex-clergymen, that this book was edited by Dr. Liddon and another High Church clergyman. Therein, just before the usual words of consecration, is inserted the prayer—'Send down Thy Holy Spirit upon this Sacrifice, that He may *make* this bread the Body of Thy Christ.' And in the first hymn for the Holy Communion are the very words condemned by the Canon :—

> Wondrous truth by Christians learned,
> Bread into His flesh is turned,
> Into precious blood the wine.

On the next page (unfortunately, there are no numbers) we read on the Blessed Sacrament :—

> Humbly I adore Thee hidden Deity
> Which beneath these Symbols are from me concealed,
> Seeing, touching, tasting, all are here deceived,
> But by hearing only safely 'tis believed.

The 'Lauda, Sion,' the 'Adoro Te devote,' from which these are taken, as well as the 'Pange. Lingua,' and the 'Verbum supernum prodiens,' to be found on the same pages of this book, are all composed by St. Thomas Aquinas, who most carefully uses the theological terms which express our doctrine of Transubstantiation.

It is for the Canon to decide with Mr. Carter and with your other correspondents whether his is the true doctrine of the Church of England. If he wishes to disassociate himself from those who are

disseminating Roman doctrines, then should he hasten to deny what is generally asserted—that this book, containing in our own language our doctrine of the Real Presence, was edited by him.

3. Much as I have seen of Ritualistic works and heard of Ritualistic practices, never did I imagine it possible that any clergymen of the Anglican communion could publish what is set forth by a 'Father of the Society of St. Joseph' on the 'Love of Mary,' in the following:—

'. . . We confess ourselves unworthy to approach Thee, therefore we unite our prayers to the all-prevailing petitions of Thy Blessed Mother, and beseech Thee to accept on our behalf the Sacred and Immaculate Heart of Mary. O Saviour of the world, grant that we who truly believe her to be the Mother of God may be assisted by her intercession with Thee, Who livest and reignest one God, world without end. Amen.

'It is no impiety to say, "Holy Mary, pray for us."—Bishop Montagu.

'A few plain Directions for Awakening in the Heart a Pious Devotion to Mary.

'Be careful to say daily at 6 A.M., 12, and 6 P.M.

'THE ANGELUS.

'V. The Angel of the Lord announced to Mary.
'R. And she conceived by the Holy Ghost.
'Hail Mary, &c.

'V. Behold the handmaid of the Lord.
'R. Be it done unto me according to Thy word.
'Hail Mary, &c.

'V. And the word was made flesh.
'R. And dwelt amongst us.
'Hail Mary.

'Collect for Annunciation of our Lady.

---

'Constantly use the Rosary; and Little Office B.V.M.
'Always hear Mass on her Festivals.

---

'Remember, O most gracious Virgin Mary, that never was it known that thy protection, help, and mediation were asked in vain. Full of confidence I fly to thee, O Mother, Virgin of Virgins, to thee I have recourse, though I am sinful and burdened with sorrow (here make mention of your desires). O Mother of the God-man, despise not my petitions, but of thy pity, hear and obtain a favourable answer to my prayers.

---

'Keep an image or picture of Mary among your objects of piety and wear a medal bearing her effigy.'

A member of this same society edits 'permissu superiorum' (!) 'Oratory Worship.' This book is published by the Church Press Company, Burleigh Street, Strand, and contains, 'Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament,' 'Procession and Veneration of Relics,' the 'Salva Regina,' the 'Rosary of the Blessed Virgin' and 'Hymns to Our Lady and St. Joseph.' The book might, with the smallest modification, be used by our own people. I must avow it almost 'took me in.' I give only one citation from page 58 :—

'Hail Mary ! full of grace ; the Lord is with thee ; blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb, Jesus. Holy Mary, Mother of God ! pray for us sinners now and at the hour of our death. Amen.'

Comment is needless. Let anyone read this book, and then say if I have exaggerated in stating that the Ritualistic clergy are 'assuredly disseminating our doctrines.'

In closing this correspondence, I beg to say I have been animated by no unkind feelings, much less by any desire to appeal, as Canon Liddon states, to 'the lower passions of the popular Puritanism.' He called in question a statement I made ; I have simply appealed to facts to substantiate it. Neither the Canon nor the Ritualistic clergy can hope to please either God or man by personalities and the imputation of base motives. Truth needs not such weapons of defence. If the doctrines and practices which I have referred to are legitimate, why hide them ? I cannot conceive, for instance, why one of our books, the 'Manuel des Confesseurs' should be translated under the title of the 'Priest in Absolution,' be widely circulated among Ritualistic clergy, become their guide-book in the Confessional, and then, because the matter

is discovered, that it should be said Confession in the Church of England is merely counselled, but not exacted. Let your readers be the judges.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

T. J. CAPEL.

Catholic University College, Kensington, Jan. 15.

## XXX.

*Canon Liddon's final reply to M. Capel.*

SIR,—Monsignor Capel tells me that, as I read his reply to Mr. Gladstone, I misunderstood his meaning. In assuring me that he 'neither said nor intended to imply' that which I attributed to him he entirely supersedes the necessity for an apology by making an explanation which he has every right to make. Every man must be presumed to know best what he means by what he says, and I could sincerely wish that it were possible for me to retire at this point, with an expression of my grateful acknowledgments, from an unwelcome discussion.

But your correspondent has followed up his opening sentences by statements which oblige me, both in justice to myself and as a matter of duty and candour to your readers, to ask you to permit me to trouble you with some further remarks.

Here let me clear my way by stating that I have heard of but not seen 'The Priest in Absolution,' and that before reading Monsignor Capel's letter I had neither seen nor heard of the book on 'The Love of Mary,' edited by 'A Father of the Society of St. Joseph,' or of 'Oratory Worship.' I cannot, therefore, discuss them with Monsignor Capel on equal terms. If 'The Priest in Absolution' teaches, as Monsignor Capel appears to imply, that confession is universally obligatory upon Christians, it certainly is without warrant from the Church of England; and I have already said enough to indicate my opinion of the two latter works, if they may be at all fairly estimated by the extracts supplied by your correspondent. Monsignor Capel may think that a 'well-known leader' ought to have known more about these books than I do; but the idea that I am responsible for a general censorship of devotional works is new to me; and of late years the calls of duty have obliged me to read, almost exclusively, in a very different direction from that of the literature to which these books belong.

Without criticising too narrowly the sources from which your correspondent derives his information, which he feels at liberty to

produce in your columns, I am very willing to inform him and your readers that the Brotherhood of the Holy Trinity is a society, composed chiefly, but not exclusively, of young men, who accept certain rules intended to have the effect of promoting serious and working lives, without unduly interfering with their liberty. One of these regulations, I may observe, binds its members not to enter an English Roman Catholic Chapel. Of this society I became a member in 1847, and while, like everything of the sort, it has had its share of failure and vicissitude, it has, in my opinion, on the whole, done a great deal of good.

The 'Priest to the Altar' was compiled by a clergyman of somewhat vehement anti-Roman tendencies, in whose learning and critical judgment I have entire confidence; and my own relation to it is limited to this—I revised some of the proof-sheets before publication, and I defrayed a part of the expenses. Fearing lest my own memory might be at fault, I have just now asked my friend to correct or to endorse this statement, and he has no hesitation about endorsing it.

But I must maintain that the book is an honest piece of Church of England work, and that it does not teach Transubstantiation. By this I do not mean that it is free from mistakes on this side and on that—mistakes to which, probably, I am more alive now than when, fourteen years ago, I first saw it. But I am speaking of its general tone and drift; and, as it is out of print, I had perhaps better give a short description of it.

It is, briefly, the Communion Service, Collects, Epistles, and Gospels of the Church of England, illustrated or supplemented from ancient sources. Of these the chief are those true treasuries of primitive devotion, the Sacramentaries of SS. Gregory, Gelasius, and Leo. Of what remains, the greater part is taken from the original source of our own Prayer Book, the ancient English lore of Salisbury; while some very few collects are from the Mozarabic and Roman rites. It is, in truth, a sufficiently eclectic compilation, and before and after the service itself there are prayers from the Invitation of Christ, from Bishop Kerr, from Arvisnet, and others.

At the end there is a collection of twelve hymns for the Holy Communion, from which your correspondent quotes, but the very existence of which, as a part of the book, I must own I had entirely forgotten when I wrote to you the other day, and until looking at it this morning. Of these hymns, four are by Aquinas; one is anonymous; three are from the 'Lyra Germanica,' translations of Protestant hymn-writers—Frank, Scheffler, and Kern; three are Wesley's, numbered 545, 549, and 551 in his hymn-book; and one

is from the hymn-book published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and numbered 133.

Monsignor Capel's criticism of this book makes two assumptions, neither of which, as an English Churchman, can I allow :—

1. First of all he assumes we have no business to use language which is older than or independent of 'Anglicanism,' which is, as he would imply, the private property of the Church of Rome. Four hymns, he urges, are composed by Aquinas. It is 'our own language,' he says, that is used; just as if the book had been guilty of a piracy, and had appropriated that which did not belong to it.

Here, of course, I do not quarrel with Monsignor Capel, because he does not understand a matter which is no business of his—the principles of the English Reformation. But does any educated and sensible English Churchman imagine that between the 16th century and the third or the first Christendom is nothing to him—that he has no part in its glories, in its deep thoughts, in its passionate devotions? I say that we have a right to the language of the Universal Church of Christ, and that, subject to loyalty to our own formularies, we mean to use it. Indeed, we have been taught to do so at and ever since the Reformation. The Reformers themselves gave us the first and most conspicuous lesson. They might have composed a new Prayer-Book, as we say, out of their own heads. As a matter of fact, two-thirds of the work is translated from the unreformed liturgy; and our collects in the main are just what they were in the days of the Plantagenets. What the Reformers began was continued by our representative divines. Andrewes compiled his 'Private Devotions' out of ancient Greek Liturgies. Cosin, as I shall presently have to show, when compiling his 'Collection,' drew freely upon the Roman office-books. So did Sherlock in his admirable book 'The Practical Christian;' while Jeremy Taylor is indebted, in no small measure, to St. François de Sales. Bishop Wilson would seem to have helped himself to a pious maxim or prayer wherever he could find one; and in the last century entire books which were certainly not of Anglican origin were household words in the Church of England. Before me is lying a copy of 'The Spiritual Combat, revised and recommended by Richard Lucas, D.D., Rector of St. Katherine, Coleman-street, and printed at London for Samuel Keble, at the Turk's Head, 1698.' It was from English Church laymen that I first, as a boy, learnt to value 'The Imitation of Christ' and the writings of Fenelon. In short, we English Churchmen have never held that, in escaping from the yoke of Rome, we were forfeiting our share in the treasures of spiritual insight and experience which are the common

heritage, whether of Latin or Universal Christendom; and our only check in making the very most of them is that which is imposed by loyalty to the guidance of our own branch of the Christian Church.

But Aquinas, it will be said, taught Transubstantiation. No doubt he did. But Aquinas was a many-sided man; a consummate genius, and also a saintly Christian; a schoolman and dogmatist of high authority, but also a commentator, a poet, a man of prayer. Aquinas, as a poet, is our common inheritance; Aquinas, as a schoolman, discussing the Eucharist, is the property of the Church of Rome. Not that the Church of Rome of to-day, I should suppose, can be altogether content with a theologian who demonstrates in a formal manner the falsehood of the Immaculate Conception. But as a poet Aquinas belongs to Christendom; and if, as I admit to be the case, there are verses of his in which, nakedly translated, we cannot follow him, we can paraphrase him so as to keep our hold on his large intellect and his tender heart without forfeiting our own consistency. This, I believe, has been done by my friend in the hymns to which your correspondent refers. And there are some good precedents for such a proceeding. For instance, Bishop Cosin, in 'Devout Prayers that may be used before and after the receiving of Christ's Holy Sacrament,' provides 'at the consecration' a translation of 'Laudis thema specialis,' which, as your correspondent knows, is part of the 'Laud of Sion.' The second stanza runs thus:—

> What at supper Christ performed
> To be done He straightly charged
> For His eternal memory:
> Guided by His sacred orders
> Heavenly Food upon our Altars
> For our souls we sanctify.

And this is followed by a paraphrastic translation of the Eucharistic Collect, 'Deus qui nobis sub sacramento mirabili.'—(Works, vol. ii. p. 273.)

Now, Cosin, as all the world knows, was engaged constantly in Roman controversy; and, in particular, he is the author of a treatise on Transubstantiation, which tells its own story. I submit that to imitate Cosin in translating Aquinas as a religious poet is not necessarily to desert him when he opposes Aquinas as a scholastic theologian.

2. The real question, of course, is whether we are or are not, in all such enterprises, keeping fairly within the limits marked out by our doctrinal standards. I understand Monsignor Capel to say

that the 'Priest to the Altar' transgresses these limits. It may be so, *per incuriam*. Such a book can make no pretensions to absolute exemption from error; but I am well assured of the intentions with which it was compiled, and do not think that your correspondent's quotations prove his case.

The book, no doubt, everywhere assumes the Real Presence, *extra usum sacramenti*. How could the Church of England appeal with a good conscience to antiquity if that truth was denied? As has been pointed out in your columns, the great Caroline divines insisted upon what was really involved in the appeal made by the Reformers, and by Jewel to the early Christian ages, in this matter of the Eucharist. But the Real Presence, as I have said, is one thing, while Transubstantiation is another; and language which appears to your correspondent to teach the latter does not necessarily teach anything beyond the former. Here I am dealing with his second assumption—viz., that it does.

Certainly, when I wrote to you the other day I had no recollection whatever of the line which Monsignor Capel quotes from this book:—

Bread into His Flesh is *turned*.

In view of all that Mr. Carter has said upon the subject, I entirely admit that the phrase is patristic, and therefore Anglican; but I cannot rid myself of a scruple as to its spiritual expediency, considering the use of language and our present religious circumstances. Indeed, in the earliest copy of the book on which I can lay hands I find a query opposite this very expression, which leads me to suppose that I must, at the date of publication, have had doubts about it. Without wishing, therefore, to condemn it as theologically indefensible, I should myself hesitate to let it pass in any book of my own.

But Monsignor Capel also quotes the prayer, 'Send down Thy Holy Spirit upon this sacrifice, that He may *make* this Bread the Body of Thy Christ,' as if it implied Transubstantiation; as if the verb to 'make' could mean nothing else or less than to change the metaphysical substance of one thing into the metaphysical substance of another thing. Whereas the prayer might even be used in a 'subjective' sense altogether; and it is repeated almost word for word, by Bishop Wilson, slightly transposed, but I apprehend with the same intention as that of the 'Priest to the Altar'—viz., that of supplementing the Latin Form of Consecration by the Greek Invocation of the Holy Spirit:—

'Send down Thy Holy Spirit upon this sacrifice, that He may

*make* this bread the Body of Thy Christ, and this cup the Blood of Thy Christ.'—(Wilson's 'Sacra Privata,' Works, vol. v. p. 74.)

Once more your correspondent quotes the lines:—

> Humbly I adore Thee, hidden Deity,
> Which beneath these symbols art concealed from me.
>
> *  *  *  *  *
>
> Seeing, touching, tasting, all are here deceived,
> But by hearing only safely 'tis believed.

Here it is, no doubt, possible to say to oneself—'This bread has ceased to be bread; Christ's Body only is really here; the senses which tell me that what I see, touch, and taste is still substantial bread cannot be trusted.' But it is, at least, equally possible to understand such lines as saying with St. Paul, that here, as elsewhere, we walk by faith and not by sight; that what the senses tell us they tell us truly, but they deceive us if we think that they tell us all; that associated, after a manner which we cannot tell, with the really-remaining substantial bread, is the Presence of the Holy One; and that we are safe in believing His Word. Of course 'beneath' may be pressed into an inaccurate sense, just as when reading the Old Testament we may take such expressions as 'the Lord smelled a sweet savour' in a coarse anthropomorphic sense. But an English Churchman would use the lines as he uses the stanza from the Christian Knowledge Hymn-book which appears last in the collection:—

> O God! unseen but ever near,
> Thy Presence may we feel;
> And thus, inspired with holy fear;
> Before Thine altar kneel.

In short, we bring our belief to such language, and we use it in the sense of that belief. Monsignor Capel, who all his life has been accustomed to explain the Real Presence to himself by the theory of Transubstantiation, and who probably has no doubt whatever as to the worth of the philosophy on which this explanation rests, naturally reads his own meaning into the words; but they may be used with great sincerity and profit by those who bring to them the simple faith of early Christendom.

It is possible that some of your readers may think the distinction between the Real Presence and Transubstantiation upon which I am insisting a shadowy or fictitious one. Let me then quote a writer whom I have too often been unable to follow in his public utterances, but whose clear intellect and immense learning are universally admired. In his Charge of 1866 the late Bishop

of St. David's is criticizing a book entitled 'Suggestions for the due and reverent celebration of the Holy Eucharist, printed for the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament.' After commenting severely upon some features of this book, Bishop Thirlwall proceeds as follows:—

'But still all this does not amount to a proof that there has been any departure from the express teaching of our Church with regard to the Sacrament. And in one important particular there can be no doubt that those who carry the assimilation of Ritual to the greatest length most decidedly and sincerely repudiate the Romish doctrine. With our 28th Article—whether for the reasons there assigned or not—they reject Transubstantiation. So, indeed, they might do with perfect consistency, *even if they used the Roman Liturgy without curtailment or alteration*; for to those who have studied the subject it is well known that the canon of the Mass is so far from teaching that dogma that it positively witnesses against it, and can only be reconciled with it by the most violent artifices of interpretation. The canon had been fixed many centuries before the dogma was defined. And here I cannot refrain from pausing for a moment to remark that there is, perhaps, no head of theological controversy in which our Church stands in more advantageous contrast with Rome, or in which we have more reason thankfully to recognise her characteristic moderation than this. The tenet of Transubstantiation, decreed as an article of faith, combines in itself the two extremes of irreverent rationalism and presumptuous dogmatism. As a speculation of the schools it is essentially rationalistic; a bold and vain attempt to pry into mysteries of faith impenetrable to human reason. As a dogma it exhibits the spectacle of a Church so forgetful of her proper functions as to undertake to give a Divine sanction to a purely metaphysical theory, the offspring of profane philosophy. This rationalistic dogmatism gives an imposing air of solidity and compactness to much in the Roman theology which, on closer inspection, proves to be utterly hollow and baseless. A conclusion is reached through a process of vicious ratiocination, composed of ambiguous terms and arbitrary assumptions. In itself it is a "fond thing vainly invented."'—('Charge to the Clergy of St. David's, 1866,' pp. 96, 97.)

I hope that it is not impertinent to say that all this appears to me to be undeniably true; and your readers will not quarrel with me if I proceed to quote the antithetical passage, which follows almost immediately:—

'The Church of England, on the contrary, has dealt with this subject in a spirit of true reverence, as well as of prudence and charity. She asserts the mystery inherent in the institution of the sacrament, but abstains from all attempts to investigate it or define it, and leaves the widest range open to the devotional feelings and private meditations of her children with regard to it. And this liberty is so large, and has been so freely used, that, apart from the express admission of Transubstantiation, or of the grossly carnal notions to which it gave rise, and which in the minds of the common people are probably inseparable from it, I think that there can hardly be any description of the Real Presence, which in some sense or other is universally allowed, that would not be found to be authorised by the language of eminent divines of our Church; and I am not aware, and do not believe, that our most advanced Ritualists have in fact overstepped these very ample bounds.'—*Ibid.* p. 98.

It is no doubt in perfect good faith that Monsignor Capel constantly uses language which might seem to imply that believers and teachers of the Real Presence teach and believe the Roman doctrine. The real question is whether, after consecration, the bread is still *bonâ fide* bread or not. To this question Monsignor Capel would give one answer, and we should give another; and when it is rhetorically suggested that after all we really mean the same thing, I am reminded of a brilliant passage in Archbishop Whately, which is somewhat to the point. He says:—

'Two distinct objects may, by being dexterously presented again and again in quick succession to the mind of the cursory reader, be so associated in his thoughts as to be conceived capable, when, in fact they are not, of being actually combined in practice. The fallacious belief thus induced bears a striking resemblance to the optical illusion effected by that ingenious and philosophical toy called the thaumatrope, in which two objects, painted on opposite sides of a card—for instance, a man and a horse, a bird and a cage, are by a quick and rototary motion made to impress the eye in combination, so as to form one picture of the man on the horse's back, the bird in the cage, &c. As soon as the card is allowed to remain at rest, the figures of course appear as they really are, separate and on opposite sides. A mental illusion closely analogous to this is produced when by a rapid and repeated transition from one subject to another alternately the mind is deluded into an idea of the actual combination of things that are really incom-

patible. The chief part of the defence which various writers have advanced in favour of the system of penal colonies, consists in truth of a sort of intellectual thaumatrope. The prosperity of the colony and the repression of crime are by a sort of rapid whirl presented to the mind as combined in one picture. A very moderate degree of calm and fixed attention soon shows that the two objects are painted on opposite sides of the card.'—(Whately's 'Logic' on Fallacies, p. 195; quoting remarks on Transportation, pp. 25, 26.)

Of course, I do not mean to say that the belief in the Real Presence and belief in Transubstantiation are incompatible beliefs. But, at any rate, they are very distinct, as Monsignor Capel would very soon proclaim if I were writing to you, Sir, not as an English Churchman, but as a Roman Catholic.

And here I hope to take leave of Monsignor Capel. If I have really misrepresented his motives I beg his pardon; but we do not cross each other's path for the first time in this correspondence, and I have had some reason to feel what measures are thought fair when an English clergyman is doing what he can to prevent conversions from among his friends to the Church of Rome. Let me assure him, that so far as I know, I believe no religious doctrines, and I indulge in no religious practices, which I have any motive for 'hiding;' and I shall be happy to be examined on the subject by Monsignor Capel, or anyone else who may care to do so. As for the 'Ritualists,' I still cannot make out why it is that if they are really, although unintentionally, doing the work of Rome, her most prominent champion in this country should be so anxious to draw attention to them. Would he not, upon the whole, serve her better by letting them alone?

I am, Sir, your most obedient servant,

H. P. LIDDON.

January 16.

## XXXI.

SIR,—I shall feel much obliged if you will have the goodness to correct an error which inadvertently appears in my letter of Saturday in the *Times*. Instead of 'I cannot conceive, for instance, why one of our books, the "Manuel des Confesseurs," should be translated under the title,' &c., please read 'adapted.'

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

T. J. CAPEL.

The Catholic University College, Kensington, W., Jan. 17.

## XXXII.

SIR,—As not uninterested in this controversy, I appeal to you as, in some sort, holding the balance in a dispute admitted to your columns.

In the letter of Monsignor Capel this morning, he says, 'Canon Liddon believes in an objective, and, therefore, local Real Presence.' Monsignor Capel has not read Thomas Aquinas, or, having read it, has forgotten him. Aquinas, who holds, of course, the Objective Presence, distinctly rules, after examining the point closely, that this presence is not local.

Anyone writing as a layman might be excused for imagining 'objective' to imply 'local' in this controversy. Monsignor Capel must not pretend to speak theologically in the future, except *ad populum*. He is not a theologian.

The place in Aquinas to which I refer is 'Summa Theologiæ,' pars iii., distinct. 76, art 5.

WILLIAM J. IRONS, D.D.,

January 16. Prebendary of St. Paul's.

LONDON: PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
AND PARLIAMENT STREET