

History of the Ritual of the Methodist Episcopal Church

With a Commentary on Its Offices

By R. J. COOKE, M. A., D. D.



CINCINNATI: JENNINGS & PYE
NEW YORK: EATON & MAINS

THE
SUNDAY SERVICE
OF THE
METHODISTS
IN
NORTH AMERICA.

With other OCCASIONAL SERVICES.



LONDON:
Printed in the Year MDCCLXXXIV.

FROM AN ORIGINAL COPY IN THE POSSESSION OF MR. ROBERT T.
MILLER, WHICH IS BELIEVED TO HAVE BEEN USED AT THE
CHRISTMAS CONFERENCE.

Contents



History

	PAGE
CHAPTER I.	
BEGINNINGS, - - - - -	13
CHAPTER II.	
FORMATION, - - - - -	49
CHAPTER III.	
DIVISIONS, - - - - -	83
CHAPTER IV.	
PARTIES, - - - - -	103
CHAPTER V.	
SOWING AND REAPING, - - - - -	123
CHAPTER VI.	
RESTORATION, - - - - -	146
CHAPTER VII.	
TRANSITION, - - - - -	160
CHAPTER VIII.	
SOURCES, - - - - -	176

Commentary

CHAPTER IX.	
ON THE OFFICE FOR HOLY BAPTISM, - - - - -	PAGE 187
CHAPTER X.	
ON THE OFFICE FOR ADULT BAPTISM, - - - - -	209
CHAPTER XI.	
ON THE OFFICE FOR RECEPTION OF MEMBERS, - - -	223
CHAPTER XII.	
ON THE OFFICE FOR THE LORD'S SUPPER, - - - -	236
CHAPTER XIII.	
ON THE OFFICE FOR MATRIMONY, - - - - -	260
CHAPTER XIV.	
ON THE OFFICE FOR THE BURIAL OF THE DEAD, - -	270
CHAPTER XV.	
ON THE OFFICE FOR CONSECRATIONS AND ORDINATIONS,	280

INDEX.

FACSIMILES OF TITLE PAGES OF KING EDWARD VI AND JOHN
WESLEY'S RITUALS.

Preface



IT is with no slight degree of hesitancy that this present work is offered to the Church. The subject itself is of such interest, and in its true relation is of such practical importance, that even after prolonged investigation and patient study of the many difficult questions involved, Historical and Theological, one might well hesitate to put in permanent form the results of his labors. It requires no surplus of genius to make a mistake. The teachings of a Church are embodied in its Ritual, and nowhere else are they so clearly seen or more readily apprehended. So intimate, therefore, is the relation between Doctrine and Form, that a misinterpretation of one is a misrepresentation of the other, and the book which was solely designed for the encouragement of intelligent devotion and Churchly Order becomes the unconscious cause of confusion and debate.

But the possibility of wrong interpretation, or of erroneous judgment in the balancing

of historical probabilities, should not forever prevent the attempt to pioneer the way to better things. The need of a work giving the genesis, tracing the growth, and interpreting the Sacred Offices of the Church must be supplied some time. From his Chair of Theological Instruction there was not a book covering the ground of this Volume in the whole range of Methodist Literature, English or American, to which the author could refer his students; and it certainly seemed strange that while our ministers were required to be proficient in general Church history, and especially in the History of Methodism, no provision should have been made for their knowledge of that Book which, with the Holy Scriptures, they must constantly use from the beginning to the end of their ministerial career.

The purpose, then, of this work is to present in briefest form the History of the Ritual, from the early days of the English Reformation to the times of John Wesley, with such explanations of its several Offices as may be helpful to our younger ministry and membership, in order that throughout the whole Church there may be preserved among us the loyalty of intelligence to the legacy of our

Fathers, and a deep and abiding veneration for the Sacred Rites of the Church of God.

To archæological or dry antiquarian notes on liturgical niceties no space has been given; nor, since the ripest product of critical scholarship can be so easily obtained, have I deemed it at all necessary to comment on the selections from Holy Scripture. In the interest of brevity also, no notes are written on the Forms for the Laying of a Corner-stone or for the Dedication of a Church, nor have I elaborated many interesting historical allusions and references found all along in my study of the Ritual. Indeed, of the mass of literature through which I have been compelled to wade in search for facts at first hand very little appears in these pages, for few, it may be assumed, would be interested in reading the titles of books seldom seen, rarely read. The critical student, however, will note my indebtedness to original documents found in Burnet's and Sparrow's Collections and in Cardwell's History of Conferences, and also to the works of Neale, Strype, Lathbury, Maskell, and Palmer. The only bias an historian should have is a prejudice for the truth, and in the Historical Division of this work I have endeavored to write History, and not Fiction.

If, therefore, I have failed to portray men and events in their true color and perspective, as a Puritan, a Churchman, or a Romanist here and there may think I have, the supposed failure may probably be found not in my conscious prejudice or misunderstanding of the situation, but in the partisan view of my critic.

And, now, there remains to me only the pleasant task of expressing my gratitude to the kind friends who have encouraged me in this undertaking, especially that eminent layman, Robert T. Miller, Esq., of Covington, Ky., who to business sagacity of a high order has united in leisure hours the ever-deepening love of scholarly pursuits valuable to Methodism. Would that of many other able laymen, numerous in the Church, it might also be said, "Saul also is among the prophets!"

R. J. C.

HISTORY

Chapter I

BEGINNINGS

Henry VIII, A. D. 1509—Edward VI, A. D. 1547

ANNO DOMINI 1784 is a memorable date in the ecclesiastical history of the United States. In a critical survey of the religious development of the Nation few dates are of greater interest, and fewer still of greater importance. The close of that year marked the beginning of one of the prime factors, one of the mightiest forces in the annals of American Christianity—the Methodist Episcopal Church—the first Protestant Episcopal Church organized in the United States. It was in this year also in which Episcopal Methodism began, that Wesley prepared and sent over from England by the hands of the Rev. Bishop Thomas Coke, Doctor of Civil Law of the University of Oxford, a Revision of the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England. The title of this Revision was, “The Sunday Service for the Use of the Methodists in North America,” and it contained, in addition to the Litany and the Daily Prayers,

the English Ordinal for the consecration of ministers and Forms for the administration of the sacraments.

The history of this Ritual, the causes which led to its original compilation, its gradual growth, and the several changes through which it passed till it was adopted by the Methodist Church, are among the most interesting narratives of the English-speaking peoples. Being identical with the English Liturgy, its history is, to a large extent, the story of those religious struggles which, beginning in the early days of the Reformation, involved in ceaseless agitation the Church, the Throne, and the People of England for nearly two hundred years. Few, perhaps, worshipping at our altars, or ministering in the sacred offices of the Church, sufficiently appreciate the struggles of that mighty past through which this Book of Ritual has come down to us. But every prayer and collect and response in it has its history. Its rubrics, or directions for ordinations or for administering the sacraments, have been the subjects of debate in the Councils of Kings and Reformers; and for its doctrines men have laid down their lives. Listening to its vigorous English, or noting its devotional tone or expressions of doctrine,

we are carried back to the stirring, tumultuous days of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The struggles of the Reformation are again before us; the stake, the block, and the gray walls of the Tower of London again glide into view; martyrs and confessors pass to their reward; bishops and mitred abbots, kings and queens, statesmen, lowly peasants, and noble champions of freedom, are all related to it, opposing it, changing it, defending it, or dying for it. In it are the religious yearnings of the age in which it was compiled, the efforts to preserve for a Scriptural Christianity the best that the Church had preserved through the ages in the service of her Lord, the attempts to compromise between the Puritan doubtful of all ceremony, and the Churchman seeking a middle ground between the severities of Geneva and the superstitions of Rome.

The task, then, before us is to trace this Ritual from its origin through successive periods to its adoption by the bishops and presbyters of the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1784. But before we take up the history of this book, it will be necessary to survey its antecedents, to study the conditions, the soil, out of which it sprung, and by thus not-

ing the situation, political and ecclesiastical, as a background to the picture of the times in which it had its origin, be the better prepared to understand the nature of those controversies which waged around it for nearly two centuries.

At the University of Oxford, where Methodism began, the Reformation in England had its beginning. It was here that John Wiclif in 1355 opened the eyes of England to the aggressions of the Roman hierarchy, the vices of the monks, and the religious corruptions of the age. Here he preached those sermons which brought down upon him the anathemas of the ecclesiastics in power, and it was here that, realizing the fundamental need of his time, he translated the Scriptures into homely English. From Oxford enthusiastic students, like Jerome of Prague, carried the writings and teachings of Wiclif to Bohemia and other parts of Europe, where they were eagerly studied, and afterward bore fruit in the moral uprising of the northern nations. Wiclif asserted the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures to direct the Church without the aid of a pope, and attacked the doctrines of transubstantiation, indulgences, masses for the dead, and auricular confession. His influence

was felt far and near, twelve years after his death the Archbishop of Canterbury complaining that his heresies had infected the whole university.¹ John Huss adopted his views, and preached them in the language of the people, and for his boldness in their defense was condemned by the Council of Constance. This Council also condemned Wiclif as a heretic, and, though he was long since dead, ordered his body to be exhumed and cast out.

Nearly two centuries after the death of Wiclif the New Learning, as it was called, came to Oxford from Florence. The fall of Constantinople, which was regarded as a portentous calamity, but which was one of those dispensations of Providence understood better by posterity than by those experiencing them, had scattered Greek literature and classical scholars over Italy, and the universities of Europe in this manner became acquainted with the language of the New Testament. The writings also of the Fathers in their own tongue, Clement, Origen, Lactantius, Eusebius, all of the Ante-Nicene Greek writers, and of the historians, Sozomen and Theodoret,

¹Lewis's "Life of Wiclif," p. 113, collection 28. Canon Trevor, "Rome from the Fall of the Western Empire," p. 285.

were thus opened up to the scholars of Europe, and by the invention of printing, made at this time, became accessible in translations more or less accurate to all who were unable to study the originals. In spite of the opposition of the friars, Oxford welcomed the New Learning. Cornelius Vitellius was the first to teach Greek there, having for a pupil the afterward famous Grocyne. There Linacre came on his return from Italy, full of the new ideas then springing into life; and there also the celebrated Erasmus came in 1497, and being taught Greek by Grocyne and Linacre laid the foundation for those critical studies which resulted in the publication for the first time of the entire New Testament in its original tongue.

This Greek edition of the New Testament, which was printed at Basle in 1516, furnished Luther in Germany and Tyndale in England the text for their vernacular versions, the two most potent agencies in the promotion of the Reformation. Here also, and chief among these Oxford reformers, was Colet, who, like Linacre, had traveled extensively in Italy, and had caught the inspiration of a new era from the apostles of Humanism, which the Medici, powerful in politics and liberal patrons of art

and classical learning, had gathered about them in Florence; and here also Thomas More, afterward Chancellor of England, shed the light of his genius, unmindful of the fate that awaited him.

These were all Reformers in a large sense before the teachings of Luther or of Zwingli were known in England. By their lectures and writings they expelled the Scholastic philosophy from Oxford, as Melanchthon afterward did from Wittenberg, and substituted therefor the study of the Gospels and Epistles, as being more serviceable to sound learning and a correct understanding of the Christian faith. The moral state of Christendom, especially the religious condition of England, was not beyond the scope of their teachings. They fearlessly attacked the ignorance and vices of the monastic orders, which had become a scandal; they challenged the doctrines and arguments which sustained and defended the mass of superstitious beliefs and practices obscuring the truth, and by their arraignment of the luxury and pride of ecclesiastics in high places prepared the way for the moral revolution which had been breeding for centuries throughout all Europe, and which was now made inevitable by the invention of printing,

the revival of learning, and the study of the Scriptures.

But the Reformation in England was of slow growth. Subjected at the beginning to the passionate impulses of a king, an absolutist in his theory of government, and whose antipathy to the ancient Church, having no religious grounds, exhausted itself in anti-papal legislation mainly in his own interest or to the profit of his courtiers, it was not possible for religious reform in England to gain at a bound that freedom from the past which the movement had reached on the Continent. In Germany and Switzerland reformation in doctrine logically led to separation from the Roman Church. But in England it was separation from Rome that first produced reformation in doctrine. Henry had no desire to purify Christian truth. He was more Catholic, it was said, than the pope himself. He had won the applause of Roman cardinals, and had obtained the title of "Defender of the Faith" by his polemic against Luther on the sacraments, and throughout his reign he showed little mercy to any of his subjects who denied the doctrine of transubstantiation. Henry VIII never dreamed of rejecting the teachings of the Church, but only of drawing

a distinction as wide as his kingdom between the political and spiritual authority of the Roman Pontiff. For this reason the spread of evangelical truth in England was as the coming of the morning in a troubled sky. Faint streaks of light now and then shot through the mists, and gave promise of the golden day, but only to be again quickly blurred by thickening clouds. Light and darkness struggled for the mastery. In many a reactionary crisis brought about by the play of politics, the conservatism of its friends, and the aggressive designs of its enemies, the Reformation in England was saved from extinction only by the direct interference of a watchful Providence.

The double dealings of the papacy furnished the occasion for the rupture. In his youth Henry was married to Catherine of Aragon, his deceased brother's wife. Such a marriage was forbidden by the Levitical law; but the exigencies of State affairs between England and Spain seemed to demand it, and a dispensation of the Law was obtained from Pope Julius II.¹ When Henry came of age he made a written protest against the mar-

¹See the Bull for the King's Marriage in Burnet, Records Book II, Pt. I. Also the King's Protest, *ibid.*

riage but such was the state of the kingdom on the death of his father, Henry VII, that, yielding to the arguments of his advisers, he publicly married her again June 3d, and together they were crowned on June 24, 1509. The children of this marriage all died after a brief life of a few months, only one, the Lady Mary, living to full age, and it soon became a conviction in the mind of the king that he was being punished for his violation of the law of God. Catherine had in person become disagreeable to him, and the sad reflection that he would die without a son to succeed him on the throne hastened his resolve to appeal to Rome for a divorce. Cardinal Wolsey in person waited on the pope, Clement VII, whom he found a prisoner at Orvieto in the hands of the Emperor Charles V, and from him he obtained assurance that a bull annulling the marriage would be issued if he, the imprisoned pope, were at liberty.¹ But nothing came of the negotiations, either then or after. Clement was in mortal dread of the emperor, the nephew of Catherine, who would not submit to this humiliation of his kinswoman, nor thus deprive her daughter, the Lady Mary, of her

¹ See Lingard, "History of England," Vol. VI, pp. 172-3, chap. iii, London, 1823.

right to the succession. Between the king and the emperor the pope temporized and maneuvered until a seeming accident took it out of his hands.

In September, 1529, Dr. Thomas Cranmer, a tutor at Cambridge University, accepted the invitation of some friends to stop at their home in Waltham. The king was in the neighborhood, or was on his way, and his secretary and almoner, Bishop Gardiner and Edward Fox, were directed to take up their quarters at this same house in Waltham. At table the conversation turned on the divorce, then a general topic, and Cranmer was pressed, because of his learning, for an opinion. He finally told them that if the marriage was unlawful in itself because of a commandment of God, then it was not possible for the pope by dispensation to make that lawful which God had made unlawful. Therefore, in his opinion, there was no need for protracted negotiations with Rome, but it were better to obtain the judgments of the learned men and of the universities of Christendom. When the king heard of this he was delighted, declaring that Cranmer "had the sow by the right ear," and sending for him to appear at court, he was immediately employed by the king

in the all-engrossing subject of the divorce. In pursuit of this business he visited Rome, and after a while failing to obtain a decision from the pope, he traveled into Germany and came in close touch with the leaders of Reform.

In the meantime there was progress in England. In order to hasten matters, and also to serve as a warning to Clement, Henry issued in 1530 a proclamation forbidding the introduction of bulls from Rome. Recourse to Rome in matters ecclesiastical was also forbidden, and restraint was put on the payment of a tax known as annates, or first-fruits. Various other acts were passed relating to ecclesiastical administration, plural livings, residences of the clergy, which last put an end to the holding of wealthy livings in England by foreign, chiefly Italian, bishops. In 1531 Parliament enacted that the king was supreme head of the Church in England. The entire clergy of the kingdom acknowledged the title, with the saving clause added, *quantum per legem Christi licet*—so far as the law of Christ allows. This clause, however, was not acceptable to the king, for under it the clergy might hold in reservation the supremacy of the pope in spiritual affairs, and being

now convinced that the procrastinations and wily policies of Clement indicated that he had no intention of granting the divorce, Henry was determined that the jurisdiction of the pope should be utterly abolished in England. In 1532, therefore, further advance was made by the enactments of laws limiting the jurisdiction of Church Courts. Prior to this, ecclesiastics were not amenable to civil tribunals, and thus a wide difference existed in this respect between the Church and the State. But the status of the Church as an independent power within the State, and as possessing authority which the State must support, was by this and subsequent Acts materially changed. The effect of all this legislation was that, in the eyes of observent men, England was rapidly drifting into separation from Rome. In February, 1531, Chapuys, the Spanish ambassador, wrote to the Emperor Charles V:

“And now the Act has been passed against the pope, which I wrote in my last. By this His Holiness will perceive the truth of what I have always told the nuncio, and written to him, that his timidity and dissimulation would not only prejudice the queen’s interest, but his own authority. The nuncio has been with the king to-day. The nuncio then entered upon the subject of *this new papacy here*, to which the king replied that it was

nothing, and was not intended to infringe the authority of the pope, provided his Holiness would pay due regard to him, otherwise he knew not what to do."¹

This was in 1531, and only one year later we find the kingdom almost wholly cut off from the authority of the Papal See. By Act of Parliament it was declared that English courts were possessed of plenary power to give justice in all cases relating to affairs, whether temporal or spiritual, within the kingdom, and that henceforth *all appeals* to Rome should cease. This was followed by a law in 1533, which granted to a Commission appointed by the king the full power, with royal assent, to abrogate or confirm canons. This was a remarkable Act. It will be observed that such a law, so radical in its influence upon the power of the Church, lodged the highest prerogatives of ecclesiastical authority in the hands of the king. It was also enacted that the bishops were no longer to be presented to the Roman See for election, but to the Archbishop of Canterbury or of York. No longer the pope, but the king alone, should exercise the authority to nominate to a va-

¹Dispatches in Childs' "Church and State under the Tudors," Appendix II.

cancy, or to issue a commission for consecration. Before consecration the bishop-elect must swear fealty to the king, after which he must pay homage to the crown and receive by royal permission his spiritualities and temporalities.

But greater changes were yet to be made; for no event of historical importance, or indeed of any importance, ends with itself. Yesterday predestinates to-morrow, and one act determines the character of another. Warham, the Archbishop of Canterbury, died about this time, and although as the head of the Upper House of Convocation he had taken part in and had guided the deliberations of the clergy in the numerous reforms actually and tentatively made, on his deathbed he entered a solemn protest against the legislation of the previous two years annulling papal authority. This disavowal of Warham, however, had no influence on the events transpiring; but his death afforded Henry an opportunity to proceed more vigorously with the work of reform. Thomas Cranmer, who had been a sagacious adviser and agent of the king in the matter of the divorce, was promoted to the vacant Archiepiscopal See. The final breach was not yet made with Rome, and Henry

having suspended the law concerning bulls from Rome, the pope, still wishing to show some friendship, signed the bull for the consecration of Cranmer as Archbishop of Canterbury, February 21, 1533. The document was sent on the 2d of March, and on the 30th of that month Cranmer was consecrated by the Bishops of Lincoln, Exeter, and St. Asaph.¹

Cranmer was an ardent Reformer. His opposition to Roman teaching was pronounced, especially respecting the supremacy of the pope over the English Church, so that when he took the oath of fidelity to the pope, on the condition of taking which the pope had issued the mandate for his consecration, he publicly affirmed in the Church of St. Stephen, Westminster, that he did not admit the pope's authority any further "than it agreed with the express Word of God, and that it might be lawful for him at all times to speak against him, and to impugn his errors when there should be occasion." Respecting the character of this prelate who had so much to do with the compilation of the Ritual and with the progress of the Reformation in this reign and in the one succeeding, nothing scarcely can be said, even to this day, by one

¹Strype's "Mem. of Cranmer," B. I, c. iv, p. 28.

party that will not be vehemently denied by another. He has been extolled by his friends and execrated by his enemies. By the former, his memory is revered as that of a saint caught in the meshes of intriguing courtiers and designing ecclesiastics. By the latter, he is depicted as the servile tool, the pliant ally, of a lustful despot, and is even denounced by the defenders of Puritanism as a Protestant by choice and a martyr by compulsion.¹ Bossuet, Hallam, and Macaulay have each drawn his portrait in Rembrandtesque style; but notwithstanding Bossuet's invective, Macaulay's merciless flaying, and Hallam's calm censure, the truth still remains that Cranmer, in spite of his weaknesses and the stains on his memory, all of which might have been virtues had he been on the other side, was a lover of truth, a foe to ecclesiastical tyranny, learned and modest, and he will hold his place in history as the most progressive leader of the Reformed Church of England in its formative period. He was not a hero. He was not a Luther, and it is useless to excuse him for the sins of his age, for the part he took in the burning of heretics, as it is impossible to exonerate Calvin for causing the death of Serve-

¹ English Puritanism, Documents, London, 1862.

tus. Toleration was unknown to that age, for men had not yet grown away from the doctrine that for the peace and stability of the State the civil magistrate should enforce uniformity in religion; and history that is not fiction can no more shield the names of illustrious Reformers from the stigma now attached to their misdeeds, than it can cover the atrocities of Bloody Mary, of Torquemada, or of the Duke of Alva in the Netherlands, with the mantle of charity.

As Primate of the Church in England, Cranmer gave impetus to the spirit of reform already rising among the people. He was the leader. Around him as the pillar of their hopes gathered other prelates of the Church: Goodrich, Bishop of Ely; Shaxton, Bishop of Sarum; Latimer, Bishop of Worcester; Fox, Bishop of Hereford; Hilsey, Bishop of Rochester; and Barlow, Bishop of St. David's. Like himself, all these were in favor of a return to the purer practice and doctrine of primitive times. Although Lee was the Archbishop of York, and had precedence, yet the Roman party in opposition rallied under the leadership of the stern, astute, and aggressive Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester; Stokesly, Bishop of London; Tonsal, Bishop of Durham;

Longland, Bishop of Lincoln; Sherburn, Bishop of Chichester; and Kite, Bishop of Carlisle. Under these parties was the Church of England divided, the Reform and the Roman, each party struggling for the supremacy; the former seeking to clean the Ark of God of the accretions that had accumulated about her in her voyage through the centuries; the latter viewing every such attempt as a sacrilegious innovation instigated by the powers of darkness, and having for its ulterior purpose the destruction of the Church and the faith of the ages. Between the two Henry mediated as umpire; but behind them all were the people, strong in their sympathies with the king, inclined to Reform, but conservative in action, and depending less on themselves than on the initiative from those in authority. A strong current, however, was setting in from the Continent, where the Reformation had made great progress; books on every subject, nearly, of theology were being brought over, and all parties felt themselves carried forward by the spirit of the time.

The year 1534 was a momentous one. The law relating to the jurisdiction of the pope, which Convocation had agreed to, but which was enforced or ignored at the pleasure of the

king, became a fact, and the papal supremacy in England was completely abolished. By Statute 26, Henry VIII, the king was declared the supreme head of the Church in England, without any qualifying clause, with full power for the reformation and correction of all heresies and abuses which could be amended by any spiritual authority whatsoever.¹ An Act relating to Annates, which was more thorough than a similar Act of two years previous, forbade payments to Rome for any purpose, thus cutting off all revenue from England to the pope. An Act of Submission, based on a previous submission of the clergy when the whole body by recognizing the legative powers of Wolsey had incurred, by the arbitrary will of the king, the penalties of the statute of *præmunire*, was also passed. In this Act the clergy, acknowledging that all Convocations ought to be convened by the king's writ, give promise *in verbo sacerdotii* not to promulgate any new Canons, Constitutions, or Ordinances, provincial or synodial, without royal authority. The Archbishop of Canterbury ordered that in all formal documents the word "Metropoli-

¹ Collier, "Eccl. Hist.," Vol. IV, p. 248. Carwithen's "Hist. of the Church of England," Vol. I, p. 112.

tanus" should be used instead of the ancient title, "*Apostolicæ sedis legatus*," for he was no longer legate of the pope. Various other Acts were passed readjusting the Church in her new relation to the State, and Cranmer, as Primate of the Church, was not slow, though greatly opposed by the Roman party, to seize the opportunity to advance the interests of the Reform cause, which the aggressive policy of Parliament afforded. Therefore, under the inspiration of the Archbishop, Convocation petitioned that "His Majesty would vouchsafe to decree that the Scriptures should be translated into the vulgar tongue by some honest and learned men, to be nominated by the king, and to be delivered unto the people according to their learning."¹

As was doubtless expected by the friends of Reform, this petition excited the apprehensions of the Romanists, and led to a lengthy debate. Gladly would the misguided bishops of the Roman party have consigned all the Bibles that were in the hands of reformers in Germany and Switzerland to the flames, in order to prevent them coming into England, for the more Bibles there were among the people the less grew the authority of the

¹Strype's "Cranmer," Vol. I, p. 34.

Church. Tyndale's "New Testament," which was the first printed edition of any portion of the Scriptures in English, had previously been published, but copies of it were very rare. As a matter of precaution the work was printed on the Continent; but Tonsal, Bishop of London, bought up through an agent the entire edition and burned it. The sale of the book, however, in such quantities enabled Tyndale to publish a better translation, and this was quickly in the hands of the printers; but both the book and the venders of it were condemned by decree. Tyndale himself, at the instigation of Henry VIII, was imprisoned in 1531, and after a long confinement he was finally strangled (1536) at Villefont, near Brussels, and his body reduced to ashes.¹ But a change had now at length come over affairs in the Church of England. A translation of the Holy Scriptures which would be free from the blemishes and heresies of Tyndale's New Testament, which we may note were not in the text, but in side-notes, comments, and prefaces, was strenuously insisted upon by the Reform leaders. The question was a serious one, of vast importance in its consequences,

¹ See the whole story in Soame's "Henry VIII, History of the Reformation."

and the demand was not easily obtained. The Roman prelates, led by Gardiner, objected to the general diffusion of the Scriptures on the ground that to give the whole Bible in English to the people would endanger the peace of the Church and the kingdom. The excesses of the peasants in Germany, who interpreted the Bible as their fancies suggested or their inclinations led them, afforded illustrations apparently pertinent to the subject, and it was not difficult, with the aid of a lively imagination, to paint in lurid colors the fearful consequences of giving the Bible to the people in the vulgar tongue. The prelates therefore proposed, as a compromise doubtless, that instead of the Scriptures a short exposition of the Christian faith should be put into common use.

This proposition was not acceptable to the Reform party, and the debate went on. Gardiner did his best in defense of the stand he had taken, and so determined was the opposition he aroused, that had it not been understood that Cranmer and his supporters expressed the wishes of the king, the demand of the Reformers would have been rejected. But the will of the king was supreme; Convocation petitioned in due form, and the translation of the Scriptures was ordered.

The Bible now authorized was Tyndale's Bible, revised and corrected by Cranmer;¹ but since Tyndale had been executed for heresy his name was omitted from the title-page, and the book was known as Thomas Matthews's Bible, or Cranmer's Bible. This work was printed at Paris, because of better facilities there, in 1548. Henry, however, was not inclined to go too far in his religious zeal, and he would only allow copies of it to be fastened by chains in certain churches, at the same time issuing a proclamation to the people "that his indulgence was not the effect of his duty, but of his goodness and his liberality to them, who should therefore use it moderately for the increase of virtue, not of strife."² He also commanded that the Bible should not be read so as to disturb the priest during the mass, and that no one should attempt to expound doubtful passages without the assistance of the learned.

A stormy year was 1536. The ferment of agitation had permeated the kingdom. The leaven of Reformation had affected the masses, and everywhere the doctrines and rites and

¹But see Dr. Price's "History of Nonconformity," Vol. I, p. 49.

²Hume, "History of England."

ceremonies and traditions of Romanism were subjects of dispute and even of ridicule. It was scornfully asked if the wafer in the sacrament was anything else than a piece of bread or "a pretty round robin." Extreme unction was denied to be a sacrament; and it was affirmed that all Church ceremonies not expressly warranted by Scripture were human inventions, and for that reason should be laid aside. Monastic institutions, it was said, were a plain contradiction to the Christian religion; that priests ought to marry; that no reverence should be shown to the images of the saints; that the tonsure of the priests was a mark of the whore of Babylon; that the stole about the priest's neck was the Bishop of Rome's rope, and that the holy oil used in consecration was no better than the grease or butter in the pope's kitchen. The mass, the practice of confession, purgatory, veneration of the Virgin Mary, excommunicating powers of bishops, priests, ordinaries, or ecclesiastical judges, were all attacked. Every doctrine peculiar to the Roman Church was made the subject of debate. Reformation principles and many others for which clear-headed preachers of the gospel would not be responsible, clashed with the teachings of Rome in every town in the

kingdom. The conflict was carried into the pulpits, and what was declared by one party to be the teaching of the Church, was declared by the other to be contrary to Scripture. Such was the situation when the clergy of England assembled this year to legislate for the Church.

On the 9th of June, Convocation convened in old St. Paul's Church. By appointment of Cranmer, Bishop Latimer preached. He was the most celebrated preacher of his time, hated by the Roman party for the same reason that he was loved and revered by the friends of Reform. Such was the enmity of Romanists toward this champion of the Reformation that, were it pleasing to the king, the majority of the Convocation sitting there in the aisles of St. Paul's that morning would have gladly consigned the preacher to the flames as a detestable heretic. But he was there for a purpose. The solemn introductory service being ended, Latimer mounted the pulpit. He took for his text, "The children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light." The sermon¹ was a strong, searching indictment of the supineness of the clergy, of superstition, and of papal abuses. His words

¹ Sermons by Bishop Latimer, pp. 33-57. Parker Soc.

were simple, throbbing with vital energy, and must have gone, every one of them, to the hearts of the bishops and abbots and other clericals before him, like a stone from a catapult. "The end of your Convocation," said he, "shall show what ye have done; the fruit that shall come of your consultation shall show what generation ye be of. For what have ye done hitherto, I pray you, these seven years and more? What have ye engendered? What have ye brought forth? What fruit is come of your long and great assembly? What one thing that the people of England hath been the better of a hair, or you yourselves either more accepted before God or better discharged toward the people committed unto your cure? For that the people are better learned and taught now than they were in time past, to whether of these ought we to attribute it, to your industry, or to the providence of God and the foreseeing of the king's grace?"

The sermon produced great commotion; but no reply was made to it till the 23d of June. Then, on the occasion of a collection of abuses that needed amending having been sent up by the Lower House to the Upper House of Convocation, the debate began.

Cranmer and Stokesly represented the opposing elements. Agreement on doctrine was apparently impossible, and prolonged controversy—for neither side would or could yield to the other—only served to embitter the combatants. Finally, the king, who had tried his theological skill with little real credit to himself in his reply to Luther some years previously, laid before Convocation for adoption Six Articles of Faith of his own devising.¹ In these articles the Scriptures and the three ancient creeds—the Nicene, the Apostles', and the Athanasian—were made the standards of faith, there being no mention of tradition or decrees of popes or Councils; the doctrine of justification by faith was fairly well stated; three sacraments out of seven were retained, purgatory left in doubt, and transubstantiation, confession, saint-worship affirmed. The articles were signed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, seventeen bishops, forty abbots and priors, and fifty archdeacons and proctors of the Lower House of Convocation, and published by the king's authority, with a Preface requiring all his subjects to accept them, in order that he might be encouraged to make

¹ In this compare Froude, "History of England," and Hardwick, "History of the Articles."

further advancement in matters pertaining to the religious welfare of the kingdom.

Rome now saw clearly the drift of events, and employed all her methods to arrest the progress of the Reformation. The clergy were stirred to opposition, the people to rebellion, and when all hopes vanished a bull of excommunication was issued against the king and the whole nation. Henry answered by abolishing monasteries, and transferring their revenues to the crown or to the nobility, and by executing several eminent Romanists and many abbots and priests as traitors. Injunctions were also sent to the bishops requiring the clergy to preach to the people that the Bishop of Rome's power had no foundation in Scripture, that pilgrimages should cease, that parents should teach their children the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and the Ten Commandments in English.

The progress of the Reformation at this time arrested the attention of the Reformers in Germany and Switzerland. Bucer, one of the noted and learned divines at Strasburg, wrote to Cranmer commending his zeal, and urging him to proceed still farther, which correspondence resulted in the bringing into England, a few years later, many eminent

scholars and theologians from the Continent to aid in the work of reform by filling important chairs at Oxford and Cambridge.

The next year, 1537, Henry VIII appointed a Commission to set forth a plain exposition of Christian doctrine. The Commission was a mild one, composed of representatives of the Reformed and Roman parties—Cranmer, Stokesly, Gardiner, Sampson, Repps, Goodrich, Latimer, Shaxton, Fox, and Barlow, and several divines. The result of their labors was the compilation entitled, "The Godly and Pious Institution of a Christian Man;" but because of its authorship it was commonly known as the "Bishops' Book." The contents of this book were in some respects favorable to Reform views, which indicates the advance those views had made among the hierarchy; but the Roman teaching on the Lord's Supper, that piccolo note ever sounding high and shrill above all other notes amid the crash and din of theological controversy in this and succeeding reigns, and the errors relating to purgatory as formerly taught, gave some comfort to the Romanists. What is remarkable, however, in this book composed by such responsible dignitaries is, that it maintains but

two orders in the Christian ministry. "*In the New Testament,*" it declares, "*there is no mention made of any degrees or orders, but only of deacons (or ministers) and of priests (or bishops).*"¹ The book was signed by the archbishops, nineteen bishops, eight archdeacons, and seventeen Doctors of Theology and Civil Law, and was adopted by Convocation.

Here Henry VIII came to a standstill. He would proceed no farther. Through the miserable fall of Anne Boleyn, who had favored the friends of Reform, Cranmer lost influence with the king, and the Roman party, under Gardiner, were coming to the ascendancy. But the people, particularly in London, did not retreat. The momentum of the new era, the impulse to make thorough work of the form of religion, which was, in their belief, steeped in superstition, cheatings, and falsehoods, constantly grew stronger. Letters written at this time reveal, as no other sources can, the popular revulsion of feeling against monks and priests, and against the worship of saints, brought about by the exposure of the tricks practiced by means of ropes and pulleys, "so that," says one of these letters, "the igno-

¹See "*The Historic Episcopate, A Study of Anglican Claims,*" etc. By R. J. Cooke. Methodist Book Concern, New York.

rant people now call them mere conjurers, and despise their contrivances, objecting to the deceits they practiced against them as long as the tower of Babel was safe, which, being now undermined, is daily threatening an overthrow.”¹

Another, referring to the demolishing of images and the indignation of the people because of the gross frauds that had been perpetrated in the name of religion, writes: “For the trickery of the wicked knaves was so publicly exposed in the image of the crucifix, that every one was indignant against the monks and impostors of that kind, and execrated both the idols and those who worshiped them.”²

The current that was carrying the nation forward left Henry in the background. His queen, Jane Seymour, for whom he showed some affection, and who was friendly to the Reformers, died in childbed; secondly, the German princes offended his pride because, on account of his adherence to the doctrine of

¹ “Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation,” Second Portion, p. 608, Parker Soc.

² “Original Letters,” p. 168. See Burnet I, 390; II, 199. Soame’s “History of Reformation,” II, 264. Ellis’s “Original Letters,” Third Series, III, 168. Henry VIII, in the second year of his reign, walked ten miles, barefooted, to adorn one of these images with a valuable necklace. Bishop Hilsey, of Rochester, exposed many contrivances in the presence of the people at St. Paul’s Cross, and Latimer threw some little images out of St. Paul’s to the crowds outside.

transubstantiation, they refused to put him at the head of the Protestant League; and, thirdly, which cooled his ardor perhaps more than any other event, Cranmer and his colleagues stoutly resisted in Parliament his appropriation of confiscated monasteries to his own use. Cranmer had no desire to see the Church robbed for the sake of Henry's courtiers. However, the hope which Martin Bucer expressed in a letter to Archbishop Cranmer, dated at Strasburg, October 29, 1539, that the king would "persist in his opposition to the pope, and . . . that he will continue our friend," was not destined to be wholly groundless. The way was being paved for the use of the services of the Church in English, so that when the Liturgy and the Ritual in the next reign were given to the people in their own tongue, it was done with less shock to the conservative element of the nation than it would have otherwise given.

On June 11, 1544, Henry VIII, on his departure for Calais, addressed a letter to the archbishop, commanding him to prepare certain prayers and a litany in English. "This," says Stephens,¹ "was the first authoritative act

¹"Book of C. P. According to the Sealed Book." A. J. Stephens, Ecclesiastical History Society.

towards the introduction of the English language into the public services of the Church." The title of the book was, "An Exhortation unto Prayer, thoughte mete by the Kinge's Majesty and his Clergy, to be read to the People in every Church afore processyons. Also a Letanie with suffrages to be said or sung in the tyme of the said processyons." The book was published in the fall, Cranmer writing to the king, October 7th, "that the worke was finished."¹

The king, however, still remained fixed in his determination to go no farther than merely to Anglicize the Roman Church in his dominions; and for those, as for instance John Lambert, who denied the corporal presence of Christ in the sacrament of the altar, he had no mercy. On the whole, the Reformation lagged or went backward. Hooper, afterwards one of Edward VI's bishops, in a letter written about this time, 1546, to Bullinger, describing the condition of affairs, says: "Our king has destroyed the pope, but not popery.

The impious mass, the most shameful celibacy of the clergy, the invocation of saints, auricular confession, superstitious abstinence

¹Cranmer's Letter to Henry VIII, "Cranmer's Remains and Letters," p. 412. Parker Soc.

from meats, and purgatory, were never before held by the people in greater esteem than at the present moment.”¹

But all things have an end. The king gradually grew more irritable and furious as the ulcer in his leg increased, his corpulency² adding to his discomfort, and on January 28, 1547, he breathed his last.

Henry was a pioneer of the Reformation. His work was mainly political and social. But the ecclesiastical reforms he inaugurated broke the power of Rome in England. It never was the same again, and a summary of the work he accomplished, whatever his motives may have been—and for these the principles of the Reformation were not responsible—will show that the ground was plowed deep for the sowing which followed. He prohibited all sums of money leaving the kingdom for the pope’s treasury in payment of ecclesiastical fees; he abolished pluralities of livings and the holding of English Sees by foreign prelates; he prohibited appeals to Rome in matters ecclesiastical and temporal; he braved the thunders of the Vatican in abolishing the suprem-

¹“Zurich Letters,” Vol. I, p. 33.

²His suit of mail, which I saw, was the largest of all the suits in the Tower of London.

acy of the pope in the Church of England; gave the Bible to the people; opened the way for the service of God being understood in the common language; lifted from the imaginations of men the awful dread of sacerdotal power, which had paralyzed their efforts to pierce through the incubus of superstition and tradition that shadowed the soul; and consciously, or unconsciously, as the instrument of Providence he prepared the way for the freedom of the Church from the bondage of centuries to the papal throne and the papal teaching.

Chapter II

FORMATION

Edward VI, A. D. 1547—Queen Mary, A. D. 1553

ON the death of Henry VIII, his son, by Jane Seymour, ascended the throne, under the title of Edward VI. During the short reign of this young prince, who, by the will of the late king, governed through a Council named in the will, the Reformation made rapid progress. The advance was wholly in a reformation or restatement of doctrine; for the Acts of Parliament and Convocation under Henry VIII show that the separation from Roman jurisdiction had been already completed a year before the death of that king. At the head of the Council stood as Lord Protector the young king's uncle, the Duke of Somerset, a decided friend of the Reformation, and Cranmer, the Primate of the Church. Religiously, the kingdom was in a disturbed state. Controversies agitated the people; churches were visited, and the images pulled down and broken; certain rites and cere-

monies were ridiculed and openly profaned; traveling preachers, infected with Anabaptist notions and heresies, proclaimed with contagious warmth their doctrines to multitudes as the infallible teachings of the Gospels; and, to make bad worse, the clergy, as a rule, were too ignorant to instruct the people or to guide them intelligently in their struggles for reform.

To correct these evils, Cranmer and the reforming bishops appointed a visitation of the Churches. Eminent preachers accompanied the visitors, and others well versed in Christian doctrine prepared sermons for the incumbents, in order that the people might be properly instructed in the principles of religion, and all hear from the pulpit the same teaching. It was ordered that a Paraphrase of Erasmus on the Gospels and Acts of the Apostles should be set up in the churches with the Bible,¹ and should be studied by the clergy. The injunctions issued by the Council for these things ordered also that one chapter of the New Testament should be read at matins, and one from the Old Testament at evensong, on every Sunday and holy day, and which is to be carefully noted, it was ordered

¹Cardwell, "Documentary Annals," II, Sec. 7, 20, 32.

that the Epistle and Gospel read at high mass should be in English.¹

While the Parliament which gave authority for the foregoing was in session—1547—Convocation turned its attention to reform in Church service. Among other far-reaching requests of an ecclesiastical character, the Lower House, on the recommendation of the archbishop, petitioned Parliament, by unanimous agreement,² that the communion should be administered in both kinds, and that, according to the intention of the late king,³ the public service of the Church should be reformed. In conformity with this request of the clergy, Parliament enacted that the holy communion should be administered in both kinds, such mode of receiving “being more agreeable to the first institution of the said sacrament of the most precious body and blood of our Savior Jesus Christ, and also more conformable to the common use and

¹Cardwell, “Documentary Annals,” Sec. 2, shows how room was made in the service for this.

²Strype, “Cranmer,” II, 4, says, “All this session (Session VI, Dec. 2), by their mouths did approve the proposition made the last session (Nov. 22) of taking the Lord’s body in both kinds *nullo reclamante*.”

³In 1546, shortly before his death, Henry VIII commanded Cranmer “to pen a form for the alteration of the mass into a communion.” Strype’s “Cranmer,” I, 311. Ecclesiastical Historical Society.

practice, both of the apostles and the primitive Church, by the space of five hundred years and more after Christ's ascension, than the receiving under the form of bread only."

With regard to the offices of the Church, which also came in for consideration, a committee, consisting of the two Archbishops, Canterbury and York, the Bishops of London, Durham, Worcester, Norwich, St. Asaph, Salisbury, Coventry, Carlisle, Bristol, St. David's, Ely, Lincoln, Chichester, Hereford, Westminster, and Rochester, together with Doctors Cox, May, Taylor, Haynes, Robertson, and Redmayn, was appointed to draw up an order or form for administering the Eucharist in the English tongue.¹ The committee met at Windsor, January, 1548.

In order that this subject, about which there was so much contention, both in England and on the Continent, might be thoroughly studied, it was divided into questions, to which an answer was required from each one on the Commission. The battle between the clerical parties for supremacy in England was now on. To the question, which went straight to the heart of the Roman doctrine,

¹ Burnet, "History Reformation," Part II, *in loco*. Also "Records," No. 25.

“What is the oblation and sacrifice of Christ in the mass?” the Romanists unanimously agreed that it was the presentation of the very body and blood of Christ really present in the sacrament. The Reformers were not so uniform in their statement, though one in sentiment. Cranmer declared that “the oblation and sacrifice of Christ in the mass is not so called because Christ indeed is there offered and sacrificed by the priest and the people; but it is so called because it is a memory and representation of that very true sacrifice and immolation which before was made upon the cross.”¹ In like form the Bishops of Lincoln, St. David’s, and Rochester expressed their opinions. But Doctors Taylor and Cox went beyond the archbishop. They answered that the oblation of Christ in the Holy Eucharist was nothing more than the prayer and thanksgiving in remembrance of Christ’s passion and death. It was evident that upon this subject, as upon many others, the Commission could come to no agreement. The times were not yet ripe for an abrupt abolishment of the service which had been used for centuries, nor for the condemnation of the doctrine underlying the service, and upon which

¹ Burnet, “Records,” 25, Part II, Book II.

so many believed their eternal salvation rested. It was therefore agreed that the chief part of the worship or service of the mass should be retained, but that such additions should be made to it as would change it to a communion.

The form settled upon was next submitted to the Privy Council, then ratified by both Houses of Parliament, and published March 8, 1548, under the title, THE ORDER OF THE COMMUNION. This form is of peculiar interest to the Methodist student, for in it he will see for the first time in English the beginnings of much of the service now in his Ritual for the administration of the Lord's Supper.

The Order commenced with an address to be read to the people the Sunday or other day before the day for the sacrament. The communion service itself began with an exhortation to consider what St. Paul wrote to the Corinthians to examine themselves, etc.

“ Then the priest shall say to them which be ready to take the sacrament: If any man here be an open blasphemer, an advouterer, in malice or envy, etc.

“ Here the priest shall pause awhile, to see if any man will withdraw himself: and if, etc., etc. and after a little pause, the priest shall say: You that do truly and earnestly repent of your sins and offenses committed against Almighty God, and are

in love and charity with your neighbors, and intend to lead a new life, and heartily to follow the commandments of God, and to walk from henceforth in his holy ways, draw near, and take this holy sacrament to your comfort, make your humble confession to Almighty God, and to his holy Church, here gathered together in his name, meekly kneeling upon your knees.

“ Then shall a general confession be made in the name of all those that are minded to receive the holy communion, either by one of them, or else by one of the ministers, or by the priest himself, all kneeling humbly upon their knees: Almighty God, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Maker of all things, Judge of all men, we acknowledge and bewail our manifold sins and wickedness which we from time to time most grievously have committed by thought, word, and deed against thy Divine Majesty, provoking most justly thy wrath and indignation against us: we do earnestly repent, and be heartily sorry, for these our misdoings: the remembrance of them is grievous unto us, the burthen of them is intolerable. Have mercy upon us, have mercy upon us, Most Merciful Father, for thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ’s sake: forgive us all that is past, and grant that we may ever hereafter serve and please thee in newness of life to the honor and glory of thy name, through Jesus Christ our Lord.¹

“ Then shall the priest stand up, and turning him to the people, say thus: Our blessed Lord, who hath left power to his Church to absolve penitent sinners

¹ For the origin of this and other prayers, see the Commentary, page 236.

from their sins, and to restore to the grace of the Heavenly Father such as truly believe in Christ, have mercy upon you, pardon and deliver you from all sins, confirm and strengthen you in all goodness, and bring you to everlasting life.”¹

Following this the minister repeated what is known as the “Comfortable Words,” so-called from the rubric, “*Hear what comfortable words our Savior Christ saith to all that truly turn to him,*” which consisted of texts of Scripture. Then he repeated:

“*Hear also what Saint John saith: ‘If any man sin we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous;’ he it is that obtained grace for our sins.*”

“*Then shall the priest kneel down, and say, in the name of all them that shall receive the communion, this prayer following: We do not presume to come to this, thy table (O merciful Lord), trusting in our own righteousness, etc.,*

the remainder being nearly the same as that which is now used.

“*Then shall the priest rise, the people still reverently kneeling, and the priest shall deliver the communion, first to the ministers, if there be any present, that they may be ready to help the priest, and after to the other. And when he doth deliver the sacrament of*

¹The reader will observe that this absolution is retained, in a supplicatory form, in the Ritual.

the body of Christ, he shall say to every one these words following: The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body unto everlasting life.

“And the priest, delivering the sacrament of the blood, and giving every one to drink once, and no more, shall say: The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy soul unto everlasting life.

The Order concludes with the Apostolic Benediction.¹

On the 13th of March the king issued a proclamation in which the people are commanded to conform to this Order, in order that the king may be encouraged to proceed with the Reformation, and “to the setting forth of such godly orders as may be best to God’s glory, the edifying of our subjects, and for the advancement of true religion.”² Throughout the kingdom generally the Order was for a time well received; but the Roman bishops—Gardiner of Winchester, who resisted every change in the old religion; Bonner of London, Vayesie of Exeter, and Sampson of Litchfield and Coventry—showed no disposition to comply with the proclamation.

¹“Liturgies, King Edward VI.” Parker Soc.

²Bishop Sparrow’s “Collections.” Stephens’s “Book of C. P.,” xxxviii.

By their influence much dissatisfaction was generated among the clergy and the more ignorant people, who at all times seem to have the faculty of morbidly dreading what they do not understand. Gardiner was thrown into prison. But the summary measures adopted against him only added fuel to the fire. Excitement swept men from their moorings. Discussions and dissensions over doctrinal questions and the authority of the Council to formulate matters of religion during the minority of the king became portentously prevalent. Rebellion was in the air. Ceremonies were scantily observed or contemptuously ignored. Confusion in forms of worship ended in chaos; irreverence for all godly things alarmingly increased, and to such lengths did religious animosities go that the sacrament was often profaned or scoffed at, and sometimes thrown out into the street.¹

To remedy the situation a proclamation was issued, and to carry out their original design the king and Privy Council now resolved upon the preparation of a Liturgical Service for the Church of England. The "Order for Communion" had been authorized by the Privy Council, the king being under age, and

¹ Collier, "Ecclesiastical History, Vol. V, p. 262.

for that reason it had been regarded by many as lacking in authority. Therefore, it was now judged that a public Liturgy composed by the most learned and godly men holding episcopal and other office in the kingdom, and confirmed by Parliament, would meet with general acceptance. The benefit to be derived was uniformity of worship. The Commission which devised the Order of Communion was summoned for this purpose. Edward VI informed them of the general nature of the desired book, and suggested that it should comprise "An Order for Morning and Evening Prayer," and also a "Form of Ministering the Sacraments, and for Celebrating all other Public Offices."

At this time in England there were several liturgical forms in use. The Churches in the south, for instance, generally followed the Liturgy used in the Cathedral of Salisbury, which was known as the Sarum Rite; in the north they followed the Form of York; while the dioceses in the Midlands adopted that employed in the Cathedral of Lincoln. In Wales the Liturgic books used at St. David's were used throughout the south, and in the north the form prescribed by Bangor. In addition to these, almost every diocese had a form of

its own, differing in some more or less important particular from every other form, so that there was but little uniformity in the public worship. Moreover, these Liturgies were all in Latin. Few, outside the clergy, understood this language, and so complicated were the ceremonies that none but the specially-trained priest could either follow them or understand them. The mazes of Divine worship were bewildering in their intricacies, and to the degree that they were unintelligible to the people were they utterly useless. Further, in these Service-books, Missals, Breviaries, Pontificals, Antiphonals, Rituals, and Hours were concentrated the essence of Roman teaching and all the superstitious suggestions of reverence for things and persons which obscured the real object of worship and ministered little to genuine edification.

All these books were now to be superseded, and one Book of Prayer and Ritual was to be prepared in English for the whole Church in England. For this purpose the Committee examined all the Liturgies in use, that whatsoever was of value and in harmony with Scripture might be retained. Nor did they confine themselves to these Liturgies only. The desire of the Reformers, as they often


declared, was to reform and not deform, to improve and not destroy, and in this desire it will be seen they were very far from undervaluing the moral force of antiquity, or of undervaluing through ignorance, love of novelty, or unreasoning prejudice, the various forms of worship employed in the primitive Church, and hallowed by the sanction and devotion of ages. They compared the Liturgies known as the Liturgy of St. James, Bishop of Jerusalem, St. Mark, Alexandria, that of St. Basil, Chrysostom, Clement, the Mozarabic, the Ephesine or Gallican, all of which were older than the Roman missal. It will be seen, therefore, that the Prayer-book and Ordinal of the Church of England, from which the Ritual of the Methodist Episcopal Church is derived, did not originate wholly in the Roman Ordinal, but was compiled from services of the primitive Church, some parts of it being handed down from the earliest times. The tabular view on page 62 will show the origin of the Rituals or Liturgies now in use in the communion service.¹

¹According to Blunt "Annot. B. C. P." For an account of these Liturgies see Collier "Eccl. Hist.," Palmer, "Origine Liturgica;" Bingham, "Antiquities;" Maskel, "Monumenta Ritualia;" Freeman, "Principles of Divine Service," "Rites and Ritual;" Maskel, "Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England."

OUR LORD'S WORDS OF INSTITUTION.

Apostolic Form—

(Unknown and probably varying.)



These ancient Liturgies were examined, and also the books in use by the Reformed Churches elsewhere. It may be helpful to state at this stage that these Liturgies required the officiating minister to be clothed in a certain dress, considered by the force of custom appropriate to the service, and undoubtedly the use of vestments is of venerable antiquity, though, of course, we do not read of such things in the New Testament. The dress of Christian ministers in the Apostolic Age was the same as that worn in every-day life. The fashions of dress changed in time; but the dress of the ministers remained the same, as in our own day we see ministers wearing a fashion of coat or vest that belongs to the eighteenth century. Gradually the clerical dress became recognized as a distinctive dress, and was used only in divine service. Thus by degrees were developed ecclesiastical vestments and their use in the Christian Church. At the period of the Reformation such was the superstitious veneration attached to these priestly habits by reason of their association with all things pertaining to the priesthood, and such was the abuse of their purposes, that the Commission compiling the service long debated their retention in the new Liturgy. Many reasons

were offered for their utter rejection, which were replied to by as many arguments for their continuance, and it was finally agreed that some vestments should be retained for the sake of propriety and as a concession to weak consciences.¹

The new Liturgy was now ready. The Communion Service, which had been published the year preceding, was retained with some slight alterations. The conflicts of the times are reflected in the inconsistent service, for in it there are undoubtedly traces of an effort toward compromise between the views of the Reformers and the doctrine of the Romanists on the corporal presence of Christ in the holy sacrament.

The communion began with the *Lord's Prayer*, followed by the Collect, or Prayer for Purity, "*Almighty God, unto whom all hearts are open and all desires known,*" etc., after which there was said, or sung, a psalm, the Introit, as the minister entered the chancel. Then, according to the Rubric, "*The priest, standing at God's board, shall begin, Glory be to God on high,*" etc., to which the clerks respond, "And in earth peace, good-will towards men, we

¹ See Letter by Martin Bucer, "Original Letters," p. 534. Also by Dryander, Letter 171.

praise thee, we bless thee, we worship thee, we glorify thee, we give thanks to thee for thy great glory, O Lord God, Heavenly King," etc. Other Collects follow; then the Epistle and the Gospel for the day are read, succeeded by the Creed, which is sung. The Creed being ended, the homily or sermon is preached, the offertory of passages of Holy Scripture are said or sung while the contributions are being collected.

"Then shall the minister take so much bread and wine as shall suffice for the persons appointed to receive the holy communion, laying the bread upon the corporas, or else in the paten, or in some other comely thing prepared for that purpose; and putting the wine into the chalice, or else in some fair or convenient cup prepared for that use (if the chalice will not serve), putting thereto a little pure and clean water, and setting both the bread and wine upon the altar. Then shall the priest say: The Lord be with you.

"Ans. And with thy spirit.

"Priest. Lift up your hearts," etc.

The Trisagion is then sung by the clerks.

"Therefore with angels and archangels and with all the holy company of heaven we laud and magnify thy glorious name evermore, praising thee and saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of hosts: heaven and earth are full of thy glory: Osanah in the highest. Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord: Glory to thee, O Lord, in the highest."

Prayer is then made for the whole state of Christ's Church, and this prayer glides into the Prayer of Consecration:¹

"O God, Heavenly Father, which of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son, Jesus Christ, to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption, who made there (by his one oblation, once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, and did institute, and in his holy Gospel command us to celebrate, a perpetual memory of that, his precious death, until his coming again: Hear us (O merciful Father), we beseech thee; and with thy Holy Spirit and word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these, thy gifts, and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most

Here the priest must take the bread into his hands.

dearly-beloved Son, Jesus Christ, who in the same night that he was betrayed took bread, and when he had blessed and given thanks, he brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take, eat, this is my body which is given for you: do this in remembrance of me.

Here the minister shall take the cup into his hands.

Likewise after supper he took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, saying: Drink ye all of this, for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you and for many for remission of sins: Do this as oft as ye shall drink it in remembrance of me."

¹ See Methodist Episcopal Ritual.

² Also in the Scotch Liturgy.

Following this was the Oblation, which, beginning in the middle with the words, "And here we offer and present unto thee (O Lord)," with the exception of the petition, "And command these our prayers and supplications, by the ministry of thy holy angels to be brought up into thy tabernacle before the sight of thy Divine Majesty," is the same as that in the Ritual. The Lord's Prayer was then said and responsive sentences, after which the minister, turning to those about to commune, shall say, "You that do truly and earnestly repent of your sins," etc.

Then followed the *General Confession* as in the Ritual,

The Absolution,

The Comfortable Words,

The Prayer of Humble Access, "We do not presume to come," etc.

The Administration, with these words: "The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life.

"The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life."

Next to the Communion Service was the Litany, then the form for the administration

of baptism, confirmation, matrimony, and the burial of the dead.

Thus was finished the first Prayer-book of Edward VI. It was the first Liturgy of the Reformed Church of England. Notwithstanding its mixed character, which can be easily accounted for when the temper of the times is considered, and the desire of the Reformers to depart as little from the usages of the Universal Church while they were feeling their way to surer ground, the book was a great victory for the Reformation. On the completion of the Liturgy it was presented to the two Convocations of Canterbury and York, by the majority of which it was approved, and then submitted to Parliament, December 9, 1548. The House of Commons gave immediate assent; but in the House of Lords it met with much opposition, the anti-reforming bishops and the Lords of Acres and Windsor, with the Earl of Derby, protesting. However, it passed the Upper House January 15th, was returned to the Commons, and then passed on the 21st, 1548-9, and it was enacted that the book should come into use in all the Churches June 9th following.

The first edition was published March 7, 1549, and other editions appeared in May,

June, and July. The work of the Commission, however, was not yet finished. The king had desired not only a prayer-book, but also a book for the offices of the Church. This does not appear to have been presented to Parliament or Convocation with the Liturgy, and the supposition is that the Roman bishops, seeing clearly that the Reformers were determined to eliminate the priestly character from the ordination of ministers, doing away with all notions of sacrifice belonging to the Roman priesthood, would have nothing to do with the new form for ordinations. The Reform bishops, however, prosecuted their labors, and in a few months later the Ordinal was published under the title, "THE FORME AND MANER OF MAKYNG AND CONSECRATYNG OF ARCHBISHOPPES, BISHOPPES, PRIESTES, AND DEACONS. 4to, 1549." This date has been disputed;¹ but this is the date on the book itself, a copy of which is in the British Museum; and on the book, with *fac-similes* of title-page, published by the Parker Society.

¹For instance, Bishop John F. Hurst, in an article in the *American Journal of Theology*, Vol. III, No. 4, misled, possibly, by Dr. Clay's "Common Prayer," illustrated, Pref. XV, and Cardwell's *Two Liturgies*, says: "It is true that the Ordinal (not of 1549, as Cooke calls it, when no Ordinal existed, but the Ordinal of 1550, etc.);" See also Hurst's "History of the Christian Church," Vol. II, p. 345.

Moreover, Lathbury says,¹ "During the same year the Ordinal was published in a separate form," and on page 26 of his valuable History he explains the reason for the mistake into which several writers have fallen: "In books published between the 1st of January and the 25th of March a diversity of practice existed among printers in giving the date. For example, a book published at the commencement of March, 1549, might have been dated 1548, because the ecclesiastical year did not begin till the 25th day of the month. . . . According to the ecclesiastical style, March, 1549, would have been 1548. Hence arose the mistake about the first edition of the Prayer-book. It was imagined that the books with the date of March, 1549, were really published in 1550, nearly a year after the supposed first edition." This date which we have fixed upon is also sustained by contemporaneous evidence. Francis Dryander, a professor of Greek at Cambridge, writing to Bullinger, conveys this information: "I hear also that a praiseworthy reformation has taken place in matters of religion. It has not yet seen the light, but its promulgation is daily expected." The letter from which this is taken is dated

¹"History of Bk. of C. P.," p. 29.

at Cambridge, March 25, 1549. Again, in June 5, 1549, he writes, and says: "I wrote to you lately before the reformation of the Churches was publicly known. A book has now been published a month or two back, which the English Churches received with the greatest satisfaction." He then goes on to describe the book. Finally the Minutes of the Privy Council meetings on February 2d, 8th, 28th, and for March 4th, 1549, prove that the Ordinal was in existence, for the Minute of March 4, 1549, reads: "Bishop of Worcester committed to the Fleet, for that obstinately he denied to subscribe to the book devised for the consecration and making of bishops and priests."¹

The Preface to this Ordinal declares:

"It is evident unto all men, diligently reading holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the apostles' time there hath been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church: bishops, priests, and deacons, which offices were evermore held in such reverent estimation that no man, by his own private authority, might presume² to execute any of them, except he were first called, tried, and examined.

And therefore to the intent these orders

¹ Pococke's Edit. of Burnet.

² Probably aimed at the wandering Anabaptist preachers of the time.

should be continued, and reverently used and esteemed in this Church of England, it is requisite that no man (not being at this present bishop, priest, nor deacon) shall execute any of them except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted according to the form hereafter following," etc., etc.

Those in the English Church who hold to the necessity of Episcopal ordination appeal to this Preface as proof that such was the doctrine of the Church of England from the beginning. But there is nothing in this Preface against the validity of non-Episcopal ordinations in other Churches, nor is there anything in it that might not have been accepted by the Lutheran bodies of that day¹ who did not choose to avail themselves of Episcopal ordination for their ministers. Further, the sentiments of the English Reformers were all against the absolute necessity of Episcopal ordination in order to a valid ministry,² and we are therefore driven to the conclusion that the Ordinal in this respect was a concession to the Roman party, whose views were expressed in the Preface, although it was probably written

¹ See Seckendorf, Hist. Lutheran lib. iii, § 56, *De Potestate et Juris. Episcoporum*. Also the scheme of government drawn up by Lutheran divines at Wittenberg in Sec. 119, *ibid.* Melancthon's Works, Vol. II, Col. 740.

² See my "Historic Episcopate" for the teachings of the Reformers, p. 88.

by Cranmer, while the Reformers carried their convictions¹ into the essential part of the ordination service.²

According to Burnet, Collier, and we may add Soame,³ the new Liturgy was gladly accepted by all the people, except the adherents of the Roman practice, throughout the kingdom. But Bucer's letter to John Calvin will not sustain the strong statements of these eminent historians. Bucer complains: "Many of the parochial clergy so recite and administer the service that the people have no more understanding of the mysteries of Christ than if the Latin instead of the vulgar tongue were still in use. And when complaints respecting these shocking abuses of the Church are laid by godly men before the rulers of the kingdom, they say it is the business of the bishops to remedy the evil; when they are laid before the bishops—those, namely, who have long since made a profession of the gospel—their reply is that they can not rectify them without an Act of Parliament for that purpose."⁴ And Hooper (afterwards bishop) writing to

¹ See Burnet's "Records" for the views of Cranmer and his colleagues in reform.

² "Historic Episcopate," *The English Ordinal*.

³ "History of Reformation," Vol. III, p. 33.

⁴ "Original Letters," 2, p. 546.

Bullinger says, referring to the Prayer-book: "I am so much offended with that book, and that not without abundant reason, that if it be not corrected, I neither can nor will communicate with the Church in the administration of the [Lord's] Supper."¹

Unhappily at this time there were in process of development the germs of those great religious parties which in later years played such important parts in the history of religion in England. The most radical opinions of the Reformed in Germany and Switzerland had been transplanted into England, and as a result, Lutheranism, Calvinism, and Zwinglianism could number numerous and powerful adherents among the English Reformed. Among the disciples of these teachings there was little or no agreement except upon a few general truths, and while they were all opposed to the doctrine of transubstantiation, yet among themselves they could come to no understanding on the doctrine of the Eucharist, nor on the question of ministerial vestments, nor on many other subjects of dispute which but for the disturbed state of the times might have

¹The foreign Reformers were all dissatisfied with the book. See *Orig. Let.* Vol. I. Ep. 130, p. 281, p. 282; Ep. 170, 173, pp. 353, 353, 354; Ep. 227, 230, pp. 480, 486, 487, 488; Ep. 267, p. 580; Ep. 312, 318, pp. 665, 674. *Ibid.* Vol. II.

been included among the adiaphora, or things indifferent. To add to the confusion and uncertainty resulting from the conflicting opinions of these English Reformers, who to the best of their ability were honestly groping their way toward the light without any Ariadne thread to guide them, swarms of German Anabaptists, who had taken refuge in England from the severities at home, began to preach their heresies everywhere, to the distress of all sober men and the reproach of the Reformation. In the same category, and as radically departed from the sanity of the Christian faith, were a class of preachers known as Gospellers, who went about as expounders of the gospel; but whose character, if any reliance can be placed on historical sources of the time, was a scandal to their calling.¹ They were obnoxious to the better element of all parties. "These," wrote Calvin in his letter to the Lord Protector Somerset, "are men of whimsey and enthusiasm, and if they might have their will, would quickly confound all order and public settlement." "They, as well as others," he says, "ought to

¹Micronius to Bullinger, Orig. Let., p. 560. Also Hooper's Letter, p. 65. See also Becon's preface to his book "Jewel of Joy." Also Carwithen's "History Church of England," p. 251.

feel the weight of a severe correction, and have the sword drawn upon them.”¹

As a consequence of this unsettled condition of religion, very natural in a period of transition, and of the harsh clashing of multi-form views, notions, and doctrines abroad in the land and growing more numerous and confusing every day, the Book of Common Prayer and the Ordinal were violently attacked by men of every shade of opinion, except those who were not insensible to the moral force of time-honored custom, and who, out of a laudable tenderness for the weaknesses of others, were content to reform slowly rather than with a shock to sever all connection with the past by a sudden ruption with ancient usage. There are reigns of terror in religion, sometimes, as there are in politics, and it is a difficult undertaking to decide between the Robespierres, Mirabeaus, and Dantons of a revolutionary tribunal, and the fanatical leaders of frenzied religionists who constitute themselves the infallible interpreters of the will of Heaven, and dethrone all authority that they might exalt their own.

Calvin criticised the book severely. This leader of the Calvinistic party was not op-

¹ Collier, "Ecclesiastical History," Vol. V, p. 354.

posed to a Liturgy, as may be supposed, for he had prepared a form for the Church at Geneva; and in a letter to the Protector Somerset he highly approves that there should be a certain Form of Prayer and Ecclesiastical Rites, giving succinct and plausible reasons for the same.¹ But he was opposed to this form. It seemed, therefore, that the book must be amended. Bucer, and Peter Martyr, and Hooper had also taken exceptions to some of the services and to the requirements of the rubrics.² Archbishop Cranmer had desired the opinion of Bucer on the book, and for his benefit, since he could not read English, had it translated into Latin. This being accomplished, Bucer, while thanking God that he found nothing in the English ceremonies but what was either taken from Holy Scripture or was in harmony with it, provided they were rightly interpreted, proceeded nevertheless to write some twenty-eight chapters of censure on the book.³ But however inconsistent Bucer's thanks may have been with his censures, there were better reasons for his cen-

¹ Fuller's "Ch. Hist. of Britain," Vol. II, p. 360.

² "Original Letters," pp. 562-81, etc.

³ *Censura Martini Bucerii super libro Sacrorum, seu Ordinationis Ecclesie atque Ministerii Ecclesiastici in Regno Angliæ, ad petitionem R. Archiepiscopi Cantuariensis Thomæ Cranmeri, Conscripta.*

asures than cause for his thanks. The book was too deeply tinged with Mediævalism. Many of its prayers and ceremonies could be in no manner reconciled to Scripture as interpreted by the reformed theology. Although it is frankly acknowledged that the compilers went back to Liturgies antedating the corruption of the Roman Church, still it must also be admitted that they did not go back far enough. Back of the fourth century, to which they often refer, there lies a long stretch of three hundred years, in which we look in vain for many of the rites and ceremonies and prayers of this first Prayer-book of Edward VI, as we look in vain for the doctrines and pious notions out of which they sprung. Peter Martyr agreed with Bucer in his criticisms; but both in the spirit of moderation were opposed to Hooper in the stand he took against the use of vestments ordered by the rubrics. Hooper was a stalwart leader among the Reformers, deeply imbued with the stern theology of the Genevan school, and inclined to go far beyond what his conservative friends deemed prudent in the unsettled state of the times. Because of his learning and zeal he was nominated to the bishopric of Gloucester; but he refused to be ordained in Episcopal

garments, on the ground that they were of purely human invention and not in harmony with the simplicity of the Gospel. Controversy over these habits threatened seriously the progress of the Reformation on the lines contemplated by a large section of Reformation leaders, who were not willing to submit their cause to the leadership of Calvin, Zwingli, or the Lutheran divines. Hooper finally swallowed his scruples, and was consecrated according to the Ordinal. These disputes concerning sacerdotal vestments, and the turning of altars into tables as a consequence of debates on the Lord's Supper, and the animadversions of German and Swiss theologians, together with the general attack induced by popular declaimers, finally led to, and in fact necessitated, a revision of the Prayer-book and Ordinal. Martyr gives thanks that he and Bucer were instrumental in bringing exceptionable places in the book to the notice of the bishops. He then goes on to say that Archbishop Cranmer informed him that a consultation had been held relating to revision, and many alterations were to be made; "and what pleases me most," he continues, "Sir John Cheke acquaints me that if the bishops refuse to consent to the altering

what is necessary, the king is resolved to do it himself, and recommend that affair at the next session of Parliament.”

The book was revised. In the office of the Communion the Ten Commandments were added at the beginning. The use of the sign of the cross and some passages in the prayer of consecration were omitted. On the recommendation of Bucer, the prayer, “*Hear us, O merciful Father, we beseech thee,*” etc., was changed to the form now in the Ritual, “*Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee, and grant that we, receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine, according to thy Son’s, our Savior Jesus Christ’s, holy institution,*” etc.

The form for the delivery of the bread to the communicants (see page 67) was changed into “*Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving.*” For the words at the giving of the cup were substituted, “*Drink this in remembrance that Christ’s blood was shed for thee, and be thankful.*”¹

In the revised book a rubric was inserted by order of the Council² concerning kneeling at the reception of the bread and wine, but

¹ Both forms are now used by the Church of England and the Methodist Episcopal Church.

² Lathbury, “Hist. B. C. P.,” p. 34.

not until some copies of the book had been circulated. The direction was ordered as a signification "of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ, therein given to all worthy receivers, and for the avoiding such profanation and disorder in the holy communion as might otherwise ensue; yet, lest this gesture should by any persons, either out of ignorance and infirmity, or out of malice and obstinacy, be misconstrued and depraved, it is here declared that thereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either to the sacramental bread and wine then bodily received, or unto any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood."¹

The Vestiarian controversy was not without results. There was a notable alteration in the outward solemnities of divine worship. The rubrics in the revised form required neither copes or other vestments, but the surplice only. Bishop Ridley on the day appointed for the introduction of the new book "did officiate the divine service of the morning in his rochet only, without cope or vestment."²

¹ Collier, "Eccl. Hist.," Vol. V, p. 426. In the reign of Elizabeth this rubric was omitted.

² Heylin, "Eccl. Hist.," p. 126. Strype's "Memorials of Cranmer," p. 416.

On the 13th of January, 1552, Parliament met at Westminster. The Revised Book and Ordinal were accepted and enjoined for public use by a statute entitled, "An Act for the Uniformity of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments." By order of the king the book was translated into French for the use of the inhabitants of the isles of Guernsey and Jersey and for the city and surrounding villages of Calais.

Thus were finished the long labors of the Reformers. They endeavored to provide the Church of England with a Liturgy, free, as they believed, from the superstitions of ages, while retaining all that was necessary to the decency and dignity of Divine service. With the exception of some superfluous rites and unscriptural prayers, it was, on the whole, an admirable expression of Scriptural teaching and intelligent devotion. Unfortunately the book fell dead. Edward VI died the next year, and a new order of unscheduled events changed the character of religion in the Church of England.

Chapter III

DIVISIONS

Queen Mary, A. D. 1553—Queen Elizabeth, A. D. 1558

ON the death of Edward VI, Mary, his half-sister, ascended the throne, July 6, 1553. During the reign of her brother, Mary had strenuously and successfully resisted all efforts, both of the king and Council, to induce her to conform to the Book of Common Prayer. It was, therefore, not to be expected, having now obtained the crown, by virtue of which, according to the laws of the realm, she was now the Supreme Head of the Church, that she would use that power and her royal prerogatives to protect that which she formerly rejected, or tolerate those who were the avowed enemies of her creed. In open Council, August 12th, she had indeed declared that while she herself was settled in her own mind concerning matters of religion, she was resolved not to compel others to adopt her views, and on the 18th of the same month a similar declaration was widely published on

the occasion of a tumult at St. Paul's, caused by the imprudence of Bourn, chaplain to the detested Bonner, Bishop of London.

Such declarations were conciliatory enough to have confirmed the hope that the people would be permitted to continue in the religion established under Edward VI, and enjoy, without fear or molestation after a stormy period, the blessings of peace. But toleration in religion was not a shining virtue in any party that was able to draw the sword or to execute the laws. The same proclamation which exhorted the people to live amiably side by side notwithstanding diversity of beliefs, also stated that there would be no change in religion "till public order should be taken in it by common consent," and it inhibited until such order was settled all preaching and expounding of the Scripture under extreme penalty of the statutes.

Parliament met in October. On the second day of the session a bill was introduced for a review of the laws of King Edward VI, but this was laid aside for the present. At the second session, the first one having lasted only eight days, a bill was sent down from the House of Lords to the Commons repealing all laws passed in the preceding reign on the

subject of religion. The Commons did not readily assent to the bill, being opposed, as they asserted, to the proposed law, that the Latin tongue should be substituted for English in public worship; but after a debate of six days it was finally carried, with an enactment that from the 20th of December next no other form of Divine service should be permitted other than that which was in vogue in the last year of King Henry VIII. At this same time a proclamation was issued against heretical books, the Book of Common Prayer and Ordinal being expressly mentioned. The order ran that no one should use "any book concerning the common service and administration set forth in English to be used in the Churches of this realm in the time of King Edward VI, commonly called the Communion Book, or Book of Common Service and Ordering of Ministers, otherwise called the book as set forth by authority of Parliament for Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments: but shall within fifteen days bring or deliver the said books to the Ordinary, where such books remain at the said Ordinary's will and disposition to be burned." Thus all things were put back where they stood at the closing years of Henry VIII.

Soon the fires of persecution were lighted. Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, and many other eminent leaders whose memory is enshrined in the Ritual, paid the penalty of their heroism with a martyr's death.

The history of this remarkable book now carries us beyond the shores of England, and opens up to us a deplorable condition of affairs among the Reformed. On the accession of Mary, as we have seen, the tide turned. Roman bishops, who had been deprived under Edward VI, were restored to their Sees; Protestant bishops were peremptorily cited before the Council, pastors were rudely expelled from their Churches, the Latin service began to appear, and all, high or low, who manifested disinclination toward a revival of Romanism were looked upon with disfavor. Religion and politics were rapidly gliding Romeward. The more noted among the Reformed took alarm, as well they might, and about eight hundred fled the country, to find refuge in the Protestant towns of Germany and Switzerland. They settled as convenience or inclination led them to Frankfurt, Strasbourg, Zurich, Geneva, and other places, where they formed small communities and maintained correspondence between themselves re-

lating to their own affairs and the progress of events at home.

The Horatian dictum that they who fly to foreign climes change their skies, but not themselves, was never better illustrated than in the case of these Marian exiles. They took their troubles and disputations with them, and sought to exercise over each other that authority which they strenuously resisted when employed by others. Nor were these discords moderated, but were the rather aggravated than appeased, by the influences at work in the places where they settled. Among the families at Frankfurt was Whittingham, who in England had manifested inflexible hostility to the Liturgy. This man had adopted the teachings of Zwingli on the Lord's Supper and the wearing of habits. An occasion soon offered itself for him in this new situation to put his convictions into practice. The exiles at Frankfurt having obtained from the magistrates the use of the church there, on the condition that they should subscribe to the French Confession of Faith, and that there should be no controversy over forms of worship, Whittingham advised the English to adopt a service widely differing from the Liturgy they had used at home. This they did,

conforming closely to the Calvinistic form of the congregation worshiping in the same church. Accordingly the Ritual was changed, and from the nature of the case the use of the surplice was discarded.

These Frankfurt exiles were not content, however, to enjoy alone the freedom they had asserted for themselves in the adoption of a new Form of Divine Service; but they desired greatly to impress its benefits upon other English congregations at Strasburg, Zurich, and Basle. The refugees in these towns were invited to Frankfurt, "where the Word of God was duly preached, where the sacraments were rightly administered, and where a Scriptural Discipline was established." Letters were also addressed to them inviting them to send some of their ministers to Frankfurt "to preside over a congregation formed after this primitive model." But these exiles failed to appreciate the novelties in worship introduced by their countrymen at Frankfurt. Strasburg, situated midway between Frankfurt and Zurich, was inclined a little to modify the English Liturgy; but the Zurich divines positively refused to heed the invitation sent them, unless they were assured the English Ritual would be retained without alteration. Finally

three leading divines were invited to preside over the Frankfurt congregation—the famous John Knox from Geneva, Leaver from Zurich, and Haddon from Strasburg.

The influence of Knox upon the troubled waters at Frankfurt was not of an oleaginous character. Knox was a mighty Reformer, a bold Elijah, a stern, fearless, but severe, defender of “the faith once delivered to the saints.” He was learned, eloquent, magnetic, and masterful. Zeal for the truth as he saw it and felt it was in him as a consuming fire. The convictions which dominated his mental and moral faculties gave him the character of a resistless hero; but they also, unfortunately, added fuel to his inflammable, impetuous temper, which could brook no control, and exalted him to that painful pre-eminence where, intolerant of weakness in himself, he looked with small indulgence on the infirmities of others. On the death of Edward VI he quitted England, and took up his abode in Geneva, where Calvin ruled both in Church and State with the authority of a king and the infallibility of a pope. In this atmosphere, congenial to his temperament, Knox became thoroughly imbued with the rigid principles and theology of the Genevan school, and from

there he went to Frankfurt, with the determination of putting these principles into practice by excluding from the public services the English Liturgy, and establishing in its stead the Genevan form. The refusal of the exiles at Zurich and Strasburg to send their divines to Frankfurt unless King Edward's book was used occasioned great controversy. The Frankfurt congregation declared that they would use the English book so far as it was conformable to the Word of God; but as for the unprofitable ceremonies, though some of them were tolerable, yet, being in a foreign country, they would not be allowed to use them, and in their own judgment they thought it better that they should never be practiced.

This way of looking at the subject was not satisfactory to the exiles at Strasburg. Two of their number—Chambers and Grindal, afterward archbishop—were therefore deputed to visit Frankfurt, carrying with them a letter subscribed by sixteen names. In this letter the plea that the magistrates of Frankfurt would not permit the use of the English Liturgy was shown to be groundless. The imperious duty of the English Protestants in the present situation, it was further set forth,

was to manifest, though in a strange land, their loyalty to the book of Edward VI as the book of the Church of England; "should they deviate from it at this time they apprehended they should seem to condemn those who were now sealing it with their blood, and give occasion to charge them with inconsistency." To this the Frankfurrians answered that "they had omitted as few ceremonies as possible, so that there was no danger of their being charged with inconsistencies. They apprehended that the martyrs in England were not dying in defense of ceremonies which they allow may be altered; and as for doctrine, there is no difference; therefore, if the learned divines of Strasburg should come to Frankfurt with no other views but to reduce the congregation to King Edward's Form, and to establish the popish ceremonies, they give them to understand that they had better stay away." This letter was signed by John Knox, John Bale, John Fox, the martyrologist, and fourteen others.¹ While this correspondence was going on, the dissensions of the exiles reached the ears of the Reformed in England, and added much to the bitterness of their sufferings. The noble martyr, Ridley, a short time

¹ Neal's "History of the Puritans," Vol. I, p. 67.

before he went to the stake wrote to Grindal, one of the deputies mentioned above from the Strasburg Church, defending in glowing language the English Liturgy from the criticisms of Knox.¹ The objections of Knox, however, were not such as might not have been adopted with profit both to the peace and the unity of the English Church; for it was here that schism began, which afterwards widened into those great dissenting bodies included under the general term—Nonconformists.

The Frankfurians were not to be brought into conformity by the Strasburg divines; on the contrary, they proposed to adopt the Genevan Form and Discipline; but Knox, strange to say, though he might have desired as much unanimity as possible, would not consent to this till consultation had been held with the congregations at Strasburg, Zurich, Emden, and other places. Until their opinion was received he would not permit the use of the Book of Common Prayer;² but should they decide that its use must continue, he would confine his office to preaching or resign. While this affair was in progress, Leaver of the Zurich congregation proposed,

¹ Strype's "Life of Archbishop Grindal," p. 29.

² Collier, "History," Vol. VI.

as Baxter did in the reign of Charles II, to draw up a Liturgy which should not servilely follow any form then in use. The Frankfurt people seemed willing at first; but perceiving that the proposed Liturgy fell below their ideas of what constituted simplicity and purity in public worship, the offer was rejected.

It was now Calvin's turn to take a hand. Thinking that perhaps some compromise might be reached, or, which is more probable, because there was no prospect of accommodation between the factions, Knox and Whittingham made a Latin abstract of the English service, and sent it to Calvin for his judgment. Calvin had no love for the English Liturgy. His cold, severely logical, and incisive intellect—a snowy, ice-clad Matterhorn lifting its granite front into the infinite blue—could scarcely tolerate suggestive symbolism or the æsthetic element in religion which appeals to imagination and awakens emotion. To him the throne of the Almighty rested on the crags of Sinai, not on Calvary. There was little need, then, for the special pleading indulged in by his correspondents, who in the abstract they prepared “obtruded,” says Carwithen, “their own censures, caviling at many parts with great severity, and pretending to have

concealed many blemishes for tenderness and shame.”¹ Calvin replied that, “For himself, he was always inclined to gentleness, and it was his custom to yield to his weaker brethren in respect to ceremonies; but yet he thought it unwise to indulge the stubborn and inflexible. In the English Liturgy he could discover many tolerable fooleries—*multæ tolerabiles ineptiæ*—or weaknesses, and such blemishes as they are not sinful might be allowed at first; when they could not be amended, they must be endured. But it behooved the learned, grave, and godly ministers of Christ to make a farther enterprise and to establish a form of greater purity.”² The congregation at Frankfurt needed nothing more. Sustained by the decision of the great leader of Reform, they refused to submit to the proposition of the Strasburg divines. But instead of peace, as was expected, fresh troubles broke out among themselves. Emboldened by their success, the admirers of Calvin translated the Genevan Liturgy into English, hoping thereby to substitute that office for the discredited book of Edward VI. The congregation, how-

¹Carwithen, “History of the Church of England,” “History of the Troubles at Frankfurt.”

²High Churchmen are severer in their criticism of Calvin’s opinion on the English Service-book than the facts will warrant.

ever, which seemed to have no settled views, rejected the Geneva Form, and a compromise was hit upon by which both Service-books were to be partially used for a period of four months, and if in the meantime any new contention arose the matter should be referred to Calvin, Musculus, Peter Martyr, Bullinger, and Vinet, eminent names in the history of those far-away times.

Before the expiration of the time, Dr. Cox, late dean of Christ Church, and who had been tutor with Sir John Cheke to King Edward VI, arrived in Frankfurt from England with several of his friends. The coming of these refugees from the persecutions of Bloody Mary stirred anew the smoldering embers of discord. Dean Cox could not endure the obloquy which had been cast upon the Liturgy of the Church of England. His Jehu-like zeal drove him to extremes. He broke through the agreement, interrupted the public service by repeating the responses aloud, and on the Sunday following one of his company ascended the pulpit and read the whole litany. Cox would recede from the Liturgy in no particular. On the other side, Knox and his party would in no degree submit to the impositions of the Coxians, and as one of

these had used the pulpit for the reading of prayers, Knox used it for an intemperate declamation against the Liturgy and the Reformation in England.

It was evident that these unseemly disturbances could not continue always. A meeting was called for the settlement of difficulties. Cox and his party, after much debate, were allowed to vote, which privilege they used to the best advantage, and drove Knox from his post as pastor of the Church. But this surprising turn of affairs allayed no strife. Whittingham complained to the magistrates of the city of the wrong that had been done, and of the disorders which were destroying the peace of the congregation. The Senate thereupon ordered a conference of the factions; but when they met, the impossibility of agreement became immediately apparent, and the meeting broke up, having accomplished nothing. The Knoxians forthwith addressed the Senate of Frankfurt, laying once more their grievances before them. The Senate, being thus compelled to take decisive action, commanded that the English should henceforth conform to the French, both in doctrine and ceremonies, or close their Church, and that those who would not conform should

leave the city. Exiles from home where the Liturgy was outlawed by Parliamentary enactment; guests of a foreign people who, though Protestant, yet had no tender feeling for the conservative English Reformation, what was left for these adherents of the English Liturgy, thus placed between the dungeon or the stake at home or endless wanderings among unfriendly people abroad, but quietly to submit to the dictates of the magistrates? But the triumph of the Scotch reformer was of short duration. The deeds of yesterday oft return to plague us, and even those acts of bravery, self-sacrifice, or affection, which once elicited applause, may be used by inborn meanness or disappointed ambition to work our ruin, as the patriotic deed of Moses in slaying the Egyptian was employed against him by one of his own countrymen. Some years before these events, Knox had published, while in England, a book entitled "An Admonition to Christians," in which he wrote severe reflections on the Emperor Charles V, his son Philip, and on Mary, the reigning Queen of England. It was an unchristian and a most dishonorable thing for his opponents to take advantage now of his mistake, which they probably approved of at the time; but un-

worthy as the act was, it was upon this book that a charge of high treason was now preferred against John Knox by the partisans of Cox, to such desperate lengths will religious bigotry sometimes lead. The senators of Frankfurt, fearing the consequences of harboring in their town an enemy of the emperor, commanded Knox to leave the city.

On his expulsion from Frankfurt, Knox returned to Geneva, where he and a Mr. Goodman were chosen pastors by the English congregation. This community having adopted the opinions of Calvin in their entirety, discarded the English Liturgy, and published in English the Genevan Form under the title, "The Service, Discipline, and Form of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments used in the English Church of Geneva." With this book they desired to set aside the book of Edward VI, and with this end in view there was prefixed a dedication addressed to the Reformed in England, lauding the Discipline which they had adopted, and stating that the late Service-book of King Edward being now set aside by Parliament, according to law it was in no sense the established worship of the Church of England, and consequently they were under no

obligation to use it any farther than it was consonant with the Word of God. Being therefore at liberty and in a strange land, they had set up such an order as, in the judgment of Mr. Calvin and other learned divines, was most agreeable to Scripture and the best Reformed Churches. Such specious pleas had no effect upon those who were not willing to substitute the authority of Calvin in matters religious for the papal authority they had formerly rejected. The Church at Frankfurt stood firmly loyal to the English book.

Thus was developed that deplorable conflict, the seeds of which had been sown some years before, which divided the Church of England, and gave rise to the great religious parties afterward known as Presbyterians, Brownists, and Independents. Looking back over these controversies with impartial eye, there appears no good reason why the book of Edward VI might not have been revised on the general lines suggested by the Puritans, and afterward accomplished by Wesley without detriment to devotion or apostolic doctrine, had the Puritans been less headstrong and radical in their demands, and the Churchmen more evangelical in their sympathies; had the Puritans been less insistent

and peremptory in their purpose to ignore the religious feelings and opinions of more than one-half of the people of England in their determination to effect an immediate rupture with the whole past history and life of the English Church, and the Churchmen been more in touch with the age they had helped to produce; and had the Puritans, finally, been content with a sober appeal to reason and Scripture, without setting up for their own notions and beliefs concerning Church government and ecclesiastical forms the exclusive and doubtful claim of Divine authority. But the peculiarity of that time was that what one party denied or resented in another, it claimed and defended for itself. Religious parties were opposed to persecutions only when they were the persecuted. When the victims of intolerance grasped the power to wield the sword, they too, in turn, justified their principles of coercive uniformity by an appeal to the majesty of law. It was the age of divisions. Mighty forces were struggling in the womb of Time. Daylight and darkness were still contending for supremacy. The new learning and the old superstitions were still engaged in eager combat. The prison, the stake, or the block were still the sure destiny

of the conquered; and it is not surprising that in such an age religious antagonisms excited earnest souls, who believed something, to the highest pitch, drove them with rancor to the making of excessive and even preposterous claims, and compelled them to look upon the moderation of conservatism with feelings of enmity and disdain not less strong in their intensity than those exhibited to the common enemy.

But the period of exile drew to a close. Two weeks after Mary expired the news of her death reached Zurich, and the exiles in the various places in Germany and Switzerland prepared with gladness for their return home. Sentiments worthy of such confessors gained for the time being the upper hand over all memories of past feuds, and letters breathing Christian charity were exchanged between the Churches. Geneva wrote to Frankfurt, praying that when they reached home they would join their Genevan brethren in preaching the Word of God, and earnestly hoped they would join with them in obtaining a form of worship similar to that practiced by the Reformed Churches on the Continent. Frankfurt echoed the fraternal voice of Geneva; but as to forms of worship they could

not assume the right to prescribe a service for the Church of England; nevertheless they would not be contentious; to things indifferent they would submit, and prayed that their brother-exiles in Geneva would follow their example when they returned to England.

Chapter IV

PARTIES

Elizabeth, A. D. 1558—James I, A. D. 1603

ELIZABETH succeeded to the throne November 17, 1558. Seldom did a sovereign assume the reins of government under circumstances more discouraging, and with prospects more uncertain than those which confronted Elizabeth on the day of her coronation. Politically, financially, and religiously, the kingdom was in a distracted condition. The pope, Pius IV, was opposed to her, and it was certain that he would both excommunicate her and depose her, and stir up against her the princes of Christendom. The French king was watching his opportunity to embroil the nation; the Scotch and the Irish were discontented; the heads of nobility holding power in the reign of Queen Mary were in sullen mood; the Roman priesthood were strenuous in their opposition to any change in the national religion; while the friends of Reform were as firmly fixed in their determination to suppress the doctrines

and practices of Rome by Act of Parliament.

The complex situation in which Elizabeth found herself, as well as her own inclination, impelled her to assume at the beginning a neutral attitude toward the two great religious parties. But the Reformed having, as they believed, sufficient reason for supposing that the private sentiments of the queen were favorable to their views, and that they would obtain the support of eminent men whom Elizabeth had called to her Council, began to use King Edward's Book of Common Prayer, to preach, to pull down images, and to commit many other acts contrary to existing laws, as the Romanists did in their religious zeal at the beginning of Queen Mary's reign. The Roman party became alarmed at this prophetic aspect of affairs, and general disorder ensued before Elizabeth and her Council were ready, whereupon a proclamation was issued December 27, 1558, commanding

“All maner of her subjects, as well those that be called to the ministrey in the Church, as all others, that they forbear to preach or to teach, or to gyve audience to any maner of doctrine or preaching other than to the gospels and epistels, commonly

called the gospel and epistel of the day, and to the Ten Commandments in the vulgar tongue, without exposition or addition of any maner, sense, or meaning to be applyed or added, or to use any other maner of publick prayer, rite, or ceremony in the Church but that which is already used, and by law received : or the common letany used at this present in Her Majesty's own chappel, and the Lord's Prayer and the Crede in English until such consultation may be had by Parliament, by Her Majesty, and her three estates of this realme, for the better conciliation and accord such causes as at this present time are moved in matters and ceremonies of religion."

In the meantime, at a conference held by the Queen, a committee consisting of Doctors Bill, Parker, May, Cox, Whitehead, Grindal, Pilkington, and Sir William Smith, had been appointed to review the Prayer-book and Order of Ceremonies and Service in the Church. Four of the number had been exiles. The occasion for reviewing the book was the desire to unite the Reformed in one establishment agreeable to all, for although conciliatory letters had passed between the exiles at Frankfurt, Geneva, and other towns, yet on returning to England the old disputes concerning ceremonies and vestments broke out among them afresh.

The irrepressible conflict was ever the order of the day, and would be for many a day to come. Some were for adopting the Calvinistic Church polity and Service-book of Geneva, while others were in favor of the book of Edward VI. The queen was opposed to extremes. She would neither countenance the radicalism of the Calvinite nor surrender to the Romanist, hoping to make the Church of England the *via media* between ultra Protestantism and Romanism. Her design was not only to bring all parties of the Reformed into agreement around a uniform mode of worship; she also hoped to satisfy in some measure the powerful Roman element in the kingdom,¹ and, with these impossible ends before her, instructed the Commission.

The first question to be settled by these divines was a choice between the first and second books of Edward VI. This evidently was not easily decided, for the records show that other eminent men were called to give their judgment. Chief among these was Guest, a very learned man, says Strype, afterwards Archdeacon of Canterbury, the queen's

¹ See "Documents from Simancas relating to the Reign of Elizabeth (1558-1568)." Translated from the Spanish of Don Tomas Gonzalez by Spencer Hall, 1865.

almoner and Bishop of Rochester. Finally the second book was adopted, and the revision begun. The work was chiefly the labor of Guest, for we find that he was appointed by the Secretary of State Cecil to "compare both K. Edward's Communion Books together, and from them both to frame a book for the use of the Church of England, by connecting and amending, altering, and adding, or taking away, according to his judgment and the ancient liturgies." On April 18th there was presented in Parliament a bill for the uniformity of worship, with a copy of the revised book annexed. The bill was read for the third time on the 20th, passed the House of Lords on the 28th, and the book as revised became the only authorized Book of Common Prayer for the Church of England from the 24th of the following June, 1559.

There were many alterations, but the principal differences between this book of Queen Elizabeth and the second book of Edward are seen in the communion service. With respect to vestments, the rubric in the second book ordered:

"And here it is to be noted, that the minister at the time of the communion, and at all other times in his ministrations, shall use neither alb, vestment, nor

cope, but, being archbishop or bishop, he shall have and wear a rochet; and being a priest or deacon, he shall have and wear a surplice only. In the Queen's Book the rubric reads, And here it is to be noted that the minister, at the time of the communion, and at all other times in his ministrations, shall use such ornaments in the Church as were in use by authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward the VI, according to the Act of Parliament set in the beginning of this book."

At the communion Edward's book ordered these words only to be said when the bread is delivered, *Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee; feed on him in thine heart by faith with thanksgiving.* And when the cup is delivered, *Drink this in remembrance that Christ's blood was shed for thee, and be thankful.*

In Queen Elizabeth's book these words must be said when the bread is delivered:¹ *The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee; feed on him in thine heart by faith with thanksgiving.* And when the cup is delivered: *The blood of the Lord Jesus Christ which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life.*

¹ Compare "Methodist Episcopal Ritual."

Drink this in remembrance that Christ's blood was shed for thee, and be thankful. In line with these changes the rubric in King Edward's book respecting kneeling during the communion was expunged. That rubric in explaining the reason for kneeling declared that "it is not meant thereby that any adoration is done or ought to be done either unto the sacramental bread or wine then bodily received, or to any real or essential presence there being of Christ's natural flesh and blood."¹ The omission of this rubric would seem to indicate that the Church of England in the days of Elizabeth was not willing to go to the lengths in a denial of the real presence of Christ in the sacrament as Cranmer had marked out. The discarded rubric was restored in 1661. In this revision under Charles II it may be assumed that, notwithstanding the restoration of the rubric, the Church was still adverse to a complete denial of the real presence.²

The grounds for this statement are seen in the significant substitution in King Charles's book of the words, "or unto any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and

¹ "The Two Liturgies." Parker Soc.

² See "Cardwell's Conferences," p. 24.

blood," for the words in King Edward's book, "or to any real and essential presence there being of Christ's natural flesh and blood." The Church condemned the doctrine of a corporal presence, which is the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation; rejected the Lutheran teaching of consubstantiation with its necessary doctrine of the ubiquity of Christ's body; ignored the mere memorial view of the Zwinglians as being wholly inadequate to explain the New Testament implications, and adopted the doctrine of a real presence of Christ in the holy sacrament.¹

The Act of Uniformity, by which the book was legally established, declared that failure to conform to the service should be punished for the first offense by a loss of goods and chattels, twelve months imprisonment for the second, and a lifetime imprisonment for the third.²

The Emperor Charles V, when in retirement, amused himself by trying to make a number of clocks keep the same time. He discovered in this amusement, when it was too late for him and for many others, that he

¹ Burnet, "History of the Reformation," Book III, Part II, has a very interesting bit of history on this subject. But see also Pusey on the "Real Presence."

² See Collier, "Ecclesiastical History," Vol. VI, p. 290.

could not compel all men to think the same thing any more than he could force his clocks to tell the same hour of day. Elizabeth and her councilors also found that to bring all men to see alike in matters of religion was not in the power of kings or Parliaments to accomplish. Persecution never yet made a man religious. Those who had adopted the Genevan Forms while in exile objected strenuously to the Act of Uniformity. Concerning doctrine there was as yet no dispute; but the controversy over vestments required by the rubrics rose to a formidable pitch. Several of the exiles, such as Miles Coverdale, Thomas Sampson, and Bernard Gilpin, were offered bishoprics, but declined the office on account of the ceremonies. England was agitated from end to end. The bishops were divided in opinion. One part, led by Parker, Horne, and Cox, were strong in their insistence that the Act of Uniformity should be complied with; the other part, represented by Grindal, Sandys, and Jewel, accepted the situation, but with the conviction that further alterations were necessary.¹ The great body of the exiles not only stood out against the use of vestments, but by degrees they began

¹ See the "Zurich Letters."

to attack the Church itself as a mere modification of the Roman Church. The service of the Prayer-book was neglected, or irregularly observed. Discontent was encouraged among the clergy, and reports were circulated that the more factious element had cast ridicule upon the ministerial vestments, and grossly insulted those who wore them. Party spirit rose high. Invidious distinction between High Church and Low Church began to appear; political theories became associated with theological principles, so that it was gradually observed that those who were in favor of the ecclesiastical system of Zurich and Geneva were inclined also to adopt republican ideas of State government, while those who stood loyal to the book as established by Convocation and Parliament were the recognized friends and supporters of the royal prerogatives. The inevitable division of the Protestant Church of England, the faint beginnings of which we have already noticed in the days of Edward VI, was rapidly approaching, and with it were also coming divisions in the State and the days of Revolution when the Church and the throne would be involved in common ruin.

In February, 1564, Cecil, Elizabeth's sec-

retary, informed the queen of the state of the country, and of the incongruous manner in which the service of the Church was performed. Never before or since was there such a medley of forms. "Some perform divine service," writes Cecil, "and prayers in the Church; others in the body of the Church; some in a seat made in the church; some in the pulpit, with their faces to the people; some keep precisely to the order of the book; others intermix psalms in meter; some officiate with a surplice, and others without it.

Some administer the communion with surplice and cope, some with surplice alone, some with neither; some with chalice, others with a communion cup; some with unleavened bread, others with leavened; some receive kneeling, others standing, others sitting; some baptize in a font, others in a basin; some sign with the sign of the cross, others make no sign," and much more that we need not quote. The information was not pleasing to Elizabeth, whose Tudor blood was quickly heated when her royal prerogatives were assailed. The Archbishops of Canterbury and York were commanded to confer with the bishops of the Ecclesiastical Commission, a body which carried out the

royal will in all matters pertaining to religion. These prelates, by means of this Commission, were to inquire diligently what diversities there were among the clergy in doctrine, rites, and ceremonies, and "to take effectual methods that an exact order and uniformity be maintained in all external rites and ceremonies as by law and good usages are provided for, and that none hereafter shall be admitted to any ecclesiastical preferment but who is well disposed to common order, and shall formally promise to comply with it."

Evidently the storm was about to break. Many of the clergy were forced into painful alternatives. Some who had entertained scruples concerning the ceremonies required, chose to comply with the wishes of the queen rather than to surrender their ministry. Robert Horne, Bishop of Winchester, expressed the feeling of his fellow-bishops in a letter to Gualter: "It was enjoined us (who had not then any authority either to make laws or repeal them) either to wear the copes and surplices, or to give place to others. We complied with this injunction, lest our enemies should take possession of the places deserted by ourselves." And Edmund Grindal, Bishop of London, in a letter to Bullinger, 1556,

wrote: "We, who are now bishops, on our first return, and before we entered upon our ministry, contended long and earnestly for the removal of those things that have occasioned the present dispute; but as we were unable to prevail, either with the queen or the Parliament," etc. But those who complied with the laws were not without tenderness for their brethren who preferred to expose themselves to the penalties of the Act of Uniformity rather than submit to the ecclesiastical injunctions. Pilkington, Bishop of Durham, addressed an earnest appeal to the Earl of Leicester in behalf of the Dissenters; Whittingham, now Dean of Durham, wrote in similar strain, as did many others. Jewel preached at St. Paul's, not in defense of the vestments, but to reconcile the people to their use for the present. Horne preached also; but, going farther than Jewel, he wished all those were cut off from the Church "that troubled it about white or black garments, round or square caps." The contest went on. Several bishops were either openly or secretly in favor of doing away with all vestments which reminded the people of the Roman services they had rejected. The foreign divines, active in their correspondence, were all

opposed to their use. The people were more pronounced in their opposition than the clergy. In many instances they converted the vestments of the priests into bed-quilts, and turned utensils in the church into swine-troughs, salt-cellars, dressers for holding dishes, and other uses.¹ Numbers refused to attend Church, but held meetings of their own; they refused to salute ministers wearing any habit, and in some places "they did spit in their faces, reviled them as they went along, and showed such rude-like behavior."²

The queen was inclined to call a halt; but the advice of Parker, the archbishop, prevailed, and the Commission insisted on conformity among the clergy, or resignation of their charges. The unreasonable obstinacy of Elizabeth, and the severe measures of the Commission in making trivial matters compulsory, can never be defended by the friend of religious freedom. The issue was plainly between the people and their clergy, who had brought about the Reformation, and the imperious will of the sovereign supported by an interested hierarchy. On the other hand,

¹ "The Church Under Elizabeth," F. G. Lee, p. 135, 136.

² Strype's "Annals," Vol. I, p. 48; "Mem. Cranmer," p. 363; "Life of Parker," p. 77.

he would be very far astray who should imagine that all political and religious virtues were the monopoly of the Nonconformists. They vigorously opposed clerical habits in the services of the Church; but their opposition was stronger than their logic, for they had no word of censure for the long black cassock worn by Genevan divines. Why they should object to the surplice, and not to garments such as Miles Coverdale wore at the consecration of Archbishop Parker, is not clear. The truth of history is, they wished to Calvinize the Church of England; that is, to put it under the same form and polity as the foreign Churches who, rejecting Lutheranism, had adopted the Discipline of Calvin. The enmity they had felt for the Church of Rome they now expressed, with perhaps greater fierceness, toward the Church of England. Pilkington, who had pleaded moderation toward these Nonconformists, wrote: "Not only the habits, but our whole ecclesiastical polity, discipline, the revenues of the bishops, ceremonies or public forms of worship, liturgies, vocation of ministers, or the ministration of the sacraments,—all these are now openly attacked from the press, and it is contended with the greatest bitterness that

they are not to be endured in the Church of Christ; the doctrine alone they leave untouched. As to everything else, by whatever name you call it, they are clamorous for its removal.”¹ The Church of England, however, could not understand why it should acknowledge the superiority of foreign theologians. English divines were not wanting who were as capable of forming a correct judgment in matters religious as any of the foreign divines, whom the Nonconformists were extolling as the only safe guides in the interpretation of Scripture, and the only Scriptural leaders in the government of the Church. Hence in an address to the Dissenters, written probably by Jewel, the writer thus expostulates with his countrymen: “You have the gospels of Christ sincerely preached unto you; why are you offended? You have the sacred Scriptures read unto you, and at your will to be perused; why are you displeased? Idolatry is reprovèd; why are you not contented? Papistry is overthrown; why are you moved? Concerning such as wear the apparel, were they not banished for the profession of the gospel?”

At length the die was cast. Some of the

¹ Zurich Letter.

clergy who had been deprived of their livings by the Act of Uniformity consulted with their friends, and an agreement was reached that it was their duty to refrain from further attendance on the public Churches, and to gather as opportunity afforded in private houses for the worship of God in a manner agreeable to their consciences.¹ But the great mass of those who were called Puritans, or Cathari, did not leave the Church at once, though in divers ways they managed to evade conformity. Within the fold of the Church they hoped that a change for the better would come about in the ongoing of affairs, and that their influence would modify the increasing antipathy of the National Church toward those who, like the Romanists and Lutherans, were now regarded as its dangerous enemies.

The last effort in this reign to alter the Book of Prayer was in 1562. That year Convocation held its ninth session in the chapel-house of St. Paul's, to consider the Articles of Religion. The deliberations on these having been concluded January 31st, Bishop Sandys brought in a petition for adoption by the House and presentation to the queen, to the

¹See Neal, "History of the Puritans," Vol. I, p. 126. Carwithen, "History of Church of England," Vol. I, 499; and also Strype, "Annals."

effect that private baptism and baptism by women should be expunged from the book; that the sign of the cross be disallowed as needless and superstitious. Another paper signed by thirty-three names, requesting that organs be laid aside, was also presented; that in the ministration of the communion the posture of kneeling be regarded as indifferent; that the use of copes and surplices be discontinued; and that all feast days bearing the name of a creature be abrogated. Many other papers bearing on the same and similar subjects were introduced, and voted down after much debating, sometimes by very small majorities, in one case by only a majority of one.

In 1570 the Dissenters printed a prayer-book of their own. It was intended to be a substitute for the one in use, and was declared to be agreeable to God's Word and the usages of the Reformed Churches on the Continent. The book received no notice. Lathbury points out the inconsistency in putting forth such a book "as perfect according to God's Word," in which there were afterwards made above three hundred alterations; but the learned historian should have remembered that a similar charge of inconsistency, if such it was, could have been made against the

Book of Common Prayer itself, which he so ably defends, for that book when set forth under Edward VI was declared over the royal signature to have been composed “by the aid of the Holy Ghost,” and yet many alterations were made in it during the short reign of that king, and again in the first years of Elizabeth.

Neither from Parliament nor from Convocation could the Dissenters hope to obtain any concession to their demands. The controversy had gone too far afield, and had embraced in its sweep more than was at first contemplated or intended. The doctrine, rites, and ceremonies of the Church were all attacked, and over against her claims that Episcopacy was Scriptural, the Nonconformists asserted the divine right of Presbytery. But, as it does not fall within the scope of this work to include a history of the Reformation, nor of the numerous controversies which grew out of it, but only to sketch the history of the Prayer-book, and that only so far as the Ritual is concerned, this chapter may now close with the issues and the rupture between the Church of England and the Dissenters clearly defined.

Five miles from London, as it then was, there stood on the banks of the Thames the

little village of Wandsworth. Here, on November 20, 1573, was organized the first Presbyterian Church in England. Eminent Puritan ministers and a considerable number of laymen, determined not to conform to the Established Church, gathered here in secret, and chose from their company eleven elders to minister to their spiritual needs. From this historic spot there went out those tremendous political and religious influences which, coalescing with other forces, culminated finally in the Civil War, the execution of King Charles I, the Protectorate of Cromwell, the power of Puritanism, and the supremacy of Protestantism in North America.

Chapter V

SOWING AND REAPING

James I, A. D. 1603—Charles II, A. D. 1660

ON March 24, 1603, six hours after the death of Elizabeth, James VI of Scotland, son of Mary Queen of Scots, was proclaimed James I, King of England. The accession of this monarch quickened the hopes of each of the three distinctive religious parties in England then contending for toleration or supremacy. It was natural that the Roman Catholics should expect under his government at least gentler treatment than they had experienced under Elizabeth. He was born in the faith of the Roman Church, and as a martyr to that faith his mother, they averred, had lost both her life and her crown. With stronger reason for the hope that was in them, the Puritans saw in the accession of James I the triumph of their principles. Although born of Catholic parents, he had been educated in the tenets of the Presbyterians, had subscribed to the Scottish Solemn League and Covenant, and on a certain occasion, with

bare head and uplifted hand in the General Assembly at Edinburgh (1590), "he praised God that he was born in the time of the light of the Gospel, and in such a place as to be king of such a Church, the sincerest [purest] Kirk in the world. As for our neighbor Kirk of England, their service is an evil-said mass in English; they want nothing of the mass but the liftings. I charge you, my good ministers, doctors, elders, nobles, gentlemen, and barons, to stand to your purity, and to exhort the people to do the same; and I forsooth, as long as I brook my life, shall maintain the same." When James was leaving Scotland to assume the crown of England, he gave public thanks to God in the Church at Edinburgh that he had left both "Kirk and kingdom in that state which he intended not to alter anyways, his subjects living in peace."

The Puritans therefore justly entertained high hopes for Calvinism, for the substitution of the Genevan Liturgy and polity for the Liturgy and polity of the Church of England. But James was a past-master in kingcraft—pedantic, conceited, obstinate, and weak. He was always loyal to his convictions; but the uppermost conviction of all was

that of his own importance. He was another illustration of Luther's retort on Henry VIII, that when "God wanted a fool, he turned a king into a theologian."

The prelates of the National Church had also every ground for their belief that the new king would be favorable to them, for the reason that the Church and her ceremonies were established by the law of the land. The bishops, therefore, because of their recognized legal relation to the State Church, and the confidence born of the consciousness that they had a right to do so, were the first to sue for His Majesty's favor. As soon as Queen Elizabeth's death was announced, Archbishop Whitgift, Dr. Nevil, the Dean of Canterbury, journeyed into Scotland to do homage to the king, to assure him of the loyalty and duty of the bishops and clergy of England, and to receive his commands respecting the ecclesiastical courts. His Majesty, in reply, expressed his determination to uphold the Established Church.

We have already referred to the conservative Puritans, who remained within the Church. These, for a moment, now came to the front. In April, while the king was on his way from Edinburgh to London, there

was presented to him a petition, styled "The Millenary Petition"—because at the time it was said that a thousand signatures were affixed to it—signed by seven hundred and fifty clergymen, all beneficed in the Church of England, setting forth their grievances and seeking reformation in the Church. The document purported to be the humble petition of the "Ministers of the Church of England desiring Reformation of certain Ceremonies and Abuses in the Church." Their complaints were gathered under four heads: relating, first, to the Church service; secondly, to Church ministers; thirdly, to Church livings; and, fourthly, to Church Discipline. The charges under each heading they offered to sustain by appeal to Holy Scripture, and they begged His Majesty to hear them, or to receive information on the same in writing, or to appoint a conference.

It would be a difficult task to criticise adversely all the demands of these petitioners; for neither ceremony nor piety would have been the poorer, and many useless and some pernicious accretions of ages would have been forever done away had their grievances been sympathetically considered. But they themselves were much to blame for the outcome

of their endeavor; for in their excessive zeal for comprehensive reformation, immediate and thorough, the momentum of their desires drove them beyond the hazy, indefinite line of prudence. Erasmus made a wise remark that went to the root of things, when he said that Luther had committed two unpardonable sins—he had touched the pope’s miter and the monks’ bellies. Men may speculate on religious, scientific, or political subjects without attracting the concentrated wrath of invested interests, so long as the purely intellectual entertainment is strictly confined to the realms of the abstract where nobody lives; but the moment abstract principles are applied to concrete conditions, then—whether it is Paul at Ephesus among the devotees of Diana, Savonarola in Florence, Luther in Wittenberg, or the Puritans in the English Church—then, invested rights, wealth, ease, privilege, profit, and power take alarm, and hurl their thunderbolts against the daring but impious reformer. Men seldom part without conflict with either bread or power.

In their petition the ministers demanded “that impropriations annexed to bishoprics and colleges be given to preaching incumbents only, and that lay impropriations be

charged with a sixth or seventh part for the maintenance of a preacher." "This motion," says the quaint Fuller,¹ "if effected, would cut off more than the nipples of the breasts of both universities in point of maintenance," and it was so felt at the time. The Universities, therefore, of Cambridge and Oxford vigorously opposed the demands of the petitioners. Cambridge passed a law, June 9, 1603, that whosoever in the university should openly oppose, by word or writing or any other way, the doctrine or discipline of the Church of England established by law, or any part thereof, should be suspended *ipso facto* from any degree already taken, and be disabled from taking any degree in the future. Oxford, "recompensing the slowness of her pace with the firmness of her footing," followed with "An Answer of the Vice-Chancellor, Doctors, Proctors, and other heads of Houses in the University of Oxford, to the Petition of the Ministers of the Church of England, desiring Reformation, dedicated to the King, with a Preface to the Archbishop, the Chancellors of both Universities, and the two Secretaries of State." A sharp attack, cleverly arranged.

¹"Church History," Vol. III, p. 196. Nichols' Edition.

The upshot of the whole matter was that the king, not desiring, for political reasons, to break abruptly with his former friends, issued a proclamation, October 24, 1603, for a conference with the two parties, in which he declares that he is already persuaded that the Constitution of the Church of England is agreeable to God's Word and near to the condition of the Primitive Church; yet because he had received information that some things in it were scandalous and gave offense, he appoints a meeting to be had before himself and Council of divers bishops and other learned men, at which consultation he hoped to be better informed of the state of the Church, and whether there were any such enormities in it. This Conference, famous for having provided for a new translation of the Holy Scriptures—our present Authorized Version—met at Hampton Court, January 14, 1603, and continued three days. On the side of the Church were nine bishops, names celebrated in that day and for all days—Whitgift, Archbishop of Canterbury; Bancroft, of London; Matthew, of Durham; Bilson, of Winchester; Babington, of Worcester; Rudd, of St. David's; Watson, of Chichester; Robinson, of Carlisle; and Dove, of Peterborough.

Other dignitaries assisting were: Dr. Andrews, Dean of the Royal Chapel; Overall, Dean of St. Paul's; Barlow, Dean of Chester; Bridges, Dean of Salisbury; Field, Dean of Gloucester; King, Archdeacon of Nottingham; and the Deans of Worcester and Windsor. The Puritans were represented by only four ministers: Dr. John Reynolds, Dr. Thomas Sparks, Professor of Divinity in Oxford; Mr. Chadderton, and Mr. Knewstubbs, of Cambridge.

The king acted as president, and evidently took great delight in exploiting his theological knowledge. It must be confessed that the Puritans appeared to poor advantage. From all the noise and turmoil they had occasioned in the preceding reign, the fierceness of their antipathy against the Prayer-book and Ritual, it would be supposed that when they had the opportunity they would expose in clearest manner and maintain with invincible argument the great apostasy of the Church from Scriptural teaching and primitive practice; that they would be able to show the doctrinal errors of the Ritual, and to demonstrate to enlightened reason the utter uselessness and incompatibility of the whole service, discipline, and government of the

Established Church with a genuine Protestantism. But they did nothing of the kind. When sifted down, their grievances were few, feebly argued, and out of all proportion in number and character with the dust they had raised. The trouble with them, when stripped of all side issues, was simply this: they had assumed that Calvinism in doctrine, and Presbyterianism in government, were the only standards for any Church claiming to be Protestant. These standards they endeavored by every means to force upon the Church of England; but the Church, though Calvinistic, was becoming Arminian, and she resolutely declined to accept Calvin as her master in theology or as a reconstructor of her polity. The first day the king met the bishops only, and commanded them, as they would answer it to God in conscience and to himself upon their obedience, to consult among themselves whether there be any corruptions in the doctrines, ceremonies, and discipline of the Church. He expressed some dissatisfaction with absolution given by the minister as savoring too much of the priestly pardon. He also objected to private baptism and baptism by women, and in compliance with his desires a few changes were made,

chiefly explanatory. On the second day the Puritan divines were admitted. The king, surrounded by his nobles and privy councillors, opened the sitting, and there being two bishops and several deans present he bade the divines to state their objections against the Church and her Ritual. Dr. Reynolds came forward, and requested—

1. That the doctrine of the Church might be preserved pure according to God's Word.
2. That good pastors might be planted in all Churches to preach the same.
3. That the Book of Common Prayer might be fitted to increase of piety.
4. That Church government might be sincerely administered according to God's Word.

As to the first, he desired that to the words in the Sixteenth Article of Religion, "After we have received the Holy Ghost we may depart from grace," there should be added these words, "*neither totally nor finally*," in order to make them agree with the doctrine of predestination in the Seventeenth Article. That is, in addition to predestination the doctrine of final perseverance should be riveted into the Articles of Religion, thereby removing all doubt of the thoroughgoing Calvinism of the English formula of faith. But to

confine ourselves wholly to our specific theme under the third head relating to the Ritual in the Prayer-book, the objection urged this second day was the lack of harmony between Article of Religion Twenty-five and the Collect of Confirmation; the propounding of questions to infants in baptism; the sign of the cross in baptism; the wearing of the surplice, and the words employed in the rite of matrimony, "*with my body I thee worship*"—an old English term of endearment and honor, as the king himself pointed out. To these objections, answers—some good, some weak—were made by the bishops and deans present, and the second day's conference came to an end, the king being much irritated by the frequent reference of Reynolds to the royal supremacy as being contrary to the freedom of the Church in her Synods. His Majesty appointed the following Wednesday for the next conference, and "rising from his chair," says Cardwell, "as he was going to his inner chamber, 'If this be all,' quoth he, 'that they have to say, I shall make them conform themselves, or I will harrow them out of this land, or else do worse,' an evil remark which Puritan England did not forget when the head of James's son, Charles I, rolled from the block in White-

hall, the victim of his own and his father's folly.

On Wednesday, January 18th, the Conference again convened. The alterations which the bishops were willing to make in the Ritual as a concession to the Nonconformists were brought in, and submitted to the Puritan divines. Strange as it may seem, these divines gave their unanimous consent, objecting to nothing that was said or done, and promised to perform their duty to the bishops and to assist them against adversaries for the quiet of the Church. (Cardwell's Conferences.)

The new Book of Common Prayer, changed as agreed, was published in March, its use being authorized by royal proclamation. But instead of Conference allaying the tempest, no sooner did the book appear than it was violently attacked by the Puritans, who repudiated the offices of the eminent men who had represented them before the king. The Puritans became more determined for the supremacy of Calvinism, the Established Church inclined gradually to Arminianism, and the differences religiously and politically widened every year. Finally the spirit of opposition became so strong that the king issued a proclamation in 1604, warning his

subjects not to listen “to the troublesome spirits of some persons who never receive contentment either in civil or ecclesiastical matters, but in their own fantasies, especially certain ministers, who under pretended zeal of reformation are the chief authors of divisions and sects among our people.”

No further changes were made during the reign of James I. He died March 27, 1625, and on the same day, it being Sunday, his son was proclaimed King of England, under the title of Charles the First.

On the accession of Charles I no attempt was made to amend the Liturgy. But the seeds of discontent, of intolerance, and also of progress, which had been sown in former years, could not but spring up and bear fruit. Moreover, the age was maturing for great revolutions. The young kings of the most powerful nations in Europe had surrendered the management of their kingdoms to their ministers, and it was impossible that the peace of mankind could be long preserved while such men as Olivarez in Spain, Richelieu in France, and Buckingham in England, controlled the destinies of the world. The religious party in England, called Puritans, associated republicanism of a peculiar kind

with Calvinism, while the prelates of the Church, who stood for the prerogatives of the crown and were inconveniently loyal in their attachments to the Church, adopted Arminianism, which was then making heroic battle with the horrible tenets of Genevan theology. Thus politics clashed with politics, and religion with religion. The profligate Duke of Buckingham became the king's favorite; the vindictive, ambitious, and intolerant Laud, small in talent but great in devotion to the king, became his chaplain and the pilot of the Church as Archbishop of Canterbury. Hume has depicted Laud in dark colors, and Hallam can only say of him: "Though not literally destitute of religion, it was so subordinate to worldly interest and so blended in his mind with the impure alloy of temporal pride, that he became an intolerant persecutor of the Puritan clergy, not from bigotry, which in its usual sense he never displayed, but systematic policy." And Macaulay thus describes him: "The mean forehead, the pinched features, the peering eyes of the prelate, suited admirably with his disposition. They mark him out as a lower kind of Saint Dominic, differing from the fierce and gloomy enthusiast who founded the Inqui-

sition, as we might imagine the familiar imp of a spiteful witch to differ from an archangel of darkness.”¹ Carlyle also thrusts him through, calling him “little Dr. Laud,” as if *he* had anything to be proud of in his dyspeptic constitution! The other side is presented not without spirit and some little show of proof. “Before the archbishop’s imprisonment,” says Lathbury, “the Presbyterians labored to damage his reputation; and after his death their hireling writers justified the enormous crime. Succeeding writers, who could not justify the act of putting him to death, have endeavored to palliate it by painting the prelate in the most odious colors. But their assertions have led to a more careful examination of his character, as well as a more minute investigation of the events of the period, and the result is most satisfactory.” The inadequate supplies voted by the Commons astonished and humiliated the king. The growth of popery and Laud’s High Churchism alarmed the Puritans, and a demand was made for a strict enforcement of the penal laws against the Roman Catholics. Unfortunate events, in the management of

¹ Macaulay is mistaken. Dominic was dead ten years before the Inquisition was established.

which Charles exercised little judgment, brought the court into unnecessary conflict with the rugged elements of the nation, now dangerously conscious of their power. Richard Montague, one of the king's chaplains, had published a book in the days of James I, which caused his arrest and appearance before the bar of the House, and he was prohibited from such writing in the future. Montague, misinterpreting the spirit of the times, gave no heed to the inhibition laid on him by the Commons, nor to the admonition of the archbishop, but published another book, entitled "An Appeal to Cæsar," and, James being dead, dedicated it to King Charles. The author was again arrested. The Commons decided that the book was a defense of Arminianism, and an attempt to reconcile the Church of England to Rome, and fined the enthusiastic but indiscreet chaplain in the sum of two thousand pounds. Archbishop Laud imagined that this act of the Commons was an attack upon the rights and character of the Church, and through the influence of Buckingham enlisted the sympathy of the king. Unadvisedly enough, the king yielded to the influence of his favorite, and expressed his displeasure against the Commons for their

ill-treatment of his chaplain. When the House met again in February, 1626, it was in no pliable mood. A Committee on Religious Affairs was appointed, and Montague's case was again taken up; but the king interfered, took the cause into his own hands, and dissolved the Parliament.

Thus matters went from bad to worse. Laud would never have led the Church back to Rome; but, true to his principles, he defended every act and writing which gave the Church the character of what in these days would be denominated High Churchism, of which, indeed, he was the father, and in the pursuit of his policy he persecuted with severity the Presbyterian or Puritan party. Baffled in their attempts to Genevanize the Church, the Puritans exalted every opposition to established authority into a struggle for liberty against arbitrary power, and persuaded themselves that they alone were the chosen of God for the preservation of religious truth. Extremes beget extremes. The court, with the hierarchy, being blindly antagonistic to the temper of the times, and needlessly resisting the efforts of the nation to defend itself against the encroachments of kingly power, struggled to maintain its autocracy by des-

potic measures, and thus, instead of guiding with steady hand the Ship of State, aroused and intensified the bitter and relentless hostility of a liberty-loving people. To the Puritans England owes her liberties. Parliament, which was wholly in the hands of the Puritans, signified its opposition to the king by refusing to grant supplies necessary to his foreign policy; and it manifested its antipathy for the Church by well-directed attacks upon the pretensions of the hierarchy.

In 1640, Convocation, contrary to custom, continued to sit, although Parliament was dissolved, and granted supplies to the king from the revenues of the Church. New Canons were framed, and fearful of the innovations which had taken place in the Scottish Church, an oath was imposed on the clergy and on the graduates of the universities, by which they were sworn "to maintain the established government of the Church, by archbishops, bishops, deans, archdeacons, etc." No one who had conscientiously assumed the ministerial office in the Established Church could honestly object to the evident intent of the oath; but the form of the oath was as mischievous as it was ridiculous, and such was the humor of the times that the abbreviation

“etc.” was taken to cover many needless offices and many insidious meanings, and it was immediately branded throughout the kingdom as the “et cetera oath.” When the Long Parliament met, it declared the Acts of Convocation null and void, impeached Archbishop Laud, sent him to the Tower, and thence to execution. The spirit of the people went beyond the intent of the Commons. Everywhere the clergy were attacked and grossly insulted. Bishops, deans, and eminent divines were prosecuted on one charge or another, and deprived of their livings. At Lambeth the remains of Archbishop Parker, the first archbishop of the English Church under Queen Elizabeth, were taken out of his coffin and buried in a dunghill.¹

Churches were filled by mobs, defiled with garbage, converted into stables and barracks, communion tables were broken, and the railings placed about them destroyed; parsons, vicars, and curates were forbidden to introduce rites and ceremonies that gave offense to the anti-Episcopal party; and when the bishops, with Williams, the Archbishop of York, at their head, addressed a protest to the king and House of Lords, to the effect

¹Southey's "Book of the Church," pp. 472-3.

that because of the danger to their lives by the ungovernable multitude they could not attend to their duties in the House, and therefore protested against all laws inimical to the Church during their enforced absence, they were impeached by the House of Commons for high treason, deprived the House, and committed to custody, no one daring to utter a word in their defense. Never was the nation so profoundly stirred. Charles and his advisers had, Ajax-like, defied the lightning, and now the pent-up wrath of a people moved to the deepest depths, as only religious animosity can move, was upon them. Deaf to all warnings they had swept onward to the Niagara, whose awful thunder now drowned their futile cries. The Episcopacy and the Liturgy were put on trial at the bar of the nation. "The debates in Parliament," says Neal, "concerning the English Liturgy and hierarchy engaged the attention of the whole nation, and revived the controversy without doors. Books and pamphlets attacking and defending both the Liturgy and the Episcopacy fell thick and fast from the press, petitions flowed into Parliament requesting the abolition of the Episcopal order; counter petitions were presented setting forth the rea-

sons why it should be continued and preserved 'notwithstanding the abuses and corruptions which in so long a tract of time have crept into it.'” The debates in Parliament continued, the Root-and-Branch party, as it was called, at whose head was Sir Henry Vane, demanding nothing less than the total extirpation of the Episcopacy. The greater number of the Puritans in the House at this time were not in favor, however, of going beyond a reformation of the hierarchy; but on May 20, 1641, a bill was brought in by Sir Edward Deering providing for the extinction of the whole Episcopal Order. This, too, after much debate was dropped for the present, and the House turned its attention to the abolition of deans and chapters.

Following this a committee was appointed to consider what innovations had been made in religion since the Reformation, and by necessity the Prayer-book and Ordinal were brought to the front. This committee became the celebrated Assembly of Divines—the Westminster Assembly—a company composed of Independents, Erastians, Presbyterians, and Moderate Episcopalians. Fatality blinded the judgments of the bishops in every step they took. Had they been less insistent,

as they could have been without hurt to conscience, upon their opinions, the evils which crowded upon each other rapidly might have been averted; but they would abate nothing of their claims. The result was the abolition of Episcopacy, the assertion of the Divine right of Presbytery, and the tragical execution of the king. In 1645, Parliament, by special ordinance, abolished the Book of Prayer, and decreed in its stead a Directory for Public Worship. Again, in August this same year, another law was passed forbidding the use of the book in any private place or family, and all copies of it found in churches were to be delivered up under severe penalty.

Thus ends another chapter in the history of this remarkable book, the history of which is so closely interwoven with the history of the kings and queens, Parliaments, and Churches and Christian forces of Modern England. It must be evident to every thoughtful reader that such an unnatural condition of religious affairs as we have just described could not continue long. Some time before the execution of Charles I, the Puritans had broken up into various and antagonizing camps. The Presbyterians were opposed to the Independents, and the Anabap-

tist elements were antagonistic to all others, and despised by all. Reaction from the violence of the civil war and the fierce enmity against the Church gradually set in. "Hence," says Cardwell in his "History of Conferences," "there was in these ordinances, and in the measures they occasioned, something so offensive to the consciences of many devout persons, so tyrannical in the estimate of reasonable men, and so profane in the licentiousness of public worship, which followed as their natural consequences, that as soon as the Presbyterian feeling began to subside, the wish for a prescribed Ritual returned with additional strength, and the prohibited Liturgy was regarded with a degree of veneration such as is felt for a saint who had suffered martyrdom," which is another evidence in proof of the truth often ignored, that those institutions alone survive all changes which, rooted deep in historic soil, demonstrate their right to exist by supplying a need of the human heart in every age, because out of such need they originally sprung.

Chapter VI

RESTORATION

Charles II, A. D. 1660—William of Orange, A. D. 1688

THE people of England could not long endure the uncertain government which Cromwell had forced upon them, and which was radically opposed to, wholly out of harmony with, their national instincts. The millennium had not followed the decapitation of monarchy, and Charles II having given assurance of pardon for the execution of his father to such as sought the royal clemency, and that full tolerance of diverse opinions in matters religious would be granted, excepting such as would be detrimental to the peace of the State, the House of Commons declared that "the government of this kingdom is, and ought to be, by kings, lords, and Commons." His Majesty, Charles II, was therefore invited to return to his kingdom, and on May 26th he landed at Dover, and journeyed in triumph to London.

While the king was at Breda, in Holland, pending the final preparation for his return,

the Presbyterian ministers of London sent over a Commission, of the most notable names among them, with an address to the king, in which, says Lord Clarendon, they professed great affection for His Majesty, and declared themselves "full of zeal for the peace of the Church and the State, and neither enemies, as they have been given out to be, to Episcopacy or Liturgy; but modestly desired such alterations in either as, without shaking foundations, might best allay the present distempers, which the indisposition of the time and the tenderness of some men's consciences had contracted."¹ The Commissioners were graciously received, and assurance was given them of the royal intention to relieve the conscience of all who scrupled to comply with the established religion; but that the extent of toleration would be determined by the two Houses of Parliament. Emboldened by the success of their mission, by the royal declaration in favor of religious liberty, and desirous, probably, of gaining some further advantage, they ventured to entreat the king not to use the Book of Common Prayer in his chapel—that it had long been out of use, and that the people were now familiar with an-

¹Cardwell, "Conferences," p. 244.

other form of worship. This attempt to suggest kingly compliance with the acts of the Rump Parliament which had outlawed Prayer-book and Ritual was construed as a presumption, and Charles replied with some warmth, "that while he gave them liberty, he would not have his own taken away. That he had always used that form of service which he thought the best in the world, and had never discontinued it in places where it was more disliked than he hoped it was by them. That when he came into England he should not severely inquire how it was used in other Churches; but he would have no other used in his own chapel."

When the king reached his palace at Whitehall, the Liturgy was restored in the Royal Chapel, in many of the Churches in the city, and in a few days after the two Houses of Parliament decreed that prayers should be said before them as in former times, for it was assumed by the loyalists that with the passing of the Long Parliament all enactments that had not received the royal assent were null and void. The Dissenters were now in bad straits. The once demolished Church was risen in triumph from her ruins. The day of the Dissenter had passed. In order, therefore,

to bring about some accommodation between themselves and the Established Church, the Puritans offered to make important concessions, such concessions, indeed, as would be regarded at the present time as utterly incompatible with the spirit and principles of Presbyterian teaching. They offered to accept Archbishop Usher's model of Primitive Episcopacy, which, as every student knows, is essentially Methodistic. They also offered to set aside the Westminster Confession of Faith, and to accept in lieu thereof the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, with a few amendments.¹ In June several of the leading divines among the Presbyterians, all eminent for sound learning—Mr. Calamy, Dr. Reynolds, Mr. Ashe, the celebrated Richard Baxter, Dr. Wallis, Dr. Manton, and Dr. Spurstow—waited on the king, and presented to him an address containing proposals for reconciling Church differences. The objections they urged against existing evils were stated with clearness and moderation, and the remedies they proposed were both wise and conservative. "Respecting Liturgy and ceremonies, these representative Presbyterian divines expressed themselves," says Neal, the

¹Cardwell, Lathbury, Collier as before.

historian of the Puritans, "in the following manner :

" We are satisfied in our judgment concerning the lawfulness of a Liturgy or form of worship, provided it be for matter agreeable to the Word of God and suited to the several ordinances and necessities of the Church ; neither too tedious, nor composed of too short prayers or responses, nor dissonant from the Liturgies of other reformed Churches, nor too rigorously imposed, nor the minister confined thereto, but that he may also make use of his gifts of prayer and exhortation.

" Forasmuch as the Book of Common Prayer is in some things justly offensive, and needs amendment, we most humbly pray that some learned, godly, moderate divines of both persuasions may be employed to compile such a form as is herebefore described as much as may be in Scripture words, or at least revise and reform the old, together with an addition of other various forms in Scripture phrase, to be used at the ministers' choice.

" Concerning ceremonies: we hold ourselves obliged, in every part of Divine worship, to do all things decently and in order and to edification, and are willing to be determined by authority in such things as being merely circumstantial or common to human actions and societies, are to be ordered by the light of nature and human prudence."

From a comparison of these concessions and demands, which may be read in full in the authorities I have mentioned—Neal's "His-

tory of the Puritans," Cardwell's "Conferences"—it will be observed that had these concessions and demands been accepted and agreed to, the Church of England would have become in many respects what the Methodist Episcopal Church is now in polity and worship. What these Presbyterians conceded concerning Episcopacy, Wesley put into practice; and what they conceded relative to Liturgy and ceremonial, and demanded concerning revision of the Prayer-book, which, it is understood, contained also the Ritual for Ordinations and other occasions, Wesley carried out when providing the Church in America with a suitable form for Sunday service and for the decent celebration of sacred rites.

The address pleased the king, who expressed his gratification on hearing their acquiescence in a Liturgy, and that they were willing in their agreement to accept Archbishop Usher's views of Church government to yield the essence of Episcopacy. But instead of the bishops coming forward with their proposals, as was expected by the Presbyterians, they drew up a formal reply to the Address, which they communicated to the ministers in July. This was disappointing.

Nevertheless, the upshot of the whole matter was, that the king issued "A Declaration," which seemed to concede all that had been demanded. This greatly pleased the Presbyterians, and many of them accepted appointments in the Church, some of them being made bishops.

According to the declaration, the king, on the 25th March, 1661, issued his warrant appointing the Commission. This body was equally divided in its composition between the two parties, and it was required to meet at Savoy, in the jurisdiction of the Bishop of London. The purpose of the Commission was "to review the Book of Common Prayer, comparing it with the most ancient and purest Liturgies." The Commission met April 15th. It was soon apparent that little good would be accomplished. The bishops insisted upon one method of procedure, the divines upon another. Moreover, the Presbyterians were divided among themselves. Some were in favor of a few important demands, hoping to obtain more when the desired union was completed. Others, and they were in the majority, insisted, under the aggressive leadership of Richard Baxter, upon demanding the utmost possible. Mr. Baxter himself acted on

this principle, and instead of keeping before him the fact that the Prayer-book was to be amended, and not a new one made, and as amended to be the book in future for the Church, and instead of presenting amendments or composing prayers which might be inserted in the proper place, he set himself to compose an entirely new Liturgy, and had, moreover, the boldness to offer that production as a substitute for the book that was to be revised. Richard Baxter was a divine as talented as he was pious, and that is praise sufficient for the author of "The Saints' Everlasting Rest," a book which has brought rest to many thousands of troubled hearts. As might have been most naturally expected, the presentation of this brand-new Liturgy, composed in fourteen days and without any regard for the whole venerable Christian past, as a substitute for the Liturgy and Ritual which had been used by the Church for a hundred years, and portions of it for a thousand years, gave great offense, and belittled the complaints of the Presbyterians. It is no wonder that Mr. Baxter's new Liturgy was rejected without examination.

The Conference was to sit for four months; but its sessions degenerated into unseemly

debates, each worse in spirit, purpose, and result than the one preceding, until July 25th, when this grave and reverend body adjourned without any prospect of agreement. The bishops did not consider that they had any special report to make in writing; but the Presbyterians set forth an account of the proceedings and the debates, and sought to obtain by petition from the king what was denied them by the prelates.

The Savoy Assembly having thus ended, Charles II commanded Convocation, which was then in session, November 20th, to review the Book of Common Prayer. The Bishops of Durham, Ely, Oxford, Rochester, Salisbury, Lincoln, and Gloucester proceeded at once to the work of revision. So industrious were these learned and devoted men that, on the 20th of December, 1661, the book, as revised, was adopted and subscribed by both Houses of Convocation of the two provinces, Canterbury and York. In April, 1662, it received the sanction of Parliament. It is not necessary to note the various alterations which were made in this revision, since the Methodist Episcopal Church does not use that book, but that book further revised by Wesley and her General Conferences. But one

important change must be carefully observed, because of its doctrinal and historical interest. It is that change which was made in the form used in the consecration of bishops and priests or presbyters. Elsewhere in this work, and in my "Historic Episcopate," I have shown that the Reformers and founders of the Church of England did neither believe nor teach that there were three separate and distinct orders in the Christian ministry by Divine right; that is, by Divine command or institution—although in harmony with Christian history they did admit such order *jure humano*, and provided for the continuance of the same as a form of government best suited to the Church of England, and proved to be the best for the cause of religion by the practice of the Church from the remotest times. Not until A. D. 1661 was there any express, definite assertion of distinction between bishops and presbyters as to order. In opposition to the Presbyterian claim of *the divine right of Presbytery*, Dr. Bancroft asserted the divine right of Episcopacy in a sermon preached at St. Paul's, February 9, 1589; but it was not till 1661 that the distinction was made officially by the Church of England, "and this," says Blunt in his "Annotations on the Book

of Common Prayer"—a standard authority—"was done by the addition of the words in the Preface to the Ordinal, 'Episcopal consecration or *ordination*,' and 'every man which is to be *ordained* or consecrated bishop,' and in the heading form of '*ordaining* or consecrating a bishop,' although previously implied in the Preface, which speaks of 'these orders of ministers in Christ's Church, bishops, priests, and deacons.' It was not until the close of the sixteenth century that the distinction between the orders of bishops and priests was asserted." This unpalatable fact is unwelcome truth to many, for while the Reformers, in the Preface to the Ordinal of Edward VI, expressed their godly judgment solely with respect to the needs of the Church of England, and that these orders were recognized in the Christian Church from the days of the apostles, not by Divine right, but by human right, and while they refrained from declaring that Episcopal ordination is essential by Divine command to a valid ministry—which declaration their writings and fellowship with non-Episcopal Churches in Germany, Switzerland, and Holland abundantly prove they did not believe—they did not carry out these distinctions in the Ordinal itself, which they com-

piled, in the all-important, vitally-essential words of consecration, as was now done for the first time by the Laudian bishops of Charles II. On the contrary, the selections of Scripture which are *now* cited in the Ordinal and in theologic writings as proof of the Episcopal order, and are *now* read exclusively at the ordination of *bishops*, were those very self-same Scriptures which the Reformers placed in the Ordinal of 1549 for the ordaining of *priests* or *presbyters*. In 1662 these Scriptures were taken from the ordering of priests, and placed in the service for the consecration of bishops. In the Ordinal of 1549 the words of consecration of a priest were:

“Receive the Holy Ghost. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained; and be thou a faithful dispenser of the words of God and of his holy sacraments. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.”

The form of consecrating a bishop was:

“Take the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the gift of God which is in thee by the imposition of hands; for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power and love and of soberness.”

It was therefore pointed out by the controversialists of those days that in these forms

there was no mention of the order to which the person had been ordained, which, it was argued, was essential to the validity of the consecration, since it could not be told from the words of consecration to what order or to what function the person had been consecrated. There was no mention of the functions of a bishop beyond an allusion to govern, to instruct, etc., which might be said to any shepherd of the sheep, the words "to ordain" not being in the Ordinal till the change was made in 1662. These defects were utilized with effect against the exclusive claims of the High Church party, and are yet; for if the forms in the Ordinal of Edward VI were sufficient, then the Convocation of 1662 did an unwise act in changing those forms; and if they were not sufficient, the change came one hundred years too late for Episcopal succession. The nature of the change may be seen by comparing the above form of the Ordinal of 1549 with the following form made by Convocation of 1662, which is:

"Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a bishop in the Church of God, committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. And remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is," etc.

On May 19th, an ACT FOR THE UNIFORMITY OF PUBLIC PRAYER, AND ADMINISTRATION OF SACRAMENTS, AND OTHER RITES AND CEREMONIES, AND FOR ESTABLISHING THE FORMS OF MAKING, ORDAINING, AND CONSECRATING BISHOPS, PRIESTS, AND DEACONS IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, received the royal assent, was prefixed to the Book of Prayer, and the book, as thus amended, became, by Act of Parliament, Stat. 13 and 14, Car. II, c. 4, the only lawful service-book in the kingdom. The name Puritan was now changed into that of Nonconformist, a generic term including Presbyterians, Independents, Brownists (Congregationalists), Anabaptists, and Quakers.

King Charles II died February 6, 1685, and was succeeded by his brother, James II, an avowed Romanist. It was not long before this king became embroiled with the bishops, and found friends, as might be expected—though he was an enemy to the Reformation—among the Nonconformists. But in his wily efforts to play off one party against the other for his own ends he was crushed by both, and, after a short and inglorious reign, fled the country. He was the last of the male line of the House of Stuart.

Chapter VII

TRANSITION

**William of Orange, A. D. 1688—Christmas Conference,
A. D. 1784**

DURING the reign of William, Prince of Orange, and his consort Mary, daughter of the royal exile James II, no change was made in the Liturgy, although an attempt at revision was made in 1689. On coming to the throne, the Prince of Orange had promised in a declaration that he would use his best endeavor to bring about a good agreement between the Church of England and all Protestant Dissenters, a promise which he now desired to fulfill.

On the 13th September, 1689, a Commission was given to ten bishops and twenty divines, requiring them to prepare alterations for the Liturgy and Canons. The commissioners, among whom will be found several famous names, were the Archbishop of York, the Bishops of London, Winchester, Rochester, Carlisle, St. Asaph, Exeter, Salisbury, Bangor, and Chester; Drs. Sprat, Smith,

Compton, Mew, Sharp, Loyd, Stratford, Burnett, Humphreys, Patrick, Stillingfleet, Tillotson, Kidder, Sir Jonathan Trelawney, Drs. Megott, Aldrich, Jane, Hall, Beaumont, Montague, Goodman, Batteley, Alston, Beveridge, Tenison, Grove, Fowler, Scott, and Williams. This body of learned men were not only to revise the Liturgy, but also to consider such other matters as would be helpful to the policy of reconciliation. It is therefore of great interest, which will be fully appreciated by the intelligent student of Methodism, to note the concessions which these bishops and representative divines of the Church of England were willing to make. It is not necessary, however, to mention more than one or two as bearing on the subject before us. Dr. Tillotson, afterward archbishop, drew up a paper setting forth the concessions which would be offered, among which were these:

“ 1. That the ceremonies enjoined or recommended in the Liturgy or Canons be left indifferent.

“ 2. That the Liturgy be reviewed, etc.

“ 3. That for the future those who have been ordained in any of the foreign reformed Churches be not required to be reordained here to render them capable of preferment in this Church.

“ 4. That, for the future, none be capable of any ecclesiastical benefice or preferment in the Church

of England that shall be ordained in England otherwise than by bishops, and that those who have been ordained only by presbyters shall not be compelled to renounce their former ordinations."

Many other concessions and proposals were made in writing by these eminent men, such as the substitution of the word "minister" for "priest," all of which would have made the Church of England almost precisely in belief and practice identical with Episcopal Methodism. It will be clearly seen that the Methodist Church has done nothing that the Church of England was not willing to do. The concessions relating to ordination completely justify Wesley's ordination of Dr. Coke, and it is fully evident that the Episcopacy of Methodism and its Ritual would have been cordially indorsed by these bishops had Episcopal Methodism been in the place of the non-Episcopal Dissenters. The bishops of the Church of England were willing to recognize the orders of the foreign Reformed Churches, as did the early Reformers, which Churches had deacons, presbyters, and superintendents, or, as we would say, bishops, to which order even Calvin did not object, providing, as we provide, that it was not affirmed to be of Divine origin and command. But Episcopal

Methodism has the same orders, and of the same validity, as those Reformed Churches and of the Church of England itself, and it can not, therefore, be denied that between the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Church of England—as that Church was under Edward VI, and as her bishops in the reign of William and Mary were willing she should become—there would be in respect to government and worship no great difference.

To those who regard the visible unity of Christendom as the New Testament norm, it must be a cause of ever-recurring regret that the work of this Commission resulted in nothing. Schism reared its hissing crest in the Church. Jacobin and anti-Jacobin divided public attention, and distracted the thought of the nation. The archbishop and several bishops refused to transfer their allegiance to the Prince of Orange, and so disturbed became the religious atmosphere that many who had advocated the concessions now withdrew them. Thus the beautiful dream of a united Church in the kingdom of England faded away. The Liturgy was not revised, and it has remained to this day as it was in the reign of Charles II.

But in 1784, the Rev. John Wesley, a

presbyter in the Church of England, completed a revision of the Book of Common Prayer and Ordinal for the use of the Methodist Church in the United States. The revision by Wesley was thorough, unequivocal in line with evangelical belief, and very similar to the second Service-book of Edward VI. He had full knowledge of the controversies concerning the book from the beginning, and was competent, as one of the most learned divines of his age, to eliminate from it all that, with proper interpretation, could give offense to a reasonable Christian having any regard for decency and order in the Church of God, and to adapt it to needs of a people who were not to be Presbyterians, nor Brownists, nor Congregationalists, nor Independents, nor Anabaptists, but an Episcopal Church, animated by an evangelical spirit, and having, through the Church of England, an underlying essential unity in orders, worship, and faith with the Church of the ages.

It will not be inferred from this that Wesley mutilated in any degree the Liturgy book of the English Church. He made no greater changes than the bishops and divines of that Church were willing to make in the reign of William of Orange. In a letter written in

1789 he says: "Dr. Coke made two or three little alterations in the Prayer-book without my knowledge. I took particular care throughout to alter nothing merely for altering's sake. In religion I am for as few innovations as possible. I love the old wine best. And if it were only on this account, I prefer '*Which*' before '*Who* art in heaven,'" and in many places throughout his Journal there is ample proof of his devotion to the historic Book whose history we have here briefly traced. For the word "Priest" he substituted the better, because truer, word "Minister," or "Elder," and for the word "Bishop" the word "Superintendent," as Bishop Poynt, in the reign of Edward VI, proposed; not that he was opposed to Episcopacy, but to the associations which had gathered about the term Bishop in the long conflict between Puritan and Churchman. Never in a single instance is the word Priest used to designate a Christian minister in the New Testament. This silence is all the more significant when it is remembered that never before the days of the apostles in all the mountain range of centuries did any one ever hear of a religion without a visible priesthood, and yet neither the apostles nor their disciples did ever designate a Chris-

tian minister as a priest. Professor Lightfoot, in an *excursus* on the Christian ministry appended to his Commentary on *Philippians*, affirms the same fact, and says that the term was brought in at the close of the second century from paganism. Hooker, perhaps the most celebrated writer in the annals of the Church of England, was of the same opinion in his day, and for the word "Elder" or "Presbyter" as a substitute for "Priest," he says, "In truth the word *Presbyter* doth seem more fit, and in propriety of speech more agreeable, than *Priest*, with the drift of the whole Gospel of Jesus Christ." And "The Holy Ghost throughout the body of the New Testament making so much mention of them [ministers], doth not anywhere call them *Priests*." ("Eccl. Polity," Book V, p. 78. Oxford Edition.)

The revised Liturgy and Ordinal being ready, it was brought over by Dr. Coke, and was adopted by the preachers at the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in the Christmas Conference of A. D. 1784. The title-page of the book reads:

THE SUNDAY SERVICE OF THE METHODISTS
IN NORTH AMERICA,
WITH OTHER OCCASIONAL SERVICES.
LONDON.
 PRINTED IN THE YEAR MDCCLXXXIV.

The contents of the book after the Tables of Proper Lessons are :

1. The order for morning prayer every Lord's-day. (Pp. 26-27).
2. The order for evening prayer every Lord's-day. (Pp. 14-19.)
3. The Litany. (Pp. 20-26.)
4. A prayer and thanksgiving to be read every Lord's-day. (Pp. 26-27.)
5. The Collects, Epistles, and Gospels to be used throughout the year. (Pp. 27-124.)
6. The order for the administration of the Lord's Supper. (Pp. 125-139.)
7. The ministration of baptism of infants. (Pp. 139-143.)
8. The ministration of baptism to such as are of riper years. (Pp. 143-149.)
9. The form of solemnization of matrimony. (Pp. 149-155.)
10. The communion of the sick. (Pp. 155, 156.)
11. The order for the burial of the dead. (Pp. 156-161.)
12. Select Psalms. (Pp. 162-279.)
13. The form and manner of making and ordaining of superintendents, elders, and deacons. (Pp. 280-305.)
 - (a) The form and manner of making deacons.
 - (b) The form and manner of ordaining elders.
 - (c) The form of ordaining a superintendent.
14. Articles of religion (twenty-four in number). (Pp. 306-314.)

The Preface to the book is as follows :

“ I believe there is no Liturgy in the world, either in ancient or modern language, which breathes more of solid, Scriptural, rational piety than the Common Prayer of the Church of England; and though the main of it was compiled considerably more than two hundred years ago, yet is the language of it not only pure, but strong and elegant in the highest degree.

“ Little alteration is made in the following edition of it, except in the following instances :

“ Most of the holy days (so-called) are omitted as at present answering no valuable end.

“ 2. The service of the Lord's-day, the length of which has often been complained of, is considerably shortened.

“ 3. Some sentences in the offices of baptism and for the burial of the dead, are omitted ; and

“ 4. Many Psalms left out, and many parts of the others, as being highly improper for the mouths of a Christian congregation. JOHN WESLEY.”

“ Bristol, September 9, 1784.”

As to the adoption of the Liturgy by the Christmas Conference, Bishop Asbury states: “It was agreed to form ourselves into an Episcopal Church, and to have superintendents, elders, and deacons.” Whatcoat says: “We agreed to form a Methodist Episcopal Church, *in which the Liturgy* (as presented by the Rev. John Wesley) *should be read*, and the sacraments be administered by a superintendent,

elders, and deacons, who shall be ordained by a Presbytery, using the Episcopal form as prescribed in the Rev. John Wesley's Prayer-book." The Discipline of 1787, at the close of the section, "On the Nature and Constitution of our Church," states: "We therefore have constituted ourselves into an Episcopal Church, under the direction of bishops, elders, deacons, and preachers, according to the forms of ordination annexed to our Prayer-book and the regulations laid down in this form of Discipline." According to these forms, Francis Asbury was ordained deacon, elder, and bishop, or superintendent. The Prayer-book was used in the cities, and Methodist ministers read the Liturgy in gowns and bands, as had been the custom of the clergy of the English Church, the successor of which the Methodist Episcopal Church was, it being the first Protestant Episcopal Church organized in the United States. In the Minutes of 1784 the reading of the Liturgy was specified among the duties of the helpers, as may be seen in the following questions and answers:

Ques. 34. Will it be expedient to appoint some of our helpers to read the morning and evening service out of our Liturgy on the Lord's-day?

Ans. It will. And every helper who receives a

written direction under the hand of a superintendent may regularly read the morning and evening service on the Lord's-day."

In 1789 this was changed so as to read:

"*Ques. 3.* Are the Preachers to accept our Liturgy?"

"*Ans.* All that have received a written direction for that purpose, under the hand of a bishop or elder, may read the Liturgy as often as they think it expedient."

But for many reasons, the chief of which grew out of the nature of the work which it was the mission and the glory of the Church to accomplish in a sparsely-settled country, the above questions and answers were omitted in 1792 from the Discipline. Jesse Lee, in his "History of the Methodists," says:

"For some time the preachers generally read prayers on the Lord's-day, and in some cases the preachers read part of the morning service on Wednesdays and Fridays; but some who had been accustomed to pray extempore were unwilling to adopt this new plan, being fully satisfied that they could pray better and with more devotion while their eyes were shut than they could with their eyes open. After a few years the Prayer-book was laid aside, and has never been used since in public worship."

It was not the genius of Methodism to be confined to forms. With Christian art and ceremonial as such, Methodism can have no conflict. To her thought there would be nothing incongruous in holding a "revival" service under the dome of St. Peter's, in the aisles of Cologne, or under the spires of Milan, in which the joyful shouts of new-born souls and the sobbings of the penitent would take the place of swelling organ and Gregorian chant. A cathedral, or a leafy bower in the forest—she is at home in either. The heir, with others, of all the ages, inheriting by lawful succession the priceless heritage of the past, all that is of deathless value in the long roll of the Christian centuries, she is conscious of her right and ability to use whatever may add to the dignity and true glory of the sanctuary, ennoble or intensify the devotions of her children, and mark severe distinctions between the holy and the profane. But Methodism, born of the Spirit, must live in the freedom of the Spirit. Where the Spirit of God is, there is the life of God; and that life can neither be restrained nor cramped by artificial and superfluous forms without the destruction of those forms or the gradual decline and final extinction of that Divine life, the manifest

presence of which is the only true standard of a standing or falling Church.] Unused to Liturgical forms, and associating them with the spiritless formalism of a Church which was by them regarded as the servile adjunct of the State, and having become without the aid of such the happy subjects of the Redeemer's kingdom—the majority of the early Methodists who were scattered along vast distances from New England to the southern border of Georgia, and living remote from centers of civilization and refinement, could never be brought to appreciate the value of these Liturgical forms to their free spiritual life, nor their adaptability to existing pioneer conditions, nor the necessity of them to the strengthening, expansion, or development of the Church.

But these observations do not apply to the use of the Ritual. Against that there never was any opposition. For more than a hundred years its nobility, its elegance of expression, its Scripturalness and sobriety have endeared it to the hearts of all who in the solemn rites of religion would worship the Father Almighty in the beauty of holiness and the holiness of beauty.

The sacraments must be administered in

some form. It is not essential to their validity that prayers, Scripture readings, Collects, and personal exhortations should be offered, nor is it essential that the exact form of administering them in every particular should be everywhere and at all times precisely the same. But it appeals to reason, if there is to be a form at all, that there should be only one authorized form for the same people. If every minister should follow the lawless moods of changeful fancy, each minister differing from all others in one or more particulars, or in the use of a form of his own devising, the picture presented to an onlooker would be one of chaos and anarchy in the most sacred rites of the Church of God, in which the apostle who, notwithstanding that it was he who gave the death-blow to the most elaborate Ritualism the world has ever seen, enjoins that everything should be done in decency and order. Christian reverence, the universal Christian consciousness, draws the line on marked individualism in administering the sacraments of our holy religion; it instinctively resents that presumption which would lead one to substitute his own methods and forms in opposition to those that have been formulated by authority, and obtained universal sanction.

It is necessary also to the satisfaction of the religious sense, and demanded by the sacred character of the service itself, that the sacraments instituted by our Blessed Redeemer should be administered with the utmost solemnity, with dignity of expression and manner, thus lifting them, as is fitting, far above the common and trivial, and awakening in the worshiper the profoundest feelings of reverential awe, faith, and love. To do less is to belittle them, and by crudeness to degrade them; as by offensively exaggerating the refinement of elegancy, common among extreme Ritualists, is to make their celebration gaudy, unseemly, fantastic, and meretricious. The early Methodists were a holy people. The mystical tinge in the devout aspirations of Wesley gave a distinctive character to their devotions, while his steadfast adherence to the Liturgy of the Church demonstrated that devotion to form was not incompatible with the loftiest spiritual fervor. Methodists, therefore, have never been opposed or indifferent to the Ritual. Its dignity of expression, its simplicity, its strength and beauty and pathos, instinct with the ardors of pure devotion, still stir piety's flame, and by the gracious aid of the Holy Spirit prepare the reverent soul for

the sacred service as when it was first adopted by the Methodist fathers.

The changes that have been made in the several offices by General Conferences from 1784 to the present time have been neither numerous nor important. They have consisted for the most part in the omission of certain words and Scripture sentences not necessary to the full meaning of the rite they elucidated, or in substituting words required by changes made, or for the removal of grounds for misapprehension of the doctrine taught. These changes may be seen *in extenso* in the histories of the Discipline by Emory, Strickland, and Sherman.

Chapter VIII

SOURCES

HAVING thus traced the history of the Ritual from the dawn of the Reformation to its revision by Wesley, it is now fitting to inquire what were the original sources whence its several parts were derived. This part of our subject has been deferred until the book, upon which we comment, should be clearly before us, and in order that the question of sources might receive a distinct, though brief, statement, an exhaustive study not being possible within the limits of this present work.

When Christianity was introduced into England, and by whom, is not known. We only know that it was brought there at a very early date in the second century. That the Churches in the island had forms of Divine service is certain; but the history of these forms is uncertain. It is, however, almost universally conceded that the formularies of the ancient British Churches were derived from the Churches in Gaul, probably from the Church of Lyons, which, through Irenæus,

Pothinus, and their predecessors, traced their origin to Polycarp and thus to the Apostle John, whose disciple he was, at Ephesus. The Gallican Liturgy was certainly derived from Eastern, and not from Western, sources; from Ephesus, and not from Rome; and those, therefore, are greatly in error who would trace the Liturgy of the Methodist Church to the Roman Church. The Roman Ritual, as a whole, was never used in England.¹

In the sixth century—A. D. 596—Augustine was sent by Gregory the Great to convert the Saxons. On his way to England through Gaul he found Liturgical forms differing from those of Rome, and when he reached England and had a conference with the presbyter-bishops of the British Church,

¹ This adapted note will be of interest :

The originals of our Church Ritual may be traced back, with more or less clearness, fullness, and particularity (diminishing, of course, as we ascend higher, and possess more scanty materials), for fourteen or fifteen hundred years. The services generally consisted of two portions, the latter of which, the Communion Office, was anciently called the Liturgy. They were handed down "memoriter" till the end of the third century, after which they were committed to writing. The principal Liturgies are—

1. The *Oriental*, ascribed to St. James, used at Jerusalem and Antioch; older than the Council of Chalcedon (A. D. 451). The order and substance the same in Justin Martyr's time. Other branches were that of Cæsarea, compiled by Basil, and that of Constantinople by Chrysostom.

2. The *Alexandrian*, ascribed to St. Mark, quoted by Origen (A. D. 220), completed by Cyril of Alexandria (A. D. 412).

3. The *Roman*, completed by Gregory the Great (A. D. 590), derived from ancient sources, probably as far back as

he discovered that they also had forms and customs differing from those of the Roman Church. In his dilemma Augustine addressed himself to Gregory: "Whereas the faith is one, why are the customs of the Churches various? And why is one manner of celebrating the holy communion used in the holy Roman Church, and another in that of the Gauls?" Bede tells us that, in the conference with the British bishops, Augustine offered to tolerate their divergences from the Roman forms and customs on certain conditions. The reply of Gregory the Great to the letter of Augustine was:

"You, my brother, are acquainted with the customs of the Roman Church in which you were brought up. But it is my pleasure that if you have found anything either in the Roman or the Gallican

the second century: with its branches, as the *Ambrosian* and *African*.

4. The *Gallican*, used at Lyons, in Gaul, and referred, through Irenæus, to St. John. This is supposed to have had offsets in the Mosarabic, and Ancient British. See "Palmer's Orig. Liturgy," Vol. I. (Walker's Element. Liturgy.)

It may be interesting to some of our readers to know that the Scotch Kirk originally possessed a Liturgy, which continued in use till the year 1636, when Archbishop Laud's unhappy attempts to enforce his New Service-book, threw all forms into disrepute. See McCrie's "Sketches of Scottish Church History," pp. 203, 204. This is probably the book alluded to by Hooker (Ecc. Pol. v. 27), mentioned by Strype as the first printed in Latin, 1556, by the exiles at Geneva, with Calvin's approbation, and afterwards translated into English, and "approved and received by the Church of Scotland." See Note to Keble's edition of Hooker.

or any other Church which may be more acceptable to Almighty God, you carefully make choice of the same; and sedulously teach the Church of the Angles, which is at present new in the Faith, whatsoever you can gather from the several Churches. For things are not to be loved for the sake of places, but places for the sake of good things. Select, therefore, from each Church those things that are pious, religious, and correct; and when you have made these up into one body, instill this into the minds of the English for their use." (Bede's *Eccl. Hist.*, I, 27.)

It is at this point we see the beginning of the process of amalgamation of the various Liturgies then used in Western Christendom. But the Roman form never superseded the old British form, although an attempt to that effect was made in the Council of Clevesho, A. D. 747. Again, at the time of the Conquest another effort was made for uniformity of worship, and not without success. Osmund, Bishop of Salisbury and Chancellor of England, actuated by noblest motives, collected about him clergy noted for learning, and by their aid remodeled the Divine offices, and gave to the Church as the result of his labors a Form for Daily Service, for the Communion Service, for Baptism, and "Occasional Offices." These several books became known

as the Salisbury or "SARUM USE." This "Use" was adopted in the Diocese of Salisbury, A. D. 1085, and being gradually introduced into other parts of the kingdom, became finally the principal or more noted Service-book of the Church of England, which place of esteem it held for the space of four hundred and fifty years. Other Service-books, to which reference has been made in these pages, continued to be used in the Dioceses of Hereford and Bangor, and by the Churches in the Province of York. St. Paul's Cathedral and other cathedral churches had their several Uses, while the distinctively Roman Use was confined almost wholly to monastic establishments. In A. D. 1516, the Sarum Use was revised by the celebrated Wolsey. This revision, further reformed in 1541, came down to the Reformation under Edward VI, and was one of the many Liturgies, perhaps the principal one, employed by the Reformers in the compilation of the Book of Common Prayer.

The Reformation in Germany having gained great headway, Luther, in 1533, translated into German from the Latin some of the old services, with emendations, for the Churches of Nuremberg and Brandenburg.

Ten years later, Herrman, Prince-Archbishop of Cologne and Elector of the German Empire, adopted Reform principles, and, although opposed by pope and emperor, endeavored to introduce the Reformation among his subjects. With this end in view, he requested the noted Reformers, Melancthon and Bucer, to draw up a Scriptural form of service for use in his territory. This they did, taking Luther's translation of the old German formularies as their model, and also his Baptismal Office, almost word for word. The work was first published in German under the Latin title, "Simplex Judicium de Reformatione Ecclesiarum Electoratus Coloniensis." In 1545 a Latin translation was published at Bonn, entitled, "Simplex ac pia deliberatio de Reformatione Ecclesiarum," etc., and from this an English translation was printed in 1547, with the title, "A Simple and Pious Deliberation of Us Herrman, by the Grace of God Archbishop of Cologne and Prince Elector," etc., which was followed by amended editions in 1548. This work, it will be observed, appeared five years before the first book of Edward VI, and afforded many suggestions to the compilers of that book, as may be seen on the margin of the following Com-

mentary. The "Great Bible," printed by Grafton and Whitechurch, 1539, was also in constant use, and we have already referred to the ancient Liturgies, which were well known to the learned divines who undertook the task of compiling a Ritual as free as they then could make it of the errors that had crept in in the run of the centuries. If, now, we were to present in one view the principal sources of the Ritual, we would have before us—

The Salisbury, or Sarum Use;

The York, Bangor, and other Uses;

The Consultation of Herrman, Archbishop of Cologne;

The English Translation of the Same;

The Great Bible of 1539 A. D.

There are no records extant setting forth the details of the method by which the commissioners produced the Service-book of 1549; but by comparison we are led to the conclusion that the foundation of their labors was the ancient Liturgies of the English Church, the Sarum, and other Uses, which, as we have seen, were not Roman, but Gallican, and derived originally from the Apostolic Churches in the Patriarchate of Ephesus. The Baptismal Office is indebted to Luther's

“Taufbüchlein,” which was inserted in Herrman’s Baptismal Service in his “Consultation” almost word for word, and also to the Sarum Use, which agrees in many particulars with the earliest Baptismal Ritual extant, that of Gelasius and Gregory, eminent leaders of the Universal Church before the long night of ignorance and superstition had eclipsed the bright sun of truth.

Prior to the revision of 1661, there was no office in the English Ritual for the administration of baptism to those of riper years. Convocation of this year appointed a committee to frame one, and the present form is the outcome of their labors. Dr. Griffiths, Bishop of St. Asaph, is said, on excellent authority (Wood, “Athenæ Oxonienses”) to have had the chief hand in its composition.

COMMENTARY

185

Chapter IX

HOLY BAPTISM

Introductory Note

BAPTISM is a sacrament of the Christian Church, instituted by the Lord Jesus, and enjoined by him upon all who profess faith in him as a personal Savior. (Matt. xxviii, 19; Mark xvi, 16.) "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter the kingdom of God." (John iii, 5.)

The Sixteenth Article of Religion teaches that "sacraments ordained of Christ are not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they are certain signs of grace and God's good will toward us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm, our faith in him. There are two sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel; that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord." And of baptism, the Seventeenth teaches: "Baptism is not only a sign of profession and mark of difference whereby Christians are distinguished from others that are not baptized, but it is also a sign of regeneration or the new birth. The baptism of young children is to be retained in the Church."

Baptism is not the new birth, but the sign of it; for a thing can not be at the same time a sign and the thing signified. In the New Testament and in the writings of the early Church, baptism and re-

generation are often referred to in synonymous terms, the misapprehension of which usage has led to the doctrinal error of baptismal regeneration in a spiritual sense. Thus we find it alluded to as the "water of life" by Justin Martyr. It is also called light, *illuminatio*, *lux mentis*; *sacramentum indulgentiæ*, because sins in it were remitted; *mors peccatorum*, the death of sins; *gratia*, *donum*, *palin-genesia*, *regeneration*, *salus*, *salvation*, etc. In the New Testament it is called "the laver of regeneration." In the Old Testament we meet with the same metaphorical style; as, for instance, Genesis xvii, where circumcision is called the Covenant, and in Exodus xii, where the lamb is called the Passover; and it is but natural that New Testament writers and early Christian fathers, and even Christians of later times, should speak of baptism as regeneration or illumination, so close, ideally, is the connection or relation between the sign and the signified; for, of a truth, they who in genuine faith receive the holy sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper do not fasten their eyes on the things that are sensible, but upon those things that are super-sensible and heavenly.

But baptism is not only a sign or seal of God's gracious promises—it is also the Divinely-instituted rite of admission to the Church of God. Under the old covenant, without circumcision, which may be called one of the sacraments of the Covenant Church—the Passover being the other—there was no citizenship in the commonwealth of Israel (see Oehler, "Old Testament Theology," English translation, sect. 88, p. 194, at the top; and Schultz, "Alttestamentliche Theologie," p. 177: "Die Beschnei-

ding ist in Israel die Weihe des Menschen zum Eintritt in das heilige Volk Jahve's," etc.); and under the new covenant, without baptism, which takes the place of circumcision, there can be no part in the fellowship of Christ's people. By it we are transferred from the sphere of the world, lying outside the covenant of grace, into the society of the holy and redeemed, of which Christ is the Head; for we are no longer "strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens of the saints and of the household of God" (Eph. ii, 19)—transferred from *this world*, with all its delusive show and vanishing glory, into the city of God, the Church of Christ, on whose walls time leaves no scars, and against whose gates the powers of darkness shall not prevail.

The prerequisites or conditions for baptism in the apostolic age were repentance and faith. "*Repent ye, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus of Nazareth, unto the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost,*" was the command of the apostle on the day of Pentecost. These conditions have always been required, and are absolutely essential; for unless there is true repentance for past sin, a *putting off of the old man with his deeds*, and a heartfelt acceptance of the truths of the gospel, the act is a dreadful mockery.

The formula as given by the Lord himself, and which must be used in every valid baptism is, "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." (Matt. xxviii, 19.) That this form was invariably used by the apostles and the primitive Church seems to have become a matter of doubt among some recent writers. Thus,

"After the third century," says Allen ("Christian Institutions," p. 403), "the formula of baptism was in the name of the Trinity, and baptism otherwise performed was declared invalid; but in the early Church, as also in the apostolic age, there is evidence that the baptismal formula of the name of Jesus only was not unusual." In proof of this the passage in Acts xix, 1-6, is cited; for it is there said the apostle baptized those disciples "in the name of the Lord Jesus." But the value of evidence depends on how the facts are interpreted.

The oldest document known at present in Christian literature, except the New Testament writings, is the "Didache," a manual of teaching often read in the Churches, and belonging, according to Schaff to the period A. D. 90-100, in which opinion Bishop Lightfoot ("Apostolic Fathers," Vol. I, p. 390, Note 1) agrees, although Harnack ("Die Chronologie der Altch. Litt., p. 438) places it later, in 131-160. Now the formula laid down in that ancient manual is, "*In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*" Justin Martyr is in evidence to the same effect. ("Apolog.," I, c.) The "Apostolical Constitutions" require the distinct utterance of the names, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and the "Apostolical Canons" declare that if a minister does not baptize according to "our Lord's institution, into the Father, Son, and the Holy Ghost, he should be suspended. Bingham (in his "Antiquities of the Christian Church," Book XI, chapter iii) cites only two testimonies favoring the administering baptism in the name of Jesus only.

As regards the testimony of Acts xix, 1-6, it supports the opposite view to that for which it is

quoted; for, clearly, the previous question of the apostle, "Unto what, then, were ye baptized?" implies the customary, usual naming of the Holy Ghost. If this question of wonder and surprise does not imply that, what can it imply? Of this passage, therefore, and of the similar one in 1 Cor. vi, 11, our conclusion is that of Godet, that the common expression, "To baptize in the name of Jesus"—"est une forme abrégée pour désigner le baptême Chrétien en general"—is an abridged form designating Christian baptism in general.

The mode is indifferent, but the element or matter must be water. From the beginning, different modes of baptizing have been used. From the New Testament itself no positive, certain proof can be obtained that baptism was administered in one way only. The recorded cases of baptism are against the assumption. Whichever mode under the circumstances was the more convenient, that was employed. Upon this subject the "Didache" also throws much light. This manual, chapter vii, teaches: "Now, concerning baptism, thus baptize ye: Having first uttered all these things, baptize into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, in running water [*hudōr zōn*, 'living water']. But if thou hast not running [living] water, baptize in other water; and if thou canst not in cold, then in warm. But if thou hast neither, pour water upon the head thrice in the name of the Father, and Son, and Holy Spirit."

That infants were baptized in the Apostolic Church there ought to be no reasonable doubt. (See my "Christianity and Childhood," chapters x, xi.) Many volumes have been written to the contrary,

but no one has ever yet been able to put his finger on a date in the annals of the Christian Church where by the Church infant baptism was not practiced. From our day to Augustine A. D. 400, and from his day back to the times of the apostles, an unbroken chain of evidence runs such as would demonstrate a case of successional inheritance from an original source in any high court in Christendom; Augustine and Pelagius A. D. 400; Council of Carthage, 397; Jerome, 390; Chrysostom, 387; Ambrose, 385; Gregory Nazianzen, 370; Cyprian, 258; Tertullian, 200; Origen, 185; Justin Martyr, 114; Irenæus, 97-110; Polycarp, disciple of John. (See Irenæus "Adv. Hær.," iii, 3; Eusebius, "Hist. Eccles.," iv, 14.) The creed of the Petrobussians, a sect of the Middle Ages, about 1126, who denied infant salvation, is the first formal denial on record of the right of infant baptism in the history of the ages.

[Let every adult person, and the parents of every child to be baptized, have the choice of either sprinkling, pouring, or immersion.]

[We will on no account whatever make a charge for administering baptism.]

¶ 442. Order for the Administration of Baptism to Infants.

The Minister, coming to the Font, which is to be filled with pure water, shall use the following :

DEARLY BELOVED, forasmuch as all men are conceived and born in sin, and that our Savior Christ saith, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he can not enter into the kingdom of God; I beseech you to call upon God the Father, through our Lord Jesus

Source,
Herrman's
Consult.
1547.

Christ, that having, of his bounteous mercy, redeemed *this child* by the blood of his Son, he will grant that *he*, being baptized with water, may also be baptized with the Holy Ghost, be received into Christ's holy Church, and become *a lively member* of the same.

Acts i, 5.
Eph. ii, 3.
Rom. vi, 3, 4.

The minister coming to the font. The font should be of sufficient size to permit the immersion of the child should that mode be desired; but ordinarily a comely basin is used. The sex should be ascertained at this time, in order that the proper pronouns may be employed in the prayers and in the address to the congregation. In the apostolic period, and for some time after, there was no special place for the administration of baptism. The sacred rite was administered wherever there was running water; but it was not confined to such places. In Acts ix, 18, x, 47, xvi, 33, 34, there are instances of baptism occurring in private houses, and in the *Didache*, or *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* (about 120 A. D.), the injunction is, "If thou hast not living water, baptize in other water; and if thou canst not in cold, then in warm." (See also Justin Martyr, "Apologia," I, c. 61, and Tertull., "De Bapt.," c. 4.) But when, by reason of persecution, the Christians were compelled to

refrain from publicity in this sacrament, *fonts* were erected in the churches, and soon came into general use. *Dearly beloved.* The usual affectionate form of address in the Liturgies to the Church present, or to those participating in the service. The address following was suggested by the form in Herrman's "Consultation" and the Gallic Formula, but only suggested. *Conceived and born in sin.* This emphatic declaration of Scripture with which the Church begins this holy service properly introduces the reason for the act and the prayers which follow, and the statement of our Lord, that *except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he can not enter the kingdom of God.* Washing by water is the Divinely-recognized symbol of spiritual purification. But baptism is a seal of the covenant, and by it we are admitted into the visible Church kingdom, or society of the pure and holy; by the Spirit we are brought into the invisible spiritual kingdom, into which none can enter except he is born of the Spirit. Baptism is the symbol of that new birth, and he who is baptized is so with the intent that he may be baptized with the Holy Ghost. *Having redeemed.* By the atonement of His Son, determined in eternity, accomplished in time, God the

Father has potentially redeemed the whole human race, so that every one born into the world is born under the atonement made by the Lord Jesus, and is entitled, because of that fact, to all the benefits of the atonement. The nature and extent of these gracious gifts must be according to the need and receptivity of the one receiving them, and therefore the Church prays that the child, *being baptized with water, may also be baptized with the Holy Ghost*. The prayer is that the blessing shall come from God, not from the elements or sacramental form, the sacrament being only a sign of the thing signified or prayed for. Nor is the grace so related to the sign or seal as its cause to effect, that when the rite is administered the gift of God must necessarily and immediately accompany it. Cornelius, the centurion, received the Holy Spirit before he was baptized with water, and Simon Magus, though baptized with water, received not the Holy Ghost. But it is going to an unscriptural extreme to assert that no Divine blessing is given in baptism. Admission to the courts of the temple is itself a gracious gift, and he who obeys the commandments of his Lord is blessed in his obedience. The only thing we do not know is that very thing which it does

not concern us to know; namely, the mode by which the Holy Spirit works.

Then shall the Minister say,

Let us pray.

Almighty and Everlasting God, who of thy great mercy hast condescended to enter into covenant relations with man, wherein thou hast included children as partakers of its gracious benefits, declaring that of such is thy kingdom; and in thy ancient Church didst appoint divers baptisms, figuring thereby the renewing of the Holy Ghost; and by thy well-beloved Son Jesus Christ gavest commandment to thy holy apostles to go into all the world and disciple all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: we beseech thee, that of thine infinite mercy thou wilt look upon *this child*: wash *him* and sanctify *him*; that *he*, being saved by thy grace, may be received into Christ's holy Church, and being steadfast in faith, joyful through hope, and rooted in love, may so overcome the evils of this present world that finally *he* may attain to everlasting life, and reign with thee, world without end, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

v1, 13, 17,
vii, 21, 22.
xix, 13.
, 13.
xviii, 15.

xxviii, 19.

Herrman's
Consult.
1547.

viii, 6, 7.
iii, 18.

O Merciful God, grant that all carnal affections may die in *him*, and that all things belonging to the Spirit may live and grow in *him*. *Amen.*

Missal.
Gallican.

29-31.
xvi, 20.
v, 4.
xv, 57.

Grant that *he* may have power and strength to have victory, and to triumph against the devil, the world, and the flesh. *Amen.*

Grant that whosoever is dedicated to thee by our office and ministry may also be endued with heavenly virtues, and everlastingly rewarded through thy mercy, O blessed Lord God, who dost live and govern all things, world without end. *Amen.*

Gal. iii, 26, 27.
Phil, 1, 9-11.
Jude 21.
Rev. xxiii, 12-20.
Matt. iii, 16, 17.
Matt. xxviii,
18, 19.

Almighty, Everliving God, whose most dearly-beloved Son Jesus Christ, for the forgiveness of our sins, did shed out of his most precious side both water and blood, regard, we beseech thee, our supplications. Sanctify this water for this Holy Sacrament; and grant that *this child*, now to be baptized, may receive the fullness of thy grace, and ever remain in the number of thy faithful and elect children, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

Salisbury
Use.
Gregory,
Gelasius.

John xix, 34.
1 Tim. iv, 5.

Then shall the minister say. The people should kneel, but throughout the entire service the minister should remain standing, as the rubrics would indicate, until the Lord's Prayer is said, when all kneel. *Let us pray.* It would be difficult to find an uninspired prayer that surpasses this in beauty of diction and fervor of devotion. The supplication is for the child now and through life. *Almighty and Everlasting God.* Who has power to accomplish all that he has promised. *May be received into Christ's holy Church.* Holy people for holy things. The Church of Christ, according to the New Testament ideal of it, is constituted of holy people called "saints" or

“holy ones,” as having been separated from the unholy mass of the world, and is therefore a holy Church. *O merciful God!* The prayer is that the prevenient grace of the Spirit may dominate the mental and moral life of the child to the destruction of evil tendencies inherent in human nature, and which, by unrestrained practice, come by the force of habit to such influence over us that we fall early victims to carnal affections and desires. *Power and strength.* An intensification of the idea of moral ability, through Divine grace, to overcome *the devil, the world, and the flesh*—three representative sources of temptation. *Grant . . . dedicated.* The minister prays that this act done in obedience to Christ’s command may be graciously accepted by blessing the subject of it with continuous grace—a most saintly desire that a sanctified life might begin and continue under the blessings of a hallowed ministry. *Water and blood.* As is written in John xix, 34, 35, Scripturally it is the blood that cleanseth; but both are used emblematically as washing away our guilt, for they are both involved in the atonement of Christ for the forgiveness of sins. *Sanctify this water.* Not by imparting to the water any miraculous virtue or infusing into it any

mystical power; but that since God is invoked to bless the sacred rite, he would also bless the means or instruments thereto, thus separating them to our eye of faith from ordinary use, as the utensils in the sanctuary were all holy in the sight of the holy God, and not to be used as common things. Nothing under the new covenant is less holy than things under the old covenant.

Then shall the Minister address the Parents or Guardians as follows :

DEARLY BELOVED, forasmuch as *this child is now* presented by you for Christian Baptism, you must remember that it is your part and duty to see that *he* be taught, as soon as *he* shall be able to learn, the nature and end of this Holy Sacrament. And that *he* may know these things the better, you shall call upon *him* to give reverent attendance upon the appointed means of grace, such as the ministry of the word, and the public and private worship of God; and further, you shall provide that *he* shall read the Holy Scriptures, and learn the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, the Apostles' Creed, the Catechism, and all other things which a Christian ought to know and believe to his soul's health, in order that *he* may be brought up to lead a virtuous and holy life, remembering always that Baptism doth represent unto us that inward purity which disposeth us to follow the example of our Savior Christ;

**Salisbury Use,
York Use,
and also in Latin form.**

Neh. viii, 1-8.
Ps. lxxviii, 5-7.
Matt. xxviii, 19,
20.
Luke xi. 1-4.
Matt. xix, 16, 17.
1 Cor. xiv, 2, 9,
11.
Prov. xxii, 6.
2 Tim. iii, 14, 15.
2 Pet. i, 13.
Heb. x, 23.
1 Pet. ii, 21.
Rom. vi, 3-6, 11.
Col. iii, 5, 8.
2 Pet. i, 3-7,
8-13.

that as he died and rose again for us, so should we, who are baptized, die unto sin and rise again unto righteousness, continually mortifying all corrupt affections, and daily proceeding in all virtue and godliness.

Do you therefore solemnly engage to fulfill these duties, so far as in you lies, the Lord being your helper?

Ans. We do.

Then shall the minister say. The rubric is imperative. The administrator is not at liberty to omit this solemn charge. Not that the sacrament would thereby be invalidated, but for the obvious and justifying reason that without it, and the engagement of parents or guardians, there would be no assurance for the Christian nurture of the child. In the early Church witnesses were required to the baptismal rite, who should also be sureties for the Christian training of the child. These sureties were called sponsors, alluding to the answer (*responsum*) given to the interrogatories. *Part and duty.* The presentation of the child for baptism is regarded by the Church as an act of the gravest import, involving responsibilities of the most serious nature. *Taught . . . nature and end of this holy sacrament.* He must be informed of his consecration to God, what his baptism sig-

nified, and its design in thus bringing him within the gates of Zion. *The ministry of the Word.* Sermons and exhortations in the Church. *Public and private worship.* Regular Church services and private prayer. *Read the Holy Scriptures.* God's great teacher. In the primitive Church, as in Israel, children were trained up from their infancy to the study of the Holy Scriptures. Eusebius, Socrates, and Sozomen, in their histories, give several beautiful examples of this general practice. That they may *lead a virtuous and holy life*, now begun in this divinely-appointed sign of invisible grace. *Solemnly engage.* Covenant before God and his Church. *We do.* The affirmative of a binding obligation and covenant with God, and for the child. The Divine side of the contract is now to be stated, in which will be shown that Christ truly accepts children dedicated to him by the prayers of his people in the waters of baptism.

Then shall the People stand up, and the Minister shall say :

Hear the words of the Gospel, written by St. Mark.

[Chap. x, 13-16.]

They brought young children to Christ, that he should touch them. And his disciples rebuked those that brought them. But when Jesus saw it, he was

much displeased, and said unto them, Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of God. Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein. And he took them up in his arms, put his hands upon them, and blessed them.

People stand up. The congregation should rise and remain standing till the act of baptism is completed. The standing Church is a witnessing Church, sanctioning the holy consecration, and by its attitude responsible for the Scriptural and proper performance of the same.

*Then shall the Minister take the Child into his hands,
and say to the friends of the Child,*

Name this child.

*And then, naming it after them, he shall sprinkle or
pour Water upon it, or, if desired, immerse it in
Water, saying,*

*N., I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and
of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.*

Then shall the minister take. Unless, for some good reason, the minister should never baptize the child except as ordered by the rubric. The whole service is symbolic, and the right to destroy any part of the picture

carries with it the right to demolish the whole. In the Gospel just read, the people brought their little ones to Jesus, and his disciples rebuked the people; but Jesus took the children in his arms and blessed them. In like manner the minister of Jesus, standing as his representative, receives in Christ's name the child brought to him and for His kingdom. There should be no haste or confusion or awkwardness of movement here. The child should be taken on the left arm, that the right hand may be free to act, the head uncovered, and the water plentifully poured upon it out of the hand, or shell, or suitable vessel. *Name this child.* Baptism is the sign of the new birth, and a new name—a Christian name—is accordingly given by those who have the right to give it. The Jews named their children on the day of their circumcision. (Luke i, 59-63; ii, 21. Compare Isa. xlix, 3-5.) In the New Testament there is no mention of this practice among Christians, nor do we find it among the earliest Christian writers; but in the third or fourth century the practice became common. The surname should not be spoken; the given name should be distinctly pronounced. *I baptize thee in the name.* This is our Lord's formula. (Matt. xxviii, 19.) To

be baptized into the name of one is to be consecrated to, given up in obedience and faithfulness to, for all time. (Acts xxii, 16; Rom. vi, 3; I Cor. i, 13-15; x, 2.) And we are thus consecrated at the threshold of life to the Triune God. In the primitive Church trine baptism was practiced. At the mention of each holy name the water was applied or the person immersed, as we see in the *Teaching*. (Chapter vii.) Tertullian, "Adv. Prox.," c. 26, says: "We receive the water of baptism *non semel sed ter ad singula nomina*—Not once, but three times at the mention of each name." (See also his treatise, "De Corona Milit.") In the Sacramentary of Gregory trine immersion is also ordered. By what authority the ancient form was changed does not appear. In the New Testament there is nothing to indicate that the apostles ever heard of trine immersion, and by what authority their mode was changed does not appear either. The *one* application in the ONE name of God, uttering clearly the name of each person in the Adorable Trinity is sufficient. *Amen*. So be it. This response should be said audibly by all present. For in this, as in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the Church acts.

*Then shall the Minister offer the following Prayer,
the People kneeling:*

O God of infinite mercy, the Father of all the faithful seed, be pleased to grant unto *this child* an understanding mind and a sanctified heart. May thy providence lead *him* through the dangers, temptations, and ignorance of *his* youth, that *he* may never run into folly, nor into the evils of an unbridled appetite. We pray thee so to order the course of *his* life that, by good education, by holy examples, and by thy restraining and renewing grace, *he* may be led to serve thee faithfully all *his* day; so that, when *he* has glorified thee in *his* generation, and *has* served the Church on earth, *he* may be received into thine eternal kingdom, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

General Conference Meth.
Episcopal Church,
A. D. 1864.
Comp.
Anglican Prayer
and Herr-
man's Con-
sult., same
at the close.

Deut. v, 16.
Eph vi, 1.
Col. iii, 20.
1 Tim. v, 4.

Almighty and most merciful Father, let thy loving mercy and compassion descend upon *these*, thy *servant* and *handmaid*, the *parents* [or guardians] of *this child*. Grant unto *them*, we beseech thee, thy Holy Spirit, that *they* may, like Abraham, command *their* household to keep the way of the Lord. Direct *their* actions, and sanctify *their hearts*, words, and purposes, that *their* whole family may be united to our Lord Jesus Christ in the bands of faith, obedience, and charity; and that they all, being in *this* life thy holy children by adoption and grace, may be admitted into the Church of the first-born in heaven, through the merits of thy dear Son, our Savior and Redeemer. *Amen.*

The people kneeling, not the minister. They, not he, are specifically named. *God of infinite mercy*. This prayer was inserted in 1864, by order of General Conference, in the place of some short prayers derived from the Anglican book. The intent of the prayer is that the merciful God will give such grace to the child as he grows up, that he may have an *understanding mind*, to perceive and mark the distinctions between right and wrong, and decide for those things which make for righteousness. *And a sanctified heart*. Pure by the grace of God from earthly defilements, from the dawn of youth, as he may have; for unless the prayers of God's people uttered in all sincerity are vain, we may rest assured that He who has provided the means will also provide the blessing. *Dangers*. The Church is not unmindful of the *temptations*, dangers, and evils resulting from *ignorance*, which lie about the pathway of child-life, marring the bloom of its innocence, bringing it into captivity to sin, and effacing all early traces of the Holy Spirit. Therefore *we pray so to order*; that is, by the inscrutable and manifold wisdom and power of God, who holds all lives in the hollow of his hand. *Good education* in the things of God previously promised by the parents—

holy examples of parents and Christian people. *Restraining.* Holding back, repressing the growth of evil tendencies. *Renewing grace.* The quickening influence of the indwelling Spirit, which keeps the moral tone, the spiritual qualities, fresh and sweet, invigorating the inner life and beautifying the outer. The whole prayer is full of energy, and rises to the sublime in its pleading for the final redemption of the child among the glorious company of the redeemed in the immortal society in the kingdom of God, and closes with a tender appeal for the parents, who in faith, hope, and love offer their little one to the Heavenly Father.

Then may the Minister offer extemporary Prayer.
Then shall be said, all kneeling,

Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread: and forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us: and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: for thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever. *Amen.*

Then. That is, after the extempore prayer, if one be offered. *All kneeling.* Both minister and people. The service thus fitly closes with

the Lord's Prayer constantly used in all Church services from the earliest days. The *Apostolical Constitutions* required that the baptized should repeat this prayer on leaving the water. In infant baptism the sponsors recited it; but in the Middle Ages, when sacerdotalism widened the difference between clergy and laity, the prayer was reserved to the minister. Our Church reverts to the primitive practice of sub-apostolic times, it being most fitting that all should join in this prayer, which sums up all that we can desire for God, for ourselves, for our fellow-creatures, and the kingdom of heaven.

For the use of the doxology at the close of the prayer, one may consult the critical commentaries of Meyer and other exegetes.

Chapter X

ADULT BAPTISM

¶ 443. Order for the Administration of Baptism to such as are of Riper Years.

DEARLY BELOVED, forasmuch as all men are conceived and born in sin; and that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and they that are in the flesh can not please God, but live in sin, committing many actual transgressions; and our Savior Christ saith, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he can not enter into the kingdom of God: I beseech you to call upon God the Father, through our Lord Jesus Christ, that of his bounteous goodness he will grant to *these persons* that which by nature *they* can not have; that *they*, being baptized with water, may also be baptized with the Holy Ghost, and, being received into Christ's holy Church, may continue lively *Members* of the same.

Source,
Ferrman's
Consult.
H. D. 1547.

Job xiv, 4.
Ps. li, 5.
John iii, 6.
Matt. xviii, 19,
20.
Acts i, 5.
Eph. ii, 3.
Rom. vi, 3, 4.

Dearly beloved. The address is to the congregation. The fact that the candidates may already have experienced the gift of the Spirit in regeneration, which is the reason why they desire baptism, would seem to render the *call upon God* unnecessary; but only seemingly, not truly so, when we consider the nature and

end of Christian baptism. The centurion in the Acts was baptized by Peter, although he had received the Holy Ghost, and the purport of this prayer is that the Holy Spirit may bless the surrender of the candidates to the service of God and membership in his Church with his renewing and strengthening grace.

Then shall the Minister say,

Let us pray.

1 Tim. vi, 15, 16.
Isa. xxv, 4.
2 Cor. vi, 2.
John xi, 25, 26.
Matt. xviii, 14.
Acts ii, 38, 39.
Tit. iii, 5.
1 Sam. i, 27, 28.
Matt. vii, 7, 8.
Luke xi, 13.
James v, 16.
1 John v, 6-8.
1 Cor. vi, 11.
Rev. i, 5, 6.

Almighty and Immortal God, the aid of all that need, the helper of all that flee to thee for succor, the life of them that believe, and the resurrection of the dead: we call upon thee for *these persons*, that *they*, coming to thy Holy Baptism, may also be filled with thy Holy Spirit. Receive *them*, O Lord, as thou hast promised by thy well-beloved Son, saying, Ask, and ye shall receive; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you: so give now unto us that ask; let us that seek, find; open the gate unto us that knock: that *these persons* may enjoy the everlasting benediction of thy heavenly washing, and may come to the eternal kingdom which thou hast promised, by Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

Salisbury
Use.
Deus, im-
mortale
praesidium,
etc.

Then shall the minister say. He is not directed to kneel. Standing in the place of authority to administer the ordinance of the Church according to the commission of Christ

Jesus, he should remain standing till at the close of the service, when, his ministration completed, he joins with the people in the Lord's Prayer, all kneeling. The people only should kneel, as the next rubric shows *they* are to stand up. *Almighty and Immortal God.* This touching and most solemn appeal to the most merciful God voices the need of every human heart, and in God finds its satisfying answer. As our *aid*, he binds up the wounds sin has made, comforts us, and strengthens us with the abundance of his enriching grace; faint and weary in our conflicts against the fiery assaults of the Evil One, he is our *help* in difficulty, our *succor* in danger. The spring of all comfort, the fountain of all joy, the ever-bubbling source of the soul's sweet peace, he is *the life of them that believe*, and as the restorer of the life that is withered, *the resurrection of the dead.* *Receive them*, as they in this moment of humiliation, prayer, and faith surrender their hearts. *Everlasting benediction.* The eternal peace of God flowing from the consciousness of Divine acceptance of *thy heavenly washing*, the spiritual cleansing of the Holy Spirit figured in the washing of baptism. *Amen.* This should at all times be said in an audible voice by all the people.

Then shall the People stand up, and the Minister shall say:

Hear the words of the Gospel, written by St. John.
[Chap. iii, 1-8.]

There was a man of the Pharisees, named Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews: the same came to Jesus by night, and said unto him, Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God; for no man can do these miracles that thou doest except God be with him. Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God. Nicodemus saith unto him, How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter the second time into his mother's womb, and be born? Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he can not enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again. The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit.

People stand up. In the early Church it was the universal custom for the people to stand during the reading of the Gospel ("Apost. Const., II, 57; Sozomen, "Hist. Eccl. Lib.," VII, c. 19), and in this rubric we see the ancient practice. *Well beloved.* The plural form will, of course, be changed into the singular

in the following exhortation when questions are asked. The Holy Scriptures and the writings of the primitive Church show that some interrogation preceded baptism. (Acts viii, 37.) Tertullian refers to the vow of renunciation of Satan (“De Conn. Mitit.”), and Cyprian says, “Moreover, the very interrogation which is put in caption is a witness of the truth.” (“Ante-Nicene Fathers,” Amer. Ed., Vol. V., 376.) The earliest sacramentary extant, that of Gelasius and Gregory, has the same form of renunciation as the Salisbury Use, from which this form is taken. *Promise made by Christ. . . Your promise.* The baptismal covenant is of two parts, as all covenants are, the Divine and the human. On the Divine side, it is the promise of all the saving benefits of the atonement here and eternally; on the human side, it is a surrender, complete and forever, to the will and service of Almighty God.

Then shall the Minister demand of each of the Persons to be baptized:

Ques. Dost thou renounce the devil and all his works, the vain pomp and glory of the world, with all covetous desires of the same, and the carnal desires of the flesh, so that thou wilt not follow nor be led by them?

Ans. I renounce them all.

1 Pet. v, 8, 9.
1 John iii, 8, 9;
v. 19.
Gal. v, 19-21.

Ques. Dost thou believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth?

And in Jesus Christ, his only begotten Son our Lord; and that he was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary; that he suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried; that he rose again the third day; that he ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty; and from thence shall come again at the end of the world, to judge the quick and the dead?

And dost thou believe in the Holy Ghost; the holy catholic Church; the communion of saints; the forgiveness of sins; the resurrection of the body; and everlasting life after death?

Acts viii, 36-38.

Ans. All this I steadfastly believe.

Ques. Wilt thou be baptized in this faith?

Ans. Such is my desire.

Ques. Wilt thou then obediently keep God's holy will and commandments, and walk in the same all the days of thy life?

Ans. I will endeavor so to do, God being my helper.

Demand of each. All standing or each one rising as he is addressed. In this solemn covenant with God and profession of faith, each one must answer for himself alone, and each question must therefore be put to each candidate separately, not to all at once. *Dost thou renounce.* In thine heart and now. In passing from the kingdom and "power of Satan" into

the kingdom of God, we must declare our voluntary rejection of the Evil One and all that his name and history and character implies. *And his works.* All active and passive manifestations of antagonism to the revelation of God in Jesus Christ, and to the forces that make righteousness and true holiness in Church, State, family, and other social life of man. *The vain pomp.* In this old word *pomp*, which comes from *πομπή*, *pompa*, we see the idolatrous rites, the altars, the statues, and temples of the heathen gods. It carries us back to the days of the Arena, when Christian martyrs were thrown to wild beasts for their faith, to the gladiatorial combats and religious processions, which the word strictly means, of the Greeks and Romans. In the "Apostolical Constitutions" the form is, "I renounce Satan and his works and his *pomps*," etc. (Tertullian.) I renounce "the devil, his *pomps*, and his angel." ("De Corona Milit.;" so, also, Ambrose of Milan, Cyril of Jerusalem, and many others.) *And glory of the world.* The sinful luxuries and illusory pleasures, wasteful of time and money, ministering only to the flesh. *Covetous desires of the same.* Not simply an external rejection, but an internal rejection of them, is required, so that

there shall be no desire for their excitement and glamour, nor shall they have any fascinating influence over the mind and heart, in which Christ dwells Lord of all. *I renounce them all.* Emphatic declaration of inward and outward severance of allegiance to or desire for perishing and sinful vanities.

Dost thou believe. Following the rejection of Satan is acceptance of Christ in the Christian revelation, and an open profession of faith in the same. This is the VOW OF BELIEF. The declaration of belief rests upon the words of the Lord, "He that believeth and is baptized" (Mark xvi, 16); and from the instance of Philip and the eunuch (Acts viii, 37), we may conclude that, from the very beginning, the Church demanded an open profession of faith in the principles of Christianity, not in any theological or philosophical explanation or interpretation of them, but in the facts. These fundamental facts or principles are summed up in this so-called Apostles' Creed, and the same may be found in nearly all the writings of the Ante-Nicene period back to the apostolic days—Irenæus, Origen, Tertullian, Gregory Thaumaturgus, all mention the same doctrines, and the same chief articles of faith may be found in the public creeds of the

apostolic Churches of Jerusalem, Cæsarea, and Antioch. *In God.* The eternal, personal Deity. This opposes Agnosticism and all forms of Pantheistic teaching. *The Father.* The ground and source of all existence, and as a Father merciful, just, and loving. *Almighty.* Having in himself underived, eternal, and infinite power in all worlds, seen and unseen. *Maker of heaven and earth.* The Creator and Sustainer of all worlds and all therein. This is opposed to all anti-theistic doctrines of materialism. *And in Christ Jesus.* The historic God-man Jesus of the New Testament, the Messiah of prophecy, prophet, priest, and king. (Acts x, 38.) *His only begotten Son.* Eternally with the Father in the unity of the Holy Ghost, and begotten as to his humanity through the Eternal Spirit of life. *Our Lord.* Master and Savior and Divine Object of worship and love. (Acts x, 36; Rom. x, 13; xiv, 8, 9.) *Conceived by the Holy Ghost.* His human nature originated by the immediate power of the pure and holy life-giving and form-fashioning Spirit of God. *Born of the Virgin Mary.* Son of God, seed of woman, contracting, by reason of his holy origin, no sin or defilement in, through, or by agency of human birth channels. (Gal. iv, 4.) *Suffered*

under Pontius Pilate. Really and truly suffered, as having a real humanity, for the sins of the world. *Was crucified . . . dead.* No seeming death, no swoon, but real death as the sacrifice for sin, making atonement and reconciliation. *And buried.* Third great fact of the record of Christ's atonement. *Rose again.* As he predicted, "for our justification," and "declared to be the Son of God with power." (Rom. i, 4.) *Ascended into heaven.* This same Jesus, who died and rose again, went up, forty days after his resurrection, to the unseen world of everlasting rest and felicity, *and sitteth,* ruling and directing, *at the right hand of God the Father Almighty;* that is, at the center of infinite power and wielding all power. (Mark xvi, 19; Heb. i, 3.) *From thence.* His throne of grace and power in heaven (Acts iii, 21). *He shall come again.* In visible manner. *At the end of the world.* These words are not in the Creed, but are put in to direct the mind to his final coming and the purpose. *To judge the quick and the dead.* Those then living and all generations from creation according to their works. (John v, 28, 29; Acts xviii, 31; 1 Cor. v, 10.) *In the Holy Ghost.* The third of the Divine Persons in the Blessed Trinity. Faith has been

professed in the existence and personality of the Father and of the Son, and we now affirm our belief in the Holy Spirit, revealed to us in the Scriptures and in our religious experience. *The holy catholic Church.* Consisting of "every kindred, tongue, and people" (Rev. v, 9), spread throughout the whole earth, and holding that form of doctrine once delivered by the authority of God. (Rom. vi, 27.) Every congregation, Church, or society of Christians baptized in, and holding to, this form of doctrine is a part of the Universal Church, and as the parts are of the same nature as the whole, though they may differ in manners and customs, each such Church may be called the Universal or Catholic Church. This historic and significant title belongs equally, therefore, to all who profess the faith of Christ. *The communion of saints.* The Church in heaven and on earth is one Church. Fellowship in this true Church is communion with the saints now, and of all ages and all climes. *The forgiveness of sins* by God, through the atonement by Christ for sin. *The resurrection of the body.* In the Greek and Latin copies of the creed, *flesh* is used here instead of body. The reference is to the resurrection at the last day. (John v, 29; xi, 24;

Acts xxiv, 15; 1 Cor. xv.) *Everlasting life.* The climax of redemption, the sure destiny of the holy ones who keep their baptismal vows. Thus the Creed closes with a declaration of triumphant faith in a glorious immortality. *Steadfastly.* Firmly, with implied idea of immovable conviction for all time. *Wilt thou be baptized.* Compulsory baptism, under any circumstances, is from its very nature null and void. *In this faith.* Not in any other. *This* is pointed, distinct, and emphatic. It does not mean in this particular Apostles' Creed, nor in its words; but in the faith of the Gospel, its facts and doctrines relating to the article here mentioned. *My desire.* This implies that the candidate understands the significance of the act, and comprehends the simple meaning of the faith he professes. *Obediently keep God's holy will.* This is the VOW OF OBEDIENCE. It was not in the primitive offices of baptism, nor in the English Ritual prior to the revision of A. D. 1661. It was probably inserted at that time by Bishop Cosin (Blunt, "Annot."), who founded it on similar declarations used in ancient times in the Eastern Church. (See Bingham, "Christian Antiquities.") *I will endeavor so to do.* This does not mean "attempt," but a deter-

mined effort, with full confidence of success. *God being my helper.* Human will alone can not resist evil forces, because it is previously handicapped by inherited weakness.

Then shall the Minister say:

O Merciful God, grant that all carnal affections may die in *these persons*, and that all things belonging to the Spirit may live and grow in *them*. *Amen.*

For Scripture authority, see form for the Baptism of Infants.

Grant that *they* may have power and strength to have victory, and triumph against the devil, the world, and the flesh. *Amen.*

Grant that *they*, being here dedicated to thee by our Office and Ministry, may also be endued with heavenly virtues, and everlastingly rewarded, through thy mercy, O blessed Lord God, who dost live, and govern all things, world without end. *Amen.*

Almighty, Ever-living God, whose most dearly-beloved Son Jesus Christ, for the forgiveness of our sins, did shed out of his most precious side both water and blood; and gave commandment to his disciples that they should go teach all nations, and baptize them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; regard, we beseech thee, our supplications; and grant that the *persons* now to be baptized may receive the fullness of thy grace, and ever remain in the number of thy faithful and elect children, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

Then shall the Minister ask the name of each Person to be baptized, and shall sprinkle or pour Water upon him (or, if he shall desire it, shall immerse him in Water), saying :

N., I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Then shall be said the Lord's Prayer, all kneeling.

Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread: and forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us: lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: for thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever. *Amen.*

Then may the Minister conclude with extemporary Prayer.

Although there is no rubric directing the posture of the candidate while receiving holy baptism, whether he shall remain standing or shall kneel, yet it seems to be the proper way for him to devoutly kneel and bow the head, invoking on his own behalf the baptism of the Holy Ghost. The minister may pass from one to the other if there be several candidates, they all kneeling at the same time. *The Lord's Prayer* should be said audibly by the whole congregation, *all kneeling*, minister and people.

Chapter XI

RECEPTION OF PROBATIONERS AND MEMBERS

Introductory Note

IN the Primitive Church the laity were divided into two classes—the *κατηχούμενοι*, *catechumens*, or learners, and the *πιστοὶ*, *believers*, or full members. The former recall the proselytes of synagogue times, and correspond, in their general relation to the Church, to our probationers, who are, in the meaning of the term, catechumens. The word is used in several places in the New Testament: Acts iii, 25; Rom. ii, 18; Gal. vi, 6; 1 Cor. xiv, 9. Catechumens were candidates for baptism and Church membership. They were placed under the care and instruction of a teacher in divine things called the *catechist*, who taught them the doctrines of Christianity and the duties of a Christian. Not only persons of mature age, but children also, were enrolled as probationers, as we learn from Tertullian, who, arguing that “according to the circumstances and disposition, and even age, of each individual, the delay of baptism is preferable,” says concerning children: “Let them come while they are learning; let them come while they are being taught whither to come.” The condition required for enrollment as a catechumen was the same as that required by the General Rules of our Church—for Wesley ever had the prac-

tice of the Primitive Church before him—"a desire to flee from the wrath to come, and to be saved from their sins." Perhaps the analogy would be more complete if we compared these catechumens with those earnest souls among us known as *seekers of religion*, and indeed this very name itself was not unknown to the Church; for by the writers of that time the ordinances were sometimes called *desiderata*, since they were so earnestly sought by the catechumen.

Great interest was always felt by the Church for the probationers. Augustine tells that, in their public prayers, it was the custom to pray for the learners, and Chrysostom gives the form used in the public prayer: "Let us pray that the most gracious and merciful God would hear the prayers of the catechumens." Careful instruction in the precepts of the Gospel was diligently imparted, and no one was admitted into the number of "the faithful" whose life and conduct were not such as were worthy of their high calling. Thus, Origen says that "Christians are so far from admitting any hand over head that they first pre-examine the minds of those that desire to become their auditors; and having privately had trial of them before they received them into the congregation, when they perceive them fully resolved to lead a pious and religious life, then they admit them in their distinct orders; some that are newly admitted, but not yet baptized; others that have given some evidence and demonstration of their purpose to live as becomes Christians, among whom there are governors appointed to inspect and inquire into the life and manners of those who have been

admitted, that they may expel and turn off those candidates of religion who answer not their profession, and heartily entertain those that do, and by daily converse build them up and make them better." (Cave, "Prim. Chris.," p. 17, 18.)

The privileges of full membership—such as partaking of the Lord's Supper, which was regarded as the highest privilege possible; deeper instruction in Christian doctrine; taking part in the public transactions of the Church and the election of ministers and other officers—were all denied the probationer until he had passed the period of his trial and was found faithful.

The requirements in the following office are in harmony with the teachings of the apostles and the practice of the Primitive Church. The failure of the Church and of the ministry to perform their duty toward those received on probation is more often a cause for regret than the failure of probationers to prove faithful to their vows when carefully watched over and intelligently instructed.

¶ 445. Form for Receiving Persons into the Church after Probation.

On the day appointed, all that are to be received into the Church shall be called forward, and the Minister, addresssing the Congregation, shall say:

DEARLY-BELOVED BRETHREN, the Scriptures teach us that the Church is the household of God, the body of which Christ is the head; and that it is the design of the Gospel to bring together in one all who are in Christ. The fellowship of the Church is the communion that its members enjoy one with an-

other. The ends of this fellowship are, the maintenance of sound doctrine and of the ordinances of Christian worship, and the exercise of that power of godly admonition and discipline which Christ has committed to his Church for the promotion of holiness. It is the duty of all men to unite in this fellowship; for it is only those that "be planted in the house of the Lord" that "shall flourish in the courts of our God." Its more particular duties are, to promote peace and unity; to bear one another's burdens; to prevent each other's stumbling; to seek the intimacy of friendly society among themselves; to continue steadfast in the faith and worship of the Gospel; and to pray and sympathize with each other. Among its privileges are, peculiar incitements to holiness from the hearing of God's Word and sharing in Christ's ordinances; the being placed under the watchful care of Pastors; and the enjoyment of the blessings which are promised only to those who are of the Household of Faith. Into this holy fellowship the *persons* before you, who *have* already received the Sacrament of Baptism, and *have* been under the care of *proper leaders* for six months on Trial, *come* seeking admission. We now propose, in the fear of God, to question *them* as to *their* faith and purposes, that you may know that *they* are proper *persons* to be admitted into the Church.

The Scriptures *the Church.* The Church here signifies the Church in general, the universal body of Christians; that is, the Church visible, as in Acts v, 11; Acts viii, 3; I Cor. i, 2; I Cor. x, 32; xi, 22. *Christ the*

head. (Eph. i, 22; Eph. iii, 6-11; Col. i, 18.) "And He is the Head of the Body, the Church." *Communion.* From the beginning the Church has nourished belief in "the communion of saints." This communion is the social brotherly relation in Christ Jesus that *its members enjoy one with another*, in comforting, encouraging, giving aid and sympathy, and showing every kindness, tenderness, and Christly love to one another as members of the same holy family, in which it is the purpose of God to comprise humanity. *The ends.* The aims, or purposes. *Maintenance of sound doctrine.* Doctrines that are not preached die out, and the purpose of the Church is to transmit in its purity the faith once delivered "to the saints." The doctrines of Christ were not delivered to the ministry alone, but to the body of Christians constituting the Church, as is evidenced by the addresses in the opening verses of the Epistles of the apostles. *The ordinances of Christian worship.* The sacraments and the ministry of the Word in public service. Christ has committed these to his Church, and it is the duty of every member of the Church to maintain them. *Power of godly admonition.* The power of discipline is the endowment of Christ, given by him in the power

of binding and loosing. When exercised in a godly manner, the act of the Church is the act of Christ himself; for when speaking on this subject he said, "When two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." For the *promotion of holiness*. This is the end of teaching and all worship—holiness of life. In so far as the members are holy, to that degree the Church is holy and without blame. Hence holiness of the Church begins with the individual. *Peace*. Strife, conflict, and all forms of antagonism are foreign to the brotherly love which Christ lays down as the law of life in his earthly kingdom. Where strife and contention destroy, the Spirit of God can not dwell, and the duty of every member is to develop those graces which make for peace, both by precept and example. *Unity*. The constant exhortation of the Apostle Paul to the Churches is to unity of faith and mind, and this is the burden of those holy men who succeeded them as teachers and pastors. *Bear one another's burdens*. And, as Paul teaches, "so fulfill the law of Christ;" for it is only by practical application of the law of love to the affairs of life that we demonstrate the possession in our hearts of "love for the brethren." In the society of

truth, theory and practice go hand in hand. *Friendly society.* Christians for Christians. Association with unbelievers, to the neglect of fellowship with the followers of Christ, first destroys the bloom of holy living, and then corrupts the heart. The children of the light can not walk in the darkness without becoming blind even as others. *That you may know.* The Church must preserve itself against the admission into its fold of those who are not in heart, in soul, in purpose, one with those within, otherwise there would soon be no distinction between the Church and the world. The admission, therefore, of members into the Christian Church is among the most important acts of the Church, because of what it involves and the fearful consequences resulting from the lack of care in opening the gates of the fold.

Then, addressing the Applicants for Admission, the Minister shall say:

DEARLY BELOVED, you are come hither seeking the great privilege of union with the Church our Savior has purchased with his own blood. We rejoice in the grace of God vouchsafed unto you, in that he has called you to be his *followers*, and that thus far you have run well. You have heard how blessed are the privileges, and how solemn are the duties, of membership in Christ's Church; and be-

fore you are fully admitted thereto, it is proper that you do here publicly renew your vows, confess your faith, and declare your purpose, by answering the following questions:

Do you here, in the presence of God and of this Congregation, renew the solemn promise contained in the Baptismal Covenant, ratifying and confirming the same, and acknowledging *yourselves* bound faithfully to observe and keep that Covenant?

Ans. I do.

Have you saving faith in the Lord Jesus Christ?

Ans. I trust I have.

Do you believe in the Doctrines of the Holy Scriptures as set forth in the Articles of Religion of the Methodist Episcopal Church?

Ans. I do.

Will you cheerfully be governed by the Rules of the Methodist Episcopal Church, hold sacred the Ordinances of God, and endeavor, as much as in you lies, to promote the welfare of your brethren and the advancement of the Redeemer's kingdom?

Ans. I will.

Will you contribute of your earthly substance, according to your ability, to the support of the gospel and the various benevolent enterprises of the Church?

Ans. I will.

Addressing the applicants. They should now stand, as this is the proper form at this time when assuming the vows of Church membership. The minister should not hurry over this most solemn event in the life of a

Christian. But rather, with gravity of manner, dignity of tone, and tender solicitude, state clearly and fully the duties and privileges and conditions of membership with the faithful. *In the baptismal covenant.* The applicant, having been under the care of proper leaders, is certainly instructed in the baptismal covenant, in the religious creed of Methodism as expressed in the Articles, and in the polity of the Church. *Saving faith.* By this question no theological or technical proposition is implied. What constitutes saving faith may be the subject of inquiry elsewhere; but here the appeal is to the experience of the candidate, to the consciousness in which all states and acts of the knowing self are known. Repentance, faith, trust, love, are all states or acts of which any rational being may be conscious, and when the object toward which these acts are directed is the Lord Jesus Christ, then the authority of God's Holy Word is warrant, sure and unchangeable, for believing that one thus experiencing these states or acts has saving faith in the Lord Jesus. *Doctrines.*

. . . *Articles.* Not that the Articles of Religion contain all the doctrines of Scripture, or that each Article contains all there is in the doctrine it sets forth, but that these Ar-

ticles are in harmony with the teachings of Scripture. The form of the question is very awkward, for it seems as if the Scriptures are to be believed through the Articles interpreting them; whereas, the real proposition must be whether the teachings of the Articles are the teaching of Scripture. *Will you cheerfully be governed?* Obedience, piety, brotherly love, and holy zeal are the four notes of a useful Church membership. Where any one of these is lacking, there is loss of power in the Christian life, and for peace and fruitfulness there is only barrenness and discontent. *Will you contribute?* The duty of supporting the gospel is not based primarily on ecclesiastical requirements, but on the express command of God. (Matt. x, 10; 1 Cor. ix, 14.) *According to your ability.* No rule as to amount is laid down in the New Testament as a rigid law; the conscience of the Christian must decide. But the giving must be according to financial ability, as the New Testament directs. For this measure an enlightened conscience will always approve. More or less than this standard is a violation of the law of honesty, either relative to one's secular obligations, or, if less than one's ability, then in relation to the gospel of the Lord.

Then the Minister, addressing the Church, shall say:

Brethren, *these persons* having given satisfactory responses to our inquiries, have any of you reason to allege why *they* should not be received into Full Membership in the Church?

Addressing the Church. Although good human sense and true Christian spirit would suggest that if any one knows of any cause why an applicant should not be received, the same should be communicated to the pastor or to the leader prior to the day appointed for his reception; nevertheless the sense of responsibility on the part of the Church for the good name and spiritual character of the body of Christ must be always awakened and appealed to. "Ye are members one of another."

No objections being alleged, the Minister shall say to the Candidates:

We welcome you to the communion of the Church of God; and, in testimony of our Christian affection and the cordiality with which we receive you, I hereby extend to you the right hand of fellowship; and may God grant that you may be a faithful and useful member of the Church militant till you are called to the fellowship of the Church triumphant, which is "without fault before the throne of God."

Then shall the Minister offer extemporary Prayer.

To the communion of the Church of God. To all those who, being born of God, truly enter the communion of the Church visible it may be said, as the apostle writing to the Hebrews said: "Ye are come unto Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to countless hosts, the joyful assembly of angels, and to the Church of the first-born who are enrolled in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling that speaketh better than that of Abel." (Heb. xii, R. V.)

The right hand of fellowship. Apostolic practice. "And when James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship."

In closing these notes, I am constrained to observe, after long and profitable study during which I seemed to have lived again in the bright morning and dewy freshness of the early Church, that if those who take upon themselves the vows of fellowship in the Church of God would, with the New Testament open before them, thoughtfully and

prayerfully read Wesley's "Character of a Methodist" and Cave's "Primitive Christianity; or, The Religion of the Ancient Christians in the First Ages of the Gospel," the tone of piety, the aggressive faith, the holy zeal, the love and power of primitive Methodism would be greatly restored, and the character of the Church and the glory of God greatly exalted in all the earth.

Chapter XII

THE LORD'S SUPPER

Introductory Note

THE Sacrament of the Lord's Supper has always been regarded as the most sacred ordinance of religion, the most solemn rite of Christian worship. Although many names have been given to it in all the centuries since its institution, such as the Communion, the Eucharist, Oblation, Mystery, Sacrifice, Sacrament of the Altar, the Body of Christ, Viaticum, and numerous other appellations; yet in the Gospels which contain the account of its origin, no name is given it. In the Epistle to the Corinthians it is called "the Lord's Supper," and also "Communion." (1 Cor. x, 16.)

Our Divine Lord instituted this holy rite the night before his death, and charged his apostles to continue it in remembrance of him till his coming again. Of this there can be no doubt. It is true that of the evangelists, Luke only mentions the continuance of the rite in remembrance of the departed Lord, and that some critics, as Westcott and Hort, have considered these words in Luke to be an interpolation. Recently, Professor McGiffert, following the lead of Professors Gardiner, Rückert, Jülicher, Stendlein, Martineau, and others, contends that it is not absolutely certain that Jesus instituted the Supper and directed his disciples to eat and drink in

remembrance of him. But in this statement he overlooks the larger and more critical view of Wendt ("Lehre Jesu," Eng. Trans., pp. 318-320), who shows, in a masterful way and in perfect harmony with all the facts, that Jesus instituted a sacrificial meal in connection with his sacrificial death (Mark xiv, 22-24; 1 Cor. xi, 23-25), and that his disciples "were in future to repeat this sacrificial meal in remembrance of him." But over against all so-called views of modern critics, and all emendations of the text of Luke by which the peculiar words concerning the perpetuity of the rite are eliminated, we must set the unimpeachable testimony of St. Paul himself, who emphatically (see the position of ἐγώ) states that he received from the Lord a special revelation on this subject: "For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That in the same night in which he was betrayed, he took bread: and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat; this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me." That Luke should record the words "in remembrance of me," and not the other evangelists, is not sufficient reason (even aided, as Westcott and Hort may be, by the omission of ancient MSS.) for regarding them as interpolations. In Luke's Gospel there are phrases and ideas which are found nowhere else except in Paul's writings (as is also true of Matthew's Gospel); compare, for instance, 1 Tim. v, 18, with Luke x, 7, and it is but natural

to regard Luke's statement as evidence of his dependence upon Paul for the facts he states concerning the Lord's Supper.

Concerning the nature of this holy sacrament, what it is we really receive or do not receive in the partaking of it, is a question which has long divided the Christian world. But passing by the doctrines of Romanists, Lutherans, Calvinists, Reformed, High Anglicans—the history of which may be readily obtained in the works on the History of Dogma, by Baumgarten—Crusius, Harnack, Hagenbach, Beck, Meier, Nupert, Pusey on the *Real Presence*, it is sufficient to state, in the words of our Eighteenth Article of Religion, that “the body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner. And the means whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith.” This teaching excludes transubstantiation, as it does consubstantiation, and the bald doctrine of the Zwinglians that the Eucharist is nothing more than a commemoration. He who in true faith partakes of the symbols, believing the words of Christ's institution, does really partake of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, for by faith he discerns the Lord's Body.” (1 Cor. xi, 29.) The not discerning the Lord's Body is condemnation. St. Paul regarded irreverence in the use of the Consecrated Elements, and unfaith in the reception of them, as a most heinous crime; for so he writes to the Corinthians, “*Whosoever shall eat the bread or drink the cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord,*” thus placing the guilty partaker of the Eucharist on the same level

with the murderers of Christ, those who crucified the Lord of glory. As a recent writer on Apostolic Christianity (H. H. Henson, B. D., Fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford, "Apostolic Chris., Notes and Inferences mainly Based on St. Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians"), truly observes: "It is the undiscerning, indiscriminating reception of the Sacrament, the reception which makes no difference between those hallowed Elements and common food, which sees nothing more in them than the lowly creatures of bread and wine they are, and continue to be, which has no reverence because it has no faith. '*For he that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh judgment unto himself, if he discern not the Body.*' This blindness to the spiritual dignity attaching to the Sacrament was, in essence, the very fault of the Jews, who murdered the Prince of Life. They were so gross of understanding, so carnal-minded, that when the Spiritual King stood before them they could—in the phrase of the prophet—*see no comeliness in him* to move their *desire*. So we can recognize the real identity of disposition between those who despise Christ present in the Sacrament, and those who despised Him before the tribunal of Pilate. Both were, in the awful language of St. Paul, '*guilty of the Body and the Blood of the Lord.*'"

The materials are bread and wine. No other can be used. The bread, such as was used at the Paschal feast, was unleavened, and this our Lord used at the institution of this sacrament; for it is written in Matt. xxvi, 26: "As they were eating, Jesus took τὸν ἄρτον [*the bread, or loaf*], and blessed it, and brake it." No stress, however, is put by the New Testa-

ment on the *kind* of bread; but stress is placed on the significant fact that Christ blessed it and broke it. If, then, the acts of Christ in the institution of this holy sacrament are to be imitated because of their significance, as his words of institution are to be repeated—without which there is no consecration, and therefore no sacrament—it follows that the officiating minister should break the bread. The wine used at the Passover was pure wine. The kind of wine is not mentioned. Our Ritual demands the unfermented juice of the grape. But there should be no mixture of water with it, although this practice dates from early times.

The time. As the Supper was instituted at night (Matt. xxvi, 20; 1 Cor. xi, 23), the first Christians seem to have celebrated its observance at this time (Acts xx, 7); but not always, as it would appear from Acts ii, 46; 1 Cor. xvi, 2. Very early in the Primitive Church, Sunday became the regular day for the celebration of the Lord's Supper. Justin Martyr says, "On the day called Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country gather together in one place," and then he describes the observance of the sacrament at that time. But this observance was not confined to Sunday. There is ample evidence in Irenæus, Tertullian, and Cyprian to the fact that daily communion was not uncommon.

From the first, the faithful only in Christ Jesus were allowed to partake of the sacred elements. Justin, recording the practice of his day, writes: "And this food is called among us the Eucharist, of which no one is allowed to partake but the man who believes that the things which we teach are

true, and who has been washed with the washing that is for the remission of sins, and unto regeneration, and who so lives as Christ enjoined." (Apol. I, chap. 66.) It might appear from the Invitation in the Ritual that only such persons now are invited; but in our opinion it would be putting a too critical interpretation upon that Invitation if it should rigorously exclude a repentant sinner, who, in his heart, "intended to lead a new life." Nevertheless, no profane or wicked person should, under any circumstances, be permitted to take this Sacrament into his unholy hands; such an act is to be guilty of the Body and Blood of Christ, and we are warned not to be "partakers of other men's sins."

[Whenever practicable, let none but the pure, unfermented juice of the grape be used in administering the Lord's Supper.]

[Let persons who have scruples concerning the receiving of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper kneeling, be permitted to receive it either standing or sitting.]

[No person shall be admitted to the Lord's Supper among us who is guilty of any practice for which we would exclude a member of our Church.]

¶ 446. Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper.

The Elder shall say one or more of these Sentences, during the reading of which the Persons appointed for that purpose shall receive the Alms for the Poor:

Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven. (Matt. v, 16.)

Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves

break through and steal: but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal. (Matt. vi, 19, 20.)

Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets. (Matt. vii, 12.)

Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. (Matt. vii, 21.)

Zaccheus stood, and said unto the Lord, Behold, Lord, the half of my goods I give to the poor; and if I have taken anything from any man by false accusation, I restore him fourfold. (Luke xix, 8.)

He which soweth sparingly shall reap also sparingly; and he which soweth bountifully shall reap also bountifully. Every man according as he purposeth in his heart, so let him give; not grudgingly, or of necessity, for God loveth a cheerful giver. (2 Cor. ix, 6, 7.)

As we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith. (Gal. vi, 10.)

Godliness with contentment is great gain; for we brought nothing into this world, and it is certain we can carry nothing out. (1 Tim. vi, 6, 7.)

Charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not high-minded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy; that they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate; laying up in store for themselves a good founda-

tion against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life. (1 Tim. vi, 17-19.)

God is not unrighteous to forget your work and labor of love, which ye have showed toward his name, in that ye have ministered to the saints, and do minister. (Heb. vi, 10.)

To do good and to communicate, forget not, for with such sacrifices God is well pleased. (Heb. xiii, 16.)

Whoso hath this world's good, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him? (1 John iii, 17.)

He that hath pity upon the poor lendeth unto the Lord; and that which he hath given will he pay him again. (Prov. xix, 17.)

Blessed is he that considereth the poor: the Lord will deliver him in time of trouble. (Psalm xli, 1.)

Thou shalt open thine hand wide unto thy brother, to thy poor. (Deut. xv, 11.)

Order for the administration. There is no rubric, it will be noticed, concerning the covering of the table. In our Disciplines from the beginning there was a direction that the table should have "a fair linen cloth upon it." The only remnant of that rubric left is in the note concerning the covering of the unconsumed elements, and from that we infer the table is still to be covered with "a fair linen cloth." What edifying influence this Divine

service, beautiful in its simplicity, pathos, and holy joy, shall have upon those who participate, will depend much upon the manner in which it is conducted, as the gospel itself does on the way it is preached. Elevated spiritual character, fineness of fiber, and the grace of Christian culture, all enter into a worthy and dignified presentation of this most sacred rite to the people. The minister should stand behind, or at a side of the table facing the people, the elements contained in plain but comely vessels on the table, decently covered.

After which the Elder shall give the following Invitation, the People standing:

If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world.

**Liturgies
of James
and Chry-
sostom.**

1 John ii, 1, 2.
1 Cor. v, 7.
2 Cor. vii, 10, 11.
1 Cor. xiii, 4-7.
1 John iv, 7-11.
Rom. vi, 4, 6.
2 Cor. v, 14, 15,
17.
Mark x, 49.
Heb. x, 22.
1 Cor. x, 16.

Wherefore ye that do truly and earnestly repent of your sins, and are in love and charity with your neighbors, and intend to lead a new life, following the commandments of God, and walking from henceforth in his holy ways, draw near with faith, and take this Holy Sacrament to your comfort; and, devoutly kneeling, make your humble confession to Almighty God.

If any man sin. The INVITATION properly opens with an offering of the sacrificial Lamb

of God, the atoning Jesus, to all who are in sin, as their Redeemer, and holding out to them the hope of pardon through him, their Advocate at the throne of mercy. *Truly and earnestly repent.* This is the first requisite to a worthy participation of this sacrament. Superficial self-examination, vague and insincere resolves to do better, are not true repentance. Under the old law the transgressor confessed his sins, and then, by a symbolical act of profound import, put them away forever. (Lev. v, 5; Num. v, 6, 7; Lev. iv, 15, 24, 29.) No less is required of those who seek pardon through the death of Him who bore our iniquities. If we repent, our sense of unworthiness should not deter us from the table of the Lord. Not what we are, but what we are not and yet desire to be, constitute our fitness. *In love and charity.* The second requisite is love. This sacrament is fellowship with Christ in peculiar nearness. It is also fellowship with one another in Christ; therefore all malice and envy and discord being utterly destructive of that union, wholly disqualifies the unhappy soul from participation in this communion. *Draw near with faith.* Third requisite. Faith in Christ as the Divine Savior of men. Faith to discern through earthly elements the

Lord's body. Faith to receive him as a personal Savior, humbly trusting in the infinite love and compassion of him who "will not break the bruised reed nor quench the smoking flax." *Take this holy sacrament.* A visible sign of spiritual grace, ordained by Christ as a means by which we receive him, and a pledge to us of the same. *To your comfort.* Conscious of a sincere desire to receive Christ in a clean heart, there will be holy joy in the possession of him and spiritual strength in the grace imparted.

Then shall this general Confession be made by the Minister in the name of all those who are minded to receive the Holy Communion, both he and all the People devoutly kneeling, and saying:

Almighty God, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Maker of all things, Judge of all men, we acknowledge and bewail our manifold sins and wickedness, which we from time to time most grievously have committed, by thought, word, and deed, against thy Divine Majesty, provoking most justly thy wrath and indignation against us. We do earnestly repent, and are heartily sorry for these our misdoings; the remembrance of them is grievous unto us. Have mercy upon us, have mercy upon us, most merciful Father; for thy Son, our Lord Jesus Christ's sake,

Matt. xii, 36, 37.
 Luke xv, 18.
 Deut. ix, 7.
 Rom. ii, 8, 9.
 Job vii, 20, 21;
 xlii, 5, 6.
 2 Cor. vii, 10, 11.
 Ezek. xvi, 62, 63;
 xxxvi, 31, 32.
 Ps. xxxviii, 4;
 li, 1.
 Rom. iii, 24, 25.
 1 John ii, 1, 2, 12.
 Rom. vi, 4, 6, 13.
 1 Thess. iv, 1.
 2 Cor. v, 14, 15.
 1 Tim. i, 17.

Source,
 Herrman's
 Consult.,
 H. D. 1547.
 Salisbury
 Use.

forgive us all that is past; and grant that we may ever hereafter serve and please thee in newness of life, to the honor and glory of thy name, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

By the minister in the name of all. Previous to A. D. 1661, this confession was to be made by "one of those desiring to commune, or by one of the ministers." The Puritans objected, and insisted that it should be said by the minister only. The change was made by Bishop Cosin. In 1864 the present form was inserted in our Ritual. *Almighty God.* In the *Didache*, chapter vii, mention is made of confession of sins before communing, and no Liturgy of any age omits it, so deep is the instinct that we must be cleansed from an evil conscience before we venture to touch too closely the things of God. Therefore that we might receive the benefits available to us from the propitiatory death of the Son of God, which this sacrament commemorates, it is necessary that we confess our sins as St. John declares, and put ourselves in utter abandonment to the tender mercies of Him who invites us to repentance. *Amen.* All the people should make this response to the general confession in audible voice.

Then shall the Elder say,

Matt. vi, 14.
Is. lv, 7.
John iii, 16.
Acts x, 43.
Gal. i, 4.
1 Cor. i, 7, 8.

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, who of thy great mercy hast promised forgiveness of sins to all them that with hearty repentance and true faith turn unto thee, have mercy upon us; pardon and deliver us from all our sins; confirm and strengthen us in all goodness; and bring us to everlasting life, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

**Suggested by
Liturgy of
John à
Lasco, Eng-
land, Reign
of Edward
VI, and
Herrman's
Consult.**

In the English book this is known as the absolution given in God's name. Our Ritual, discarding all priestly absolution, has changed it into a prayer, and this, too, in harmony with revisers of the Ritual in 1661, who designated it as such in emendation of the rubric. *Then shall the elder say.* Kneeling. As the minister of Christ sent to proclaim forgiveness of sins to all who repent and believe, he now, in behalf of the penitent, turns earnestly to God, imploring his pardoning grace.

The Collect.

Job xiii, 2.
Ps. xlv, 41.
Matt. xxii, 37.
John iv, 16, 17.
Luke i, 46, 47.

Almighty God, unto whom all hearts are open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid, cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of thy Holy Spirit, that we may perfectly love thee, and worthily magnify thy holy name, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

**Salisbury
Use.**

The Collect. A brief prayer in a *collection* of people, or a number of such petitions *collected* into one. Collects are as ancient as Liturgies, and Liturgies carry us back to primitive Christianity. This is known as the Collect for Purity. The Latin in the Sarum Use, which is word for word with the English, is very fine: "Deus cui cor patet et omnis voluntas loquitur, et quem nullum latet secretum: purifica per infusionem sancti Spiritus cogitationes cordis nostri: ut perfecte te diligere et digne laudare mereamur. Per Christum." *To whom all hearts are open.* What unfeigned sincerity of desire is breathed out here! The humble soul that has prayed for pardon, now pleads for purity, being conscious of its need of cleansing before it would approach the table of its Lord. *The thoughts of our hearts.* The purposes, desires, volitions, and hidden springs of action in the hidden man. *By the inspiration of thy Holy Spirit.* Who searcheth the heart. Thus is the Holy Ghost invoked, that, by his expulsive presence and power, all sinful desires may be banished from the heart, that *we may perfectly love thee* with undivided affection, the highest, holiest, best, and most glorious God. *And worthily magnify thy name* by holy living, thus setting

forth the power, goodness, and mercy of the Lord, which are the attributes of his nature.

Then shall the Elder say:

We do not presume to come to this thy table, O merciful Lord, trusting in our own righteousness, but in thy manifold and great mercies. **Salisbury and York Uses. Gregory.** We are not worthy so much as to gather up the crumbs under thy table. But thou art the same Lord, whose property is always to have mercy. Grant us, therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his blood, that we may live and grow thereby; and that, being washed through his most precious blood, we may evermore dwell in him, and he in us. *Amen.*

Luke xviii, 13.
Ps. v, 7.
Heb. iv, 14-16.
Gen. xviii, 27.
Luke vii, 6, 7.
John vi, 34.

Then shall the Elder say. Still kneeling, of course. *We do not presume.* This is the prayer of Humble Access. Such is the thought, tone, and atmosphere of this remarkable supplication that no half Christian, half infidel, rationalistic, or latitudinarian spirit which, while rightly eliminating all Roman and semi-Roman doctrines of the sacrament, would go farther and rob this holy institution of its exalted character, can ever eradicate from the consciousness of the Church the conviction, cherished from the beginning, that this Eucharistic service, in which by faith the King of Glory comes in unique relation to those who worthily eat and drink of the ordained

elements, is peculiarly, transcendently sacred beyond any other service of the sanctuary. *Grant us, therefore, . . . so to eat.* The emphatic “so to eat” will not be overlooked. The meaning is that God would grant us the grace of faith to “discern the Lord’s body,” and to appropriate him—that is, his life, character, holiness, and all that makes him as Lord and Savior, the holiest ideal of the sanctified heart—into our poor life and character and spirit, so that he will truly and really be our spiritual food, strength, and life. *Flesh . . . blood.* Bread is bread, wine is wine; but to the eye of faith, which looks through the material and the earthly to the spiritual and the heavenly, these elements, by Christ’s own words, are received figuratively as the body and blood of Christ. The real presence is not in the elements, but in the soul of him who worthily partakes of the elements.

Then the Elder shall offer the Prayer of Consecration, as followeth:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, who of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption; who made there, by his oblation of himself once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world; and did

**Book of
Common
Prayer
by the
Reformers,
H. D. 1549.**

Ps. cxix, 156.
Rom. v, 8.
Acts iii, 18.
Eph. i, 7.
Gal. iii, 13.
Isa. liii, 10.
Heb. vii, 27; ix, 28; x, 10-14, 26.
Acts iv, 12.
1 John ii, 1, 2.

Luke xxii, 19, 20
1 Cor. xi, 23-26,
28.

institute, and in his holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of his precious death until his coming again: hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee, and grant that we, receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine, according to thy Son our Savior Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed body and blood; who, in the same night that he was betrayed, took bread; ⁽¹⁾ and when he had given thanks, he broke it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take, eat; this is my body which is given for you; do this in remembrance of me.

Bucer,
1552.

⁽¹⁾ *Here the Elder may take the plate of bread in his hand.*

Matt. xxvi, 26.
Matt. xiv, 22.
Luke xxii, 19, 20

Likewise after supper he took ⁽²⁾ the cup; and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this; for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you, and for many, for the remission of sins; do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me. *Amen.*

⁽²⁾ *Here he may take the cup in his hand.*

The prayer of consecration. This is so called because the elements which Christ himself ordained to be used, by his selection of them, are now in Christ's own words of institution set apart by the prayers of the Church following the commandment of Christ as the visible emblems of his most precious body and blood. This our Lord did (Matt. xxvi, 26), and St. Paul (1 Cor. x, 16) says: "The cup of blessing which *we bless* (ὃ εὐλογοῦμεν) and this prayer

is, therefore, the central and essential part of the service. *Hear us, O merciful Father!* In the first book of King Edward VI, as we have already shown in the historical division of this work, these words introduced the prayer for the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the elements; but at the instance of the learned Reformer, Bucer, the words following, which he suggested, up to the words, "who in the same night," were substituted for the invocation of the Holy Ghost. *May be partakers of his most precious body and blood.* In a heavenly manner, though not less real on that account; otherwise we do not partake at all. *Who in the same night.* The suffering, agony, and death of the Lord are here kept before the mind. No one in tender love and sympathy with the atoning Jesus, and possessed with a reverent sense of the solemn significance of what he is saying and doing, need be reminded that deliberation, blended gentleness and gravity should characterize the reading of this part of the prayer. A rapid, noisy, undignified shouting or mumbling of this tender and pathetic rehearsal of that melancholy scene in the upper chamber when Jesus, shadowing forth his approaching death, instituted this simple but beautiful and luminous memorial,

is repugnant to Christian feeling and a sin against all propriety. *Took bread.* Unleavened bread, there being no other kind at the Passover. We are not confined, however, for that reason to unleavened bread, for then we would also be confined by parity of reasoning to the specific kind and quality of wine which He used. The Christians of the apostolic days used the bread they brought to the Agapæ. *This is my body.* Our Lord's physical body was present before the eyes of his disciples when he uttered these words, and we may as clearly understand as they did what he meant. Similar words were used by the Jews at the eating of the Passover.

Then shall the Minister receive the Communion in both kinds, and proceed to deliver the same to the other Ministers, if any be present; after which he shall say:

It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty that we should at all times and in all places give thanks unto thee, O Lord, holy Father, Almighty, Everlasting God.

**Salisbury
Use, and
Ancient
Liturgies.**

Therefore with angels and archangels, and with all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify thy glorious name, evermore praising thee, and saying, Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Hosts, heaven and earth are full of thy glory. Glory be to thee, O Lord most high! *Amen.*

Ps. xxix, 2.
Heb. xiii, 15.
Ps. xxxiv, 1.
Eph. v, 20.
Kev. xix, 5, 6.

Then shall the minister receive. That he and other ministers assisting may be free to minister to the people, and thus pass on to the remaining service and conclusion without interruption. *It is very meet.* The thanksgiving in the so-called St. James's Liturgy, used in the Church of Jerusalem, ran thus, "It is truly meet, right, becoming, and our bounden duty." *Therefore.* This is the triumphal hymn of praise into which our thanksgiving naturally runs, part of it caught from the skies, the Trisagion song of the angels encircling the throne of God. (Isa. vi, 1; Rev. iv, 8.) It is not so indicated; but the Preface, "*It is very meet, right,*" etc., should be said by the minister, and then, because the death of Christ has reconciled heaven and earth, because the Church militant is one with the Church triumphant, because we are one with the saints of all ages, all the people should join, with one voice, in this glorious outburst of thanksgiving and praise. This has always been the custom from the remotest times, and there is no good reason why it should not be continued till "we hail him in triumph descending the skies." Our Liturgy affords ample opportunity for the participation of the people in this holy service.

The Minister shall then proceed to administer the Communion to the People in order, kneeling, into their uncovered hands; and when he delivereth the Bread, he shall say:

Matt. xxvi, 26.
Mark xiv, 22.
Luke xxii, 19.
1 Cor. xi, 24.

The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for *thee*, preserve *thy soul* and *body* unto everlasting life. Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for *thee*; and feed on him in *thy heart* by faith, with thanksgiving.

III
Liturgies.

And the Minister that delivereth the Cup shall say:

Matt. xxvi, 28.
Mark xiv, 24.
Luke xxii, 20.
1 Cor. xi, 24.

The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for *thee*, preserve *thy soul* and *body* unto everlasting life. Drink this in remembrance that Christ's blood was shed for *thee*, and be thankful.

[If the Consecrated bread or wine will be all spent before all have communed, the Elder may Consecrate more by repeating the Prayer of Consecration.]

[When all have communed, the Minister shall return to the Lord's table and place upon it what remaineth of the Consecrated elements, covering the same with a fair linen cloth.]

Thee . *thy*. These pronouns, being in italics, indicate not emphasis, but that the plural form may be used to all kneeling at the same time at the railing; therefore the minister, not having an assistant, may take the bread in one hand and the cup in the other, and, presenting them to the people, repeat the words, "The body of our Lord," "The blood of our Lord," and then deliver the elements in succession to each communicant without further speaking.

Then shall the Elder say the Lord's Prayer; the People kneeling, and repeating after him every petition:

Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread; and forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us: and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: for thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever. *Amen.*

After which shall be said as followeth:

O Lord our Heavenly Father, we thy humble servants desire thy Fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; most humbly beseeching thee to grant, that, by the merits and death of thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we and thy whole Church may obtain forgiveness of our sins, and all other benefits of his passion. 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; humbly beseeching thee that all we who are partakers of this Holy Communion may be filled with thy grace and heavenly benediction. And although we be unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto thee any sacrifice, yet we beseech thee to accept this our bounden duty and service; not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offenses, through Jesus Christ our Lord; by whom, and with whom, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honor and glory be unto thee, O Father Almighty, world without end. *Amen.*

Ps. i, 14, 23;
 cxvi, 17.
 1 Pet. ii, 5.
 Heb. xiii, 15.
 Eph. vi, 18.
 Heb. ix, 22.
 Eph. i, 7; v,
 25-27.
 1 Cor. i, 30.
 Rom. viii, 32.
 Prov. xxiii, 26.
 Rom. xii, 1.
 1 Cor. vi, 20.
 Psa. lxxv, 4.
 1 Cor. x, 16.
 Eph. i, 3.
 Luke xv, 18, 19.
 Isa. vi, 5.
 2 Cor. viii, 13.
 Ps. xix, 14;
 cvii, 22.
 Luke xvii, 10.
 2 Chron. xxx,
 18, 19.
 Rom. v, 8, 9.
 Eph. ii, 18.
 Rom. xvi, 17.

**Salisbury
 Use.**

Shall be said. By whom? The custom has been for the minister to offer this prayer of thanksgiving; but there is nothing to prevent all the people from repeating it with him, it being also a prayer of personal consecration.

Then shall be said or sung:

Glory be to God on high, and on earth peace,
good will toward men! We praise thee, we bless thee,
we worship thee, we glorify thee, we give
thanks to thee for thy great glory, O ^{Greek} Liturgies.
Lord God, heavenly King, God the Father Almighty!

O Lord, the only begotten Son Jesus Christ: O
Lord God, Lamb of God, Son of the Father, that
takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon
us. Thou that takest away the sins of the world,
have mercy upon us. Thou that takest away the
sins of the world, receive our prayer. Thou that sit-
test at the right hand of God the Father, have mercy
upon us. For thou only art holy; thou only art the
Lord; thou only, O Christ, with the Holy Ghost, art
most high in the glory of God the Father. *Amen.*

*then the Elder, if he see it expedient, may put up an
extemporary Prayer; and afterward shall let the
People depart with this Blessing:*

The peace of God, which passeth all understand-
ing, keep your hearts and minds in the knowledge
and love of God, and of his Son Jesus ^{Salisbury}
Christ our Lord: and the blessing of God ^{Use.}
Almighty, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost,
be among you, and remain with you always. *Amen.*

Luke ii, 14.
Matt. xxi, 9.
1 Chron. xxix,
13.
Ps. lxxxvii, 9.
Rev. xi, 17.
John xiii, 13.
Rev. v, 12-14.
Heb. i, 3.
1 Tim. vi, 15.
Rom. ix, 5.
Eph. ii, 18.
Rev. xv, 34.

Deut. xxi, 5.
Heb. vii, 7.
Phil. iv, 6, 7.
2 Thess. iii, 5.
Numb. vi, 23-26.
Ps. cxxxiv, 3.
Eph. i, 3.
2 Cor. xiii, 14.

Then shall be said or sung. If said, then it should be said by all; for if sung, it would be, or should be, sung by all. But it is more in harmony with the first communion service to sing the "Gloria in Excelsis," than to say it, for we read in Matthew that "when they had sung a hymn they went out," thus concluding the events of that hour. No Liturgy in the world comes to a more solemn or majestic conclusion. All the grandeur and magnificence of language is put into it; the sacred fire of ecstatic love, adoration, thanksgiving, and praise glows in every ascription of honor and glory, and it is most fitting that all who have partaken of this holy institution should sing their gratitude in this peerless hymn of the Universal Church.

The benediction given should be invariably used. It is better than any extemporized form.

N. B.—If the Elder be straitened for time in the usual administration of the Holy Communion, he may omit any part of the service except the Invitation, the Confession, and the Prayer of Consecration; and in its administration to the sick he may omit any part of the service except the Confession, the Prayer of Consecration, and the usual sentences in delivering the Bread and Wine, closing with the Lord's Prayer, *extempore* supplication, and the Benediction.

Chapter XIII

MATRIMONY

Introductory Note

THE foundation-stone of Church and State is the Family. The highest relation which Divine Revelation makes known between God and man, between God and his Church, is set forth under the image of marriage. (Eph. v, 23.) The Family is the oldest and the most important of human institutions. It is ordained of God. Christ honored it by becoming a member of a family; he honored marriage by his presence at the marriage-feast at Cana; his apostles made the family the nursery of the Church; and from the beginning Christianity has sanctified the marriage of believers. So early as the close of the first century, Ignatius in his Epistle to Polycarp exhorts that notice of intended marriage be made to the bishop: "But it becomes both men and women who marry, to form their union with the approval of the bishop, that their marriage may be according to God and not after their own lust. Let all things be done to the honor of God." And even Tertullian, in the midst of all his misgivings concerning marriage, says: "Whence are we to find words enough fully to tell the happiness of that marriage which the Church cements [*quod ecclesia conciliat*] and the oblation confirms, and the benediction signs and seals, which the angels carry back the news of, which the Father holds for ratified? For even on earth, children do not rightly and lawfully wed with-

out their father's consent." (Ep. Ad. Uxor.) Thus has Christianity sanctified every honorable relation of our earthly life.

The solemnization, then, of marriage is a religious service, and levity or lightness of manner of any description upon the part of the minister should receive severe rebuke. But worthy of all censure and condemnation is he who degrades his holy office and the solemn rite of matrimony—so important to the Church, to the kingdom of God, and to the morals and dignity of the State—who performs the ceremony in places and amid circumstances repugnant to the moral sense. Such ministry is condemned by the moral instinct of all men, and should not be tolerated in the Church of God. In this, as in all other offices, the minister should present a grave and dignified demeanor, as is fitting the sacredness of the service in which he is engaged; not, however, with any show of austerity or of self-satisfied importance; for dignity is compatible with humility, and gravity is most weighty when mixed with kindness of tone and geniality of spirit.

¶ 447. Form for the Solemnization of Matrimony.

[The parts in brackets throughout may be used or not at discretion.]

At the day and time appointed for the Solemnization of Matrimony, the persons to be married—having been qualified according to law—standing together, the man on the right hand and the woman on the left, the Minister shall say:

DEARLY BELOVED, we are gathered together here in the sight of God, and in the presence of these

Acts x, 23.
 Ps. lxxxix, 5, 7.
 Ruth iv, 9, 10.
 Heb. xiii, 4.
 Gen. ii, 18, 21-24.
 Eph. v, 22-33.
 Matt. xix, 4, 5.
 John ii, 1-3,
 7-11.
 Gen. vi, 1-5.
 1 Cor. vii, 2.
 1 Kings xi, 1-4.
 Prov. xix, 4.

witnesses, to join together this man and this woman in holy Matrimony; which is an honorable estate, instituted of God in the time of man's innocency, signifying unto us the mystical union that exists between Christ and his Church; which holy estate Christ adorned and beautified with his presence, and first miracle that he wrought, in Cana of Galilee, and is commended of Saint Paul to be honorable among all men; and therefore is not by any to be entered into unadvisedly, but reverently, discreetly, and in the fear of God.

**Salisbury
Use.**

Into which holy estate these two persons present come now to be joined. Therefore if any can show just cause why they may not lawfully be joined together, let him now speak, or else hereafter forever hold his peace.

**Salisbury
and
York Uses.**

Qualified according to law. Of the State in which the marriage is solemnized, and of this the minister must be assured by license. *Right hand left hand.* This was added in 1661. *Dearly beloved.* From the earliest period of the Christian Church marriage has been solemnized by religious rites. For though no form for the solemnization is to be found in ancient Liturgies, yet it is evident from the writings of those primitive times that for the first three hundred years Christian marriages were performed by Christian ministers. *We are gathered together here.* The Church is no party to secret deeds, and this is

a statement openly made at the beginning of what is contemplated, so that all might know the import of the service. *Just cause . . . lawfully.* The appeal is to all present, if there is any legal reason why the ceremony should not proceed. If a reason is alleged, it must be one which in the courts would nullify the marriage. A frivolous reason is an injustice to the parties desiring to be married, and should not be recognized by the minister. *Hold his peace.* In public and in private.

[And also speaking unto the persons that are to be married, the Minister shall say:

I require and charge you both, that if either of you know any impediment why you may not be lawfully joined together in Matrimony, **York Use.** you do now confess it: for be ye well assured, that so many as are coupled together otherwise than God's Word doth allow, are not joined together by God, neither is their Matrimony lawful.]

If no impediment be alleged, then shall the Minister say unto the man:

M., wilt thou have this woman to be thy wedded wife, to live together after God's ordinance in the holy estate of Matrimony? Wilt thou **York Use.** *love her, comfort her, honor and keep her, in sickness and in health; and forsaking all other, keep thee only unto her, so long as ye both shall live?*

Matt. xix, 4-6.
Eph. v, 28, 29.
1 Pet. iii, 7.
Eccl. ix, 9.
Mal. ii, 15, 16.
1 Cor. vii, 3-5,
10.

Know any impediment. This final appeal to the consciences of both the man and the woman is evidence of the great care the Church exercises in preventing improper marriages. Among the impediments are degrees of consanguinity forbidden by the law of God, the lack of parental consent in the case of minors, the having a divorced wife or husband living, according to the law of the Church in paragraph 39 of the Discipline, and such natural disabilities as prevent conjugal duties. *Lawful.* In ecclesiastical, civil, and all other law, fraud vitiates all contracts.

The man shall answer,

I will.

Then shall the Minister say unto the Woman,

Gen. xxiv, 58;
ii, 18.

Prov. xxxi, 11,
12.

Eph. v, 22, 24,
33.

Tit. ii, 4, 5.
1 Cor. vii, 39.

N., wilt thou have this man to be thy wedded husband, to live together after God's ordinance in the holy estate of Matrimony? Wilt thou love, honor, and keep him, in sickness and in health; and forsaking all other, keep thee only unto him, so long as ye both shall live? York Use.

The Woman shall answer,

I will.

The above interrogatories concerning mutual consent are of utmost importance.

Forced marriages are abhorrent to reason and religion and the best interests of society. Opportunity, therefore, is here given before the irrevocable pledge is given for the parties to withdraw. *M.* The letter *N* was anciently used as an abbreviation of *Nomen*, *name* and “*name or names*” was expressed by double *n*, thus “*n. vel n.*”=*nn*; and this became corrupted into *M*. The man should be called by his Christian name and the woman by hers.

[Then the Minister shall cause the Man with his right hand to take the Woman by her right hand, and to say after him as followeth:

I, *M.*, take thee, *N.*, to be my wedded wife, to have and to hold, from this day forward, for better,
 for worse, for richer, for poorer, in sickness and in health, to love and to cherish, till death us do part, according to God’s holy ordinance; and thereto I plight thee my faith.

Matt. xix, 8.
 Mark x, 2, 5-8,
 11, 12.

York Use.

Then shall they loose their hands, and the Woman, with her right hand taking the Man by his right hand, shall likewise say after the Minister:

I, *N.*, take thee, *M.*, to be my wedded husband, to have and to hold, from this day forward, for better,
 for worse, for richer, for poorer, in sickness and in health, to love and to cherish, till death us do part, according to God’s holy ordinance; and thereto I plight thee my faith.]

Rom. vii, 2, 3.

York Use.

No stronger declarations of fidelity can be made. They comprehend all that pure and honest love includes, and exclude all that would mar its peace or divide its loyalty to the one pledged. Thus polygamy and concubinage are forever condemned by the vows of Christian marriage.

Then shall the Minister pray thus:

Phil. iv, 6.
 Rev. iv, 11.
 Job vii, 20.
 1 Pet. v, 10.
 Gen. i, 28.
 2 Sam. vii, 29.
 Gen. xxiv, 67.
 Eccl. v, 4.
 Deut. xxiii, 21,
 23.
 Col. iii, 18, 19.
 Luke i, 5, 6.
 Ps. cxix, 165.

O Eternal God, Creator and Preserver of all mankind, Giver of all spiritual grace, the Author of everlasting life: send thy blessing upon these thy servants, this man and this woman, whom we bless in thy name; that as Isaac and Rebecca lived faithfully together, so these persons may surely perform and keep the vow and covenant between them made, and may ever remain in perfect love and peace together, and live according to thy laws, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

**Salisbury
Use.**

[If the parties desire it, the Man shall here hand a Ring to the Minister, who shall return it to him, and direct him to place it on the third finger of the Woman's left hand. And the Man shall say to the Woman, repeating after the Minister:

With this ring I thee wed, and with my worldly goods I thee endow, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. *Amen.*]

**York Use.
Herrman's
Consult.**

The minister pray thus. Standing. The prayer is one of blessing upon the persons

about to be married, and for Divine grace to keep the pledges made by both of unceasing love and loyalty, with beautiful allusion to the ideal love of Isaac and Rebecca, favored of heaven. *Ring.* The use of the wedding-ring is of ancient date. We find it among the Jews and the Romans. (Juvenal, Sat. VI, 27.) *Third finger.* Anciently the ring was placed upon the thumb in the name of the Father, then on the next in the name of the Son, on the next in the name of the Holy Ghost, and then on the fourth at the word *Amen.* *In the name of the Father.* In the name of God each weds the other.

Then shall the Minister join their right hands together, and say,

Forasmuch as *M.* and *N.* have consented together in holy wedlock, and have witnessed the same before
Ferrman's God and this company, and thereto have
Consult. pledged their faith either to other, and have declared the same by joining of hands; I pronounce that they are husband and wife together, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Those whom God hath joined together, let no man put asunder. *Amen.*

Mal. ii, 14-16.
 Gen. xxiv, 58,
 67.
 Ruth iv, 9, 10.
 Matt. xviii, 18.
 Col. iii, 17.
 Matt. xix, 6.

Minister join. As the minister of God who joins these hearts in holy matrimony, the minister performs the symbolical act of joining

their right hands. . . . *I pronounce.* By the authority of God. *Husband and wife together.* Excluding all other from each, thus united by pledges, prayer, and the *name of God.*

And the Minister shall add this blessing :

2 Cor. xiii, 14.
Num. vi. 24-26.
Ps. cxxxiv, 3;
cxix, 58, 132.
Eph. i, 3; iii, 14,
16-19.
1 Pet. iii, 7.
Rom. vi, 22.

God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, bless, preserve, and keep you; the Lord mercifully with his favor look upon you, and so fill you with all spiritual benediction and grace that ye may so live together in this life that in the world to come ye may have life everlasting.
Amen.

Salisbury
Use.

Add this blessing. The act of blessing is usually given with uplifted and extended hand. This form was substituted in 1552 for the almost identical form in the book of 1549.

Then shall the Minister offer the following Prayer :

Matt. xxii 31,
32.
Gen. xxviii, 3, 4.
Luke viii, 11, 15.
2 Tim. iii, 16, 17.
James i, 22;
ii, 8.
Deut. xxvi, 15.
Gen. xvii, 16;
xxviii, 3, 4.
Ps. cxii, 1-3;
xxiv, 3-5.
John xv, 4.
1 John ii, 17.

O God of Abraham, God of Isaac, God of Jacob, bless this man and this woman, and sow the seed of eternal life in their hearts, that whatsoever in thy holy word they shall profitably learn, they may indeed fulfill the same. Look, O Lord, mercifully on them from heaven, and bless them: as thou didst send thy blessings upon Abraham and Sarah to their great comfort, so vouchsafe to send thy blessings upon this man and this woman, that they, obeying thy will, and always being in safety under thy protection, may abide in thy love unto their lives' end, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Salisbury
Use.

Almighty God, who at the beginning didst create our first parents, Adam and Eve, and didst sanctify and join them together in marriage, pour upon these persons the riches of thy grace, sanctify and bless them, that they may please thee both in body and soul, and live together in holy love unto their lives' end. *Amen.*

Then shall the minister offer. This prayer is a union of two in the Salisbury Rite. *Deus Abraham*, etc., and *Omnipotens misericors Deus*, etc.

Here the Minister may use extemporary Prayer.

Then the Minister shall repeat the Lord's Prayer:

Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread: and forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us: and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: for thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever. *Amen.*

The minister may use extemporary prayer. But unless there is special reason for doing so, he will do wisely should he refrain and close the service, he alone repeating the Lord's Prayer.

Chapter XIV

BURIAL OF THE DEAD

[We will on no account whatever make a charge for burying the dead.]

¶ 448. Form for the Burial of the Dead.

The Minister, going before the corpse, shall say,

I am the resurrection, and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die. (John xi, 25, 26.)

**Salisbury
Use.**

I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth: and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God: whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another. (Job xix, 25-27.)

We brought nothing into this world, and it is certain we can carry nothing out. The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord. (1 Tim. vi, 7; Job i, 21.)

The minister going before, leading the procession up the aisle of the church, shall say the words following until the "chancel" rails are reached, where the minister leaves the procession and enters the pulpit. If services are held in the house, these verses will be omitted.

Nor are they used at the burial ground. They begin the whole service, presumably, at the church, where we are baptized, where we are married, where we worship, and from whence our bodies are taken to the grave. The remains of those who have died from very contagious diseases should never be taken to the church, and on all occasions the building should be well ventilated.

In the House or Church may be read one or both of the following Psalms, or some other suitable portion of the Holy Scriptures.

Psalm xxxix:

I said, I will take heed to my ways, that I sin not with my tongue: I will keep my mouth with a bridle, while the wicked is before me. I was dumb with silence, I held my peace, even from good; and my sorrow was stirred. My heart was hot within me; while I was musing the fire burned: then spake I with my tongue, Lord, make me to know mine end, and the measure of my days, what it is; that I may know how frail I am. Behold, thou hast made my days as a handbreadth; and mine age is as nothing before thee: verily every man at his best state is altogether vanity. Surely every man walketh in a vain show: surely they are disquieted in vain: he heapeth up riches, and knoweth not who shall gather them. And now, Lord, what wait I for? my hope is in thee. Deliver me from all my transgressions: make me not the reproach of the foolish. I was

dumb, I opened not my mouth; because thou didst it. Remove thy stroke away from me; I am consumed by the blow of thine hand. When thou with rebukes dost correct man for iniquity, thou makest his beauty to consume away like a moth: surely every man is vanity. Hear my prayer, O Lord, and give ear unto my cry; hold not thy peace at my tears: for I am a stranger with thee, and a sojourner, as all my fathers were. O spare me, that I may recover strength, before I go hence, and be no more.

Then may follow the reading of the Epistle, as follows:

I Corinthians xv, 41-58:

There is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars; for one star differeth from another star in glory. So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption: it is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power: it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body. And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit. Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterward that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy: and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly. Now

this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood can not inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption. Behold, I show you a mystery; We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ. Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labor is not in vain in the Lord.

*At the grave, when the Corpse is laid in the Earth,
the Minister shall say,*

Man that is born of a woman hath but a short
Salisbury time to live, and is full of misery. He
Use. cometh up, and is cut down like a flower:
In the Dirge. he fleeth as it were a shadow, and never continueth
in one stay.

Job xiv, 1, 2.
Ps. ciii, 15, 16.
1 Chron. xxix,
15.

In the midst of life we are in death: of whom
may we seek for succor, but of thee, O Lord, who
for our sins art justly displeas'd?

Prov. xxvii, 1.
James iv, 14.
2 Kings xx, 1-3.

Exod. xv, 11.
Ps. lxxxix, 6-8.
Isa. xxxiii, 14.

Ps. xxxviii, 9.
1 Pet. iii, 12.
Joel ii, 17.
Ps. cxvi, 3, 4;
xxiii, 4.
Acts vii, 59, 60.

Yet, O Lord God most holy, O Lord most mighty, O holy and most merciful Savior, deliver us not into the bitter pains of eternal death.

Thou knowest, Lord, the secrets of our hearts; shut not thy merciful ears to our prayers, but spare us, Lord most holy; O God most mighty, O holy and merciful Savior, thou most worthy Judge eternal, suffer us not at our last hour for any pains of death to fall from thee.

At the grave, when the corpse is laid in the earth. That is, when the coffin is lowered into the grave and is ready to be covered. *In the midst of life we are in death.* This noble prose poem was originally an anthem, and is often so used now. Its authorship is attributed to Notker, a religious poet, of St. Gall, in Switzerland, in the latter part of the ninth century. It was used during the Middle Ages on all occasions of gloom, and even armies adopted it as their battle-song. Luther composed a fine hymn on the same line of thought, the last part of which suggested the latter part of this anthem. Luther's hymn closed "O holy Lord God, O holy mighty God, O holy merciful Savior, thou God eternal, suffer us not to fall from the consolation of true faith." Mr. Blunt in his notes remarks that, "When sung to such strains as befit its beautiful words, this anthem has a solemn magnificence, and at the same

time a wailing prayerfulness which makes it unsurpassable by any analogous portion of any Ritual whatever.”

Then, while the Earth shall be cast upon the Body by some one standing by, the Minister shall say,

Forasmuch as it hath pleased Almighty God, in his wise providence, to take out of the world the soul of the departed, we therefore commit *his* body to the ground, earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust; looking for the general resurrection in the last day, and the life of the world to come, through our Lord Jesus Christ; at whose second coming in glorious majesty to judge the world, the earth and the sea shall give up their dead; and the corruptible bodies of those who sleep in him shall be changed and made like unto his own glorious body; according to the mighty working whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself.

**Salisbury
Use, and
Herrman's
Consult.**

1 Sam. ii, 6.
Eccl. viii, 12;
xii, 7.
Gen. iii, 19;
xviii, 27.
Acts xxiv, 15.
John xi, 25.
Phil. iii, 20, 21.
John vi, 39, 40.
1 John iii, 2.

Then while the earth shall be cast upon the body. This does not mean that while the minister is speaking some one shall be casting earth into the grave. Such mode would be unseemly, producing confusion. But it signifies that while the minister repeats the words, “*earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust,*” some one standing by shall throw in a handful of earth. The act is symbolic, and is

done at the mention of "earth," "ashes," and "dust."

Then shall be said :

I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Write, From henceforth blessed are the dead who die in the Lord: Even so, saith the Spirit; for they rest from their labors.

Then shall the Minister say :

Lord, have mercy upon us.

Christ, have mercy upon us.

Lord, have mercy upon us.

Then shall be said. By the assistant, or the minister if no assistant is present. The Church passes no judgment on those whom she thus buries. But every thinking Christian will see that such prayers as the preceding one, and such comforting promises as are here repeated, can not be used at the funerals of people of known wicked lives. None but a Christian is entitled to this service, and while in all charity the service may be said even over those who may not have lived as shining lights, yet it would be nothing less than mockery to use it over everybody. *Then shall the minister say.* The lines in italics should be said by the congregation in audible voice, responding to the minister.

Then the Minister may offer this Prayer :

Almighty God, with whom do live the spirits of those who depart hence in the Lord, and with whom the souls of the faithful, after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, are in joy and felicity: we give thee hearty thanks for the good examples of all those thy servants, who having finished their course in faith, do now rest from their labors. And we beseech thee, that we, with all those who are departed in the true faith of thy holy name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in thy eternal and everlasting glory, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

**Salisbury
Use.**

**Prayer-
book,
1549 H. D.**

Exod. iii, 6.
Luke xx, 38;
xxiii, 43; xvi,
22.
2 Cor. v, 4.
Ps. xvii, 15;
xvi, 11.
Job i, 21.
Isa. lvii, 1, 2.
Rev. vi, 9-11.
Matt. xxiv, 31;
vi, 10.
Rom. ix, 28.
Rev. xxii, 20.
Heb. xi, 13, 39,
40.
2 Tim. iv, 8.
Rev. vii, 14-17;
xi, 15.

The minister may. If the life of the departed would to any degree justify it, the prayer should always be said. It is most comforting after such melancholy services, the bright rift in a dark cloud. *With whom do live the spirits.* Even at the mouth of the remorseless grave the Church of God proclaims the doctrine of immortality. *Are in joy and felicity.* All false teachings concerning purgatory, soul sleeping, or such ideas as transmigration or reincarnation, are utterly rejected as unbecoming the noble sanity of the revelation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. *We with all those.* Parted here, but reunited in the eternal and everlasting glory. The Church ever

points to the coming day. Undying faith in a blessed future is her word of holy comfort to her bereaved children, who mourn in the present, and this is the inspiration for those who are bowed down. *Everlasting glory.* Triumphant contrast to the present life of uncertainty and sorrow.

The Collect.

1 Pet. i, 3, 4.
 John xi, 25, 26.
 John v, 21, 24,
 26; viii, 51.
 1 Thess. iv, 13,
 14.
 Job xix, 25-27.
 Eph. ii, 1-5.
 1 Pet. ii, 24.
 Phil. iii, 8-11.
 Isa. lvii, 1, 2.
 John xi, 24.
 2 Tim. i, 18.
 2 Cor. v, 9.
 Rev. xiv, 13.
 John xiv, 2, 3.
 Matt. xxv, 24.
 1 Pet. i, 3-5.
 Rom. v, 21.

O Merciful God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the resurrection and the life; in whom whosoever believeth shall live, though he die, and whosoever liveth and believeth in him shall not die eternally: we meekly beseech thee, O Father, to raise us from the death of sin unto the life of righteousness; that when we shall depart this life we may rest in Him; and at the general resurrection on the last day may be found acceptable in thy sight, and receive that blessing which thy well-beloved Son shall then pronounce to all that love and fear thee, saying, Come, ye blessed children of my Father, receive the kingdom prepared for you from the beginning of the world. Grant this, we beseech thee, O Merciful Father, through Jesus Christ our Mediator and Redeemer. *Amen.*

Prayer-
 book,
 1549 H. D.

The Collect. This beautiful, final plea at the grave as we turn away to take up again life's duties belongs, like the prayer preceding it, to the Revision in A. D. 1552. It is a profession of faith and a prayer for grace that all

the saints of the Lord may be preserved blameless, and have at last an abundant entrance into the eternal kingdom. The body was carried to the church with open declaration of belief in immortality through Jesus Christ; it is laid in the grave with firm hope of resurrection, and it is left in its rest with the prayers of the living, that they, too, may be worthy of the life of joy and felicity in the kingdom of God. The services fitly close with our Lord's own words, and the Apostolic Benediction breathing the peace of the Holy Spirit.

Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread: and forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us: and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: for thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever. *Amen.*

The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, be with us all evermore. *Amen.*

Chapter XV

CONSECRATIONS AND ORDINATIONS

Introductory Note

ORDINATION is an act by which a Church confers authority upon its chosen officers to minister the rites of religion. Christ instituted the Christian Ministry (Mark iii, 14), and the New Testament is authority for ordination. Thus, in Acts xiv, 21-23, recording the organization of Churches at Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch, it is said Paul and Barnabas "ordained elders in every Church," and in accordance with this practice the Apostle Paul in his Epistle to Titus (i, 5) writes: "For this cause I left thee in Crete that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I appointed [directed] thee." In Acts vi, 1-7, is the account of the appointment of deacons to serve in the Church at Jerusalem; and other ordinations are mentioned in Acts xiii, 1-4; 1 Tim. iv, 14; v, 22; 2 Tim. i, 6. Nowhere is there any record or intimation that any one was ever appointed to a ministerial office in the Church without ordination.

The Form of ordination was the imposition of hands with prayer, a mode employed in the synagogue, and derived probably from Exodus xxix, Leviticus viii, and other passages. Thus in the ordination of the deacons at Jerusalem (Acts vi, 1-7), the first ordination on record and which served

as a model for all subsequent ordinations in the Apostolic Church, we read that the multitude chose certain holy men "whom they set before the apostles; and when they had prayed, they laid their hands upon them." So also in the consecration of Paul and Barnabas to special work. "The Holy Ghost said, Separate me [*ἀφορίσατε, set apart; ἀφορισμός, a setting apart*—used by Greek writers and John Wesley for the Latin *ordinare, ordinatio*] Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they [the ministers at Antioch] had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away." Paul exhorts Timothy (1 Tim. iv, 14) not to neglect the gift given him "with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery." (See also 2 Tim. i, 6.) And in the First Epistle v, 22, he exhorts him to "lay hands suddenly on no man." The act is symbolic of the imparting of the Holy Ghost, which is prayed for, and is the sacred form of blessing; thus the last act of the Divine Lord for his disciples: "And he led them out as far as to Bethany, and he lifted up his hands, and blessed them, and it came to pass, while he blessed them, he was parted from them and carried up into heaven." (Luke xxiv, 50, 51.)

The effect of ordination is not the impartation of any Divine power or qualification for any office in the Church of God. Priestly power, such as is claimed by the Roman and Greek Churches and a certain school in the Anglican Church, is wholly unknown to the New Testament and the age immediately succeeding the apostles. God alone gives power. He alone gives the Holy Ghost. The Church can give,

and does give, that only which she possesses—the authority to use the gifts and qualifications of the candidate, already bestowed by the grace of God, in the service of God. No one has any right to execute the office of a minister in the Church of God without this authority. Should he do so, he is a violator of law, a contemner of apostolic order and discipline, a usurper, one who climbs into the fold “some other way, and the same is a thief and a robber.”

Of the various kinds of ministers in the New Testament it is not necessary to speak, but of those only which belong to the settled, organized, permanent form of the ministry. Of these we meet with the names of deacons, presbyters, and bishops. Deacons were distinct from presbyters or elders in the functions of their office, and were, therefore, a separate and lower order from that of presbyters, to whom was committed the whole care of the Church. Bishops and presbyters were not distinct orders by any Divine command or by the granting of any superior power. In the New Testament they are one and the same order. On this subject it will be well to quote the high Anglican authority, Riddle, who, in his standard work, “A Manual of Christian Antiquities,” says: “Bishop and presbyters were not at first distinct orders, but the bishop was only the chief in a body of presbyters. And the same titles of distinction were applied to both, *presidents*. When the first place was assigned to the bishops, they were only *primi inter pares*—chief among equals. It is, however, correct to say that the order [*i. e.*, degree, office] of bishop is different from that of a presbyter; if we mean by this only

that a bishop is a presbyter invested by the Church with superior rank and authority, and intrusted with the discharge of duties appropriated by the same authority to the episcopal office. The original commission, divinely given to all presbyters, whether bishops or others, is alike; but from a very early period of the Church, probably ever since the beginning of the second century, the Church has judged it right and expedient to adopt a regular and permanent system of superintendency and subordination among her ministers, corresponding, in some respects, to the state of things in Crete when Titus resided in that island, possessed of a delegated authority over the other elders of the Church, or in Ephesus, where Timothy was charged with a similar (temporary) superintendence." And this learned authority, after citing various writers from Jerome down, concludes: "Upon the whole, then, it appears that the order [or office] of a bishop is above that of a priest [elder]; not by any authority of Scripture, but only by the custom of the Church, or by virtue of an ecclesiastical arrangement." (Second Edition, p. 242.)

The historical basis of our ministry is the ordination of our first bishop, Thomas Coke, by Wesley. Yielding to the providential call, and following the example of the Primitive Church at Alexandria, whose presbyters, when deprived of a bishop, chose one from among themselves and ordained him to that office, John Wesley "set apart" Thomas Coke, a presbyter of the Church of England, to the office of a superintendent over the Church in America, and commissioned him to ordain Francis Asbury for

the same episcopal office. He also sent a Liturgy, containing forms for ordaining superintendents, elders, and deacons. The authoritative statement on this subject is the historical account of the "Origin of the Methodist Episcopal Church," contained in the Discipline of 1789 and often reprinted:

"Section 4.—On the Constituting of Bishops and their Duty.

"Ques. 1. What is the proper origin of the episcopal authority in our Church?

"Ans. In the year 1784 the Rev. John Wesley, who, under God, has been the father of the great revival of religion now extending over the earth by the means of the Methodists, determined, at the intercession of multitudes of his spiritual children on this continent, to ordain ministers for America, and for this purpose sent over three regularly-ordained clergy; but preferring the episcopal mode of Church government to any other, he solemnly set apart, by the imposition of hands and prayer, one of them—namely, Thomas Coke, Doctor of Civil Law, late of Jesus College in the University of Oxford—for the episcopal office, and having delivered to him letters of episcopal orders, commissioned and directed him to set apart Francis Asbury, then general assistant of the Methodist Society in America, for the same episcopal office, by prayer and the imposition of the hands of the said Thomas Coke, other regularly-ordained ministers assisting in the sacred ceremony. At which time the General Conference held at Baltimore did unanimously receive the said Thomas Coke and Francis Asbury as their bishops, being

fully satisfied of the validity of their episcopal ordination."

Thus spoke the fathers five years after the organization of the Church concerning the historical basis of our ministry—ordination.

The Form of Consecrating Bishops.

[This service is not to be understood as an ordination to a higher Order in the Christian Ministry, beyond and above that of Elders or Presbyters, but as a solemn and fitting Consecration for the special and most sacred duties of Superintendency in the Church.]

The Collect.

Almighty God, who by thy Son Jesus Christ didst give to thy holy Apostles, Elders, and Evangelists many excellent gifts, and didst charge them to feed thy flock: give grace, we beseech thee, to all the Ministers and Pastors of thy Church, that they may diligently preach thy word and duly administer the godly discipline thereof; and grant to the people that they may obediently follow the same, that all may receive the crown of everlasting glory, through Jesus Christ our Lord.
Amen.

John xx, 21, 22.
Matt. x, 1, 8.
Acts ii, 4.
John xxi, 15, 16.
Acts xx, 28.
Eph. vi, 18-20.
1 Cor. xii, 7-10;
xiv, 33, 40.
2 Tim. iv, 1-8.
Heb. xiii, 7, 17.
2 Thess. i, 11, 12.
Rev. ii, 10.

This service. The note inclosed in brackets was inserted in 1884. The necessity for it, in the light of our history and of the teachings of the New Testament, and the practice of the Church in its formative period, does not fully appear. The opinion was never held in Methodism that bishops were of a higher order by Divine right or expressed command, be-

yond that of prebyters or elders, nor on the other hand did any one ever imagine that a presbyter or elder, as such, was a bishop. The Episcopate is an office to which a presbyter is elected and ordained, as a presbyter is ordained to his office, and so far as ordination makes a distinction between offices in the powers, authority, and responsibility belonging to them, the Episcopate is an order. (See Emory, "Defense of Our Fathers.") If the ordination of a deacon puts one in the order of deacons, and the second ordination puts him in the order of elders or presbyters, where does the third ordination place him? It makes no difference whether the word "consecrate" is used instead of "ordain," for both words have been used interchangeably for ages; nor does it make any difference whether we say "office" or "order," for these terms are also interchangeable. There is no office in the ministry analogous to the episcopal office. It is *sui generis*, and no ingenuity of phrase can escape the simple truth that Episcopacy is an order. We do not ordain or consecrate an elder to the office of presiding elder, nor other ministers to other offices of ecclesiastical administration, for the significant and conclusive reason that however flexible words and

phrases may be in the hands of controversialists, the Church has never felt that such solemn services as are used in ordaining to the episcopal office could be justified by any sort of reasoning for inducting mere officials into temporary offices. The instinct of the Church, which is often followed regardless of consistency, clearly apprehends that the office of Episcopacy is in no sense or degree such an office as are other offices in the Christian ministry. It differs from them in function, authority, and purpose. And yet it must not be understood that Episcopacy is an order by Divine right or express command. It is an order only by ecclesiastical right and custom, and for the well-being, not the essential being, of the Church.

The Collect. This short prayer, which appropriately begins the service by invoking special grace for special purposes, is taken from the Book of Common Prayer, with few changes and the insertion of the clause relating to administration of discipline. There must be governors where there is society, and the Church can not exist without rulers. Hence prayer is made that those who govern in the Church of God may have *grace to preach Thy Word*, by which we are instructed in all

duties. *And duly administer.* That is, in proper spirit, as fellow-mortals also erring, and with the purpose of reforming rather than punishing. *The godly discipline thereof* As may be learned by examples of the apostles in the New Testament, reproving, exhorting, excluding. *Grant to the people.* Special grace is also needed by the laity, that for the glory of God in the holy character of the Church and for the sake of their own souls they may, by subduing all vain suggestions of carnal pride, submit themselves to the godly admonition of faithful pastors, who, not as men, but as ministers of Christ, watch over the flock committed to their care, and for which they must give an account.

Then shall be read by one of the Elders,

The Epistle. Acts xx, 17-35.

From Miletus Paul sent to Ephesus, and called the elders of the Church. And when they were come to him, he said unto them, Ye know, from the first day that I came to Asia, after what manner I have been with you at all seasons, serving the Lord with all humility of mind, and with many tears, and temptations, which befell me by the lying in wait of the Jews: and how I kept back nothing that was profitable unto you, but have showed you, and have taught you publicly, and from house to house, tes-

tifying both to the Jews, and also to the Greeks, repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ. And now, behold, I go bound in the spirit unto Jerusalem, not knowing the things that shall befall me there: save that the Holy Ghost witnesseth in every city, saying that bonds and afflictions abide me. But none of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy, and the ministry, which I have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the gospel of the grace of God. And now, behold, I know that ye all, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God, shall see my face no more. Wherefore I take you to record this day, that I am pure from the blood of all men. For I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God. Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood. For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them. Therefore watch, and remember, that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears. And now, brethren, I commend you to God, and to the word of his grace, which is able to build you up, and to give you an inheritance among all them which are sanctified. I have coveted no man's silver, or gold, or apparel. Yea, ye yourselves know, that these hands have ministered unto my necessities, and to them that were with me. I have

showed you all things, how that so laboring ye ought to support the weak, and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said, It is more blessed to give than to receive.

Then shall be read by one of the elders. The participation of the elders in the consecration of a bishop is in harmony with the practice of the Church in the apostolic and sub-apostolic days. No arguments derived from practices of the third or fourth centuries can invalidate the testimony of the first and second centuries. Presbyters ordained one of their number to be the president over all, *primus inter pares*; and only by degrees was this inherent right of the presbyters given solely into the hands of the *Episcopi*. The fact that the Scripture selected to be read clearly teaches not only the duties of a bishop, but also that bishops and presbyters in the time of the apostles were identical, is a significant indication of the belief of the Church.

Then another shall read,

The Gospel. St. John **xxi**, 15-17.

Jesus saith to Simon Peter, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these? He saith unto him, Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, Feed my lambs. He saith to him

again the second time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? He saith unto him, Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, Feed my sheep. He saith unto him the third time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? Peter was grieved because he said unto him the third time, Lovest thou me? And he said unto him, Lord, thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love thee. Jesus saith unto him, Feed my sheep.

Or this: St. Matthew xxviii, 18-20.

Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.

After the Gospel and the Sermon are ended, the Elected Person shall be presented by two Elders unto the Bishop, saying,

We present unto you this holy man to be consecrated a Bishop.

Elected by the laity and clergy from among the presbyters or elders, two of the elders present the elect in the name of all the people and presbyters, as was the custom in ancient times. (See Riddle, "Christ. Antiq.;" Bingham,, "Christ. Antiq.")

Then the Bishop shall move the Congregation present to pray, saying thus to them:

Luke vi, 12, 13.
Acts xiii, 1-4.
Heb. iii, 1.
1 Cor. xi, 1.

Brethren, it is written in the Gospel of Saint Luke that our Savior Christ continued the whole night in prayer before he did choose and send forth his twelve Apostles. It is written also in the Acts of the Apostles that the disciples who were at Antioch did fast and pray before they laid hands on Paul and Barnabas, and sent them forth on their first mission to the Gentiles. Let us therefore, following the example of our Savior Christ, and his Apostles, first fall to prayer before we admit and send forth this person presented to us to the work whereunto we trust the Holy Ghost hath called him.

**Salisbury
Use.**

Then the bishop. In the old Gallican Ordinal there is an exhortation to the people, and from time immemorial the people have participated in the consecration of the elder chosen by them for the Episcopacy, following in this the practice of the Church in New Testament days. *The Holy Ghost hath called him.* The Holy Spirit called Paul and Barnabas, and the Church ordained them to the designed mission. In like manner the Church now consecrates those who believe they are called to the office of a bishop. One may choose to do the work of a bishop, resting solely on his inward call; but notwithstanding

that call, only the Church can give that call validity for the exercise of the office in the Church. The Holy Spirit did not call Paul or Barnabas independently of the Church. The call came to the Church to set apart those holy men, and thus the Church alone had authority to give them commission. The Divine call is of a twofold nature. It is inward and outward; in the man and by the Church. Enthusiasm for God is subject to the laws of God.

Then shall the following prayer be offered :

Almighty God, Giver of all good things, who by thy Holy Spirit hast appointed divers Offices in thy Church: mercifully behold this thy servant now called to the Work and Ministry of a Bishop, and replenish him so with the truth of thy doctrine, and adorn him with innocency of life, that both by word and deed he may faithfully serve thee in this Office, to the glory of thy name, and the edifying and well governing of thy Church, through the merits of our Savior Jesus Christ, who liveth and reigneth with thee and the Holy Ghost, world without end. *Amen.*

Salisbury Use.

Matt. vii, 11.
Eph. iv, 11-13.

Prayer be offered. All kneeling. The prayer is for the special gift of the Holy Ghost, that the elect may be able to perform the duties belonging to the Episcopate, which no

one can do to the glory of God without the help and guidance of the Spirit breathed by Christ upon his apostles and poured out upon all on the day of Pentecost. *Divers offices.* The old ordinals had “divers orders;” but there is no evidence in Scripture or in history that Almighty God appointed divers orders in the Christian ministry in the sense that the term “order” is understood by theorizers on apostolical succession. *With the truth of thy doctrine.* The office of a bishop is to teach, and he must therefore know the truth. But knowledge is not enough. He must be pure and holy, hence the prayer to *adorn him with innocency of life.* A self-seeking, crafty, ambitious, unclean man is unthinkable in this responsible station, this pinnacle of influence and authority in the Church of God. His life before all must be beautiful in its transparency, humble as a child, pure as a lily—firm with all gentleness for the *edifying, up-building, and well-governing*, not governing, but *well governing*, of the ministry and laity; for a bishop is not merely the head of the ministry, is the chief pastor of the people. Wherefore the apostle said, “Take heed unto yourselves and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers.”

Then the Bishop shall say to him that is to be Consecrated :

Brother, forasmuch as the Holy Scriptures command that we should not be hasty in laying on hands and admitting any person to government in the Church of Christ, which he hath purchased with no less price than the shedding of his own blood; before you are admitted to this administration, you will, in the fear of God, give answer to the questions which I now propound:

**Salisbury
Use.**

¹ Tim. v, 22.
Acts xx, 28.
¹ Tim. iii, 2, 7

Are you persuaded that you are truly called to this Ministration, according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ?

Ans. I am so persuaded.

The Bishop. Are you persuaded that the Holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all doctrine required of necessity for eternal salvation, through faith in Jesus Christ? And are you determined out of the same Holy Scriptures to instruct the people committed to your charge, and to teach or maintain nothing as required of necessity to eternal salvation but that which you shall be persuaded may be concluded and proved by the same?

¹ Tim. iii, 15.
Titus i, 7, 8;
ii, 1.

Ans. I am so persuaded and determined, by God's grace.

The Bishop. Will you then faithfully exercise yourself in the same Holy Scriptures, and call upon God by prayer for the true understanding of the same, so that you may be able by them to teach and exhort with wholesome doctrine, and to withstand and convince the gainsayers?

John v, 39.
Ps. cxix, 18.
Ezek. iii, 17.
Titus ii, 7, 8.
² Tim. iv, 2.

Ans. I will do so, by the help of God.

Titus i, 5; iii, 10.

The Bishop. Are you ready with faithful diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's word, and both privately and openly to call upon and encourage others to the same?

Ans. I am ready, the Lord being my helper.

Titus ii, 11, 12.
1 Tim. iii, 1-7;
iv, 12; v, 14.
Titus ii, 7, 8.

The Bishop. Will you deny all ungodliness and worldly lust, and live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world, that you may show yourself in all things an example of good works unto others, that the adversary may be ashamed, having nothing to say against you?

Ans. I will do so, the Lord being my helper.

2 Tim. ii, 16, 22-
25; iv, 2.
Tit. i, 13; ii, 15.
1 Tim. i, 9-11;
v, 20, 19.
2 Cor. xiii, 10.

The Bishop. Will you maintain and set forward, as much as shall lie in you, quietness, love, and peace among all men; and such as shall be unquiet, disobedient, and criminal, correct and punish according to such authority as you have by God's word, and as shall be committed unto you?

Ans. I will do so, by the help of God.

Titus i, 5.
2 Tim. ii, 2.
Acts xiv, 23.

The Bishop. Will you be faithful in ordaining, or laying hands upon and sending others, and in all the other duties of your office?

Ans. I will so be, by the help of God.

2 Tim. ii, 24.
Luke vi, 36.
1 John iii, 17.
Heb. xiii, 2.

The Bishop. Will you show yourself gentle, and be merciful, for Christ's sake, to poor and needy people, and to all strangers destitute of help?

Ans. I will so show myself, by God's help.

Then shall the bishop say. It would seem that the bishop should be seated during this examination, the bishop-elect standing before him. This was the primitive mode, and is the

form still followed by the Church of England. There is certainly no reason why the consecrator should stand. This is a compulsory examination, and by the authority of the Church the consecrator is at this moment in a judicial office, and analogy suggests that being seated with the elders about him is the proper form. *Truly called.* He may be persuaded of it if he has sought service and not place, if he is elected by the free suffrages of his brethren, and every one knows when he means right. *The will of the Lord Jesus Christ.* The will of Christ concerning position in his Church is, "He that would be greatest among you let him be the servant of all." *The Holy Scriptures contain all doctrine required of necessity.* The conviction that the Holy Scriptures are a sufficient revelation of the will of God without recourse to other sources or means of man's devising, lies at the foundation of evangelical usefulness. *May be concluded or proved by the same.* The idea is that all teaching, preaching, and instruction of every kind must be in harmony with the Scriptures as they may be interpreted by the voice of the general Church. *And call upon God by prayer for the true understanding of the same.* This is a call to a holy life of Scripture study and prayer

for mastery in the deep things of God. He who does this will have that heavenly mindedness which is the fruitful soil of all graces that adorn the lives of Christ's holy ministers. *Correct and punish.* Not by physical means, but according to the Discipline of the Church, authorized by *God's Word.*

Then the Bishop shall say :

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, who hath given you a good will to do all these things, grant
Salisbury Use. also unto you given strength and power to perform the same, that he accomplishing in you the good work which he has begun, you may be found blameless at the last day, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

Then shall the bishop say. Rising, if seated, and repeating this prayer, all the people responding, *Amen.* Then, all kneeling, the bishop, ministers, and people are to repeat responsively the following :

Then shall Veni, Creator Spiritus, be said :

Come, Holy Ghost, our souls inspire,
And lighten with celestial fire.
 Thou the anointing Spirit art,
Who dost thy sevenfold gifts impart.
 Thy blessed unction from above
Is comfort, life, and fire of love.

Enable with perpetual light
The dullness of our blinded sight ;
Anoint and cheer our soiled face
With the abundance of thy grace ;
Keep far our foes, give peace at home ;
Where thou art Guide, no ill can come.

Teach us to know the Father, Son,
And Thee of both to be but ONE ;
That through the ages all along
This may be our endless song :
Praise to thy eternal merit,
Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

This hymn was introduced into the service for the consecration of presbyters probably in the eleventh century. It is found in all the English Ordinals, except that of Winchester, and is considered one of the most ancient hymns of the Church. The above translation is by John Cosin, Bishop of Durham, and was inserted in 1662. This invocation of the Holy Ghost and all the prayers for the special outpouring of the Holy Spirit give this service of consecration certainly as much significance as belongs to the consecration of elders.

That ended, the Bishop shall say,
Lord, hear our Prayer.
Ans. And let our Cry come unto thee.

The bishop shall say. Still kneeling. *Our cry.* Minister and people are all supplicating the Source of all grace and power in behalf of the bishop-elect, that he may be filled with the Holy Ghost in great measure for his special duties. Since all prayer that is acceptable to God is in faith that God will do that which is for his glory, we may confidently believe that in ordination the prayers of the Church are answered.

The Bishop shall then say,

Let us pray.

Almighty and Most Merciful Father, who of thine infinite goodness hast given thine only and dearly-
Salisbury beloved Son Jesus Christ to be our Re-
Use. deemer, and the author of everlasting life; who, after that he had made perfect our redemption by his death, and was ascended into heaven, poured down his gifts abundantly upon men, making some Apostles, some Prophets, some Evangelists, some Pastors and Teachers, to the edifying and making perfect of his Church: grant, we beseech thee, to this thy servant, such grace that he may evermore be ready to spread abroad thy Gospel, the glad tidings of reconciliation with thee, and use the authority given him, not to destruction, but to salvation; not to hurt, but to help; so that as a wise and faithful servant, giving to the family their portion in due season, he may at last be received into

everlasting joy, through Jesus Christ our Lord, who, with thee and the Holy Ghost, liveth and reigneth, one God, world without end. *Amen.*

Then the Bishop and Elders present shall lay their hands upon the head of the Elected Person, kneeling before them, the Bishop saying :

The Lord pour upon thee the Holy Ghost for the Office and Work of a Bishop in the Church of God now committed unto thee by the authority of the Church through the imposition of our hands, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. *Amen.* And remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee; for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and of a sound mind.

Bishop and the elders present. The elders selected are not consecrators, but assistants; not because elders have not the right to ordain—for that they do possess this right is conceded in their appointment to assist in the ordination of a bishop—but for the reason that when a bishop is present or is obtainable, to him alone by authority of the Church is given the authority to ordain. *Lay their hands upon the head.* This symbolic act is as old as religion. It is the sign of conferring something. What the bishop and the elders confer is not the Holy Ghost, as the words of the Anglican

form suggest, but that only which they have the right to bestow. *The bishop saying.* The first among equals, and representing all. *The Lord pour upon thee the Holy Ghost.* In the Anglican book the form is, "Receive the Holy Ghost for the Office and Work of a Bishop," etc., and the same form was in our Ritual until 1864, when, in order to avoid misapprehension, the present form was substituted. *For the office and work of a bishop.* The prayers of the Church and the words of consecration specifically mentioning the grace required and the ministry to be performed, distinctly differentiates the episcopal office from every other office in the Church of God. Whether, then, Episcopacy is an office or an order is nothing more than a logomachy. It is something distinct by virtue of this solemn service of the Holy Ghost, who is constantly invoked, from all else; and that something can not be the same as, nor less than, the ordained person was before his consecration. *Now committed unto thee by the authority of the Church.* The Church is the source of authority, for it was to the Church that the gifts of ministries were given, and those only have the right to minister in the Church who have received authority from the Church

through her agents or instruments—the ministry. *In the Name.* Thus completing the act, and sealing it with the holy name of the Triune God.

Then shall the Bishop deliver to him the Bible, saying :

Give heed unto reading, exhortation, and doctrine. Think upon the things contained in this **Salisbury** book. Be diligent in them, that the increase coming thereby may be manifest **Use.** unto all men. Take heed unto thyself, and to thy doctrine; for by so doing thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee. Be to the flock of Christ a shepherd, not a wolf; feed them, devour them not. Hold up the weak, heal the sick, bind up the broken, bring again the outcast, seek the lost; be so merciful that you may not be too remiss; so minister discipline that you forget not mercy; that when the chief Shepherd shall appear, you may receive the never-fading crown of glory, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

1 Tim. iv, 13-16.
John x, 2, 12.
Acts xx, 28, 29.
1 Pet. v, 1-8.
Ezek. xxxiv,
2-4, 11, 16.
1 Thess. v, 14.
Luke iv, 18;
xix 10.
2 Cor. x, 1, 2, 8,
9; ii, 3, 5, 6, 10.
1 Pet. v, 4.

[Then the Bishop shall administer the Lord's Supper to the newly-consecrated Bishop and other persons present.]

Deliver to him the Bible. That is, into his hands. The fourth Council of Carthage directed that the New Testament, literally "Evangeliorum Codicem," should be placed on the head and neck, "super caput et cervicem," while the bishops present laid hands on the elected person's head. Some Oriental

Churches give the book open, others closed. *Be to the flock of Christ a shepherd.* This charge is common to all the historic Churches, both East and West. Morinus quotes from the order of the Syrian Maronites this charge: "Pascite gregem Dei, qui creditus est manibus vestris, et visitate illum spiritualiter, non violenter sed sponte, non propter lucra turpia . . . ut sitis bonum exemplar," the closing words of which are identical with our own, "Ut cum apparebit Princeps Pastorum, accipiatis ab eo coronam quae non marcescit," "That when the Chief Shepherd shall appear you may receive from him the crown which fadeth not away."

Then shall be offered the following Prayers :

Ps. lxvi, 1.
 2 Tim. i, 2; iv,
 3-8.
 1 Tim. iv, 11, 12,
 14, 15.
 2 Tim. iv, 4-8.
 Rev. ii, 10.
 1 Tim. vi, 13-16.

Most Merciful Father, we beseech thee to send down upon this thy servant thy heavenly blessing, and to so endue him with thy Holy Spirit that he, preaching thy Word, and exercising authority in thy Church, may not only be earnest to reprove, beseech, and rebuke with all patience and doctrine, but also may be, to such as believe, a wholesome example in word, in conversation, in love, in faith, and in purity; that faithfully fulfilling his course, at the last day he may receive the crown of righteousness laid up by the Lord, the righteous Judge, who liveth and reigneth, one God with the Father and the Holy Ghost, world without end. *Amen.*

Prevent us, O Lord, in all our doings with thy most gracious favor, and further us with thy continual help, that in all our works, begun, continued, and ended in thee, we may glorify thy holy name; and finally, by thy mercy, obtain everlasting life, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

Most merciful Father. These short prayers are adaptations from certain prayers in the Salisbury Ordinal, and have been used in England through all these centuries. *Prevent us.* *Prævenio*, I come before; the original meaning being almost the opposite of the present signification. God is supplicated not to hinder or to put obstacles in the way, but to remove them, to go before, clearing the path.

The peace of God, which passeth all understanding, keep your hearts and minds in the knowledge and love of God, and of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord: and the blessing of God Almighty, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, be among you, and remain with you always. *Amen.*

The Ritual for the ordination of elders is so similar to the form for the consecration of bishops that comment on it is unnecessary. Its source is the same, and all that need be said on its several parts has already been given, except this, that in giving the charge *the bishop should be seated.* The rubric does

not indicate this; but the rubric following, directing that the prayer, "Almighty God, who hath given you this will to do," etc., shall be said, reads, "Then shall the bishop, *standing up*, say." This plainly teaches that when delivering the charge just preceding the bishop was not standing up, and he certainly was not kneeling; he must therefore have been sitting as an instructor giving godly advice and admonition to the person about to assume the responsible duties of a presbyter.

The form for the ordination of deacons is so simple, that the few observations which it invites would scarcely justify the printing of the whole of it, and it may be sufficient to say that it follows ancient models and preserves the practices of the early Church in appealing to the people to show reasons why the ordination should not take place, and in giving the Holy Scriptures to the ordained. In the Collect the reading, "all good things," is not clear as to meaning. It is a translation of the Latin, "bonorum;" but this, it is said, is a corruption for "honorum," for in the Salisbury Use we read, "Domine sancte, Pater omnipotens, æterne Deus, *honorum* dator, ordinumque distributor, ac officiorum dispositior,"—"Holy Lord, Almighty Father, Eternal

God, giver of *honors*, distributor of orders, and disposer of offices.”

The remaining forms for laying a cornerstone and the dedication of a church do not seem to require any special notes. They were inserted in the Ritual in 1864, and have undergone no change. Thus we bring this work to a close, repeating the inspired words of the apostle, “LET ALL THINGS BE DONE DECENTLY AND IN ORDER.”

Index



	PAGE
Act of Submission to the Clergy,	32
Act of Uniformity under Elizabeth,	109
Act of Uniformity under Charles II,	159
Allen on Baptismal Formula,	190
Alliance of James II with Nonconformists,	159
Ancient Liturgies,	59
Baptism, Introductory Note on Origin, Nature, etc.,	187
Baptism, Infant Always in the Church,	192
Baptism, Infant, Comment on Office for,	193
Baptismal Covenant,	200
Baptism, Comment on Form for Adult,	209
Beginnings of Parties in Church of England,	99
Bishop, Consecration and Character of,	294
Bishops Impeached by House of Commons,	142
Bishops and Elders,	282
Book of Common Prayer Abolished,	144
Bucer Writes to Cranmer,	41
Criticises Book of Common Prayer,	77
Change by in Ritual,	253
Bullinger,	74
Burial of the Dead, Commentary on,	270
Catholic Church, Meaning of,	219, 226
Calvin Against the Gospellers,	75
Against the Liturgy,	76, 93
Change in Liturgy under James I,	134
Charles I, King of England,	135
Chapuys's Letter to Charles V,	25

	PAGE
Charles V and Henry's Divorce,	22
Charles I and the Puritans,	135
Charles II and the Presbyterians,	147
Children as Probationers,	223
Church Membership, Purpose of,	227
Church of England on Episcopacy,	155
Christmas Conference Adopts Ritual,	166, 168
Coke, Dr., Brings Sunday Service,	13, 166
Colet at Oxford,	18
Collect, Probable Meaning of,	249
Commission on Order of Communion,	52
Commission Ordered on Liturgy under Edward VI,	59
Commission on Revision of Liturgy under William of Orange,	160
Commission on Christian Doctrine,	42
Consecrations and Ordinations,	285
Conference on the Lord's Supper,	52
Cranmer, Character of,	28
Agent of Henry VIII,	23
Consecrated Archbishop,	28
Debate on the Scriptures,	35
Discipline of 1789 on Origin of Methodist Episcopacy,	284
Discerning the Lord's Body,	238
Doctrine of Real Presence,	109
Edward VI ascends Throne of England,	49
Progress of Reformation under,	50
Death of,	82
Elizabeth, Queen of England,	103
Proclamation of, on Religion,	104
Revision under,	105
Elizabeth, Conservatism of,	106
Elizabeth's Revision of the Liturgy,	107
Final Effort Toward Revision,	119
Erasmus on Luther,	127

	PAGE
Foreign Sects in England,	74, 75
Flight of the Reformed to the Continent,	86
Fox, the Martyrologist,	91
Frankfurt, Troubles at,	88
Great Bible, Source of Ritual,	182
Grocyne,	18
Gregory the Great, Letter to Augustine,	178
Hallam on Archbishop Laud,	136
Hampton Court Conference,	129
Harnack on Date of the Didache,	190
Henry VIII and Catharine of Aragon,	22
Henry VIII, Supremacy of, in the Church of England,	32, 24
Death of,	47
Summary of His Reform Work,	48
Herrman's "Deliberation,"	181
Hooker on the Word "Priest,"	166
Hooper, Letter of, on Ritual,	46
Ignatius on Marriage,	260
Impediments to Marriage,	264
Infant Baptism, Form for,	192
Jesse Lee on Methodist Episcopal Liturgy,	169
Justin Martyr on Time of the Lord's Supper,	240
Kneeling, Rubric on, Expunged,	109
Knox, John, at Frankfurt,	89
Latimer's Famous Sermon,	39
Laud, Archbishop, Character of,	136
Lambert, Execution of,	46
Legal Grounds against Marriage,	263
Linacre at Oxford University,	18

	PAGE																																
Macaulay, Lord, on Archbishop Laud,	136																																
McGiffert, Prof., Views of, on Lord's Supper,	236																																
Mary, Queen of England,	83																																
Proclamation of, Against Heretical Books,	85																																
Marian Exiles, The,	87																																
Matrimony, Introductory Note on,	260																																
Matrimony, Form for Solemnizing,	261																																
Matrimony, Commentary on Form,	262																																
Methodist Episcopal Church Established,	13																																
Methodist Preachers Use the Liturgy,	169																																
Methodists, Early Character of,	174																																
Methodism and Forms,	171																																
Millenary Petition,	126																																
Ministers, Kinds of, in the New Testament,	282																																
Momentum of the New Era,	43																																
Morinus on Episcopal Charge,	304																																
Naming of Children,	203																																
Notker's Burial Hymn,	274			Order of Communion,	54	Ordinal the first, Date of,	69	Ordinal, Important Change in,	153-158	Origin of Office for Adult Baptism,	183	Ordination, Meaning of,	280	Ordination Basis of Methodist Ministry,	283	Ordinations and Consecrations, Commentary on,	285			Parker, Archbishop, Exhumed,	141	Parties in English Church,	29	Presbyterians and Episcopacy,	151	Poynt, Bishop, on the Word "Superintendent,"	165			Reformers before the Reformation,	19	Reformation in England,	15, 20
Order of Communion,	54																																
Ordinal the first, Date of,	69																																
Ordinal, Important Change in,	153-158																																
Origin of Office for Adult Baptism,	183																																
Ordination, Meaning of,	280																																
Ordination Basis of Methodist Ministry,	283																																
Ordinations and Consecrations, Commentary on,	285			Parker, Archbishop, Exhumed,	141	Parties in English Church,	29	Presbyterians and Episcopacy,	151	Poynt, Bishop, on the Word "Superintendent,"	165			Reformers before the Reformation,	19	Reformation in England,	15, 20																
Parker, Archbishop, Exhumed,	141																																
Parties in English Church,	29																																
Presbyterians and Episcopacy,	151																																
Poynt, Bishop, on the Word "Superintendent,"	165			Reformers before the Reformation,	19	Reformation in England,	15, 20																										
Reformers before the Reformation,	19																																
Reformation in England,	15, 20																																

	PAGE
Religious Ferment in England, 1536,	37
Reception of Probationers and Members,	223
Reform in Church Service,	51
Religious State of England under Edward VI,	50
Riddle on Bishops and Elders,	282
Royal Decree for a Liturgy,	59
Sacrament, Meaning of,	187
Sarum Use, The,	180
“Saving Faith,” Meaning of,	231
Savoy Assembly,	152
Scriptures Translated,	33
Six Articles, The,	40
“So to Eat,” Meaning of,	251
Sources of the Ritual,	175
Tabular View of Liturgies,	62
Teaching of the Twelve Apostles Quoted,	190, 247
Tertullian on Marriage,	260
Time for the Lord’s Supper,	240
Trine Baptism,	204
Tyndale, Death of,	34
Use, Proper, of the Form for the Lord’s Supper,	243
Veni, Creator, Translation of,	299
Vestiarian Controversy,	79
Vestments, Clerical, Origin of,	63
Vow of Renunciation,	213
Vow of Belief,	216
Vow of Obedience,	220
Wendt Quoted against McGiffert,	237
Wesley, John, Revises English Ritual,	164
Wesley’s Liturgy,	166
Whatcoat, Bishop, on the Liturgy,	168
Wolsey, Cardinal, and the Divorce,	22

Other Works by the Author of this Book.



OUTLINES OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE RESURRECTION.

Biblical, Historical, and Scientific. 12mo. 90 Cents.

“A volume of constructive Biblical criticism of great value.”—*Northwestern Christian Advocate.*

“It is a vigorous treatment on the whole subject.”—*New York Observer.*



REASONS FOR CHURCH CREED.

A contribution to present day controversies. 12mo. 45 Cents.

“An able and eloquent defense.”—*Christian at Work.*



CHRIST AND THE CRITICS. GÉRÔME.

16mo. 50 Cents.

“It is a masterful presentation of the subject in hand.”—*Omaha Christian Advocate.*

“The treatment is clear, able, and reassuring, the author, we suspect, being one of the eminent scholars of Methodism.”—*Northwestern Christian Advocate.*

“Gérôme is as direct to the conclusion as a bullet to the target; as logical as Socrates; and as clear as Wesley.”—*Western Christian Advocate.*

“His style is clear, and his argument will challenge the attention of even those higher critics who dissent from his conclusion.”—*Northern Christian Advocate.*

“After discussing the subject with admirable fairness and ability . . . he gives, which many writers on theological matters do not give, a clear, frank, and definite answer.”—*Christian Advocate*, New York.

“Who Gérôme is we do not know; but the little book which bears his name is well worth knowing. . . . The author has a fluent style, is confident of his powers, and follows up his attack with the dash of a Dewey.”—*The Sunday-school Journal*, New York.



THE HISTORIC EPISCOPATE.

12mo. \$1.00.

“The historic review of the question is ably handled.”
Union Signal.

“It is scholarly, liberal minded, and convincing.”—
Public Opinion.

“It is on the whole the most clear and convincing demolition of the claims of the Anglican Church which we have seen.”—*The Congregationalist*.

“Dr. Cooke conducts his inquiry in the historic spirit.”
The Christian Intelligencer.



**CHRISTIANITY AND CHILDHOOD; or,
The Relation of Children to the Church.**

12mo. 90 Cents.



JENNINGS & PYE,

CINCINNATI, CHICAGO, KANSAS CITY.

EATON & MAINS,

NEW YORK, BOSTON, PITTSBURG,
DETROIT, SAN FRANCISCO.

