

# ALTAR SINS:

OR,

HISTORICAL ILLUSTRATIONS

OF THE

## EUCCHARISTIC ERRORS OF ROME,

AS

TAUGHT AND ENFORCED IN ENGLAND.

BY EDWARD MUSCUTT,

*Author of "The History and Power of Ecclesiastical Courts;" and "The History of Church Laws in England."*

"Because Ephraim hath made many altars to sin, altars shall be unto him to sin."

HOSHA VIII. 11.

LONDON:

JUDD & GLASS, NEW BRIDGE STREET,

AND

GRAY'S INN ROAD.

MDCCCLVII.

110. c. 5.

**LONDON :**  
**PRINTED BY JUDD & GLASS, GRAY'S INN ROAD AND NEW BRIDGE STREET.**

# CONTENTS.

---

## CHART.

Introduction . . . . .	v
Explanation of Chart . . . . .	xiii

## PART I.

### THE INSTITUTION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

Household Character . . . . .	1
-------------------------------	---

## PART II.

THE ORIGIN OF EUCHARISTIC ERRORS . . . . .	14
--	----

## PART III.

THE PROGRESSIVE DEVELOPMENT . . . . .	20
Under the <i>Anglo-Saxons</i> . . . . .	22
„ the <i>Danes</i> . . . . .	112
„ Edward the Confessor . . . . .	116
„ the <i>Normans</i> . . . . .	118
„ the <i>Plantagenets</i> . . . . .	131
„ the <i>House of Lancaster</i> . . . . .	178
„ the <i>House of Tudor</i> . . . . .	190
The Six Article's Act of Henry VIII. . . . .	191
THE REFORMATION, and Edward VI—	
His Statute respecting the Altar . . . . .	196
His Two Books of Common Prayer . . . . .	203
His Short Catechism . . . . .	224

THE RETROGRESSION, and <i>Mary</i> . . . . .	229
Elizabeth's Articles of Faith contrasted with those of	
Edward VI. . . . .	232
The <i>Stuarts</i> . . . . .	248
The Commonwealth . . . . .	256
The <i>Restoration</i> . . . . .	260
The <i>Revolution</i> . . . . .	268
THE HOUSE OF BRUNSWICK . . . . .	273

## PART IV.

Appeal to British Churches . . . . .	279
„    Episcopalians . . . . .	281
„    British Christians . . . . .	287
Appendix of Notes . . . . .	303

\*.\* *A copious Index will be found at the end of the volume.*

## INTRODUCTION.

---

**The Altar** receives, retains, and reflects the character of the people by whom it is erected. It is a national monument, and defines by its front and sectional elevations; the disposition, taste, and purpose of those who aid in the construction. It has a philosophy of its own. Bringing, or seeking to bring, men into immediate and direct connection with the Creator; it so expresses and excites their strongest aspirations, as to impart a marked and mighty influence to every other institution; whether it be one they most revere, by way of retention; or one they most deprecate, as to removal. This influence is so unique, potent, and diversified, that out of those laws which regulate or enforce altar observances; the scholar may collect his data as to the quality and extent of national intelligence: the philanthropist obtain his index to the public happiness or misery; the statesman his tests of civil government; and the historian his materials, the

illumination of which describes the lurid shade, or the brilliant halo, thrown around the phases through which any nation shall have passed.

Men invariably maintain among themselves the principles they either carry up to, or bring away from, the altar. Did not the sacrificial rites of the ancient Druids depict the whole of their national characteristics? And if the Jewish prophet, whose words form the motto of this work, had written them as many years after, as he had before, the Christian era; might he not have employed the same terms by which to describe the cumulative guilt and punishment of papal Rome? Ephraim was the leader tribe of Israel—Rome once was the ruling power over Christendom. Ephraim had had a favourite object, among many others, of idolatry—Rome has had her chief attraction in the false worship she established. Ephraim *in* its sin was punished *by* its sin; (for “when he offended in Baal, he died;”) Rome sank into shame and contempt, in proportion as she became intoxicated with this wine of her abomination. Ephraim induced the whole Jewish Commonwealth to transgressions against Jehovah as a lawgiver; and thus entailed captivity and the loss of national independence upon all Israel—Rome in this, her one great transgression against the authority of Christ, was compelled to cover over her guilt, by enforcing principles, the certain results of which were to reduce English monarchs into eccle-

siastical serfs; and extort such tributes from their people as to bring about their "utter undoing." Ephraim was to stand alone in apostacy;—all other tribes, especially Judah, were to withdraw themselves from the contamination, shame, and sorrow;—Rome is to be shunned by all Christendom, and for no one thing more than for her sins of the altar. Had these been unopposed, Christianity would have become extinct in England, and the nation carried back to some of the worst principles and forms of pagan superstitions; for it was out of these, and not from even a perverted construction of the phraseology of Scripture, that the Eucharistic errors of Rome took their rise, and became engrafted upon the civil and ecclesiastical institutions of England.

One great object sought to be attained in the following pages is to show the CONTINUOUS history of these errors: for if they are seen in their unfolding form of development, they immediately supply their own refutation. The antecedents of each error show the motive, not only of that error as it stands alone; but also the reason of those other errors which became necessary to support the one, out of which the more matured errors were so fashioned, as to become the exponents and consolidation.

The reader will not, therefore, be troubled with argument, or any formal conflict, with the opinions of theologians or schoolmen. These are all embodied in the Eucharistic laws; they are the life-giving

power of sentiment, come it from whomsoever or in what form soever it may. As a question of fact, it must be taken as a whole.

The laws which contain this entire view, will be formed into groups, corresponding with the dynasties in England. Each one of these will serve as a tumulus; on which, taking his stand, the reader will for himself trace the flow of an originally narrow, but afterwards broad, stream of poisoned and prurient waters. The chart will, it is hoped, here afford material aid; especially to those who may not already be conversant with ecclesiastical history; and to whom even this momentous subject may hitherto have presented few inducements, and still fewer facilities, to wade through the intricacies, with which historic researches of such ancient date have generally been involved.

The historical illustrations which accompany these laws will also prove, it is to be hoped, of essential service; as they will enable the reader to place himself in the position occupied by those to whom they were originally addressed. The laws being thus clothed with the circumstances attendant upon their primary or after development, will show three important facts: one, that they displaced antecedent principles and practices: another, that although despoiling powers in themselves, they yet left behind such portions of their antecedents as will, if properly employed, despoil the despoilers: and lastly, that throughout the



whole, one unbroken connection has so constantly obtained as to link the past with the present.

If, therefore, we shall have to do with antiquity, we shall discover that it has not destroyed authority. On the contrary, it will be found that many of the most ancient laws retain a present existence, and can any day be applied. With many it is a most favorite axiom to "swear by whichever canon will best suit the purpose." They shelter themselves under a double protection: statute\* as well as ecclesiastical authority. Except, as any one of the canons may, after an expensive suit, be declared in a common law court "contrary or repugnant" to secular jurisprudence (whether in civil or ecclesiastical matters), the entire code, foreign and domestic, remains in full force. The recent case of Archdeacon Denison was abandoned, simply because it was found that law did not condemn what proved to have been an extra-judicial opinion.

Henry VIII. fastened this chain upon us, although in so doing he held out the promise of abolition.† That promise put the whole question to sleep. Within the folded draperies of ecclesiastical and civil legislation, it has slumbered on during the past three hundred years. Little more than half that period had been required to introduce and establish canon

---

\* 25 Henry VIII., cap. 19, section 7.

† " " " section 2.

law;\* but after it had been once fully established, seven centuries and nearly another half elapsed before even a feeble cry was heard, that the whole thing ought to be abolished. Then Henry charged the Bishop of Rome with “extorting great sums of money in the exercise of divers authorities, which, until now, by the subjects of this realm have been *timorously and ignorantly* accepted.”† Up to this period, therefore, the nation had, blindfold, been sliding down an inclined plane: once at the bottom, it acknowledged that it was thus fallen because of a timorous and ignorant submission. With this acknowledgment the nation has been content; for *even* “until now,” it has not made any systematic effort to crawl up again. With the exception of Edward VI., sovereigns and subjects have alike been content to remain where they were. The extortions of which Henry charged the Bishop of Rome had, he said, induced “intolerable inquietations and an utter undoing.”‡ But what were these “extortions,” compared with the many wrongs both the State and the Church have experienced from the same cause, subsequently to Henry’s reign? Or what even these wrongs, compared with the active mischief working agencies employed to replace the one centre-point of the radiating power of the whole system of canon law? That centre-

---

\* From A.D. 597, to A.D. 785, page 61.

† 28 Henry VIII. cap xvi., section 1.

‡ *Ibid.*

point is the Altar : this it is which gave and continues to give to the Roman order of architecture its characteristic attractions and power. On this Rome laid its foundation ; by this it erected its superstructure ; and by this it intends to rebuild. Let but this ONE POINT be gained, and everything else is safe. Gained it may and will be, so long as canon law supplies those abundant facts and cogent pleas which are found to intermix themselves with the existing institutions of England.

One word as to the authorities for the facts about to be presented. The principal of these is Spelman, whose self-sacrificing labours have placed him in the highest position among ecclesiastical historians. Next to him comes Johnson. He was vicar of Cranbrook. His translation (A.D. 1720) of the Old Saxon laws has never been impeached ; while his corrections of some verbal inaccuracies of Spelman render his labours increasingly valuable. In some few instances, a somewhat different translation would have been preferred, and would have been given ; had not the author been deeply anxious upon one important point. With him it has been a matter of conscience to prevent, so far as he could ; any impediment being raised against the full reception of the facts about to be described, under the impression that they had received a colouring in his hands. He has not done this ; but has confined himself, for the reason now

stated, to the very punctuation of the words of Johnson. For the same reason he has restricted himself, in his explanation of the laws, to their own phraseology. Had he written as a polemic or as a partisan, he might have seized the many opportunities these laws furnish to construct a work swelled out to two, if not four, large volumes. But he has had to do with principles, not persons; with results, not abstractions; and he trusts that the plan he has adopted will commend itself, and, above all, the momentous subject, to every sincere mind.

*Montague Terrace,  
De Beauvoir Square,  
June, 1857.*

## EXPLANATION OF CHART.

---

The **OUTER** margin, on the left-hand side, shows the dynasties which have obtained in England.

The **SECOND** margin is a scale of centuries, each divided into ten equal parts.

The **THIRD** margin gives the names of persons connected with the origination, enlargement, or execution of Eucharistic laws and observances.

---

THE chart commences with "THE APOSTLE JOHN AND THE BRITISH CHURCHES." This shows the connecting link between the apostles—to some one of whom Britain is indebted for the introduction of Christianity—and the ancient British Churches. The last of the apostles was St. John, who died at Ephesus, A.D. 97. Between that event and the arrival of Augustine in England, five hundred years intervened. To this period Edward VI. refers in his first law relating to "the Sacrament of the altar." The church of that period he designates "the Primitive Church."

When, therefore, the taunting inquiry is put by the Romanist, "Where was your Church before the time of Luther?" the reply is, THERE it was: all the time between John the apostle, and Augustine the monk.

The events which transpired within this period confirm the fact. Thus, in the chronological arrangement, we have—

**A.D. 161. LUCIUS.**

“ This king of the Britons [Welch] sent a letter to Eleutherus, a holy man, who presided over the Roman Church, entreating that, by his command, he might be made a Christian. He soon obtained his pious request; and the Britons preserved the faith uncorrupted and entire, in peace and in tranquillity, until the time of the Emperor Diocletian.”\*

**A.D. 300. DIOCLETIAN.**

The **PURPLE** and **RED** colours indicate that under this Roman Emperor commenced—

“ The tenth persecution since the reign of Nero; and it was more lasting and bloody than all the others before it, for it was carried on incessantly for the space of ten years [answering the prophetic declaration of the apostle John: Revelations ii. 10], with burning of churches and the slaughter of martyrs. At length it reached Britain also; and many persons, with the constancy of martyrs, died in the confession of their faith.”†

So extensive were these martyrdoms, that Lichfield was called by Ingulphus and Henry of Huntingdon, *Lechfeld*, or “field of the dead,” from the traditionary martyrdom of one thousand Christians during the Diocletian persecution. Among other martyrs, St. ALBAN occupies a prominent position.

He suffered death “by having his head struck off on the 22nd day of June, near the city of Verulam,” [now called after his name, St. Alban’s, in Hertfordshire.] The British Christians, however, so far recovered this persecution, that “after having hidden themselves in woods and deserts, and secret caves, they appeared again in public; rebuilt the churches which had been levelled with the ground; founded, erected, and finished the temples of the holy martyrs; and, as it were, displayed their conquering ensigns in all places. This peace continued in the churches of Britain until the time of the Arian madness, which having corrupted the whole world, infected this island also with the poison of its arrows.”‡

\* *Bede*, lib. i., c. 4.

† *Bede*, lib. i., c. 6.

‡ *Bede*, lib. i., c. 8.

To quell this heresy, a council was held at,

A.D. 850, ARMINIUM.

Constantinus assembled this Council, at which several Bishops were present. After this another heresy broke out, called the Pelagian Heresy. To quash this, a different method<sup>r</sup> was adopted. Instead of a Council of Bishops, the people were called to express their sentiments and to pronounce their judgment. Referring to this matter, Bede says:—

“The Britons thought of an excellent plan [for they were unequal alone, to the theological conflict], which was to crave aid from the *Gallican* prelates in that spiritual war.”\*

The Bishop of Rome was, therefore, not yet recognized as the supreme arbitrator of theological controversies. But the British churches acted upon the plan of seeking aid from churches of kindred character with themselves; and, as will immediately appear, an appeal was made to reason and the Scriptures. The Gallican prelates who appeared were,

A.D. 429. GERMANUS and LUPUS.

“They filled the island with the fame of their preaching and virtues; and the word of God was by them daily administered, not only in the churches, but even in the streets and fields.”  
 “At length the authors of the erroneous doctrines had the boldness to enter the lists, and appeared for public disputation. An immense multitude was there [Verulam] assembled. The people stood around as judges and spectators. The venerable prelates poured forth the torrent of their apostolical and evangelical eloquence. Their discourse was interspersed with scriptural sentences, which they supported by the written testimonies of famous writers. Vanity was convinced, and perfidiousness confuted. The people who were judges could scarcely refrain from violence, but signified their judgment by acclamations.”†

This refers to the *first* visit of Germanus into Britain. He paid a second visit, probably about eighteen years

\* *Bede*, lib. i., c. 17.

† *Ibid.*

afterwards, with a view to suppress the same heresy, which had broken out afresh.

“By the judgement of all, the spreaders of heresy, who had been expelled the island, were brought before the priests to be conveyed up into the continent, that the country might be rid of them, and they corrected of their errors.”\*

And this “judgment of all” was as pitiable as the former had been commendable.

These facts, recorded by the venerable Bede, if they stood alone, would be sufficient proofs that Christianity had existed in these isles prior to the arrival of Augustine. And yet in the face of these facts; some ancient and modern ecclesiastics venture to ascribe to him the honour of having first converted the British from Paganism to Christianity. He came not so much to convert, as to subvert. This the conference about to be recorded under the next marginal date will prove. It was, therefore, a serious historic error on the part of Cuthbert to assert, as he does, in his canon of A.D. 747, that—

“Augustine, the Archbishop and Confessor, who being sent to the nation of the English, first brought the knowledge of Faith, the Sacrament of Baptism,† and the notice of the heavenly country.”‡

On this account he had been canonized, and was to be honoured in England by

“His birthday [the old form of describing the day of death] which is the seventh of the kalends of June, being honourably observed by all with a cessation from labour.”

Did Cuthbert *intend* to misrepresent facts? Probably not. He however did, and intended to do, one other thing; and that was to repudiate all the labours of those men to whose predecessors even Augustine was indebted for his first place of public worship.§

The twenty-first successor of Augustine was Odo, whose

\* *Bede*, lib., i., c. 21.

† See Appendix, AA.

‡ *Johnson's Ecclesiastical Laws*, A.D. 747. *Spelman*, vol. i., p. 245.

§ See page 23.



account is much more accurate. He, in A.D. 948, was frank enough to say, "through Augustine's endeavours, the *RULE* of Christianity first appeared from this Archbishopal See to the remotest parts of the English."\* The difference between "the first to bring the notice of the heavenly country," and "the first" to make appear "the *rule* of Christianity," is as marked as any two things, "wide asunder cast," can possibly be; and by all historians and ecclesiastics ought to be kept distinctly and declaredly apart.

#### A.D. 597. AUGUSTINE.

His first effort with Ethelbert having succeeded, his next step was to win over the clergy of the British Churches.

"With the assistance of King Ethelbert, Augustine drew together to a conference, the bishops or doctors of the next province of the Britons [probably Aust, formerly Austre Clive, Gloucestershire], on the borders of the Wiccii and West Saxons; and began, by brotherly admonition, to persuade them that preserving Catholic unity with them they should undertake the common labour of preaching the Gospel to the Gentiles: for they did not keep Easter Sunday at the proper time. Besides they did several other things which were against the unity of the church. When, after a long disputation, they did not comply with the entreaties, exhortations, or rebukes of Augustine and his companions, but preferred their own traditions before all the churches in the world, which in Christ agree among themselves, the holy father Augustine put an end to this troublesome and tedious contention [by an appeal to God], that he will vouchsafe, by his heavenly tokens, to declare to us which tradition is to be followed. Let the faith and practice of those, by whose prayers some infirm person shall be healed, be looked upon as acceptable to God, and be adopted by all." "The Britons confessed that it was [might be?] the true way Augustine taught; but that they could not depart from their ancient customs without the consent and leave of their people. A second synod was therefore decreed; and it happened when they came they endeavoured to contradict all he said. Yet, said he, if you will comply with me in these three points, viz., to keep

---

\* *Johnson, A.D. 943: Spelman, vol. i., p. 415.*

Easter at the due time ; to administer baptism, by which we are again born to God, according to the custom of the holy Roman Apostolic Church ; and jointly with us to preach the Word of God to the English nation, we will readily tolerate all the other things you do, though contrary to our customs." "They answered, they would do none of those things, nor receive him as their Archbishop."\*

They did more than refuse subjection : they proffered, through Dinorth, Abbot of Bangor, this advice, at once noble, courteous, and scriptural :—

"Be thus persuaded of us, that in the bond of love and charity we are all subjects and servants to the church of God ; yea, to the Pope of Rome and every good Christian, to help them forward, both by word and deed, to be the children of God : other obedience than this we know not to be due to him whom you call Pope ; and this obedience we are ready to give both to him and every Christian continually. Besides we are under the government (*sub gubernatione*) of the Bishop of Caerleon, who, under God, has the superintendence over us, and is to watch (*servare*) over our spiritual course." (*viam spiritualem.*)

A.D. 601. "THE ROMAN MODEL."—The civil law of the Romans.

This took cognizance of sacrifices, priests, altar observances and privileges ; all of which were under the authority of Roman emperors, as well pagan as Christian.†

\* *Bede*, lib. ii., cap. 9.

† This ever-memorable answer is taken from Archbishop Parker's *Antiquitate Britannicæ Ecclesiæ*, page 592, where it may be seen in the Latin and Welsh languages. It is to be regretted, that some historians and ecclesiastical writers do not invariably adhere to the strict phraseology of the words actually used by the Abbot of Bangor. He is often made to use the word, "jurisdiction," whereas the term was wholly unknown prior to the arrival of Augustine. Episcopal "government, superintendence in the spiritual course," are the only things recognized. As superintendents, the English bishops were designated by Otho, the legate from Rome, in A.D. 1237. (*Spelman*, vol. ii., p. 221, and the 22nd of *Johnson's Laws* of this last date.) To which reference is also made in Appendix AAA, p. 305.

† Page 23.

## A.D. 673. THEODORE.

No one of the six predecessors of Theodore achieved what he, as Archbishop of Canterbury, accomplished. Augustine had attempted it, but signally failed. "THIS WAS THE FIRST ARCHBISHOP WHOM ALL THE ENGLISH CHURCH OBEYED." It had been the intention of the Anglo-Saxons to have rendered it a self-supplying church. Egbert, King of Kent, and Oswy, King of Northumbria, had expressed the desire of the two provinces when they selected Wighard, a priest belonging to "the English race," whom they wished to be made Archbishop of Canterbury. As a native of these isles, they wisely thought he was better prepared to supply English wants than foreigners. For this purpose they sent him to Rome for consecration.\* But Wighard died in Italy; and in his stead, Theodore, a native of Cilicia, came.

"He was willingly entertained by all persons; and there daily flowed from him and Hadrian his companion, rivers of knowledge, to water the hearts of their hearers, whom they taught the arts of ecclesiastical history, astronomy, and arithmetic."†

Theodore ordained bishops in proper places. Among these was Chad,

"Whom he upbraided, that he had not been duly consecrated; and he himself completed his ordination after the Catholic manner."

One other kind office he also performed for him. Chad

"Was accustomed to go about the work of the Gospel to several places rather on foot than on horseback. Theodore commanded him to ride, and he himself lifted him on the horse, for he thought him a holy man."‡

Theodore was sixty-six years of age when he reached England.

---

\* See page 35. † *Bede*, lib. iv., cap. 2. ‡ *Bede*, lib. iv., cap. 2 & 3.

“Nor were there ever happier times since the English came into Britain. From that time also they began in all the churches of the English to learn sacred music, which till then had been only known in Kent.”

Having thus prepared his way, his next step was directed towards the clergy.

“He assembled a synod of bishops and many *other Teachers\** of the church who loved and were acquainted with the canonical statutes of the Fathers.”†

This memorable synod was held at Hatfield, in Hertfordshire, on the 24th of September, 673. There were present—

“Bise, Bishop of the East Angles [Elmham], Wilfred, Bishop of the nation of the Northumbrians (and immediate successor of Chad), Putta, of Rochester, Lutherius, of the West Saxons, and Winfred, Bishop of the Mercians, and many masters of the church.‡ And when we were assembled, and had taken our proper places; I said, I beseech you, most beloved brethren, for the fear and love of our Redeemer, that we may faithfully enter into a common treaty for the sincere observance of whatever has been decreed by the holy Fathers. I enlarged upon these, and many other things tending to charity, and the preservation of the peace of the church. And when I had finished my speech I asked them, singly and in order, whether they consented to

\* “*Teachers.*” The reader will mark this word in the connection and under the circumstances in which it appears. The persons here mentioned took rank as officers, next to the bishop or pastor [*episcopum et pastorem*], whether that officer be a diocesan pastor, or a congregational pastor. The subsequent history of these pages will show how the word “priest” jostled out the word, “teacher.” (page 39.) He is called “Doctor,” and appears as such before Augustine, at the conference mentioned immediately before. The title did not pertain exclusively either to the bishop or pastor, or to priests, as ministers associated with the altar: it was applied to instructors. Bishops, it is true, are stated to be “divine teachers” in A.D. 1009, and again in A.D. 1017, “preachers and doctors of God’s laws.” But in these periods, the office had been merged into the duties of other officials in the church. The German Universities to this day, confer the title of Doctor of Divinity upon other persons than those pertaining to the priesthood. The late pre-eminent scholar, Dr. Kitto, was one among other instances.

† *Bede*, lib. iv., cap. 6.

‡ *Spelman*, vol. i., p. 15.

observe all things which had been of old canonically decreed by the Fathers? To which all our fellow priests answered, 'We are all well agreed readily and cheerfully to keep whatever the canons of the holy Fathers have prescribed.\* These five bishops or 'fellow priests' (for the terms are used interchangeably) brought themselves 'singly and in order' under the pontiffs of Rome. Seventy-six years before this had occurred; seven British bishops had not only refused any such submission, but declared they could not do anything of the kind 'without the consent and leave of the people.† The *people* were not now consulted; nor is there the smallest trace that the bishops represented them. On the contrary, they expressly provided that they 'had determined these points to the intent that no scandalous contention should be raised *henceforth* by any of us. Whoever, therefore, shall attempt to oppose or infringe this sentence, let him know that he is forbid every function of a priest, and all society with us."‡

It was, therefore, purely an ecclesiastical submission. Among other causes which induced it; one was that among the clergy "scandalous contentions" had arisen about benefices and rank. Theodore also had contributed by his own proceedings to swell the tumults by deposing or creating Bishops. He, however, with their submission, made a concession: viz., that priests should not be "driven out" of their churches "without the consent and authority of the Bishops. If any one attempt to do this, let him be struck with a sentence of the synod," consisting of ecclesiastics and the laity.

In these acts of Theodore, we trace the prior independence of bishops, both of the pope and canonical decrees. Nor was that independence entirely lost, even by this submission. For long after it had been made,—

"Primates had very great latitude left them in points relating to discipline and jurisdiction; and, in fact, acted at discretion. It was most reputable to act by stated rules; yet in cases where there were different rules, Primates and even Bishops were to choose by which they would act."§

---

\* *Johnson's Ecclesiastical Laws.*

† See under Augustine.

‡ *Johnson.*

§ *Johnson's Preface to the Code of Ecbricht, in A.D. 740.*

In short, bishops were then, as now; independent of each other. They framed their own rules, prepared their own liturgies, ruled their own clergy; and administered, with the people, "in synod," their own laws. The limits of the diocese were the limits of jurisdiction. This last principle still prevails; but it would never have known an existence, had it not been that the Bishops of the English Church were originally independent of Rome, as well as of each other.

A.D. 698. INÆ,

The West Saxon monarch, and the first to impose a Sacramental test. (Page 25.)

A.D. 740. ECBRIHT.

A.D. 747. CUTHBERT.

The laws made by these two Archbishops (York and Canterbury) are remarkable. The *black* becomes deeper, as it was under them that the Eucharistic errors received consolidation, influence, and enlargement. Opposite to their names are black *perpendicular* lines. These indicate the beginning of those laws which related to the *dead*. The line which meets the year 740 shows that it was then the first law was made about dead *bodies*—particular persons being denied Christian burial. This line runs on till 1878, when, by "Sudbury," the law became enlarged and associated with those relating to the Confessional, out of which it is seen to emanate. It continues its course down to the present time; and was, in 1846, carried into effect in the case of "Guyer." (See Appendix, page 345.)

The other line is also perpendicular. It commences at 747, and indicates the law respecting the *souls* of the dead. This line runs down to the time of Edward VI., when it is broken off. It re-appears in Mary's time; but afterwards is lost.

The *green* horizontal lines, opposite to these

names, intimate the pagan notions they incorporated in their laws, relative to the Eucharist. (Pages 36, 48.)

A.D. 785. NORTHUMBRIA AND MERCIA.

The *broad* horizontal line intimates that these two kingdoms were now first brought under subjection to the papal power. Henceforth this power overhangs the English Church, and English monarchs. Canon law was also now introduced, professedly as the guide of the Roman pontiffs in their government of the nation. The *authority* of the pope, and that of canon law were contemporaneous in respect of time; but distinct in regard of execution. Hence the authority of the pope is cut off under Henry VIII.; but canon law remained in force, and to this day retains vital power. Throughout, the *deep blue* is seen to overhang the *black*, and also to overlap the *red* colours; showing that the pope ruled the church, and the church ruled the monarch. But it is a singular historic fact, that in exact proportion as the *authority* of the pope was resisted by our monarchs; so the errors of the church increased. The *blue*, therefore, gradually contracts, while the *black* not only spreads, but becomes more intense. The doctrines of Rome remained long after the power of Rome was renounced. (Pages 61, 198.)

A.D. 877. ALFRED THE GREAT.

The first PENAL law of the civil power in connection with the altar. (Page 68.)

A.D. 925. ÆTHELSTAN.

The altar and ordeal. (Page 73.)

A.D. 950. ELFRIC.

Incipient transubstantiation. (Page 80.)

## A.D. 960. EDGAR.

Reduced standard of qualification for the Housel, or Communion. The *green* colour intimates the accumulation of pagan notions and customs. (Page 93.)

## A.D. 1015. ETHELRED.

The last Anglo-Saxon monarch and his penal laws, being in direct contradiction to the principles Ethelbert had sanctioned. (Page 102.)

## THE DANES.

## A.D. 1017. CANUTE.

Remarkable laws. Individual responsibility to God. (Page 112.)

## THE NORMANS.

## A.D. 1066. WILLIAM THE CONQUEROR.

"The two swords, and one sword shall help the other." (Page 118.)

## THE PLANTAGENETS.

## A.D. 1175. HENRY II.

The *shaded light* indicates the decree of a pontiff, which asserts Judas was *not* present at the Lord's Supper. (Page 132.)

"Roaring John"—Peckham, Archbishop of Canterbury. (Page 148.)

## A.D. 1378. SUDBURY,

Archbishop of Canterbury. The *oval* opposite this date represents the ecclesiastical cesspool, or confessional. It spreads itself over Church and State, as its power stretched into the civil as well as the spiritual government of the nation. In the midst



of the oval is a still darker line, which indicates the law now made that non-communicants, and those who confessed not at Easter, were to be deprived of Christian burial. (Page 167)

The *green* colour intimates pagan customs, out of which this canon law, respecting non-Christian burial, emanated. (Page 168.)

A.D. 1400. HENRY IV.

Pre-existing canons and statutes of a penal character became more despotic, and led to the burning of heretics. The intense *red* indicates this fact. (Page 178.)

A.D. 1547. HENRY VIII.

The *consolidation* of penal laws; or the Six Articles Act of Henry VIII. (Page 190.)

EDWARD VI.

The Reformation. The *black* nearly disappears; the *red* less intense: and the *blue* subdued. Page 196.)

A.D. 1558. MARY.

Return to Popery. Comparison between the ten years' persecution under Diocletian; and those from Henry IV. to the death of Mary. (Page 229.)

A.D. 1558. ELIZABETH.

The colours shaded off—still much remains. Page 232.)

THE STUARTS.

A.D. 1603. James I.

Colours deepened. (Page 248.)

A.D. 1649. CROMWELL.

(Page 256.)

## A.D. 1661. CHARLES II.

The three distinct lines in the stream of *red* indicate the municipal, clerical, and parliamentary sacramental tests. (Page 260.)

## THE REVOLUTION.

(Page 268.)

## THE HOUSE OF BRUNSWICK.

## A.D. 1828-9. GEORGE IV.

Repeal of municipal and parliamentary tests: *red* contracted; and the force abated. (Page 273.)

A.D. 1846. *Guy*.

Denial of Christian burial. (Page 346.)

**ALTAR SINS.**

# ALTAR SINS.

---

## PART I.

### **The Institution of the Lord's Supper.**

IN few things has Christianity suffered so severely as in the ceremonies its professed friends have gratuitously invented for themselves and despotically imposed upon others. And in no one set of religious rites have they created so many or such fatal mischiefs as in those which relate to the Lord's Supper. The perverted memorial of his death has defeated the design for which it occurred. "To bring us unto God" was the grand and only purpose of Christ. By this he meant "to reconcile all things unto himself;" or, so to change their character, as to restore an unbroken sympathy between earth and heaven. The death of the Son of God was, therefore, the most glorious event that had ever transpired in our world. But the perversion of that event is the next most marvellous thing in the moral history of man.

The Eucharistic errors of Rome have cost her more dearly than all her other errors put together—have sacrificed more of liberty and life than the criminal jurisprudence of any nation ever occasioned for any one class of civil offences—have raised up more formidable opponents, and quickened them into fiercer forms of resistance against the moral

government of God, than wicked men themselves thought it possible could be evinced—have produced a larger and longer continued amount of personal and social suffering than any plague that swept down hosts of terror-stricken men and women—and have loaded persecutors with an intensity and an extent of guilt before God, which none but Himself can correctly estimate ; and, happily for them and us, which none but himself can safely punish.

### Respecting the institution of the Supper.

As a Jew, Christ had celebrated the national feast of the Passover, when, at its close, “ He took bread, and gave thanks [*i. e.* blessed God for it. The words *ευχαριστησας εκλασε* signify to give thanks *for*, not to impart any new property *into*, the food] and brake and gave unto them,” &c. (Luke xxii. 19, and 1 Cor. xi. 24.)

One rule, and one rule only, of interpretation must determine what these words really meant. That rule is, what did they induce the men who heard them spoken, as also those men who came into close proximity with the persons to whom they were originally addressed, to do ?

Now, it is a fact, patent in the history of the early Christian Church, that the words induced believers to celebrate the Lord’s Supper every day, and probably at every meal, or, at least, the principal meal of the day, consequently in their own private houses. There were, in fact, no places of *public* resort where this, or any other Christian solemnity, could then have been celebrated. Christ knew this. He knew that the Temple doors were, and would long remain, closed against the apostles ; that into the synagogues

they would not be permitted to introduce the memorial of himself; and that, to erect houses of worship for themselves was, at that time, wholly impracticable. If observed at all, therefore, the Lord's Supper must be celebrated in private houses, and thus form part of domestic religion.

The Eucharist and the Passover are here seen somewhat assimilated. Both were of a household character; and what is of greater importance, both were designed "to show forth," or to serve "for a memorial." (Exodus xii. 14.) Hence the expression respecting the Passover, "It *is* the Lord's Passover" (Exodus xii. 11), closely resembles the words of Christ, "This *is* my body." (Matthew xxvi. 26.) The agreement (for the same verb is used in the Septuagint as is used in the New Testament) is worthy special attention.\* We translate *isri* by the word "is." One meaning of which is, "to signify, denote, represent figuratively or symbolically."† And so long as this meaning is exclusively attached to the word so long are we safe from the dogma of transubstantiation of Papists; the consubstantiation of Lutherans; or the insubstantiation of every order of semi-papistical men.

Out of the original necessity thus to observe the Eucharist, arose a high moral advantage. The sympathies of the family circle were enlisted in behalf of Christianity; and by so much as this could lay

---

\* Zwingle, the Swiss Reformer, obtained the solution of all his difficulties upon the subject of the Real Presence by having had his mind directed to this fact.—*D'Aubignie's Reformation*, vol. III., book xi., cap 7.

† *Parkhurst's Greek Lexicon*, under the fifth signification of *εἶμι*.

hold of these hallowed and ever-expanding associations, by so much did it enlarge and consolidate its influence upon society. Long after this original necessity thus to perpetuate the death of Christ had ceased to render the household celebration the *only* form it could preserve, believers still clung to the domestic practice. The place of celebration was never given up: it was wrested from them, as we shall afterwards find.

And well might they cling to the domestic feature of this solemn act. Was not baptism commanded to be performed by the parent as a household administration, and the Eucharist given to the newly baptized child? Was not hospitality also enjoined upon the faithful in Christ? By Scriptural authority and by canon law, a stranger was never to be turned away from their homes, or expected to pay for his accommodation. The moment the householder received from the traveller "his letter of communion,"\* as a fellow-disciple of Christ, the rites of hospitality became increasingly attractive and endearing. "The household of faith" was gladdened, and the heart of the stranger cheered, when together they partook of the memorial of the love and death of their common Lord. This, in an especial manner, served the double purpose of a pledge of Christian kindness, and a solemn act of fealty to the Divine Sovereign in heaven.†

---

\* *Calmut's Fragments*, "House."

† So late down as A.D. 994 "the *mass priest*" was especially commanded "to instruct and persuade" his people "that they be hospitable to strangers, and never turn a traveller out of their house. No worldly recompense ought to be taken of the strangers."—*Johnson*.

As a domestic institution, the householders of the "faithful in Christ" regarded this memorial of the once crucified and afterwards glorified Son of God with peculiar veneration and gratitude. The church saw this, and incorporated into her institutions of public worship, that which had never failed to excite sacred interest as a household observance. The liberty inherent in the Christian religion allowed the church to incorporate this institution into those other public ordinances, which were to aid the enlargement of the kingdom of Christ among men. But that liberty did not, and in the nature of things could not, allow the church to alter the essential character of the institution itself; any more than by such incorporation the church received its own essential element of manifestation. Could any greater peril threaten religion than so to construct and regulate *public* worship, as to make it supersede *family* worship? Even Rome never dared openly to *avow* such a principle as this, although she has dared to avow and to enforce, a principle in respect of the memorial of Christ, not only alien to its original intention, but also subversive of the very character of the church of God. That church is formed of persons, each being possessed of an inward principle; and not of persons who together perform an outward act. The great and eternal law of Christ is, that where His Spirit is, there His church is, and nowhere else.\* Every one of the affinities "the mind of Christ" calls up, it so calls up in mind, and in mind only. It has not, because it needs not, any conducting agent, other than itself. Neither wine, bread, water, nor any other material matter, can convey, any more than they can create, spirit.



Were it otherwise, the church of Him who is the wisdom and the power of God would rest upon the spoils of truth and reason. The only method by which the conducting agency of the church could be brought into an article of faith was, for the church to teach the gratuitous dogma that Christ had deposited an indwelling spirituality in visible agents. But this the faithful did not believe in the early periods of their history. They had all that they required in and from Christ alone: among themselves: and at home; and to which the *public* institutions of Christianity were auxiliary and evidential. Let us, then, turn to the facts and illustrations of the household character of the Eucharist.

1. Take the practice of the apostles themselves. "Daily with one accord they continued in the Temple; and *breaking bread from house to house.*" (Acts ii. 46.—A.D. 30-37.) And this last act of "breaking bread" was detached from the services in the Temple. Again, "Upon the first day in the week, when the disciples came to break bread in the upper chamber." (Acts xx. 7, 8.—A.D. 52-58.) "The upper" was the principal "chamber," where the ancients generally supped or took their chief meal. It answers to the "cœnaculum" of the Romans, in which they gave feasts.

2. Take the work known as the "Apostolical Constitutions." Some parts of these date as far back as the 4th century; and though by some persons they are not received as an authority, yet may they be quoted as illustrations of the practices of the early Christians. Among many injunctions respecting the Eucharist, these are found:—

- “Let every Believer take the Communion at the dawn of day.  
 “Let every Believer hasten to partake of the Eucharist before he tasteth of any other thing.  
 “Let every one take care, by investigation, that no unbeliever eateth of the Eucharist; nor a mouse; nor any other creature or any thing has fallen into it which has strayed. For if *thou* [the master or head of the family] hast blessed the cup in the name of God, and hast partaken of it like as the blood of Christ, keep thyself with the greatest care; spill not of it, lest a strange spirit lick it up.”—(*Coptic Coll.*, lib. ii., Canons 57-60.)

3. Take the old Saxon word, “*housel*.”\* This was the designation given by the Saxons to the Lord's Supper. It comes from the same noun which we in the present day employ as house. As the adjective of that word, it expressed among the Saxons the character or quality of the memorial of Christ. It remained in use until, and long after, the Danish conquest, and will be found in the laws which then regulated or enforced the observance of the Eucharist. “The *housel*,” therefore, carries us back to the period when the Lord's Supper was celebrated by the head of the household, among the members of his family. It does more: it describes the characteristic of the families in which it was celebrated, and shows that these households were marked by it in contradistinction to the Pagan families, by whom they were scorned; as also the nominally Christian families, by whom they were regarded with disapproval or indifference.

4. Take the English canon, A.D. 740.—This was the first law which *interdicted* the custom. It says, “No priest shall presume to celebrate mass in houses, nor in any other places but consecrated churches.”

---

\* See *Walker's Dictionary*, “*Housel*.”

The prohibition establishes the fact, that up to this period the practice obtained. It is also worthy of notice, that though the canon changed the place of celebration, it did not condemn, nor even so much as touch the *principle*, that the Eucharist was a household thanksgiving memorial, preserved as such in the families of the faithful. That principle was placed in abeyance, and as we shall immediately discover, is not yet lost.

5. Take the unrepealed statute of Henry VIII. (37th Henry VIII., cap. xii., sec. 12) relative to the payment of tithes and offerings in the City of London. Tithes are to be paid by every *Citizen*, but Easter offerings are demanded only of "Householders, if the wife, children, servant, or other of their families take their rights of the Church at Easter."

Two things are remarkable in this last clause: one—participation is the basis of the payment of Easter offerings; the other—that the highest offices of the church, viz., the Eucharistic, are enstamped with a domestic character ("if the wife, or other of their *families*"); and a still more expressive feature of the whole is, that householders are said "to take *their* RIGHTS of the church." The phraseology gives a parliamentary sanction to one of the most ancient prescriptive or common law rights of the people—rights which the church could not legally withhold, inasmuch as they form parts of the unwritten, or common law constitution of the church. The statute, therefore, recognizes and ratifies the *rights* of *families* to partake of the Lord's Supper. Why? Simply because the church had, centuries before, undertaken to perform the part of trustee or depositor. As a *church*, in its corporate capacity, it

did not possess any power over the Lord's Supper. It is possessed of administrative duty only; and therefore it has BORROWED FROM HOUSEHOLDERS, and NOT HOUSEHOLDERS DERIVED FROM THE CHURCH. This fact, legally established, is worthy distinct remembrance.

6. Take the two prayer books of Edward VI. The first was published in (as sanctioned by parliamentary authority) A.D. 1549, and gives several directions as to "receiving of the sacrament, most agreeable to the institution thereof, and to the usage of the primitive church." Among the rest, this is one—"Some one at least of *that house* in every parish, to whom by course, it appertaineth to offer for the charges of the communion, shall receive of the holy communion with the priest." The second book was published by like authority, A.D. 1552. One of the directions as to the celebration of the Lord's Supper is, "The bread and wine for the communion shall be *provided* by the curate and churchwardens at the charges of the parish, which shall be discharged of such duties, which hitherto they have paid for the same, by order of *their houses*, every Sunday."\* This appears to have been the first legal acknowledgment of the new method of providing the bread and wine. "Hitherto," *i. e.*, for eight hundred years, householders had, or were assumed to have had, provided these elements of the Eucharist. But thus to have offered those elements, would never have been submitted to by householders, had they not been induced to transfer to the ordinances of the church that which they had been accustomed to celebrate in their own houses.

---

\* *Liturgies of Edward IV.*, Parker Society, pp. 98 and 283.

Before this change took effect, the daily observance, even in the church, had greatly declined. Still it obtained. Cathedrals and some parish churches retained the practice; and to this day the custom is not *prohibited*. "The church had stuck close to the primitive institution for the first four hundred years; and certainly the most sure way to restore the church to its true strength and beauty is to begin with that which is of the greatest moment—I mean the re-establishment of the primitive communion office, and the frequent celebration of it, viz., every Lord's-day, for the whole of our religion may fairly and without any force be summed up and recapitulated in the Holy Eucharist."\*

If, however, there be any force in this appeal to antiquity, that antiquity ought to be carried not only to the furthest possible period, but to the *whole* of what that period attests. Then we reach the daily observance, as part and parcel of the household observance. The decline in the first sprang out of the decay of family religion. To this last fact all, or nearly all, the fatal errors of the church is to be traced. Why is religion—pure, vigorous, mental and practical religion—even now so effete in all our churches? Because religion is so ephemeral in our households. Elevate, ennoble, and enlarge home piety, and you expand and exalt church piety. The house must

---

\* *Johnson's Ecclesiastical Laws*. General Preface, page 52.—This distinguished canonist here advances a most dangerous assertion. "The Holy Eucharist, the whole or summing up of religion." (?) The error of judgment is proved by the indisputable fact, that it was *eucharistic perversions*, more than any other one matter, which destroyed, after having distorted, the whole of religion. Nor would it be safe to entrust the church again with any such despoiling power.

first become the cradle of the church, and then it will prove a most faithful guardian and an efficient coadjutor. Upon this great principle, that the character of the family is to impart the character of the church, Jehovah himself established the Jewish theocracy. The institution of the household celebration of the Passover was the first step, or rather the foundation-stone of the after-government of the Jews as a distinct nation. And when, after the lapse of many years, and the fatal departures of that nation from its original obligations, it was promised restoration to its own land, and the re-establishment of its civil and religious constitutions, it was led to expect that mighty and thrilling work as the result of an altered and improved character, commenced in the households and completed in the nation. "In that day, I will be a God to all the FAMILIES of Israel, and they shall be my PEOPLE." (Jeremiah xxxi. 1.) The moral reformation which preceded the national restoration there predicted, advanced from the smaller to the greater circle. Without the one, the other could not exist, seeing it would want that connecting *influence* by which alone Jehovah brings to pass mighty and required results. The matchless wisdom he displays in this rule of his moral government is of universal application. Nations must be prepared for whatever he is prepared to make them; so, too, must churches, be they great or small. But that preparation must itself proceed by fixed laws: the laws of influence, based and proceeding upon a rule of geometrical progression, so that the greater result can never be expected unless the lesser power has previously been employed. Reverse this order in the Divine government, and we defeat the purpose of

heaven, so long as this violation of his laws obtains practical operation. Sinister and corrupt priests in olden times did reverse this rule both in relation to the principle, and the progress of religion. They not only shut out the family, but substituted one person instead. Seizing hold of one of the most vigorous active powers of household religion, they taught that the Eucharist belonged exclusively to themselves to celebrate and to guard. We shall hereafter find that they declared it to be a "sacrifice," which none but priestly hands were to touch; and no other place than a "consecrated church" be honoured by its being celebrated. Determined that it should be something more than a simple memorial, or thanksgiving "remembrance" of Christ, they, by a long course of perversions, succeeded in teaching the people that there was something else in it than they had ever themselves discovered or appreciated.

Was this all? Assuredly not. A hidden purpose lie coiled up under the error. That purpose itself sprang out of one grand, all-absorbing, and exciting object of ecclesiastical ambition. Whence then was it that the Eucharist became perverted from its pristine simplicity, both of character and celebration? Did any ambiguity or mystery pertain to it? Certainly not. Was it that Christianity, taken as a whole, required such a framework as should present it to men in a form different to that which its Divine Founder designed should be put together? He was too wise so much as to sanction, much less originate either of these suicidal principles in his spiritual government. But, said the church, Is not the Saviour of souls the Sovereign of souls? He is. Then we mean to place his table in close proximity

to his throne. And as she passed by his table she so measured her steps as to snatch at his throne. Laying hold of his sceptre, she broke it against his cross; then gathering up one of its broken parts, she showed it with complacent triumph, and shouted, "See an emblem of mercy!" It was a rod. In her hands it became the rod, not of a usurper only, but of an oppressor. A ruler she had determined to be; and by no method could she so easily or effectually succeed, as by teaching, that the only pathway to his throne, either of grace or of glory, was that which encompassed his table.

The religious element in all this was not allowed to remain an abstract opinion. Ambition gave it vitality; and vitality imparted organization, development and strength. The first kindling of which originated from the fact that imperial Rome had become dismembered under the first Christian Emperor. Ecclesiastical Rome, therefore, chalked out for herself a more glorious empire; one that should embrace all nations, consolidate all influences, and obtain the homage of rulers both of the East and West. "We will construct," said the Bishop of Rome, "an entirely new empire." And in this determination we have the spring-head of all her errors.



## PART II.

**The Origin of Eucharistic Errors.**

THEY all sprung from one source: false and dangerous opinions respecting Christ's kingdom on earth. The fondly-cherished purpose of Rome was to establish a Christian theocracy. Of this visible embodiment of the power of the King of kings, the city on the seven hills was to be the metropolis; the successors of Peter the head; canon law the rule of government, and England a province. This was her grand ulterior purpose. For this she planned her schemes, baited her enticements, and consolidated her influence. "The King of all kings," she exclaimed, ought to possess a *visible* throne as well as a table; ought to hold a court; and in return for having once had put into his hand a mock sceptre, and suffered insults from the mob that crowded around his cross, ought to be able to display the full regalia of his kingdom on earth.

Rome taught this lesson to the world. Where had Rome learned it? She had had two schools, from each of which she had gathered detached portions of the one great lesson. Her two model powers were the Pagan and the Jewish. The Pagan model she more studiously imitated than the Jewish, as there were many considerations inducing her to prefer Pagan altars.

One of these, dedicated to Hercules, under the designation of *Ara Maxima*, was held in high vene-

ration by the Romans three hundred years before the Christian era:\* to this hero the Romans offered sacrifices after his death. His worship became as universal as his fame: the temples they erected to his honour were numerous and magnificent. The "*Ara*" was generally made four square, nigh to, if not upon the ground: upon this they offered to the inferior gods. But the "*Ara Maxima*" stood high above the ground; so high, that the priest who sacrificed was constrained to lift up his hands *in altum*. Upon this they sacrificed to the great gods only, *i.e.*, to men deified, because they had lived as gods on earth, and who were canonized, by having their dead bodies carried with great solemnities to a pile of wood, and thereon consumed.

The Romans borrowed also from the Greeks. On the 5th of April they performed sacrifices unto Ceres, which they called *sacra Græca*. The bread of this order of sacrifice became deified; hence the custom at their marriages for the man and woman to eat of the same barley cake as they had offered in sacrifice. They had sacrifices of wine, of which those present lightly tasted of the cup as it was carried about to all the people. This rite passed under the designation of *Libatio*.† But their principal sacrifices were beasts, slain at, and offered upon the altar. Of certain parts of these the people also partook. For it was the opinion of the heathen that the *very substance and body of their deities insinuated itself into the victim as it was being offered, and became united to the person who eat of the sacrifice.*‡

---

\* Universal History, vol. xii., p. 100.

† Godwin *Romanæ Historiæ*, 34, 42, 56.

‡ *Elsner's Observations*, vol. ii., p. 108.

Their notion was, that thus to participate of, was to assimilate themselves to, the gods. A more attractive model could not have been presented than Hercules proved himself to the warlike Romans. Were they asked, *how* does he insinuate himself into the victim? *how* does your participation induce assimilation? They replied, We are not careful to explain what the gods themselves have not revealed.

The Romans therefore had the notions both of a real presence and of an invisible mystery. But if pagan Rome borrowed from pagan Greece, so did papal Rome copy from both. We shall therefore find these and other rites about sacrifice incorporated into her Eucharist observances. As a "sacrifice," the Lord's Supper was declared to be by an ecclesiastical law, in the eighth century.\* And when this one grand error had been committed, all the others were mere questions of time and mode of introduction.

As to the Jewish altar, the case was somewhat different, as this never possessed the same features as the pagan, though there were many things about even this, which by certain modifications could be easily inwrought into the newly forming Christian theocracy. Indeed Rome did not hesitate to select from either the Pagan or Jewish models. Each offered scattered fragments, which she employed assiduous care to collect, unremitting energy to frame together, and no small amount of artistic skill to adorn as an edifice of her own. From the Jewish model she copied. With the Pagan model she made a compromise.†

---

\* See under A.D. 740, Part III.

† See Appendix A.

Her purpose was adroitly developed. It was not avowed, even while she was busily engaged laying the foundation stones. By little and little men were taught the elementary portions of the one great lesson. At first such words were employed as intimated, and at the same time excited, a desire to prove more of the reality of which these words were the studiously-prepared symbols. So early as A.D. 679, after Agatho, the Pope, had assembled an extraordinary Council "to examine and treat concerning the state of the church in the island of Britain," consisting of fifty bishops and abbots, he sent the copy of their decrees back to England, stating that this Council "was held in *the Royal Palace*, of Our Saviour the Lord Jesus Christ, at a place called Constantiniana."\* Silently the design was carried forward. It oozed out where it was least expected. "Odo, the Lowly and Meanest" (for so he called himself), as Archbishop of Canterbury, in A.D. 943, made a number of Canons, in which he speaks of Gregory, with many bishops and priests, as having assembled in the "*Royal House of Blessed Peter*," and of his own fellow-bishops as being "subject to *our imperial command*."† An English monarch was, in A.D. 1237, told by a legate from Rome that "the dedication of *royal temples* was known to have taken its beginning from the Old Testament, and was observed by the Fathers in the New Testament, under which it ought to be done with the greater care and dignity; because, under the former, sacrifices of dead animals were offered, but under the latter, the heavenly, living, and true sacrifice, that is, Christ, the only begotten Son

---

\* *Spelman* i. 158—160.

† *Johnson*.

of God, is offered on the altar for us by the hands of the priest."\* This was bold blasphemy ; it, however, harmonized in intention, and did in effect pave the way for what was more fully avowed by Othobon, another legate from Rome, who, in A.D. 1268, declared that "the institutes of the sacred canons are to be imitated by secular princes in their laws."\* An Archbishop of our own, in his Constitutions, passed at Reading, A.D. 1279, required "the people to prostrate themselves or make humble adoration wheresoever the *King of Glory* is carried under the cover of bread." And not content with demanding this prostration of the people, he had the audacity, three years after, to declare "that those whom Peter binds with his laws, are bound in the *imperial heavenly palace*."\*

Another Archbishop, also of our own, hath said, "*the whole court of heaven* is undoubtedly present at the Sacrament of the altar while it is consecrating and after it is consecrated."\* (A.D. 1322.)

But the iniquity became full blown under the auspices of Archbishop Arundel, who, in his memorable Constitutions, passed at Oxford, A.D. 1408, says the church is "the key-keeper of eternal life and death ; the vicegerent not of an earthly man, but of the true God : and to whom God himself hath given the *rights of a celestial empire*."\*

In these quotations the purpose of establishing a theocracy is clearly seen. The climax was reached after a period of seven hundred and twenty-eight years. At first we read of a "Royal Palace," but at

---

\* These words are all taken from *Spelman, or Johnson's Ecclesiastical Laws*, as they appear under their respective dates.

last we are told of the "rights of a celestial empire," exercised by the key-keepers of eternal life and death!

Impiously arrogant key-keepers! Stand aside. We wish to enter your palace; and for that purpose shall borrow those very canons which ye tell us "are like keys to open the gates of salvation and grace to man." Not that we care much for "the grace" they confer; and still less desire "the salvation" they pretend to secure. But we mean to use them nevertheless. They will unlock every compartment of your "royal temple." There we shall trace out the whole collection which a thousand years and more have served to accumulate. And as the principal part of this collection relates to *the* table of "the King of Glory," we shall chiefly examine its provisions. You yourselves have taken greater pains about this than about any other portion either of grace or salvation. No one subject ever engaged so much thought, called up so much solicitude, or enlisted so many appliances of power on your part. As ecclesiastical legislators, ye have made the Eucharist a pre-eminent study, simply because it occupied a pre-eminent position.

We advance, then, to our third and principal theme, viz., the Progressive Development of Eucharistic Errors.

## PART III.

**The Progressive Development of Eucharistic Errors.**

THESE mischief-working principles were unfolded by a process, silent as time and certain as death. Rome did not dare to avow them in their entire form, either of merit or of effect, all at once. Had she done so, they would have been disowned, renounced, and execrated by the indignant voice of an insulted nation. It required considerable judgment to evolve them safely. The standard of treason against the Son of God was not raised the very moment that that treason was planned. Even the traitors themselves scarcely knew at first what course to pursue. But as domination was the creed, and conquest the determination, Rome employed every available method within her power by which to succeed. The end justified the means; the purpose honoured the agent; and the results attested heaven's approval of the whole. So, at least, Rome has proclaimed to the world.

The chronological development of the errors will illustrate these statements. This method will show that Rome, having selected her model power, chose from time to time those agents whom she could best trust to carry on the superstructure.

Changes might and did affect the fortunes of the sovereigns, particularly the earliest, she entrapped. No matter : if they rose, she could press them to her bosom ; if they sank, she could as complacently spurn them from her feet. Dynasties, even, might flourish or perish, kingdom might swallow up kingdom, and the whole eventually become absorbed into one supreme ruling power, and still she was seen at their side : now tacitly approving, then arrogantly condemning ; now showing "the cross," then pronouncing "the doom ;" and all with one fixed, silent, and expressive purpose—that of gaining the ascendancy, whoever and whatever might dwindle into helplessness. That most sinful of all dispositions, selfishness, lie coiled up at the base of her every action ; and that most odious of all its features, viz., religious selfishness, dishonoured her every intention.

This is patent to the world. The facts and illustrations abound. As we advance along the high road papal Rome threw up for the purpose of facilitating her moral conquest of the world, we shall trace the remnants of her power in far more numerous aggregations, and in much more impressive characteristics than imperial Rome has left behind of her prowess in the four highways which took the length and the breadth of the kingdom. Upon every one of these remnants of papal Rome, this one inscription may be deciphered, "The *RULE* of Christianity."\*

That rule will now appear. It commenced with the Anglo-Saxon dynasty.

---

\* See explanation of the chart, under "Germanus," the last paragraph.



## SECTION I.—THE ANGLO-SAXON DYNASTY.

## ETHELBERT.

The first Anglo-Saxon monarch with whom the Bishop of Rome came into contact was Ethelbert, King of Kent. Him Augustine saw, influenced, and half persuaded, soon after having landed in the Isle of Thanet, where he tarried with his forty companions until sent for by the now inquiring monarch. He had heard of the Christian religion from Bertha, his wife, who, upon her marriage, had stipulated that she should be allowed the free use of her religion. Some days after Augustine's arrival, the King came into the island, when "bearing a silver cross for a banner, and the image of our Lord and Saviour painted on a board, and singing the litany, they offered up prayers to the Lord for the eternal salvation of those to whom they were come."\* And thus Augustine introduced the Romish faith.

Ethelbert heard Augustine preach; "But as your words," said he, "are new to us, I cannot approve of them so far as to forsake that which I have so long followed with the whole English nation."† He, however, permitted them to reside in the city of Canterbury, and did not refuse them liberty to preach. "There was on the east side of the city a church dedicated to the honour of St. Martin, built whilst the Romans were still in the island, wherein the Queen used to pray. In this they first began to meet, to pray, to say mass, to preach, and baptize, till the King, being converted to the faith, allowed

---

\* *Bede*, lib i. cap. 25.

† *Ibid.*

them to preach openly and to build or repair churches in all places.”\*

Ethelbert was not only King of Kent, but Bretwalda, or dominant king, chosen by the other monarchs of the Heptarchy, who delegated to this one certain prerogatives. “He exercised an almost absolute power over all the kingdoms lying south of the Humber, the Northumbrians alone having found means to keep themselves independent. All the rest chose rather to submit than contend with him.”†

Augustine could present to this ambitious King an inducement of no ordinary character in support of his mission. The Benedictine monk told him of Roman law—the embodiment of the wisdom and government of Roman Emperors when they ruled the nations of the earth. This had received considerable enlargement and improvement about seventy years previously, under the renowned Justinian, whose code was received both in the eastern and western empires, and at the time of Augustine’s mission into Britain, was held in great repute. “Among the benefits which Ethelbert conferred upon the nation, he also, by the advice of the wise persons [or supreme assembly], introduced judicial decrees after the Roman model, which, being written in English are still kept and observed by them, resolving to give protection to those *whose doctrine he had embraced*.”‡

The Roman model§ embraced ecclesiastical as well as secular government. For this purpose the

\* *Bede*, lib. i. cap. 26.

‡ *Bede*, lib. ii. cap. 5.

† *Rapin* i. 198.

§ See Appendix, Note B.

Roman law was divided into several compartments, one of which, relative to religion, was designated pontifical law, and included all matters connected with sacrificial rites as they had obtained under Pagan Rome. The emperors had therefore been styled "Pontifex Maximus," or high priest; but this "title the Emperor Gratian, in the year 375 of the Christian era, refused, thinking it inconsistent with the Christian religion to bear even the name of high priest in the rites of the Gentiles."\*

The ostensible inducement for the papal church to adopt Roman law, was that under its sanction a very great number of secular privileges were conferred upon the ecclesiastical estate. This fact was constantly pleaded by the church. Hence in that most eventful act—the submission of the civil power in England to the bishops of Rome (hereafter more fully to appear), the special privileges of the church were distinctly provided for and secured. "Let no unjust tributes be imposed on the church of God," (said to the Legates from Rome,) "nor greater than those allowed by the *Roman* law, and the custom of former emperors, kings, and princes." This was exacted in A.D. 785, and was so worded as to include *all* secular authority, whether foreign or English. "Emperors" referred to Roman sovereigns: "kings and princes" to Anglo-Saxon monarchs, several of whom had, before this period, exempted the church from taxation and other public burdens.

An equivalent for those privileges was supplied (at least in profession) in the advantages the secular power obtained from the ecclesiastical authority.

---

\* *Universal History*, vol. xiii, p. 521.

When these advantages were first presented to the Anglo-Saxon monarchs, they exerted all the freshness of first-born distinctions—distinctions pertaining to the mightiest of mighty emperors; and with which they were proud to be adorned; and for which their subjects felt equally honoured to make acknowledgment.

Augustine, therefore, could have little or no difficulty in inducing Ethelbert, his patron and convert, to adopt a code of laws, recommended by emperors both of the earliest, and the then latest periods in the history of the Mistress of the World. To the aspiring Anglo-Saxon monarch was offered an attractive “model” of imitation. As explained and superintended in its application by Augustine, it would, to a very great extent, supersede the necessity of a distinct class of religious laws for the kingdom of Kent. This accounts in a great measure for the fact, that the kings of Kent made fewer ecclesiastical laws than most of the other Anglo-Saxon monarchs.

#### INÆ AND THE WEST SAXONS.

The king who in this country first intermeddled with the Lord’s Supper was Inæ, of the West Saxons. He thus ushered in his laws :—

A.D. 693,  
Inæ Rex. “I, Inæ, by the gift of God, King of the West Saxons, by the advice of Kenred, my father, and Hedde,\* my bishop,” (who would have informed him of the labours both of Augustine and Theodore) “and with all mine aldermen and the senior counsellors of my nation; and also a large assembly of the servants of God have been consulting the health of our souls and the stability of our reign, that right law and right royal dooms may be settled among our people.”

---

\* “Hedde” was the third bishop of Winchester, to which See he was appointed A.D. 676, and after holding it twenty-seven years, died

He goes on to say—

“If a man be charged with robbing in a very large gang, let him either pay his weregild or make his purgation. Half of them that take the oath shall be frequenters of the communion.”

This was the first sacramental test in England. It was the test of veracity, and contains principles both of a religious and civil character, more important than upon the surface of the laws becomes immediately apparent. In a religious aspect, it was designed by the framers of the law to impress upon the mind that there was a more direct and immediate connection between God and the frequenter of the communion, than was secured by any other religious act. Insincerity at the altar involved higher penalties than the same sin committed at other places or times. Oaths, called upon God to witness the truthfulness of evidence; the communion taken upon that oath, called upon God to punish any falsehood.

It is, however, remarkable that neither moral worth, nor judicial veracity were in that age estimated according to their own intrinsic value. For this same law provided that “a bailiff of one of the king’s thanes, if his weregild be laid at twelve hundred shillings, and if he be a frequenter of the communion, his oath shall be of as great availment as his that hath sixty plough lands.”

---

in A.D. 703. “He was a good and just man, and exercised his episcopal duties rather by his innate love of virtue than by what he had gained by learning. Many miraculous cures, it is wont to be related, have been wrought in the place where he died, through the merit of his sanctity; and that the men of that province used to carry the dust from thence for the sick, which, when they had put into water, the sprinkling or drinking thereof restored health to many sick men and beasts; so that the holy earth being frequently carried away, there was a considerable hole left.”—*Bede*, lib. v. cap. 18.

A plough land was probably thirty acres, or as much as one plough and one team would plough in a year. Sixty plough lands therefore indicated a man of considerable substance. The man who possessed these stood second in degree in a court of law; the deacon's oath being laid at sixty plough lands, and the priest's at one hundred and twenty, which was the highest rate at which any subject could then be laid.

Deeply as such an ecclesiastical law would in that early age intermix itself with judicial proceedings, and through them with the transactions of society (for laws always form, as well as indicate, social life) it took a still wider range. It silently, but powerfully, identified the altar with the land. Augustine had induced the making of a law in Kent respecting the "*goods*" of the church, to steal which was deemed sacrilege, and was punished with more severe penalties than if the same things had been stolen from laymen. Now, the *land* is linked in with the altar. High as the bailiff of a king's thane (or the baron who held *in capite*) might stand with his lord, or his lord's serfs, he took a higher position still "if a frequenter of the communion." There he was next the priest, as to the value of his oath. "Give us some of that land, the value of which is increased, if you come to our altars," said the priests. And the proprietors of the soil replied, "It is but fair you should hold a part of that, which to us becomes more valuable by reason of our approach to your communion. If we gain the honour, you ought assuredly to reap advantage." It was in fact the principal way in which the priest could then be paid. It was easy therefore, for sinister men to grasp more land than

they ought; and especially since they could more successfully cultivate it than many of the untutored Saxons knew how to do. As these rose in intelligence, some of them saw and felt the chain by which they had been bound while ignorantly or superstitiously asleep. Their descendants suffered more severely in after periods;\* so much so that at one time ecclesiastics bid fair to become the owners of the greatest part of the land.

The principle of identifying oaths and the Eucharist, introduced by West Saxons, was adopted by the other kingdoms during the heptarchy, and became so wrought in all the civil institutions (especially the judicial) of the nation, as to prevail a very long time after the Saxon heptarchy had itself become absorbed into one united kingdom. An oath, and the sacrament upon that oath was, down to a late period in English history, held as an additional solemnity; and when voluntarily performed, gave the highest possible sanction to any declaration. Curious as is the law of Inæ, we shall hereafter find that his example, in imposing sacramental tests, was followed in the seventeenth century. Nor need he be ashamed of the *animus* of his law, when compared with the dishonour done to Christianity in the latter period.

This West Saxon monarch was a great warrior, and something more. He twice went on pilgrimages to Rome: was the first English king that established tribute money to the Pope, under the name of Peter Pence, the enforced payment of which embroiled succeeding sovereigns in no small amount of national conflict with the Pontiff, until the time of Henry VIII.

---

\* See Appendix, Note C.

He was also one of the eight or nine Anglo-Saxon kings who turned monks, as his own predecessor, Cadwalla, had done; and having, like him, resigned his crown, Inæ retired from his own country and finished his days as a saint at Rome.

At the superstition which induced such proceedings, we shall not be surprised when we learn that the emissaries of Rome were eager and successful teachers of religious bondage. No matter how impious, rapacious, warlike, and cruel these kings were one among the other, they had but to bend their way to Rome, and there they would find the gates of heaven open before them. Hence Bede\* says of Inæ's predecessor, Cadwalla, "that having governed his nation two years, he quitted his crown for the sake of our Lord and went to Rome, being desirous to obtain the peculiar honour of being baptized in the church of the blessed apostles, for he had learned that in baptism alone the entrance into heaven is opened to mankind!" "He was baptized on the holy Saturday before Easter, in the year of our Lord 689, and being still in his white garments he fell sick and departed on the 20th of April."

#### WIHTRED.

But we must leave these West Saxons, and direct our way towards the adjoining kingdom of Kent. Wading through marshes, which impede our progress, picking our course over roads which resemble ploughed fields, watching the appearance of robbers at almost every step we take, we at last arrive at a place called at that time Baccanceld, but now known

---

\* Lib. v. cap. 7.



as Bapchild, a little village containing about seventy houses, and less than four hundred inhabitants. It is near Sittingbourne, on the Canterbury side. The traveller sees in it nothing to excite curiosity; but to the antiquarian it is replete with interest,

In this place King Wihtred, or Withred, "as soon as he was king, commanded a great council to assemble, he himself being present, and Brihtwald, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Tobias, Bishop of Rochester, and the abbots and *abbesses* with them; and many wise men were there assembled to take counsel together about the reparation of the churches," (which had suffered dreadfully in the then late wars with the West Saxons) in Kent.

But as the laws made in this council (held A.D. 692) did not contain any reference to the altar, we proceed to consider more particularly those which were enacted at a second grand council. The record thus ushers in these "dooms of Wihtred, the most clement A D. 696,  
Wihtred Rex. king of the Kentish, where he bare rule in the fifth year of his reigh, on the 6th day of August, at a place called Berghamstead," (now called Burstead, near Maidstone,) "a conciliary congress of great men was assembled. There every order of the church in that nation, of the same mind, with the *people* subject to them, were present and treated." In this council three things are remarkable.

1. "It is sufficiently plain that the people in this country had consultive and even conclusive voices."\*

2. The freedom granted to the church. By this and the preceding council, it was declared exempt from taxes; and the law adds, "Let men pray for the

---

\* Johnson's observation upon this law.

king, and honour him of their own accord, without any compulsory law." In this there appears a striking confirmation of the fact, that in Kent at least, compulsion in matters of religion was unknown. One hundred years previously the same principle had been acted upon by Ethelbert, of whom it is said, "He had learned from his instructors and leaders to salvation that the service of Christ ought to be voluntary, not by compulsion."\*

In the case of Wihtred, the principle of religious freedom appears the more extraordinary, as it was accompanied by exemption from all pecuniary burdens or taxes. He must, therefore, have had unbounded confidence in himself as a righteous ruler, in the people as obedient subjects, and in unfettered religion as the great conservator of the rights of both parties in the state.

3. The most remarkable of these laws are those relative to "the communion." For the word sacrament as applied to the Lord's Supper, or in fact to any other sacred ceremony, was as yet unknown. The ninth in this code utters this memorable sentence:—

"If a man give freedom to a slave *at the altar*, let the family be free; let him take his liberty, have his goods, and a weregild and protection for all that belong to his family, though out of bounds where he pleaseth."

"Most clement" Anglo-Saxon monarch! Thou hast put to shame republicans of the nineteenth century. The President, the Congress, the ministers of religion, and hosts of people confederated and known as the American United States, act upon diametrically opposite principles. They there refuse

---

\* *Bede*, lib. 1, cap. 26.

liberty to slaves ; nay, they pursue with blood-hounds those fugitives who seek, and therefore deserve to be able, to snap their chains asunder ; they denounce and punish those who teach slaves to read ; they even sell by public auction the husband apart from the wife, and tear asunder the mother from her child ; and, as if they meant to offer a studied insult to Christendom, some of the very ministers of religion bring, or attempt to bring, the authority of heaven to bear upon and justify this gross violation of the first law of nature ; and are no less guilty of a suicidal act against their own constitution, which at one time *said*, "All men are equal."

"Freedom at the altar." Attractive association of words ! The very enunciation of them proved that their freedom was regarded as an essential element in religion ; and that, to *give* freedom to a slave was a religious act. No wonder that the common people should exclaim, "See, the men who serve at the altar are our friends ; they encourage our freedom ; they provide that the act which liberates the husband emancipates at the same time his wife and family. Ah ! and a weregild also." The price he would fetch if sold, or the money his master would claim if he were injured or murdered by another, lie upon the altar, and was put into the slave's hand along with his grant of liberty ! Whatever, therefore, these benefactors said *about* the altar was sure to be believed, so long as *at* the altar they dispensed such precious gifts. Hence the comparative ease with which Eucharistic errors were enforced upon the people. They cared little for the theological niceties of the question. To men who loved liberty as much as they valued life, this association of freedom with

the altar rendered the latter an object of immense attraction.\*

It deserves, therefore, to be distinctly remembered that, to the eternal honour of the Anglo-Saxon Church, it adopted as its own the civil interests of the poor slave; and that at a time when kings were despotic, and manorial lords swayed rods of iron.

In these laws of Wihtred there are several more relating to the slave, all of which pointed in one direction—his rescue by church authority from the then irresponsible domination of their masters. It would richly repay perusal to quote these laws; but, as they do not immediately connect themselves with the Communion, we pass them by, in order to record the 23rd of those of the Kentish King. It says:—

“If any one impeach a servant of God, being a man of their own convent, let his lord purge him upon his (*i.e.* the lord's) single oath *if he be a communicant*. If he be not a communicant, let him have another good voucher with him at taking the oath.”

From this it is evident that the same principle obtained in Kent as in West Saxony, in relation to criminal trials. “The Communion” imparted higher sanction to the oath. The value of this particular Kentish law was great. The lord of the convent was the abbot. Laymen frequently, in this and succeeding periods, occupied the position, and were

---

\* In the adjoining kingdom of the South Saxons, Bishop Wilfred “laboured among them five years, during which he instructed them in the faith of Christ, and baptised them all. Among whom were 250 men and women slaves, all of whom he, by baptism, not only rescued from the servitude of the devil, but gave them their bodily liberty also, and exempted them from the yoke of human servitude.”—*Bede*, lib. iv., cap. 13, A.D. 681.

not always communicants, as their characters were often such as to disqualify them for the ordinance of the Lord's Supper. Rank did not, therefore, supersede moral worth, even in the age when honours and wealth were special objects of ambition; nor did ecclesiastics even then receive a boon for admitting improper men to the table of the Lord.

We would fain linger in Kent; but must now take a geographical leap. This is done in order to preserve that chronological arrangement upon which the whole of this book is based. The leap of which we speak is from Kent into

#### NORTHUMBRIA.

Gregory having heard from Augustine that he had a great harvest and few labourers, sent him additional helpers. Among them was Paulinus, who, on the 21st of July, A.D. 625, was ordained Bishop to the nation of the Northumbrians; and, on the 12th of April, A.D. 627, the King, Edwin, was by him baptized:—

“So great was then the fervour of the faith, and the desire of the washing of salvation among the nation of the Northumbrians, that Paulinus, at a certain time coming with the King and Queen to the royal country seat, which is called Adgefrin (Yeverin, in Glendale, near Wooler, Northumberland), stayed there with them thirty-six days, fully occupied in catechising and baptizing; during which days, from morning till night, he did nothing else but instruct the people, resorting from all villages and places, in Christ's saving word; and when instructed, he washed them with the water of absolution in the river Glen [Bowent], which is close by.” “He baptized also in the river Swale, which runs by the village of Cataract [or Catterick in *N. York*], for as yet fonts could not be made in the early infancy of the church in those days.”\*

Paulinus was not allowed to reap the full reward

---

\* *Bede*, lib. ii., cap. 14.

of his toils. His convert and patron, King Edwin, was slain in battle in 633. All Northumbria after this was in confusion. The Bishop fled by sea into Kent, from whence he had originally departed on this mission; and as Romanus, Bishop of Rochester, had, on his being sent to the Pope, been drowned at sea, Paulinus took charge of that Church, and there died, 10th of October, 644.

Ecclesiastical historians, and particularly Bede, who was himself a native of Northumbria, tell us of a great many wonder-working men, both kings and priests; but whose exploits inflicted no small injury upon the religious institutions of this extensive kingdom. Zeal of a certain character prevailed among the Saxon monarchs generally. Oswy, King of Northumbria, and Egbert, King of Kent, "consulted together about the state of the English Church," and one result was, they sent Wighard, "a good man and fit priest, to Rome, that he, having received the degree of an Archbishop, might ordain Catholic prelates for the churches of the English nation throughout all Britain."\* Death, however, was beforehand with the Pope; for he and his companions were swept away by the pestilence which at that time raged at Rome. Vitalian then occupied St. Peter's chair, and, as "the servant of the servants of God," addressed to Oswy and his wife a kind letter. To the former he sent presents, "the relics of the blessed apostles, Peter and Paul, and of five holy martyrs;" and to the latter, "a cross with a gold key to it, made out of the most holy chains of the apostles Peter and Paul."

---

\* *Bede*, lib. iii., cap. 29.

Where had the ecclesiastical toys been manufactured? What was the intention of their being thus sent as precious gifts? That they were highly valued is evident; for Oswy and his wife deposited them in their royal chapel. The purpose of the Pope was to bind their minds still faster to the church; and, by inducing confidence and affection for them, to render her influence more certain, and her authority more extensive and easy.

No set of monarchs were more fatally ensnared by Rome than these Anglo-Saxon monarchs. It was as common for them to turn monks as it was for them, previously, to have been crafty, cruel, and rapacious warriors. Hence Eadbryht, or Eadbert, King of Northumbria, brother to the authority we shall next quote, assumed the monkish habit, and was "shorn" in 757, as had Ceolwulf, from whom he received the kingdom, twenty years before. This was done, says Bede, that Eadbert might "gain the heavenly kingdom by violence."

His brother was not less remarkable as Archbishop of York. He held this See thirty-two years, that is, from 734 to 766. His name was

#### ECBRIHT.

To him the church owed more than the kingdom received from his brother—owes, not in the way of gratitude, but of deep regret. At the time he passed the laws about to be considered, he most probably thought he was promoting the interests of his church. But even pure intentions are not always tests of pure laws. Nay, the very worst laws may, and often do, proceed from upright motives, so far as the individual making them is concerned; but

which, nevertheless, lay the foundation, if they do not exactly raise the superstructure, of an edifice, which afterwards becomes the abode of birds of prey. This fact receives illustration in the case before us; for we shall find that what Ecbriht began in 740, Cuthbert carried forward in 747, and remained as a despoiling power during eight hundred years.

In those ages it was common for one kingdom of the heptarchy to follow the example of another. Among the customs imported into Northumbria, one related to fasts: Ecbriht therefore, in A.D. 734, said—

“The custom grew up (thanks be to God) in the Church of the English, and was holden from the time of Vitalian the Pope, and Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury, that not only clerks in the monasteries, but also laymen, with their wives and families, went to their confessors, and cleansed themselves with tears and abstinence on twelve days before the nativity of our Lord, that so they might, with the greater purity, be partakers of the communion of the Lord on his nativity.”

The fact here stated is a remarkable evidence of the pains Theodore had taken to indoctrinate the English church with pagan notions. One of their laws said—

“It behoved them that would take in hand these holy things [chosen and selected sacrifices], to purify themselves some days before, and to abstain from carnal delights. Being thus prepared, they came and stood round the altar.”

Again—

“If they were about any solemn sacrifice to the gods, be the time what it would, it could never be lucky for either, not to abstain.”\*

Say, which of these prurient authorities—the

---

\* *Archæologia Attica* (published A.D., 1671), lib. ii., cap. 4, pp. 57—192.



pagan, Theodore, or Ecbriht, do you prefer ? Or are they all alike repulsive ?

Six years afterwards, Ecbriht promulgated other laws, bearing more expressly upon the Eucharist. These last laws he called a "Book, to be used as a Place of Prospect, from whence a view may be taken of canonical determinations." This compendium contains some one hundred and sixty-two canons : it is called the "Excerptions of Ecbriht," the MS. of which is in C C C C library, k 2.

The important bearing these canons had upon the character and discipline of the church in those days, requires that we give them special attention. The very preamble is of singular interest : it says, "priests only are to put in use, and read canonical constitutions ; for as none but bishops and priests ought to offer the Sacrifice, so neither should others put in use these dooms" [or laws]. Among these are the following—

1. "That no priest presume to celebrate mass in  
A.D. 740 private houses, nor in any other places but consecrated churches."

The previous use of the word "sacrifice," prepared the way for and justified this prohibition : that one word was ominous and fatal. Priests substituted their own ministrations in lieu of the memorial, which, up this period, householders had themselves in their private houses celebrated. This prohibition, therefore, was the first direct inroad made upon the rights of laymen by the Church of Rome. How laymen were brought to submit to it, we have no authentic data by which to judge. That their submission was itself singular appears from the fact, that laymen claimed and exercised other rights of prime im-

portance. Two only we will refer to, because they were matters of legislation by the same authority, and are contained in this very code. One was their appointment of priests: for notwithstanding the canons of Theodore,\* the people still remained in possession of the right to elect, although their power to dismiss criminous priests was crippled. Hence Ecbriht says, "Priests and deacons shall be ordained on the Sabbaths of the four seasons, that their ordination, being performed in the presence of the people, the reputation of the elected and ordained may be debated under the testimony of all." He had in 734 enjoined the same proceeding, based upon the same principle, with this difference; that then he employed the word "*examined* under the testimony of all." In what manner this election was debated or examined, is uncertain: it is, however, evident that in such election the testimony of all the people was studiously sought and solemnly given. The remnant of this right is still preserved. "Good people," says the bishop, "after due examination, *we* find they be lawfully called to their function and ministry; *but yet if there be any of you* which knoweth any impediment, now, in the name of God, declare the same."†

Another equally important right was that laymen might and did teach. This, also, was now prohibited.—"Let not a layman dare teach in the presence of clergymen, unless it be at their request." And another prohibition was still more authoritatively given—"Let not a woman, though holy and learned,

\* See under 673, Explanation of Chart.

† See "The Ordinal, or Ordination of Priests," in the books of Common Prayer of Edward VI. and that of Charles II., now in use.

dare to teach men in the assembly." So that the priests, having grasped the celebration of the Lord's Supper into their own hands, under the plea that it was a "sacrifice," went a step further, and monopolized the functions of teachers.\* These had been a distinct order (Eph. iv. 11); but were now struck dumb. The people of that age might wonder at this act; but the church of the present day may wonder still more that the "order" has never since been re-established.

2. "That all priests, with compassion, give the viaticum and the communion of the body of Christ to all sick people before the end of their life."

Was this an original idea? Is there anything in Christianity out of which it could arise? There is not so much as the shadow of a word to indicate that it came from Christ. The only source whence it could have been derived was pagan. It was one of their customs to put a piece of money into the dead man's mouth, with which he was to pay his fare to old Charon. "Together with the money, they threw in a piece of pudding or paste, for him to give to Cerberus to stop his wide mouth. It was usually made of flour, tempered with honey."\*

"The viaticum" appears to have been an improvement upon heathen mythology. It was to prepare the dying man for an immediate passage; whereas "the money" and "the paste" were given to the dead to prevent the delay or difficulty he would

---

\* Was an equivalent given to laymen for having been denied the memorial of Christ in their private houses, and at the same time tied up to the teaching priests chose to give them? One was offered, and, unhappily for them, accepted: it is contained in the next law.

† *Archæologiæ Atticæ*, lib. v., c. 20, p. 244.

otherwise have experienced in crossing the river Styx or Acheron. We pity them because they had not the "light of life." May they not, with sardonic grin, ask, when did that light go out?

3. "That all priests have the Eucharist always ready for the sick, lest they die without the communion."

They thus, in effect, held the fate of dying men in their own hands; although, in strictness of even Canon Law, they were nothing else than guardians of the reserved Eucharist.

4. "All must be careful to celebrate Easter at the certain season, viz., after the fourteenth moon of the first month."

5. "Such seculars as do not communicate on the nativity of our Lord, on Easter, and Pentecost, are not to be esteemed Catholics."

These two last are remarkable laws. That numbered 4 is remarkable for fixing the particular time at which Easter was to be observed. There had been great diversities of opinion and of practice as to this point. The men of the church in that period had long resembled those children at school, who seldom bring such strong passions to bear either upon their words, or conduct as when debating possession of some favourite toy; for they had fiercely contended about the time of Easter. At length, however, the English Church got rid of the old and much disputed question by fixing the precise time of Easter.

That numbered 5 is also remarkable. Upon the face of it, no reason appears for its enactment. Calvin, indeed, says, "The devil was the author of this law;" and Johnson, who quotes this opinion of Calvin, does not seem disposed to disavow the pater-nity. There must, therefore, have been some special

reason, as also some special results, to justify such an opinion. There were both. Bede informs us (A.D. 731) that—

“The Britons, though they for the most part, through innate hatred, are adverse to the English nation, and wrongfully, and from wicked custom, oppose the appointed Easter of the whole Catholic Church; yet from both the Divine and human power withstanding them, can in no way prevail as they desire; for though in part they are their own masters, yet elsewhere they are also brought under subjection to the English.”

“The wicked custom” of which these Welch Christians were guilty had been continued ever since Augustine had sought to bring the English Bishops under the Pope. This was one hundred and forty-four years before the time Bede wrote. During this period a constant warfare was kept up between the Welch and the Saxons. At length the latter settle the dispute by the very amiable method of excluding the former from Christian fellowship; and more than this, they signalize their triumph by an act of treason against not merely religious liberty, but religion itself. Every secular was to become a communicant three times a year at least. This law we shall find subsequently enlarged. The vicious principle once established, lived, grew, flourished, and reproduced itself in more vicious results. That this principle was intended to produce some special result appears certain from the fact, that it was *the* one constant point to which the church, in every succeeding age, reverted, and from whence it gathered additional weapons both of fraud and force. Calvin traced all these results in close, continuous, and unbroken succession; each one and all of which were strongly depicted upon his mind,

and led him to pronounce the emphatic sentence of condemnation now quoted. The ecclesiastical reproach of the eighth century is unremoved in the nineteenth! If, on reading the law of 740, we say, "This their way was their folly," historic truth compels us to add, "yet their posterity approve their sayings" (Psalm xlix. 13); for to this day, not only does this canon remain in force, but many others, which arose out of it, are distinctly recognized as the law of the church. When the reader arrives at the fourteenth century, he will, under the canonical institutes respecting the burial of non-communicants, have the required proof of present law.

6. "Let no altars be consecrated by Uction, with Chrism, unless they be of stone."

The pagans followed the same rule of consecration.

7. "In officiating at the altar, let prayer be always addressed to the Father. Let no man mention the Father for the Son, nor the Son for the Father."

This seems to open afresh the controversy which the Nicene Council had, in A.D. 325, attempted to settle. That controversy had turned upon the Sonship of Christ; and by the Arians was narrowed down to a single Greek letter—the difference lying between *ὁμοῦσιος* and *ὁμοιῶσιος*—that is "the same"—or "the like," substance.

8. "Let the priests of God always diligently take care that the bread and wine and water (without which masses cannot be celebrated) be pure and clean; for, if they do otherwise, they shall be punished with them who offered to our Lord vinegar mixed with gall, unless true penitence relieves them."

9. "Let those who are married contain themselves for three nights before they communicate, and one afterwards.

10. "If any one use his wife, not out of lust, but for procreation of children, he is to be left to his own discretion, either as to going to church, or receiving the mystery of the body and blood of the Lord."

This is the first English *law* which cites the word "*mystery*." The law itself is copied from the 6th answer to question viii. put by Augustine to Gregory, who employed various terms, *e. g.*, "inestimable Sacrament," "the Sacrament of the communion." True it is, that the terms, "holy mysteries," are used by Augustine in his question ix., in relation to their celebration by a priest. But up to this period there are no traces of any *legal* enactment in which the "*mystery*" is represented as being received by the people. Ecbricht derived the idea from Gregory; and Gregory admits he had it from pagans. He tells Augustine that "the sentiments and practice of several nations are very different as to this particular; yet it has for many ages past been the constant practice of the Romans reverently to abstain for awhile after having performed the conjugal act. Yet if a man be," &c.\* By his own showing, Gregory had gained his theology from libidinous sources. He quotes, it is true, Scripture; but never were the words of inspiration so misquoted or misinterpreted. He had far better have confined himself to "the many ages," during which pagan "Romans" had adhered to the same "sentiment and practice." He might also have gone to pagan Greeks. They had their *μυστηρια* to Venus, just as

---

\* See Gregory's Answers to Augustine (6th Answer to question viii.) in *Johnson's Ecclesiastical Laws*, A.D. 601.

pagan Romans had had their "*mystica sacra Dianæ.*" She was one of the five gods, whom the five torches carried before the bride on her way to the husband's house, represented: "to signify that no marriages were thought happy which were not contracted *sacramento ignis et aquæ*; the man and woman, therefore, did, both of them, at the time of their contract, touch water and fire provided for that purpose."\*

This "mystery of the body and blood of the Lord" now took the place of the mystery of Venus, or of Diana. It suggested the idea of marriage being a sacrament. Hence Ecbricht says, "Let the bridegroom and bride be *offered* by the parents to receive the priest's benediction; and let them remain virgins that night, in honour to that benediction, when they have received it."

11. "If any man be deprived of communion by his own Bishop, let him not be received by others before he is reconciled to his Bishop; or, however, comes to the Synod when assembled and makes satisfaction for himself. Let this determination be in force as to laymen, priests, and deacons, and to all that are known to be under the rule."

Laymen, therefore, attended Synods, and thus took part in the government of the church. Nor was "that decree valid," says Ecbricht, "which has not the consent of the most."

One more law and we will close. It is inserted at length; partly because of the light it throws upon certain rites which obtained in that age, but principally because it stands in intimate connection with the Eucharistic customs in the middle of the eighth century. It says:—

---

\* *Romanæ Historiæ Archæologiæ* (A.D. 1671), lib. ii., sec. 2, p. 71.  
—*Archæologiæ Atticæ*, lib. iv., c. 5, p. 161.



12. "All the faithful may—nay, it is demanded that they should—snatch a soul from the devil by baptism; that is, by baptizing them [children] with water simply blessed in the name of the Lord, by immersing them, or pouring water upon them, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Therefore they who can, and know how to baptize, faithful monks especially, ought always to have the Eucharist with them, though they travel to places far distant."

The Eucharist was given to the newly-baptized child; and therefore monks especially, who travelled more than priests, were always to take care to have the sacred elements with them in their itinerancies.

From these singularly expressive enactments, it is evident that if Northumbria proudly acknowledged she had borrowed her religious institutions from Vitalian and Theodore, she by that means obtained a very corrupted Christianity. Ecbricht himself proves this. He says, "Men must do nothing on the Lord's-day; but attend on God with hymns and psalms and spiritual songs. And all the days of Easter week are to be observed with equal devotion." Church authority is here placed upon a par with Divine authority—nay, more: it is virtually made to ride over it. "Equal devotion for all the days of Easter week," to that "observed on the Lord's-day!" This was to bring the commandments of men upon a level with the commands of heaven. Once do this, and you must go a step further. Inducing a preference for human authority, you offer a premium to set aside the sole authority of the Supreme Lawgiver, and then every particle of religion will drift off in any direction, sagacity, superstition, or impiety may for it prepare an under current.

## MERCIA.

We now pass into Mercia ; one of the most important, and, in territory, the largest of the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms. As it adjoined Northumbria, and in many respects was brought into close contact with its institutions, it was to be expected that, aided by the emissaries of Rome, Mercia would not remain behind any other kingdom in the character of its religious ordinances. In A.D. 742, Ethelbald, king of the Mercians, held a great council at Cloves-hoo, [the place at which Theodore had in 673 determined a synod should be assembled twice in the year,] "and they diligently inquired how matters were ordered in relation to religion, and particularly as to the creed, in the infancy of the Church of England." "Ancient privileges" came in also for a share of inquiry. The ordinance "of the glorious king Wihfred," king of Kent, was read, "and all that heard it said there never was any such noble and wise decree ; and therefore they enacted that it should be firmly kept by all." Thus Ethelbald, the greatest of the English monarchs, did honour to Wihfred, the King of Kent, the least of the seven kingdoms into which England was then divided. Ethelbald says he adopted "those ordinances of the King of Kent for the health of my soul, and the stability of my kingdom, and out of reverence to the venerable Archbishop Cuthbert ; and now confirm, by the subscription of my own munificent hand, that the liberty, honour, authority, and security of the Church of Christ be contradicted by no man."

A.D. 742. And to add greater solemnity to the whole, Ethelbald Rex. he declares, "If an earl, priest, deacon, clerk, or monk oppose this constitution, let him be deprived

of his degree, and separated from the participation of the body and blood of the Lord, and be far from the kingdom of God.”\*

All this, however, was only the beginning. The King of Mercia was too rich a prize to be left to himself. Five years afterwards, therefore, Cuthbert hastens to the same place [Cloves-hoo], and Ethelbald, King of the Mercians, is again present “in Synod with his princes and dukes:” this was in the thirty-second year of his reign. He appears to have been present, as approving of the proceedings; for the assembly was purely of an ecclesiastical character. Not one of the thirty laws which were then passed related to secular affairs; no, not even to the civil rights of priests. This council was held “at the beginning of September, in the year of our Lord’s Incarnation, 747—Indiction 15.”

These laws will be found at length in *Spelman*, vol. i., p. 245: but those only are here inserted which relate to the Lord’s Supper. Before, however, these are quoted, it may not be uninteresting to present the reader with the introduction to the whole code. He will perceive by this that no small importance was attached by the bishops assembled at this extraordinary council to the laws they then adopted. Their own intrinsic merits, and especially the relation in which these very laws were intended to place the English Church to the Bishop of Rome, gave to them special interest. It is to be remembered that up to this period the AUTHORITY of the Pope was not completely established in the whole island. This explains the following expressive paragraph in

---

\* *Johnson*.

the preamble—"When the prelates of the sacred order of divers provinces of Britain met at the Place of Synod, the writings of Pope Zachary (the pontiff and apostolical lord, to be venerated throughout the world) was in the first place produced, and publicly recited and explained in our own tongue, as he enjoined; in which writings the pontiff admonished in a familiar manner, the inhabitants of this isle of Britain of every rank and degree of quality, and authoritatively charged them, and in a loving manner instructed them, *and hinted* that a sentence of anathema should be certainly published against them that persisted in their pertinacious malice and contempt.

Twelve bishops\* heard this sentence read. "After the reading thereof, the prelates, who were promoted by God to be masters of others, betook themselves to mutual exhortations, and contemplated themselves and their office in the homilies of the blessed Father Gregory, and in the canonical decrees of the holy fathers, as in a bright mirror."

These extracts from the introduction will prepare the reader for a body of laws which paved the

- They were—Cuthbert, Archbishop of Canterbury } representing  
 Dun, Bishop of Rochester ..... } Kent.
- Totta „ Leicester }  
 Hinta „ Lichfield } representing Mercia.  
 Podda „ Hereford }
- Hunferd „ Winchester { representing the West  
 Herewald „ Sherborn { Saxons.
- Heardulf „ Dunwich, representing the East Angles.
- Ecgulph „ London „ „ East Saxons.
- Milred „ Worcester „ „ Mercia.
- Alwin „ Lindsey „ „ „
- Siega „ Selsey „ „ South Saxons

way for the most grievous violations of scriptural truth the Church of Christ had ever before sustained and some of which remained in full vigor during the long period of eight hundred years.

Among other errors now taught and enforced, were these :—

1. "They taught that priests should learn to know how to *perform* every office belonging to their orders; *i.e.*, to construe and explain in our own tongue, the sacred words which are solemnly pronounced at the celebration of mass." "Let them also take care to *learn* what those sacraments which are *visibly performed* in the mass, baptism, and other ecclesiastical offices, do *spiritually signify*, lest they be found ignorant in those intercessions which they make to God FOR THE ATONEMENT OF THE SINS OF THE PEOPLE, if they do not know the meaning of their own words."

Had the Son of God so stultified his own work as to assign to these men the office of making an atonement? No, answered the archbishop; but as all Christ said or did, bore a mystical character, it is imperative that the priests should "know" in what the mystical or spiritual signification really consists. The church here claims the right of authoritatively expounding mysteries; her interest, therefore, would lie first in creating them, and then in explaining them. This pretension would alone have been sufficient to entail, as it did, hosts of ridiculous, profane, and even revolting dogmas: but not satisfied with even this prolific source of corrupting Christianity, the church enacted another and even more fatally pernicious requirement, and one which assimilated her highest offices to Pagan rites. Her next law said—

2. "The Litanies, that is Rogations, shall be kept with great reverence, with fear and trembling, with the sign of Christ's passion,

and of our eternal redemption, carried before them,\* together with the relics of saints. Let all the people with bended knee humbly entreat the pardon of God for their sins."

Pagans had had their "solemn going in processions and carrying about their gods in the cirque. This solemnity was called *Pompa*, in which images of gods and the images of well-deserving men were carried in solemn procession." They, too, had their principal "sign;" for "the Romans made choice in every such solemnity of some one principal thing in their show unto which the glory should, in a more especial manner, belong." With them, an egg constituted this principal sign, "partly from its globe-like form, partly from the matter whereof it consisteth; the hard shell resembling the solid earth; the more spirituous part the air; the liquid part the water, and the yolk the element of fire: yea, as there is in the earth, so likewise there is in the egg a kind of quickening and enlivening power in both."†

Would we had ridden ourselves of all such Paganism, and of rites which retain *inter se*, "a quickening and enlivening power," and "a spiritual signification!" Another law said—

3. "Ecclesiastics are admonished to keep themselves always prepared for the Holy Communion of the body and blood of our Lord; and rectors shall take diligent care that none of their subjects lead such dissolute, wretched lives, as to be separated from the participation of the altar."

---

\* These processional displays are being revived. On the Feast of the Dedication of St. Matthias, Stoke Newington, June, 1856, the clergy and choristers formed a lengthened procession. Four, if not six, banners were displayed; one of which, being the principal, was formed of white silk, with a red cross, and was suspended over the pulpit, in which the Bishop of Salisbury preached.

† *Romanæ Historiæ*, lib. ii., sec. 3, pp. 81—4.

And how did they propose to prevent such dissolute lives? By teaching the fatal error that the sacrament of the altar would exert a saving effect. They therefore went on to say—

4. "Lay boys shall be also admonished often to communicate while they are not yet corrupted, as not being of the lustful age: also those of a riper age, whether bachelors or married men who refrain from sin, are to be exhorted that they frequently communicate, lest they grow weak for want of the salutary meat and drink, since our Lord says, 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.'" (John vi. 53.)\*

If those bishops who were said to be "promoted by God to be masters of others" were really advanced by heaven to this distinction, how came it to pass that in commanding other priests to understand the meaning of the words used at the celebration of mass they themselves did not understand the meaning of their own professed master? When Christ said, "Eat my flesh, and drink my blood," he used these words in a way common among the Jews, and intended not to refer to a ceremony, but to a principle. To eat as applied to teachers, was then understood to imbibe their doctrines, and related therefore to a mental participation of sacred truth, and not to a corporeal partaking of bread and wine at the altar. The word is employed by the sacred writer as a figurative expression in Rev. x. 9, where its obvious meaning is deep acquaintance with truth.

But the monster evil remains: it reads thus—

5. "THE ATONING CELEBRATION *shall be often piously performed by the ministrations of great numbers of priests of Christ, FOR THE REST OF THEIR SOULS WHEN THEY ARE DEAD, on condition that they remember to prepare themselves for this benefit while they are living, by often extending their pious patronage to the Church.*"

---

\* See Appendix, Note D.

Whatever importance these men attached to their own laws—and the records prove they believed them pre-eminently important—it did not come up to the mighty results which at the time, and for many ages afterward, flowed out of them. Let us, then, examine them. Two questions suggest themselves: whence did this law especially originate, and how did it work?

Their idea of an “atoning celebration” sprung out of fatally erroneous conceptions of the death of Christ. They misapprehended the work of the Son of God. His death was to them more than his life. The doctrine he taught for our instruction, the example he set for our reformation, and the precepts he gave for our obedience, were all placed in the back ground, in order that his cross might stand out in a prominent position. As the consummation of his mediatorial work, it was entitled to distinct recognition; but not such distinct recognition as to separate it from all he had said or done previously to his having suffered crucifixion. That death he himself intended should never stand *alone*. Once dis sever it from his life, and it will be regarded with superstitious awe, or perverted into irreligious indulgences. The DESIGN of his *death* was identical with the DESIGN of his *life*. Hence he asserted, “*This is the work of God that ye believe on him whom he hath sent.*” (John vi. 29.) His mission was “to bring us unto God.” This was his one grand ulterior purpose; nor can that purpose be realized except the *entire* work he performed present itself to the mind, and even then only by its exciting a sympathy in man with the conjoint purpose of Jehovah and Christ. Apart from sympathy with this grand and illimitable *design* of heaven; the death of Christ is devoid of benefit, simply because the



receptive disposition on the part of man is wanting. Belief in the historic fact that Christ died is nothing, any more than is a belief of the historic fact, that Christ lived. Nor were these men content with substituting a spurious, nay ruinous, credence for vital and active faith; but they went further. Having separated the death from the character of the Lord of glory, their next step downward was to misconceive that part of his work upon which they fastened exclusive attention. His propitiation for sin they regarded as a pacification of divine wrath. Whereas Christ declared that his Father had so loved the world as to entrust to him a mission of mercy. He sent him, not as the excitation, but as the evidence of love. No new, or other disposition, was therefore called forth by the death of Christ than had previously been displayed by the grant of this unspeakable gift. But, instead of regarding the death of Christ as the exhibition of divine love, they distorted it into a pacification of divine wrath. Pagans did the same. Their sacrifices were intended to pacify angry deities. These were to be appeased by the living on behalf of themselves, and were also to be invoked on behalf of the dead. It was a common thing, therefore, for Pagans to pray to their gods on account of departed relatives. They even prayed to departed human spirits. "Ulysses, after he had lost threescore and twelve of his company among the Cicones, presently made it his business to give a whoop for every one three times." Those who died in foreign countries were said "to be gone too far that they could not be reached by thrice calling."\*

---

\* *Archæologie Atticæ*, lib. v. c. 17, pp. 236-7.

Praying for the dead obtained as a custom one thousand years before the incarnation of Christ; and it is not a little singular that Henry VIII, speaking the language of the church which had employed the phraseology; interdicted the payment of stipends to priests "to sing for souls."\* So that one might almost say, the Church of Rome had learned from Ulysses to give a "whoop" for the departed.

Was all this a harmless theory? By no means. Even to pagans themselves, the notion of praying to and for the dead was calamitous; but for the Church of Rome to foist the practice upon the institutions of Christianity, was an act which fastens upon it the charge of treason against Christ, and destruction to the souls it professed to save.

In its religious aspect, the result was well described by Edward VI., by whom the religious dogma was attacked and *legally* demolished. Right royally, he thus delivers himself in the statute.†

"The lords spiritual and temporal and the commoners, considering that a great part of superstition and errors in Christian religion hath been brought into the minds and estimations of men by reason of their ignorance of their very true and perfect salvation through the death of Jesus Christ; and by advising and phantasying vain opinions of purgatory and masses satisfactory to be done for them which be departed; the which doctrine and vain opinion by nothing more is maintained than by provisions made for the continuance of the said blindness and ignorance."

Let the reader compare the dates of the canon of Cuthbert (A.D. 747) and that of the statute of Edward VI., and the painful fact is established, that during eight hundred years, not only had "the very

\* 21 Henry VIII., cap. xiii., sec. 30.

† 1 Edward VI., cap. xiv., A.D., 1547.

true and perfect salvation" been withheld from the people by the men who proposed to offer it, but, instead thereof, the church had carried them back, as far as it dare, to the worst times of paganism.

This fact, if it stood alone, would be a sufficient confirmation of the assertion made in the introduction, viz., that had not the church been opposed, the whole of Christianity would have become extinguished in England.

Nor were the results less dangerous to the state itself. It had sanctioned the doctrine of the church, that the atoning celebration was to be offered for "the rest of their souls" when men were dead, provided money were left for that purpose. Now mark the civil results of this religious error. Prayers were to be paid for. The people believed and acted accordingly. They gave their money for this special purpose. The wealth the church thus acquired flowed into the three grand channels which the ecclesiastics of the age cut out. These were monasteries, benefices, and hospitals. In each one of these institutions we shall find the results described by Catholics themselves. Thus, as to monasteries. Hear Cuthbert himself. He, in the code of laws, whence his dogmas about masses for the dead have been taken, says, "They cannot in any wise in these times be reformed according to the model of Christianity, by reason of the violence of tyrannical covetousness." By which he meant, that lords and ladies of manors obtained charters from the crown constituting their estates monastic institutions, which, as such, were exempt from taxation, and enjoyed other secular privileges and honours; so much so that they were chief objects of ambition to establish, and important sources

of profit to defend. They had been taught by Cuthbert a new principle in religion—that if they would find the cash on earth, he and his successors would obtain the credit in heaven. The wealth of nobles was therefore at the feet of priests; nor did they deem it beneath the dignity of the sacerdotal office to stoop and take it up. Once in their hands, how did they use it—legitimately or fraudulently? Let the statute of Edward I. give the reply. He says:—

“The King and his progenitors, and noblemen and their ancestors, have founded and given a very great portion of lands to monasteries—the abbots of the said houses, and of the order of St. Augustine, have at their own pleasures set divers impositions upon them, and—(*inter alia*) thereby *the souls of the dead be miserably defrauded.*” \*

During the long period of five hundred and sixty years, therefore, a double cheat had been played off. The kings, nobles, and others, were first cheated into the belief that the money arising from lands would be employed in payment for prayers that were to secure the repose of their souls when dead; but which money “is now converted to an evil end;” and then they were after death, “miserably defrauded.”

As to benefices; the same fraud was committed. These were said to have been founded “for the souls of the founders:” but “against the good disposition and will of the first founders, subverted to the great damage of the people and the estate of the realm.” †

As to hospitals—These were declared to have been “founded as well by the noble kings of this realm, and lords and ladies, to the honour of God and of his glorious mother, in aid and merit of the souls of

---

\* 35 Edward I., cap. i., A.D. 1307.

† 25 Edward III., statute 6, cap. xxiv., sec. 2, A.D. 1350.

the said founders:" but "the goods and profits of the same are withdrawn and spent in other use, whereby many men and women have died in great misery for default of aid, to the displeasure of God, and the peril of the souls of such manner of disposers."\*

All these greivous charges against the church were mainly attributable to previous customs and laws. Founders of monasteries, churches, and hospitals would have been comparatively unknown, had not the national mind run in one direction, that of paying for the repose of their souls when dead. So deeply had this sentiment sunk into the minds of men of all grades, that to pay the priest for mass was more common than to pay the physician for medicine. For many centuries after Cuthbert's time the custom prevailed, and became intensely powerful. So much so that statute law not only recognised, but helped on the national custom. "If nothing be owing unto us," said Henry III., "all the chattels shall go to the use of the dead (saving to his wife and children their reasonable parts)." †

These extracts from the statute book are the best exponents of this religious error. But we must now part with Cuthbert. Having held the see of Canterbury eighteen years, he died A.D. 758, eleven years after having given this fatally mischievous legacy to the Anglo-Saxon Church.

Before we retire from his tomb, we must mark one feature in the history of the laws he passed. If to him we are to ascribe the first *legal* enforcement of a

\* 2 Henry V., cap. i., A.D. 1414.

† 9 Henry III., cap. xviii., A.D. 1224.

most hurtful, insidious, and active Eucharistic error, to this error we are also to ascribe other evils equally perilous to the souls of men, and antagonistic to the principles of Christianity. Did he, for instance, deceive and ruin men by declaring that the "souls of the dead" could obtain a quietus after death, by "the atonement" being offered by the priest? His successors planned schemes by which to render the delusion a reality. Said they, if Cuthbert had this power over "souls," why should not we have power over the *bodies*, as well the living as the dead? As one error always produces others, we shall hereafter find the Eucharist denominated a medicine for the "body of man," as well the living as the dead. Non-communicants were therefore denied Christian burial. This *last* repulsive form of supercilious superstition still exists, and can at any moment be brought into active development by those priests who adventure upon full obedience to the laws of their church.\*

The laws, now examined, were passed at a council of the whole heptarchy. Northumbria, it is true, does not appear to have sent its representatives. From whatever cause this arose, it is yet evident, from what is about to be recorded, that Northumbria was not disposed to rank as a dissentient to papal authority. On the contrary, it hailed the legates of Rome, who came over into this country thirty-eight years after Cuthbert had given the laws just recited, and then united with Mercia in no less an act than that of submitting the civil power of England to the Bishop of Rome! The year when it occurred was A.D. 785.

---

\* See under A.D. 1378.

## NORTHUMBRIA AND MERCIA.

A.D. 785,  
Legates from  
Rome.

“At this time messengers were sent from Rome by Pope Adrian to England to renew the faith and peace which St. Gregory had sent us by Augustine the bishop, and they were worshipfully received and sent away in peace.”\*

By the modest designation of “messengers,” two priests, one named Gregory, bishop of Ostia, and the other named Theophylact, came to execute the powers of legates. Their instructions were special; and the instruments they had to submit for adoption were brought with them ready prepared, that so they might not only avoid all discussion, but return to Rome with such records as should one day prove of immense importance to the pontiff. The place where they held council was called Cæalchythe (now Culcheth, a township in Lancashire, on the borders of Cheshire, and on the confines of the two kingdoms of Northumbria and Mercia), and the decrees then passed ushered in an eventful epoch in the history both of the ecclesiastical and secular powers.

Take the ecclesiastical. “We advise,” said they, “that the synodical edicts of the six general councils with the decrees of the Roman pontiffs, be often read with attention, and that *the ecclesiastical state be reformed* according to the pattern prescribed there: that so *no novelty* be introduced, lest there be a schism in the church of God.” This was not “to *renew*” the faith brought in by Augustine, unless Augustine had intentionally kept something back; or unless his successors had had to contend with greater difficulties than they were disposed to acknowledge; or unless

---

\* *Bede*.—See Appendix, Note E.

this successor of Gregory, who had sent them, had some sinister latent motive in seeking to renew the mission into England. Be this as it may, one thing is certain—the church was now for the first time brought under the authority of canon law, as expounded by Roman pontiffs. A period of one hundred and eighty-eight years had intervened between this formal surrender by the ancient Episcopal Church of all independent power, and the arrival of Augustine. He had virtually declared this to have been his ulterior purpose in his memorable controversies with the British bishops; but had failed, even although he had so far succeeded with Ethelbert as to establish the Roman law, and thus, *sub silentio*, obtained a secular head over the ecclesiastical estate. It was success limited to the acknowledgment of a principle only. It was no such submission as that now made; a submission which carries on its very front evidence of an entire subversion of its original freedom of action. “No novelty” was henceforth to be allowed. Mind, worship, obedience were all chained down to one rule of authority, exercised by one man, and he a foreigner. That authority, however, after the lapse of one thousand years and more, is still acknowledged by the church, and not disowned by the state! For canon law still exists in England.

Take the secular. “We proposed these decrees,”—say the legates,—“Most blessed Pope Adrian, in a public council before Alfwald, the king [of Northumbria], and Eanhald, the archbishop, and all the bishops and abbots of the country, and the senators, and dukes, and people of the land; and they vowed with all devotion of mind that they would keep them to the utmost of their power by the help of the



supernal mercy. And they confirmed their vows with the sign of the cross, which we held in our hands in your stead." And to what did this vow in its full import amount? To this—"The kings and princes were wholly to keep themselves free from imposing all unjust tributes, as they desired to keep themselves in communion with the holy Church of Rome and blessed Peter, the prince of the apostles."

"After this was finished, and we had given our blessing, we departed, and carried the decrees to the council of the Mercians, where the glorious King Offa, with the counsellors of the land, were assembled. They all with unanimous heart and voice promised to obey and cheerfully to keep the statutes: and they afterwards confirmed this present paper with the holy sign of the cross." This was an oath; for the most solemn form of making an oath in that age, was to lay the hands on a cross holden in the hand of a bishop, or other prelate. If the cross were consecrated the oath was the more solemn.

Thus the two mightiest Anglo-Saxon Kings and kingdoms brought their necks under the papal yoke. Of the monarchs themselves much has been said. Alfwald "was slain by Siga, on the 8th before the kalends of October (789), and a heavenly light was frequently seen at the place where he was slain; and he was buried at Hexham within the church"\*—the place assigned for the most distinguished and deserving. As to Offa, his memory is tarnished with the most perfidious murder, and unscrupulous rapacity. In "792, Offa, King of the Mercians, com-

---

\* *Bede.*

manded the head of King Ethelbert [of East Anglia, who had gone to sue the daughter of Offa for his wife] to be struck off.\* After which "he marches into East Anglia with a numerous army, and meeting with no opposition, seizes the kingdom and unites it to Mercia."† Remorse drove him to Rome, where Adrian, "whose messengers" he had a few years before "worshipfully received," granted him a pardon on condition of his endowing churches and monasteries. Among the rest he erected a church at Hereford, where the body of the murdered Ethelbert was buried, and in which prayers were to be offered both for the murderer and his victim. The monastery of St. Albans was also established by this murderer, who gave to it costly gifts and endowments.

The events were not in themselves more remarkable than the Eucharistic Laws passed at both councils of Northumbria and Mercia were of singular significance. They were only three in number; but they contained a vast deal more than at first reading appears. Thus one of them says:—

1. "Let no minister of the altar presume to go A.D. 785.  
Alfwald Rex. celebrate the mass with naked legs, lest his filthiness appear and God be offended. For if this were forbidden in the law, we know it ought more carefully to be observed in the Sacrament of Christ."

This rude law was addressed to men of ruder minds. "Naked legs" might or might not at this period have been common among the people. Priests were not to be thus exposed; and by assigning the reason for the prohibition, we obtain the clue to the law. It formed a part of the ulterior purpose of

---

\* *Bede.*

† *Rapin*, i., 187.

Rome to set up a Christian theocracy. The altar was intended to serve as the centre point around which that purpose was constantly to revolve; and from whence the after accomplishment was more easily to be effected. Hence the appeal to the Mosaic law, and the more careful observance of its meaning "in the Sacrament of Christ."

Couple this enactment with the fact that it occurs in a legal instrument which records that the civil power yielded itself to ecclesiastical domination, and a principle of intermixture between the two authorities becomes recognized, which in its turn paved the way for the future elongation of such principle in subsequent eras of English history.

The other law is also of singular import. It says:—

2. "Let bread be offered by the faithful—not crusts."

The meaning of this short law will fully appear by a reference to the habits of the people. They provided the offerings for the altar. They brought them in their hands, or sent them with due formality of presentation. "See," exclaimed the ecclesiastics, "there is the church; but of what use is a church without an altar? or of what utility is the altar without a sacrifice? But who is to provide that sacrifice? Ought not they provide for whose benefit the atoning celebration is offered?" And the people replied: "Be it so. We will continue to offer the bread; take it; there are the remnants of that very bread which, notwithstanding your law, we ourselves have used in our own houses; for we cannot always reach the church by reason of its distance; and, therefore, to preserve among ourselves 'the venerable solemnity of the Lord Jesus Christ,' we have,

and mean to have, the celebration in our own houses whenever we choose : but seeing you demand offerings for the church, there they are. ‘Crusts,’ you call them. They are all, however, that we intend to give.”

The people could thus bring the whole spiritual machinery to a dead stand still—a state of things to which it would have drifted had it not been for the next law. This met the difficulty by saying:—

3. “We have directed all in general, according to the apostles, to confess your sins one to another, and to pray one for another that ye may be saved, lest death should find any of you unprepared; and [therefore] receive the Eucharist according to the judgment of the priests.”\*

The last clause completed the new rule of celebrating the Eucharist. The Lord’s Supper had been diverted from the simplicity with which the early English church had observed it; still more grievously had it suffered an entire fatal perversion, by being pronounced an atonement for the sins of the living and the dead. Another thing remained to be done, and that was to snatch every matter connected with its participation out of the hands of the people, and transfer the whole to “the judgment of the priests.” Half a century before this† “none but priests were to offer the sacrifice, or put in use the laws” relative to its being offered. And now, the priest, not content with having curtailed these privileges, demands that “his judgment” shall be the sole guide to the communicant.

But at this humiliating exhibition, we ought not to be surprised. The people, with their princes,

---

\* *Spelman*, vol. i., p. 293.

† *Spelman*, vol. i., p. 18.

deserved to be denuded of their privileges after having solemnly pledged themselves "to profess, hold, and teach the apostolical Catholic faith\* of the six synods, which is approved of by the Holy Ghost, and not fear to die for it,† if there be occasion. And that they would receive all such men as the universal councils have received, and reject and condemn all those heartily whom they have condemned." This was the first recognition by the state, that it would entertain theological questions; in other words, determine what was, or was not heresy.

Had there been a few stout-hearted heretics at that period, they might have done battle on behalf of their submissive princes. It would indeed have been a glorious thing for Christianity itself had the men who now vowed they would "not fear to die for the apostolical Catholic faith," been put to the test. But there was no "occasion" offered. They could afford to be bold when there were no enemies to resist. They therefore continued to press onward, having at that time an unobstructed and undisputed high road open before them. Hence another law which, thirty years after, carried forward the work upon which they had now entered.

#### MERCIA,

At the expiration of these thirty years, again appears. The King, Kenulf, in the twentieth year of his reign, was present "with his princes, dukes and grandees," at a "synod assembled on the sixth day before the kalends of August, at a famous place called Celi Chyth," with twelve bishops, who say, "We expounded

---

\* See Appendix, Note F.

† See Appendix, Note G.

the Catholic faith and the orthodox Christian rule which, as we have been taught, were ordained by the holy Fathers." And what then? They say—

"When a church is built, let it be consecrated by the bishop of its own diocese. Let the water be blessed and sprinkled by himself, and all things be thus accomplished in order, according to the ministerial books. Afterwards let the Eucharist, consecrated by the bishop in the same ministration, be laid up in the same repository with the other relics in the Royal House; and if he can find no other relics, this may serve as well, because it is the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ."

A.D. 816,  
Kenzilf Rex.

Mark the ingredients of Eucharistic errors, as they now mix themselves up with other matters: "*A Royal House*," rather than the old word, "Church." This shadowed forth regal power, as pertaining to the ecclesiastical class, and thus renewed and enlarged the idea of a theocracy. Then, again, the "Eucharist was to be laid up with other relics." One will "serve as well" as the other. The dry bones of dead sinners, and the body and blood of our Lord, placed upon a level! What an indignity to the Son of God! but a still greater dishonour to the men who offered it. Yet these ecclesiastics were extremely sensitive upon the subject of their own official superiority; for they said, "Let none of the *Scottish Extract* be permitted to usurp to himself the sacred ministry, nor to administer the Eucharist to the people, because we are not certain how or by whom they were ordained."\* And if "ordination" produced such egotistical assumptions, it is evident that the interests of religion, *per se*, were damaged rather than promoted by these early English Episcopalians.

---

\* *Johnson.*

## ALFRED.

It is now one hundred and eighty-six years since the first Eucharistic law was passed by Inæ, the West Saxon King. His successors were content to incorporate into their religious and ecclesiastical institutions those several sacramental enactments which had obtained in other kingdoms: they became parts of their own rule or government, *sub silentio*.

The tenth king from Inæ was the famous Alfred the Great, whom we are about to introduce as enacting a singularly expressive law in relation to the Lord's Supper. He thus ushers it in among other ecclesiastical laws.

“I, Alfred, the king, made a collection of what our predecessors had observed; and which I approved, to be transcribed; and those which I approved not, altered, with the advice of my counsellors, and commanded them to be observed in another manner; for I durst not presume to set down in writing very many of mine own, because I know not what would please them that are to be after us. What I found in the days of Inæ, my kinsman, or of Offa, King of the Mercians, or of Ethelbert (who first of the English nation received baptism), which seemed to me most righteous, I have here collected, and passed over the rest. Then I, Alfred, king of the West Saxons, showed them to my counsellors, and they declared that they approved of the observance of all of them.”

By this singular introduction, we obtain a knowledge of the fact that the Saxon monarchs copied from each other's laws. Here are Alfred, Inæ, Offa, and Ethelbert. The connecting link between them all, was the ecclesiastical laws of each. These flowed from ecclesiastics, who in these periods took the management of the connecting link among their royal subservients. In this code is the following law:—

A. D. 877.  
Alfred Rex. "If any men, without leave, take down the Holy Vail in Lent, let satisfaction be made with one hundred and twenty shillings."\*

Some special cause must have been the occasion of this memorable resistance of the people: memorable, because it is the only instance extant in which they at the very altar offered violence to its observances. We, however, presume to ascribe it to a very different cause to that which Johnson supposes.

Let it be remembered that the people were at this period for the most part heathen idolators; as such, they were acquainted with customs which, having been borrowed from Greece, had been handed down to them from time immemorial. Among other customs pertaining to the altar, one related to what they esteemed a distinguished privilege, conferred by the pagan priesthood at an annual festival. This occurred in the month called Bœdromion, answering to our September. To the 14th of this month they gave the designation *Ἀγυρμὸς Μυστηρια*, or the Assembly at the Mysteries. The rites then observed were regarded as the general thanksgiving for the delivery of Greece, and on account of which an altar was erected to Jupiter as the deliverer. The greater thanksgiving was still more special, as the people upon this occasion were "admitted to the sight of that they worshipped,"† and were therefore described as *εποκλαι*, or eye-witnesses of the whole mystery; hence both the day and the service were reckoned among pagan feasts as holy-days. In direct contradiction to this, the Christian priesthood kept its grand thanksgiving memorial hidden from the people.

---

\* Johnson.

† *Archæologia Atticæ*, lib. ii., cap. 10, p. 69.



Show us, exclaimed they, *your* god on this your feast or holy-day. 'Tis veiled, said the priests. Then we will tear down that veil; and down they tore it, again and again. This direct resistance was not so much against any newly-invented method of celebrating Lent, as against the Christian religion itself, seeing it curtailed, rather than sanctioned, the former, old altar privileges.

This view of the cause of their violence appears confirmed by another of Alfred's laws, which says—

"In the first place [or the principal thing] the English and Danes have declared that they would love one God and abandon all heathenism in earnest; and they have enacted a just secular law, because they knew that they could not otherwise govern many, who would not submit (as they should) to Ecclesiastical discipline. And they have decreed a secular discipline between Christ and King in all cases where men were [are] unwilling to conform to Ecclesiastical discipline, with a just regard to the authority of the Bishops."\*

This penal sanction was the second made by the West Saxons as to ritual Christianity.† Taken in connection with the other penalty about the Lenten veil, it is evident that "ecclesiastical discipline" was the main point aimed to be established. It is worthy also attention, that the law seeks to consolidate and preserve that discipline, by the intermixture of two distinct authorities, "Christ and King"—an intermixture which, in no other instance, is so openly proclaimed by express words, as those Alfred here employed. That intermixture had existed antecedently, was kept up in succeeding dynasties, and is still preserved; but nowhere is it so expressed as

---

\* *Spelman*, vol. i., pp. 390 and 350.

† The first had been made by Inæ, about baptism. See Appendix, AA, under date A.D. 693.

in these emphatic words. We are not, therefore, to be surprised at finding another penal sanction, relative to the entire system of the Christian religion. "If any one do *reject* the Christian religion, or show his *esteem for heathenism*, let him pay his weregeld, and a mulct, and a fine, in proportion to the fact."\*

It is to be regretted that Alfred, in thus distinguishing his own character as a lawgiver, should have injured, rather than improved the power and purity of the kingdom of Christ. Had he foreseen how the men that came "after us" would abuse the vicious principle he now established, he would have shrunk from any attempt to promote "the Christian religion" by the legal force he was determined to wield in its favour.

These heavy penalties were intended to put an end to great conflicts between priests and people. That during the time of Lent, when the curtain was drawn before the altar, and hid the people from seeing what took place during that season, Johnson supposes arose from the people asking, "Why do you put it up?" And the priests replied, "Just as Moses put a veil before the altar of old to denote that the priests were in the light and the people in darkness; so we by this veil declare that there is a separation between you and us under the Gospel." And Catholics rose up, and tore it down; again and again they tore it down. Alfred then steps in and says, "Whoever takes it down without leave shall be fined one hundred and twenty shillings." This quieted the conflicts; nay more, so reconciled became the people to it, that several centuries after, parishes were by

---

\* *Spelman and Johnson's Ecclesiastical Laws.*

canon law, compelled to provide "a decent veil for lent." (A.D. 1305.) The fact speaks ill for the people. Four hundred and twenty-eight years have elapsed and they, notwithstanding their opposition to tithes, tamely submit to tax themselves for the very thing their forefathers, with Saxon-like indignation, tore into shreds! The lenten veil passed under the designation of one of the church ornaments; and but for a few words in the 1st of Elizabeth, cap. ii., which restricts the ornaments to such "as by *authority of Parliament* were used in the second year of Edward VI.," the lenten veil might again be drawn before the altar, by those priests who retain their places in the Protestant, but have given their hearts to the Romish Church.

#### MERCIA.

But Mercia can supply us with another remarkable law, and another notable monarch. His name is Ethelstan, or Athelstan. He was chosen by the Mercians, and consecrated at Kingston, A.D. 924. His exploits as a warrior are thus rudely recorded in Bede—

" Here Athelstan, king  
of earls, the lord;  
of heroes—the bracelet-giver.  
In battle won  
with edges of swords  
near Brumby.  
Carnage greater has not been  
in this island;  
ever yet Angles and Saxons  
came to land.

Britain sought mighty war-smiths.—Christ helping [them] they had the victory; and they [Athelstan and his brother Edmund] there slew five kings and seven earls."\*

---

\* *Bede, Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, 937.*

The sword thus wielded indicated a monarch of no ordinary character. He goes, however, to his archbishop (Wulfhelm) for "advice;" and then says, "My will is that my bishops, aldermen, and reeves do effectually put in execution my dooms." One of them reads thus:—

"If any one make a promise of ordeal let him come three nights before, to the mass priest who is to hallow it, and live on bread and salt, water and herbs before he go to it; and let him stand at  
A.D. 925,  
Ethelstan Rex. his masses these three days and make his offering, and go to housel [the Eucharist] the same day that he goes to ordeal, and take an oath that he is not guilty according to the common law of the accusations."<sup>\*</sup>

This barbarous mode of establishing innocence was not an original idea with Saxons. They had learned it from pagans. Their custom in purging themselves of crimes "was to creep upon their hands through the fire, or to hold in their hands a red-hot iron, supposing that if they were not guilty, they should be insensible of the pain."† The ordeal and altar the Saxons placed side by side; and thus powerfully tended to blunt the moral perceptions of law-givers, criminals, and witnesses. The proofs of this were innumerable in that age. Take only one. The renowned monarch whose law is quoted, himself supplied evidence that, the whole moral government of God was completely misunderstood. Hear him say, "I declare that it is my will that *for the forgiveness of my sins*, ye give from two of my farms, one poor Englishman an amber of meal and a gammon of bacon, or one ram worth fourpence." Easy purchase this of pardon from heaven! But what must have

\* *Spelman*, vol. i, p. 396.

† *Archæologiæ Atticæ*, lib. vi., cap. 6, p. 287.

been the character of the ecclesiastics from whom such fatally ruinous opinions had been obtained? The question shall be answered by the highest ecclesiastical personage in that age. Odo, Archbishop of Canterbury, who styled himself "the lowly and meanest that is promoted to the honour of a pall, and of being a chief prelate,"—quotes Gregory as saying, "Whoever attempts to violate the parishes of the church of God [by imposing taxes] let him be excommunicated and become wholly an alien from the body of Christ." "For," the archbishop adds, "they who disdain to obey the rules of the church's discipline *are more bold than the soldiers who crucified Christ!*" "Lowly" Odo! To whatever else thou didst pretend, thou wast not the "meanest" denouncer of those who, by laying taxes upon the church, sought to recover a part of those profits which ecclesiastics reaped from the lands they daily grasped into their own hands! Yet he ventured to say, "If it could be that the riches of all the world now laid in our view so as to be wholly subject to our imperial command, I would willingly give them all away; and, moreover, spend myself for the salvation of your souls, my fellow bishops." \*

This archbishop was known as "Odo, the Good." A proof that if moral excellency did exist in him personally, it was shrouded over by deeply offensive pretensions to superior sanctity and unsolicited generosity; or if, as is most probable, the appellation was the result of some of his extraordinary acts of church discipline, it then proves that Christian virtue was at that time so unknown by the people generally as to

---

\* *Johnson.*

be placed in a less commanding position than clerical pretensions. Morals, intelligence, liberty, go together; immorality, ignorance, and thralldom flow out of and accompany priestly assumptions. This accounts for the following law, made in

## NORTHUMBRIA.

It said—

A.D. 900. "If a priest celebrate mass in an unhallowed house, let him pay twelve ore" [twenty shillings].

This was the first penal law against the priesthood for performing a religious act. There had previously been penalties inflicted upon them if they *neglected* their duty; but never against them for the actual discharge of their functions. There must, therefore, have been some special and cogent reasons for such a law. They were these: First, the gross perversion of the Lord's Supper in private houses. In spite of the interdict of 740-1, the people continued to celebrate this solemnity in their own houses. Placed in many instances at a very great distance from the church, out of sight of the bishop, rarely present at public worship, because of the impassable state of the roads, the people thought they did well to adhere to the custom of their forefathers, and among themselves perpetuate the memorial of their Lord. They invited the priest. Was it then purely a sacred or religious engagement? No such thing. The people mixed up with this institution many of the customs of their heathen neighbours. The Lord's Supper was profaned by obscene, or at least, wicked and irreligious rites. Priests might be betrayed into these scenes by being told they were asked to be present for the performance of a Christian solemnity; or

vicious priests (who unhappily even at this and subsequent periods abounded) might themselves betray Christianity, by lending the sanction of their presence to scenes of riot, disorder, and vice. And so the people, having abused their ancient privilege, lost it. The opportunity thus offered, the Church of Rome instantly seized; and therefore under the acknowledged necessity for a better state of religion and morality, she applied her own remedy. This forms the second reason, viz., that the new order of church government was now about to be carried into full effect. Hence these remarkable words—

“We ought all to love and worship the one God, and zealously to observe the one Christianity, and wholly to abandon all heathenism. And our Will is especially, that we main'tain one Christianity and one monarchy in the nation for ever.”

This is the earliest record which by express words unites “Christianity and monarchy.” The nation had become one by the previous consolidation of the Saxon kingdoms under one sovereign. It is also to be remembered that this law was made by Northumbrian priests. They appear anxious to repay English monarchs for the acts of Alfwald and Offa, who had, in 785, brought the kingdoms of Mercia and Northumbria into submission to the Pope. “We ought,” say these priests, “now maintain one monarchy, as well as one Christianity for ever. The two powers shall henceforth be kept distinct, yet inviolate, and united. And as the altar is the centre power of Christianity, we will that no priest celebrate in private houses what ought to be performed at the altar exclusively; seeing that if we tolerate any such diversity in religious rites, we may lay the foundation for division in secular government.” Having established this apparently exalted

and safe principle, they on its merits interdicted Eucharistic practices, which, as to *place*, raised a perfectly opposite order of celebration, both as to its spirit and intention. They managed to execute a long-cherished purpose, viz., that of removing all cause of apprehended danger by taking away from the people any opportunity whatever, either to continue their own customs or to contravene the principles enunciated by their priests. This supplies the third and principal reason for the law, which was, *the exclusion of the people from all participation in the government of the church*. "Let us," said they "get rid of them; now is the moment. Ever since Augustine's time, 'the people' have given us trouble. They prevented their teachers submitting to him when he first came; they tore down the Lenten veil in Alfred's time; and unless we take care, the nation will again be filled with religious violence. They profane their old custom of celebrating the Lord's Supper in their own houses; let us now, therefore, effectually, and for ever, abolish the practice, and purify the church. This we can now do if we punish timid or vicious priests, who connive at the practice of those people who intermeddle with the sacrifice of the mass." And the people, who had become profoundly indifferent to Christianity, did not perceive wherein they were being despoiled of their rights. They once had had the right of choosing their own bishops;\* but had disqualified themselves from exercising it, in consequence of the tumults raised and the murders committed at such popular elections.† They had taken part in the half-yearly

---

\* See *Apostolical Constitutions*, book ii., can. 31. (*Coptic*.)

† *Burns' Ecclesiastical Laws*. (*Bishop*.)



synods of the bishops and clergy, and were not yet wholly excluded from this right, although it had virtually become a shadow, inasmuch as the communicant was dependant upon "the judgment of the priest," as to his partaking or being denied that ordinance.\* Laymen ranked higher in the state, if communicants,† than if non-communicants; which of itself shows that being once identified as members of the church, they participated, not merely in its privileges, but in its government. Again, they had had the right of "teaching in the presence of clergymen;" but of this they were deprived, "unless it was at their request."‡ Women even taught: these, too, were denied by the authority of the canon which says, "let not a woman, though learned and holy, dare to teach men in the assembly."§ They had preserved to themselves the right of celebrating the Lord's Supper in their own houses; and thus dispensed with both an exclusively priestly consecration or celebration.|| But not satisfied with prohibitions, the church now completes its inroads upon the rights of the people, by threatening those priests, who so sympathized with their wants and wishes as with them to celebrate mass in unconsecrated houses, with a fine of one hundred and twenty shillings. The fine fell upon the priest; but the blow was aimed against the householder.¶

No sufficient palliation can be pleaded for all this wrong. Is it alleged the people were for the most part rude, ignorant, irreligious? So were the priests;

---

\* See page 65. † See Inæ's first Sacramental Law, A.D. 693.

‡ See ante, under A.D. 740. § *Ibid.* || *Ibid.*

¶ See Appendix, Note H.

so much so, that more than 300 years *after* this very crowning act of excluding the people from the government of the church had passed, Friar John, as he called himself, fulminated from Lambeth a set of canons, in one of which he says :—

“The ignorance of priests plunges the people into error ; and the stupidity of clerks, who are commanded to instruct the faithful in the Catholic faith, does rather mislead than teach them.”\*

Had the people been left to themselves, they would have struggled through all their minor errors. Common sense ; above all, the Sacred Scriptures (of the free use of which those who could read were not yet deprived) would more quickly and effectually have corrected all their mistakes, than this excision from their prescriptive rights. But excluded they must be from performing any priestly functions, ere the servant of servants could become lord of all. Every check upon the priests was now removed ; and the history of the world demonstrates that no priesthood, be it pagan, papal, or Protestant, can safely be trusted ALONE, either with the rights of the people, or the interests of religion. This law, therefore, *completed* an offence against the founder of Christianity.

This, it is admitted, is an awfully grave charge. It can easily be established. Did not this exclusion destroy every one of those active motives to self-respect which invariably spring out of self-reliance ? Weaken these, and you dry up every stimulant to personal improvement. This last is a moral obligation, and rests upon every man ; but emphatically and pre-eminently upon every Christian man, simply

---

\* A. D. 1281, *Johnson*.

because the whole system of Christianity is framed upon the principle of individual responsibility. There is not a single doctrine it teaches but depends upon personal faith—not a single duty it enjoins but reposes upon personal obligation—not a single delight it promises but flows out of personal purity : no, nor a single destiny it exhibits but derives its influence from personal accountability. Destroy, then, this grand motive power, self-improvement, and you render the entire framework of Christianity a huge mass of effete ceremonials, alike valueless, if not indeed, ruinous. Do you doubt this ?

Then read, ponder, and recollect the historic accumulations which the next six hundred years will exhibit of Eucharistic errors—errors of giant form and destructive power ; and the like of which, for malignant perversion of an originally pure and beneficent institution, have never been surpassed, or perhaps equalled, in the history of any religious organization : an organization, be it remembered, of an exclusively priestly character ; for though laymen still attended synods, it was rather as witnesses than as compeers.

#### ELFRIC.\*

We now stand upon the threshold of one of the most eventful eras in the English church. A new

---

\* In Saxon times, there were two men of this name, or names strongly assimilated, which was no uncommon thing among the Saxons. About two hundred years ago, a treatise was published, *De Duobus Æfricis*, in which it was attempted to be proved that Elfric, the grammarian and great writer, was he that was Archbishop of York. His name, however, was Alfric Puttoc. There was also an Alfric

class of errors gather thick around us. The poisonous seeds which Ecbricht and Cuthbert had sown, more than two hundred years ago, had grown up—become matured—and resown themselves again and again. They had been broad-cast, and are about to be not only gathered in, in an abundant harvest, but to serve as seed corn, stored up for other generations. So much so that it is from this, rather than from any other store-house, that certain portions of Eucharistic seeds are being drawn off in the present day. In other words, the doctrine of transubstantiation was now broached in legal or canonical form; but in so *incipient* a manner as to cover over the real character of the law itself; and thus reconcile it to the rapidly increasing and erroneous dogmas of the age.

The chief actor in the scene about to open before us was Elfric, or Alfric. "He was a very wise man: so that there was no sager man in England."\* He was at first Bishop of Wilton (which See was afterwards removed to Salisbury), and then became Archbishop of Canterbury. He had, however, to scramble for this See. He had competitors in the

---

Bishop of Thetford, who might afterwards have become Archbishop of York, as both names appear contemporaneously, *i.e.* about A.D. 1020; he died in 1050; whereas the Alfric, or Elfric, Archbishop of Canterbury, had been Bishop of Wilton at an earlier period, having, according to Bede, died in 1006. Some difficulty exists as to the precise date of his laws. Into this question, as that of men, of kindred name, it is unnecessary here to enter. No matter of importance would be settled, were ever so lengthened and wearisome a disquisition attempted.

\* *Bede: Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, A.D. 995. The difference in this date and that afterwards given in the margin, it is not necessary here to reconcile.

clerks, " who sent two of their order to the Pope, to whom they offered great gifts and silver on condition that he should give them the arch [pall]. But the Pope would not, because they brought him no letter, either from the King or from the people, and commanded them to go, lo! when they could."—" Then came Alfric to Rome, and the Pope received him with much worship ; and he put on him his own pall and greatly honoured him."\* Alfric, on his return, went to Canterbury, and drove the clerks out of the minster ; and " there within placed monks, all as the Pope commanded him."†

He is said to have been a prodigy of his age ; and as an authority, was received by the Bishops of both provinces. His canons may, therefore, be said to be national. They appear to have been so designed ; hence the expression in the body of them, " We Bishops decreed, when we were together, that the *whole nation* fast " on such days as were then specially mentioned.

These records supply data which remarkably illustrate the fact that, up to this period, the ecclesiastical pathway had not been an easy one for the Pope in this country. He had had to contend against the English clergy : hence Elfric complains that " through this perverseness, the canonical decrees and the doctrine of the church are in effect abolished." And what did he do ? Fall back upon the authority, the life-giving power of the Word of God, as the only standard of truth ? No such thing. He says—

" There have been four synods in behalf of the true faith in opposition to the heretics, who spake absurdly of the Holy Trinity, and

---

\* *Bede: Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, A.D. 995.

† *Ibid.*

the Incarnation of Christ. The first was at Nice, of 318 Bishops of all nations. They wrought many mighty wonders at the synod, and they excommunicated Arius, the mass priest, because he would not believe that the Son of the Living God was so mighty as his Great Father is; therefore they all condemned this man of the devil; but he would not desist till he saw all his entrails gush out together, when he went to the house of office. The second was at Constantinople, the third at Ephesus, and the fourth at Calcedon. And all these were unanimous as to what was decreed at Nice; and they repaired all the breaches that had been made therein. *And these four synods are to be regarded as THE FOUR BOOKS OF CHRIST IN HIS CHURCH.*"

Who now appears as "*the heretic?*" Arius or Elfric? The one, for holding an error shared in "by many who were distinguished by the superiority of their learning and genius;"\* or the other, for uttering a blasphemy, till then unknown, or at least not avowed, in the church? Arius did not believe the Son as great as the Father. Elfric avows a religious impiety, and maintains that the "four synods" are upon a par with "the four Books of Christ!" But the four Books of Christ teach eternal truth; the four synods inculcate essential error. The authority of Christ, as registered in his Books, was benignant; the authority of the synods, as recorded in their after history, was malignant. Never was evidence more expressive of the fact, than that which Elfric and his successors supply, that it is an easy, and a common thing for men to palm off upon themselves the belief that "opposition to heretics" is sufficient, though they themselves, all the while, are under the influence of as fatal an heresy as the one they arrogantly attempt to quell.

---

\* Mosheim: *Ecclenastical History*, vol. i., p. 413.

For this very Elfric was the first to teach and enforce a law containing the seminal principles of transubstantiation. With him the Eucharist formed the chief burden of his legislation. Here are his laws:—

A.D. 967.  
Elfric. 1. "God's house is hallowed to this purpose that the body of God may be there eaten with faith.

2. "Housel [the Sacrament] ought not be hallowed on Long Friday [Good Friday], because Christ suffered for us on that day; but yet what concerns the day must be done. Let them [the people] pay their adoration to the Rood: let all greet God's Rood with a kiss. Let the priest go to God's altar with the remains of the Housel which he consecrated on Thursday, and with unhallowed wine, mingled with water, and cover them with a corporal. Then let him put a particle of the Housel into the chalice, as it is customary,† but with silence. Then let him go to Housel, and whoever else pleases." "Some priests reserve the Housel, that was hallowed on Easter-day, over year, for sick men. But they do very greatly amiss who cause the Holy Housel to putrify, or become musty, or lost, or if a mouse eateth it, through carelessness.

3. "That Housel is Christ's body; not corporally, but spiritually; not the body in which he suffered, but of that body of which he spake when he blessed bread and wine for Housel, one night before his Passion, and said of the bread, blessed: 'This is my body;' and again of the wine, blessed: 'This is my blood,' that is shed for many for the forgiveness of sins.

4. "*Know now that the Lord, who was able to CHANGE THE BREAD INTO HIS BODY, before his Passion, and THE WINE INTO HIS BLOOD, in a spiritual manner, he his self daily blesseth bread and wine by the hands of his priests into his spiritual body and blood.*

5. "Let the priest beware, that the oblation be not too long baked,

\* Johnson assigns this date to these laws; and his reasons have swayed the determination thus to place this extraordinary set of laws.

† This formed a sop; and was believed to contain the blood of Christ in the bread. Henry VIII. expressly so defines it. See under A.D. 1540.

lest it be unsightly ; and let him always mingle water with the wine. For the wine betokeneth our redemption through Christ's blood ; and the water betokeneth the people, for whom he suffered.

6. " Under the old law, the Bishop\* might well have a wife ; for then they never celebrated mass nor Housel'd men ; but offered beasts after the ancient manner, till Christ hallowed Housel before his passion and instituted the mass. But the priests reply, that Peter had a wife. They say what is very true ; for so he might under the old law, before he submitted to Christ ; but he left his wife and every worldly thing after he had submitted to Christ, who instituted chastity."

He thus describes the seven orders in the church :

" The Ostiary, or door-keeper, who is to unlock the church to believers, and to lock out the unbelievers ; the Lector, or reader ; the Exorcist, or he who adjures malignant spirits ; the Acolyth, or he who holds the candle, when the Gospel is read, or the Housel hallowed at the altar, to signify bliss by that light to the honour of Christ, who is our light ; the Subdeacon, who brings forth the vessels to the Deacon at the holy altar ; the Deacon, or he who places the oblation on the altar ; and

7. " The Presbyter, who is the Mass Priest, or Elder ; not that he is old otherwise than in wisdom. He halloweth God's Housel, as Our Saviour commanded. There is no more between a bishop and a priest, but that the bishop is appointed to ordain, and to bishop children, and to hallow churches, and to take care of God's rights ; for they would be abundantly too many, if every priest did this. He hath the same order, but the other is more honourable.

8. " That mass be not celebrated in any house but what is hallowed, except in case of necessity, or if the man be sick."

Such were Elfric's laws. They demand analysis.

The first may be said to have enlarged previously announced notions, as to the Eucharist being a

---

\* " A Bishop under the old law " may sound oddly enough. But " bishop and priest " were interchangeable terms, as appears not only from the succeeding extract, but from many other canons both before and after this period.



“sacrifice” in itself, or an “atoning celebration,” as Cuthbert had described it. Now, it is “God’s body, eaten, and eaten in faith.”

The second reaffirms the Eucharistic idolatry, when it required the people to pay their “*adoration* to God’s rood” on Good Friday. At the same time, it may occasion no small surprise that it never occurred to this “sagest man in all England” that, in requiring the adoration kiss, he accompanied the command with an interdict which exposed it to contempt. A careless priest might allow a “mouse” to nibble away the little piece of bread which he had put by as a god, and reserved a whole year for the sick! This contempt, Elfric seeks to escape, by enjoining that “the holy housel ought to be kept with great diligence, and not be permitted to be stale, but another be always hallowed anew for sick men in about a fortnight.” The priest was also told that it was his duty to housel men while the sick were capable of swallowing the housel. Let him not do it if the man be not half alive. For Christ “commanded that a man should *eat* the Housel.” The professed hallowing was not to occur on Long Friday, “because Christ suffered on this day,” and therefore to hallow on the selfsame day would be in effect to substitute the act of the priest for the great propitiation itself! That, however, which the priest might not do on this day, he might,—nay, actually did, do any other day! At least so he pretended.

The third utters a positive error, viz., that Christ himself, in speaking certain words, produced “a change” in the elements of the bread and wine. When he said “blessed,” he used words of thanks-

giving. Elfric construes them to mean an act of transformation. In other terms the bread and the wine were, by the words of the priest, rendered receptive; or they received in, and by, certain words an element which did not, and cannot, otherwise belong to them. This absurdity lies at the foundation of the dogma of transubstantiation. We shall find it reasserted by "roaring John" in 1281, when he speaks of a certain "medicine *reposit*ed in the seven sacraments."

The fourth is the completed form of the preceding error. Christ "changed the bread" into his body, spiritually, and "the wine" into his blood, spiritually, and that by simply uttering a word! That same word has only to be pronounced by the priest, and the same result will follow! "In a spiritual manner," Christ repeats this change every day by the hands of his priests! Such was the law of Elfric, when he assumed the position of becoming an exponent of the act of Christ!

The doctrine now urged was the result of previously taught errors. Cuthbert, for instance, had in A.D. 747, taught the doctrine, that mass was a "propitiation—an atonement—for the sins of the living and the dead." Eager as the people then were to embrace so sweet a delusion, they still felt desirous to obtain evidence of the fact. *How*, said they, is that atonement made? Of *what* does it consist? And Elfric answers—"It is the body of Christ, and it has become that, in consequence of a certain spiritual change effected by the utterance of certain mysterious words!" Out of this now enlarged error sprung all the notions of transubstantiation, and which, as they unfolded themselves, became a con-

stant source of theological absurdity and of civil thralldom. And yet Dr. Philpotts, Bishop of Exeter, in his Pastoral Letter of 1854, does not hesitate to say—"A morsel of bread and a drop of wine are *made* by the effectual word of our Lord himself to be his body and blood." So also Archdeacon Wilberforce, in his "Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist," pp. 53—64, says—"It [that is the bestowing himself] was commenced in the upper chamber, but was consummated on the cross; and that which our Lord began to do by his own words, when he was upon earth, he still continues to do through the ministry of his servants, now that he has ascended into heaven." Again, "What seems bread is not bread, though bread by taste, but the body of Christ; and that what seems wine is not wine, though the taste will have it so, but the blood of Christ." Thus, although more than eight hundred years have intervened between these dignitaries and Archbishop Elfric, they all appear so much alike, that it seems almost impossible so lengthened a period can have passed between them. They do not wear exactly the same vestments, but they use precisely the same language.

The fifth law was an insult to the people. They are betokened by the water. The priests are represented by the wine in the sacrament!

The sixth illustrates the fact that the celibacy of the clergy was an ancient and favourite dogma of the Church of Rome. The way in which Elfric seeks to evade his own admission, that Peter had a wife, and therefore that the priests, nay even the Pope himself might have his wife, illustrates the common resort of Roman casuists. "He had a wife before he sub-

mitted to Christ, but he left his wife after he submitted to Christ." This gratuitous assumption calls for nothing else than the smile of incrudulity.

The seventh places the bishop and the presbyter upon an equality. And by so much as this canon is worth the argument of those who maintain that in the New Testament bishop, elder, pastor, and presbyter are interchangeable terms, is confirmed by this law which regulated the orders of ancient episcopacy. Elfric himself declares "there is no order appointed by *ecclesiastical institution* but the seven" he had previously described. The highest of all distinctions among *his* priesthood was this—"The souls of the priests that keep themselves chaste are an holy oblation!"

The eighth law was in effect a relaxation of the former interdict \* to celebrate mass in private houses. In case of sickness, it was henceforth to be allowed. It might so have been used, notwithstanding the interdict; inasmuch as the third injunction under that date *might* have been construed so as to *imply* this privilege. The difficulty, if it existed, was now wholly removed. The present practice of administering the sacrament to the sick or dying, in the house, is therefore a remnant of the original household character of the Eucharist.

Another and very expressive law of Elfric is this:—

"And let no priest sottishly drink to intemperance, nor force much drink on others, for he should always be in readiness so as to have his wits, if a child be to be baptised, or a man to be houseled; and if nothing of this kind should happen, yet ought he not to be drunk; for our Lord forbids drunkenness to his ministers."

---

\* See page 38.

This law was an enlargement of that of Ecbriht, which threatened punishment upon the priest who was so drunk as not to be able to baptize a child.\* Now, he was to have "his wits," so as to be prepared "to housel a man." Was this nothing more than a prohibition of drunkenness? It was that, and more than that. While it very properly sought to prevent the then common habits of priestly drunkenness, it at least tacitly, but yet slightly, condemns the also common habit among the people, that of mixing up the celebration of the Lord's Supper with drunken frolics. We shall hereafter find these customs more expressly condemned; but these customs could never have attained the repulsive height they reached had not sottish priests, not only led the way to drunkenness itself, but to drunkenness associated with, and almost inseparable from their notions of the sacramental supper.

**MARK THE DEFINITION OF "ORDERS."** There are seven enumerated, nearly all of which are pure inventions. No other "orders" were appointed "by *Ecclesiastical* Institution." Be it so. Had these, then, been appointed by Christ? We know him not, replies Elfric. To what does his own description amount? To two things: the setting aside of an order in the church, which the supreme and sole head thereof had instituted; for "HE gave some apostles and *teachers*" (Eph. iv. 11): and next, the re-affirmation of the law of Ecbriht, in A.D. 740,† which virtually extinguished the very order. That it had obtained in the early Episcopal Church is certain. Among other proofs, the records before quoted are evidence.

---

\* See Appendix, Note AA, under 740.

† See page 40.

“Doctors” or teachers met Augustine: “teachers” assembled with the Bishops whom Theodore congregated together in the Synod held at Hatfield.\* These “teachers,” therefore, took rank or position, and were a distinct and most important class of officers in the church.

The almost imperceptible method of their extinction by Ecbricht was an essential injury to the church; so much so, that it sought to recover itself from the self-inflicted wrong. “It is sad to say how few now-a-days do heartily love and labour for sacred knowledge. They are from their youth rather employed in divers vanities and the affectation of vain-glory.” So complained Cuthbert, in A.D. 747, and as the evil increased, rather than lessened, Theodulf, in A.D. 994, required “mass priests always to have a school of learners in their houses,” whom they were “to teach at free cost,” except what “they are willing of their own accord to give.”

This was to exact heavy duty from mass priests. Why were they selected? Because, as “mass priests,” they had incorporated the office, and absorbed the duty of “teachers.” But for this, they would have rebelled against the imposition of turning their houses into “a school of learners.” As it was, they had only to evade the obligation by inducing “good men” *not* “to commit their little ones to them to be taught.”

The church thus sought to recover itself. But it failed then, as it has in all subsequent periods, to impose the duty of education upon priests. And fail the church ought. The supply of education for

---

\* See explanation of chart under the respective dates.

"learners" does not necessarily and essentially belong to priests. It belongs to the whole church of Christ as such, and not to any one distinct order of men who may happen to be attached to it.

Another, and much more momentous question remains. How comes it to pass that the order of "teachers" has never been revived? Not, be it observed, teachers of "learners"—for this was only to narrow down the original institution—but teachers of men? Intellectual, noble-minded, vigorously-thinking, and laboriously-active men? For these no provision is made! "Not in our churches and chapels by preachers?" No, not even there, nor by them. Preaching never was, and never can be, teaching, in the full sense of the word; nor will Christianity reach, or even seem to aspire, to the exalted standard Christ himself erected, when he said, "Go, TEACH all nations," until it falls back upon both the principle and the practice He has himself inculcated.

It was the contravention of this divinely-instituted means of enlarging and preserving the kingdom of Christ which occasioned such unexampled disasters to the church; disasters which no one other body has ever perpetrated against itself. Would Cicero have been content that Latin should be taught by orations, and by orations only? Would Demosthenes have expected men to become familiar with Greek by exclusively listening to lectures upon the beauty, structure, and power of that language? Would not Handel have laughed at the idea of our being made proficient in music by no other means than by concerts? Yet we have so done in respect of religion. That which appeals more to mind than any other

subject,—which embraces in order to enlarge and elevate mind ; and so elevates as to delight, and so delights, as to hallow our every perception, thought, motive, and aspiration, has been so presented as to nauseate, rather than feed intellect.

“Give us back our teachers,”—ought now to be the demand of those, whom Rome in 740, despoiled of them. Then shall we be supplied with something more useful than fragments of elementary truths, and learn those higher branches of Christianity which lie beyond the present functions of priests or pastors to perform. Then (and the Episcopal Church has but to WILL to call them forth, and forth they will come) shall we be led on by men who, themselves having learned to grasp the full meaning, not of disjointed sentences, but of an entire paragraph of Sacred Writ, will be able to train up *mind* itself: and—bringing it into a more commanding proximity to the mind of God,—lessen the accumulating number of persons who cannot, under the existing order of ministrations, disentangle their minds from the uncherished impression that, after all, Christianity is only a miniature exhibition of the moral government of God.

#### EDGAR.

The scene still darkens. We have been brought to the door of a sepulchre. Before, however, we enter we must examine its precincts. We take, therefore, another step, which brings us to this monarch.

He became King of Mercia at the age of sixteen. His first act was to call home Dunstan, the bishop, who, for having reprov'd Edwy, the king's brother, was banished to Flanders in exile. Edgar was not crowned till the thirtieth year of his age. The coronation was celebrated at Bath with great pomp and



splendour, on the feast of Pentecost. Going the next year to Chester, all the kings that held under him did him homage. Eight of them rowed him in a boat down the river Dee. He was a great favourite with the monks of that day, to whom he was lavish with his gifts; as they then, and for many years after his death, were prodigal of their praises. "With him died all the Saxon glory." \* And had that been all, after ages might have been advantaged. But Christianity itself almost expired under him. Not only did the "worship of fountains and necromancy, and auguries, and enchantments, and soothsayings, and false worship and legerdemain, and imposures respecting groves, and Ellens, and also many trees of divers sorts, and stones" prevail among the people; but priests themselves (the men who were to make "the atonement" for their sins) were charged with being "common rhymers, hunters, hawkers, players at dice, false witnesses, too much the lovers of the company of women and over-drinkers, and teachers to other men of the same." †

Such was the state of religion and morals in that age. We ought not therefore to be surprised to find that ecclesiastical law was brought into requisition. To elevate? Nay; rather it lowered the authority and influence of religion. But we must hear the church under Edgar. The laws we are about to quote are remarkable on many accounts, and will amply repay any fixed attention to their character. They say—

1. "Every man shall learn to be expert at Pater Noster and Credo, as he *desires to lie in holy ground*, or to be esteemed worthy of the Housel; for he that refuseth to learn that, is not a good Christian.

\* *Milton's History of England*, book v.

† See Edgar's Laws (16, 58, &c.) in *Johnson*.

2. "That a priest never celebrate mass without book; but let the canon be before his eyes to see it if he will, lest he mistake.

3. "And that the priest have the Housel always in readiness for them that may want it, and that he keep it with diligence and purity, and take care that it does not grow stale: if it be kept so long that it cannot be received, then let it be burnt in a clean fire, and let the ashes be put under the altar.

4. "That no woman come near the altar while mass is celebrating."

Then follow various regulations as to the altar vestments of the priests, and other parts of the ceremonial or celebration.

5. "That no hallowed thing be neglected, as holy-water, salt, frankincense, bread, or any thing that is holy.

6. "That a priest never presume to celebrate mass unless he hath all things appertaining to the Housel, viz., a pure oblation [bread], pure wine, and pure water. Woe be to him that begins to celebrate unless he have all these; and woe be to him that puts any foul thing thereto, as the Jews did when they mingled vinegar and gall together, and then invited Christ to it by way of reproach to him.

7. "Let a light be always burning in the church when mass is sung."

To what did all these Eucharistic laws of Edgar amount?

The first reduced the standard of being "a good Christian" to the finest possible point of elementary knowledge. It did this under somewhat aggravated circumstances. Ecbricht, in A.D. 740, had required "every priest with great exactness to instil the Lord's Prayer and Creed into the people committed to him, and to show them to *endeavour*, after the knowledge of the **WHOLE OF RELIGION** and the *practice of Christianity*." This was an exalted standard, and had it been preserved entire, from that time down to the present, would have secured for the English

nation a far larger benefit from Christianity than it has yet obtained. But two standards having been in the early ages offered: men chose the inferior one of Edgar, and respectfully bowed out the superior model of Ecbriht. Nor must it escape observation, that so low had the standard of religion already fallen, between the two periods, that in order to nerve men up even to the inferior standard, an appeal had to be made to their fears. Not "to lie in holy ground" was a dishonour; at least so Edgar and his priests taught. In this they however dishonoured themselves. Pagans would have taught them a better lesson. With them burial was an act of justice. Hence the Latins placed it among their *Justa*; and the Greeks among their *τα νομιμα*. They even punished the man who, finding a dead body, did not thrice cast earth upon it. Nor could a greater imprecation be invoked against an enemy than that "he might not be covered with the earth."\* But these men, who would fain force others to become "good Christians," threaten to withhold the rites of burial if the Lord's Prayer and the Creed are not learned before death. Do we blame them? What, then, shall we feel or say of the man who stretched this matter much further—the man who made the canon law of 1378; and the nation who slumbered on when that law was itself exhumed in 1846?†

The second is remarkable for the evidence it supplies, that in the early ages of episcopacy, liturgical forms were in use as guides, not as authorities. Even these priests, who are described in no very

\* *Archæologia Attica*, lib. v., c. 16, p. 124.

† See under these dates.

eulogistic terms, were at liberty to have "the canon [*i.e.*, the most important words of the mass service] before his eyes, lest he mistake." He was, therefore, "to take care to have a good book, at least a true one," according to another injunction in this very same code.

The third law constitutes the priest, guardian of the reserved Eucharistic bread; and re-affirms, therefore, the same principle as had been established when, in 740, Ecbriht first interdicted the celebration in private houses. This reserved bread might be kept "too long." It was then to "be burnt in a clean fire." So also did the Greeks, for they considered it unlucky if they burnt not the haunch and shinbones of the victim in a fire.

The fourth injunction was an insult.

The fifth law, relative to the "salt" used in the mass, was borrowed from the pagan notion. Among the Greeks it was a pledge of hospitality; and was given to strangers, "to intimate that their friendship was to be seasoned with good carriage, so that it might keep long and sweet."

But Edgar must give place to an ecclesiastic. His name was

#### THEODULF.

He was preferred to the See of Orleans about the latter end of the eighth century. His *Capitula* is, at least in part, still extant in the Papal Decrees. It was most probably received and acted upon both in France and England, as well as in those other countries where canon law obtained. For the sake of order (though there may be some trifling difference

among historians as to the precise date), the compilation is placed in this year. We shall discover an increasing amount of blind and superstitious feeling; although in some few instances there are slight intimations that the compiler was sincere, although in error. He thus addressed his clergy:—

1. "We charge you that the oblation which ye offer to God in that holy mystery be either baked by yourself, or by your servants in your presence; and that ye know that it be done A.D. 984  
Theodulf in purity and chastity; and that both the oblation, and the wine, and the water, that belongs to the Offering in the mass-song be provided and regarded with all purity and diligence, and with the fear of God; and that nothing be done unchastely or impiously, for there can be no mass-song without these three things, viz., the oblation, the wine, and the water, as the Holy Writ says, let the fear of God be with you. The wine betokens the Lord's sufferings which he endured for us; the water the people for which Christ shed his blood.

2. "We charge that at the time when the priest sings mass no woman be nigh the altar, but that they stand on their own place, and that the mass priest there receive of them what they are willing to offer; a woman should be mindful of her own infirmity, and should, therefore, dread to touch any of those holy things that belong to the ecclesiastical ministry. And laymen should also dread this, lest they deserve such a punishment as Uzza did when he would bear up the ark of the Lord, for then he was soon struck dead by God."

Then follows a canon which, upon the first reading, may seem to be of little meaning. It says—

3. "Mass-priests ought by no means to sing mass *alone by themselves* without other men, that he may know whom he greets and who answers him. He ought to greet the by-standers, and they ought to make the responses. He ought to remember the Lord's declaration in the Gospel. He saith, 'Wheresoever two or three are gathered together, there am I in the midst of them.'"

This canon is remarkable on one account. It makes an addition to those practices of the Anglo-

Saxon Church, which were borrowed or assimilated to those of the pagan ritual. The priest, as he stood at the altar, was accustomed to cry out *τίσ τῆδε*; "Who is here?" To which they replied, "Many and good."\*

The *principle* upon which these responses from the people were required, was correct and important. It taught the priest and the people that, between them, there subsisted, or ought to subsist, a visible sympathy; and so far as words could excite or sustain such sympathy, the rule was valuable. The principle is avowed in one paragraph regulating the celebration of the Lord's Supper, contained in the second book of Common Prayer of Edward VI., viz., "There shall be no celebration of the Lord's Supper, except there be a *good number* to communicate with the priest according to his discretion. If there be not above twenty persons in the parish of discretion, there shall be no communion except four, or three at the least, communicate with the priest." This was in 1552, and is contained in the present Book of Common Prayer. Such, however, is the state of religion in our large towns especially, that for three in every twenty parishioners to be seen at the Lord's Supper would be deemed one of the most remarkable events that ever occurred in them!

He went on to say—

4. "The church is a holy place, for there the holy *mystery* is offered. There is no doubt but the presence of God's angels is there, and he himself full near.

5. "Let there be no man of the sacred, especially of the lay order, that dare presume to use either the cup, or the dish, or any of the

---

\* *Archæologiæ Atticæ*, lib. ii., c. 9, p. 58.

vessels which are hallowed to Divine service for any worldly purpose. Plainly he who drinketh anything out of the hallowed cup but Christ's blood, which is consecrated in the mass-song, or that puts the dish to any other service but that of the altar, he ought to consider that that concerns him as it did Balthasar (when he had seized the vessels hallowed to the Lord for his own use), viz., he lost at once his life and his kingdom."

It is a curious circumstance that this last argument was, after an interval of five hundred and sixty years, renewed as an argument to induce obedience to Rome. At the time of that ever-memorable humiliation of Mary, and the English nation, to the Pope; no small difficulty arose, as to those church goods and lands which laymen and others, had obtained in consequence of the dissolution of the monasteries, by Henry VIII. and Edward VI. "For the sake of peace," the Pope was willing to allow the question of possession, or restitution, to remain at rest. Cardinal Pool so expressed it, in his dispensation, dated Lambeth, the 9th January, 1554. In this document he, however, gave an admonition to the holders of these goods in the following words:—

"Admonemus tamen,—ut ante oculos habentes divini judicii severitatem contra Belthasarem Regem Babylonis, qui vasa sacra non a se, sed a patre e templo, ablata in prophanos usus convertit,—ea propriis Ecclesiis si extant, vel aliis restituant."\*

We must recur to Theodulf. At the end of his Capitula is this canon:—

6. "The people also, who at the Holy Time (Lent) are to take the Holy Mystery of Christ's Body and Blood, (that is the Holy Housel) are to be instructed that they do it with much awe and reverence. And let them first cleanse themselves both with fasting and alms, and abstain from the conjugal work, and from every vice; and adorn

---

\* The Dispensation is to be found at large in the Statute Book, 1 & 2 Philip and Mary, chap. viii. (*Keble.*)

themselves with alms and every good work, and so with great reverence receive it. Both is very dangerous, either that a man take it without being prepared, in a negligent manner; and also that any man be too long without it; especially let no man receive it without his shrift's (confessor's) leave. But there are many minster men [cathedral priests] and widows of so holy, religious a life, that they may do it every day when they please."

The laity in general were told their duty thus:—

7. "It behoves every Christian that can do it, to come to church on Saturday and bring a light with him, and then hear even song and nocturn in their proper hour; and come in the morning with an offering to High Mass. After the Holy Service, let every one betake himself to his own home, and entertain himself in a ghostly manner with friends, neighbours, and strangers; and guard himself agaiust immoderate eating and drinking."

By this canon, it appears that Saturday was observed as a preparative for the Sabbath. Indeed, the law of A.D. 958 says, "Let every Sunday be kept from the noon-tide (three in the afternoon) on Saturday, till Monday morning light, under the penalty which the Doom's-book mentions."

Another law, Theodulf made, related to the removal of the altar from one church to another. The circumstances under which this became necessary were these:—

8. "It has been an old custom," says this authority, "to bury dead men within the churches; and [thus] places hallowed, and blessed to the service of God, to make oblations to him, have been made burial grounds. Now, for the future, we will that none be buried in churches but he that is in holy orders; or further, a layman so righteous (as is known by his careful living) as to have deserved such a place of rest for his body. Nor yet is it our will, that corpses [already] buried in churches be thrown out; but the risings of the graves there. That men choose either to bury them deep in the ground, or at least to make a way over them, and to make the floor of the churches even and convenient, that no risings of graves be seen, or be there. If in any place there are so many risings of graves that this is difficult



to be done, then let it remain for a burying ground; and let the altar be taken away, and set in a clean place, and let a church be there raised, where men may offer to God in a worthy and pure manner."

The evident intention of this law was to honour the "righteous" dead. So far it is entitled to respect. Had the *mode* of paying that honour been as wise, as the intention was originally pure, it would not only have advanced its own purpose, by a less exceptionable method; but at the same time have prevented those after-consequences, which resulted from a perversion of its *animus*. We will honour, said Theodulf, eminently pious priests and laymen, by allowing their dead bodies a distinguished place of burial. Be it so, said the men, who came after him as lawgivers in the church. We will heighten that honour, on behalf of "righteous men who deserved it," by reversing the order of procedure against unrighteous men. These are those, who treat our laws with contempt; by neglecting to come to the Confessional, and from thence to the Communion table. The contrast will strike terror, and induce obedience." Hence the indignity offered to the bodies of those, who adhered not to ritual observances.\*

#### ETHELRED.

Old Time had struck his last stroke, announcing that He who was the "Light of the world" had now, for one thousand years, resumed his seat at the right hand of his Father in heaven; when his professed church entered upon its records one of the most

---

\* See under 1378.

painful illustrations of the great truth He had uttered, when He said, "If the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is *that* darkness?" Behold then an assembly at which "all the great men of the English were present." "On the Holy Day of Pentecost," they met "at a place called by the inhabitants Eanham."\* There sit "Alfeah and Hulfstan, the Arch Prelates" of Canterbury and York; "a multitude of venerable worshippers of Christ being with them." And "they being divinely inspired, conferred together for the recovery of the Exercise† of the Catholic religion." They are thus congregated together "by the peremptory edict of King Ethelred," the last of the Anglo-Saxon monarchs. The record thus proceeds:—

"These are the ordinances which the English Counsel-givers chose and enacted, and strictly charged to be observed.

A.D. 1009.  
Ethelred Rex. And this, in the first place, is the prime decree of the Bishops: that we all, uniformly, maintain the one Christianity, and earnestly avoid all heathenism.

"And it is the ordinance of the wisemen, that right law be advanced both in relation to God and the world."

1. "And let every Christian man prepare himself to go to *Housel* [the Sacrament] *thrice a year at least.*

\* Probably Ensham, in Oxfordshire.

† "Exercise." This is a generic term, and includes the whole of religion; its doctrines, discipline, and ritual observances. It is the very same word that is used in the first of William and Mary, cap. xviii. (A.D. 1688), to "ease scrupulous consciences in the *exercise* of religion." This statute, therefore, employed an old canonical word, and, in effect, comprehends every act of worship or religion performed "by Protestant Dissenters from the Church of England." In the face, however, of this statute, "their *Sacraments*" of religion are not only rejected, but they are denounced who use them. (See under the Stuarts.)

2. "Come on. He who henceforth is in contempt of the right law, either of God or man, let him make satisfaction—which money arising from Divine satisfaction, is to be applied, at the command of the Bishops, to the purchasing of prayers, to the relief of the poor, to the reparation of churches; to the instructing, teaching, clothing, and feeding of them that serve God; and to the purchase of bells, books, and church vestments."

All this was to be effected—

"By mulct [or fine], sometimes by weregild [the money payment in commutation of murder], sometimes by the heals-fang [a collar worn as the badge of permanent slavery], sometimes by the Danish fine, sometimes by the loss of honour, sometimes of estate, sometimes by a greater punishment, sometimes by a less."

This extraordinary enactment is founded upon a principle which, in that age, was a greatly favoured one. It was "contempt of the right law of God," in which was included not going to the Sacrament "thrice a year at least." This neglect was deemed a direct resistance against the law of God. Herein the law-makers were themselves the greatest moral delinquents, inasmuch as they were guilty of a three-fold offence; for

In the first place, they committed an outrage against Christ. He had never said one word which, by any construction, could be made even to imply that the man who did not go to the altar, thrice a year, was to be treated as an evil-doer against civil authority.

In the second place, they violated the contract entered into, and acted upon, between Ethelbert and Augustine. He, when he introduced "the Catholic religion" into Britain, taught the King of Kent, that "the service of Christ ought to be voluntary and not by compulsion."\* Had Augustine so much as

---

\* *Bede*, lib. i., cap. 25.

hinted, that he or his successors would ever teach any such compulsory doctrine, as that now proclaimed, it is certain that the opportunity of enacting so dangerous a law as this, would *in limine*, have been denied them. Had he inscribed upon the banner, uplifted in the sight of Ethelbert, "Ye shall lose your honors; wear the heels-fang; submit to fines; forfeit estates, if ye neglect the right law of God," instantly the indignant shout would have been heard: "Begone! ye ecclesiastical robbers. We sought not your appearance amongst us; we despise the laws ye proclaim." And Augustine, with his forty Benedictine monks, would have been hooted back to Rome, laden with indignity and reproach.

And, in the third place, they imperilled every one, of the civil, as well as the religious institutions of England. In the history of the world, was it ever known that any nation, savage or civilized, received either an essentially new religion; or a new set of religious ceremonies, by *force*? No matter what their ignorance, or viciousness, or what their innate enmity to "the right law of God," dragooned into a more excellent way they never were; unless at the same time, they became enslaved in every other relation of life. Augustine brought, not a new religion, but a new "*rule of Christianity*."\* During the four hundred years that had elapsed from his times, down to these of Ethelred, this rule had never been so presented, as it was by this national act. Humiliating as this was, both to the church and the monarch, a still further illustration of the mental prostration of that period, is supplied in the fact

---

\* See explanation of Chart, under A.D. 429.

that it is based upon the *same principle of legislation* as had obtained under *pagan* Roman Emperors. It speaks of "contempt of the right law of God and man." That "contempt" is the legal term as to development; as also of process and proof. The singular feature in this enactment is, that while it is copied from Roman law, it is a transcript, not of Roman law, as modified under *Christian* Emperors, but of Roman law, as it had existed under *pagan* Emperors. The Christian model, as explained under Justinian, says—

"Satisfactionum modus alius antiquitati placuit, alium novitas per usum amplexa est, &c.—In taking security, the *ancients* pursued a different method from that which the moderns have made choice of; for, anciently, if a real action was brought, the defendant was compelled to give security, which species of caution is termed *judicatum solvi*," &c.\*

So that, if an action had been brought against a man, to dispossess him of his estate, he was obliged to give security, that the sum demanded against him, should be paid, if he were cast in the action. But the new law relaxed this security as to the payment of the money; and required only "a promise upon oath, or a simple promise without an oath, according to the person of the defendant."†

The "ancient" law, to which Justinian here refers, differed from his own; inasmuch as instead of "*an oath*," "*or promise without oath*," it had required an oath of a very peculiar character. For the *pagan*, in *his* action at law, respecting his "estate," took an oath or bond to defend his right, after having deposited a sum of money in court; and having so done, he was

---

\* *Justinian Institutions*, lib. iv., tit. xi.

† Section ii., *Jus novum*.

said to "contendere ex provocatione," or "contendere sacramento." The money was called "sacramento,"—the oath (or as we should call it the Sacrament), "because, if the money became forfeited, it was bestowed *in rebus sacris et divinis*."\*

Could pagan priests and gods thus gain money from an unsuccessful litigant? So also might the priests of Ethelred. "If any money arises from *divine* [contradistinguished from secular] satisfaction, it is to be applied to the purchasing of prayers, and feeding them that serve God."

Do not laws make, or destroy, those who originate or obey them? Then mark in this instance, of an Anglo-Saxon king, indisputable proof of that national prostration which, as we pursue the inquiry a little further, will show up those results, which never fail to accompany any, and every mental degradation; whether it spring from an innately vicious character, or corrupting religious institutions. For a national overthrow, followed this national humiliation. The historian tells us, "the English put on airs of courage;" for "they fitted out a fleet, so many as never before had been among the English nation in any king's days; and they were all brought together to Sandwich, to defend this land against every foreign army." But a storm having dashed some of them to pieces, "the king went his way home; and the earldomen and nobility lightly left the ships; and they let the whole nation's toil thus lightly pass away."†

War raged for some time after this. Again and

---

\* *Romanæ Historiæ*, lib. iii., sec. 4, p. 245.

† *Bede: Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, A.D. 1009.

again, were the Danes paid to quit the land; and each ransom price, induced them to raise the demand still higher. Amid all the miseries induced by this state of national humiliation, the monks drove at their old trade—that of buying and selling relics:—

“The Abbot of Peterborough went to the minster called Boneval, where St. Florentine’s body lay. There he found a poor place, a poor abbot, and poor monks, for they had been plundered [by the Danes]. Then bought he there, of the abbot and of the monks, St. Florentine’s body, all except the head, for five hundred pounds; and then, when he came home again, he made an offering of it to Christ and St. Peter.”\*

#### Superstition hastened destruction.

It was during this universal prevalence of intestine war, famine, floods, and desolation, that “the great council at Oxford had been held” under the auspices of Ethelred. His reign was a constant toil. From his coronation to his death, he had one continued conflict with the Danes; who, at his death, had made themselves masters of the principal towns, and having settled themselves in the heart of the kingdom, were in a condition soon to complete the conquest of the whole. According to the custom of the age, the piety of the Anglo-Saxon monarch was extolled beyond all praise. The old historians † tell us that being at prayers, on a day of battle, he resolved not to move till the service was over, though the Danes had in the early part of the conflict gained some advantage. “God,” said they, “rewarded his piety with a single victory.”

Ethelred, “after a long, troublesome and ill-governed reign, died at London, and was buried in

---

\* *Bede: Anglo-Saxon Chronicle.*

† *Dunelm*, p. 125, and *Brompton*, p. 808.

the Church of St. Paul," and "with him ended the Anglo-Saxon race of English kings."\*

Would they could be as easily dismissed in influence, as they were now extinct in government. But they left an imperishable epitaph upon the tomb of vital Christianity in England. Here they had reigned in religion four hundred and eighteen years since Augustine's time; and during all this time lent themselves to the despoiling power of the Church of Rome. Had you, however, engraved upon the sepulchre of Ethelred an "*hic jacet*" every way suitable to him, or his successors, and had it been in the few words, "Here lies the *last* Saxon despoiler of Christ's religion," it would have been true, but not the *whole* truth upon this momentous matter. For one, even of Ethelred's laws, is sought to be revived in the present day. He had said—

"Let men often visit God's churches with light and offering, and there often pray to Christ in their own persons."

Why then, or *there*? Because of the greater availment of prayer, when offered in hallowed places. Pagan idolaters, had always shown a fondness for this very thing; so also did Mahomedans. Some Jews also, once followed the same rule. We here trace the marked agreement between religionists, living at remote periods, and under perfectly dissimilar civil and religious institutions: an agreement which demonstrates the avidity with which nations will copy, although they do not acknowledge each other's authority.

More than this; it illustrates the fact, that by a *moral* assimilation, periods, however remote from each

---

\* *Milton's History of England*, book vi.



other, are frequently brought together by an expressive agreement, in some one or other remarkable sameness of character.

Whatever respect we might feel for the assumed religious motive which prompted Ethelred to enjoin this observance upon his people; mingled as that respect must be, with lamentation at the positive religious loss which both the motive, and the act would entail, under a supposed invaluable gain:—that respect must be exchanged, for grave censure upon the men, who seek to carry us back to the period when Christianity received such deadly wounds at the hands of the men, who ministered at its altars.

There are men in the present day who openly enunciate the same rule of prayer. In the porch of St. Matthias Church, Stoke Newington, are two large boards, one of which contains the following announcement:—

“**FERIAL DAYS.**”\*—This church is open for *private prayer* from the time of matins [half-past ten] till one o'clock, and from three p.m. till evening song” [half-past seven in the evening].

“*This church*” (unhappily not the only one) then unites the Anglo-Saxons of A.D. 1009 with their descendants of A.D. 1857, in the same spiritual degeneracy. Once bring the custom here recommended, to bear upon the minds and habits of the people generally; and the priest will soon stand higher in their estimation than Christ; and the church block up every scriptural avenue to the throne of God. The *effect* of such a custom is greater than the pretension. The virus outlives, and outspreads

---

\* Days set apart by private individuals from their ordinary labour and pleasure.

the virtue. "This church," too, is enshrouded with "lights." The proper officer brings them in, at a particular moment, places them reverently on the altar, and bows before them, and it. The appeal made by the priests of this church, is also based upon the non-payment of "fees." These, by the same public notification, are repudiated; and "voluntary offerings" only are accepted. The intention is evident: they seek to lay hold of mind; to fashion that mind, once grasped, according to their own model; and then so to call forth all its powers, as to assist them in securing one great object: an object which shall exert a mightier charm, than even the unrivalled music of the service, which helps on the delusion of the whole. Such spurious attractions will, however, do again what they have done before. They will eat away the heaven-born principles of religion; and, when these expire, all will be lost! The struggle is not between "this church" of St. Matthias, and (happily for the locality) that architectural gem of St. Jude, standing off at the distance of scarcely two minutes' walk: but, between artificial lights and vital power; between prayer offered in a church, and the prayer issuing from the heart; between an altar adorned by men, and the atonement offered by Christ; between flowers which bedeck the font, the arches, and the altar of "this church;" and the fruits of righteousness, which flourish only in those, who by the hand of God, are "planted in the courts of our God."

## SECTION II.—THE DANES.

## CANUTE.

Canute was now master of England, and servant to ecclesiastics. Among the kind offices he did them, one was, publicly to honour a dead saint. Elphege, the archbishop of Canterbury, was reputed a martyr. He had been buried in St. Paul's minster, and now his body being taken up from the tomb, "the illustrious king and very many clergy, and also laity, carried in a ship his holy body over the Thames to Southwark; then with worshipful band and sprightly joy bore him to Rochester, and then worshipfully brought him into Christ's Church [Canterbury] and there deposited St. Elphege's holy body on the north side of Christ's altar, to the glory of God and the honour of the holy archbishop, and the eternal health of all who there daily seek to his holy body with a devout heart, and with all humility. God Almighty have mercy on all Christian men through St. Ephege's holy merits."\*

The altar and relics were in great demand. Without these, not any one important thing was done in the Church; and independently of these, nothing of moment was attempted in the State.

"This," then, "is the provision which Canute, King of all England and of the Danes and Norwegians, made with consent of his wisemen, to the praise of God, and his own royal dignity, and the *benefit* of the people at the holy mid-winter [Christmas] tide at Winchester." The wording proves that the advisers

---

\* *Bede: Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, A.D. 1023.

under Ethelred occupied the same place under Canute. That unhappy Saxon monarch, as he tottered with a falling throne, exclaimed, "Let every man diligently mind his Christianity." Canute, the Dane, as he refixes its position for himself, says, "The *principal* point is, that the one God be ever loved beyond every thing, and one Christianity be uniformly observed, and King Canute be duly and truly loved and honoured."

Our "benefit" ? said the people. Cui bono ? Cui bono ? Tell us what *we* get by your altar and its relics ? Listen, said the priests :

1. "Let him that *will*, or *can*, understand, that great and remarkable is that which the priest hath to do for the benefit of the people, if he aright propitiate the Lord. Great is the exorcism, remarkable is the consecration, by which he expels the devil and puts him to flight, as oft as he baptizeth a man or consecrates the Housel, for angels glide about the place and guard those holy actions, and assist the priest with a Divine power, as oft as he duly ministers to Christ ; and this they always do, when, with inward earnestness of heart, they call upon Christ and intercede for the wants of the people."\*

A.D. 1017.  
Canute Rex.

And has it already come to this, that four hundred and twenty years practical operation of the "rule of Christianity" introduced by Augustine, and carried forward by his successors, have taught men such absurd notions ; that priests feel themselves safe from public execration when they foist upon the people, these worse than childish articles of belief ? 'Tis even so. Nor was this all. For these laws repeated, and even enlarged, one of the most dangerous dogmas the Church of Rome ever uttered, when, by the mouth of Cuthbert, in A.D. 747, she

---

\* Johnson : *Spelman*, vol. i., 539.

had declared the priest made an "atonement for the sins of the people." In this Danish law, he is said to "propitiate the Lord." And what is more; this law laid the foundation of another dogma, alike false in character, deceptive in operation, and ruinous in power. "The *inward* earnestness of *heart*" are remarkable words, and stand associated with those actions of the priest by which he can "propitiate the Lord," *if* they are performed "*aright.*" You have here the commencement of the doctrine of *intention*, which, we shall hereafter find, wrought out the most frightful results.\*

The second of Canute's laws is—

2. "We charge that every Christian learn to *know*, at the least, the right faith, and be expert at Paternoster et Credo. He hath no Christian communion in the consecrated places of rest, after death, nor is he capable of the Housel in this life, who will not learn it."

Then follows this remarkable canon :—

3. "Let every Christian carefully learn to love God inwardly with the heart; and diligently attend to the Divine doctors; and study the laws and instructions of God to his own benefit. And let the Bishops be preachers and doctors of God's laws. The shepherds should be wakeful, and earnestly call out against invaders, that the furious wolf may not tear in pieces or bite too many of the flock. And he who NEGLECTS TO HEAR GOD'S AMBASSADORS, LET HIM CONTENT WITH GOD HIMSELF."

The last clause may carry the appearance of a threat; and might have been so designed. It, however, contains a principle in religion which never, either before or subsequently, has been embodied in any canon or ecclesiastical authority. The principle is—*individual responsibility to God*. This Scriptural rule (for every man shall give account of himself to

---

\* See under A.D. 1322.

God) has not been carried into effect; but rather it has been contravened, contradicted, openly and declaredly set at nought; both by ecclesiastics alone, and by statesmen and priests conjoined. Had the golden principle been as studiously inwrought in ecclesiastical jurisprudence, as it unhappily has been denied even a recognition; what spiritual wickedness in high places would it not have prevented—what heaps of rubbish, in the form of canon law, would it not have scattered to the four winds of heaven, or buried, *en masse*, in the depths of the sea;—what innumerable blazing piles would it not have hindered being lit up—what shouts of malignant joy from diabolical fiends would it not have choked—what sighs and groans from saints “slain under the altar” would it not have spared: and, above all, what dishonour to the religion of the Son of God would it not have hurled back upon the enemies of the cross of Christ!

Is it too late to REVIVE *this* law? For be it remembered, it is not repealed. It still stands part of canonical authority; and, as such, can legally be quoted, quite as appositely to any subject, as the canon of Elfric is now resuscitated as an authority in favour of semi-transubstantiation.\*

Had Canute's last law stood alone, it would have proved itself divinely pure; but being surrounded by multitudes of other enactments of a perfectly opposite character, it has lost the prominent position it deserves to occupy; and what is more, lost the benignant power it still more richly deserves to exert.

Canute is often held up in our schools as an ex-

---

\* See under date A.D. 995.

ample of kingly wisdom in putting servile flatterers to the blush, by the part he acted in a unique scene upon the sea-shore. Ought he not also to be honoured with higher honours? He is the only king who passed, at least *one* law upon religion, in full and complete harmony with the laws and spirit of Him, who having given us evidences upon which to build our faith, leaves those evidences to work conviction upon every individual mind, according to its moral aptitude to perceive their force, and comply with their obligation.

#### EDWARD THE CONFESSOR.

This monarch occupies a somewhat anomalous position in the history of the English Church. To him the title of "Saint," "Martyr," "Confessor," has been given, just as suited the particular purpose for which his name has been mentioned. We do not find he was any sufferer on account of religion, unless we consider it as a sort of martyrdom, the mortification he privately laid upon himself from a religious motive. He passed as a saint among the monks, who reaped great advantage from his liberal disposition.\*

"A little before his death, he was heard to pray—that if it were a true vision, not an illusion, which he had seen, God would give him strength to utter it; otherwise not. Then he related how he had seen two devout monks, whom he knew in Normandy, who told him that they were sent messengers from God, to foretel that, because the great ones of England, dukes, lords, bishops, and abbots, were not ministers of God, but of the devil, God had delivered the land to their enemies; and when he desired that he might reveal this vision, to the end they might repent, it was answered they neither will repent,

---

\* *Rapin*, i., 478.

neither will God pardon them. At this relation, others trembling, Stigand, is said to have laughed, as at the feverish dream of a doting old man.”\*

Stigand could do other things as well as laugh. He will appear again very shortly; with, not the laugh of scorn at the dream of “a doting old man,” but the laugh of joy, at the realities of an aspiring conqueror.

Edward the Confessor made no ecclesiastical laws of his own. He contented himself, and pleased his admirers, by evincing an unusual zeal in administering those of his predecessors among the Anglo-Saxon and Danish kings.

---

\* *Milton's History of England*, book vi.



## SECTION IV.—THE NORMAN DYNASTY.

## WILLIAM THE CONQUEROR

Was as decidedly the military, as Augustine more than four centuries and a half before, had been the ecclesiastical emissary of Rome. The Pope consecrated a banner, which he delivered to the Norman bastard, as the pledge of his sympathy in his projected subjugation of England. By this he conquered; not, indeed, at the battle of Hastings, where Harold had stretched his length on the place of carnage; but at Berhampstead, whither the Norman invader arrived on his way towards London. Before he reached this prime object of his ambition, he was met by three representatives of the church: Stigand, Archbishop of Canterbury; Aldred, Archbishop of York; and the Bishop of Winchester. Two of these dignitaries were, from previous habits, admirably adapted to enter upon negotiations which should secure to them all the advantages that could possibly arise from this eventful change of dynasty. Stigand had been first Bishop of Thetford, from which he was deposed by King Edward, "because he was nearest to his mother's counsel, and she went just as he advised her as people thought."\* Afterwards he was restored, and became Bishop of Winchester; and then reached "the highest stall" [Canterbury], after having "eaten at the best manger" [Winchester]. Aldred was a hero as well as an Archbishop. He seems to have surpassed another ecclesiastic of his times, who "bore

---

\* *Bede, Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, A.D. 1043.*

his knapsack during his priesthood *until* he was a Bishop,"\* which "he held eleven weeks and four days." Him Aldred imitated; and afterwards was honoured, so as to place the crown upon the Conqueror's head.

The sword will henceforth supplant the cross, and uphold the crown. Hence the following recital:—

"King William, in the fourth year of his reign, after the conquest of England, by the advice of his barons, caused the English noblemen, that were men of knowledge and learning in their own law, to be

A.D. 1064. summoned together through all the provinces of England, that he might hear their laws, rights, and customs; therefore twelve men, chosen out of every county of the whole nation, did make oath before the King that they would make known the sanctions of their own laws and customs, proceeding in a direct way without swerving to the right hand or the left; without making omissions, additions, or prevaricating variations. Therefore beginning with the laws of the Holy Mother, the church, because by her the king and kingdom stand upon a solid foundation, they declared *her* laws, liberties, and protection, saying—

"Let the protection of God and the Holy Church be"—(the same as it had in former years, with this important addition)—"if any man out of arrogance will not be brought to satisfaction in the Bishop's Court, let the Bishop notify him to the King; and let the King constrain the malefactor to make satisfaction where the forfeiture is due; that is, first to the Bishop, then to himself: so THERE SHALL BE TWO SWORDS; AND ONE SWORD SHALL HELP THE OTHER."

In this last sententious declaration lies embedded the whole system of religious FORCE. The law itself declares much, but defines little. The thirteen words might be turned any way to suit a purpose. Despots, and especially papist despots, have generally been wary of their words; and therefore it is that in this instance we find so studious a regard to brevity.

---

\* This was Leofgar.—*Bede*, A.D. 1056.

Under the sanction of this now clearly expressed principle, viz., that of the combined forces of ecclesiastical and secular authority, the future government of the people was to be conducted. Its results are registered in those penal laws which afterwards inflicted civil penalties for religious opinions ; such as fines, imprisonment, degradation, and "death by burning."

The Eucharistic code was not enlarged by this unique national council. Indeed it appears upon the face of their proceedings that to make new laws was not their object. The customs that had been, were to remain untouched ; and these were then deemed amply sufficient in relation to the Lord's Supper. The record, however, is in itself remarkable ; not less for having supplied the data by which we easily blend the past with the then future civil history of England ; but is still more impressive, in furnishing the connecting link, between theological error, and secular persecution.

The miseries England suffered under this reign are patent to the world. The men who had assisted in placing William upon the throne came in for their share of misery. They had not to wait long before they were made to learn the lesson so frequently taught in the moral history of man, viz., that oppressors generally know how to press hardest upon the necks of those who lent themselves as stepping-stones for their exaltation. Bede thus recounts the acts of William :—

"The king had a great consultation and spoke very deeply with his witan concerning this land, how it was held, and what were its tenantry. He then sent his men over all England, into every shire, and caused them to ascertain how many hundred hides it contained,

and what lands the king possessed therein ; what cattle there were in the several counties, and how much revenue he ought to receive yearly from each. He also caused them to write down what belonged to his archbishops, to his bishops, his abbots, and his earls, and, that I may be brief, what property every inhabitant of all England possessed in land or in cattle, and how much money this was worth. So very narrowly did he cause the survey to be made, that there was not a single hide nor a rood of land, nor, it is shameful to state that which he thought no shame to do, was there an ox or a cow, or a pig passed by, and that was not set down in the accounts, and then all these writings were brought to him.”\*

Nor did Stigand himself escape. The Conqueror even deposed him. Three of the Pope’s legates, Hermenfide, bishop of Lyons, John and Peter, priests, cardinals were present at his deposition.† Bede thus continues his history :—

“ A.D. 1070.—This year Lanfranc, abbot of Caen [in Normandy], came to England, and in a few days he was made Archbishop of Canterbury. He was consecrated at his metropolis on the fourth before the kalends of September by eight bishops, his suffragans ; the rest, who were absent, signifying through messengers, and by writing, *why* they could not be there.”

A correct idea may be formed of the state of the church at this period, by quoting one more (and it shall be the last) paragraph from this Anglo-Saxon chronicle. Speaking of the monastery of Canterbury, the monks of which Lanfranc imprisoned because of

\* *Bede’s Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, A.D. 1085.

† He was so far restored as to appear at Lanfranc’s council, held in 1075, at which he is named “ Stigand of Seolsey,” which See shortly after became absorbed into that of Chichester. The discrepancy in the dates may be explained by the fact, that Bede sometimes places an event under a certain year, although the recital proves that it must have occurred at some other period. His chronological order is not invariably so precise as could be desired.

the resistance they raised against the abbot whom he had forced upon them, Bede says :—

“The same year (*i.e.*, the eighteenth of his prelacy) the dissensions were renewed, and the monks plotted the death of their abbot, but one of them named Columba being taken, Lanfranc caused him to be brought to him. As he stood there before him, Lanfranc asked if he desired to murder his abbot? And the monk forthwith replied ‘Yes, if I could I would certainly kill him.’ Then Lanfranc commanded that he should be tied up naked by the gates of St. Augustine, and suffer flagellation before all the people; that his cowl should then be torn off, and that he should be driven out of the city. This order was executed, and thenceforth, during Lanfranc’s life, sedition was suppressed by the dread of his severity.”

Though now brought to the commencement of the eleventh century, we are supplied with few illustrations upon the matter of the Eucharist; the fact being, that mighty conflicts were going on between Norman oppressors and their English resistants. Lanfranc held his synods. At one of them, celebrated at Winchester, this subject engaged attention, when it was decreed :—

1. “Of altars, that they be of stone.\*
- A.D. 1071. 2. “That the sacrifice be not of beer, or water alone, but of Wines mixed with water only.
3. “That the bells be not tolled at celebrating at the time of the *secret*.”†

---

\* This was a repetition of an old canon, dating 740, which said, “Let no altars be consecrated by unction with chrism, unless they be of stone.” Probably this very canon was based upon the twenty-sixth canon of Epone, in 517. The injunction was copied from Moses (Exodus xx. 24, 25), with this difference ;—the *command* was to make it of earth; the *permission* was to make it of stone.

† “*Secret*.”—This word (mystery, or “holy mystery,” which before this period was repeatedly used) has been made by ecclesiastics to mean more than it ever ought to have conveyed. They have so construed it as to make an idol of a word. Lord Bacon mentions four

This secret is the act going before the elevation of the Host. The bells were rung as soon as the consecration was finished to excite the people to prayer;

---

idols: those of the tribe, or general prejudices; those of the den, or prejudices which pertain to every individual of the race; those of the market-place, or prejudices which arise out of words and terms in common use; and those of the theatre, or prejudices connected with visionary theories. He might have added, the idol of the altar, or those prejudices which spring out of a word, or rather out of one monosyllable. That one awful monosyllable will be found described hereafter. It forms part of a sentence, which itself became dependent upon the unknown intention of the person whose duty it was then and there "roundly and distinctly to utter these *secret* words of the canon." Why? Because by Romanists this word "secret" is made to mean the same as "sacrament." But "it is very false to say that the Latin word *sacramentum* is equivalent to the Greek word *μυστήριον* for *sacramentum* signifieth an oath, which the Greek word doth not; and also it includeth holiness, which the Greek word doth not."\* Mystery and sacrament cannot be identical; or we should read "the sacrament of God's will (Eph. i. 9); the sacrament of piety (1 Tim. iii. 16); the sacrament of a dream (Daniel ii. 18, 30, 47); the sacrament of the seven stars (Rev. i. 20); and the sacrament of the woman (Rev. xvii. 7)."<sup>†</sup> "The earliest perversion of this word *μυστήριον* from its genuine and original sense (a secret, or something concealed), was in making it denote some solemn or sacred ceremony. Among the different ceremonies employed by the heathens in their idolatrous superstitions, some were public and performed in the open courts, or in those parts of the temple to which all had access; others were more secretly performed in places from which the crowd was carefully excluded. These secret rites, on account of this very circumstance, their secrecy, were generally denominated *mysteries*. The Christian worship, which though essentially different from all pagan rites, yet had as much resemblance in this circumstance—the

---

\* *Fulke's Translation of the Bible*, 493: published by the Parker Society.

† *Campbell Dissertations*, part i., dissertation x., section i., ix., & x., pp. 298, 303—4.

for as yet the worshipping of the Host was not known.

4. "That chalices be not of wax or wood."

---

exclusion of the multitude—as would give sufficient handle to the heathen to style them the Christian mysteries. Probably the term would be first applied only to what was called in the primitive church the *Eucharist*, which we call the Lord's Supper, and afterwards extended to baptism and other sacred ceremonies. In regard to the first-mentioned ordinance, it cannot be denied that in the articles of concealment, there was a pretty close analogy. Not only were all infidels, both Jews and Gentiles, excluded from witnessing the commemoration of the death of Christ, but even many believers, particularly the catechumens and the penitents; the former because not yet initiated by baptism into the church; the latter, because not yet restored to the communion of Christians, after having fallen into scandalous sin. Besides, the secrecy that Christians were often, on account of the persecutions to which they were exposed, obliged to observe, which made them meet for social worship in the night time, or very early in the morning, would naturally draw on their ceremonies, from the Gentiles, the name of *mysteries*. And it is not unreasonable to think that a name which had its rise among their enemies, might afterwards be adopted by themselves.\* This distinguished theologian and linguist also says, "In the communion office of the Church of England the elements, after consecration, are sometimes termed *holy mysteries*."† In what sense are these words now used? In the old Roman, or ecclesiastical meaning? Then they mean too much. They convey the delusive idea of some hidden virtue. But this the Jews themselves, passionately fond as they were of ceremonial institutions, never once imagined. It is a curious circumstance that they drew a broad distinction between the *non-communication of a ceremonial holiness* and the actual conveyance of *ceremonial impurity*. "If one have holy flesh in the skirt of his garment, and with his skirt do touch bread or pottage, or wine or oil, or any meat, shall it be holy?"

---

\* *Campbell Dissertations*, part i., dissertation x., sections i., ix. & x., pp. 298, 303—4.

† See the Exhortation in the present Rubric.

## At another council—

“In the reign of William, the glorious King of the English, the ninth year, was assembled in the church of the blessed apostle Paul, London, a council of the whole English nation, viz., of bishops, abbots, and many persons of religious order.”

A.D. 1076.

## It was decreed—

“That monks observe their order according to the rule of Benedict. If any without license, are discovered to have anything of their own, and do not with repentance confess, and discard it before they die, let not the bells be tolled; *nor the salutary sacrifice be offered for such an one; nor is he to be buried in the churchyard.*”

This denunciation was designed to frighten two parties: disobedient monks,—by punishing them with a denial of the usual mass, for the repose of their souls at death; and also casting their bodies out of the churchyard: and refractory people, whom it was intended to induce to argue in this form, “If such be the punishment inflicted upon disobedient monks, what may not we expect, if *we* resist the church?”

Lanfranc died, and the See of Canterbury remained vacant nearly five years. Bede calls him “the patron of monks; but we trust that he has entered into the kingdom of heaven.” If, however, he patronized monks, he pillaged the clergy.

And the priest answered and said, No. Then said Haggai: If one that is unclean by a dead body touch any of these, *shall it be unclean?* And the priest answered and said, It shall be unclean. (Haggai ii. 12, 13.) “Holy mysteries,” under the Christian dispensation, which is one of essential principles, rather than of ritual observances; is surely an exceptionable, form of words: especially so, since “the English word mystery is as commonly used profanely and secularly as any other word. For what is more common among artificers than their science or mystery of weaving, of dying, and such like?” (*Fulke’s Translations of the Bible* (Parker Society), page 495.)



Many and urgent were the applications made to William Rufus to fill the vacant See of Canterbury, all the profits of which he kept to himself. At length the bishops went to him in a body, with "May it please your Majesty to allow us to prepare a prayer, to be put up in all our churches, that God would grant you his grace to appoint an archbishop of Canterbury;" to whom he replied, "You may pray as you like; I shall do as I like."\*

At length Anslem succeeded to the archiepiscopal chair. He revived synods. One was held at Westminster "with the consent of the king and principal men of the whole realm, the archbishop petitioning that they might be present, to the intent that what was done might be more unanimously observed, especially because for long want of synods, Christian zeal was grown cold."

Now commenced the *enforcement* of celibacy of priests. And it is remarkable to find that it stands connected with the Eucharist. It was decreed—

"That no priest marry a wife, or retain her.

"That the priest who is lewd with a woman is not a lawful priest; let him not celebrate mass, or be heard by others if he do."

A.D. 1102.  
William II. Rex.

The ulterior purpose covered over by this last interdict, was not so much to denounce lewd priests, as to dishonour married priests. This appears in the very next council; where, when speaking of priests generally, it decreed—

"That such of them as have kept or taken women, since the prohibition at London [the one above] and have celebrated

A.D. 1106.  
Henry I. Rex.

mass, do so wholly discard them as not to be with, or meet them in any house knowingly; and that the woman

---

\* *Henry's History of England*, vol. i.

may not live on any ground that belongs to the church. Let such priests as chuse to live with women, *in contempt of God's altar* and their holy orders, be deprived of their office and benefice, and put out of the choir, being first pronounced infamous.

“And if he celebrate mass, and do not leave his woman, let him be excommunicate, unless he come to satisfaction within eight days after summons.

“All archdeacons shall swear that they will not take money to tolerate men in transgressing this statute; nor for tolerating priests whom they know to keep women, to celebrate mass, or to have vicars. Deans shall do the same. He that refuses shall forfeit his archdeaconry or deanery.

“The bishops shall take away all the moveable goods of such priests, deacons, subdeacons, and canons as shall offend herein for the future; and also their adulterous concubines, with their goods.”

Again, you read—

“We forbid priests, deacons, subdeacons, and canons to live with women not allowed by law. But if they adhere to their  
A.D. 1127. concubines, *or wives*, let them be deprived of their ecclesiastical order, dignity, and benefice. If any such are parish priests, we cast them out of the choir, and decree them to be infamous.

“We require archdeacons to use their utmost diligence for the *rooting out this plague* from the church of God.”

This completed, what Elfric commended in A.D. 957, and the canon of 1009 had encouraged; by granting the unmarried priest “the worldly honour of being equal to a *thane*, both as to rights in his life and at his burial.”

At length the Pope himself takes this matter in hand. Innocent II. sent a legate into England. His name was Alberic, Bishop of Ostia. He held a national council at Westminster, eighteen bishops and thirty abbots being also present and consenting. Among the rest of their decrees, we have these upon the Eucharist:—

“That the body of Christ be not reserved above eight days; and that it be not carried to the sick, but by a priest or  
A.D. 1138.  
Legatin. deacon; in case of necessity by any one, but with the greatest reverence.”

Only sacred hands were to administer sacred things. The law was—

“As it is abominable for laymen to say mass and consecrate the sacrament, so is it ridiculous for a clergyman to carry arms and fight in wars.

“Following the holy fathers, we deprive priests, deacons, and sub-deacons both of their office and benefice, if they are *guilty of marriage* or concubinary, and forbid any to hear their mass.”

“Guilty of marriage!”—This ulterior purpose had, thirty-six years before, induced the denunciation against priests living with women. The *reason* for these prohibitions of priests marrying was as simple as it was wicked. That reason is found in one great fact. Rome sought to concentrate all the sympathies of the priesthood within itself. Once allow priests to mix up with other human beings; feel what and as they feel: in short have something in common with other people, and “the gain of her craft” would be lost. Hence the law of 960, “That no priest desert the church to which he has been blest and married,” nor “too much love the company of women, but love his lawful wife, that is, the church.” And again, in 1237, the reigning evil [the matrimony of priests] was denounced, “because of the lessening the goods of the church.” Here was the grand motive; the all-pervading desire of the master-purpose of Rome—to grasp wealth; every thing was to turn to gold, and all that gold was to cling to herself. Whoever, therefore, was likely to lessen this wealth, by turning

the offerings of the dying, into other channels than those of an ecclesiastical character, would assuredly hear an awful denunciation levelled against him, followed by expulsion both from office, and benefice.\*

Had this conflict been restricted to the marriage of priests, they and the Pope might have been left to fight out their own battles alone. But unhappily the laity were dragged into the matter. Priests that married at all were to be expelled their livings; laymen that married twice, or the bachelor who married a widow, were to be hanged! And that by virtue of statute law, copied, as that law was, from a foreign canon law. Here it is:—

“Concerning men twice married, whom the Bishop of Rome, by a constitution made at Lions, hath excluded from all clerk’s privilege, whereupon the prelates have prayed for to have them delivered as clerks; but justice shall be executed upon them as upon other lay people.”†

How long did it last? Down to 1547; this wicked law remained in force: ah! and was frequently executed! Edward VI. modified it so as to give the benefit of clergy to those persons who “have been divers and sundry times married to any single woman, or single women; or to any widow, or widows; or to two wives or more; any law, statute, or usage to the

\* It may serve to illustrate the systematic cupidity of those days to quote what Bede states. Under date A.D. 1044, he says, “This year Eadsine gave up the bishopric (Canterbury) by reason of his infirmity; and he blessed thereto Siward as bishop, by the king’s leave and counsel. It was known to few men before it was done, because the archbishop thought that some other man would obtain or buy it whom he could less trust in and be pleased with, if more men should know it.”—*Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*.

† 4th of Edward I., cap. v., A.D. 1276.

contrary notwithstanding.”\* If a man could read or write, he was not now to be hanged; but if he could do neither, the scaffold waited his return from the altar, where, on his marriage, he had taken the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper! This modified law continued until the year 1828, when both it, and the statute it had relaxed, were repealed.

Thus to have mixed up marriage, with the Eucharist, must have proved an awful, and even revolting, evil. It had began in 1108 with priests; from them it extended to the laity, upon whom the heaviest portion of the legal calamity fell; and had, therefore, remained four hundred and thirty-nine years in existence! The records of the judgment seat, if they could be obtained, would illustrate the complaint of the canon of A.D. 1308, that secular judges “did not stick” to execute this law upon the clergy as well as the people. But such records are not now extant. If they were, they would increasingly exhibit the extent to which those statutes and canons stretched their appalling authority. Who could have dreamed that such would ever have been the perversion of Christ's death! No one: unless he had heard of pagan abominations, emanating from pagan laws of abstinence.

---

\* 1 Edward VI., cap. xii., sec. 16.

## SECTION V.—THE PLANTAGENETS; OR, THE SAXONS RESTORED.

If "the proceedings of the new race of kings, gave great hopes to good men,"\* what expectations are we to cherish as to the old race of primates? From time, almost immemorial, they had been extremely sensitive upon matters of priority, rank, power, and wealth, among themselves. Law had often stepped in with her aid to defend the weaker, or in support of the stronger brother. Monarchs were as frequently appealed to for a kind word, or an angry frown: him at Rome had not unfrequently been favoured with tacit acknowledgement of being "venerated throughout these isles," by disputatious bishops laying their complaints against each other at his feet; or carrying away with them the heavily paid-for decree in their favour.

But now a new scene opens to us. Richard, who had succeeded the murdered Thomas Becket, was, as Archbishop of Canterbury, embroiled with Roger, Archbishop of York, as to the right of certain dioceses; and consequent equal rank with him of Canterbury. Frequent were their appeals to the monarch, and to the Pope. At length,

"A council was held, at which the Cardinal Hugo, or Hugezun, was sent from Rome to settle the disputes. A large assemblage of prelates was present; but when Roger saw Richard placed at the right hand of the Legate, and the left assigned to himself, he thrust himself into the lap of Canterbury; hereupon the

---

\* *Rapin*, ii., 277.

servants of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and even the Bishops themselves, threw him flat on the ground, trampled on him, and rent his cope; at which the whole council broke up, and the Cardinal withdrew in great hurry and confusion. The two Archbishops vented their indignation against each other by complaints to the King, and mutual appeals to the Pope.\*

At the council where this scene was enacted, the King was not present; but at another council, where the canon (about to be quoted) was passed, the King with his son Henry were both present in the assembly, and were consenting parties to its decisions. The Archbishop opened the Synod by intimating that he "rather chose to adhere to the rules of the Fathers, than to make new ones." Among the decrees of six preceding foreign councils, and the decrees of nine popes, upon a great variety of ecclesiastical matters; he adopts the decree of Pope Julius,† which reads thus:—

"We forbid the Eucharist to be sopt, as if the Communion were by this means more entirely administered.

A.D. 1175. Henry II. Rex. Christ gave a sop only to that disciple whom he pointed out for a traitor, and that not to denote the Institution of *this* Sacrament.

And that Pope Julius was here right, appears confirmed by the historic relation given by the Apostle (John xiii. 30). "He [Judas] then having received the sop [which was the last, or concluding act of the Passover, and the formal intimation from the master of the house that it was closed], "went immediately out, and it was night." Judas was present, there-

---

\* *Johnson's Historical Remarks at the end of his Laws*, A.D. 1175.

† Bishop Burnet thinks Julius ought not to have this canon attributed to him, seeing it might more correctly be ascribed to some other authority.

fore, as a Jew at the national Passover, but *not* present at "the institution" of *this* Eucharistic solemnity.

But this solitary light, in the midst of surrounding darkness, served to depict more impressively the thick gloom spread over all people. Feeble as it was, it almost immediately disappeared; for the canon that immediately followed, enjoined—

"We charge that the Eucharist be not consecrated in any chalice not made of gold or silver; and that no Bishop bless a chalice of tin."

The reason of "tin" being interdicted, was, that as an inferior metal, it was not to be used for the Eucharist, properly and purely—the Eucharist; but, as we shall afterwards find, it was to be the metal in which the *subordinate* part of the Eucharistic element of wine and water was to be reserved. And, in this respect, it was an advanced step towards the now rapidly-accumulating Eucharistic errors.

Twenty years elapse; and we find Hubert Walter on the archiepiscopal throne. He was Legate *a latere* from the Pope, and likewise had the King's commission to act as Chief Justiciary or Vice Roy of England. This latter dignity the Pope compelled him to resign, as contrary to the canon law. He took, however, the Chancellorship, since no cause of blood can be tried in Chancery. This Legate went to York,

"And came there on the Lord's-day, being the Feast of the apostle St. Barnabas, and was received by the clergymen in solemn procession, and was introduced into the Church of the Cathedral See. On Monday he caused *Assises de novel Disseisin* and *de Mort d'Ancestre* and of all the Pleas of the Crown to be holden by his officers, but he and his officials held pleas of Christianity [*i.e.*, the Ecclesiastical



Courts]. On the Wednesday and Thursday, having assembled together in the Church of St. Peter, the Legate himself sat in a choir aloft, and celebrated a most famous council, in which he ordained the under-written decrees to be kept.”

The first of which is this:—

“Whereas the Salutary Host hath a pre-eminence\* among the other Sacraments of the church, therefore the devotion of the priests ought to be more particularly employed upon it; that so it may be consecrated with humility, received with awe, administered with reverence. And let the minister of the altar be sure that bread and wine and water be furnished for the sacrifice; and let it not be celebrated without a

A.D. 1195.  
Richard I. Rex.

---

\* It is scarcely possible to estimate the full effect which thus giving to the Eucharist a pre-eminence has had upon the minds of men. It may be said to be, the cardinal error of Rome, for it cut up every principle of piety. Unhappily the error still prevails, and that among Protestants, who never suspect whence they borrowed the idea. To sit down at the Lord's Supper is regarded by too many as the crowning act of a religious profession. Christianity and the Communion Table are virtually placed side by side. The consequence is, we have more members of churches than true believers. Even faithful men themselves are often found placing this rite in too high a position. Let it, however, be distinctly known that a mighty injury is done to real godliness by any and every such undue exaltation. The higher the order of personal piety, the greater is the hesitation frequently evinced to approach the Table; while the less of genuine, heartfelt, consistent piety professed, the more forward the person becomes to rush to it, in order to satisfy his own mind that *all* has been done that is required to establish his reputation among other communicants, or in the general ranks of society. Obedience to the “letter,” killeth; culture of the “spirit,” giveth life. The history of this canon illustrates the apostolical declaration. Its prior history shows a constant accumulation of error, until the whole reached this apex; and its after-history as painfully shows a rapidly-increasing amount of impiety and persecution. Against these evils, Protestants have studiously to guard themselves. The spirit of many Protestant Churches runs in the same direction. It is true an opposite road is taken, but the same citadel may be reached by different routes.

lettered minister; and let care be taken that the Host be reserved in a clean and decent pyx, and let it be renewed every Lord's-day.

"As oft as the Communion is to be given to the infirm, let the priest in person carry the Host in a clerical habit, suitable to so great a Sacrament, with a light going before it, unless the roughness of the weather, or the difficulty of the way, or some other obstacle, do not admit of it.

"We forbid the priest to make a bargain for celebrating mass at a certain price; but that he take that only which is offered at the mass.

"And let the Sacrament of the Eucharist be consecrated in a silver chalice, where there is a sufficiency for it" [*i.e.* where the church was "a fat one"].

The priests were commanded "that as they are superior to others in dignity, so they may give them a more perfect scheme and pattern of decency, by not going in copes with sleeves." "They who have received the crown [the tonsure] from the Bishop, shall preserve the crown and tonsure, and if out of contempt they do it not, let them be compelled to it by deprivation of their benefices, if they have any. Let them who have no benefices be clipped against their wills by the Archdeacons or Deans!"

Five years after this, another council was held at Westminster, where the following canons were made:—

"Whereas an error" [even to that of a word being incorrectly pronounced] "in Divine offices endangers both the souls and bodies of men, it is wholesomely provided by this council that the words of the canon be roundly and distinctly pronounced by every priest in celebrating mass; not curtailed by a hasty, or drawn out into an immoderate length by an affectedly slow pronunciation, but rehearsed plainly and distinctly, without clipping or mangling the words.\*

"A priest may not celebrate twice a day, unless the necessity be urgent. When he does, let nothing be poured into the chalice after the

---

\* See also Canon A.D. 1322.

receiving of the blood at the first celebration ; but let the least drops be diligently supped out of the chalice, and the fingers sucked or licked with the tongue, and washed ; and washings kept in a clean [tin] vessel to be had for this purpose ; which washings are to be drunk after the second celebration, except a Deacon or some other considerable minister be present to drink the washings at the first celebration. Further, let the Eucharist be reserved in a clean decent pyx, and so carried to the sick with a clean cloth laid over it, and a candle and a cross before it, unless the sick man live at too great a distance. Let the Host be renewed every Lord's-day. And let there be a distinction between the consecrated and *unconsecrated* hosts, that the one be not taken for the other. Further, let the Eucharist be given in private to no impenitent person ; but it is to be given in public to every one that earnestly repents, so that his crime be not *notorious*."

Could ever a greater premium be offered for secret crimes ?

If Hubert Walter, from whom this famous decree issued, had been obsequious to the Pope ; his successor, Langton, was haughty and imperious to King John. He was roughly handled by both of them. Walter, however, did himself honour by declaring that John's resignation of the crown and kingdom to the See of Rome was invalid. This was the more remarkable, as he was nominated and consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury by the Pope, who laid the King and kingdom under an interdict for not receiving him as the Primate. Eventually the King submitted.

Synods were rarely held during the national turmoils of this period. Langton, however, summoned a council ; and, among other decrees, said—

" We decree that both the nocturnal and diurnal office be celebrated with diligence and devotion as God gives *ability* : and  
 A.D. 1222. that all the Sacraments, those of baptism and the altar especially, be performed with such devotion as *God inspires* ; that the words of the canon, especially of the consecration of Christ's Body, be perfectly pronounced. After the priest hath re-

ceived the Lord's body and blood at the altar, let him not twice drink the wine poured into the chalice, or spilt on his fingers, though he do celebrate again the same day."

The reason for the last clause, according to Lindwood, was this. The priest was obliged, after every mass, to pour wine into the chalice, that so the remains of the *Sacramental* wine might be clean washed out of the cup. He was to suck or lick his fingers, lest any particle of that wine should adhere to them, and also drink the wine with which he had washed out the chalice. But he could not do *this* if he knew he had to celebrate a second time; for the drinking of the *unconsecrated* wine broke his fast, though drinking of the consecrated cup did not; and the mass was to be celebrated only by such as were fasting.

These minute regulations, as to what may be called the apparatus of the celebration, were of secondary moment, compared with the principle declared in the first clause. There, an emphatic distinction is drawn between ability and inspiration. The one, God gives at the time the priest offers up prayers; of the other he becomes possessed, when he celebrates the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Of this "inspiration" the priest could boast: and if his claim were admitted by the people, of that inspiration they of course would stand in awe. This arrogant pretension is one, among other illustrations, of the cumulative character and the aggravated guilt which pertained to Eucharistic errors. Two hundred years prior to this,\* the church had declared *angels* were present at the celebration of the Lord's Supper;

---

\* See page 113.

now "*God* himself inspires" the priest. The "inward earnestness of heart," which then he was enjoined to guard, is now more than supplied him; for, according to this new law, if the *words* of the canon were "perfectly pronounced," inspiration had accompanied them. Considerable pains must have been taken to concoct this invention. It flowed out of the pre-existing opinion; but still every mind would not have been able to carry that opinion out, either so far, or in such a form. The fact that it was now so developed, proves, that some difficulty had been experienced in reconciling the minds of the people to *all* that the priests then taught; and, therefore, they settled the matter by laying claim to inspiration. Believe this: and the future course, both of priests and people, was paved before them.

Another canon required—

"That every church have a silver chalice, with other decent vessels, and a clean, white, large linen cloth for the altar. Let the old corporals, which were not fit for the altar, be put in the place appointed for the relics, or be burnt in the presence of the Archdeacon if they were consecrated. And let Archdeacons take care that the cloths and other ornaments of the altar be decent; that books be fit for singing and reading; that there be two suits of vestments for the priests; and that the attendants at the altar wear surplices; that due esteem be paid to Divine offices."

Archdeacons were also enjoined to

"Take care that the canon of the mass be correct; and that the priest can rightly pronounce (at least) the words of the canon, and that he knows the true meaning of them. And let them look diligently that the Host be kept under lock and key."

These and his other decrees were to be "read and explained yearly in the *Episcopal Synods*."\* The

---

\* See ante page 45, under 740.

excommunications were to "be read four times in every year in the parish churches."

The next Archbishop who appears in the character of an ecclesiastical legislator was Edmund Rich, or Edmund of Abindon. He was remarkable for learning and piety, and was zealous to reform many Popish scandals. For this he incurred the displeasure both of the Pope and the King. He died in voluntary exile, and was canonized by the Pope two hundred years after his death. The place where his Constitutions were made, does not appear. He begins by charging

"All ministers of the church, especially priests, diligently to examine themselves by the testimony of their own consciences in what state, and for what end, they entered into orders."

Some he described as Irregulars—as, for example, "Advocates in cases of blood; Simoniacs, or that were *ordained by Schismatics, Hereticks*, or such as were excommunicated by name;" and otherwise canonically irregular. Respecting the Lord's Supper, he said—

"When the Eucharist is to be carried to a sick man, the priest [is] to have a clean decent box, and in it a very clean linen cloth, in which to carry the Lord's body to the sick man, with a little bell going before to stir up the devotion of the faithful by its sound: and let the priest go on this occasion with his stole and in his surplice, if the sick man be not too far distant. And let him have a silver or tin vessel always to carry with him to the sick, appropriated to this special purpose, that is for giving the WASHINGS OF HIS FINGERS TO BE DRUNK BY THE SICK MAN\* AFTER THE TAKING OF THE EUCHARIST."†

---

\* This indignity was a violation of an old law, as old as 740, which said "the Viaticum" was to be given to dying men. That "Viaticum" was the *whole* body and blood of Christ: so, at least, the church had taught, and therefore the people might thus complain to

If this Edmund were sincere, as doubtless he was, in his efforts to reform the priesthood, it is painful to trace in his laws such clear evidence of the blind superstition of that age. "The cup of blessing" is withheld, and the washings of the priest's fingers given instead! Yes, and the washings of those very priests whom this very archbishop, in a preceding canon, had thus denounced:—

"We forbid clergymen the ill practice, by which all that drink together are obliged to equal draughts, and he carries away the credit who hath made most drunk, and taken off the largest cups.\* Therefore we forbid all forcing to drink. Let him that is culpable be suspended from office and benefice. We forbid the publication of Scottales to be made by priests [in the church]. If any priest or

---

the priests, "You palm off upon us the washings of priests' fingers. Give us both the holy bread and the holy wine, or you hazard our salvation." We give you, said they, the holy bread only; for that has within it the essence of the holy wine, as well as the species of bread. Hence sprang up a conflict between priests and people—a conflict which lasted several years, and was at length settled by Friar John in 1281, whose third canon upon this point will be read with additional interest when this conflict is recollected to have occurred.

† By a subsequent canon (1367) "the *celebrator* was not [himself] to drink the washings of his fingers and of the cup. "Let the offender know that he is suspended from his office, unless perchance he is compelled by necessity, which we think fit thus to explain and limit, viz.: If *espousals* [which were separate from the solemnization of marriage] are to be made on a Festival that has nine Lessons, or in Lent, or in the Ember weeks, or on account of the sudden illness of a fellow-priest, or of his manifest absence on the business of the church, or upon his own necessary occasions." Plenty of latitude for licentious priests!

\* Pagan devotees had set them the example. On the 14th of February they kept a feast in honour of Bacchus, when "a capacious vessel was broached, and he that could drink down his companions had a golden crown."—*Archæologia Atticæ*, lib. ii., cap. 10, p. 75.

clerk do this, or be present at Scottales let him be canonically punished."

Thirty-six years before, "drinking bouts," as they were called, had been prohibited, "for from thence come quarrels, and then laymen beat clergymen and fall under the canon," *i.e.*, were cited into and punished by the ecclesiastical courts, of which many of these clergymen might themselves be the judges; and which office they filled by virtue of institution, in case the living was "a Peculiar."

What awful evidences are these canons of the deplorable condition of both the priests and people of that period! They are not, however, the only evidences that gross vices invariably spring out of superstition, for one more proof remains to be produced, and that from the same canons. It was therefore added—

"At the celebration of mass, let not the priest when he is going to give himself the host first kiss it; because he ought not to touch it with his mouth before he receives it. But if (as some do) he takes it off from the patten, let him, after mass, cause both the chalice and the patten to be rinsed in water; or else only the chalice if he did not take it from the patten. Let the priest have near to the altar a very clean cloth, cleanly and decently covered and every way inclosed, to wipe his fingers and lips after receiving the sacrament of the altar."

Does the reader ask, how did all this superstition become so consolidated and unbroken? Did it arise from ignorance, so that the people were ignominiously content to be "betokened by the water," while the priests were "betokened by the wine?" Not exclusively so. Was it that there was something beside, and apart from religion, which engrafting itself upon their professedly sacred institution, gave to the extraneous matter a peculiar power, just in proportion as



it weakened the truly religious element? Not altogether. Was it, for instance, that that ecclesiastical cess-pool, the confessional, stood hard by the altar, so that you could not approach the latter except by going round the former? Not wholly so. There must have been some hidden spring of this monster evil; some secret power which threw a besotting and polluting influence over the whole Eucharistic errors; something quite detached from religion, and yet a something in which the priests and the people were most emphatically implicated. Law drove both to the altar: the one to administer, and the other to receive a certain rite. But neither law, nor superstition *alone*, would have served to keep up this systematic and monster offence against Christ; unless there had been at the same time some latent, but all-inducing attraction. We arraign two guilty parties: the priest as *princeps criminis*, and the people as accessories before and after the fact. A conjoint iniquity was committed; and it consisted in this: they CONSPIRED TO MAKE THE EUCHARIST A BUSINESS TRANSACTION.

It was bought and sold as any other thing. It was sold by legal covenants and deeds, and was recoverable in courts of common law, or equity.

This extraordinary fact shall first be proved; and then some circumstances in relation to it, stated.

The facts are supplied from their canons. These spread over a period of forty-six years, and the length of time occupied in applying the remedy, proves the extent and malignancy of the evil it sought to remove. The first law is dated A.D. 1222, and said, "Archdeaonries and deanries, which consist merely of *spiritualities* shall not be let to farm; but if any estate be annexed to the office, that may be farmed

out." And that the Eucharist, or sacrament of the altar, was included in these "spiritualities" appears evident from the canon of Otho, or Otto, the Pope's Legate. He said—

"We have heard what is horrible to be heard and said, that some wretched priests who receive what arises from the altar and from penance (as belonging to the vicarial benefice let to farm) or for other filthy lucre's sake, admit none to penance unless some money be first deposited, and deal with the other sacraments in the same manner. Now because they who do such things are unworthy of the kingdom of God and an ecclesiastical benefice, we strictly charge and ordain that he who is guilty, shall be suspended.

A.D. 1237,  
Henry III., Rex.,  
in the 21st year  
of his reign.

"We will by no means of our authority, support the farming of churches, or the general placing of farmers in them. Yet we are afraid to put forth edicts of prohibition, by reason of the infirmity of very many, which might make us seem to lay snares, than to find out remedies. But we are bound to obviate some evils arising from this cause which have come to our knowledge. For it very often happens that farmers, as they are called, while they desire to get more than they pay, commit sordid exactions. We forbid the profits arising from the altar or from any sacraments be henceforth in anywise granted to farm."

Otho said he was afraid to provide remedies, lest he should by that means prepare snares. His legantine successor was Othobon; who was not equally timid. He boldly enters the lists with these mercenary sacramentarians, and said—

"It is a great indignity to spiritual things to traffic for them with money. Thus we have found a constitution of the aforesaid legate [Otho] providently forbidding the profits that arise from the altar, to be in any way wise granted to farm. Now, we hearing that many offend against this wholesome statute, do farther ordain that for the future such granting to farm be of no force; and that neither of the parties, contracting be obliged to the other by such contract, however it be strengthened, or by whatever authority of law."

A.D. 1268,  
Henry III., Rex.,  
in the 52nd year  
of his reign.

This was well said. If ever canon law rode with

honour over common law ; this was the canon : and it is not hazarding too much to say, that it is the *only* instance in which ecclesiastical or canon law proved itself stronger than common law : for until the last clause was added, the superior courts acknowledged and confirmed the vicious contracts.

So extraordinary an exercise of legantine authority respecting an equally extraordinary iniquity, must have been attended with peculiar circumstances. These are entitled, therefore, to distinct notice.

If the reader refer to the preface of the law of 1236, he will find Edmund, the then Archbishop of Canterbury, in the character of a reformer. He stood alone. Otho, who came the year after that law had passed, was not welcomed by Edmund. He rather resented his coming. The king, however, was weak, inconstant, and superstitious. He went to meet the cardinal at the sea-side, bowed his head down to the legate's knees, and declared he would do nothing in government without consent of the pope or his legate. By him he was carried to York, whither he called an assembly to meet him ; and Alexander, the King of the Scots, came there also ; and between him and Henry, peace was made by Otho. By the clergy he was well received. Peter, of Winchester, sent him fifty fat oxen, a hundred quarters of the best wheat, and eight pipes of the strongest wine, as a winter stock of provision. This legate goes to St. Paul's, where he appeared sitting on a lofty throne—Canterbury on his right, York on his left hand. Three earls and some of the king's retinue attended him to and from the assembly. He lifted up his voice like a trumpet, and preached from the words of Ezekiel—" In the

middle of the throne and round about were four animals full of eyes;" which he considered emblematical of episcopal care and circumspection; and after preaching he passed his decrees, of which the one quoted above (1237) formed a part.

In bold and noble contrast to this servile submission of the English monarch, appears the conduct of Alexander, King of Scotland. To him the legate, while at York, evinced a desire to visit his dominions. "There is," said he, "God be thanked, no occasion for a legate in Scotland; there never has been any there in time of my ancestors, nor will I myself endure it. Have a care how you come into my country; the inhabitants of Scotland are savages; they lately intended to drive me out of my kingdom."\*

But if Scotchmen were savages, they were wise. Otho had no right among them. Four hundred years prior to his appearance in England, a predecessor of Otho had said in one of his canons:—

"That none of the Scottish Extract be permitted to usurp to himself, the sacred ministry in any one's diocese, nor let it be allowed such an one to touch any thing which belongs to those of the holy order; nor to receive any thing from them in baptism, or in the celebration of the mass, or that they administer the Eucharist to the people: because we are not certain how, or by whom they were ordained. We know how 'tis enjoined in the canons, that no bishop or presbyter invade the parish of another without the bishop's consent. So much the rather, should we refuse to receive the sacred ministrations from other nations, where there is no such order as that of metropolitans, nor any regard paid to other orders."†

This refusal to recognize the Scotch ordinations was repeated in 1322, when it was said in *Reynolds's Constitutions*, "Let not such as have been ordained

\* *Johnson.*

† Wulfred's canons, A. D. 816.

in Scotland be admitted to officiate within our province without letters commendatory from their own ordinaries." And was, in 1851, sanctioned by the 14th and 15th Victoria, cap. 60, sec. 3, which declared "That any bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Scotland, exercising episcopal functions in some district or place in Scotland, shall not have any right to assume or use any name, style, or title which he is not now by law entitled to assume or use."\*

Scotland *might* have gained by her loss. Although for more than one thousand years the episcopal Church of England has refused her episcopal ordinations, she might have thrown a shelter over her own nation from the abominations of the Eucharistic errors of Rome, had she not adopted them as her own. But "the Episcopal Church *in* Scotland," now teaches the same fatal errors. Thus Bishop James, of Brechin, speaking of the Eucharist, asks :—

"Did he [Christ] not offer the sacrifice of himself upon the cross ?

"No. It was *slain* upon the cross, but it was *offered* at the institution of the Eucharist.

"What is the consequence or the effect of the priest repeating our Saviour's powerful words ?

"The *bread and cup* are in a capacity to be offered up to God as the GREAT CHRISTIAN SACRIFICE.

"Is this done ?

"Yes : the priest immediately makes a solemn oblation of them.

"*How* do the bread and cup become capable of conferring all the benefit of our Saviour's death and passion ?

"By the priest praying to God the Father to send his Holy Spirit upon them.

"But are they not changed ?

---

\* "An Act to prevent the assumption of certain Ecclesiastical Titles," &c.

“Yes: in their qualities, but not in their substance.

“Are they then bread and wine and the body and blood of Christ at the same time?

“Yes: but not in the same manner.

“How so?

“They are bread and wine by nature: the body and blood of Christ in mystery and signification. They are bread and wine to our senses: the body and blood of Christ to our understanding and faith.”\*

So also Bishop Jolly, in his catechism, teaches that “the chief benefits conveyed to those who worthily receive the sacrament, are the pardon of their past sins, fresh supplies of the Holy Spirit, and a principle of immortal life to their bodies, as well as their souls. The qualifications for which are, a valid baptism, and confirmation by a bishop of the Catholic Church!”†

Had Alexander admitted either Otho or Othobon, or his holiness himself, *they* could not have taught the doctrines of Rome, in a more painful and offensive form. That which the direct teaching of cardinals did not entail upon Scotland, her own teachers have inculcated. The Episcopal Church of that kingdom is indebted for its establishment to the Stuart family, and is a standing evidence of what the Stuarts *meant* to do in England. Of this we shall have equal and abundant proof, when we have to describe the sacramental laws of that race of English monarchs.

Before we part with Othobon; we may be allowed to exhibit another of his Eucharistic canons. He thus delivered himself:—

“The church of God not differing as to its materials from private houses; by the invisible mystery of dedication, is made the temple of the Lord, to implore the expiation of sins and the Divine mercy; that there may be in it, a table at which the living bread, which came down from heaven, is eaten by way of intercession, for the quick and dead.”

---

\* *James's Catechism*, 1829.

† *Jolly's Catechism*, 1829.

The last clause is a repetition of the dogma taught in 747.\* But—

“Come on,” say some of the old canons, when urging priests or people to acquaint themselves with the *whole*, of any given number of laws. “Come on,” we must say to the reader, for he has still very much more to learn upon this matter of the Eucharist.

The last distinguished personages, who gave us laws upon this subject, were foreign legates from foreign pontiffs. We have now to introduce an English legislator: “Friar John” [Peckham] he delighted to call himself. He tells us that “the chief pontiff had enjoined him, with the lively oracle of his own voice to obviate certain abuses:” especially pluralities, against which he levelled no small censure. He told the men immediately to resign (“for no delay can be granted them when the infernal pit is ready to swallow them, and the millstone to sink them”). From him we may reasonably expect some rare things upon the Eucharist. He says:—

“We charge that for the future, the most worthy sacrament of the Eucharist be so kept that a tabernacle [or canopy in which to suspend]

be made in every church with a decent enclosure, according to the greatness of the cure, and the value of the church, in which the Lord’s body may be laid; not in a purse or bag, but in a fair pyx, lined with the whitest linen, so that it may be put in and taken out, without any hazard of breaking it. And we charge that the venerable sacrament be renewed every Lord’s-day, and that the priests who are negligent in keeping the Eucharist be punished according to the rule of the general council [Lateran, 1216, c. 20]. We decree also that this sacrament be carried with due reverence to the sick, the priest having on his surplice and stole, with a light in a lantern before him, and a bell to excite the people to due reverence, who are discreetly to be informed by the priest that they

A.D. 1272.  
Edward I. Rex.

\* See page 52.

prostrate themselves, or at least make HUMBLE ADORATION,\* WHERESOEVER THE KING OF GLORY IS CARRIED UNDER THE COVER OF BREAD. And let archdeacons be very solicitous in this point, that they may obtain remission of their sins; and let them with the rigour of discipline chastise those whom they find negligent in this respect."

"Chastise" those who did not adore the host! If he were a rich man; by citing him into the Ecclesiastical Court, for "contempt of the right law of God" [according to the third canon of 1009]; or if a poor man, by imposing a fast upon bread and water at the discretion of the priest.

Three years elapse, and Friar John again appears. He now roars,—

"We intend, by the preventing grace of the Spirit, to correct some transgressors of the canons; to re-establish some things that have

A.D. 1281.  
Edward I. Rex. formerly been published for the curing our evils, and yet not been so approved as to be put in practice, to obviate SOME INNOVATIONS, OR RATHER TRANSGRESSIONS NOW EXHALING FROM THE INFERNAL PIT."

Be calm! Holy Friar. Calm? "When we find some, both clerks and laymen, who boast themselves Christians, do yet cast away the yoke of the canons, and trample upon apostolical sanctions?"† Holy Friar! They are only a set of non-conformists! "I tell you they are more than this: they are exhalations from the infernal pit." Be it so. Those who are

---

\* This adoration was meant, say the Romanists, for Christ, who it was believed was there present, and therefore seeing it was to terminate in him, it mattered not whether he was present or not. But what then? Did not men worship the sun in the East? Did not our Saxon ancestors fall down and pray to the elden, or elder tree? The one thought the Divinity was lodged within the sun; and the other that God was in the tree. Did the misconception of either, excuse their idolatry? No; nor remove their guilt.

† These appear to be the first avowed Nonconformists, of whom more hereafter.



nearest the pit know most about its exhalations! At length he recovers himself, so far as to declare that—

1. "The most High hath created a medicine for the body of man, reposit in the seven vessels, that is, in the seven sacraments of the church." Yet so profane were these men having cure of souls, that these were said to be "handled and dispensed with little reverence and diligence, as our own eyes informs us. Here, then, we begin our correction, and especially in the Sacrament of our Lord's Body, which is a Sacrament and a Sacrifice of a Sacrament sanctifying those who eat it; and a Sacrifice\* which by its oblation is profitable for all in whose behalf it is made, as well the living as the dead. By daily scandals we find that there are many priests of the Lord in number, few in merit. We chiefly lament this among their damnable neglects, that they are irreverent in respect of this sacrament, that they consecrate it with accursed tongues; reposit and keep it with contempt, and neglect to change it so long that the containing species is corrupted; † so that the Author of our salvation, who gave himself a viaticum to the church, ‡ is justly offended with such irreverence.

2. "We ordain, as a remedy for this mischief, that every priest that hath not a canonical excuse do consecrate every week at least."

---

\* "In denying the blasphemous sacrifice of the popish mass, with the altar and priesthood that thereto belongeth, we use no wily policy, but with open mouth in all times, and in all places, we cry out upon it. The sacrifices, priests, and altars of the Gentiles were abominable. The sacrifices of the Jews, their priests and altars were all accomplished and finished in the only sacrifice of Christ, our High Priest, offered once for all upon the altar of the cross: which Christ our Saviour, seeing he is a priest according to the order of Melchisedec, hath an eternal priesthood, and such as passeth not by succession. (Heb. vii.) Therefore did not Christ, at his last supper, institute any external propitiatory sacrifice of his body and blood, but a sacrament joined with the spiritual sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving: which sacrament being administered by the ministers thereto appointed, the sacrifice is common to the whole church of the faithful, who are all spiritual priests, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, as much as the minister of the word and sacraments."—*Fulke*, Master of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, against Martin, page 241 (Parker Society).

† See Appendix, Note M.

‡ See Canon, ante 740.

And then he repeats his former law about a tabernacle, and continues thus :—

“Let the bells be tolled at the elevation of the body of Christ, that the people who have not leisure daily to be present at mass, may, wherever they are, in houses or fields, bow their knees, in order to having the indulgences granted by many bishops.

3. “Let priests also take care, when they give the holy Communion, at Easter or at any other time, *to the simple*,\* diligently to instruct them, that the body and blood of our Lord is given them at once” [this is what the Romanists call the doctrine of concomitance] “under the species of bread, nay, the whole living and true Christ, who is entirely under the species of the sacrament. And let them, at the same time, instruct them that what at the same time is given to drink is not *the* sacrament, but mere wine,” [the distinction had in 1200 been drawn between the consecrated and the *un*-consecrated wine] “to be drunk for the more easy swallowing of the Sacrament which they have taken. For it is allowed in such small churches to none but them that do celebrate, to receive the blood under the species of consecrated wine. Let them also direct them not overmuch to grind the Sacrament with their teeth, but to *swallow it entirely* after they have a little chewed it, lest it happen that some small particle stick between their teeth or somewhere else.”

This last clause is in direct contradiction to the canon of A.D. 957.†

So much for the benefit of the living devotees. Now for something on behalf of dead transgressors—

“Let all priests beware that they do not so oblige themselves to celebrate peculiar masses for families as to disable themselves from discharging their canonical office in the church ; nor undertake to celebrate annals [yearly commemorations] for the dead, except they can celebrate daily, or procure others to do it. Nor undertake more annals than they have priests to assist them, unless he who procures these devotions for the dead, do expressly consent that the memory of his deceased friend may be joined with others in the same mass. And

---

\* See Note, page 139.

† See Observation the Second in page 86.

let not the celebrating priest think that by saying one mass he does what is sufficient for two, in behalf of whom he promised entirely to celebrate; for though the canon say, that 'not less benefit is received when a mass is said for many, than if it were said for every one singly,' this is to be understood of masses said with a reluctance of mind. And far be it from any Catholic to say that one mass is as effectual for a thousand men, as a thousand masses said with equal devotion. For though Christ, as a sacrifice, is of infinite virtue, yet he does not operate in the sacrament or sacrifice according to his immense plenitude; for then but one mass need be said for one man. He operates in these mysteries by a certain distribution of his plenitude, annexed to them by an ineffable law. And we monish them who have accepted of stipends for celebrating annals or anniversaries, and yet, through malice or carelessness, do not perform their obligations, that they make full satisfaction for their omissions, and give to the poor such profits as they have received in behalf of souls. And if they wilfully neglect both the one and the other, let them be sharply corrected by their ordinaries as deceivers of the faithful."

Poor priests! Your negligence was harmless. It was your diligence and devotion only that deceived "the faithful."

But this was not all. This extraordinary Friar John had only to unlock an ecclesiastical medicine-chest, and there were repositied, in seven different compartments, seven curatives. These the priest had to apply to any, and to every spiritual disease, and the remedy was certain. He had—

"Seven sacraments of grace, of which the prelates of the church were dispensers, and five thereof every Christian ought to receive, viz., baptism, confirmation, penance, eucharist in its proper season, and extreme unction; which last ought to be given to them only who seem to be in danger of death; and to them let it, if possible, be given while they have a sound mind and reason. And we advise it to be given to them that are in a frenzy or alienation of mind \* (if they had

---

\* This had been an almost universal practice. In 740 we have this canon—"All religious offices are to be administered to idiots." The sacramental grace had therefore at an early period been taught, and was now pushed by the friar to its extremest point of absurdity.

before a due care of their salvation) with good assurance. For we believe and have learned by experience, that the receiving thereof contributes to their getting a lucid interval; or, at least, to their spiritual good, that is, increase of grace, upon condition that they be sons of predestination, how frantic soever they be. There are two other sacraments—orders and matrimony. The first is proper for the perfect; the other, in the times of the New Testament, to the imperfect only. And yet we believe it confers grace (if it be contracted with a sincere mind) by its sacramental virtue.”

And that there should be no mistake upon this matter, of the efficacy of these sacraments; the principle of conveyance and of repulsion is stated in these words:—

“Whereas, according to theological doctors, the clerical army is fortified with seven orders, by every one of which a character is impressed on the soul; and an increase of grace is received, unless the ordained dissemble, or are involved in some crime; it is expedient that no man have orders inculcated [multiplied] on him; because the inculcation lessens the reverence, and by consequence the grace, which bounds back from graceless men.”

Such was the privilege of the staff attached to “the clerical army,” and as there were seven orders, by every one of which a character was impressed on the soul: the rank and file of the army, took equal benefit from baptism, confirmation, and especially from the Eucharist.

This friar tells us, however, that these privileges had thrown around them a degree of uncertainty. In the case of the priest, he might have his “orders” inculcated or multiplied too fast; and then his way would become blocked up by the very speed with which he had sought to snatch all his orders at once. And as to the faithful themselves, they might hazard the perpetuation of grace; for, although it was “reposed” [inherent] in the sacraments, it might

yet "bound back," or exude from those sacraments; if after having received that grace, the recipient himself allowed any mortal sin to remain unconfessed, and consequently unpardoned.

The friar did not, however, tell the church how grace and graceless men might be distinguished. Upon this point he was silent. And herein he was unkind, seeing that he inveighs against ignorance, which he says is as fatal as crime.

"Seducers of souls," "priests of Baal," "ye slay souls redeemed with the blood of Christ;" he exclaims. "By your ignorance, the sacrament of penance, which is a singular remedy for such as have been cast away, loses its effects;" so that "they who were thought to be safe landed, are but sunk deeper in the abyss of damnation." Therefore, "we judge such men to be confossors of the devil's ditches rather than confessors." This play upon words some canonists say they do not understand. May not this compound word, "*con-foss-ers*," be explained thus? Foss meant dyke, or channel cut out as a water-course; *con-foss-ors* were those who cut out other than authorized channels of conveying grace. They were "*con-foss-ors*" therefore "of the devil's ditches," and not conductors of streams of salvation.

But we must hurry away from such violence of language, and violation of religious truth. We take leave of this amiable friar with only one regret, and that is; that although we shall not soon, if ever again, meet with similar canonical tirades of impiety; we shall, nevertheless, be compelled to pass through scenes, which in themselves will prove as distressingly irreligious.

Do we wonder at the darkness of this dark age?

Do we tremble, as amid that darkness we hear the profane language of this roaring friar? Let us remember he occupied a throne set up within the region of the shadow of death. A funeral pall was spread over the nation, which alike covered kings and mendicants; priests and penitents; criminals and judges; the debauchee and the dying. Law itself was powerless, unless linked in with the Altar. The easiest way to govern even turbulent men was to deny them "the sacrament of the altar." No wonder, therefore, that the church which had thus acquired the "art of arts," should apply the same authority to the protection of its own property.

Towards the close of this, the thirteenth century, the kings of England were often embroiled with the clergy about money payments. When their quota towards the national expenditure was demanded, the church pleaded that, by prescriptive right it was exempt from taxation. The kings seized the goods of the clergy, and for so doing they were threatened with excommunication. It is our privilege, said they, if we pay at all, to tax ourselves in what way, and to what extent, and as often as we choose. Conflicts long, severe, and portentous arose between monarchs and prelates. The popes, anxious to crush that spirit of resistance inherent in the *English* bishops against his domination over them, frequently sided with the sovereigns of England; in the hope that by joint means they might accomplish, what by individual or separate effort would have been impracticable. In 1295, Edward summoned the lower clergy, with their bishops, to Westminster, and demanded a grant of half their goods; with which demand they complied. The next year they were called to parliament, when

a third of the remaining half was demanded; but the king accepted a tenth. After this they sought the aid of the Pope, who now was induced to forbid them to agree to any taxation without his consent. This was in their favour. Refusal founded upon the Pope's bull, led to their being outlawed. The laity were ordered by the king not to deal with the clergy, and the archbishops, in their turn, excommunicated all who seized their goods.

The struggle between the two powers was conducted on the part of the ecclesiastical state by Winchelsey, Archbishop of Canterbury, who says in his constitutions:—

“It was enjoined by us in our last congregation at the New Temple, London, that the violaters of the charters should be excommunicated.

We therefore command that the said sentence be published in the times and places before mentioned, and to be throughout explained in order in English, with bells tolling and candles lighted, that it may cause the greater dread; for *laymen have greater regard to this solemnity than to the effect of such sentences.*

A.D. 1296.  
Edward I. R.

“And for the suppressing the iniquity of perverse men, let the celebration of mass be stopt while such evil doers, thus solemnly denounced by name, are present.”

This storm having passed off, the church resumed its former position upon the matter of the Eucharist by adding fresh laws in respect of its celebration. We shall find the commencement of the fourteenth century not less superstitious upon this matter than any preceding period.

At a council held at Oxford, Archbishop Reynolds commanded that “rectors and priests be diligent in what concerns the honour of

the altars, especially when the Holy Body is reserved and mass is celebrating. Let the holy Eucharist be kept in a clean pyx of silver, or ivory, or otherwise, as befits the Sacrament. Let not the host be reserved above seven days after consecration; but be renewed every week: and let it be carried with reverence by the priest, or, in case of extreme necessity, by the deacon, with a light and lanthorn going before; unless the distance of the place, or the shortness of the time, forbid this. And let the ministers so behave themselves going and coming that the sick man have the office duly performed to him, and they who hear and see them be invited to pay due reverence to the Sacrament.

A. D. 1352.  
Edward II. Rex.  
Canon.

“ Let the linen clothes, corporals, palls, and other altar clothes be whole and clean, and often washed by persons assigned by the canon for this purpose, out of regard to THE PRESENCE OF OUR SAVIOUR AND OF THE WHOLE COURT OF HEAVEN, WHICH IS UNDOUBTEDLY PRESENT AT THE SACRAMENT OF THE ALTAR, WHILE IT IS CONSECRATING AND AFTER IT IS CONSECRATED. Let the words of the canon be fully and exactly pronounced, and with the greatest devotion of mind; with an especial regard to those words which concern the Holy Sacrament. Yet let not the priest, through affectation, make the office nauseous to the hearers, and take away the marrow and fatness of their devotion, for dead flies destroy the sweetness of the ointment.

“ And let two candles, or one at least, be lighted at the time of High Mass.”

The candles, says Lyndwood,—

“ Ought to be of wax, for such a candle represents Christ himself; who is the light of the world, for three reasons: It is composed of wax, a wick, and light; so also Christ consists of the Virgin generated without seed, as wax proceeds from the bee without generation. The wick being white, signifies the human soul of Christ adorned with the whiteness of innocence. Lastly; the light represents his divinity united to the flesh.”

Such was the learned nonsense of this expositor of canonical folly. We stop not to expose this absurdity about the lights, because there are more important matters for consideration.



The whole of these laws may be said to form some of the most remarkable of the Eucharist laws of the Church of Rome. They demand, therefore, special attention.

*“ Let the altar clothes be washed by persons assigned by the canon for this purpose.”*

That is, the deacons or ministers; for no other persons might touch the Eucharistic vessels or furniture. This last rule obtained in respect of baptism, the water of which (when a lay person had baptized in case of emergency) was, “in honour of baptism,” to be “thrown into the fire, or be carried to the church to be put into the font.” (1223.) The canon of 1236 adds to the foregoing words these additional terms: “And let the vessel be burnt or deputed to the use of the church:” that is, for washing the altar linen, according to Lynwood. At this provision, respecting the water itself, we shall not be surprised, when we read, “Baptism shall be celebrated with great reverence and caution, and in the prescribed form of words, *wherein the whole virtue of baptism consists*, and likewise the salvation of the children, that is, I baptize thee,” &c.

The reader here obtains a clue to much that is mysterious as to the regenerative process of baptism: “its whole virtue” is dependent upon the use of the prescribed form of words. In harmony with this law, that relative to the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper is represented; for here also particular words contain and exert special influence. Hence the requirement—

*“ Let the words of the canon be fully and exactly pronounced, AND with the greatest devotion of mind.”*

What words were these? *Hoc est corpus meum: Hic est sanguis meus.* These were “to be fully and exactly pronounced, and with the greatest devotion of mind.” We have here the doctrine of intention, as the Romanists call it. Upon this intention of the priest, the whole thing was dependant. As the priest uttered the words “sanguis meus,” he was bound to guard specially the devotion of his mind, seeing that at the moment he uttered the last syllable in “meus,” the mysterious change took place. What a moment and a monosyllable! Upon these salvation was poised! Nay more: that monosyllable might be uttered “fully and exactly”—at the moment when the ominously last syllable was spoken—and yet the change in the element *not* be effected. How so? The priest might not *intend* to “propitiate the Lord.”\* *His* state of mind was the turning point of the whole. What! if he had become cross with his people, because they had not paid their tithes? or gone to confession? or made their usual offerings? Why this was the moment when he could effectually, if not eternally, pay them off. Did he venture so to tell them *after* he had celebrated mass? The people might say, you *have* “propitiated the Lord for us;” for have you not said the words “fully and exactly?” “I have,” replied the priest; “but, for all that, it has not been done ‘*aright*.’ I *meant* nothing: ‘the inward earnestness of heart’ I intentionally withheld from you. The salve was there; but the ‘dead fly’ was in it; and this took away the effect of the ointment.” So that, according to this monstrous doctrine of intention, it was “in the power of a false Christian,

---

\* See under A.D. 1017.

or an atheistical priest or bishop, to damn those who expected grace and justification from the Sacrament.\* Nor is this an incorrect deduction from the canon; for, according to the Eucharistic law, in the year 1200, "an error in Divine offices endangers both the souls and bodies of men."

That "error" applied to *all* the offices of the church. To baptism; said to be "the first plank of salvation:" to confession; the refusal of which was to "slaughter an immortal soul" (1268); and to ordination, which "impress a character on the soul" (1281.) The gist of such error in any one or other of these offices lie in the absence of a correct "intention." In the case of ordination, the "intention" was a matter of as grave importance as in the celebration of the Eucharist. Baptism and confession must precede ordination; so that there were two previous acts, in either one of which; if the "intention" had been wrong, doubtful, or wanting, that intention would, *in limine*, have vitiated the ordination; or if the intention had been correct in baptism, or at confession; but wrong at ordination; the same results would have followed: so that the very priesthood itself became seriously, if not fatally, impeached.

"No orders are given if an intention lies against them; and then he who passes for a priest is no priest; and all his consecrations and absolutions are so many invalid things, and a continued course of sacrilege." "This may be carried so far as even to evacuate the very being of a church; for a man not truly baptised can never be in orders, so that the whole ordinations of a church, and the succession to it, may be broke by the impiety of any one priest." "If this

---

\* *Bishop Burnett's Exposition of the Articles*, p 297.

doctrine of intention were true, it alone might serve to destroy the whole *credit* of the Christian religion.”\*

And had the credit of the Christian religion depended upon these men and their laws, the whole system of Christianity would have been exploded. Mark the contempt to which these men had by this last law exposed it. They said, the highest position in the church is the altar: and the glory of the altar is, that around it the whole court of heaven are assembled when the priest there offers the atoning celebration. “While the Eucharist is being, and after it has been, consecrated?” At the time; and for how long after? We cannot exactly determine; but it is a sufficient time. Does that consecration, after it has been made; spread itself among the people, or does it still hover upon the altar? “The invisible mystery of consecration” is possessed of plenitude, and therefore spreads itself among the people. And does it *convey* a holy efficacy? It does; and therefore all the people ought to be very heavenly at the time they are occupied with the Eucharistic ritual. They ought. Then out of thine own law, will I put thee to shame, impious devotee. This very same Archbishop, three years after having told the people that the whole court of heaven was at the altar, said also to them,—

“Verily the children of drunkenness and gluttony, whose god is their belly, of old introduced this corruption into the holy church, that immediately after the receiving of the Lord’s body upon Easter-day, unconsecrated oblations and wine should be presented to them *in the church*, where they sit and eat and drink as they would in a tavern; from which custom we have learned by experience that damnable

---

\* *Burnell’s Exposition* (26th Article), p. 297.

errors have arisen in the holy church; for some irreverently and rashly come to the Eucharist that they may be preferred before others in these revels; and if the clergy should help some more bountifully than the rest, others murmur and threaten them. But what is still worse, it is to be feared that some are led by the outward appearance of the bread into a damnable error, being unable to distinguish between the material food, and the food of the soul, which is the very body of Christ: wherefore we command you to prohibit this in your several deaneries, on pain of the greater excommunication. Nor let any person think this constitution of ours harsh, since it was anciently decreed that he who took the body of Christ in the morning should fast till the third hour; and that those who received it at the third or fourth hour should fast till the evening. Wherefore Christians of the present day should think it an easy thing to abstain till they reach their own houses after the Communion.”\*

It may be said that all this authenticated superstition and consequent vice was confined to the untaught, the ignorant, and besotted multitude. By no means. Senators and monarchs were alike demoralized, befooled, and dishonoured. One of the most expressive proofs of this painful fact is contained in the parliamentary roll of the period. It has this law,† which says:—

“ Because that complaint is made to our lord the king by the clergy that divers priests, bearing the sweet body of our Lord Jesus Christ to the sick people, be sundry times taken and arrested by authority royal—in offence of God and of the liberties of holy church—[at] the same our lord be sore displeased, if any did in such manner; will and granted, and defendeth upon grievous forfeiture that none do the same from henceforth.”

The monarch was, however, rather suspicious that every thing might not be transparent in this matter; and therefore it is added:—

---

\* *Wilkins' Concilia*, vol. ii., p. 528.

† 50th Edward III., cap. v.

“So that collusion or feigned cause be not found in any of the said persons of holy church in this behalf.”

The King passed three more laws beside this, and then yielded up his throne and his life. The statute had been extorted from him as he tremblingly stood at the gate of death.

His successor, in the first year of his reign, reiterated the law; and that under still more expressive proofs of servile submission. The exemption of priests from arrest had been restricted to their occupation while carrying the sacrament to the sick, or while engaged in Divine service in places “dedicate to God.” By a skilful transposition of certain words, professedly quoting the former act; and by adroitly dropping the words, “dedicate to God,” they secured exemption from arrest, every where and at all times. This second law reads thus:—

“Because prelates do complain themselves that men of holy church be arrested and drawn out, and sometime whiles they be intended to divine services [even] although they be bearing the body of our Lord Jesus Christ to sick persons: it is ordained that if any minister of the king do arrest any person of holy church by such manner: or ‘in other places,’ than cathedrals, churches, or churchyards, he shall have imprisonment, be ransomed at the king’s will, and make gree [satisfaction] to the parties so arrested.”\*

A.D. 1377.  
Richard II. Rex.

---

\* This arrest of criminous clerks, by the secular power, was a great grievance with the church. In 1257 it formed one (viz. the xv.) of the complaints laid before the king. Among fifty other serious wrongs charged upon the civil authority, one was that “the captors of such clerks do not give them up; and in the mean time, hang them during the night.” (*Wilkin’s Concilia*, vol. 1, p. 696.) Again, in 1351, Archbishop Islip complains in his *Constitutions* that “secular judges, putting their sycthe more than usually into God’s harvest; exceeding the bounds of their judicial power, and usurping a power

But although the clergy had power and influence sufficient to secure such an unrighteous and inglorious privilege; they could not, and did not, prevent some persons scrutinizing the whole of their ecclesiastical distinctions and conduct.

Again, therefore, let us mark the position, not of the altar only; but of the public morals arising out of those feasts, on which occasions the people were commanded "reverently to go to the parish churches, and *stay out the conclusion* of the masses and other divine offices." Men were told they were then "to sabbatize, in honour to God, and not to the scandal of him and holy church." Did they then scandalize rather than sabbatize? They did. Listen to the same authority.

"The tavern, on those days, is more frequented than the church, and there is greater abundance of junkets and drunkenness than of

---

over the Lord's bishops, are not afraid to condemn and deliver clerks and priests, after they have first ensnared and indicted them for several crimes; to a shameful and unwonted death, to the contempt and scandal of God and holy church, and the grievous hazard of their own souls." This question, he said, threatened "*to put the whole kingdom into a disturbance.*" Did the church propose a remedy? It did. And it amounted to this. Priests, who could not deny their felonies, were to be imprisoned, and every Wednesday and Friday they were to be allowed, once a day, bread and water; on other days, bread and small beer; but, on the Lord's-day, bread, beer, and pulse, for the honour and eminence of that day. (*Johnson, A.D. 1351.*) From these records, it is evident that "the whole kingdom" had been disturbed with this one question for one hundred and twenty years. To what a painful condition must religion, and the civil authority have been reduced all this time! And when, at length, the church triumphed: to what a still more painful and prostrate condition must religion have been reduced by the very remedy the church provided against this, its pretended "scandal of God." All this sprang out of "carrying the sweet body of Christ to sick people."

tears and prayers; and men spend their time in debauchery and quarrels more than in devotion."

The remedy for all this immorality perpetrated under the outraged name of religion was—

"We command our brethren, enjoining them that they admonish and effectually persuade the clergy and people subject to them, strictly to observe, and with honour to venerate, the feasts in their seasons."\*

He adds—

"These solemnities [are so treated] as if they were intended for the exercise of profaneness and mischief, which increase in proportion to the number of these days."

By its own showing, the church was then the hot-bed of vice. Happily there were, even at this time, "a few names who had not defiled their garments:" and although on the side of the ecclesiastical rulers there was the power of despoilers, there was still left in the kingdom of Christ many bold and heaven-born renovators. By Friar John they had been denounced "innovators; trampers upon apostolical sanctions; exhalations from the infernal pit." But his rage had proved harmless against the sacramental nonconformists of his day. Instead of crushing them, they appear to have gathered strength; for, in 1363 (that is, eighty-two years after his violent tirade against them), those persons were, by the constitutions of Archbishop Thorsby, to be excommunicated "who adhered to heretics to the subversion of the faith, and in contempt of the church caused themselves to be baptized, or *ordained* by them." They form one among the thirty-seven classes who were pronounced guilty of "the greater crimes," which

---

\* A. D. 1362, *Archbishop Islip's Constitutions.*



the Archbishop reserved for his own absolution. These greater crimes included—

“Sins against the faith; sins against nature, and especially sins with brutes; murder; notorious adultery; a clerk guilty of bigamy (*i.e.* marriage), and not to be tedious, the last is when men commit enormous crimes by which the whole city, town, or vill, or country is in a commotion.”

Among these public delinquents, those persons were included “who, in contempt of the church, were baptized or ordained by heretics.” The reader will not fail to remark the difference the law made with respect to the punishment of these men; and the simple admonition given to those who, on solemn feasts, frequented the tavern rather than the church, and who spent their time in debauchery and quarrels rather than in devotion.

The heretics now denounced proved pioneers to the noble army of martyrs. At that time they were a little “band of men, whose hearts God had touched.”\* Of them the children of Belial tauntingly asked, “How shall these men save us?” And they not only despised them, uttered contemptuous expressions against them, but every parish church was made to ring with their names publicly announced in a sentence of excommunication; which, while it was being read; the bells tolled, and, as the priest drew towards the close of the sentence, he seized the lighted candle at the altar, and said, “Just as this candle is deprived of its present light, so let them be deprived of their souls in hell.” And all the people were commanded to say, “So be it; be it so.” Nor was this all. Civil punishment fol-

---

\* 1 Sam. x. 26, 27.

lowed. They were imprisoned, excluded from every civil privilege, and lost all legal status. Fifteen years after the last-mentioned canon pronounced them excommunicated, another denunciation was fulminated against them. They had deserted both the confessional and the altar. To punish such contempt, a new canon was passed, which said—

“Let confessions be heard thrice in the year, and let men be admonished to communicate as often, viz., at Easter, Pentecost, and Christmas. Yet let them first prepare themselves for it by observing some abstinence according as the priest shall advise. But *whoever does NOT confess* to his proper priest once in the year at least, and receive the Sacrament of the Eucharist at Easter (unless he think he ought to abstain by the advice of the priest), let him be forbidden entrance into the church while he is alive, and be deprived of Christian burial when dead. And let them be often told of this.”\*

And what was this confessional? An ecclesiastical cesspool. It had received the moral defilements of polluted priests and people for ages, and at last it became brimful. See how the men who had charge of it were commanded to manage :—

“Let the priest choose such a place in the church for hearing confessions as is open to the view of all; and never take the con-

---

\* If this law-giver could have foreseen the long continuation which awaited his law, he would have been filled with self-gratulation. For not only were the people of that age “often told of it,” but more than four centuries and a half did not destroy the letter of the law, nor annihilate the spirit by which it was originally distinguished. In modern times this very law was carried out; and carried out in respect of the same class of men whom this and the canons immediately preceding had denounced. The refusal to bury one who had “been baptized or ordained by heretics” was revived and justified under circumstances of singular interest in 1846; the facts respecting which are supplied by the minister, whose conscientious adherence to the law of the church he himself will best describe.—See Appendix, Note N.

fessions of any, especially of a woman, in secret, unless in cases of necessity. Let the priest enjoin such penance to the wife as may not make her suspected of any grievous secret crime by her husband; the same is to be observed in relation to the husband." "The sins or the names of the persons with whom they [the penitents] themselves sinned shall not be disclosed, but only the circumstances and quality of the sin."\*

So the wife or husband who had sinned against each other, having been sheltered in their "grievous secret crimes" by one priest; might hie off to another priest, and from him receive "the saving oblation." Well might Friar John tell confessors that these sacramental "penitents were sunk deeper in the abyss of damnation." But we must not be content with a summary dismissal of this canon. For as it strikes deeper, and lasts longer than almost any other; it is worthy a more elaborate exhibition, especially as it is not extinct.

Pagans had set the example for this: they also knew how to resent their displeasure against a man when dead.

"The place where the coffin was put was a sepulchre common to all the rest of the family: only such as proved unthrifts were excommunicated by law, and branded with the name *Ἄπο ραφοί*."†

These unthrifts, or dissolute relatives, were denied the funeral sacrifice when prayers were offered to the gods and the ghosts of the dead; as also a place of sepulchre among their kindred. Strange that the law of a Christian church, sanctioned by the law of a Christian country, should almost to the letter follow a pagan model! The only difference in this case is, that the resentment of pagans was levelled against

\* Canon of Archbishop Reynolds, made at Oxford, 1322.

† *Archæologia Atticæ*, lib. v., cap. 29, pp. 264 and 266.

the viciously extravagant and immoral ; while by the ecclesiastical law of a Christian state, the resentment is shown against the nonconformist to a mere ritual observance. Read the instance recorded in Appendix N, and say, whether Pagans themselves would not have wondered if such a case could have been made out in their times ?

They would have stood still more astonished if, in listening to the enunciation of this law ; they had recollected that it formed the finale of all those institutions which once obtained authority as to their own altars. How stands the matter ? Thus : the compromise made with pagans by the authority of Rome\* had led to conformity to pagan notions and customs ; and that under no less than two Archbishops,† two if not three monarchs, and in some ten or twelve different, but most important principles. All this had been done by law—itsself the expression of the mind of the people ; who, having gained so many points, adopted others of their own choice. We shall afterwards learn what practices they introduced and sanctioned, and to what public results they contributed.

Here, then, we have pagan Rome, papal Rome, (and most painful is it, to be compelled to add ; Protestant Christianity in the nineteenth century) standing side by side ! Twelve hundred and sixty years are thus brought to one and the same depressing point ; for all this while the fountain-head has continued to send forth its stream.

This notable canon, therefore, still exists. It is suspended over the head of every non-communicant

---

\* See page 16.

† Page 40-51.

at the episcopal altar. So late as 1846 it was carried into execution, and therefore was four hundred and sixty-eight years old. Half the age of Methuselah had come and gone, bringing along with it generation after generation; that had lived, died, been buried, and forgotten: when, all at once, the whole of them are exhumed for the purpose of doing homage to an ecclesiastical law. Truly the axiom, "*nullum tempus occurrit Ecclesiæ*," holds in this case. "No time runs against the Church?" Certainly not: so long as Time puts no limit to the race of men, who deem it an imperative moral obligation to obey human laws, simply because they exist; although they offer grossly offensive violations to the first dictates of natural and revealed religion.

This canon is the climax of some twelve or fourteen cases which still form the *excluded* class from *Christian* burial. They commenced in A.D. 740, when certain persons were denied the offices of the church at the time of interment. At that time those "who by any fault inflicted death upon themselves with a sword, with poison, by a precipice, or an halter, or by any other violent means," were excluded the "Commemoration." So also were capitally-punished criminals. During succeeding periods, adulterers and other debauchees were added to the list of persons who were denied Christian burial.

Taken as a whole, these laws teach us three great lessons.

1. That the influence of law, in framing and sustaining moral perceptions and decisions of mind, is peculiarly strong and permanent. It required six hundred and thirty-eight years (*i.e.* from 740 to

1378) to prepare the public mind, even of rude ages, for this last master-stroke of ecclesiastical power. But since the scaffolding, by the help of which this pillar of bigotry was erected, has been partially removed; the antique monument itself stands forth in all the freshness of its original finish and completeness: even though its foundations were laid more than eleven hundred years from the present time.

2. That essentially right principles can never, with safety, be associated with doubtful appliances by which to increase their effect. It was a right principle, for instance, when in 994, Theodulf sought to honour "righteous men" after death; but a doubtful appliance to associate such honour by giving them a distinguished place of burial in churches. So also it was a right principle, to dishonour adulterers and other immoral persons; but a wrong method to wreak the vengeance of the church upon them after their death: rather than so frame the discipline of the church as to distinguish: in fact visibly and declaredly separate them from its communion while they were alive.

3. That every error which springs out of a dangerous custom, becomes the germ of other and far more dangerous errors than those of the original or parent stock. For how stands this matter? In 994 righteous men were honoured with distinguished burial. By degrees, men claimed the distinction as a right. Nay, according to the law of Cuthbert, in 747, they could *purchase* honour to the body and "rest for the soul when they were dead." That regulation remained when this law of 1378 came into operation; and continued to uphold what was strictly

the religious immorality of the respective ages. Men clung to the law: all men clung to it. "Tis our inheritance," said they, "to be buried with Christian rights—rights without stint, and without doubt."

"Be it so," replied the church. "We may, however, exercise a discretion as to whom, and how, we shall bury." The only discretion they might use was confined to those who did not approve of the church. Over these they might refuse to read the service; but for all others who were in communion at the altar, they were to use the whole Burial Service, without drawing any distinction between one man and another at the time. And the church yielded to the demand; and therefore it is that the line drawn in 994 between "righteous" men; whose "careful living" had attested their moral excellence, is now entirely lost. Not the slightest trace is to be found in the present "offices of burial" of any difference between the righteous and the unrighteous—between the previously "careful," and the careless "living." Nay, more, the minister, who should have sufficient data to justify his omitting to thank "Almighty God, who of his great mercy has *taken to himself the soul* of our dear brother here departed," would expose himself to suspension from office; and the payment of heavy costs in the Consistory Court, levied as a mulct for "the health of *his* soul," because he had had the moral courage to decline the use of words, which utter a lie respecting the unrighteous dead, and offer a premium to irreligion among the living.

Had the words of Edward VI., in his first order of burial of the dead, been retained; we should have

heard the expression of hope, rather than the declaration of a fact. The prayer that was to be added, after the body was committed to the earth, says, "Almighty God, we give thee hearty thanks for this thy servant, whom thou hast delivered from the miseries of this wretched world, from the body of death and all temptation; *and, as we trust,* hast brought his soul, which he committed into thy holy hands, into sure consolation and rest: Grant," &c.

But the present order of service not only reverses this correct mode of expression, but introduces terms than which few, if any, could have been selected more exceptionable, dangerous, and (as to wicked men), false.

But we must retire from these painful exhibitions of olden and modern canon laws. Many are the objections which pious members of the episcopal church urge against them; and it is to be hoped they will eventually so feel the fulness of their own disapproval of the law, as to relieve themselves from the guilt with which it is so deeply stained before God. HE, who is judge of quick and dead; will not hold them harmless, who seek to ante date and contradict the decisions he will one day pronounce, by saying to those on his left hand, "Depart from me."

At the period when this memorable canon law was made, the ecclesiastical power exhausted its own resources. It had had the uninterrupted run of six hundred and eighty-five years from the time of making the first Sacramental law among the West Saxons. During this lengthened period it had by turns tried the persuasive and the coercive: now seeking to draw



and then determining to drive men up to the altar. For this purpose it had piled heaps upon heaps of canons, the whole forming vast aggregations of folly, impiety, and despotism. Match them, if you can, in the religious legislation of any age, or in any region of the world! Talk of idolatry? It was innocency compared with these Eucharistic errors. Condemn the Jews? They were pure religionists placed by the side of these papal devotees. And had we dared to write out all that these laws contained upon the subject of domestic guilt, pagans themselves would be pronounced wiser men and purer moralists!

“But were they ashamed when they had committed abomination? Nay, they were not at all ashamed; neither could they blush.” At the time they were preaching and enforcing the last law of confession, they were preparing new courses of crime. They, however, knew that, alone, they would fail again as they had done before. Single-handed they were comparatively powerless. They therefore beckon over to their aid the assistance of secular men. Behold, they exclaim to Richard II., your kingdom torn in pieces, because the unity of the church is broken. See those swarms of Lollards, who impiously declare that, “by the law of God, any faithful man or woman may consecrate the Eucharistic bread and wine” without the priest; they trample down the apostolical sanctions; they set at naught “the pontiff to be venerated throughout the world.” Did not the inhabitants of this isle of Britain, more than six hundred years ago, most solemnly swear that they would obey the pontiff?\*

---

\* Page 62.

That oath they not only renewed, but enlarged, when within little more than three hundred years they said, "there shall be two swords; and one sword shall help the other."\* Now, O King, you can prove that these engagements and oaths were sincerely made, and will be faithfully performed. We, as prelates, cannot do all that is wanted; canon laws cannot put down the rapidly-rising opposition to the sovereign pontiff. "By the laws of the holy mother church," it has been acknowledged both the "king and kingdom stand upon a solid foundation." If therefore you mean to preserve yourself, or retain your throne; come at once and help us with your sword, as we have often helped you with our own. This you are bound to do; not only by your own express law; but by one of still higher authority. Here is the Council of Lateran, the 3rd canon of which enjoins that "the secular powers *throughout Christendom* shall be compelled to take an oath to use their utmost endeavours to root all heretics out of their territories."—And the king heard, and obeyed the mandate. The 5th of Richard II., cap. 5, therefore said:—

"Forasmuch as it is openly known that there be divers evil persons within the realm, going from county to county, and from town to town, who, by their subtil and ingenious words, do draw the people to hear their sermons; and do maintain them in their errors by strong hand and great routs: It is ordained and assented in this present parliament, that the king's commission be made and directed to the sheriffs and other ministers of our sovereign lord the king, or other sufficient persons, learned and according to the certifications of the prelates thereof, to be made in the Chancery from time to time, to arrest all such preachers, and also

A.D. 1382.  
Statute.

---

\* See page 119.

their factors, maintainers, and abettors, and to hold them in arrest and strong prison till they will justify themselves according to the law of holy church. And the king willeth and commandeth that the chancellor make such commissions at all times, that he by the prelates, or any of them, shall be certified and thereof required as aforesaid."

This law placed the liberty of every man in the hand of any one prelate.

But the king paid dearly for his wickedness. Had this been the only violence he himself offered, and encouraged others to continue, against those who "cast away the yoke of the canon" law, it would have exposed him to the just reprehension of every rightly-constituted mind. But Richard was a murderer as well as a persecutor. His own parliament impeached him of "bearing gall in his heart, although he had pardoned the Duke of Gloucester, the Earls of Arundel and Warwick;" yet "taking opportunity, caused to be seized the Duke of Gloucester, and caused him to be strangled and inhumanly and cruelly murdered. The Earl of Arundel, pleading his charter of pardon, was encompassed with great numbers of armed men, and had his head damnably struck off." Among other (thirty-three) grave charges, he was also accused by parliament of "having supplicated and obtained from the pope his apostolick letters or bull, wherein were contained *grievous censures* against all such as should *presume to contravene them*." This and the other articles of impeachment were preferred against him, all of which were acknowledged by parliament to be well founded; and therefore it deposed Richard from the crown.\* He was sentenced to be imprisoned for life, in

---

\* *Rapin*, iv., 86.

Pontefract Castle. In what manner he died, whether by starvation, by poison, or by the sword, is matter of no importance here to attempt to determine.

By Richard's deposition and death, the reign of Saxon monarchs became extinct. We have now therefore to pass on to another race of kings.

## THE HOUSE OF LANCASTER.

We are arrived at the spot where, in consequence of a curve in the road, we may obtain a distinct view of the past, and a distant perspective of the way along which we have still to wend our course. The last *Anglo-Saxon* King signalized his reign and his character by becoming a party to the law which *threatened* the men who neglected to appear thrice in every year at the Lord's Supper with the loss of honour or estate, and the infliction of public indignation; and the last of the restored Saxon monarchs distinguished himself by approving a statute which placed liberty of speech and the rights of conscience at the mercy of merciless prelates. Between the extinction of the one race and an overthrow of the other dynasty, three hundred and sixty-three years had elapsed. There had been time enough, therefore, for persecutors to have grown wiser and better men: instead of which, persecution at this period indicates not the least sign of decay. On the contrary, it is about to develop itself in new, augmented, and more revolting forms, and to take a wider and more deadly range of operation. Fraudulent and sinister priests stealthily crowd around the throne of the Plantagenet sovereign, who had to cut his way through many formidable resistances.

See, said they, to Henry IV.: here is a phial containing precious oil. The Virgin Mary herself, with her own hand, delivered it to blessed Thomas Becket while he was in France. By him it was given to a holy hermit, who prophesied that the kings which

should be anointed with that sacred oil would prove true champions for the church.\*

“Let it then be poured on our head,” replied the king; and on his head it was poured at his coronation.

The sentiment possessed greater fragrance than the oil. It sank deep, and deeper still. The phial with its gems and golden eagle disappeared: the oil was lost—but the moral of the fiction was so cherished as to assume a power than which no ecclesiastical development had ever, or could ever, prove more revolting or dangerous.

To this monarch is attached the inglorious distinction of being the first English sovereign that burnt heretics. Of these he found hosts. They were designated Lollards; respecting whom, the king of his own accord sent a message to the convocation saying he was determined to extirpate all heresy. Since the last penal law of Richard this had swelled into formidable masses of opposition against the authorized teachers of Rome. “Crush them,” exclaimed the monarch; “they are rebels against my throne,” “Crush them,” responded the church; “they are enemies of the pope.” As rebels they have had twenty years to repent and return to their allegiance to the crown and the church, since Richard II.’s time; it was now resolved to extinguish them altogether and for ever. This is the law.†

“Whereas it is shewed to our Sovereign Lord the King, on behalf of the prelates and clergy of this realm, that although the Catholic faith, builded upon Christ, and by his Apostles, and the holy church, hath been amongst all the realms of the world most devoutly observed,

---

\* *Rapin*, vol. iv., p. 117.

† 2 Henry IV., c. xv.

and the Church of England by his noble progenitors and ancestors laudably endowed—yet, nevertheless, divers false and perverse people of a certain new sect of the said faith—

“OF THE SACRAMENTS of the church and authority of the same, damnably thinking. 1. And against the laws of God and of the church, usurping the office of preaching, do perversely and maliciously, in divers places, under the colour of dissembled holiness, preach and teach new doctrines, contrary to the same faith and blessed determinations of holy church; and of such sect and wicked doctrines and opinions they make unlawful conventicles and confederacies; they hold and exercise schools, they make and write books; they do wickedly instruct and inform people; and as much as they may, excite and stir them to sedition and insurrection, and maketh great strife and division among the people; and other enormities, horrible to be heard, daily do perpetrate and commit, in subversion of the said Catholic Faith, and in diminution of the estate, rights, and liberties of the said Church of England.

“2. And whereas the diocesans of the said realm cannot by their jurisdiction spiritual, *without aid of his Majesty*, sufficiently correct the said false and perverse people, nor refrain their malice, because the said people do go from diocese to diocese, and will not appear before the said diocesans, but the same, and their jurisdiction spiritual and the keys of the church, with the censures of the same, do utterly contemn and despise [as well they might, and for which the nation has since applauded them].

3. “Upon which novelties above rehearsed the prelates and clergy have sought that this wicked sect, preaching doctrines and opinions, should henceforth cease and be utterly destroyed.

4. “Therefore, by the assent of the States it hath been ordained and granted that none within this realm presume to preach openly or privily, without license of the diocesans; nor teach, hold, or instruct openly or privily, nor make nor write any book contrary to the Catholic faith or determination of holy church, nor make any conventicles, or in anywise hold or exercise schools.

5. “And if any persons be before the diocesans convicted according to the canonical decrees, the Sheriff of the county, Mayor of a city or town, or borough, after such sentences promulgate shall them receive, and them before the people in a high place do put to be burnt, that such punishment may strike in fear to the minds of others,

whereby no such wicked doctrine against the Catholic faith be sustained or suffered; and the sheriffs, mayors, and bailiffs shall be attending, aiding, and supporting to the said diocesans and their commissaries."

"The two swords," provided in the time of William the Conqueror, did now in right earnest "help one, the other." To what extent, the history of the English martyrs best illustrates. The particulars are patent to Christendom.

The church authorities having obtained this aid from the State, could more safely than ever fall back upon their own power. They again issued canon laws. The Constitutions of Thomas Arundell, Archbishop of Canterbury, Legate of the Apostolical See (*i.e.*, *Legatus natus*), are replete with indignation against the Lollards. He begins thus—

"To all and singular, our venerable fellow bishops, and all clerks and laies whatsoever: Health and firm adherence to the doctrine of Holy Mother Church. He does an injury to the most reverend Synod who examines its determinations; and since he who disputes the supreme earthly judgment is liable to the punishment of sacrilege, as the authority of civil law [*i.e.*, the Roman law, which Augustine had induced Ethelbert to adopt,] teaches us, much more grievously are they to be punished, and to be cut off as putrid members from the church militant, who, leaning to their own wisdom, violate, oppose, and despise, by various doctrines, words and deeds, the laws and canons made by the key-keeper of eternal life and death (the vicegerant not of an earthly man, but of the true God, and to whom God himself hath given the rights of a celestial empire), when they have been published according to form and canon. For they ought to consider that in the Old Testament Moses and Aaron were the first among the priests, and in the New Testament there was a distinction among the apostles; and Our Lord granted, and the apostles agreed, that Peter, called Cephas, that is the head, should be the prince of the apostles."

It is evident this Archbishop had "no Greek in



him," or he would not have said "Cephas" meant the head, whereas its literal meaning is a stone. This is, however, only one among the many other perversions of Scripture with which the Church of Rome is chargeable. It is not to be compared with what he said the black horse mentioned in Rev. iv. 5 signified, viz., "Heretics, and especially Wickliffe."

He then proceeds to denounce the new sect of preachers, and says :—

"Because that part which does not agree with its whole, is rotten : We decree and ordain that no preacher of the Word of God, or other person, do teach, preach, or observe any thing in relation to the Sacrament of the altar—any thing but what hath been determined by Holy Mother Church; nor call in question any thing that has been decided by her; nor let him knowingly speak scandalously, either in public or private, concerning these things; nor let him preach up, teach, or observe any sect, or sort of heresy, contrary to the sound doctrine of the church."

A.D. 1408.  
Henry IV. Rex.  
Canon.

Heretics and relapsed converts were to suffer the loss of "goods, which shall be deemed confiscated, and seized by them to whom they belong." He then denounced the works of John Wickliffe, whose books were not to be "read or taught in any school, hall, or inn, or other places in the University of Oxford or Cambridge;" nor any "translation of any text of Scripture into the English tongue, or any other, by way of book or treatise" (*Textum aliquem Sacræ Scripturæ—per viam libri, libelli, aut tractatus*), which may signify either Hebrew, Greek, or Latin. *Any text* may include the whole Bible, or any portion of it.

He then goes on—

"Let no one presume to dispute of things determined on by the

church : especially concerning the adoration of the glorious cross, the veneration of the images of saints, or pilgrimages to their places and relics ; but let all henceforth preach up the veneration of the cross and of the image of the crucifix, with processions, genuflexions, bourings, incensings, kissings, oblations, pilgrimages, illuminations, and all other modes and forms whatsoever used in the times of us and our predecessors."

Was this a mere repetition or re-enforcement of old customs ? It was more. The church of that day had no occasion to trouble itself about any matter connected with such histrionic attractions. Men had long before swallowed down with delight such and many more equally absurd nostrums. Latent fear called up vindictive rage ; for, says the Archbishop, "new and unusual emergencies require new and mature applications, and the greater the danger, the more caution and opposition is necessary."

Whence this "new danger ?" It sprang from the men whom the common people, by way of derision, called Lollards, but whom Arundel more expressively honoured by saying they were stirred up "by the Old Sophister, to erect for himself a church of malignants"—they having dared "to dispute the determinations of Holy Church." In disputing these determinations, they justly charged it with having acted not only contrary to the laws of Christ ; but also of having been guilty of many infractions of the ancient episcopacy, to which they still adhered. For Wickliffe and the Lollards only reasserted the principles adopted by their ancestors, when they boldly asserted that "the lying miracle of the Sacramental bread leads almost all men to idolatry." They went further ; and avowed their belief that "any faithful man or woman might con

secrete the bread without any such miracle" as that implied in priestly consecration.

This was the front of their offence. And in committing it, they reverted to the right which their ancestors, nearly seven centuries before, had allowed to be curtailed;\* but which other progenitors, corrupt as these were, had tried hard to retain; and from which they could only be driven away by threats of punishment.†

Had the Lollards fully comprehended the unwritten constitutional rights of the laity in the church, without being diverted by any adventitious circumstances; they would have simplified their own labours, and succeeded in establishing a base of operations which eventually would have carried them through every remaining difficulty; or at least have lessened the difficulties which still remain to be overcome. They, however, deserve eternal honour. They were the pioneers attached to the "noble army of martyrs" in England. Who has not read the intensity, extent, and duration of their sufferings; and those of the main body whom they had led on to the never-fading glory, of having sought to emancipate the Church of Christ from the revolting contaminations of the Church of Rome? They were the first to enter and the last to leave the field of battle. Here is the record of their conflict with the Prince of Darkness. It recites their toils, proves their purity, honours their adroit fearlessness, and encrimsons the guilt of their legalized oppressors. It tells you that all this was done to extirpate from—

"Our province, which is infected with new unprofitable doctrines,

---

\* See page 38.

See page 78.

and blemished with the new damnable brand of Lollardy, to the great scandal of the University itself, and to the seemingly irreparable damage of the Church of England (which used to be defended by her virtue and learning, as with an impregnable wall, but whose stones are now squandered) unless speedy remedy be used."

He now describes the organization which Friar John had before denounced as an "obstruction from the Old Sophister, who by degrees separates men from their universal sacred mother, that he may erect to himself a church of malignants." And that the iniquity might be complete, this Archbishop, after providing that offenders should be cited, "if they can be caught," provided that if they could not be found, "the party thus cited, though he be absent and neglect to appear, shall be proceeded against without noise and forms of indenture, or a *contestatio litis*"—*i.e.*, all legal process might be suspended; the heretic: though absent, condemned: and burnt as soon afterwards as he could be caught.

This manifest infringement of the constitutional law of England was, in effect, a suspension of those pre-existent rights for which Englishmen had contended against monarchical tyranny. They had had to struggle, often and severely; but they succeeded as frequently as they struggled. But Rome could easily trample down every sacred and indefeasible immunity, while monarchs were serfs; legislators transmuted into instruments of cruelty; law prostrated at the shrine of ecclesiastics; and religion itself scattered to the four winds of heaven.

On they went. Henry V.\* exacted from all his officers—from the Lord Chancellor down to the

---

\* Second of his reign, cap. 8.

lowest officers of the State, "having governance of the people" at the time of their appointment—an oath that they would assist "the ordinaries in extirpating heretics," who now were to suffer not only the loss of goods and life, but also of *lands*—a plain intimation that persons in the higher grades in society were "infected with the new doctrine."

A.D. 1414.  
Henry V. Rex.  
Statuta.

The apparatus by which this persecution was to be carried forward proved incomplete. Again, therefore, the church applied itself to supply the deficiency. This was done under the auspices of Archbishop Crichley, who, in his Constitutions, said—

"Whereas, the taking of hereticks, who like foxes sculk in the Lord's vineyard, ought to be our principle care, that the dust of negligence may be shaken off clean from the feet of our-selves and our brethren: We ordain that every one of our suffragans, and of the archdeacons, do by themselves or commissioners, diligently make inquiry, twice at least every year, of the persons suspected of heresy; and cause three or more men of good report, in every deanery and parish in which heretics are said to dwell, to swear on God's Holy Gospel that if they know any heretics who keep private conventicles, or differ in their life and manners from the generality of the faithful, or who maintain heresies or errors, or have suspected books written in the vulgar English tongue, or that entertain persons suspected of heresies or errors, or that favour such to dwell or converse, or resort in or to such places—they will inform against and discover in writing, as soon as conveniently they can, those persons to our suffragans, archdeacons, or commissioners."

A.D. 1416.  
Canons.

These officials were "secretly to transmit" such information to the bishops, who were to make lawful process against them with effect—

"And if any persons be convicted before them, whom they do not deliver to the Secular Court [to be burnt], let them in good earnest commit them to perpetual or temporary imprisonment at least until the next convocation."

So much for ecclesiastical love of justice ; now for a specimen of ecclesiastical intelligence. This very Archbishop (Crichley), who thus distinguished himself by being the first to establish a corps of spiritual spies in every parish ; obtained for himself still higher distinctions by palming off as gross, if not a grosser, cheat upon the public than any travelling mountebank ever performed. Hear him say—

“ The sacred name of the English Church (whom all the world extols beyond the churches of other countries for her devout veneration of God and his saints) deserves to abound and exult in praises towards them by whose patronage and miracles the public interest, not only of the church, but of the whole kingdom, is strenuously maintained, which God has of late more miraculously comforted by the special prayers of the almighty confessor and pontiff, John of Beverley, in behalf of the said church and all the great men of the kingdom. (O, the ineffable consolation of *these our times especially*, refreshing and memorable to all ages), that is, the gracious victory of the most Christian Prince Henry the Fifth, King of England, and his army, in the battle lately fought at Agincourt, in the county of Picardy, which was granted to the English by the immense mercy of God and the honour of the kingdom of England, on the feast of the translation of the said saint.”

This John of Beverley had been a Saxon Bishop nearly thirty-four years ; saint and miracle-worker. He died A.D. 721 ; and had therefore been in his tomb six hundred and ninety-five years when this canon passed in Convocation. And had this been all that was said, it would have been enough to show up the folly of the Archbishop and his Convocation. But we must read on :—

“ In which feast, during the engagement of our countrymen with the French (as we and our brethren heard in the last Convocation from the true report of many, and especially of the inhabitants of the said country), holy oil flowed by drops like sweat out of his tomb, as an indication of the Divine mercy towards his people, without doubt through the merits of the said most holy man.”

These men said they "desired therefore to *dilate* the worship of God in our province, especially for the elevating the praise of so great a patron." Change the a into u, and you have "*dilute* the worship of God." This they most assuredly did. And more than this they did: they demonstrated that their mental perceptions had become vitiated, simply because their moral character had been transformed into a revolting deformity.

The thoughtful reader asks, was there not some hidden motive for all this religious imbecility? There was; and a very hideous motive it was. Just eighteen years before this canon passed, Thomas Becket had had similar honors conferred upon him, as having been one of the most glorious martyrs of his times. His shrine at Canterbury brought no small gain to these craftsmen. In one year, nearly one thousand pounds were there offered by devotees from all parts of England and Europe. This threatened to exhaust other shrines. The people in the north, taking the alarm, determined to make the most of their patron saint, John of Beverley. They therefore go to one Convocation, and persuade the assembled conclave that they had seen the drops of oil oozing from his tomb. Taking time to prepare and beautify their plan, the next Convocation pass a law, that his memory and his shrine shall be as much honoured at York as were Becket's at Canterbury. Thus the two provinces became leagued together to share the spoils of a conjoint wickedness.\*

From this fact, recorded by their own hands, and registered in their own canons, the prophecy of the

---

\* See Appendix, Note O.

Hermit appears to have been fully verified ; for not only did Plantagenet sovereigns prove "true champions of the church," but the bishops, whom these sovereigns appointed, contributed their authority and influence in aid of the one grand object at which both powers aimed, viz., the extirpation of *true* Christianity.

"The real presence" became the watchword of these crusaders against the Lollards. To deny that a piece of bread contained "the real, living, and true Christ," was a sufficient offence, the punishment for which was consuming their bodies in the flames. And thus were executed two laws at one time—the law of burning for the heresy ; and the law of non-burial, for neglecting to go to confession, and to mass.

During the whole eighty-five years that the Houses of Lancaster and York sought to destroy one the other ; ecclesiastics were as eager to annihilate rich or poor : old or young : polished or rude : powerful or defenceless ; who dared so much as whisper a word in derogation of the altar. And when at last the two houses merged into one, the union was not in favour either of liberty or religion. The penal statutes against heretics retained their full violence, and were executed with all the rigour corrupt priests could command.



## THE HOUSE OF TUDOR.

## HENRY VIII.

The victims to papal cruelty were innumerable. The offences with which they were charged became at length so varied and so complex, that it was almost impossible to specify the distinct ecclesiastical crime for which they suffered burning. The church had said heresy means "*any* opposition to *any* canonical decree." This did not sufficiently define the thing. The code of laws gathered together by the church, was one entire perplexity; so peculiarly intricate and confused were they. To put an end to this difficulty, it was proposed to consolidate the penal laws upon religion; but as this might occupy more time than was desirable to allow men to become emboldened in their resistance of Rome; now that they had ascertained that the legislators themselves scarcely knew what the real law really was under which men should forfeit their goods, their lands, and their lives: Henry VIII. exclaimed "Leave it with me:"—and he and his lords spiritual, selected six cardinal points of religion, respecting each of which an appropriate penalty was to be attached. These six points were therefore embodied in a statute. Six articles of faith were particularized, which obtained for it the inglorious designation, "The Six Bloody Articles Act." The Eucharist formed, of course an important point. And here is the law\* :—

---

\* 31 Henry VIII., cap. xiv., sec. 8 & 9.

“If any person do teach, preach, dispute, or hold opinion, that in the blessed Sacrament of the altar in the form of bread and wine, after the consecration thereof, there is not present really the (1) natural body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ, conceived of the Virgin Mary; or that (2) after the consecration there remaineth any substance of bread and wine; or (3) any other substance but the substance of Christ, God and man; or (4) that in the flesh, under the form of bread, is not the very blood of Christ; or (5) that with the blood, under the form of wine, is not the very flesh of Christ as well (6) apart as though they were both together; or (7) affirm the said Sacrament to be of any other substance than is aforesaid; or (8) deprave the said blessed Sacrament, he shall be adjudged an heretic, and suffer death by burning, and shall forfeit to the king all his lands, tenements, goods, and chattels, as in high treason.”

A.D. 1546.  
Henry VIII. Rex.  
Statute.

That is,—it was the highest crime in the State, not to believe the greatest lie ecclesiastics ever uttered. In this lie, there were no less than eight separate points; and no less than four modes, by which the disbeliever in either one, or all of these distinct parts, might be entrapped to his ruin.

The enormity of this climax of “wickedness in high places,” was equalled only by the dexterity of theological skill displayed in framing the enactment. For the law as passed by the Senate, was the law supplied it by the Convocation. The preamble of this act, entitled “An Act for abolishing Diversity of Opinions,” states that—

“Forasmuch as in the Synod and the Convocation there were certain articles set forth, which the king, of his most excellent goodness, commanded should be deliberately and advisedly, by his said Archbishops, Bishops, and other learned men of his clergy, debated: whereupon, after great and long, deliberate and advised disputation and consultation had, concerning the said articles, as well by the consent of the lords spiritual and other learned men in their Convocation, it is with the consent of the Commons, assembled,” &c.

One important principle is illustrated by this offensive and sinful law. It is this. The principle of a Christian theocracy (out of which the long train of unexampled legalized wrongs had now been continued from the time the first penal sanction was given to the Eucharistic observance) received in this Act of Henry VIII. its full and completed form of manifestation. The "high treason," for which heretics were burnt, because they denied the real presence; was treason against the church, rather than against the crown. The very mode of putting the law in execution proves it. To behead the traitor was the secular form of maintaining the majesty of secular law: to burn the traitor was the ecclesiastical mode of vindicating the supremacy of the church. This, however, was only the least expressive part of the distinction between the two orders of jurisprudence. The treason is against us, said ecclesiastics: for wherever the priest goes with the Eucharist, he carries along with him "the King of Glory under the cover of bread."\* To deny this, is direct rebellion against Him, whose throne we are appointed to guard and whose sceptre we are delegated to sway. Did not Moses put the blasphemers to death? Blasphemy under the Jewish theocracy was direct rebellion against Jehovah. It was the overt act of an impious mind: so under our Christian theocracy, to deny the real presence of Christ in the Eucharistic Sacrament is an overt act of rebellion against "the laws of the vicegerant of the true God, who to us has given the rights of a celestial empire."†

Henry VIII. believed all this. He had expressly

---

\* See Canon of A.D. 1279.

† See Canon of A.D. 1408.

said by law\* he did "not intend to decline, or vary from the congregation of Christ's Church in any things concerning the very articles of the Catholic faith of Christendom." The fact is, that though the pope, *as such*, was dead as to any *authority*, the removal of his dead body, did little else than leave behind in the very chamber of death, a pestiferous effluvia; insinuating itself into unsuspected places, and ready to break out afresh long after the contaminating body had been removed. Hence Henry's contention with Lambert; the disputation giving the monarch an orthodox way of settling the question of the real presence:—assigning to his antagonist the opportunity to finish his arguments amid the cracklings of an heretic's fire.

But so monstrous was this law of the Six Articles, that Henry was himself compelled, so to qualify and relax its operations as virtually to repeal it.† No person was now to be accused of any of the offences mentioned in the Act, except upon the oath of twelve men, before commissioners duly authorised. The charge was to be preferred within one year of the offence having been committed. Arrest was to follow indictments, rather than originate under the sole authority of the bishop. Nor was any preacher or reader to be indicted for speaking any thing in his sermons or reading against any of the six things after forty days had elapsed. If within that space he was not arraigned, he could not be tried. Yet this very relaxation of a cruelly wicked law, became during Mary's reign, an additional incentive to per-

---

\* 25th Henry VIII., c. 21, sec. 19.

† 35th Henry VIII., cap. v.

secution. Informers were obliged to be expert, or they would lose their game.

Before, however, we pass from this reign of Henry VIII., it is desirable to pause. The period demands distinct observation; for, viewed in connection with the laws then consolidated, it suggests some principles of great practical importance. In the first place (1), this one error of transubstantiation was remarkable for the simplicity of its originating source. It sprang out of one idea—that of change of element. This was the germ of all those pernicious and deadly poisonous opinions, which clustered around the consecration of bread and wine, after being placed upon the altar. Elfric ushered in the first legal enunciation of this error,\* and Henry celebrated its maturity, by providing a harvest-home for persecutors. A period of five hundred and eighty-three years had intervened between the tares being first sown, and afterwards ripened:—so firmly and so fatally had this grand absorbing error, consolidated and embedded itself into the hearts and habits of the people. In the next place (2), this one master error of Rome had been concocted, and was eventually perfected, by two men of rare parts. Elfric, for instance, was said to be the “sagest man in all England.”† Henry VIII. was pronounced by his own parliament, a very few months after the unique specimen of theological absurdity and legalized murder, recorded in his Six Articles Act had passed, to be “a sovereign otherwise by learning taught than his predecessors in time past for long time have been.”‡ If it were so, it will follow, that the highest

---

\* See page 84. † *Bede*. ‡ 32 Henry VIII., c. 38, sec. 1.

amount of learning, and the largest amount of theological folly, can co-exist in the same person; or, if you choose, that while civilization may advance, religious wickedness may become contemporaneous.

It is often said, "Rome can never become dominant in this *enlightened age*." Let no one be deceived by the assertion. Historic facts are against it. The dark ages, as they are called; reached their most dense and appalling midnight gloom in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. But turn to those centuries, and trace, if you can, any Eucharistic error comparable, either for determined savageness or profound absurdity, to those which obtained during the fourteenth, fifteenth, and part of the sixteenth centuries. The dark ages! Why, though men, then cowered together, or rather hid themselves under the outspread funeral pall of church despotism; they yet took care not to trample down, no, nor even disturb (if they could help it) each other. They were all alike disposed to slumber on under the influence of one and the same narcotic draught. But under Henry, the most "learned sovereign than any of his predecessors," we have presented; not only the concentrated essence of errors, such as the dark ages did not originate; but also the most aggravated forms of ecclesiastical barbarity, such as the dark ages neither of England nor all Christendom had not even attempted to perpetuate. So true is it that light can be perverted into darkness; and if so, how great is *that* darkness! And lastly (3), the most offensive portions of the *theological* error of this law of Henry VIII. are of the *very same character* as those many Protestant papists of the present day, assert.\*

---

\* See page 88.

At length this royal purveyor of ecclesiastical impiety feels uneasy. He is restless and anxious. He sees at a distance the shadow of a tyrant greater than himself; and crouches as he beholds him lift the fatal wand. He holds his breath as he listens to a hoarse voice exclaim, "I am sent to bid thee vacate thy throne."

Henry obeyed; came down, and was buried within seven years after passing his law of ecclesiastical high treason.

And a lovely little boy took the place of his father. He was as mild as he was pious; and had he only been spared half the time his parent had occupied the throne, England would have had abundant cause for gratitude and joy, and Christendom equal cause for triumph.

---

## THE REFORMATION UNDER EDWARD VI.

### SECTION I.

#### HIS STATUTE RESPECTING THE SACRAMENT OF THE ALTAR.

THE scene about to open upon us, is one of a mixed kind. The youthful monarch occupied himself with the Eucharistic question immediately upon coming to the throne. This had been the one great source of other errors in the church; and of imminent peril to the State. One thing is certain, had the Eucharistic laws remained much longer in existence; or continued to be enforced; the nation would eventually have crumbled beneath the mighty wrong: or it would, by some violent reaction, have thrown off both the "yoke of the canons" of the church, and the equally galling laws of the State.

Edward and his council knew this; and therefore the very first law that was passed related to this subject of the Eucharist. It is entitled "An Act against such as unreverently speak against the Sacrament of the Altar, and of the receiving thereof under both kinds."

The laity had been despoiled of the cup for ages. They were entitled to this as an original and indefeasible right. A right secured them alike by the authority of Christ; the practice of the earliest Christian churches; and the impartial voice of the common sense of mankind.

The restoration of the communion in "both kinds" must, therefore, have been hailed with emotions of joy and praise. The law is thus ushered in:—

"The King providing the governance and order of his most loving subjects to be in most perfect unity in all things, and especially in the true faith and religion of God: and wishing the same to be brought to pass with all clemency, to the intent that his subjects may study rather for love than for fear to do their duties first to Almighty God, and then to his highness and the commonwealth; nourishing concord and love among themselves [and which previous laws had prevented]; yet considereth and perceiveth that in a multitude all be not on that sort that reason and the knowledge of their duties can move them from offence, but many had need have some bridle of fear, and that the same be men most contentious and arrogant for the most part, or else most blind and ignorant; by the means of which sort of men many things well and godly instituted—be perverted and abused—the which doth appear in nothing more or sooner than in matters of religion, and in the great and high mysteries thereof, as in the — Sacrament of the altar and in Scripture, [called] the Supper and Table of the Lord—the Communion and taking of the body and blood of Christ,\* the institution of which Sacrament being ordained

---

\* The passages of Scripture are quoted in the body of the Act, and the references are given in its margin, of which there are fifteen in number.



by Christ, and the words spoken of it being of eternal, infallible, and undoubted truth.

“ Yet the said Sacrament hath been of late marvellously abused by such manner of men who have condemned in their hearts and speech the whole thing ; who for certain abuses heretofore committed of some in misusing thereof, and contemptuously depraved, despised, or reviled the same most holy and blessed Sacrament ; and not only disputed and reasoned unreverently and ungodly of that most high mystery ; but also in their sermons, preachings, readings, lectures, commendations, arguments, talks, rimes, † songs, plays, or jests, name or call it by such vile or unseemly words as Christian ears do abhor to hear rehearsed.”

A. D. 1547.  
Edward VI. Rex.

Such offenders were to be punished by imprisonment and outlawry ; and in this the King was unfortunate. The old penal laws were not yet abrogated, so that this enactment was in some respects an addition to the penal code.

It was the intention of the framers of this clause to distinguish between the Sacrament *ab intra*, and its abuses *ab extra*. The first they preserved by penal sanctions ; the other they virtually admit to have been such as deserved reprehension and contempt.

---

† The common people were accustomed, upon meeting a priest in the street, to insult him with this distich :—

“ Your bishops are bite-sheep,  
Your deans are dunces,  
Your priests are priests of Baal,  
The devil fetch them all by bunches.”

*Bastwick*, 328.

Nor were priests behind the common people in expressions of contempt. They returned their complimentary taunts by one of their own. “ Your Sacrament of the altar,” said they, “ is all hocus pocus.” This was a classical play upon the words, “ hoc est corpus,” and “ opus operatum :” hocus pocus being a compound of certain syllables taken from the two sentences.

### The Act thus proceeds :—

“ And for as much as it is more agreeable both to the first institution of the said Sacrament of the most precious body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and also more conformable to the common use and practice of the apostles and of the primitive church (1) by the space of 500 years and more after Christ’s ascension, that the blessed Sacrament should be ministered to all Christian people under both the kinds of bread and wine, than under the form of bread only ; and also it is more agreeable to the first institution of Christ, and to the usage of the apostles and the primitive church, that the people, being present, should receive the same with the priest, than that the priest should receive it alone. Therefore be it enacted that the said blessed Sacrament be hereafter commonly delivered and ministered unto the people being within this Church of England and Ireland, and other the King’s dominions, under both the kinds, that is to say, of bread and wine, except necessity otherwise require. And also that the priest which shall minister the same shall, at the least one day before, exhort all persons which shall be present likewise to resort and prepare themselves to receive the same. And when the day prefixed cometh, after a godly exhortation by the minister made (wherein shall be further expressed the benefit and comfort promised to them which worthily receive the Holy Sacrament ; and danger and indignation of God (2) threatened to them which shall presume to receive the same unworthily, to the end that every man may try and examine his own conscience before he shall receive the same). The said minister shall not, without a lawful cause, deny the same to any person that will devoutly and humbly desire it ; any law, statute, ordinance or custom to the contrary thereunto in any wise notwithstanding, not condemning hereby the usage of any church out of the King’s dominions.” (3.)

This valuable parliamentary record contains principles of such prime importance as to entitle them to distinct notice.

(1.) “ The first institution by Christ, and the common use of the primitive church.” By these words the *authority* of popes and councils received a graceful *coup de main* which virtually annulled all their coercive power. In this respect a mighty stride was taken towards a complete emancipation from the tyranny

of Rome. But the historic reference to "the use and practice of the primitive church for five hundred years" was incomplete. The fact is true, as far as the allusion goes; and what is more important, it recognizes that church *anterior* to Augustine. Still it does not go far enough. It would greatly have strengthened the case of the reformers had they stated the *whole* historic facts. In the first part of this work, we have seen that the Eucharist was a daily observance; and that so far was "the primitive church" from believing in priestly consecration, that the head of the family was the person by whom the elements were solemnly set apart as a Eucharistic service. More than this: the Eucharist was a domestic act of worship, answering in a measure to the domestic character, which the primitive church and even canon law itself had enstamped upon the administration of baptism. That, by the canons, was said to be "the first plank of salvation"—to possess "a regenerative power"—"a mysterious character"—and, by the law of 740, to be the means of "snatching a soul from the devil." But this rite laymen and laywomen were not only permitted, they were strictly and repeatedly enjoined to perform; and the parent who should neglect the duty, was to be punished by being fed three days upon bread and water.\* These two rites (Baptism and the Eucharist) partook therefore, of a household character. It would have been well if the reformers had, in their historic reference, comprehended this last fact in their Eucharistic allusion. It would have excluded the idea of a priestly consecration; and by conse-

---

\* See under A.D. 950, in note A A (Baptism).

quence, the dogma of transubstantiation ; just as the law relative to lay baptism precludes the idea of an exclusively *priestly* regenerative power, seeing that that regeneration (fiction though it be) is conveyed as much by lay as by sacerdotal hands.

(2.) "The indignation of God." In the first Prayer Book issued by this monarch, soon after the passing of this statute, the exhortation is fully set forth ; in which the "danger threatened" is thus expressed :—

"Lest, after taking of that most blessed bread, the devil enter into him as he did into Judas, to fill him full of all iniquity, and bring him to destruction both body and soul."

The reformers were here at dead fault. In the canon of A.D. 1175, the reader will find that, according to apostolical authority, Judas was *not* present at the Lord's Supper. But even had it been otherwise, there is not one word in the institution of this solemnity by Christ which leads to any such conclusion as the exhortation contains. Paul speaks, indeed, of eating and drinking "condemnation, or judgment to himself," as the act itself expounds the words of the apostle in 1 Cor. xi. 26. But not one word does he utter of any *special* indignation from God falling upon the unworthy recipient. No doubt spiritual benefit is obtained as well from this, as any and every other instituted means of grace, if performed from correct motives. Equally certain it is, that great moral disadvantage accrues to those who unworthily partake of the Eucharist. But the whole matter ranges under the same category as includes correct or incorrect, holy or impure motives in any other religious ordinance. Christ, the only supreme legislator in his church, when he annexed a sanction to disobedience, or wrong feeling ; fixed, not upon a

rite, but upon a principle. "He that *believeth* not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God." (John iii. 18.) One other remark, and we close this part of the subject.

(3.) "The usage of any church out of the King's dominions." This was an intentional departure from the usual phraseology of a statute. In this instance it is clear that the reformers travelled out of the record; and they did so in order to enunciate an important principle. The singularity of the words cannot but arrest attention. They were added for an important purpose. They fix a parliamentary sanction to the great Protestant principle, viz.: that the universal Church of Christ admits usages, differing in degree without infringing upon identity of character. In this respect the words stand out in beautiful contrast with an express proviso in section 19 of the 25th of Henry VIII., cap. 21, wherein that monarch says, neither he nor his nobles intended "to *vary* from the congregation of Christ's Church in any things concerning the Catholic faith of Christendom." Edward having, for the first time, recognized the fact that diversity, does not destroy unity in respect of the Church of England and its relation to *foreign* churches; was followed by William and Mary some one hundred and twenty years afterwards, when establishing the same principle in respect of non-conformists at home.

Such was the mixed character of this remarkable statute. It broke in upon, if it did not destroy, the most entrenched system of religious error and secular wrong the British churches had ever endured. The accumulated mischief of nearly one thousand years'

growth it sought to root out. It grasped the mightiest superstition that had ever entwined around, or inwrought itself into, the intellectual perceptions, social habits, and religious hopes or fears, of any people; and it aimed to bring men to one, and only one, standard, "the institution of Christ, and the common use of the primitive church."

That this first attempt should have failed to accomplish all it had designed, is no matter of surprise. This, to a very great extent, was attributable not so much to the law respecting the sacrament of the altar; as to the Books of Common Prayer, subsequently prepared and sanctioned by parliament, regulating the actual celebration of the Eucharist. To these books we now advert.

## EDWARD VI.

### SECTION II.

#### HIS TWO BOOKS OF COMMON PRAYER, AS TO THE CELEBRATION OF THE SACRAMENT OF THE ALTAR.

Whatever requires a personal act of the mind must necessarily exert a greater power than any law which merely regulates certain ceremonials. To join in prayer, or unite in hymns of praise; creates  
A. D. 1549. a greater moral sympathy, than to listen to the reading of an act of parliament, or even to attend to the delivery of a sermon. Edward's law relative to the sacrament of the altar, would have been a dead letter; had it not been followed by the provision of a new order of celebrating the altar service. This important adjunct to the statute was therefore supplied with all convenient speed. It was

sanctioned by parliament as, "An Act for Uniformity of Service and Administration of the Sacraments throughout the realm."\* This law states the fact that—

"Of long time there hath been divers forms of common prayer—that is to say, the use of Sarum, of Bangor, and of Lincoln; and *besides* the same, now of late much more divers and sundry forms and fashions have been used in cathedral and parish churches, as well concerning [other matters] as the holy communion."

With which rites and ceremonies some "were pleased and others greatly offended." The king therefore appointed the Archbishop of Canterbury and others

"To consider and ponder the premises; and thereupon having as well eye and respect to the most sincere and pure Christian religion taught by the Scriptures as to the usages in the primitive church, should draw and make one convenient and meet order, rite, and fashion of common and open prayer; the which, by the aid of the Holy Ghost, with one uniform agreement is of them concluded."

This book, so composed, was the first act of uniformity.† It was published with a proclamation prefixed. In the proclamation the king

"Willeth every man to receive this our ordinance, that we may be encouraged from time to time further to travail for the Reformation, and setting forth of such godly orders as may be most to God's glory, the edifying of our subjects, and for the advancement of true religion, which thing we, by the help of God, most earnestly intend to bring to effect. God be praised, we know what, by his Word, is meet to be redressed, and have an earnest mind, by the advice of our most dear uncle and other of our privy council, with all diligence and convenient speed to set forth the same, as it may most stand with God's glory, and edifying, and quietness of our people, which we doubt not but all our obedient and loving subjects will quietly and reverently tarry for."

But purity of motive was not, in this instance,

---

\* 2nd & 3rd Edward VI., cap 1.

† A. D. 1549.

associated with efficiency of means. The book was practically rejected; it retained too much of the old Popish absurdities. It had therefore to undergo an essential change. The reformed Prayer Book, and the second Act of Uniformity,\* were intended to explain the preceding one:

“Because there hath arisen in the use and exercise of the aforesaid common service in the church, heretofore set forth, divers doubts for the fashion and manner of the ministration of the same, rather by the curiosity of the ministers and mistakers than of any other worthy cause—therefore, as well for the more plain and manifest explanation thereof, as for the more perfection of the said order of service, in some places where it is necessary to make the same prayer and service more earnest and fit, to stir Christian people to the true honouring Almighty God.”

But though the first book was set aside, it was not revoked: nay, the former act was to stand in full force and strength, and to “be applied for the establishing of the book now explained.”† So strong and violent had been the contentions about the ecclesiastical observances; that the people quarrelled and fought in the churches and churchyards; and hence the act against fighting therein, passed close upon that relative to the order of service; for it was the fourth act of the same session. The violence, law was able to suppress: but the opinions which gave rise to such violence, Edward VI. appears to have been anxious to control by means of the Scriptures. Hence curates were, by section 6,

“To declare unto the public, by the *authority of the Scriptures*, how the mercy of God hath been showed to his people by means of hearty and faithful prayers made to Almighty God, especially where people are gathered together with one faith and mind to offer up

\* 5 & 6 Edward, cap. i., A. D. 1552.

† Sec. 5.



their hearts by prayer, as the best sacrifices that Christian men can yield."

This was the old divinity, now for the first time infused into statute law; and most deeply is it to be regretted that the *public* sympathy still run in favour of the old superstition. Hence the altercations in churches and churchyards. Indeed that superstition had become inwrought in almost every social act of life. Hence in the first book the marriage ceremony was so ordered, that not only was the sign of the cross made by the priest when he blessed the man and woman, but at the end of the order of service it was stated, "The new married persons, the same day of their marriage, must receive the holy communion." In the Second Book, the sign of the cross was omitted; but the obligation to receive the sacrament at the time remained in force. The obligation sprang out of canon law, which made marriage a sacrament. This error the statute\* also recognized; for it took away all liberty to marry, without asking in church, or without "the ceremonies in the Book of Common Prayer and administration of the sacraments."

The spirit of these laws still lurks within the present law; for an instruction in the prayer book now in use says, "It is convenient that the new married persons should receive the holy communion at the time of their marriage, or at the first opportunity after their marriage."

Another, and at that time a still more remarkable, statute was passed. It is styled, "An Act for the

---

\* 5th and 6th Edward VI., cap. xii., sec. 3.

keeping Holy-days and Fasting-days.”\* This law says :—

“For as much as at all times men be not so mindful to laud and praise God, hear God’s holy Word, and to come to the *holy communion*, and other laudable rites which are to be observed in *every Christian congregation*, as their bounden duty doth require, therefore, to call men to remembrance of their duty, and to help their infirmity, it hath been wholesomely provided that there should be times and days appointed, wherein the Christian should cease from all other kind of labour—that is, to hear, to learn, and to remember Almighty God’s great benefits, and to render unto him most high and hearty thanks, which may well be called God’s service ; so the times appointed specially for the same are called holy-days, not for the matter and nature either of the time or day, or for any of the saints’ sake, whose memories are had on those days (for so, all days and times considered, are God’s creatures and all of like holiness), but for the nature of those holy works wherewith *only* God is to be honoured and the *congregation* to be edified : neither is it to be thought that there is any certain time or definite number of days prescribed in holy Scriptures, but that the appointment both of the time and number is *left* by the *authority of God’s Word* to the *liberty of Christ’s Church*, to be determined in every country by the discretion of the rulers and ministers thereof, as they shall judge most expedient to the true setting forth of God’s glory and the edification of their people.”

This law more determinately upset the spiritual domination of Rome than any preceding law. Saint days with that church had from time immemorial been honoured specially : on which occasions canon law prescribed that “holy communion or high mass should be celebrated ;” so that by reducing, as this act did, the number of feasts to some twenty-eight days in the year (still providing, in addition thereto, “all Sundays in the year”), the church lost the opportunities it had under the old system enjoyed of

---

\* 5th and 6th Edward VI., cap. iii.

making these saint days so many means of keeping up and enlarging its power over the people. This, however, was only a part of the benefit this startling law produced. The *principles* enunciated in its unique preamble roused a slumbering and corrupt church: frightened it into rage; the impotency of which was proved by the lawgiver in the church carrying his will into effect. That will of the "supreme head of the church immediately under God" was, by this act, subordinated to "the authority of God's Word;" as also to "the liberty left in" and by that word to "the church of Christ;" and "its discretion" in the use of such liberty: the whole being tied up and directed towards one great object, "God's glory and the edification of *every Christian congregation.*" Mary repealed this act. But by the 1st of James I., cap. xxv., sec. 48, that repeal is itself declared void; so that the Act of Edward revived, and is to this day in force. The same days are kept as feasts—those of the conversion of St. Paul and St. Barnabas having been since added to the list.

But this was not all. The statutes relative to the Books of Prayer and administration of the Lord's Supper did not, in either of them, contain the *whole* of what the church taught and enforced. These prayer books, therefore, must themselves be examined in order to ascertain the full amount of truth or of error which, at the different times of their becoming law, obtained in the Church of England. The contrasts are great; and they will become more striking by being placed in parallel columns.

*The Communion Service: according to the First Book* (1549).      *The Communion Service: according to the Second Book* (1552).

After the prayer and praise addressed "to God the Father Almighty," the sentence which immediately follows is—

"O Lord, the only begotten Son of God, 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, receive our prayer.

"Thou that sittest 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."

The first "Exhortation to those that be minded to receive the same:"—

"Dearly beloved in the Lord, ye that mind to come to the Holy Communion, must consider what St. Paul writeth to the Corinthians, how he exhorteth all persons, &c. Therefore if any here be a blasphemer, adulterer, or be in malice or envy, or any other grievous crime, let him bewail his sins, and not come to that Holy Table,

The whole repeated, as also in the book of Common Prayer, used and authorized at the present time.\*

Repeated verbatim.

---

\* See also the 7th canon under date of A.D. 740, p. 43.

*First Book.*

lest, after the taking of that most blessed bread, the Devil enter into him as he did into Judas, to fill him full of all iniquity, and bring him to destruction both of body and soul."

The above is only a portion of the Exhortation.

The second Exhortation is—

"Dear friends: I do intend on to offer to all such as shall be godly disposed, the most comfortable sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, &c.

"If any man have done wrong to another, let him make satisfaction, &c.

"Neither the absolution of the priest can any thing avail them; nor the receiving of this Holy Sacrament doth any thing but increase their damnation.

"And if there be any of you whose conscience is troubled and grieved in any thing, let him come to me, or some other discreet and learned *Priest*, taught in the law of God, and confess and open his sin and grief secretly, that he may receive such ghostly counsel, advice, and comfort that his conscience may be relieved, and that of us (as of the minister of God and of the church) he may receive comfort and absolution to the satisfaction of his

*Second Book.*

Repeated.

Altered thus:—

"And because it is requisite that no man should come to the Holy Communion but with a full trust in God's mercy, and with a quiet conscience; therefore if there be any of you, which by means aforesaid cannot quiet his own conscience, but requireth further comfort or counsel, then let him come to me or some other discreet or learned *Minister* of God's word, and open his grief, that he may receive such ghostly counsel, advice, and comfort

*First Book.*

mind and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness :

[requiring such as shall be satisfied with a general confession not to be offended with them that do use, to their further satisfying, the auricular and secret confession to the priest ; nor those which think needful to open their sins to the priest, to be offended with them that are satisfied with their humble confession to God and the general confession to the church. But in all things to follow and keep the rule of charity, and EVERY man to be satisfied with his own conscience, not judging other men's minds or consciences ; where as he hath no warrant of God's word to the same." ]

The directions as to the method of celebration are various. Those which involve *principles* are chiefly quoted.

1. " 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 cloth], 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

*Second Book.*

as his conscience may be relieved ; and that *by the ministry of God's word* he may receive comfort and the benefit of absolution, to the quieting of his conscience and avoiding all scruple and doubtfulness."

The paragraph between [ ] is wholly omitted.

1. Omitted.

*First Book.*

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."

After the prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church—

"Then the priest, turning him to the altar, shall say or sing this prayer following :

"Almighty and ever living God,"  
&c.

Among other things are these words—

2. "We commend unto thy mercy, O Lord, all other thy servants, which are departed hence from us, with the sign of faith and now do rest in the sleep of peace : Grant unto them, we beseech thee, thy mercy and everlasting peace, and that at the day of the general resurrection, we and all they which be of the mystical body of thy Son, may altogether be set on his right hand," &c.

3. "O God, heavenly Father, which of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ, to suffer death upon the croes for our redemption, who made there a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, ob-

*Second Book.*

2. Omitted.

---

\* See the 2nd under A.D. 957, as to the water being mixed with wine.

*First Book.*

lation, 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 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 to his disciples, saying: ‘Take, eat; this is my body which is given for you: do this in remembrance of me.’”

“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.’”

*“These words before rehearsed are to be said, turning still to the altar, without any elevation or showing the Sacrament to the people.”*

“Wherefore, O Lord, according to the institution of thy dearly beloved Son, we thy humble servants

*Second Book.*

## 3. Altered thus:—

“Hear us, O merciful Father, we beseech thee; and grant that we, receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine, according to thy Son, our Saviour 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, and when he had 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.’ 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.’”



*First Book.**Second Book.*

do *celebrate* and MAKE here before thy Divine Majesty, with these thy holy gifts, the *memorial* which thy Son hath willed us to make: desiring thee to accept this *our* sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; humbly beseeching thee to accept this our bounden duty and service; and command these our prayers and supplications, by the *ministry of thy holy angels to be brought up into thy holy* tabernacle before the sight of thy Divine Majesty; not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences through Christ our Lord.

4. Then shall this 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.

5. "Then shall the priest, turning him to God's board, kneel down and say in the name of all them that shall receive the communion this prayer following:

6. "When he [the priest] delivereth the Sacrament of the body of Christ, he shall say:

"The *body of our Lord Jesus*

4. Repeated verbatim.\*

5. Repeated verbatim.

6. "When he [the minister] delivereth the bread, he shall say:

"Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee;

---

\* The Book of Prayer, *now* in use and of legal force, reads the paragraph thus:—"Then shall this general confession be made in the name of all those that are minded to receive the Holy Communion, *by one of the ministers*, both he and all the people humbly kneeling upon their knees and saying."

*First Book.*

*Christ which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life."*

At delivering the cup he shall say :

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

This was the old popish form, and was based upon pre-existing canons.

*Second Book.*

and feed on him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving."

And the minister that delivereth the cup shall say :

*"Drink this in remembrance that Christ's blood was shed for thee, and be thankful."*

This was the new, or Protestant form.

The reader is requested to ponder these two expressively different forms ; and afterwards compare them with the *present* form of words. The words are these :—

"When he [the minister] delivereth the bread, he shall say :

*"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, and feed on him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving.*

"At delivering the cup, he shall say :

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

This form of words combines, therefore, the popish and the Protestant principles : the popish principle of sacramental efficacy, or some mysterious operation on the body and soul ; and the Protestant principle, of a simple remembrance of Christ. How they do or can co-exist, is a mystery.

*First Book.*

After the distribution of the elements—

7. "The priest shall give thanks thus :

"Almighty and ever living God, we most heartily thank thee, for that thou hast vouchsafed to feed us in these holy mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of thy Son our Saviour. We *therefore* most humbly beseech thee so to assist us with thy grace, that we may continue in that holy fellowship, and do all such good works as thou hast prepared for us to walk in, through Jesus Christ," &c.

At the end of the service there are several paragraphs: the contrasts of which go far to show the then prevailing custom and law of the church. Among the more important of these are the following :—

8. "For avoiding of all matters and occasion of dissension, it is meet that the bread prepared for the Communion be made, through all this realm after one sort and fashion; that is to say, unleavened and round, as it was afore, but without all manner of print, and something more larger and thicker than it was, so that it may be aptly divided in divers pieces: and every

*Second Book.*

7. Altered thus :—

"Almighty and ever living God, we most heartily thank thee for that thou dost vouchsafe to feed us, which have duly received these holy mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of thy Son. We *now* most humbly beseech thee, so to assist us with thy grace," &c.

8. Altered thus :—

"And to take away the superstition which any person hath, or might have, in the bread and wine, it shall suffice that the bread be such as is usual to be eaten at the table with other meats, but the best and purest wheat bread that conveniently may be gotten. And if any of the bread or wine remain, the curate shall have it to his own use."

*First Book.**Second Book.*

one shall be divided in two pieces at the least, or more, by the discretion of the minister, and so distributed. And men must not think less to be received in part than in the whole, but in each of them the whole body of our Saviour Jesus Christ."

9. "Also that the receiving of the Sacrament may be most agreeable to the institution thereof, and to the usage of the primitive church: In all cathedral and collegiate churches, there shall always some communicate with the priest that ministereth. And that the same may be also observed every where abroad in the country: Some one at least of *that house* in every parish,\* to whom by course, after the ordinance herein made, it appertaineth to offer for the charges of the Communion, or some other whom they shall provide to offer for them, shall receive the Holy Communion with the priest. And with him and them who doth so offer the charges of the Communion, all other who be then godly disposed thereunto shall likewise receive the Communion. And by this means the minister, having always some to communicate with him, may accordingly solemnise so high and holy mysteries with all the suffrages and due order appointed for the same. And the priest on the week day shall forbear

9. Altered thus (as to providing the bread and wine at the charge of the parish):—

"The parish shall be discharged of such sums of money or other duties, which hitherto they have paid for the same, by order of their houses every Sunday."

---

\* See page 4.

*First Book.*

to celebrate the Communion, except he have some that will communicate with him."

*Second Book.*

In the Second Book is a paragraph of no small importance; although, unhappily, the proof of its possessing *legal* force, even at that time, is not of so satisfactory a character as every Protestant could wish. The portion most important is this:—

10. "And although it be read in ancient writers, that the people, many years past, received at the priest's hands the Sacrament of the body of Christ in their own hands, and no commandment of Christ to the contrary: Yet, forasmuch as they many times conveyed the same secretly away, kept it with them, and diversly abused it to superstition and wickedness: lest any such thing hereafter should be attempted, and that an uniformity might be used throughout the realm, it is thought convenient the people commonly receive the Sacrament of Christ's body in their mouths, at the priest's hands."

"*Whereas* it is ordained in the Book of Common Prayer, in the administration of the Lord's Supper, that the communicants kneeling should receive the Holy Communion: which thing being well meant for a signification of the humble and grateful acknowledging of the benefits of Christ, given unto the worthy receiver, and to avoid the profanation and disorder, which about the Holy Communion might else ensue: lest yet the same kneeling might be thought or taken otherwise, *we* do declare that it is not meant thereby, that any adoration is done, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental bread or wine there bodily received; or to any *real* and *essential* presence there being of Christ's natural flesh and blood. For as concerning the Sacramental bread and wine, they re-

*First Book.**Second Book.*

main still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored, for that were idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians. And as concerning the natural body and blood of Our Saviour Christ, they are in heaven and not here. For it is against the truth of Christ's true natural body to be in more places than in one at one time."

This paragraph is, however, of doubtful authority as law; and that for the following reasons:—Not to insist too strongly upon the contrast in the construction of the sentences, it may yet be worthy of notice that the style is wholly dissimilar to that employed in all the other paragraphs in both the First and Second Books. These were simple enunciations; but this assumes a somewhat parliamentary style. The words "whereas" and "we" were terms unemployed before. In the next place, the king's printer (Grafton) in his first edition, has several copies without the paragraph; and in other copies of the same edition,

*First Book.**Second Book.*

the leaf containing it was pasted in *after* the copy had been bound; while even in the second edition the paragraph is printed on a separate leaf, which, from its signatures, bears evidence of having been added after the other leaves had been finished off.\* Too much reliance must not, therefore, be placed upon this important paragraph. It might, and doubtless did, embody the sentiment of many divines of that day; but that it expressed the *law* is very questionable.

11. At the time of celebration, it was prescribed :

“After the Gospel ended, the priest shall begin :

“I believe in one God.”

“The *clerks* shall *sing* the rest.

“The Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible,” &c.

11. Altered thus:—

“And the Epistle and Gospel being ended [by the priest], shall be *said* the Creed.

“I believe in one God, the Father Almighty,” &c.

In the present arrangement the instructions are :

“Immediately after the Collect, the priest shall read the Epistles.”

---

\* Liturgies, &c., of Edward VI., published by the Parker Society.

“ And the Gospel ended, shall be *sung or said* the Creed following, the people still standing as before :

“ I believe in one God, the Father Almighty,” &c.

It is, therefore, at the option of the priesthood to adopt either the Protestant method of reading, or the popish method of singing this creed, as also other parts of the service.

“ The Articles of Faith ” agreed to in Convocation during this reign, might, in order of time, immediately follow : they are, however, reserved till we come to the reign of Elizabeth, and will be found in page 233.



## EDWARD VI.

## SECTION III.

## HIS EDUCATIONAL EFFORT; OR THE LAST WORK OF THE REFORMERS.

When the youthful monarch, aided by his council, sought to uproot the corruptions that had been gathering strength for ages, he undertook a task which would necessarily require time, perseverance, wisdom, and benevolence to complete. His statute upon the subject of the sacrament of the altar, and his two books of Common Prayer, produced certain immediate effects; but these were limited in extent, uncertain in continuance, and questionable in character. His motive was pure, but the *modus operandi* doubtful. The very purity of his intention rendered him keen in discovering the yet grand defect in his plan of action. Something more; and something perfectly dissimilar to legal sanctions, he saw was still wanting. And he adopted a method, which, had it been the first, rather than the last act of his reign, would more effectually have secured his ulterior purpose. He now sought, therefore, to educate the national mind.

For this purpose, a book of inestimable value was prepared and published, bearing this title, "A Short Catechism; or Sum of Christian Learning."

This catechism was first printed in Latin, in the year 1552, and again printed in English, 1553. There have also been two reprints: one in "The Fathers of the English Church," by the Rev. Legh Richmond, of

Turvey, the other in the *Euchiridion Theologicum*, by Dr. Randolph (Oxford, 1812), who says:—

“It was the last work of the reformers in that reign, whence it may be fairly understood to contain, as far as it goes, their ultimate decision; and to represent the sense of the Church of England as then established. It was in some measure a public work, ‘the examination of it having been committed to certain bishops and other learned men,’ after which it was published by the king’s authority.”

Heylen in his *Historia Quinquarticularis*, part ii., chap. xv., sec. 1, A.D. 1660, says:—

“That it was so hard to come by, that scarce one scholar in five hundred had ever heard of it, and hardly one of a thousand hath ever seen it.”\*

The design of the king’s advisers in preparing this catechism, was to instil the whole of religious knowledge, and to direct that knowledge to practical godliness. Dry lessons of ethics, and stiff definitions of historic facts, did not satisfy them. Young people were not only to be taught, but incited to pray; and to pray, so that by prayer they might “*teach* themselves.” We have, therefore, this “prayer to be said of children before they study their lesson at school,”—

“O blessed Lord, which art the well-spring of all wisdom and knowledge, since it hath pleased thee of thy mercy to provide for me such means to be instructed in my tender age, let it be thy pleasure also to illuminate my dark wit and understanding, so that it may be able to receive accordingly the learning that shall be uttered; refresh thou my memory, yea, imprint thou it in my remembrance that I may keep it assuredly; dispose thou my heart also, and frame my will that I may apply my mind to receive it with such affection and fervent desire as it behoveth: let it stand with thy gracious pleasure to pour

---

\* *Liturgies and Documents of King Edward VI.* Parker Society: Preface, xi., xii.

out thy holy Spirit into my heart, thy Spirit, I say, of understanding, of truth, judgment, wisdom, and knowledge, whereby I may become apt to learn, and my schoolmaster not lose his pain in teaching me ; and what study soever I apply my mind unto, I may reduce and bring it to the right end, that is, to glorify thee in our Saviour Christ.\*

The book containing this and other short prayers, together with the catechisms, are said to be "imprinted at London by Jhon Day, and solde at hys shop, by the little conduit in Cheapside, at the sygne of the Resurreccion." †

Would there were signs of another resurrection ! A resurrection, not of bodies, but of principles ; principles embodied ; not in praying children only, but in full grown men ; "men of renown ;" valiant for those principles Edward VI. taught, and "commended all schoolmasters to teach," and by consequence, all Christian men to know, appreciate, and carry into practical effect. Then he, who is "the resurrection and the life," would nerve us up to "the right end" of sacred "wisdom, truth, and knowledge." He would be glorified ; Christendom would be glad ; and England, by a spiritual "reintegration of the rights of the crown, ‡ secure that conservation" of sacred truth, as shall purify, enlarge, honour, and protect the entire church of Christ throughout all time.

The sum of Christian learning, as Edward calls his "Short Catechism," thus begins :—

"It is the duty of them all, whom Christ hath redeemed by his death, that they not only be servants to obey, but also children to

\* *Liturgies and Documents of Edward VI.* : Parker Society, pp. 539 and 540.

† *Ibid.*

‡ Edward III., in the 15th of his reign, A.D. 1341 : Statutes at large.—*Keble*, p. 108.

inherit; so to know the true trade of life that they may be able to answer to every demand of religion, and to render account of their faith and profession."

The METHOD OF INSTRUCTION is by "dialogue," which is "the plainest way of teaching, and which, not only in philosophy Socrates, but also in our religion, Apollinarius hath used."

The BASIS OF INSTRUCTION is "the religion of the Lord Christ, which in Acts xi. is called the Christian religion." This the scholar is supposed "boldly to profess; yea, therein account the whole sum of my glory."

The DOCTRINES taught are: "that God minding to renew his image in us, first wrought this by the law written in tables, that we might therein, as it were in a glass, behold the filth and spots of our soul; that acknowledging our sin, and perceiving the weakness of our flesh, 'we might the more fervently long for our Saviour Jesus Christ, which by his Spirit createth new hearts in us.'" By sending down his Holy Spirit, he lighteneth our dark blindness; moveth, ruleth, teacheth, cleanseth, comforteth, and rejoiceth our minds."

"Christ is not so altogether absent from the world as many do suppose. He that in earth will see the Godhead of Christ, let him open the eyes, not of this body, but of his mind, but of his faith. Yea, he shall both see and feel him dwelling within himself, in such sort as he doth his own proper soul. His Godhead filleth both heaven and earth. But as touching the *bodily presence* of Christ here on earth (if it be lawful to place in comparison great things with small) Christ's body is present to our faith: as the sun when it is seen is present to the eye: the body whereof, although it do not bodily touch the eye, nor be presently with it together here in earth, yet is it present to the sight. So CHRIST'S BODY, which at his glorious going up was conveyed from us, *is a great way absent from our mouth, EVEN THEN, when we receive with our mouth the holy sacrament of his body and blood.* Yet is our faith in heaven, and beholdeth the sun of righteousness; and is presently together with him in heaven: in such sort as the sight is in heaven with the body of the sun, or in earth the sun with the sight. We must therefore so say, that Christ's body is in some one place of heaven, and his Godhead everywhere: that we NEITHER OF HIS GODHEAD MAKE A BODY: NOR OF HIS BODY A GOD. *Ut nec de ejus Divinitate corpus faciamus, nec de illius corpore Deum.*"

The GOVERNMENT OF CHRIST is thus defined:—"He remaining invisible governeth his kingdom and common weal, that is his church,

with sovereign wisdom and power. It is for men to rule their common weals by a certain civil policy: but for Christ and God, by a heavenly god-like order."

The HONOUR of Christ "is not to be mixed up with wicked traditions and cold devices of men, but with heavenly honour, and spiritual in deed: most fit for us that give it, and him that shall receive it, even as he hath honoured and doth honour his Father."

The CHURCH of Christ is said to be "a most beautiful kingdom and holy common weal, called by the apostles and the ancient fathers, who wrote in Greek, *Ecclesia*,\* or a congregation, or assembly; all subject to one king as their sovereign, and only one head, him we call Christ, or the 'anointed' one. As many as do truly fear, honour, and call upon God, wholly applying their mind to holy and godly living; and all those who, putting all their hope and trust in him, do assuredly look for the bliss of everlasting life. Witness hereof they have within their hearts; the Spirit of Christ, the author, the earnest, and unfailing pledge of their faith. That faith doth lay *hand upon*, UNDERSTAND, and PERCEIVE our righteous-making to be given us of God freely; by no deserts of our own, but by the free grace of the Almighty Father."

The church or congregation "in all points is governed and ruled by the laws and statutes of their king and high bishop, Christ, in the bond of charity."

The COMMUNION of saints, and holy universal church, are two things fitly coupled together, "Because the fellowships and incorporations of other men proceed and be governed by other means and policies: but

---

\* "*Ecclesia*." The ancient Greeks had their *κυρια εκκλησια*—about thirty-two in number, spreading over twelve months, in each of which there were two, if not three, of such assemblies. On these occasions, it was common for a conflux of the people to be present at their sacrifices. Their priests, who served at the altars, were never denominated the *ecclesia*, or assembly. (*Archæologia Atticæ*, lib. ii., cap. 10, pp. 67-79.) They had also other assemblies, or gathering together of the people, especially when war, or any other accident, suddenly troubled the state. These assemblies were, by public authority, designated *συγκλητοι*, or "called together," *i.e.*, summoned out of the fields and streets by the common crier. Whereas, in the other instances (the *εκκλησια*), the people came together of their own accord, at fixed times, and for a previously well-understood purpose.—*Archæ. Atti.*, lib. iii., cap. 2, p. 102.

the church, which is an assembly of men called to everlasting salvation, is both gathered together and governed by the Holy Ghost. And therefore this calling together of the faithful is called universal, because it is bound to no one special place. For God, throughout all coasts of the world hath them that worship him; which, though they be far scattered asunder, by divers distance of countries and dominions, yet are they members most nearly joined of the same body, whereof Christ is the head; and have one spirit, faith, SACRAMENTS, prayers, forgiveness of sins, and heavenly bliss common among them all; and be so knit with the bond of love, that they endeavour themselves in nothing more, than each to help other, and to build together in Christ.

“The LORD’S SUPPER is ‘a certain thankful remembrance of Christ; forasmuch as the bread REPRESENTETH his body, betrayed to be crucified for us; the wine STANDETH IN STEAD and PLACE of his blood, plentifully shed for us.”

GODLINESS is said to be “directly contrary to godlessness. As for superstition and hypocrisy, they counterfeit and resemble it; whereas, nevertheless, they are most far different from all true godliness; the principal point of which is to *know God only*—to covet him only as the chief felicity—to fear him as our Lord—to love and reverence him as our Father, with his Son our Saviour Jesus Christ. The next point of godliness is: to love each man as our brother; for if God did create us all, feed and govern us; if he be the cause and author of our dwelling in this wide frame of the world, the name of brother must needs most fitly agree with us; and with so much straiter bond shall we be bound together as we approach to Christ, who is our brother, the first begotten and eldest; whom he that knoweth not (he that hath no hold of), is unrighteous indeed, and hath no place among the people of God.”

GOOD WORKS are evidences of faith. Neither “the Spirit alone,” nor “faith,” doth put us into a state as to justify its being said, “that sleep we never so soundly, or stand we never so reckless and slothful,” will yet so work all things for us, as without any help of our own, either of them “will carry us idle up to heaven. They so cleave unto faith, that neither can faith be found without them; nor good works be any where without faith.”

ANTICHRIST is not yet slain; and, “therefore, we pray that Christ’s kingdom may come; that he may reign with his saints according to God’s promises; that he may live and be Lord in the world according to the decrees of the Holy Gospel; not after the traditions and laws of men, nor pleasure of worldly tyrants.”

OBEDIENCE to the rule of faith is encouraged by the scholar being enjoined "that thou so frame thy life, that heavenly and godly knowledge decay not in thee; nor lie soulless and dead, as it were, in a tomb of flesh."

And finally he said that :

"THE FOUNDATION OF ALL RIGHT AND JUSTICE TO OUR NEIGHBOUR is Christ. Do that (saith he) to another that thou wouldst have done unto thyself. Beware, therefore, thou do nothing to any man that thyself wouldst not willingly suffer. If it grieve thee to suffer injury—if thou think it wrong that another man doth to thee—judge likewise in the person of thy neighbour that thou feelest in thyself; and thou shalt perceive that thou dost no less wrongfully in hurting another than others do in hurting thee. Here if we would stedfastly fasten our foot—hereunto if we would earnestly travail—we should attain to the very highest top of innocency."

So closed this catechism : and so terminated the reformation. Within forty-eight days after he had, on the 20th May, at Greenwich, "commended this invaluable text-book to all schoolmasters to teach:" the angels of God escorted Edward VI. to a "higher top of innocency" than that he had so graphically described as the terminus of scriptural knowledge on earth.

But "the light had shined in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not." The majority of the nation were "for going back to Egypt;" and in this preference added another illustration to the fact that mental and spiritual thralldom long endured, incapacitates any people either to understand, or desire true liberty. The highest and noblest form of liberty ever presented to an enslaved world is that proclaimed by the King of all kings, whom Edward VI. denominates Christ. *His* laws this English monarch was anxious to establish; and had he lived as many years after he issued this book, as he had reigned prior to its appearance; the effect would have so consolidated

the glorious work upon which he had entered, and to which he was publicly committed; as to have frustrated any attempt of his successors to revert to Rome: such an attempt would then immediately have recoiled upon themselves. But the matured superstition of his sister Mary, induced her to watch with a daily-increasing interest, the trembling grasp with which her brother held his sceptre. She had become more and more intent upon undoing all he had undertaken, the moment his throne should become vacant. Her exasperation against Protestantism became heightened by the publication of this very book.

---

## THE RETROGRESSION.

### MARY.

The records of this woman's government say :

“Whereas much false and erroneous doctrine hath been taught and brought from foreign countries, by reason whereof the spirituality and temporality have swerved from obedience to the see apostolic and declined from the unity of Christ's church; and so have continued, until such time as your Majesty was raised up by God; and then, by his divine and gracious providence, knit in marriage with the virtuous prince, when the Pope's Holiness sent unto your Majesties as persons undefiled and preserved from the common infection: and we, after sundry long and grievous plagues and calamities, have acknowledged the same, and now upon our humble submission and declaration of repentance, as repentant children, are received into the bosom and unity of Christ's Church; [and thus] this noble realm is delivered from excommunication and other censures ecclesiastical, which have hanged over our heads for our defaults [since the time of the schism, which is to be understood since the twentieth year of the reign of Henry VIII.]; and which was upon condition to repeal and abrogate such acts as had been made against the supremacy of the See Apostolick.”\*

---

\* 1 & 2 Philip and Mary, cap. viii.



If Rome felt proud of her "repentant children," "this noble realm" has reason to feel ashamed of its "undefiled" sovereign. She had signalized the commencement of her reign by the very second act which she passed. It related to religion, and enacted that—

"All such divine service and administration of sacraments as were most commonly used in England in the last year of A.D. 1558. Henry VIII., shall be used through the realm, after Mary. the 20th December, 1553, and no other kind of service nor administration of sacraments."<sup>\*</sup>

This set aside all that Edward had done, and paved the way for after sanguinary laws.† By virtue of the old laws of Henry VIII. and his predecessor, Henry IV., the fires of persecution were again lighted up, and to them hosts of victims were dragged. Among them were, one archbishop; bishops; and thirteen other ecclesiastics; and laymen: amounting in the whole to three hundred persons; during the five years and four months of her inglorious reign. This places the number too low, if we take the computation of some historians; for they state that eight hundred heretics were burnt. But it is to be hoped the number was not so great: at any rate, the preponderance of authentic data favours the belief, that the smaller number approaches nearer the real facts of the case.

Here we pause. Compare this revived persecution under Mary, and those of corresponding character

\* 1 Mary, Sessio Secundo, cap. ii.

† It is not necessary to refer to these general laws, as they relate not exclusively to the Lord's Supper. By the one law quoted above, Mary secured her great object at once, which was the restoration of the mass, or altar service.

between 1400 and 1558; with that which obtained under Diocletian in 300, while Britain was a province of the Roman Empire—and how impressive the contrast! Then pagans martyred Christians, because they would not offer sacrifice to dead heroes or living emperors. Now Catholic Christians put real Christians to death, because they did not believe that the mumbling of a few Latin words over a piece of bread changed it into a living Christ! Then pagans spent their fury against Christians for the space of ten years; the longest persecution pagans themselves had ever kept up. Now the fires of persecution (after deducting the intermission during Edward's reign) blazed for more than fifteen times ten years.

Mark, too, the fact—the idolatry of the *altar* occasioned all this—the idolatry of the *Christian altar*. But had anything of this kind taken place respecting *pagan altars*? No. They were sanctuaries—criminals fled to them: though dead in law, whoever dared to meddle with them, exposed himself to banishment. “The altars are not far off;” and on—the affrighted criminal hastened his flight to any of the six appointed *ασυλοι* (asylums) in Greece. To have drawn them from the altar was held in law to be a trespass upon religion.\* But here the Christian altar is converted into a hiding-places for destroyers. They first pervert it into an ecclesiastical trap; and then, having ensnared the innocent, hurry them off to the flames.

Rome, at her first coming into Britain, had made a compromise with pagan idolaters.† Ought she not to have imitated pagan humanity? She had, or pro-

---

\* *Archæologia Attica*, pp. 54 and 275.

† See Appendix A.

fessed to have, divine revelation ; they had natural religion only. She had civilization beckoning her to an advanced position in the history of the world ; they had had to contend with barbarism ; crushing down mental power, and demoralizing every social virtue. And yet, notwithstanding all her advantages, she appears to an awful disadvantage. Placed by the side of papal persecutors ; pagan idolators stand out as benignant religionists.

But death can vanquish demons. Hark ! the cathedral knell sounds—Mary is dead. And village bells ring—Elizabeth is on the throne.

#### ELIZABETH.

The principal parts of the distinct ecclesiastical government established in the reign of this princess, are those found in "The Articles of Faith agreed to in Convocation, held at London, 1562." These form the present legal standard of opinions. With the far greater portion of them we have nothing whatever to do ; as these pages are restricted to the one subject of the Lord's Supper.

Nor will it be necessary to repeat all that the articles contain even upon this point ; seeing that a far more important result may be obtained, if we strictly limit our remarks to those articles only, in which a *contrast* appears between that of Edward VI. and Elizabeth.

We will endeavour to present the contrast in the easiest form, by placing the articles in juxtaposition. There are six points of essential disagreement. Thus—

1. In A.D. 1552, Edward VI. had said—

“Our Lord Jesus Christ hath knit together a company of new people (*novi populi*) with sacraments most few in number, most easy to be kept, most excellent in signification, as is baptism and the Lord’s Supper.”\*

1. In A.D. 1562, Elizabeth preserved the silence of the grave, respecting all these words. She dropped every one of them.

The beautiful construction of this sentence is only surpassed by the purity of the main sentiment: “A company of *new* people.” *Novi* among the Latins answers to *καινον* (Matt. xxvi. 29) among the Greeks, and expresses something distinct, superior, and exalted; rather than exclusively that which is novel. In the superior sense of the word, Bishop Sanderson has it. Speaking of the Fathers, he says—

“They everywhere testify that the precepts of Christ are *new laws*, not only in respect of their being more fully, clearly, and explicitly propounded than the old laws of Moses; but chiefly because they stand higher, and incite Christians to a more eminent standard of perfection; on both sides of which are the most powerful attractions (*efficacissimis θελακτηριοις*) viz., on the one side the present example of Christ; and on the other, the more ample reward in his future celestial kingdom; so that the new law authority (*in lege nova imperatis*) lies in the two great things, by which the duty of the Christian life is mainly preserved: watchfulness against enemies, and bearing the cross.”†

The “new people” obey the new laws. The bishop here follows Edward VI., who, in another authorita-

\* *Liturgies and Documents of Edward VI.*, Parker Society, pp. 532 and 577.

† *Prælectiones Decem: Oxonii in Scholæ Theologicæ Habita*, A.D. 1647, A. Roberto Sandersono, Professore Regio, postea Episcopo, Lincolnensi—the Fourth Praelection, sec. xxxiv., p. 110.

tively commended document, speaks of the church of Christ as "a kingdom or commonweal of Christians, severally and plainly known asunder from each other fellowship of men;" "gathered together and governed by the Holy Ghost:" and "so knit together with the bond of love that they endeavour themselves in nothing more than each to help other, and to build together in Christ."\*

2. EDWARD asserts that—

"Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about, but that we should *rightly* use them; and in such only as worthily receive the same, they have a wholesome effect and operation [and yet not that of the work wrought as some men speak; which word, as it is strange and unknown to holy Scripture; so it engendereth no godly, but a very superstitious sense]. But they that receive the sacrament unworthily purchase to themselves damnation, as St. Paul saith."

2. ELIZABETH declares that—

"The sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about; but that we should *duly* use them; and in such only as worthily receive the same, they have a wholesome effect or operation. But they that receive them unworthily, purchase to themselves damnation, as St. Paul saith."—25th Article.

The reader will remark that all the words in Edward's article, placed within brackets, are omitted by Elizabeth. The omission of important words like these, speaks ill of those who prepared her articles. Edward VI. pointedly condemns a prime article of the Church of Rome—that of the *opus operatum*, or

---

\* *Liturgies and Documents of Edward VI.*, Parker Society, pp. 513, 514, and 515.

the work wrought by the priest. Upon this one point, the whole of the atoning celebration\* had reposed. This is dealt with in a way expressive of the full intentions of the Reformers, whose evident intention was not merely to bring this revolving centre to a stand-still; but wholly to remove it. Edward, therefore, adopts a style of condemnation usual with some laws of affirmance; that is, they both affirm and deny: especially do they deny, when that which they affirm stands uppermost in their intention.

But how does Elizabeth deal with the question? She simply affirms; not a single word does she utter about this grand point—the *opus operatum*. She says not one word by way of negation or condemnation of that very doctrine against which Edward had so pointedly directed his censure. More than this: one rule of construction in the law courts will here apply; which is, that when one law quotes the words of a preceding law, it affirms only so much of that law as it quotes; and all the words which are *not* quoted, it sets aside. And still more: when any renunciatory words are dropped, the thing which is not re-renounced is held, *pro tanto*, to be revived. When, therefore, Elizabeth *omits* to acknowledge the renunciation of Edward; she is deemed to have renounced his prior renunciation; and in so doing, to have re-quickened that which previously he had pronounced dead in law.

But now comes the grand difference between the two authorities. It is visible upon the first reading, and will become still increasingly appreciated upon examination.

---

\* See p. 52.

3. EDWARD enunciated the Eucharistic law of his church by employing these words :

“The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another; but rather it is a Sacrament of our redemption by Christ’s death; in-  
somuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the bread which we break is a COMMUNION of the body of Christ; likewise the cup of blessing is a COMMUNION of the blood of Christ.”

3. ELIZABETH adopts these expressions :

“The Supper of the Lord, &c.,

insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the bread which we break is a PARTAKING of the BODY of Christ; and likewise the cup of blessing is a PARTAKING of the BLOOD OF CHRIST.”—28th Article, 1st clause.

The contrast between these two articles of faith is most impressive, and demands special attention. The reader will remark the word “*communion*.” Edward VI. quotes it from the whole paragraph of the Apostle Paul,\* which Elizabeth does not: rather she seems studiously, and almost surreptitiously, to have omitted it. The omission is most serious; as it induces an entire alteration; if not, indeed, subversion of the fact stated by the sacred writer. He had a full knowledge of that one word. As a Jewish lawyer of the highest order, he was acquainted with Roman law; and although Paul could not have borrowed the word from Justinian, the Roman Emperor; yet does Justinian employ it, as a word long before his time well understood. Under the desig-

---

\* 1 Cor. x. 16.

nation "*De Societate*," he, in his Institutions, thus speaks:—

"*Societatem coire solemus aut totorum bonorum, quam Græci specialiter κοινωνίαν appellant;*" &c. "It is common for persons to enter into a general partnership, or a society of all their goods, and this the Greeks emphatically call *κοινωνίαν*, i.e. Communion."\*

Paul has the same word, "communion," or partnership, not indeed of goods, but of privilege; not of persons generally, but of the Church of God. Hence he speaks of "being many;" but yet "all partaking of that one bread." (1 Cor. x. 17.)

Unite this expression with the words in the eleventh chapter, from the twenty-third to the twenty-seventh verse, and we have an authoritative explanation of the first institution; the design; and the guilt of prostituting, the Lord's Supper. And it is to this matter, and to this only; that he, in the last clause of the twenty-seventh verse, uses the words "body and blood of the Lord." But must not these words cohere with those he had previously employed? If they are to be taken *alone*, they contradict his antecedent argument; whereas, if united with it, they strengthen his appeal, and justify his decision.

Three considerations will not only remove any seeming contrariety of terms; but explain the words "body and blood of the Lord." First, that it is an invariable rule of interpretation of law (especially an explanatory law), that a short sentence shall never set aside a lengthened explanation: in other words, that the *minor* parts of a sentence can never prevail against *major* antecedents. Second, that the

---

\* Lib. iii., tit. xxvi. See also the word in Luke v. 10.



words, "body and blood," even in their having been separated from the previous part of the argument, do yet not teach any doctrine opposed to the preceding part of the Apostle's argument: and thirdly, and most emphatically, it is to be observed; that St. Paul's intention was to draw a marked distinction between different persons, and not to enunciate any theological doctrine. The distinction is itself apparent, from the expressive difference in his description of the two classes. Thus, in the sixteenth verse of the tenth chapter, he says, "the cup we bless" (or for which we give thanks); whereas, in the twenty-seventh verse of the eleventh chapter, he says, "WHOSOEVER unworthily drinks of this cup"—*i.e.*, those whom he had, in the twenty-second verse, designated "*despisers of the Church of God.*"

Now, let it be distinctly remembered, that in respect of the persons mentioned in the tenth chapter, he never once utters a word which conveys the idea that **THEY** receive "the body and blood of the Lord." That is restricted to the "despiser" mentioned in the eleventh chapter; and who take the cup "unworthily," or *profanely*; and who, for such profanation, and the *intentional* indignity offered to it, shall be "held *ενοχος*"\*—exposed to punishment. Why? Because he is "guilty" of acts which, by *design* (for the motive here constitutes the guilt) shall so degrade the MEMORIAL, as to lead others to despise **CHRIST HIMSELF**. These men at **Corinth**, therefore, resembled those other apostates mentioned by Paul,†

---

\* "Held fast as a criminal is, when manacled against the day of execution."—*Leigh's Critica Sacra*, 91.

† Heb. vi. 6.

whom he, by a bold figure, said, did again "*crucify* the Son of God." These Corinthian "despisers of the Church of God" purposely, openly, and constantly defiled the external framework of Christianity, in order that they might more indignantly show their contempt for the Divine Architect, in whose honour it had been constructed; and by which the memorial of his character and death was celebrated. Hence they were "guilty of" such affronts to the symbolic *representation*, as though they had been offered to the very "body and blood of the Lord" HIMSELF.

Did the ecclesiastical advisers of Elizabeth not perceive the full and powerfully-expressed opinion of Paul? Rather must we not say, they sought to evade the meaning of Edward VI? That meaning they suppress; and by suppressing, convey a perfectly opposite meaning to that which either Paul had conveyed; or Edward had designed.

Do we justly blame Anglo-Saxon monarchs for having, during four hundred years, despoiled Christianity in England? \* What shall we say of ourselves, for having, during the last three hundred years, allowed one sovereign to undo all that another, and almost immediately preceding sovereign, had attempted? He had intended not only to purge out what the first race of despoiling monarchs had corrupted; but also to restore that which other monarchs, during other five hundred years before his own times, had almost demolished.

Him we repudiate; and her, who rejected him, we still obey!

---

\* See page 109.

## 4. EDWARD tells us that

“Transubstantiation, or, the change of the substance of bread and wine into the substance of Christ’s body and blood, cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.”

[“Forasmuch as the truth of man’s nature requireth that the body of one, and the selfsame man cannot be at one time in divers places, but must needs be in some one certain place; therefore the body of Christ cannot be present at one time in many and divers places. And because (as holy Scripture doth teach) Christ was taken up into heaven, and there shall continue unto the end of the world, a faithful man ought not either to believe, or openly to confess the real and bodily presence (as they have it) of Christ’s flesh and blood, in the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper.”]

The omission of the *argument* against transubstantiation, contained in Edward’s article, must not be overlooked: it was not accidental, but intentional. Bishop Burnet assigns a reason for the words having been dropped. “The original subscription by both Houses of Convocation yet extant shows” that the paragraph “made part of the articles as at first prepared by Convocation.” “But the design of the Government was to draw over the nation to the Reformation, in whom the old leaven had gone deep, and no part of it deeper than the belief of the corporeal

## 4. ELIZABETH admits that

“Transubstantiation, or, the change of the substance of bread and wine into the substance of Christ’s body and blood, cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.”

presence of Christ in the sacrament; therefore it was thought not expedient to offend them by so particular a definition in this matter, in which the very word, 'Real Presence,' was rejected." "Therefore it was thought fit to suppress this paragraph."\* The after-argument of the bishop, partly excusing the clergy of that time; and partly explaining why other words than those Edward VI. had employed, were adopted, cannot we apprehend, be deemed satisfactory to impartial persons: for though no one, whose judgment is entitled to respect, would wish needlessly to offend erroneous minds; yet even those minds themselves can never and do never approve of any attempt to "draw them over" to truth, by suppressing a condemnation of their error. "The design of the *Government*," if transparent; would have been better secured had it adopted a less equivocal line of procedure. To say the least, it was a fatally timid policy; and like every other of the same sort, be it about what "matter" soever it may, not only defeats itself; but promotes the very error it professedly seeks to uproot. Hence the more than equivocal expressions that were substituted, and which are contained in the next sentence.

5. EDWARD does not use one of these words.

5. ELIZABETH asserts that—

"The BODY of CHRIST is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual Manner. And the Mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith."

---

\* Burnet's Exposition of the 28th Article, p. 308.

If the reader turn to Elfric,\* he will find what is there denominated *incipient* transubstantiation. Here he discovers its *resilient* type. Nor will the expletives "after an heavenly and spiritual manner," so much as relieve; much less remove, the dangerous symptoms of the returning disease. Cuthbert had nearly the same words when he taught the same doctrine of a "spiritual signification."† The expletives offered by Elizabeth require themselves to be explained; and therefore it is that the far greater portion of those who think at all upon this subject, put such an interpretation upon the words, as prove that they believe there is some invisible, indwelling substance of Christ in the bread and wine: that though they are not exactly *changed* by consecration, yet that, by and in that consecration they become possessed of certain properties, and exert certain influences which, apart from such consecration, they would not and could not possess or exert: that having had "*reposed*" in them‡ some fixed virtue, that virtue ceases to remain dormant, but takes an active form, of some sort or other. If it were not so; why should the priest say to the recipient, the "body of our Lord preserve *thy body* and soul unto everlasting life?"§ Are the soul and body of the recipient actual realities? So also is that body of Christ; which, in "the Supper, is given, taken, and eaten." To this it may be replied, that is eaten "*only* after a spiritual manner." Indeed! Is it then an ethereal supper? No: it is really bread and wine "*taken* after" a spiritual manner. The "*manner*" is in the recipient, the matter is in the bread. What,

---

\* See p. 81. † See p. 50. ‡ See p. 150. § See p. 215.

then, are we to do with these words, "the *mean* whereby it is received and eaten is faith?" Faith in what—the Supper? Then you teach a doctrine which presses hard upon the real presence; for where there is faith in "a *thing*," and that thing a sacrament (as the next article will be found to assert), there must of necessity be a reality of some kind. But perhaps the faith refers to Christ. If so, the expression is equally open to objection; for, by associating "faith" in Christ with this act of receiving and eating his body; you teach one, if not both, of two dangerous and unscriptural doctrines: viz., that faith is nothing more than an occasional act of the mind (for not one word is said about a previously developed evidence), whereas the Word of God describes faith as an habitual exercise of the soul—its *life*, in short: or you teach the still more dangerous doctrine that the physical sufferings of Christ (his passion) constituted at least a part, if not the essence of the atonement offered: and thus, as Edward VI. had said, you either so reduce "his *Godhead* as to make it a body;" or you so exalt "his *body* as to make it a God." Nor ought these emphatic words escape special notice. They seem to be intended to disprove all such portions of the papal Eucharistic errors; as closely resembled those of pagans, who "deified the effect of God, as bread and wine."\*

Why did Elizabeth indulge in all this mystification? A plain question of fact required it not: nay, more, admits it not. Was Edward VI. right in saying, as he does in his catechism, "the Lord's Supper REPRESENTS the body of Christ;" or was Elizabeth

---

\* *Archæologiæ Atticæ*, lib. ii., p. 37.

wrong in saying that "the BODY of God is eaten in the Supper"?

The truth of the matter is; she evaded and meant to evade Edward's opinions; and to adopt, under a somewhat new form, those of Cuthbert, Elfric, and Peckham. Hence her studiously complex terms—terms which never would have been employed, had there been a transparent intention: the absence of which accounts for the words which convey the concentrated errors of the preceding periods. In no one period, of any ten years in the previous ecclesiastical history of England, had any terms been employed in two authenticated documents, so thoroughly antagonistic to each other; as are the two sets of words used by Edward and Elizabeth.

Her theory about "the body of Christ being eaten in the Supper" was a pitiful and hurtful substitute for the rejected paragraph of Edward VI.: pitiful in pretension, hurtful in influence. It was, however, "received and published by the next Convocation," and "seemed to be more theological than" Edward's "definition, that went too much upon the principles of natural philosophy."\* What then? Does any correct "natural philosophy" contravene a scriptural theology? or, can it really be "more theological" to say that "the body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten," in the act of receiving the bread, than; that "the truth of man's nature requires that the selfsame body cannot be at one time in divers places"? If Edward's "natural philosophy," did not chime in with certain "theological" inventions; certain it is that these inventions are (for they do not "*seem*" to be) opposed

---

\* Burnet *ut supra*.

to the common sense of mankind, and the Word of God. Nor is the work of mystification yet finished. Take, therefore, the next article, where—

6. EDWARD has not one of these words.

6. ELIZABETH asserts that—

“The wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth, as St. Augustine saith, the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they *partakers of Christ*, but rather, to their condemnation, do eat and drink the sign or sacrament of so great a Thing.”—29th Article.

*Whence* this mystification? “St. Augustine saith” it; and it is not a little singular that he should have been so pointedly named as its patron. It would seem that Elizabeth acted upon a diametrically opposite plan to that adopted by Edward VI. He, in his first sacramental law,\* gives a graceful *coup de main* to Augustine; by dropping everything Augustine or his successors had said or done, opposed to the institution of the Lord’s Supper, or the usages of the primitive church, during the five hundred years *anterior* to his coming into England. Whereas, Elizabeth beckons him back into the church; names him; assigns him a place and an authority at her altar; adopts, by express words, his opinion; and makes it the basis of her own law.

How, then, had Augustine supported his opinion? He supported it by an appeal to the case of Judas,

---

\* See p. 199.



whom he supposed had been present at the Lord's Supper; and if he, other "wicked men" might also be there.\*

But what if Augustine was himself mistaken upon this point? Judas was *not* present at the Lord's Supper. This has been proved,† and that by an authority (human and erring as it is in many other respects) which Augustine himself was bound to acknowledge; even if the Scriptures had not been against him as well.

Nor must we stop even here; for Elizabeth not only went back to an Anglo-Saxon bishop (Elfric) for her model of theology; but to Anglo-Saxon principles of legislation, for her method of enforcing it. Her statute law about the "Communion" is this:

"If any person, [*i.e.* a Protestant Dissenter or Roman Catholic,] shall refuse to receive the holy communion as it is now [when the act passed] received in the Church of England, or hold any error in matters of religion or doctrine not received and allowed in the said Church of England," he was liable to be cited into any Consistory Court, the bishop of which might feel it a point of conscience to cite them.

Such are the provisions of the unrepealed statute,‡ as it applies to Episcopalians.

As it is an invariable test and evidence of retrogradation in any science or pursuit, to tie up the human mind to one man's opinion or conduct; equally so is it an evidence of some latent despoiling influence, to restrict historical inquiries to one and only one period. The truth of the *whole* is the only safe method by which we can arrive at the truth of any part of an historic development.

\* *De Civitate Dei*, lib. xxi., cap. 25.

† See p. 132.

‡ 5 Elizabeth, cap. xxiii., sec. 13.

Take, then, the Elizabethan articles of faith. They expressed the opinions entertained in her own times. They did more. They linked them in, not only with the then past, but also with the then forthcoming future. The theory that "the *body* of Christ is received in the Supper," was a very ancient dogma at the time she enunciated the aphorism. Neither had it become so worn out by age as to sink into decrepitude, dotage, and nonage of life. Though venerable for years, it was vigorous in power; so much so, that it allowed itself to appear, bedecked with a new attire, without eliciting one single condemnation of its want of taste or adaptation.

If the old errors had drained themselves into an ecclesiastical cesspool, the confessional; and, as we have seen,\* took a revived form in the present century; have we any warrant to suppose that Elizabeth, having crushed Edward; would not also reproduce her own opinions in after periods? The history of the world, in relation to the growth, spread, and influence of error is against any other supposition: and the history of England, in respect of the operation of Elizabeth's sacramental laws, is equally against any persuasion that they remained what she had been made.

We appeal to national records for the facts of this case. Those facts are evolved under the Stuarts.

---

\* See p. 167.

## THE STUARTS.

## JAMES I.

The throne is again unoccupied ; but

“ Within a few hours after the decease of our late sovereign the Queen ; we, with one full voice of tongue and heart, endeavoured to make demonstration of our inward love, zeal, and devotion to your most excellent majesty : We, therefore, now do sacrifice our unfeigned and hearty thanks to Almighty God for blessing us with a sovereign adorned with the rarest gifts of mind and body ; and upon the knees of our hearts do agnize our most constant faith, obedience, and loyalty to your majesty [who] by God’s goodness is more able to protect and govern us than any of your noble progenitors ; and thereunto we do submit and oblige ourselves, until the last drop of our bloods be shed.”

Why this flourish of trumpets ? Because—

“ Of the extraordinary care and pains which so great wisdom, knowledge, experience, and dexterity, your majesty have taken for the continuance and establishment of the blessed peace both of the Church of England in the true and sincere religion of the Commonwealth,” and of “ your thankful occupation of all our faithful and constant endeavours to promote the same.”

This was the welcome James, the First “ of England, and of Scotland the seven and thirtieth,” received from his Parliament.\*

Servile adulators ! ye reminded your idol of the long and miserable dissention and bloody civil war “ which almost wasted this noble realm,” prior to the “ union of the two noble Houses of York and Lancaster,” and the blessing consequent upon such conjunction. Ye exult over the “ more inestimable and

---

\* Anno Primo Jacobi Regis, cap. i.

unspeakable blessings" poured upon you by "the union of the two mighty, famous, and ancient kingdoms of England and Scotland." And ye add to these the blessings with which "the Divine Majesty hath further enriched your highness," by having given him "a most royal progeny of most rare and excellent gifts and forwardness; and in his goodness is likely to increase the happy number of them."

And having thus exhausted your stock of laudation, ye desired that the document, which enrolled your praise; might be "adorned with the royal assent," and handed down "to posterity."

"The true and sincere religion," was it? Equally true and sincere those men believed their religion to be who, eight hundred years before; had declared they would "not fear to die for it," when Pope Adrian demanded submission from English monarchs.\* "True and sincere" those men asserted their religion to be, who two hundred years before, had told the first of the Plantagenets that those monarchs who were anointed with the oil, the Virgin Mary herself had brought down from heaven, would "prove true champions for the church."† In this case, however, the Scot had the advantage of the *Anglo-Saxon*; for "a rare progeny" was seen in the background of the picture; and added not a little interest and effect to the family group, and the still more brilliant perspective which these men thought was now for the first time opening before them.

Had the common sense of the nation fallen into a deep sleep? Were there no historians to tell of the social wrongs and the religious iniquities the

---

\* See under A.D. 785.

† See under A.D. 1400, p. 178.

nation had suffered from the two distinct lines of sovereigns that had occupied the English throne? But we need not ask any more questions; for where flattery is rampant, truth is retrograde; and especially so when religious adulation becomes a stepping-stone by which ecclesiastics may mount to supreme power.

This union of "the two mighty, famous, and ancient kingdoms of England and Scotland" eventually cost both of them unparalleled suffering, dismay, and dishonour. One of the very progeny of this monarch himself, so "extraordinary in mind and body," lost his life; and the second James abdicated his throne—both events being brought about, if not exclusively, at least principally, by each sovereign having put himself in the hands of men, who, above all others, are the last to be trusted with irresponsible power; or permitted to become directing agents to those sovereigns that seek to exercise such power. For although despotic kings can generally command abundance of self-seeking servants, yet such patrons are always scarce where such slaves are few.

But we have to pass through the palace of the Stuarts, and direct our way to their altar. Contemporaneously with the statute last quoted, a new code of canon laws was ratified by James I. He says, in his confirmation of them, that they were adopted in convocation for "the good and quiet of the church, and the better government thereof." So many an incompetent head of a family has acted; who, as he laid aside the rod by which he had failed to quiet an unruly set of children; thought to frighten them into obedience by brandishing over their heads whips of scorpions. Hence the additions of canonical denun-

ciations against "*impugners* of the public worship," "*impugners* of the Articles," "*impugners* of the rites and ceremonies," "*impugners* of the government," "*impugners* of the consecrating Archbishops and Bishops of the Church of England."\* And hence, too, the excommunications denounced against "*authors* of schism," "*maintainers* of schismatics," "*maintainers* of *conventicles*," and "*maintainers* of *constitutions made in conventicles*."† Nine distinct classes of offenders appear from these canons to have been particular objects of censure. The gravest offence of all is that which is stated in the tenth canon. It says:—

"Whosoever shall henceforth affirm that such ministers as refuse to subscribe to the form and manner of God's worship in the Church of England, PRESCRIBED IN THE COMMUNION BOOK, [and  
A.D. 1603. that they in consequence, either ministers or] their ad-  
Canon. herents, may truly take unto them the name of another  
James I. church, not established by law, and dare to publish it, that this their pretended church hath of long time groaned under the burden of certain grievances imposed upon it, and upon the members thereof before mentioned, by the Church of England and the orders and constitutions therein by law established, let them be excommunicated, and not restored until they repent and publicly revoke such their wicked errors."

The altar and its service are here represented as occupying the highest position in the Church of England. Not that this was a *new* opinion or practice: rather the canon here reiterates a sentiment of immemorial date. As far back as A.D. 740, the law

---

\* See Canons 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8. † *Ibid*, 9, 10, 11, and 12.

These canons, though approved by the king, were not conformed to common law, which the 25th of Henry VIII., cap. xix., sec. 7, required they should be, before they could bind the nation at large. Laymen saw that if these canons reached *them*, no man was safe.

had prescribed "If the altar be taken away, let the church be consecrated anew;" for as it was the altar which necessitated a priesthood—imparted efficacy to worship—and added power to discipline—to impugn this and its service was to impugn, if not, indeed, uproot, the whole ecclesiastical economy.

The "pretended church" of these impugners, continued to "dare presume to publish" all their "grievances," and to hope the day would come when they would be redressed. Relief was not only denied; but "burdens" were multiplied. These "*adherents*" of "another church" were special objects of reprehension; because, but for them, the pretended priesthood of any church, other than that "established by law," would speedily have fallen into decay and eventual ruin. The laity had, in fact, always formed a principal source of ecclesiastical care. To exclude them from concurrent power with the priesthood in the government of the church had, nearly six hundred years before this canon passed, engaged anxious thought; and when at length they were "bowed out" of the administration of their own affairs; they were narrowly watched, lest by any means they should steal back into the position they once occupied. Centuries of accumulated error, superstition, and idolatry; more than reconciled the laity to this abnegation of their old rights. But when, from another or a "*pretended church*," the laity and the priesthood were seen marching forth in conjoint and augmenting order of movement, it became necessary to repeat; again and again, marked denunciations against both the "*adherents*" and the "*ministers*" of such pretended church.

As expressing the *animus* of the church, these

canons are worthy special attention. By these the clergy are still bound ; and therefore taken, as they in law must be taken, with pre-existing canons, they are documentary evidence, at least, that the old spirit of haughty repudiation still adheres to the church "established by law."

Had this been the only thing James did to sever men from his own church ; his futile attempt to coerce liberty would have sunk down into a position which could only excite the scornful smile of defiance. But he did more. Under his sanction a conference was held in Hampton Court Palace ; and, by the authority of that conference, an addition was made to the Catechism.\* It had been used, subsequently to the time of Edward VI., without the explanation of the two Sacraments. But now it declares that :—

"Baptism and the Lord's Supper are generally necessary to salvation. [As Sacraments they are said to be] signs of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us, and a pledge to assure us of its possession. In the Lord's Supper, bread and wine are the outward sign, and the body and blood of Christ the inward part, or thing signified"—

Anything more ? A most fatal error—

"Which [*i.e.* the body and blood of Christ] are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper."

Is it not a legitimate deduction from these words, that the fears entertained by the government in the time of Elizabeth, were not felt in the time of James ? She dropped the words, "real presence," which Edward VI. had used, because, to express a renunciation, might offend the people in whom the

---

\* Burns' Ecclesiastical Laws (Catechism).



doctrine of the "real presence" had sunk so deeply as to make it expedient not to displease their taste.\* But James now revives the doctrine, although he does not employ the words, "real presence." For if words convey any meaning at all, these words, "verily and in deed," teach that the body and blood of Christ are received by the faithful communist. This doctrine, Archdeacon Denison pleaded, was taught "in the Formularies and in the Catechism of the Church," and therefore justified those opinions for holding which he was deprived. Impartial men must admit, that looking at the Articles of Elizabeth, as well as the Catechism of James, there is more of transubstantiation in the Episcopal Church than many of its sincere members believe, and more than it is now safe to allow to remain. For so long as the authority of the two sovereigns can be pleaded, a *virtual* transubstantiation finds a home in the bosom of the church. This Catechism the clergy are bound by the canon to teach.

The singularity of these laws of Elizabeth and James, becomes still more impressive from the fact, that while both tacitly gave a resilient form to Roman doctrine, they openly punished conscientious Romanists. Hence the painfully numerous penal laws against papists and nonconformists. Elizabeth commenced a series of retaliative laws against the former; and vindictive laws against the latter: and thus contradicted her own Article of Faith, which says, "the Lord's Supper is a sign of love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another." These penal statutes were swelled into

---

\* See page 241.

huge heaps during the reign of James I. and the unhappy Charles. Into the merits of these penal absurdities, it would be not deemed *ad rem* here to enter ; as they do not exclusively pertain to the Lord's Supper ; and therefore they are dismissed with only one more reference to the period during which they were accumulated. That period hastened an event, which even the men who took the most prominent part in bringing about, would probably not have repeated, had the opportunity presented itself. That event was the execution of Charles I.

Of the main features of his inglorious government, there are not now many apologists ; and of the leading traits of his duplex character, there are few, if any, admirers. It did not, however, follow that he ought to have been put to death. If he had reached the climax of regal wickedness against the rights, the liberties, and the religion of the nation : the nation in a rage reached the climax of judicial wrong against him.

But we hasten to the next dynastic change, known as the Commonwealth.

## THE COMMONWEALTH.—1649.

## CROMWELL.

By referring to the chronological chart prefixed to this volume, it will be perceived that the space which represents the government of this remarkable man is left free. The black colour, expressive of the Eucharistic error, is not there. The red colour, describing the civil power, enforcing Sacramental errors, is not there. Why? Because there are no laws extant out of which authentic data could be supplied as to the character of the legislation of this eventful period in English history. Upon laws as they appear enrolled; or canons as they appear written out, all the facts contained in this book are founded. These, and only these, supply what may be called the substratum of this work. Any other authorities which may be quoted, are designed to serve as illustrations, or elucidations of the laws and canons themselves; care being taken that these minor authorities shall be, *per se*, as indisputable as the legal enactments they are produced to explain.

Now it has happened that the enemies of Cromwell, during the reign of Charles II., procured the destruction of all the Acts of Parliament that had passed during the Protectorate. This they did by sanction of public authority. Hence we have no legal evidence of the legal enactments of this period. Why, then, it may be asked, introduce Cromwell's name at all? For two reasons. First, because, in a

chronological survey of great national changes, to have passed him or his government by, would have ranked among the *res delicta* of history. And secondly, although there are no legal records of Cromwell's *laws*, there are yet abundant other proofs of the spirit by which his government, both in its home and foreign relations, was distinguished. To reject these collateral evidences in matters of religion, and especially on this one point of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, would have been as inexcusable, as to deny the fact that there were many engagements by Cromwell's sea or land forces, simply because the parliamentary roll, containing the laws which granted the money for his wars, cannot be found.

What, then, do we find among the state papers? There are no less than ten to twelve letters from Cromwell, addressed to the King of France, the King of Sweden, the senators of the city of Geneva, and other civil authorities, imploring protection for the persecuted "Piedmontese." On their behalf he says, when writing to the evangelic cities of Switzerland:—

"We are no less anxious than if this conflagration had broken forth in our own republic; or as if the axes of Schwitz Canton had been sharpened for our necks, or that their swords had been drawn against our breasts."

To their relief he sent two thousand pounds as an earnest of—

"The affection of this [English] nation toward their brethren labouring under the burden of such horrid inhumanities."

His letters spread over a period of three years; and are replete with sentiments of heroic purity

on behalf of the inhabitants of the region at the foot of the Alps—

“Among whom our religion was either disseminated by the first doctors of the gospel, and preserved from the defilement of superstition; or else restored to its pristine sincerity long before other nations obtained that felicity.”\*

Those Piedmont sufferers who refused “to hear mass,” or “to change (within three days from the edict being issued) their reformed religion; were to depart from their native seats and habitations upon pain of capital punishment.” Within twenty days they were to embrace the Roman Catholic faith.”

For this resistance of the papal power, they were attacked by the soldiers, who slew several, put others in chains, and compelled the rest “to fly into desert places, and to the mountains covered with snow, where some hundreds of families are reduced to much distress, that it is greatly to be feared they will, in a short time, all miserably perish through cold and hunger.”†

The archives of Christendom cannot produce documents of equal moral worth, with these and other letters, Cromwell wrote from “his palace at Westminster,” during 1565 and 1568. And the kings of Christendom are challenged to produce, if they can; similar letters on behalf of the defenceless, and persecuted adherents to the pure faith once delivered to saints.

The stream of religious liberty continued to roll

\* See all the State papers in Milton's prose works (*Fletcher*), page 606, *passim*.

† *Ibid.*

on during the whole of the Protectorate. At length the tide turned; and, on "the top of the tide," in rode Charles II., who, taking up the thread of his father's legislative acts, continued one passed in the third year of his reign; and thus adjusted a connecting link between the two sovereigns, as though no interruption in the royal succession had occurred.

## THE RESTORATION.

## CHARLES II.

“THE preservation of the public peace, both in church and state,”\* became the rallying point of the friends of the Restoration. Under the principle which these words secreted, “those persons who were well affected to His Majesty and the established Government,” were to be kept in all the municipal corporations of the kingdom; and all others who were either suspected, or might, from their religious habits, induce a suspicion against them, were to be kept out: “it being well known that many evil spirits are still working.”† It was therefore enacted that—

“No person or persons shall for ever hereafter be placed, elected, or chosen, in or to any office of mayor, alderman, recorder, bailiff, town clerk, common councilman, or other place of magistracy or trust, or employment relating to the government of cities, corporations, burroughs, cinque ports, or other port towns, that shall not, within one year next, before such election, or choice, *have taken the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper according to the rites of the Church of England.*”

A.D. 1661.  
Charles II. Rex.  
Statute.

Noble senators! Ye fetched your wisdom from afar! Nearly one thousand years before this notable Act was made, a West Saxon king (Inæ†) had established a Sacramental test: the test of veracity of witnesses at criminal trials. Ye copy his model without having the justification of his motive. He meant

\* 13 Charles II., statute ii., cap. 1.

† *Ibid.*

‡ See page 11.

to secure greater solemnity to judicial proceedings, which involved the life or liberty of a subject, by providing that half the witnesses upon whose testimony his guilt or innocence was to be found, should themselves establish their own moral competency to take part in so important an issue. Ye improve the model, by constituting the same religious rite a test of competency for honour, employment, or wealth. Competency? No. *In*competency to discover the essential difference between municipal duties and sacramental solemnities! Ye say, too, that this national obliquity of intellectual perception and moral integrity shall be "*for ever*"—that is, a parliamentary "*for ever*"—or until lawgivers shall change their minds.

Which legislation possessed the highest pretension to wisdom or virtue? The Saxon, which aimed to exalt the Communion table? or the Stuart, which excluded men from office simply because they would not profane the Supper of the Lord? This national reproach has happily been removed.

But though the laity have been relieved from the dishonours, this unhallowed sacramental task heaped upon them; the clergy still suffer as great, if not greater, moral wrong by another act, passed under the auspices of the same Stuart King.

A few months elapsed after the exclusion of papist and nonconformist laymen from civic offices and honours; and the clergy themselves are taken in hand. They were not everything they ought to be. Were they, then, grossly immoral? No. Were they disaffected to the civil power? No. Disobedient to their diocesans? No. But by reason of "the great and scandalous neglect of ministers in using the liturgy [enjoined



in the first year of Elizabeth], great mischiefs and inconveniencies during the time of the late unhappy troubles, have arisen and grown, and many people led into factions and schisms, to the great decay and scandal of the reformed religion of the Church of England, and to the hazard of many souls.\*

For their sakes, therefore, a revised liturgy was prepared; and now, by authority, was to be enforced. The administration of sacraments came, as a matter of course, under the sanctions and penalties of this new act of uniformity.

“And to the end that uniformity in the public worship of God may be speedily effected, [every parson] vicar, or other minister shall, upon some Lord’s-day, before the Feast of Saint Bartholomew, openly, publicly, and solemnly read the Morning and Evening Prayer, according to the [New Book], and after such reading shall openly and publicly declare his unfeigned assent and consent to the use of all things in the said book contained and prescribed.”

And—

“All and every person who shall neglect or refuse to do the same shall, *ipso facto*, be deprived of all his spiritual promotions, and the patrons and donors of the said spiritual promotions shall present or collate to the same, as though the person or persons so offending or neglecting were dead.”†

A.D. 1662.  
Charles II.  
Statuta.

The old book was to be used until the Feast of St. Bartholomew, A.D. 1662.

The day came; and never, in the history of any church, had so eventful a day dawned and closed upon the public. Six hundred and fifty-three years had grown old and grey since, in A.D. 1009, the first penal sanction sought to crush the contempt men evinced to the corruptions and errors which had sprung out of the Eucharistic errors of preceding ages; and for which Elizabeth had intentionally omitted

\* 13 and 14 Charles II., chap. iv.

† Sections 4 and 57.

to provide effectual remedies. Many and repeated had been the coercions, the threats, and the flames which alternately had blazed forth or died away, to give place to milder, but still terrible, punishments for neglecting to come to the Lord's Supper. But all these laws were general. They were chiefly intended for the people; and if an unhappy priest fell within the cruel grasp of such unrighteous laws, he was first denuded of his sacerdotal vestments and character, and after that was assigned no higher place at the stake than any lay heretic would have occupied. The only time when priests, by name, had, on account of any religious ceremony, been exposed to penal law, was seven hundred and twelve years before this act of uniformity passed; that is, in A.D. 950.\* But though the payment of twenty shillings might have proved heavy to a poor priest at that period; the law left him the chance of recovering the fine, seeing it did not deprive him of his benefice. In this case, however, *i.e.*, in 1662, the minister was "*deprived of all his spiritual promotion.*" Look at the periods, as they thus may be seen in juxtaposition, *viz.*, the tenth and the seventeenth centuries. By the law of the one, priests were compelled to forego all aid to the master of a family, if he retained so much of the primitive mode of celebrating the Lord's Supper as to make it a part of domestic religion: by the law of the other, priests were turned out of their livings if they neglected to use or to assent to the celebration of the Lord's Supper by ritual observances; which, in not a few particulars, partook largely of a papistical character.

---

\* See page 75.

The interval of these two eventful epochs in the history of the church, had been filled up by experiments, many of which aimed to crush every endeavour to purify, elevate, and enlarge its spiritual character. Every attempt to suppress the work of Reformation had failed; each failure being more expressive than its preceding discomfiture. The tide of opposition against religious coercion, once set in; continued to flow, to swell, to gather strength, and to widen, in spite of the spiritual or secular authorities, which sought to stem its progress or divert its course. On it ran. By the side of many a tributary stream stood the minister, by "whose great and scandalous neglect a great number of people in divers parts of this realm had been led into factions and schisms." "Abandon irregularities, or quit your promotion;" was the demand of law. "We take you," said the ministers, "at your word: We do quit:" and two thousand of them turned out on that never-to-be-forgotten Bartholomew Day. One of the ejected ministers was the Rev. Thomas Watson, M.A., Minister of St. Stephen's Walbrook, London. He thus addressed his flock.

"The hour is come wherein the sun is setting upon not a few of the prophets. Our work seems to be at an end: our pulpits and places must know us no more. You are not ignorant what things are imposed on us as the condition of our continuing our ministration. I must profess before God, angels, and men, that my non-submission is not from any disloyalty to authority, or any factious disposition, but because I dare not do anything, concerning which my heart tells me the Lord says, 'Do it not.' I feel I must part with my conscience or with my ministry. I choose, therefore, that my ministry be sealed up by my sufferings, rather than lengthened out by a lie; but I shall, through the grace of God, endeavour patiently and peaceably to suffer as a Christian. And now, welcome the cross of Christ! welcome, reproach!

welcome poverty, scorn, and contempt, or whatever may befall me ! This morning, I had a flock, and you had a pastor ; but now behold a pastor without a flock, and a flock without a shepherd ! This morning, I had a living ; now I have none. This morning, I had a house ; now I have none. The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away : blessed be the name of the Lord. And thus, brethren, I bid you all farewell. Finally, brethren, farewell ! ”

The like of this had never been seen before : nor had the like of its results been conceived before the census Sabbath of 1851. Then it became a legally ascertained fact, that the descendants of these giant heroes mustered, in various family groups, no less than three millions, one hundred and ten thousand, seven hundred and eighty two, actually present at public worship ; and consequently leaving no inconsiderable number at home from various causes. All this was within one hundred and ninety years ! May such results ever attend persecution : come it from whomsoever, or for what cause soever, it may !

There remains to be told one more remarkable enactment in this extraordinary law. It is the 14th section, and declares—

“ That no person whatsoever shall presume to consecrate and administer the Holy Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper before such time as he shall be ordained priest, according to the form and manner in and by the said [revised] book prescribed, unless he may have been *made* priest by *episcopal* ordination, upon pain to forfeit for every offence the sum of one hundred pounds—half to the king, and the other half to be equally divided between the poor of the parish where the offence shall be committed, and such person as shall sue for the same by action of debt—and be disabled from taking or being admitted into the order of priest for one whole year.”

To “ make a priest,” in the legal acceptation of the word, pertains only to the episcopal church of Rome and the episcopal church of England : any person so made, prior either to the Act having passed ; or to

Holy Sacrament being consecrated and administered, was held harmless. The Protestant episcopal Church, here, therefore, recognizes the ordination of the papal episcopal church. The order of priesthood is one : although the altars at which they serve are divers.\*

This, the last, and the worst, Act of Uniformity remains in force. It does injury to the church which it designed to guard and uphold ; and it also contravenes that liberty which at one time† obtained in the Church of England as to the use of a liturgical service, and especially that of the Sacramental celebration.

All this spiritual spoliation of the ancient freedom of those priests who served at the altar, was followed by another Act of excision. For the purpose of "quieting the minds of his Majesty's good subjects," Charles II. declared that—

"As well peers as commoners, that bear any office, civil or military, shall receive the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, according to the usage of the Church of England, in some parish church, immediately after Divine service and sermon."

A.D. 1672.  
Charles II.  
Statute.

And shall likewise make and subscribe this declaration, viz. :—

---

\* The penalty of £100 extended to Protestant Dissenting ministers : seeing they were not priests within the meaning of the Act. From this penal law these ministers were exempt by the 1st William and Mary, chap. xviii., the seventh section of which expressly repealed "the penalty." This statute, however, did not touch canon or ecclesiastical law. The position of Protestant Dissenters had been one of extreme exposure. Both orders of jurisprudence had been against them : *i.e.*, canon law and statute law. The former remained, and still remains, in force : so that the State, in this and other efforts to rid Christianity of popedom, has had to contend against one great master evil, viz. : separate orders of jurisprudence.

† See A.D. 960, page 95.

"I do declare, that I do believe that there is not any transubstantiation in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, or in the elements of bread and wine, at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever."\*

Failure attended this effort, as the law did not stretch itself out full length. An addition was, therefore, made to it a few years after, when the 30th of Charles, cap. i., statute 2, declared that—

"No person that now is, or hereafter shall be, a peer, or member of the House of Commons, shall vote or sit, until he shall  
A.D. 1678. audibly repeat this declaration:—I do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, declare that I do believe that in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is not any transubstantiation of the elements of bread and wine *into the body and blood of Christ*, at or after the consecration thereof, by any person whatsoever."

A long addition followed about invocation, the sacrifice of the mass, &c., with which the reader need not here be troubled.

Each one of the three last-mentioned Sacramental tests, was based upon the plan of protection. The nation was, or thought it was, in danger, from the religious opinions of certain men; and therefore to defend itself from the evils previously suffered, these men were, by law, excluded from civil rights and honours. In imposing these tests, the legislators laid hold of the highest point of their religious creed; and brandishing their views of the Lord's Supper in derisive condemnation over the heads of objectors, declared that such religionists should be men in the State.

This was to act on a grand scheme of retaliation. The Roman Church had burned the men who be-

---

\* 25th Charles II., cap. 2.

lieved not in the "real presence:" the English Parliament now declares, that those who do believe that doctrine shall be punished; not, indeed, with being hurried to the stake; but with being driven off from municipal association and government, from the army and navy, from parliament, and the councils of the sovereign.

"*Reason* is the life of law."\* But reason was in this case contravened; if not, indeed, positively contradicted. For these laws created the very danger they professed to avert. The sovereign under whose auspices they passed, drew his last breath under a covert administration of the last rites of that church, the open adherents to which he had all but driven out of the country. And as to his successor, the parliamentary roll contains the record that—

"The late King James the Second, by the assistance of divers evil councillors, judges, and ministers employed by him, did endeavour to subvert and extirpate the Protestant religion and the laws and liberties of this kingdom."

His miserable government brought about

## THE REVOLUTION.

A.D. 1688.

THE determination of parliament, in calling William, Prince of Orange to the English throne, was avowed to be "in order to such an establishment as that their religion, laws, and liberties, might not again be in danger of being subverted."†

\* *Coke's Institutions*, book i., ch. 1.

† *Rapin*, vol. xii., p. 214.

This assumed that "RELIGION" had by law been wholly dissevered from Romish credulities. It was in no such happy condition. Had the legislators of that age gone back but a few pages in ecclesiastical legislation, they would have ascertained that the germinating or in seminal principles of the Romish church lie embedded in their own statute book. The case stood thus: Charles II. had, in his act of Uniformity, distinctly recognized the "ordination" of the Church of Rome.\* Any man "made a priest" by such an episcopal ordination, became by that means possessed of the highest official qualification, for serving at the altar of the Protestant Episcopal Church. Upon this one rite of ordination, the whole economy of the two hierarchies rested. Without ordination, there was no priest; without the priesthood, there was no altar; and without an altar, there was no church.

Up to this period, statute law had not drawn any distinction between the two churches, *i.e.*, in their exclusively spiritual relation to each other. The old papal church was, in strict legal phraseology, regarded as still standing: the occupants were different; their costumes varied; and the furniture of their house was better made, and of a superior quality; but the ancient church itself, remained. As the Church of England [*Anglicana Ecclesia*], Henry VIII. designated it, one year *after* he had declared, that neither "he, nor his nobles, nor his subjects intended to decline or vary from the very articles of the Catholic Faith."†

In order, therefore, to establish legally, what the

---

\* See page 265. † 25th Henry VIII., c. 21, sec. 19, & 25th, cap. i.



Protestant Episcopal Church had always asserted, viz., that she could prove an uninterrupted succession in her priesthood; it became necessary to give a parliamentary sanction to her own priests, as contradistinguished from those of Rome; and yet, so contradistinguished, as to appear in *ap*position, rather than in opposition.

How was this delicate point to be settled? By declaring the *Protestant* Church of England to be a *separation* from the *papal* Church of England? No. For that would have impeached its own order of priesthood; and the link in the chain snapped asunder. Another mode was therefore adopted. By a few words, advisedly and almost parenthetically introduced in a clause designed to correct long-endured irregularities in her own church, as to non-ordained men; she managed so to frame her law, as to make it include *all* episcopal ordinations; the functions belonging to which were exercised in England.

But though the Church of England, in its Protestant character, recognizes the ordinations of the Church of Rome, it does not extend the declaration to any other church. It must be an episcopal ordination: and what is also singular, even the ordinations of the Episcopal Church in Scotland are, by canon and statute laws, distinctly disowned.\*

We shall not be surprised, therefore, to find, that notwithstanding the changes which took place in the secular government; and notwithstanding, also, the relief Protestant Dissenters so far obtained, as not to be "molested or disquieted," while engaged in their

---

\* See page 145,

celebration of *public worship*, there was yet a marked silence maintained as to the *sacraments* of THEIR church. In short, neither at the revolution, nor in any subsequent period, has statute law ever once recognized so much as the existence of any sacraments at all in Protestant Dissenting churches. The Toleration Act itself\* speaks of their ministers as "teachers," and as "pretending to holy orders;" although it is certain that the two thousand ejected members, under Charles the Second's Act of Uniformity, had received "holy," or priestly orders: that is, had received Protestant episcopal ordination: and what is more, had, twenty-four years before the revolution, carried those "orders" along with them; for, by ancient canon law, these "orders" could never lose "the character they had impressed on the soul;" nor, according to modern canon (1603), "be forsaken upon pain of excommunication." But even that judicial process, expensive as it might prove, would not eradicate the impressed character received in and by ordination as a priest: and still more, ordination conveys what the "consecration" of a bishop does not secure. That is capable of being given up; whereas the sacerdotal character can never be surrendered: at least, so a fiction of ecclesiastical law determines.

The only time in the ecclesiastical history of England, when divers churches were recognized as "one, in sacraments," was during the reign of Edward VI. To this fact we have had occasion previously to refer;† and need not, therefore, in this place, enter more at large upon the point.

---

\* 1 William & Mary, c. xviii.

† See page 227.

The golden opportunity, which at "the glorious revolution" offered itself, to fall back upon a full recognition of the *principles* of the Reformation, was lost. This, however, was scarcely to be wondered at, when the House of Lords, led by the Bishop of Ely, occupied themselves and the House of Commons, nearly seven days, with conferences upon one word. It was whether James had "ABDICATED," or "DESERTED," the throne.\* And though the Commons prevailed, and retained their own word, "abdicated," yet it was evident, from the discussions, that a latent purpose had been enshrouded under the word to which the Lords so tenaciously clung.

---

\* *Journals of the two Houses.*

## THE HOUSE OF BRUNSWICK.

THE numerous injuries done to religion and the well-being of even irreligionists (for they are ever contemporaneously developed) by Charles II. have, to a certain extent, been repaired. The municipal test, said by the Act which imposed it to be "for ever," was brought to a close by means of Lord John Russell. In direct and declared opposition to the Government of the day, he triumphantly carried a resolution in the House of Commons that it ought to be repealed. The Act, therefore, that had made the altar a stepping-stone to civic honours was, in 1828, abrogated. As a moral triumph, it has had few, if any, compeers: nor did it long stand alone. Having paved the way for an after achievement, it was followed, in 1829, by the annulment of the parliamentary test, which had imposed disabilities upon those persons who conscientiously believed the doctrine of transubstantiation. No two classes of religionists can hold opinions more essentially opposed to each other, than Protestant Dissenters and Roman Catholics, upon this matter of the "sacrament of the altar." For them both to obtain relief from the pains and penalties of statutes, which legislators had no moral right to enact, was in itself a glorious result; and repaid the continued, anxious, and expensive efforts each party had for many years put forth to rid themselves of social dishonours, as well as free other parties, from the guilt contracted by all legalized persecutors.

The name of George IV. appears as the sovereign who sanctioned these two acts of the British legislature. Happy would it have been for England if the clergy test of Charles II. had also, under the same reign, been repealed. But the Act of Uniformity remains, and has not yet worked out its results to so full an extent as to force its advocates to abandon its principles and provisions.

The only two names inscribed on the chronological chart are "George IV." and "Guyer"—the one a sovereign, the other, a minister of religion: the first, a repealer of unrighteous statutes; the second, a victim of vindictive canons. Humanity taught, or rather forced, the one to learn the distinction between religious ceremonies and legal tests: Christianity has now taught an English Parliament that the altar and the grave require perfectly dissimilar laws of regulation.\*

The highest distinction any sovereign might desire would be to dissever the present component branches of ecclesiastical jurisprudence. Statute law rides over canon law, so far as authority goes; but it lends that authority to sustain an opponent, so long as canon law is not abolished. Were this active remnant of papal supremacy swept away by the reigning sovereign, the name of VICTORIA would be inscribed upon the chart: opposite thereto might then be left one broad, full, untinted colour of white: indicative of the fact that the effort to abolish canon law had been successfully associated with an entire clearing away of all those Eucharistic errors, which still mar the religious institutions of our country.

---

\* See Note W.

What, then, is the present position of *legal Christianity*?\* Is it where Edward VI. left it? Assuredly not. Compare his articles† upon the Lord's Supper with those of Elizabeth, and how remarkable is the contrast! Compare, too, the form of words prescribed to be used by the priest, contained in the *Second Book of Common Prayer*, authorized by Edward VI., at the time of delivering the bread and wine to the communicant,‡ with the words *now* used at the same part of the solemnity; and no two sets of words could be framed that shall convey more directly opposite religious sentiments. Be it distinctly remembered that the sentiment conveyed at the moment of putting the bread or the wine into the hand of the communicant is, *par excellence*, the sentiment which will make the deepest impression upon thoughtful minds. The Protestant communicant may not regard that moment with the same idolatrous veneration with which the papist hears the last monosyllable which works the change in the element:§ but he is taught that what he receives is "*the Body of Christ*;" and not, as Edward VI. in his second book enjoined, viz., to "take and eat *this* [the

---

\* The reader is requested to distinguish between "legal Christianity" and "religious liberty." This last is the term usually employed by which to express the number of civil rights, either infringed or enlarged, by laws relating to religion. "Legal Christianity" is confined to such Christian doctrines, duties, or discipline, as are explained in, or enforced by, law. "Religious liberty" was enlarged when, in 1828, the Municipal Test Act was repealed, and again in 1829, when the Parliamentary Test was abrogated. But such repealing acts left untouched the great questions involved in legal Christianity.

† See page 233.

‡ See this contrast in the words themselves, page 210.

§ See canon A.D. 1322.

bread] in *remembrance* that Christ died for thee." May it not therefore be said that the legal Christianity of the nineteenth century has superseded that of the sixteenth?

Nor is this the only important matter respecting which the Church of Christ has lost ground. Another point of prime moment in which a retrograde step has been taken; is to be seen in the fact that Edward VI. recognized "the primitive church for five hundred years, and more, after Christ's ascension into heaven." This was his ruling standard; and consequently it cut off the church of Rome, which was not acknowledged in this country by the civil power until A.D. 785.\* But this, his graceful and emphatic repudiation of the church of Rome in the sixteenth century, was itself abrogated, when Charles II. acknowledged the ordination of the church of Rome to be concurrent with that of the church of England.

And still more. The rites observed at the celebration of the Lord's Supper under Edward VI. all pointed in one direction—that of simple, unostentatious, pure worship. Even his first Book of Common Prayer speaks of the clerks singing "in English for the office or Introit (as they call it);"† and by this parenthesis he casts a slur upon the *mode*, even though he could not then abolish the practice; and therefore he prescribed, "the priest shall *sing*, I believe in one God, and the clerks shall sing the rest" of the creed. In his *second* book, however, he cast singing away: "The creed shall by the priest be said."

---

\* See under this date, *ante*.

† *Liturgies, &c., of Edward VI.*, Parker Society, page 76.

Herein, again, a change has taken effect. The present law prescribes that "the creed shall *be said or sung*;" that is, the mode of going through this part of the service may, if the priest think proper, revert to the old popish style; and that style many priests are in haste to adopt. Trifling as the difference may seem in the words themselves, the effect is momentous. Music is much more exciting than reading. Hence, "John, the precentor of the church of St. Peter, was sent from Rome to Britain," to teach "the most approved modes of singing the Roman service." \* Music was again commended by Cuthbert, the great corruptor of the Eucharist, who in A.D. 747, enjoined that "the celebration of masses should be in the manner of singing, according to the written copy which, from the Roman Church," had been received by John the precentor. And by music, or intoning, we, in the nineteenth century, are, by the English emissaries of Rome, sought to be carried back to the whole Roman economy.

We ask the impartial of all orders of religionists in the state, with confidence, do not these three points, viz., the mode of celebrating the Lord's Supper; the recognition of priestly ordination from the papistical church; and the alterations in the articles of faith, prove that there are, within the episcopal church as established by law, elements so essentially Romish as to require another extensive change? The question is limited to the one subject of the work—the Lord's Supper; but if other subjects were admissible, the proofs of the necessity for such a revision would be swelled out to a very unexpected extent.

---

\* A.D. 679, and *Johnson's Preface to Theodore's Canons, in 673.*



But, however multiplied such evidences would then appear as to numerical amount ; they would not add to the proofs now adduced respecting the most essential points of legal Christianity.

We have thus brought the whole of this momentous subject before the reader. He has had facts, and not arguments ; elucidations, not censures ; history, not theology ; and we now close by an Appeal to the British churches.

## PART IV.

**Appeal to the British Churches.**


---

“ **THERE** was a decision made in the Third General Council in the case of the Cypriotick Churches, which pretended that they had been always complete within themselves and independent; therefore they stood upon their privilege: not to be subject to appeals to any Particular See: The Council judged in their favour. So since the Britannick Churches were converted long before they had any commerce with *Rome*, they were originally *Independent*; which could not be lost by anything that was afterwards done among the *Saxons* by men sent over from *Rome*.”\*

---

\* Gilbert Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury, Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles (the 37th), page 383. The *italics* are the Bishop's.

## AN APPEAL.

---

THAT the Britannic churches had been perverted by their commerce with Rome: and although in fact, ejected from their ancient episcopacy, had yet not lost the title deeds to their estate,—was the ground upon which Edward VI. endeavoured to dispossess the despoilers. The allegiance which, as an individual and a sovereign, he owed to the King of all kings, urged him to reclaim what “the men sent over from Rome” had thought was entirely and eternally lost to the English nation.

What those efforts were, which he made, have passed under review. At the close of one of the records of his memorable reign, he says—

“Let us, therefore, KNOW OURSELVES; pluck out the faults that are in us, and in their place plant virtues: like unto the husbandmen, that first used to scrubbe and root out the thorns, brambles, and weeds out of their lay-land, and *unlooked* to: and then, each where therein scatter and throw into the womb of the earth good and fruitful seeds, to bring forth good fruit in their due season. Likewise let us DO.”\*

So taught Edward VI. He had no fear of the result: all he deprecated was neglect. He knew, by the facts then before him, that apathy leads to apostacy; and apostacy brings on ruin.

He, however, had to rein in the people of his

---

\* *Liturgies and Documents of Edward VI.*: Parker Society, page 525.

time. They were told "not to enterprize to run afore, and so by rashness become hinderers" of their own desires.\*

We may not be required to attempt precisely what he or they had to accomplish; but we have as much to do; and what is rather discouraging, we have less means at command. It was far easier for them to extinguish fires; open prison houses; raise the shout of defiant expostulation; storm and demolish the strongholds of a revolting persecution; than it is for us to nerve some men up to the point of discovery. They close their eyes; stop their ears; soothe their slumbers; and even threaten to quarrel with those who seek to waken them up to a sense of danger or of duty. Others there are, who are tremblingly alive to both the danger and the duty; and fully prepared "to quit them like men." Armed with the force of a noble and pure patriotism, hallowed by the still more noble principles of enlightened and comprehensive piety, they wait to be assigned their work.

**EPISCOPALIANS.** The "UNLOOKED-TO thorns, brambles, and weeds," are rapidly ripening to their harvest. They would have been rooted out had Edward, your greatest reforming authority, accomplished all he intended. The tallest weed, "whose seed was in itself," he, it is true, cut down: but the root remained in the soil; and so remained as not only to outlive the owner and occupier of the estate; but to grow up and again become the favourite plant with his successors. These have not only neglected to

---

\* *Liturgies and Documents of King Edward VI.* Parker Society: page 2.

“scrubbe” it out; they have housed it; fenced it round with singular protectors, and seem determined never to part with possession; and therefore it is that what they cultivated has now become climatized.

In any work of national moment (and especially that of uprooting a gigantic evil) it behoves every one to “*ponder* the path of his feet, and look well to all his goings.” Caution will inspire decision; and decision will secure progress; and progress issue in triumph.

That you have been despoiled by the men sent over from Rome, is indisputable. That you must recover yourselves, if recovered at all, is equally certain. Especially is this the case with the LAITY. THEY constitute the church. Rome has said that it is a “*clerical* army,”\* but Edward VI. declares it to be composed of “a certain multitude of men, professing the pure and upright learning of Christ:”—“as many as do truly fear, honour, and call upon God.”† As well speak of an army, consisting of commanding officers; as of a church, composed only of priests and deacons. To assert that the church consists of the ministers thereof, is as great a solecism as would be the assertion, that the head servants in a family constituted the household. To admit this, would be evidence of imbecility on the part of the master, and of arrogance on the part of the domestics.

The lay-members of the church have all their interests in it at stake. They, in an especial manner,

---

\* See page 153.

† *Liturgies, &c., of Edward VI.*, page 513 and 511.

have been despoiled of their rights. So long have they been kept out of them, that the very records of their existence have passed away from their observation. But they must be recovered; and, in that recovery, not only will they regain their original position; but by it, be able to remove whatever the men sent over from Rome so fatally engrafted upon the ancient Episcopal Church.

Take one part of those rights: "consultive and conclusive voices,"\* at councils and synods. The facts previously adduced show, that from the year A.D. 740, until A.D. 1222,† these episcopal synods were held; the last-mentioned period being in rather a singular way linked with a law which inculcated the most pernicious and deadly errors. These were to be "explained" at such meetings. Why not, then, revive episcopal synods, in order that scriptural truth and church discipline may be explained, enforced, and maintained? Is the nineteenth century less intelligent than the thirteenth? Or are Protestant, less valuable than Catholic, laymen? or less disposed to share the burden, and participate in the honour of self-governance?

The principal thing here claimed is revival of the right, rather than a close adherence to the ancient mode, of lay administration. The altered state of society renders it absolutely necessary, that the practice should not be allowed to contravene the design. It would hardly be safe, for instance, to allow the Bishop to summon whom he choose, or when he thought fit; or so to direct the proceedings, as to prevent free expression of thought and judgment.

---

\* See page 30.

† See pp. 45 and 138.

These and other minor points could be so regulated as to secure to the church the full benefit of episcopal synods, without converting them into mere instruments of official authority. Better not revive them at all, than restore them under such circumstances.

THE EPISCOPAL PEERS OF THE REALM have a deep interest in this and the main question before us.

It is difficult to conceive any proceeding more thoroughly assimilated to the practices of the primitive episcopal church, than for the Bishop, and a portion of the clergy and of the laity, to meet together for the purpose of carrying out the law of A.D. 785, which said—

“There shall be two councils every year; that the briars and thorns may be cut off from the hearts of all offenders, as spurious branches are by good husbandmen.”\*

Or the still more ancient canon of A.D. 673, which required “that a synod be assembled twice in the year,” that being also a copy of such antecedent laws as bring us very close upon the time of the Apostles themselves. The deduction from these facts is this:—The primitive episcopal church sought to sustain, enlarge, and preserve itself by ACTION, and not exclusively by Sacraments: by CONJOINT action, rather than by class labour; and by conjoint action, systematically carried out by the whole church, rather than by fitful or official duties of ministerial servants. Public worship, even, was not the only duty deemed sacred and beneficial; and it is a singular fact, that that worship itself became corrupt and contami-

---

\* *Johnson's Ecclesiastical Laws, and Szelman, vol i., page 292.*

nating, just in proportion as this grand principle of conjoint action degenerated, and eventually became extinct. But it became extinct by the same means that discipline and action were given up.

The descending steps, down which the people were courteously conducted; served as ascending steps, up by which priests as blandly raised themselves to a commanding position. Convocation of Bishops (divided into the Upper and Lower House) rose out of ancient episcopal synods. And of that Convocation, the national records contain two remarkable incidents in connexion with this question of the altar. One dates as far back as six hundred years, when the Bishops asked the Lords temporal to affirm a principle of marriage, by which children born *before* the solemnization of marriage might be placed upon the same footing as children born *after* such marriage of the same parents.\* On their side they had the imperial law of Rome; the canon law of the church; the then, and now the law of Scotland; and the moral law of God. But the Bishops failed where they ought to have succeeded. The other record dates three hundred years ago, when some of the Bishops carried from the House of Convocation, into the Senate House of the State, a Bill, the provisions of which stand in manifest contradiction to the law of heaven; the dictates of humanity, and the constitutional laws of the ancient episcopal Church, and the constitutional laws of England.† And they succeeded, where they ought to have failed.

---

\* Statute at Morton, the 20th Henry III., A.D. 1235.

† Six Articles Act of Henry VIII., A.D. 1540, page 191.



There is, however, another and still more remarkable record of the proceedings of the episcopal order : not, indeed in Convocation, but in combination with each other. Bishop Poynt prepared, and other Bishops examined, the Short Catechism, which Edward VI. commended, and, by authority royal, had printed and sent forth to the nation at large.\*

We have then, three models, expressive of the character of the same order of men, at three different periods. Each model relates to the Eucharist. The first mentioned related to marriage, which, being by law, at that period, deemed a Sacrament, closely allied the perceptions and habits of the people with the solemnities of the altar. The second record, proves that the altar had continued to exert the most powerful of all influences over the national mind ; and had called to its aid, some of the most malignant dispositions ever embodied in human laws. The third record shows that a strong, fixed, and hallowed determination had been formed to up-root and annihilate the *principles* out of which the two preceding errors had either arisen or been indissolubly allied.

Between this last period and the present time, three hundred and four years have intervened ; between the two others, three hundred and five years had passed away. If therefore, there be any truth in the theory, that the moral world has its cycles, as well as the physical creation ; the period will have arrived when the episcopal order of Bishops should again appear. Were they to do so, with any

---

\* *Liturgies and Documents of Edward VI.*, Parker Society, page 493, A.D. 1553.

of the prominence which attached to their prior appearances, the law of ecclesiastical rotation would be demonstrated ; and we should at once be enabled to determine, whether these luminous bodies retain the orbit of Edward VI., or whether they, too, have among them the aberration of light, by having wandered from the path in which they were expected to move.

**BRITISH CHRISTIANS.** We all admit that the Christian Church is possessed of a Sovereign, as well as a great High Priest. We can as safely dispense with His authority ; as we can, even if we wished, set aside His death. The cross, without the sceptre, is a brilliant shadow. The sceptre, without the cross, is an eternal enigma. The Son of God saves ; and whom he saves, he governs ; in order that he may preserve, and “ present faultless before His throne with exceeding joy.”

His government is coeval with the authority of Jehovah. He hath commended that government to us, by having illustrated, in his own Divine person and character, the love upon which the rule of Jehovah is based ; and by having authoritatively expounded the one great eternal and universal principle, “ Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbour as thyself. Upon these two commands hang all the law and the prophets : ” in other words, this one principle is the compendium of all religion. A more resplendent exhibition of the Divine government never was, and never can be, presented to man. In it we learn that the Creator designed the creature to be happy with Him ; for we cannot love even a human governor if there be the consciousness that he himself scorns our esteem.

We learn, too, that the Creator intended man should be happy with his fellow-man; and, as the consequence of both, happy in himself. Such a law as this, is therefore applicable to all creatures, be they fallen or restored: to all times, whether paradisaical, prophetic, or millenarian: a law which can never be altered, without producing one vast havoc in the moral universe of God: nor abrogated, without unseating the majesty of heaven: nor restricted, without incurring the guilt of charging the Eternal Wisdom with folly, and Omnipotent Power with weakness.

This law, expounded by Christ, is equal to the wants and the woes of a fallen world. Sinful and wretched as it is, it yet has left to it sufficient light to discover in this one law, a plenitude of illimitable benevolence; inexhaustible might, and attractive authority. Fallen as was the Jewish nation, when He appeared, it proved that "the law was good;" for the people not only heard and admired his doctrine; but would have accepted his authority, had it not been for their rulers.

The Church of Christ needs no other law than this. And had the church presented it to the world with the same fulness and purity in which Christ deposited it in his church, the world would long ago have done homage to Christ. He, in giving it, had shown that Jehovah cherished a sympathetic confidence in man; and that Christ required that his church should repose an equally pure, strong, and untiring confidence in Him; in itself; and in the human family at large.

Has it done so? Ask not again, lest her own blush of shame, speak louder than the acknowledgment of the guilt of her accomplices!

Why has it not done so? Because it has been more intent upon its own "inventions," than upon divinely-appointed remedies: more eager to impose, than to obey: more in love with itself, than with God or man: and more careless of the honour of Christ, than careful of its own appearance among men. Short-sighted policy! Purity would have been power: obedience would have brought honour: peace within, would have secured prosperity "without:" and while salvation was being offered to a lost world, a lost world would have hailed a restoring church. But instead of being a restoring, it has itself all along been a transgressing, church: the law of love to God and love to man, it has openly, declaredly, and uniformly violated; nay, it has insulted the Law-giver to his face, by so constructing his table as to defeat his authority.

Is it not so? Look at the history recorded in these pages. Do they not prove that for nine hundred and fifty years,\* the church was almost exclusively occupied in contriving and enforcing its Sacraments: all that while not only accumulating errors, alike false in theory and fatal in practice; but by such errors actually setting aside the law of heaven, by enforcing upon men the belief that these seven sacraments were either essential to, or necessary appendages to the salvation of souls? And when, after having spent all this time in doing homage to its seven, it was compelled to reduce them to two Sacraments; has it not again principally occupied itself in enforcing these two, by imprison-

---

\* That is, from the coming of Augustine, in A.D. 597, until the time of Edward VI., in 1547.

ments, fines, death, proscription, denunciations, sinful divisions; and still more sinful hostilities?

Christianity stands out in bold and eternal distinction from every other system of religion. It has its external framework; but that framework or scaffolding is intended to help, not obstruct, the erection; much less form the foundation, of the Christian church.

Has Christianity thus been aided by Sacramental efficacies? Has it not rather suffered a thousand-fold more by their being retained, than it could have suffered had they been surrendered? The entire body of Sacramentarians, be they who they may, or where they may; are challenged to prove wherein Christianity, taken as a whole, has had the gain. Make them seven Sacraments, or reduce them to two: declare these two "necessary to salvation:" clothe them with all the sacredness invention can suggest: arm them even with authority as positive institutions by Christ: and what then? Why, as positive institutions, they must have had specific purposes, and could establish the fact of their utility, only as those specific purposes have been answered. Will any Sacramentarian dare affirm, that the Lord's Supper (even assuming the words of Christ to have been of "eternal truth," as Edward VI. says they were,) has answered the specific purpose to which it was designed! Rather, will not the facts previously adduced demonstrate that that specific purpose has been contravened; frustrated; and set at naught: nay more, so perverted as to bring about the very things it was designed to destroy? The great and eternal principle in the moral government of God is—that where any positive institution in his church causes other results to accrue to himself or to it, than he

designed; he steps in, and places that institution in abeyance. Look at the Jewish theocracy. Its special purpose was the preservation, enlargement, and perpetuation of His worship among the nations of the earth. He made the Jewish church depositors of that worship, and of His honour, as flowing out of it. But when all Israel contumaciously persisted in betraying and corrupting its trust, Jehovah asserted his original right by dispossessing those who had thus thwarted his intention. Indeed, He had no other alternative; than either to dissolve the theocracy, and so preserve his worship and his government by some other means; or to allow the conspirators against both, undisturbed possession of their power; and so cause an eternal separation between earth and heaven.

But if God spared not the natural branches, we must take heed, lest he spare not those branches which have been grafted in, rather than form the root and fatness of the tree. In other words, obedience to the authority of Christ, is the only security for the preservation of the Christian Church; just as obedience to the law of Jehovah would have secured the continuance of the Jewish Church.

That obedience must be entire. The law of love to God and man in its entire manifestation, must be our standard: the spirit, rather than only the letter: the spirit in its complete form, embodying the whole of the written law, or God's word; and the whole of the unwritten law, embodied and exemplified in God's works. No part of that law must be kept back. As much guilt will be incurred by suppression, as by misrepresentation; and by either or both of these, as by open defiance or visible transgression.

“For the wrath of God is revealed against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men who hold the truth in unrighteousness.”\* “Hold” *καπεχοντων*, keep back; hinder, obstruct: this is ungodliness, *ασεβειαν*, impiety towards God: and unrighteousness, *αδικιαν*, injustice towards man. With this double guilt, “all” men are charged, who so treat “truth” as to hinder its progress; obstruct its power; corrupt its purity; or limit its influence upon their own minds, or the minds of others. No man is responsible for the truth as it may be held by another: but every man is responsible for the *use* or *non-use* he makes of truth for himself; and the use or *non-use* of truth he induces in another. Unhappily, some ecclesiastical authorities, now for “long time past,” have so occupied themselves with suppressing giant truths; and so compressing truths of middle stature; that men of thought in matters of religion, have found themselves compelled to stand aloof from all religious associations, lest they should lose every religious perception, or fail to entertain any truly religious aspiration. Is it not, then, high time that we had this heaven-born law of Christ commended to men in the manner it deserves? View this law in its connexion with the remembrance of his death: and to what does it amount? To this: that the Christian religion is a religion of facts, not of ceremonies: facts supported by evidence; evidence that so expands the mind, as to repel every attempt to cripple its powers; which does not even tolerate any such attempt, simply because, if they are once crippled in religion, they become crippled in everything else. Therefore it is

---

\* Rom. i. 18. *Stuart in loco.*

that Christ's law of love is as readily understood by a child, as it is admired by a philosopher; so understood by the one, as to draw out its mental capabilities, and thus qualify it for all the duties of after-life; and so admired by the other, as to enkindle and yet exceed his researches; clear his perceptions, direct his decisions, and appropriate his very being to the honour of the eternal mind, and the happiness of other and more dependent minds than his own.

The memorial of Christ's death must, therefore, correspond with the design of that death. And as that design was to induce us to love God, and by that, excite us to love all men, the memorial of that stupendous event must harmonize with the event itself. Corrupt, vitiate, pervert, mystify the memorial; and it will imprint upon the memory, register on the will, enstamp upon the soul, an "image:"—not that of God, in which man was at first created; but an image of the evil one, by whom the first resemblance has been defaced.

The originating source of this moral death-process lie coiled up in one thing: submission to human authority in religion. The regenerating spring of the life-restoring process, consists in a return to Divine authority alone.

Hence the law of Christ must be held paramount. In our esteem it must over-ride every other authority come from whencesoever it may; or adorned by what blandishments soever it may. The great difficulty of the age, is to bring men to this one point of obedience; and it is this difficulty which creates the present imminent danger. So it was with pagans of old. It was not until they continuously proved, both by inventions and actions, that they did not



like to **RETAIN** the knowledge of God, that he **allowed** them to grope their way further; and still further, along the darkening avenues which lead down to eternal night.

To the authority of Christ we must voluntarily return (for it is no part of the Divine government to **FORCE** men into the reception of **TRUTH**), or be **carried** back to the practices and principles of the church in those ages, when men were taught to believe that the only stepping-stone between earth and heaven was that of their own altar.

“Faithful men in Jesus Christ!” say: Is not the sole authority of Christ of infinitely higher magnitude than the decrees of erring councils; the opinions of doting Fathers; the dogmas of priests, be they sinister or sincere; the selfishness of partizans; or the repulsive coldness of dead formalists? They will all of them blame (and probably severely blame) any and every effort to bring either them or others, to the “**SIMPLICITY THAT IS IN CHRIST JESUS.**”<sup>\*</sup> But by so much as they resent, by so much must we adhere to that authority.

Devoid of the essential element of simplicity, the professed Church of Christ forfeits its claim to the distinction. It may be an assembly; but not of faithful men: it may possess wealth, and covet more; but it is not the gold tried in the fire; or intrinsic purity of character: it may count numbers; but it will lack power: it may be fierce in contention, as was that evil one who contended for the body of Moses, after the spirit had fled; and think as he did, that out of such a relict it will be able to fashion an

---

\* 1 Cor. xi. 3.

idol of more than ordinary attraction: but the very glitter of its attractions will expose it to the rapacity of men, who never feel so much delight as when they can first demolish, and then appropriate costly shrines: and lastly it may fence in, its favorite idol with all the ingenuity, zeal, and obduracy of idolators; but it will have to answer the demand, "Who will set briars and thorns against *me*? against ME, in battle? I would go through them: I would even burn them together."\* Shall we wait for such a conflagration to throw a lurid glare upon the neglected law of love? Or shall we not rather rush into the still outspread arms of eternal mercy; and accept with the grateful joy of humble penitents the alternative: "Let him take hold of MY strength, and make peace with me?" We have but "to hearken to his commandments; and peace shall flow as a river, and righteousness as the waves of the sea."†

HOW IS ALL THIS TO BE DONE?

1. By associating the light, with the law, of Christ.

If ever law is seen riding forth in the majesty of its strength, in order to be seen to perfection, its reason must be as apparent as its authority. Dissociate the two, and the pathway of despots is easy: broad, and inviting. Herein consists the mighty pre-eminence of divine over human legislation: that it not only is self-possessed of a higher kind of authority, *per se*; but also of a larger amount of influence. It has the purest reason for every requirement; and in the requirement supplies the reason. Trace the motive of the lawgiver; and obedience is delight. Nor is there other obedience

---

\* Isaiah xxvii. 4.

† *Ibid*, xlvi. 18.

than this. The service of Christ is perfect freedom ; whether performed by us as individuals in the closet : in the family ; and in the world : or by us as parts of the congregation of faithful adherents to his banner ; or still more careful imitators of his character. In each act : in every circle : at all times : the *light of life* must appear. " In that light we shall see light." But in order to this, we must not resemble men confined in a prison ; that prison located in a valley : that valley environed with mists, and all those mists deceptive and distorting. Rather let us emerge from the prison, even though it be formed like unto a palace : let us away off to the mountain-top, or the table land of truth : let us clear our visual organs : enlarge the range of observation : and remove the smallest misleading media of perception : fix upon the beauties at our feet ; round about us, and above our heads : dispense with all the pieces of differently tinted coloured glass through which we have been accustomed to contemplate objects, which however beautiful in themselves, have yet had thrown upon them a shading that has changed their aspect. Then, with a clear atmosphere ; and rays of light ; full, free, untinted, and constant ; we shall discover the great orb itself. The light of that sun will prove to us sevenfold, as the light of seven days ; or converging into " the day when the Lord bindeth up the breach of his people and healeth the stroke of their wound."\*

The patient must, however, submit to the regimen prescribed by the physician : or death may so occur, as to leave the stain of suicide upon his character. Such submission is always accompanied with effort.

---

\* Isaiah xxx. 26.

Health can only be restored by co-operative exertion between him that is to be cured ; and him who is to work out the cure. Hence the restoration of the church must be brought about,

2. By exertion : corresponding to illumination.

That some effort must be made to recover Christianity, is most anxiously admitted by those, who know most of its present legal position. Such persons have the strongest inducements to look at the facts previously adduced. Those facts must not be evaded, concealed, or denied. The longer any or either of these dispositions are evinced ; the greater will be the difficulties thrown in the way of a full and complete recovery of true Christianity in England : and through its agency, of its enlarged progress and life-inspiring power throughout the world.

The facts produced show what Christianity has been ; and now is ; as respects its relation to authority apart from that of Christ : its Founder, Patron, and Lawgiver. These facts spread over a period of nearly twelve hundred years ; and divide themselves into a threefold order of development.

The first order was the mythological philosophy. To support this, ecclesiastics taught that religion is an act, rather than a life ; an act performed by another for you : rather than a life, sustained, invigorated, enjoyed, developed by yourself : the act so performed by another, being declared by those who performed it ; and believed by those for whom it was performed ; an inexplicable mystery. This order began in A.D. 740-7, and ran on till A.D. 1547. During the whole of this lengthened period, the moral problem was being, or attempted to be, solved by the aids law could supply : those penal sanctions inducing results which

proved crushing loads of apostacy, superstition, **vice**, and moral prostration : impiety towards God, inducing injustice among men ; and every act of injustice, accumulating and accelerating national calamity.

The second order of development was the scriptural philosophy : and was designed not only to negative the first, but to substitute the simple, safe, and effective principle, contained in this prayer, " Lord, we beseech thee to keep **THY HOUSEHOLD**, the church, in continual godliness"\*—the " household " constituting the mansion, to which the " church " was an appendage. Character, therefore, is to stand higher than combination. Six years, and scarcely the half of another, was all that this scriptural principle enjoyed under the sanction of law.

The third order of manifestation is the recessional philosophy. By this not only has law respectfully bowed the second order out of court ; but covertly aims to carry men back to the first order of moral philosophy. It has now had the run of three hundred years and more : and is brought down to this one point—whether the Lord's Supper still retains " the real presence : " or as a simple " remembrance," has an entire absence of everything like mysterious efficacy.

With this last order we are now compelled to deal. From it, we may so far learn as to supply ourselves with a *mode* of action. It is suggested by the course adopted by Mary. She set the Reformation wholly aside : as being included in " the schism against the see apostolick, the which is to be understood since the twentieth year of the reign of Henry VIII."†

---

\* *Liturgies &c., of Edward VI.*, p. 450. See also pp. 3–8 of this work.

† 1 & 2 Philip and Mary, chap. viii., the last clause of section 2.

That she meant to repudiate her brother, as much if not more, than her father is evident: for "the schism" consisted in "much false and erroneous *doctrine* taught, preached and written, by reason whereof the nation has swerved from the unity of Christ's church." A charge which could not apply to Henry: for he declared by law that the nation did not intend to "*vary* from the Catholic church."\*

One fact in relation to this charge brought by Mary against Edward, and ratified by parliament; must not be overlooked. It is this: the charge has never by law been withdrawn against the Reformation: statute law has silently condemned the reforming monarch; and statute law must withdraw the charge, ere the stain upon our national legislation can be wiped away. It is true that Elizabeth, so far repudiated the acts of Mary as to declare, that her repeal of their brother Edward's two Acts of Uniformity, had led "to the great decay of the due honour of God and discomfort to the professors of the truth of Christ's religion."† But as to the "schism," of which Edward was by Mary charged and chargeable; not one word does Elizabeth use, disapproving of her sister's condemnatory statute.

Might we not, then, fix upon his reign as our returning centre-point; just as Mary fixed upon the twentieth of Henry, as her retreating stand-point? Taking it as the base of operations, everything else would fall into its proper place and course of operation.

---

\* See page 193.

† 1st of Elizabeth, chap. ii.

Three things will follow : or rather accompany this plan of action.

THE ABOLITION OF CANON LAW.

“Timorously and ignorantly” have we accepted it, Henry told his subjects.\* Boldly let us at once and for ever explode it. Is “Christ to reign among his saints?” He is so to reign, says Edward VI., “according to God’s promises : and not after the traditions and laws of men.”† For if these be the *only* exponents of Christianity, the world is justified in rejecting it. But happily for the world, it distinguishes between the founder ; and these expositors of the Christian religion. Why then should canon law continue to corrupt, and impede it among Protestants?

THE EXTINCTION OF PENAL CHRISTIANITY.

As the new site of the city of our God, make its walls salvation and its gates praise. Convert no part of its precincts into ramparts ; nor any portion of its materials into an arsenal : allow not any of the citizens to train themselves into belligerents against each other. Engrave upon its principal portal the inscription, commended by authority royal : “Judge the same in the person of thy neighbour” [be he orthodox or heterodox] “as thou feelest in thyself ; and thou shalt perceive that thou dost no less wrongfully in hurting another, than other do in hurting thee.”‡

The ABROGATION of *whatever human law may have*

\* 28th Henry VIII., cap. xvi., section 1.

† *Liturgies and Documents of Edward VI.* (Parker Society) p. 520, the ninth line from the bottom of the page.

‡ *Liturgies and Documents of Edward VI.* (Parker Society) p. 524. the seventh line from the bottom of the page.

*engrafted upon the Lord's Supper*, CONTRARY TO THE WORD OF GOD. Are there not in the present articles many such things? Let us conform them, to those of Edward VI., so far as he aimed to conform them to the Scriptures. Are there not other things in the liturgy? Let us expugn them. Are there not still worse things in the catechism? Let us purge them away: and instead of them all, let us incorporate into the whole communion "such PURENESS and SIMPLICITY as the Apostles of Christ USED, and left behind IN WRITING, in all those points which are commonly called sacraments."\*

THUS TO RESTORE THE CHURCH, WILL BE TO EMANCI-PATE CHRISTENDOM.

Thine, O Lord, is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory. "By so saying, we *teach ourselves* that beside Him none glisteneth with so shining glory, none hath dominion so large, or force so great, as to be able to stay him from giving that he hath appointed according to his pleasure, or to take away that he hath already given us. And there is *no evil of ours* so great, that he may not put away by his exceeding great power, glory, and wisdom."†

---

\* *Liturgies and Documents of Edward VI.* (Parker Society) p. 513, the sixteenth line from the bottom of the page.

† *Liturgies and Documents of Edward VI.* (Parker Society) p. 523, the twenty-fifth line from the bottom of the page.





## APPENDIX OF NOTES.

---

NOTE	PAGE
AAA Superintendents; or, the Episcopate . . . . .	305
AA Baptism . . . . .	309
A Paganism and Judaism . . . . .	324
B The Roman Model; or, Judicial Decrees . . . . .	225
C Sacramental Oaths and Land . . . . .	329
D "Eating the flesh of the Son of God" (John vi. 53) . . . . .	333
E Adrian (Pope) . . . . .	335
F Apostolical Faith . . . . .	336
G Not fearing to die for it . . . . .	337
H Householders . . . . .	339
M The containing species of the Reserved Bread . . . . .	346
N The Eucharist: Easter and Christian Burial . . . . .	342
O John of Beverley . . . . .	345
W The Altar and the Grave . . . . .	349



## APPENDIX.

---

### “SUPERINTENDENTS;” OR, THE EPISCOPATE.

*Note AAA., referred to in Note in the Explanation of Chart, under “Augustine.”*

“*Superintendents.*”—The re-use of this word by Otho, in 1237, after having been downcast six hundred and forty years, is an historic fact replete with interest. Some special occasion must have called it forth. He used it as a taunt: and designed by it to reprove what he and the Pope regarded unjustifiable assumption on the part of the English episcopate. It had been the one great repelling word when Dinoth uttered the determination, of himself and compeers; not to submit to Rome. And therefore, in order to ascertain what this one word conveyed, we must look to the times when it was first and afterwards employed.

We have to confine ourselves, in the outset of this inquiry, to the institutions, out of which it first arose: that is, the civil institutions, which gave a character to ecclesiastical phraseology. As an ecclesiastical term, it conveyed the idea of one priest being raised by other priests to a commanding position among them. Hence, in the Anglo Saxon times it was said, “the bishop *in the Church*, shall sit elevated above the bench of priests, but *in the House* let him know himself to be the colleague of priests.” He could not, therefore, of his own accord “send priests hither and thither without distinction”—A.D. 740. So the Pope had himself decreed in A.D. 679, when he used the words “bishops, or faithful priests,” as interchangeable terms. The “House” was the *civil* designation, originally applied to the bishop’s see; which, as a missionary station, was planted in those localities where

churches were most required, rather than in those where they most abounded. At these the priests lived in common; and from them were sent to evangelize the district. Mass priests were therefore to be "very diligent in the instruction of the people," and every one was to "certify in synod what fruit he had produced in his district"—A.D. 994.

"The House" formed the secular establishment of the church. "Let not the bishop," says Ecbricht, "concern himself with the family affairs of his single church"—A.D. 740. The designation given to "the house or family" was the Friburgh. Under this title it formed a part of the *legal condition* of the English nation, which, in A.D. 926, Ethelstan divided into "the Earl and the Churl; the Thane and the sub-Thane." From the one they could ascend to the other rank. Thus: if the churl so "thrived as to have five hides of his own land, a church, a bell tower, a seat, and an office" in the king's court, he was esteemed equal in honour to a Thane. And "if the Thane so improved as that he ministered to the king, he was esteemed equal to the earl." Among other classes to whom these incentives to skill, industry, and position were offered; one was, "the scholar; who, if he made such proficiency in learning, as that he obtained orders, and ministered to Christ, he was thought worthy of the honour of a Thane." In this customary law, lies the inducing cause of the ancient connexion between nobility and the episcopate. "The house," or friburgh; consisted in general of ten families, who were securities for each other's good behaviour. They eat and drank together. No one was allowed to be absent without lawful cause. The chief among them was the "tithing man;" and was called borsholder, who was security for the whole ten families. The bishop was security for *his* friburgh; and therefore had "satisfaction" of one hundred and twenty shillings "if men fought before the archbishop, or another bishop." He also had his own court, in which he heard the causes, and punished criminals.\* So far, his "court" possessed civil jurisdiction. But every thing

---

\* Alfred's law, A.D. 877.

purely ecclesiastical, was regulated in a court, anciently known as the "Forum Domesticum."

In these customs we have the foundation of the following law :

"Let archbishops, bishops, earls, barons, and all that have *sac* and *soc*, toll, team, and infang-thef, have their knights and proper servants, viz., stewards of their *household*, chamberlains, butlers, cooks, and bakers, under their *own friburgh*; and if a complaint of the neighbourhood rise against them, they should oblige them to what is right in their own court"—(A.D. 1064).

The constitution of "their own court" may be gathered from the meaning of the old words used to define their powers. *Sac*, was the forfeiture paid by the plaintiff, failing to prove; or the defendant failing to rebut a complaint: *soc*, was the right to search for anything on one's own land; as also the right to search for stolen goods on the lands of another. *Toll*, was money a man paid for liberty to buy and sell on another man's land. *Team*, was the right to challenge a third party if goods were stolen. *Infang-thef*, was the right to try one's own man as a thief, apprehended on one's own land.

These were very ancient rights, and pertained to the barons, and to the archbishops and bishops. Hence the following law, or claim of the church :

"Archbishops and bishops, who hold of the king *in capite*, are to look on their estates as baronies, and on that account to be responsible to our justices and officers; and ought, as other barons, to be present at judicial proceedings in the King's Court, till they come to deprivation of life or member."<sup>\*</sup>

The statute afterwards admitted this claim. Archbishops and bishops are said "to hold a whole barony."<sup>†</sup> And again, they were said to be "peers of the land."<sup>‡</sup>

It was therefore a bold attack for Otho, in A.D. 1237, to tell "Edmund of Canterbury and Walter of York, as also the other bishops of England" that "the name BISHOP (that

\* *Articles of Clarendon*, A.D. 1164. *Spelman*, vol. ii., p. 63.

† A.D. 1235, 13 Edward I., cap. 42.

‡ A.D. 1350, 25 Edward III., cap. 6.

is, superintendent) clearly expresses what is required of the venerable fathers the archbishops and bishops, to be done in virtue of their office ;” seeing that seventy-three years before they had been acknowledged by their own sovereign to rank as “barons holding *in capite*.” Well might Edmund resent the decrees of such an “ecclesiastical reformer,” (for so he described himself,) which were designed not only to reduce them to the rank of superintendents ; but to the toil of men who were “to watch over their flocks by *night*.” Why by night? Because it was the office of some priestly drudges to “ring and sing the hours ;” that is, the midnight as well as the mid-day hours. And still more contemptuously did he treat them, by requiring that “for the better performance of all this” they were “to cause the profession which they made at their consecration to be read to them twice a-year” (Advent and Lent). So that those “superintendents” were themselves to be superintended.

If the reader compare the two periods (A.D. 597 and A.D. 1237) in which this one word was used as a generic term, he will obtain evidence of the fact ; that words shall at one time serve a very different purpose than they did at another. Had Dinorth been present at the convocation in St. Paul’s, he would have stood astonished to hear the word “superintendent” thrown against him as a term of reproach ; when he himself had used it as a term expressive of vigilance on the part of one, rather than of obedience on the part of many. During his slumbers in the grave, another, and another, race of bishops had risen up in the church ; each succeeding race more eager than the preceding to finish what the other had not fully completed ; until at length an order of men having gained the pinnacle of their ambition, signalized their triumph by a shout of derisive exultation. For the taunt of this cardinal, direct from Rome, amounts to a tacit denial of the order of succession of the English bishops. “Ye come,” as though he had said, “from your own parent stock of bishops ; a stock which we at Rome have been obliged occasionally to replenish, and thus preserve it from extinction ; but for *us*, the line of succession would have been for ever cut off ; yet, two races have now been long intermixed, it may

be prudent to go no further at present than give you one gentle intimation, that we may hereafter find occasion to bring your episcopate back to mere superintendence ; and so confine you to your old term of office."

---

## BAPTISM.

[*Note A.A., referred to in Explanation of Chart, A.D. 429.*]

"The Sacrament of Baptism." It will not escape the notice of the reader that Cuthbert, in his exaltation of the mission and labours of Augustine, confines himself to three things. "Faith, Baptism, and the heavenly country." These were the principal things. He says nothing about the Eucharist : neither had Augustine referred to it in his conferences with the British Bishops. Their mode of celebrating the Lord's Supper was, probably, one among "the many things they did contrary to the custom of Rome," which he was willing to waive for the then present, if they would but have conformed upon the matter of Baptism. To this Augustine, Cuthbert, and all their successors gave a prominent position in those religious ceremonies they either originated or maintained.

The laws relative to Baptism are in some respects more remarkable than those relating to the Lord's Supper. As laws, they from their very commencement partook of and abruptly announced a penal character : whereas, those relating to the Eucharist, were more of an authoritatively persuasive order at first ; and it was not until they had failed to persuade, that they assumed the offensively penal form. The malignant cruelty which attached to the laws about the real presence, never pertained to those which enforced Baptism : and that for the simple reason :—that Rome could not so visibly engraft the rite of Baptism upon her favourite and



cardinal object of ambition: viz., the consolidation of a Christian theocracy, as she managed to inwork upon her Eucharistic institutions. The altar stood higher than the font: and therefore was a more influential object, both of authority and incorporation. But though her laws about the water were not so fierce as those about the bread; they were equally savage; and that, centuries before even the shadow of coercion appeared about a morsel of bread.

The **FIRST PENAL LAW UPON RELIGION EVER KNOWN IN THESE ISLES RELATED TO BAPTISM.** It is contained in the ecclesiastical code of Inæ, the West Saxon monarch; in whose kingdom Christianity had been introduced about sixty years, when the following law was made by his whole parliament. It was made

In A.D. 693. "Let a child be baptized within thirty nights. If it be otherwise, let the father make satisfaction with thirty shillings. If it then die, without Baptism, let him make satisfaction *with all that he hath*"—[i.e., the forfeiture of lands, goods, or chattels, for neglecting to Baptize, preceded confiscation for heresy seven hundred and fifteen years.]

This outrageous enactment remained in full force; and was confirmed by Alfred the Great one hundred and eighty-four years afterwards. It was even enlarged by this renowned monarch enacting, that "if the mass priest neglected to fetch the chrism, or refuse to baptise in case of necessity, let him pay a mulct among the English and a fine among the Danes of twelve ore." This was in A.D. 877.

The kingdom of Northumbria adopted laws strongly assimilated to those of the West Saxons.

In A.D. 740, Ecbrecht, Archbishop of York, decreed that "the priest shall not neglect to Baptize the infirm; or if he be so drunk that he cannot do it, let him desist from his ministrations. If he neglected to come when asked, let him be chastised by the doom [law or judgment] of the Bishop for the damnation of a soul. Let the parent, whose child is dead without Baptism, through his neglect, do penance one year; and never live without penance."—[The parent was "to baptize with water, simply blessed, in the name of the Lord, by immersing, or pouring water upon them in the name of the Father," &c.]

By this time, three kingdoms [Kent, Wessex, and Northumbria] had embraced the views of Augustine and his coadjutors and successors, imported in full-blown splendour from Rome; and thus paved the way for Cuthbert to bring the whole nation under the same government. He, therefore, in a National Council, held

In A.D. 747, enacted, that "All priests perform every sacerdotal ministry everywhere in the same way or fashion, in baptizing, teaching, and judging [or administrative government], and which is the principal point, that their sentiments concerning the Belief of the Trinity be right and sincere; and that they propose the Creed to infants, and to them who undertake for them in Baptism, and teach them the renunciation of diabolical pomps, and auguries and divinations, and afterwards teach them to make the established professions."

It was easier for Cuthbert to prescribe than to secure "the same way and fashion in baptizing." For another National Council, held

In A.D. 816, required that "The priests be taught, when they minister Baptism, not to pour [as they had been accustomed to do] water on the heads of infants; but that they be immersed in the font, as the Son of God hath, in his own person, given an example to all the faithful when he was thrice immersed in Jordan. In this manner it ought to be observed."

And the priests exclaimed, "We will do nothing of the kind. All the faithful follow the example of Christ?" Why, though Christ was baptized in Jordan, you cannot prove it was by being immersed thrice—nor can you prove it was "as an example to *all* the faithful." If "an example," it was "given" only to priests; for Christ "fulfilled all righteousness," *i.e.*, submitted to the Jewish law, which required priests, at their inauguration into office, "to be baptized." Then do you refuse thus to immerse thrice? "We do," they replied. Conflicts ensued, and for a lengthened period prevailed: until, at last, canon law again stepped forth; and

In A.D. 950, said, "If a priest *refuse* to fetch the chrism at the proper season, let him make satisfaction with twelve ore; and especially let him diligently compound it with God."

“Let every child be baptized in good time, within nine nights under the penalty of six ore; and if the child die a heathen within nine nights, let satisfaction be made in respect to God, without any worldly mulct: if it happen to die after nine nights, let satisfaction be made in respect to God; and let twelve ore be paid for the contumacy because he was a heathen so long.”

The chrism was a composition of oil and balsam, consecrated by the Bishop during Passion week, and by him distributed to the clergy. According to Elfric, in A.D. 957, the priest was to “have oil hallowed distinctly for children.” But “let no oil be put into the font except a child be there baptized.”

If the reader turn to the Eucharistic consecration, or blessing, mentioned in page 84, he will find that in this last mentioned year that Elfric spoke authoritatively about the “change” of the bread and wine; a change said to be brought about by the ministrations of the priest. Consecration of the water of baptism by means of the chrism; and consecration of the element of bread by means of sacerdotal offices; appear therefore, to have run in parallel lines. And what is still more remarkable is this: just as these two subjects were thus by priests placed under priestly influence and control; so, at the same time; the people, by an adroit crowning act of spoliation, were deprived of their conjoint administration of the affairs of their church.\*

Many canons were subsequently made about “not selling the chrism,” and other prohibitions respecting Baptism, so far as enforcing the performance upon priests and parents. With these the reader need not be troubled, further than to state that the priests in those ages had frequently to undertake long journeys to the Bishop’s church for this sacred oil. Much expense was incurred, and time occupied, and fatigue endured. The oil that was to hallow the water; and the water that was to cleanse from sin, were too holy to be purchased with money. To this day, therefore, Baptism and all other sacerdotal rites are, by *canon* law, to be given freely.

---

\* See page 74 to 79.

*Fees* are only recoverable in the Civil, and not in the Ecclesiastical Courts, as customary payments. These are demands which priests may make under the sanction of the common law of the land, rather than under the common law of the church.

In A.D. 960, Edgar thought to "extinguish heathenism," by enjoining (among other things) "that every priest give Baptism as soon as it is desired;" that "every Christian man diligently win his child to Christianity, and teach him *Paternoster et Credo*; and that he who refuseth to learn that is not a good Christian, and cannot of right undertake for others at Baptism, nor lie in holy ground."

If the parent did not "win" the child to Christianity by having it baptized; the innocent was itself also excluded Christian burial.\*

The most remarkable; and, it may be added, the most revolting part of the subject of Baptism, consisted in the almost incredible fact; that though the parent was bound to baptize his child in order "to snatch a soul from the devil," yet that

\* Nearly nine hundred years have rolled away, since this law came into existence. And such have been the advances made in and by Christianity, that it is still the law of the church and of the land. "The order for the burial of the dead," now used, contains, as its first directing paragraph, these words: "Here it is to be noted that the office ensuing is not to be used for any that die unbaptized or excommunicate." *Who* are the "excommunicate?" Those who, by the canons of A.D. 963, are denied "Christian burial to him that relinquisheth his wife or taketh another; or that hath a wife and concubine; or that seduces another man's domestic from him for carnal purposes with his gins." This canon is not dead any more than the Prayer Book; and therefore the denunciation contained in it against those "that die unbaptized," whether children or adults, is an *ex parte* statement. It is even more than this: for it may be said to make the unbaptized the only objects of its exclusion from Christian burial: whereas, in the tenth century, those indignities the church had the power to offer, were hurled as well against the non-baptized as the grossly immoral. The plea urged in extenuation of this non-recital respecting the immoral being denied Christian burial, is, that prior to such exclusion from the offices of the church, they must have been pronounced "excommunicate" by process; and a judicial sentence of law. Then why not have enumerated the crimes, in order to lessen the number of criminals?

the moment he thus saved his child, he became canonically divorced from his wife! Here is the law, which contains the evidence that such had been the case, antecedently to the relief which the canon gives. This relieving canon passed

In A.D. 1200, and says, "When the priest cannot, or will not, baptize, and yet death threatens the child or sick man," it shall devolve upon the "layman to baptize a child in case of necessity (*and even a father or mother may do it without IMPEACHMENT OF MATRIMONY*); let all that follows after the immersion be performed by the priest."

How had matrimony thus become "impeached!" By the act of baptizing. That brought the parent into a "*spiritual relation*" to his child; and marriages between parties so circumstanced, were null and voidable. Hence this very same canon said,—

"Let not a man contract [marriage] with a relation, such as a godson with the daughter of the baptizer, or the godfather, whether born before or after."

This was itself a repetition of the then old laws about the "spiritual relation," some of them dated several centuries back at the time now mentioned, *i.e.*, 1200.

Can we conceive a greater violation of all the dictates of humanity, than an "impeachment of matrimony" from such a cause? Conceive of an anxious father or mother, watching over a child lying at the point of death, saying, as they might, "If I do *not* baptize thee, my own darling, first-born son, thy soul will be lost! and if I *do* baptize thee, thy mother and I must for ever separate; or be doomed to suffer the penalties and disgrace of incestuous persons!"

The enormity of this criminal law of ecclesiastics, can scarcely be equalled. It was proved too bad for enforcement. Human nature resisted its authority, and hurled defiance at its impiety. The outrage it committed against the sacred laws of marriage, and all the endearments and obligations of domestic life, can scarcely in the present day be conceived. Had it stood alone, it would have been enough to pollute every household. But there were other laws, the effect of

which run in the same channel. For instance, foundlings were more numerous than legitimates. They were left at church doors: a little salt was put upon the bosom, or in the basket. What shall we do with them? the priests asked. And this law which gave relief about the "impeachment of matrimony," answered, "Let foundlings be baptized, whether laid with salt or without."

Is there, then, any inherent virtue in Baptism? inquired the people. Listen, ye doubters, replied Archbishop Langton. He said,

In A.D. 1223, "Baptism shall be celebrated with great reverence and caution, and in the prescribed form of words, *wherein the whole virtue of Baptism consists*, and likewise the salvation of the children, that is, I baptize thee, &c. And in honour of Baptism, let the water with which the Baptism was performed [*i.e.*, privately by laymen] be thrown into the fire, or be carried to the church to be put into the font." "We charge that the fonts in which children are baptized, be of stone, or, however, whole and decent, that they may occasion contempt or aversion in none, but be held in veneration by all."

The fonts were not, however, deemed sacred. If they were to be "of stone, or however decent," some of the people, at least, treated them with "contempt." For it was decreed by Edmund,

In A.D. 1236, that "Baptismal fonts be kept under lock and key, for fear of sorcery" [which, Lyndwood says, "had better be concealed than explained;" and therefore concealed it shall remain]. "The water shall not be kept in the baptistery above seven days; the vessel in which Baptism was performed by laymen at home, shall be burnt, or deputed to the use of the church; and the water thrown into the fire, or poured into the baptistery."—But as malcontents among the priests still prevailed, the canon further says, "when the priest is not able, or not present, or *stupidly unwilling* to baptize, and death is imminent, the deacon may perform it; but if by a layman, what goes before the immersion, and what follows after, must be fully supplied by the priest."

The church set apart special seasons for the celebration of this rite. People were not satisfied with this arrangement. The inquietude induced among them, on this account, called

for a special remedy. Cardinal Otto, or Otho, Legate à Latere of Pope Gregory IX., supplied, therefore, a Legatin Constitution,

In A.D. 1237, when it was decreed that, "the two Sabbaths, viz., before the resurrection of the Lord, and Pentecost, are by the holy canons appointed for the solemn celebration of Baptism on a *mysterious account*"—[that is, the mystery as to Easter, consisted in the *form* of Baptism, representing the death and resurrection of Christ, administered by the immersion of the child and its being lifted up out of the waters; which notion was itself a mystification of the words of Paul (Col. ii. 12), "buried with him in baptism." The mystery respecting Pentecost, consisted in the assumption by the church, that it was a second Easter.]—The Legate goes on to say, "Yet some in these parts, as we have heard, being imposed upon by a diabolical fraud, suspect danger if children be baptized on these days: which fears are inconsistent with faith; and it is demonstrated to be false, because the chief pontiff does personally solemnize this mystery on the days before named."

Still difficulties prevailed. The people had not the mystery sufficiently explained. Another Legate, Othobon [who was an Englishman, and had been Archbishop of Canterbury], therefore takes up the subject; and in the Cathedral Church of St. Paul, London, on the 9th of May, declared,

In A.D. 1268, "Baptism is known to be the first plank which brings those that sail through this dangerous world to the port of salvation, which our Saviour instituted as a gate to the other Sacraments. Since then an error in our entrance by the gate, is most dangerous, the Legate aforesaid [desired] to recall some from their execrable idolatry who suspected danger to their children if they were baptized on the days assigned for the solemn celebration of Baptism."

An explaining canon was, however, required; and it was, soon after Othobon's departure, supplied by Friar John, Archbishop of Canterbury. He said,

In A.D. 1279, "We think fit to explain what is provided in this present constitution concerning reserving children to be baptized till the general Baptization at Easter and Pentecost, out of regard to that statute [Otho and Othobon's] which seems to

have been hitherto neglected. Let children, born within eight days, receive Catechism [or inquiries made for the children of their sponsors] between the time of their birth and their being thus perfectly baptized, and that nothing but the immersion remain to be performed on the day of Baptism."

Half baptisms were then common, and tended to perplex and mystify the Baptism itself, which was to be performed on two special occasions, "on a mysterious account."

This notable friar, therefore, found plenty of work prepared for his "curing our evils." Nor did he "fear the teeth of detraction: for though the most perfect laws of God have certain limits, yet necessity will allow no bounds to be set to human laws: therefore, both Testaments teach the contempt of law and canons to be monstrously criminal." Admirable logician! Profound theologian! God's laws have limits: *therefore*, human laws have "no bounds!" Hear him, however, upon this subject of baptism. He

In A.D. 1281, states, "We find some have transgressed as to the sacrament of baptism. Let the exorcisms and catechisms be used over children baptized, in reverence to the ordinances of the church. But the form of the sacrament in the vulgar tongue consists not only in the signs, but in the series of the words in which it was instituted by God, inasmuch as Christ the Lord hath conferred a regenerative power to those words, so ranged as they are in the Latin tongue." "Let then the baptizer say thus: '*In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, Amen.*'" \* "Let priests take care that names which carry a lascivious sound, be not given to children at their baptism, especially to those of the female sex. If they be, let them be altered by the bishop at confirmation."

The "exorcisms" referred to by the archbishop were of ancient date. So far back as A.D. 740, the exorcist was a distinct order among the seven orders of the church. The English church then adopted a canon of Carthage, which required that "exorcists lay hands on the possesst every day."

It was thought to be one, among other proofs, of apostolical succession. Edward VI. in his *first* book of Common Prayer (*i.e.*, in 1549) has the words which the priest, prior to taking

---

\* So Spelman has it, vol. ii., p. 320.



the child into his arms at the font, was required to use. These words are—

“I command thee, unclean spirit, in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, that thou come out and depart from these infants : Remember, thou cursed spirit, thy sentence : remember the day to be at hand, wherein thou shalt burn in fire everlasting. And presume not hereafter to exercise any tyranny toward these infants whom Christ hath bought with his precious blood.” After this and other acts it was required that “the priest shall take the child in his arms : and naming the child, shall dip it in the water thrice : first, dipping the right side : second, the left side : the third time dipping the face toward the font, so that it be discreetly and warily done, saying, ‘I baptize thee,’ &c. And if the child be weak, it shall suffice to pour water upon it, saying the foresaid words.”

The Second Book of Prayer in 1552 did not retain the exorcism. But by the 72nd canon, adopted by Convocation in A.D. 1603, and now the authority of the church, this power of expelling unclean spirits is placed in abeyance. No authority, inferior to that of the bishop, signified under his hand and seal, can “attempt, under any pretence whatever, either of possession or obsession, to cast out any devil or devils.” A marked distinction is, however, to be drawn between the exorcisms of 740, and those of 1603. The former were performed by a special officer, appointed specifically for this purpose ; and therefore may be presumed to know, how most effectually to work out this cure. Those of 1281 were performed by the priest *at* and *by* the anticipated baptism. But the exorcism of 1603 gives the interesting occupation to “the minister,” who, if he succeed at all, must gain his victory over the “devil or devils” only by “fasting and prayer.” Has not then a mighty stride been obtained against all and every kind of demoniacal possession ?

In A.D. 1322, Archbishop Reynolds required that “children [having been baptized] on the third day after confirmation be carried to the church, that their foreheads may be washed in the baptistery [which stood hard by the font, and had supplied to it water for this exclusive purpose] by the priest’s hand, in honour to the chrism, and at the same time let the fillets be there burned.”—These fillets were to bind the forehead and dry up the chrism.”

In A.D. 1363, Archbishop Thorsby defined "the greater crimes which we reserve to ourselves to absolve." Among the thirty-seven crimes enumerated, one is, "When any one adheres to heretics to the subversion of the faith, and in contempt of the church causes himself to be baptized or ordained by them."\*

After this period, the church had more onerous duties to perform. Schismatic baptisms multiplied: and as they increased, ecclesiastics became infuriated. The zeal formerly evinced in exacting the baptism of children was now turned into another channel: that of burning heretics. Edward VI. put an end to their persecution, but still retained a large portion of their ancient practices about baptism. We have already quoted his instructions about the exorcism: let us now trace his laws about baptizing. In his time, the very font itself was to be sanctified. His first Book of Common Prayer, therefore—

In A.D. 1549, required the "water in the font to be changed every month at least, and *afore* any child be baptized in the water so changed, the priest shall say at the font these prayers following: 'O most merciful God, our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hast ordained the element of water for the regeneration of thy faithful people; upon whom, being baptized in the river of Jordan, the Holy Ghost came down in likeness of a dove: Send down, we beseech thee, *the same* thy Holy Spirit to assist us: and to be present at this our invocation of thy holy name: Sanctify † *this fountain of Baptism*, thou that art the Sanctifier of all things, that by the power of thy word, all those that shall be baptized therein may be spiritually regenerated, and made the children of everlasting adoption.'" The minister was also to "put the white vesture, commonly called the chrisam, upon the child, saying, 'Take this white vesture for a token of the innocency which, by God's grace in this holy sacrament of Baptism, is given unto thee.'"†

The white garment put on at, and worn during seven days after Baptism was a very ancient custom. As far back as A.D. 689, Cædwalla, King of the West Saxons (and whom Inæ succeeded on the throne) went to Rome, and was baptized by the Pope Sergius, "on the holy Saturday before

---

\* The foregoing canons are taken from *Johnson's Ecclesiastical Laws*.

† *Liturgies, &c., of Edward VI.*, Parker Society, p. 116.

Easter, and being still in his white garments, he fell sick, and departed this life on the 20th of April." The epitaph written on his tomb by the pope's command, among other laudations contains this praise.

" And following Peter's rule, he from his Lord  
Assumed the name [of Peter] at Sergius' word,  
At the pure font, and by Christ's grace made clean,  
In heaven is free from former taints of sin." \*

In the Second Book of Edward VI., "the white vesture" ceremonial was dropped. And thus the church was silently freed from a custom, ancient in date, and anti-Christian in effect.

Had there been a similar sweeping away of error as to other and more important principles, the results would by this time have proved highly beneficial. But we find that, not only did Mary revive the old laws of persecution, and the still older customs pertaining to the Baptismal rite; but that Elizabeth gathered up the expiring embers of the once-blazing piles where martyrs suffered. Elizabeth,

In A.D. 1563, threatened a suit in the Ecclesiastical Courts, with a view to authorize the Civil Courts to issue a writ of imprisonment against every person who shall "refuse to have his or their child baptized according to the customs of the Church of England." †

This penalty may not appear so terrific as that of Inse, in A.D. 698, which threatened the confiscation of "all that he hath," upon the negligent parent: but the principle is as vicious. It forms part of the old Saxon laws of compulsory Baptism; and goes far to sharpen the edge of that punitive enactment which immediately follows the above sentence, by which similar penalties are incurred by those who do not partake of the Lord's Supper.

---

\* *Bede*, lib. v., cap. 7.

† 5th Elizabeth, c. xxiii., sec. 13.—This Act was designed to cut two ways: against Papist and Protestant nonconformists. Both parties have, by subsequent laws, obtained relief from its penal sanctions. Episcopal are now liable to them.

It is not hazarding too much to assert that, but for the civil penalties, which drove men and women with their children to the font; there would never have been either so many, or so fierce, a set of laws compelling them to approach the altar. Had there never been fines enforcing Baptism, there would never have been fires flickering about the Eucharist. And it is to the great reproach of the Elizabethan age that such a connecting link, between the two things, should have been re-established in her day: except, indeed, it be the greater reproach of the present day to allow such a statute to remain unrepealed. For is it not a scandal to Elizabeth's Protestant Church to have gone back to the very worst periods of the papal Anglo-Saxon Church for its model of religious coercion? It forms one among many other *suelei* around which the incoming papal church may, at the favourable juncture, rally its forces and prevail once more.

But a still more remarkable statute requires and invites attention. It is the statute of Charles II.\* It passed

In A.D. 1660, and says, "Every minister formerly ejected and kept out, after lawful presentation to the profits of any ecclesiastical benefice or promotion, which hath not subscribed any petition to bring the late King Charles, of blessed memory, to trial; or which hath not by writing, printing, preaching, or other open act procured, endeavoured, or justified the murder of the said late King; or which hath not, by preaching, writing, or constant refusal to baptize, declared his judgment to be against infant Baptism, shall be restored to the possession of his ecclesiastical promotion."

The grouping is almost grotesque. It forms the finale of a series of canons and statutes, spreading over a period of nine hundred and sixty-seven years, during which the church had occupied itself with this matter of Baptism; and is a clear proof, that in no one thing will the human intellect remain so long or determinedly enamoured, as when it can lay hold of a religiously-magnified trifle.

Whatever may be the conscientious opinions now enter-

---

\* 12th Charles II, cap. xvii., sec. 4.

tained as to the obligation, the virtues, the mode, or the subjects of Baptism, one thing is evident: that the ceremony, by having so large an amount of ecclesiastical legislation, has had an importance attached to it which has proved highly dangerous. That danger has arisen from what it has been made *per se*. Othobon had, in 1268, said it was the entrance "gate to salvation:" and in so saying he embodied a sentiment as old before; as it has become, since, he spoke. This the "plank that brings to the port of salvation?" It is the sunken rock at the mouth of the harbour. And what is more, the pilot on board the entering vessel may, himself, run it on the rock. For the same doctrines of "error" and "intention," which applied to the Eucharist, are equally applicable to the administration of Baptism.\* If, therefore, the priest, when he baptized, did not "*intend*" to regenerate; regeneration did not accrue!

The contingency is, however, swallowed down whole. Were it apprehended, it would go far to destroy one of the most fatal and insidious dispositions of the human mind in its appreciation of religion. That mind never luxuriates so complacently, as when taught to believe that a form is as effectual as a principle. By all (except those who design to deceive) this is acknowledged to be at one and the same time, the weakest and the strongest point: the weakest, because forms alone do not, and cannot, establish sympathy between the mind and God's character, purpose, or government: and the strongest, because when once forms superinduce false reliance, they simultaneously create the mightiest of all the resisting powers the human mind can bring against the entrance, or indwelling influence of the principles which beget and sustain spiritual life.

Once bring the authority of law to foster and patronize this suicidal religious tendency in the human mind, and you destroy the very thing professedly withheld. Formalism is legalized; and by so much as this is encouraged, by so much are the energies of Christianity crippled—its purity

---

\* See pages 135 and 159.

corrupted, its progress retarded, and its expulsive power of evil checked. But allow its inherent attractions to become its only laws—let it resemble the light of day, and impart by beauty, fertility and order to all, without borrowing from any purely adventitious resources, and you may then watch; and as you watch, admire the outspreading certainty with which it will quicken into life whatever is morally great, noble, free, and benignant among the almost endless groups into which the human family is divided.

## THE JEWISH AND PAGAN MODELS.

*Note A, page 16.*

“From the Jewish model she copied : with the pagan model she made a compromise.”

As to the first.—If we take the period that intervened between Augustine and his successor Elfric, which was about four hundred years ; we shall find Rome occupied with laborious efforts to lay down the foundation upon which her then contemplated Christian theocracy was to rest. The canons and injunctions passed during this period may be classified ; each subject being based upon principles or practices of the Jewish theocracy. Thus, upon religious subjects : such as communion, bishops, purification of men and women, fasts, vows, and other matters amounting to some ten or twelve altogether ; we have twenty-one laws. Upon civil matters : such as assaults, trespass, stealing, &c., in all ten matters, we find sixteen laws. Upon mixed subjects (*i.e.* partaking of the religious and the civil), such as marriage, the rights of priests, tithes, sacrilege, slavery, witchcraft, kings, &c., there are fifteen subjects and thirty-five laws :—making a grand total of thirty-seven different subjects and seventy-two distinct laws. All these were copied from, or given in, the very words of Jewish law. And if we include illustrations or enforcements of the canons, taken from the same authority, the catalogue would be swelled to a much greater extent. This, it is repeated, includes the early period of legislature only. Had the whole range of period (*i.e.* from Augustine down to the last made canons of A.D. 1603,) been quoted, the list of subjects would have been swelled to an almost incredible extent. In short, principles have been commended, ceremonies commended, and reasons assigned more frequently from the Jewish

than from the Christian Scriptures. As an authority, Moses has been placed not only anterior; but also posterior to Christ.

As to the second, or pagan model; in addition to the observations in the text, it is worthy remark, that pagan observances were more than tolerated. Hence we find that Gregory, who sent Augustine into England, wrote thus to the Abbot Mellitus, in A.D. 601 :—

“ Upon mature deliberation on the affair of the English, I have determined, that the temples of the idols in that nation ought not to be destroyed; but let the idols that are in them be destroyed. . . . Because they have been accustomed to slaughter many oxen in the sacrifices to devils, some solemnity must be *exchanged* for them on this account :—they may build themselves huts of the boughs of trees about those churches, which have been turned to that use from temples. . . . For there is no doubt that it is impossible to efface everything at once from their obdurate minds. Thus the Lord made himself known to the people of Israel in Egypt, and yet he allowed them the use of the sacrifices, which they were wont to offer to the devil, in his own worship; that whilst they offered the same beasts which they were wont to offer, they should offer them to God, and not to idols.”\*

And to what did this unwise and unhallowed compromise amount? The encouragement of the very worship it feigned to repudiate. Four hundred and seventeen years afterwards, we discover a Danish monarch evincing more sound sense and religion than the Roman pontiff. Canute found idol-worship rampant. He therefore said—

“ We forbid *all heathenism*, or that men worship idols, or heathen gods: the sun, the moon, the fire, or the rivers, fountains, or stones, or any kind of trees.”†

The general impression had grown up and prevailed, that as at their first coming the Romish missionaries had openly avowed a compromise between paganism and Christianity; it could not be contrary to the latter to *retain* that, which they

---

\* Dated 17th June, in the nineteenth year of Mauritius Tiberius, the fourth indiction. *Bede*, lib. i., c. 80.

† *Johnson*, A.D. 1018.



at the onset of their labours had evinced no determination wholly to extirpate.

Let the fact be borne in mind, that during the whole of these four hundred and seventeen years, the church, under the Anglo-Saxon kings, had, by gifts from the dying—by charters from monarchs—and, in not a few instances, by forged documents, become possessed of the greater portion of the land in Britain. She gained it under the pretext of establishing Christianity: but though she took the land, she betrayed the trust upon which it was held. The method by which dying men were induced to give land to the church, is more fully shown in Note C.

---

#### THE ROMAN MODEL.

##### *Note B, page 23.*

*“The Roman Model.”* Whatever benefits Ethelbert, by adopting these “judicial decrees,” had conferred upon the English nation; it is certain that the introduction of civil or Roman law, taken as a *whole*, into this country, laid the foundation of innumerable evils. If it be admitted that in the early period of the Anglo-Saxon government, such a model of the ancient and accumulated wisdom of the mightiest empire in the world, might, and undoubtedly did, supply many important and useful principles of legislation; it is due also to historic truth to admit, that such a model introduced under such auspices, was calculated to produce essential injury. It is evident from the phraseology Bede employs, that the *ecclesiastical* portion of that code, was the great object which Augustine principally aimed to establish. He took the whole in order to secure that part which most tended to promote his own individual purpose. Hence sacrilege formed an important part. By this law, Ethelbert punished the man who robbed a church; by inflicting a double penalty than if he had robbed from his own palace, or from any other place. So that

“the protection of the church,” as it was called, placed it in a higher position than appertained to the civil power. This superiority once introduced, ecclesiastics knew well how most effectually to ply in all its ramifications. They never lost sight of it. Archbishop Arundel, therefore, in A.D. 1408, laid hold of this very matter of “sacrilege,” and applied it thus—“if the authority of Civil Law teaches us” that he “who *disputes* the supreme earthly judgment” is liable to punishment, “much more grievously are they to be punished who violate, oppose, and despise the law and canons of the key-keeper of eternal life and death.”

It will be remarked that the Roman law is here mentioned as the “*judicial* decrees.” The execution of these rested with the bishops. “God’s law and the world’s law” was distinct; but the bishops sat with the earldoman in the county court, “to put in use each of them.” This joint exercise of judicial authority was, after many years’ exercise, finally terminated by William the Conqueror; who, by charter, separated the two orders of judicature; and, in so doing, inflicted upon the nation one of the greatest sources of judicial wrong and national dishonour, by the creation of ecclesiastical courts; distinct from, and, to a very great extent, independent of the supreme source of all judicial authority, viz., the sovereign of this country.

One other fact of great importance in connexion with this matter of the Roman model, must not be overlooked. It is this: the setting up by the Church of Rome, of “judicial decrees,” was not only a usurpation of regal authority, but a deadly injury to the Church of Christ. Against this very thing the Apostle John pointedly guarded the Christian Church. His epistles were directed against Judaizing and anti-Christian teachers, as much as his Book of the Revelation. In one of those epistles (the first, chap. v., ver. 16) he *prohibits* the church exercising judicial power. Our translation, unhappily, does not give the true meaning: in fact, it is difficult to attach any meaning at all to the words, unless we supply our own suggestions, as to what the apostle might intend. The error has arisen from having translated two different Greek verbs, by one and the same English word.

Thus, in the first clause of the verse *αιτησαι* is correctly rendered "pray," i.e., prayer addressed to God : prayer carried into action ; which, in their combined influence should lead to the restoration of an erring brother, if restoration did by any means take place. But in the last clause of the verse, the same English word [pray] is used ; and is generally construed to interdict both prayer and effort : whereas, it is not prayer that is here interdicted, but all judicial inquiry. For in this last clause the Greek verb is *ερωτησθη*, which signifies not so much to ask, as to ask interrogatively—or to make claim in law ; \* the essential difference lying between an act of prayer before God ; and judicial inquiry by men. In a judicial sense it was used, when the Sanhedrim sent their proper officers authoritatively to demand of John the Baptist his credentials : by asking [*ερωτησωσιν*] Who art thou ? (John i. 19.) This important distinction is generally overlooked : and having been overlooked by some ; and studiously kept back by others, has engrafted upon the Christian discipline of the New Testament dispensation, a set of principles and practices, wholly opposed to the letter and spirit of Christianity. It may not be undesirable to add, that this last Greek word is, by the Vulgate, rendered "roget,"—from "rogo,"—to ask consent to a law. By the Romans, this word was employed as a term of jurisprudence. "During the republican government, the laws were passed in a general assembly of the people. The affirmation of a law consisted in the use of the words 'Uti Rogas,' be it as thou hast asked." † So also in a legislative character, the word was employed ; when in 1285 the English bishops brought in a bill, and asked [rogaverunt] the lords to approve of it. ‡

It would therefore appear that, foreseeing the damage Christianity would suffer from any such judicial authority in

---

\* "Duplicem habet significationem, sicut etiam Latinum Rogere duo significat ; viz., *Interrogare et Petere* ; in priore significatione, accipitur, John i. 19." *Leigh's Critica Sacra*, Eporas.

† *History of the Roman or Civil Law*, by M. C. J. Ferriere, page 14, A.D. 1724.

‡ See Parliamentary Roll containing the Statute of Merton, *ad tem*, Henry III.

matters of faith, the apostle positively interdicted it. The Jews had had their "sin unto death," *i.e.*, excision from the church, for what their civil courts pronounced a civil offence, as well as what their ecclesiastical courts decreed a religious offence. Bertram, in his *Politia Judaic*, cap. ii. p. 21, applies the words to the Jewish law of excommunication. Such a weapon was too dangerous to be again entrusted to any church; and, therefore, the apostle most anxiously sought to guard the Christian Church from any attempt to use it. *g.d.* The relative limits of 'the sin unto death,' and 'the sin *not* unto death,' will involve you in endless mischiefs if attempted to be settled by the sanction of law." The prediction was fulfilled. One of the most fruitful sources of evil sprang from this one cause. The fourth century is replete with illustrations. "The sin unto death," said Acesius to Constantine, "signifies apostacy; of which those who are guilty ought never to be restored to the communion of the church." To whom Constantine replied, "Set up a ladder, Acesius, and climb up to heaven by yourself."\* But though Constantine could safely laugh at the haughty prelate in the fourth; so could not men in the eighth century. Then, the Archbishop of York (Ecbriht) pronounced "him who goes out of the auditory, while the priest is preaching, excommunicate;" and further "it shall not be lawful either to pray, or speak, or eat, with an excommunicate."†

---

SACRAMENTAL OATHS AND LAND.

*Note C, page 28.*

In no one department of practical results, emanating from professedly religious solemnities; were more complicated, momentous, and wide-spreading influences exerted, than flowed out of this connexion between the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper and the land.

---

\* *Milner's Church History*, century iv., cap. 3, p. 66.

† *Johnson*, A.D. 740 the 84: and *Spelman*, the 70 of cccc. MS.

To support the altar, was regarded a national obligation : and by no method at once easy, certain, and permanent ; could that support be rendered so effective as by bestowing upon those who there ministered, not merely the produce of land, but the land itself.

The possession of land, as the inheritance of the church, formed the basis of all its hopes, the secret of all its power, and the glory of all its expanding operations. Without the land, a Christian theocracy could not be consolidated or retained. It had formed the basis of the Jewish theocracy ; and is contained in that most emphatic provision Jehovah himself established ; when he said, " the land shall not be sold for ever, for the LAND IS MINE." (Lev. xxv. 23.) This one law imparted life, coherence, power, and every other law bearing this connecting link between the ecclesiastical and the civil commonwealth of Israel ; so much so, that but for it, the whole Jewish theocracy would silently have crumbled to pieces. The appearance of all the males thrice a year at Jerusalem, " before the Lord," was, according to Jewish law, a public and solemn reiteration of fealty or faithfulness to the sovereign of the state ; and, therefore, a pledge not only of continued fidelity to the worship of Jehovah as their God ; but of honour to him as the ruler under whom they held their land.

The all-attractive and commanding desire of the Church of Rome, was to establish a Christian theocracy. Without " the land," it would, *in limine* ; have lacked the most essential element towards the attainment of its object.

How then was the land to be secured ? It had not been gained by conquest ; nor acquired by discovery ; nor ceded by treaty. If gained at all, it must be gained either by purchase, or by grants from the owners. Purchase it ecclesiastics could not ; for they then had, or professed to have, no money. Grants were the only method : and of these the church availed itself from two sources. The first was common. There were dying men. As they heard death fumble about, for the key which was to unlock the gate placed at the boundary line between time and eternity ; they became anxious to know how they might most easily and safely pass. They eagerly listened to

the whisper, "I can gain you a passage." "How?" asked the dying sinner. "The keys of the church have been given it by Peter, for this very express purpose; so that if you will support the church, the church will conduct you through at once." "If my land will save my soul, take it." And the priest having said that *all* was too much; the dying man said, "Take then as much as *your oath* is worth." And the priest took on behalf of the church, "sixty plough lands."

There were also servile monarchs; who, being intent upon supporting themselves, enriched their priests. The conduct of one expressed the character of most.

"I, Edgar, grant and give to-day, before God, freedom to St. Peter's Minster, Medeshamstede [afterwards called Peterborough], from king and from Bishop: and all the villages, Eastfield, Dodsthorp, Eye, and Paston. And I give the town called Oundle, with 'the eight hundreds.' And I give to Christ and St. Peter, these lands: Barro, Kettering [and eight other towns] and one moneyer in Stamford. These lands, them declare I free; that is, with *sac* and *soe*, toll, and team, and infang-thef;\* these eight and all others, them declare I the SHIRE OF CHRIST and St. Peter."†

Beside Peterborough, Edgar alone founded fifty or fifty-one monasteries, to each of which grants of land were given. These grants or charters passed under the designation of frank-almoign, or free alms. They were one of the two great divisions which obtained as to land; feudal tenure and Divine service. Under the last, men of religion (as abbots and others were called) held lands on condition of making before God; prayers, masses, and other Divine services, for the souls of those who granted the land.

The fact of a condition being appended to the grants, must not be overlooked. A right to re-enter, is invariably assumed if the original condition be contravened, perverted, or extinguished. Upon this eternal principle of moral rectitude, Jehovah himself acted towards the Jewish nation. Having corrupted, profaned, misapplied his worship; he by human agents and a series of events; dispossessed the nation of its

\* These terms are explained in page 307, Appendix AAA.

† *Bede, Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, page 382, A.D. 965.

land, and by such dispossession caused the theocracy to quiver to its very dismemberment and dissolution.

This last fact is one of deep interest. It teaches one great lesson: it is, that the Divine government depends upon vital principles, rather than monotonous systems; upon mind rather than upon inheritance; and upon change itself rather than upon custom. His own theocracy, to establish which he drove out the intruding Canaanites, so as to have the land as his own: to consolidate which, he had taken more pains than he had employed about any other pre-existing order of government; to honour which he had given more direct and indisputable marks of approval, than had been given to the external framework of any other order of religious institutions: and to perpetuate which he had said, "it shall be for ever,"—this unique, divinely guarded, and all-absorbing system, is by his own hand taken to pieces, simply because it had frustrated his own intention. Therefore it was that in the mission, and especially by the death of the Son of God, he rolled it up, and laid it for ever aside.

But the Church of Rome dared to copy the whole; even to the very ground plan itself. And in this as much as in her errors, her cruelties, and her apostacy; she offered as direct an insult to heaven, as she spread desolation and woe upon earth.

The possession of land was to her the retention of power; and to the people the hindrance of emancipation. The error was as immovable as the land. Had it been left to the people they would have starved out the error, by starving out the priests who taught it. Ye "sons of malediction (exclaims Mephah, in A.D. 1328), when God in the person of his ministers is to be honoured by the oblations of his people, ye reduce your offering to a penny, or the small pittance of an offering."

Had it not been for "the land," or territorial possessions, the bishop of Rome would himself, long before this; have been reduced to an historical personage: but, as it was, it became necessary, in order to check his power, and that of his emissaries; for the English sovereigns, catholics as they were, to prevent the land passing entirely into the hands of the church.

Hence the laws of Mortmain ; some of which enabled the king to re-“ enter into the land, and to hold it in fee and as an inheritance.”\*

And if any one thing more than another, tended to show the extreme point of prostration to which Mary and the nation were reduced ; when they became reconciled, in order to “ be received as children repentant, into the bosom and unity of Christ’s Church ;”† it is supplied in the provision then made ; by which “ it shall be lawful to such as ” are “ seised of any manors, lands, to make grants or other assurances to any spiritual body politick or corporate, without any license of Mortmain therein to be obtained ; any act or statute heretofore made, in anywise notwithstanding.”‡ Thus the church hoped to regain more land than it had lost by the dissolution of the monasteries.

---

“ EATING THE FLESH OF THE SON OF MAN.”

*Note D, page 52.*

The exposition of the words of our Lord, given in the canon, may be said to rank among the principal Eucharistic errors. Like many more, it obtains the sanction of time in its favour. For it is retained by many to the present period. And what is more, *seems* to have “ scriptural authority.”

In many editions of the Bible, there are marginal references. These often refer to texts where the same word, and sometimes the same sentiment ; is expressed in other passages. In the instance of John vi. 53, we find one, and but one text placed in the margin. It is Matthew xxvi. 26, which records the first institution of the Lord’s Supper. Most people would infer from this, that the two passages refer to the same subject. By being placed in apposition they seem to convey one and

---

\* 9th Henry III., cap. xxxvi., A.D. 1224 : and 7th Edward I., A.D. 1279.

† 1 Philip and Mary, chap. viii.

‡ *Ibid*, cap. viii., sec. 52.



the same principal idea; that being no more nor less than this—that to “eat,” mentioned in John, signifies the same as to “eat,” in Matthew; not literally to eat ordinary food, but to partake of the symbols of the body of Christ in the Lord’s Supper. Now, Christ meant nothing of the kind. His words recorded in John, were addressed to captious, unbelieving Jews at Capernaum: his words recorded in Matthew, were spoken to believing disciples, at Jerusalem. Between the utterance of those in John, one whole year intervened before those in Matthew were spoken; the first relating to doctrine, and the second relating to a ceremonial institution. And it is worthy special attention, that although our Lord, in explaining himself to his disciples, gave a plain intimation of his then distant betrayal, he yet did not utter one syllable as to his last supper. Indeed, he appears to have kept back all allusion to any remembrance, or memorial of himself; until the last hour: and then only in connection with another and perfectly dissimilar “shewing forth.” More than this: the explanation which Christ gave of his meaning, restricts the subject to doctrine. “The words I speak, are *life*;” \* or, as Edward VI. has it, “The true knowledge and taste of Christ, that was born and died for us; wherewith the faithful soul is fed.” †

Let it be supposed, however, that the two passages were *intended* to be taken together; and that these words recorded by John, were spoken in *anticipation* (a rule of interpretation, at once gratuitous and dangerous) of those he afterwards employed, as recorded in Matthew xxvi. 28; and what will follow? This—that Christ’s mission comprehended the establishment of a code of ceremonial observances; to the exact obedience of which he attached higher sanctions than any, Moses had ever attempted to enforce. Indeed, the Church of Rome did not shrink from the avowal of this very sentiment, when she desired to set up a visible theocracy under Christ.\* The dogma of the “real presence” flowed out of this, her secret purpose; and so helped on the delusion and

---

\* John vi. 63. † *Liturgies, &c., of Edward VI.,* page 521.

\* See page 147, under A.D. 1537.

the snare to souls ; by teaching that Christ himself had declared that unless they eat his flesh at the supper, they had no life in them.

Happy would it have been for Protestants, if they had never attached the same meaning to the words in John as papists attribute to them. They have occasioned much perplexity and distress of mind to many thoughtful persons ; while vain, self-deluded, and insincere formalists, are by the perverted use of the words induced to become communicants. This to them is then considered the crowning act in their profession. Beyond this form of obedience, they never seek to advance. The consequence is, religious indolence supervenes ; and a profession, designed to be a stepping-stone to progress ; brings on moral death ; rather than sustains spiritual life.

---

ADRIAN.

*Note E, page 60.*

*“ Adrian.”*—The Anglo-Saxon monarchs were not the only sovereigns that had cause to dread the exploits of this ambitious pope. Like his predecessors ; he was an artful intriguer. Of this we have the proof in his conduct to Desiderias, the King of Lombardy. His territories he invaded ; and having induced Charlemagne to send an army in to aid his own troops ; he succeeded in gaining them for himself. The vanquished King with his wife and children, he sent to end their days in a monastery in France. By means of a grant, solemnly ratified, and publicly with his own hand laid on the altar of St. Peter’s at Rome ; Charlemagne gave to Adrian and his successors ; Pentapolis, the island of Corsica ; a large tract of country extending from Luna to Sorano ; the provinces of Venetia and Istira ; and the two Dukedoms of Benevento and Spoleto ; the Sabinian territory, and Campania ; if not, indeed, other and more important regions ; and thus he put an end to the kingdom of the Lombards.

When Adrain sent his two Legates into Britain, the avowed object was "to renew the faith:" but beneath this, lie a hidden purpose. The Saxon kings had heard of the fate of the kingdom of Lombardy; and thought it prudent to submit to the pope, as an ecclesiastic; although it is not too much to infer that had they chosen to resist him in that character, he would speedily have dealt with him, as he did with the unfortunate King of Lombardy. The full development of this Pope's character may be seen in the *Universal History*, vol xix, pp. 686—694.

---

### THE APOSTOLICAL CATHOLIC FAITH.

#### *Note F., page 66.*

"*The Apostolical Catholic Faith.*" It is one of the most ominous characteristics of this period, that men; not belonging to the Church of Rome, should yet seek to carry us back to her dogmata. The title here assumed by the Legates from Pope Adrian, is the same that is adopted by the Irvingites. They style themselves "the Catholic Apostolic Church;" and in an appeal lately made "to all who profess the Faith of Christ, and especially to the Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, and as many as exercise rule or ministry in the Church of God," they say, "Marked lineaments of character have faded or disappeared; discipline has been changed; the constitution of the Church, as a visible body, appears maimed and defective." We might expect, therefore, such an organization as should, *de novo*, bring out and exhibit the grand features of a Church of Christ. But what do we read?—

"Holy Baptism is an indispensable element in the constitution of the Christian Church. Begotten by the word of truth, regenerated by the Spirit of life from Christ Jesus; the baptized became 'a kind of first fruits' of the creation of God. Partaking in the Holy Eucharist of the flesh and blood of the Lord, they were nourished unto eternal life. Thus they dwelt in Christ, and Christ in them; and were sealed with that holy spirit of promise vouchsafed through the ministry of the Apostles, as the earnest of their inheritance, until the redemption of the purchased possession."

Again,—

“Christian men have always possessed *in the Sacraments*, and in the pastoral ministry, those means of grace and guidance *without which they could scarcely be saved.*”

And again,—

“Those who are burdened with a conscience of sin, are admitted to the privilege of voluntary confession and *the grace of absolution.*”

And yet again,—

“The Angel of the Church fulfils his high and peculiar office, by presenting, morning and evening, the supplications, prayers, and thanksgivings of the Christian people in a solemn act of Intercession.”\*

Deeply is it to be regretted that any Church, in proclaiming to Christendom a new order of government; should thus place, as its base of operations, principles so essentially mischievous. They form the inseminating, fatal errors of an ancient and apostate church. The fact proves the extent of hidden mischief which is again preparing to be let loose upon the age.

“NOT FEARING TO DIE FOR IT.”

*Note G, page 66.*

“*Not fear to die for it.*”—That is, take up arms and fight for the faith. These men little conceived that the boldness they now avowed, their descendants would one day be called upon to evince *against* the Bishop of Rome. He by virtue of this national submission to his authority, carried it with so high a hand as at length to rouse the English Parliament to declare that—

“The crown of England, which hath been so free at all times, that it hath been in no earthly subjection, but immediately subject to God in

\* “From the Angels ordained over Churches in England by the Apostles of the Lord, with the Priests, Deacons, and People under their charge,” pp. 3, 10, 13, 14. A.D. 1856.

all things touching the regality of the same crown, and to none other, authority."

But—

"Now a common clamour is made, that the Bishop of Rome hath purposed that the laws and statutes of the realm should be submitted to the Pope; and by him be defeated and avoided at his will, in perpetual destruction of the sovereignty of the King our Lord, his crown, his regality, and of all his realm."

Therefore—

"The Commons say they will stand with the King and his crown in all cases attempted against him and his regality in all points *to live and to die.*"

And—

"The Lords temporal have answered every one by himself, that they will be with the crown in all cases which shall be attempted against the crown and regality in all points, *with all their power.*"

And—

"The Lords Spiritual have said, they will and ought to be with the King in—lawfully maintaining of his crown."\*

Six hundred and seven years had intervened between the first subjection of the civil power to the pope, and this resistance of his usurped authority; for he had been submitted to as an ecclesiastic and not as a secular power: as pontiff only, and not as a *sovereign* pontiff.†

The ecclesiastical authority exercised by the Bishop of Rome had, during this lengthened period, been matter of many and grievous complaints: out of which had arisen several penal statutes against certain proceedings in relation to the church only. In the statute here quoted, the conduct of the Bishop of Rome is denounced in its relation to "the crown, the regality, and all the realm."

By a little attention to the phraseology employed by the Legates and the Parliament, it will be seen that two opposites, viz., the Act of Submission, and the Act of Resistance, meet at one point—*force*. We swear, exclaim the Anglo-Saxons, that "we will not fear to die for" the Catholic faith;

\* 16th Richard II., cap. v., A.D. 1392.

† See Note E, p 335.

and we declare, say the Commons of England, that we will "live and die," in resisting the encroachments of the Bishop of Rome.

It will be evident to the thoughtful reader, that such a point could not have been reached after so long an interval, had it not been filled up by transactions of a deeply aggravated character. And the question will occur, how was it that, notwithstanding all such transactions on the part of him at Rome, that the English nation; while it held up the sword in a menacing attitude, did not also repudiate the religious errors of Rome itself? The answer is: the people deemed their eternal salvation dependent upon the Sacraments Rome had taught them to covert. But for this, the pope would never have dared to invade English liberties; any serious infraction of which, he well knew, they could have effectually resented, had they not dreaded "the power of the keys," which, at his pleasure, opened or closed "the gates of grace and salvation to men." The religious element in the institutions of any nation is thus demonstrated to be the substratum of its civil freedom. That civil freedom, in its entire form, was lost by submission to Rome, as a spiritual power.

---

## HOUSEHOLDERS.

### *Note H, page 78.*

"*The blow was against the Householder.*"—That this exclusion of the people was intended, will become still more evident if another law, passed within one hundred and ninety years afterwards, be taken into account. It said—

"We, by apostolic authority, forbid any man to build a church or oratory upon his own estate, without his Bishop's license."\*

This was one of, if not the boldest, *direct* attacks Rome

---

\* Alberic, Legate, in a National Council, held at Westminster, A.D. 1138. *Spelman*, vol. ii., p. 41. (*Johnson*.) The same authority it was which first interdicted the marriage of priests. (See page 128.)

ever made upon the English Church. It is a daring infringement of the inalienable rights secured by natural and revealed religion; and is also in manifest contravention of the very Roman model which Augustine had introduced and established. That had (and but for this law, would then have) "allowed a man to erect a building merely by his own authority"—although it did not become a "sacred" thing, unless it was consecrated in due form by the pontiffs.\* Many men, however, especially in England in that age, would be disposed to build a church, without pontifical consecration; seeing that "if the edifice were destroyed," the land would revert to them: whereas pontifical consecration "made the very ground upon which the destroyed edifice had stood sacred;" and no longer the property of any one person.

But this law of A.D. 1138 cuts up one important point of the imperial law, when it forbids any man so much as to build a church or oratory without the Bishop's license. Of course, the Bishop was now *sui juris*, and could make what terms soever he chose with the Lord of the Manor. The hiatus induced by this state of things, the Bishop filled up, by allowing the Lord of the Manor to present his clerk, which the Bishop became bound to induct. For as the lord had as an "offering," granted a tenth part of the produce of his estate to the permanent support of Divine offices, it was but equitable that he who paid the priest should choose him.

Out of this right of ancient patrons, arose the division of parishes. They were co-extensive with the manors. Hence it is, that to this day, the more ancient parishes are part and parcel of the original domain, the advowson being in the person who holds the manor

---

\* *Divi Justiniani Institutionum*, lib. ii., tit. 1. *De rerum divisione*. Sections vii., viii., ix., x. These divisions of things were fourfold: *De rebus nullius*: *De rebus sacris*: *De religiosis*: *De rebus sanctis*. Things holy were the gates and walls of a city, as being of Divine right: things religious, were repositories of dead bodies: things sacred, were churches, chapels, and all moveable things dedicated by a pontifical act to the service of God: things *nullius*, were what belonged not to any person as his own, or could be vested in him, as his own property.

So that the parochial system is a remnant memorial of the part taken by the people in the government of their church. More than this: dioceses were often in olden time called parishes;\* but whether dioceses or parishes, each one was complete in itself, as much so as each manor was complete in itself: for as every manor has its own court, customs, and usages, so every parish taxed itself and managed its own affairs.† Out of this grand rule arose also the rights of parishioners. Within their own boundary they are their own masters. So also is every rector, or vicar, as pertaining to the parochial; and every Bishop as belonging to the diocesan clergy.

With this ancient characteristic of the English Church, the people are every year brought into contact. A remnant of it is constantly brought before them. Hence it is that they elect their churchwardens, as the representative guardians of parochial rights. Nay, more: the conjoint government of the church is illustrated in the fact that the rector or vicar appoints his churchwarden at the same time and

\* Hence Theodore, in A.D., 673, said, "That no bishop invade the parish of another, but be content with the government of the people committed to him." So also Ecbright, in 740: says, "Let every bishop take care that the churches of God within his parish be well built," &c.—*Johnson*.

† An important difference, however, existed as to the independence of each parish, and that of each manor. In the latter instance, the Lord of the Manor was absolutely free of every other lord. But in the case of a parish, the Bishop was required to act in concert with other Bishops. Hence "if any man be deprived of Communion by his own Bishop, let him not be received by others before he is reconciled to his Bishop." (Ecbricht, A.D. 740.) So that though each Bishop acted *by* himself, he did not act exclusively *for* himself. A community or spiritual oneness obtained among the churches: what one did in the way of discipline, another recognized. As each church possessed the same essential elements, it was imperative that they should act in concert; or, as Edward VI. expresses it, "build together in Christ." Why this visible oneness? Because individual Christians, as individuals, have that oneness: the church in its aggregate capacity, receives, unites, cements, and carries forward, the same moral element each one of its members possesses alone. And therefore, except for discipline, the church possesses no more and none other qualities, that every separate Christian enjoys alone, or in his own person.



place, for the purpose of becoming the representative guardian of his rights of office.

These rights the laity retain: and that in spite of the early effort wholly to despoil them of their integral or component share in the government of the episcopal church. They may be said to be remnants of the original title deeds, which, though sadly torn, are not entirely obliterated: sufficient is left to prove that the estate was possessed by joint tenants in common. The well-directed blow against the householder did nothing more than lay him prostrate: ejected he is not. But perhaps the day will come when he will so far recover himself as again to walk erect over his "own estate." The effort by which he recovers possession will, at the same time, remove one of the most forbidding heir-looms upon the estate. It is a portrait—that of a father whose countenance indicates that he never, even in the domestic circle, once was seen to unbend: everywhere and in everything he was a stern despot. The lines in every lineament showed that his very love was either cruel or selfish; and his benevolence wormwood and gall. In the house he was a hated tyrant, and in the country he was a despoiler of the rights of other men. His portrait stands at the top of every one of his laws, and is to them what the sign manual is to a statute—the attestation of authority. And what is more: his authority is still virtually acknowledged, inasmuch as the laws it created are allowed to stand. The original owner of the estate is, therefore, not only kept out of full possession; but of that portion of which he has repossessed himself, he is in danger of being again disinherited.

---

"THE CONTAINING SPECIES AND THE RESERVED  
BREAD."

*Note M, page 150.*

"*The containing species is corrupted.*" Does not the friar here prove too much? He also said, "Under the species of bread, the whole living and true Christ, is entirely given"

in the sacrament. Be it so. Then how came it to be "corrupted?" The "true" body of Christ "saw no corruption"\* in the grave during the three days it was entombed. Surely if the priest could so change a piece of bread as to "make" it receive, he might also have made it retain "the living Christ." Or why not have set to work a second time, and by a still greater transformation than the first, make the very corrupted species a thoroughly true body?

Had the friar sent his priests to the civilians of the age, they would have learned from Roman law that "when a man hath made any species or kind of work [*aliena materia species*] with materials belonging to another,—it is not to be doubted but that he who made the species is master of it [*eum esse dominum*]."†

Here the priest "made the species" out of the bread which the householder had given him for that purpose. It had become "corrupted," so that the "containing species" was in effect lost. Still, as the priest had made the species, he was the undoubted "master of it." Why not then use his right, so as to prove his power? Had he done this (which the golden opportunity seemed almost put into his hands to enable him to prove) how powerfully might he thus have appealed to the people: "See the true body of Christ; it has seen corruption in this tabernacle, though it saw no corruption in the grave. I have, however, restored it; again it is a 'living' Christ! so that you see I have power to create, and power to resuscitate." The absurdity of such a pretension would not have equalled the original falsehood. But the people knew it not, for they were not aware that the bread had become stale: the unconsecrated wine enabled them to swallow down both it and the species at one gulp. "The reserved bread" had brought about all this mischief. The custom was now a most ancient one;‡ nor was it legally abolished until the time of Edward VI. He says, that

\* Acts xiii. 37.

† *Justinian Institutions*, lib. ii., tit. i., section 25, De Specificatione.

‡ See page 6.

although the householders (long after they had ceased to celebrate the Lord's Supper in their own houses) "received it according to the ancient writers, at the priest's hands, yet they many times conveyed the same secretly away, kept it with them, and diversely abused it to superstition and wickedness."\* In this one custom, that of reserving the bread (a custom apparently innocent, though not pious) we trace the in-seminal principle of potent mischief. Out of it arose a series of evils, each one possessed of a germinating power, and the whole of which brought forth a giant evil in religion. It was made to consist in something material, rather than in realities that are purely and exclusively moral. The history of that whole is comprehended in the various words which bespoke the latent mischief. Thus at first we have, as a designation, "the venerable solemnity," then "the sacrifice," then "the viaticum," then "the mystery;" after that "the atoning celebration," then "the propitiation for the souls of the dead;" after that "the sacrament," "the sacrament of the Eucharist," "the sacrifice of a sacrament," until we arrive at last at "the whole true and living Christ, entirely under the species of the sacrament."

So had not pagans advanced in religious absurdity. They had had their sacrifices and their Eucharistic ceremonies, and the last was chief. But what was it? A thanksgiving acknowledgment of dependence upon, and gratitude to, their gods. Hence the grand ceremonial; when a pot of sodden pulse, such as beans, peas, and the like, which a woman, neatly trimmed and decked in purple vesture, bore upon her head at the time of celebrating the erection of an altar to Jupiter or Apollo. This they called, *ευχαριστήρια απονέμονται της πρώτης διαίτης*,† or the thanksgiving tribute; it being an acknowledgment of a portion of that food which formed their principal subsistence. But Romanists stretch beyond, far beyond this; and instead of acknowledging dependence, and thankfully presenting an offering to their God, they eat the

---

\* *Liturgies and Documents of Edward VI.*, Parker Society, p. 99.

† *Archæologia Attica*, lib. ii., cap. vii., p. 53.

god himself! Yet the "species of bread" which contained him might in seven days become corrupted! So was it with the water of baptism. That was not to be kept in the font beyond seven days.†

---

THE EUCHARIST: EASTER, AND CHRISTIAN BURIAL.

*Note N, page 169.*

As the case about to be quoted is a remarkable one, and stands in intimate connection with this still more remarkable law; it is expedient to direct attention to a few particulars prior to going into the case itself.

The reader will therefore observe the words "the Sacrament of the Eucharist at *Easter*." This feast had from the eighth century been regarded as the principal festival of the church. It is, therefore, "the *Sacrament* of the Eucharist at *Easter*." Was the institution original, or only a copy? It was a copy. Greeks anterior to the birth of Christ had had their special sacrificial month. On the 20th April, which they called *Hecatombæon*, they offered to Jupiter or Apollo twenty-five beasts (whose feet made up the number of an hundred, as they counted by hoofs, rather than by heads); and "when the Christians, in honour of their *Easter*, began the year in April, they called April *Hecatombæon*, as Petitus testifies."\*

Having since A.D. 740 (when *Easter* was first settled as to the time of its celebration †), for more than six hundred years adhered to the pagan original, the church here carried out the same spirit pagans had evinced. Hence he that observed not "the Sacrament of the Eucharist at *Easter*," is denied entrance into the church while alive, and denied also the rites "of Christian burial when dead."

Was the law ever a dead letter? It is a living power. To

---

\* See under 1236, in page 315 of this Appendix.

† *Archæologia Atticæ*, lib ii., c. 10, p. 65-67.

‡ See page 41.

this day it not only exists, but is carried out. Here is a document which attests the fact. It is the letter sent by a clergyman to a son, just bereaved of his father.

“REV. P. HEWETT TO MR. T. S. GUYER.

“SIR,—

“In reply to your letter of yesterday’s date (10th March, 1846), I have to state that Mr. Colenutt, the undertaker, did request me to inter, in Binstead Churchyard, the body of the late Mr. Guyer, minister of the congregation of Independents in the town of Rye, and that I refused to comply with his request.

“I believe that if Mr. Guyer had died within the parish of Binstead, the law of the land, overruling the law of the Church, would have compelled the minister of Binstead to bury him. But as he was resident during his lifetime, and died in the parish of Newchurch, the law of the land does not prescribe any rule for such a case; and in the absence of any other conflicting law, I am compelled to obey the law of the Church, which clearly forbids her ministers from using her office for the burial of the dead for any that have stood in the same relation to the Church that Mr. Guyer did. I pray you to bear in mind that I am not acting upon a private feeling, but simply complying with the rule which the Church prescribes to me. I can honestly say, that if my refusal to comply with their wish is attended with pain to his friends, it is no less distressing to me to be the instrument of communicating that pain. And I will add further, that if in any case personal character could furnish a warrant to me, as a minister of the Church, for deviating from my prescribed rule, it would be found in the case of your late father.

“I remain, Sir,

“Your obedient servant,

“PHILIP HEWETT.

“Binstead Rectory.”

“P.S. I see I have omitted to touch upon a point to which you have adverted in your letter, and which is not unimportant, viz. : the fact that two of Mr. Guyer’s children are buried in Binstead Church-yard, and that my refusal to bury Mr. Guyer separates the father from the children in their death. One of these children was buried before my appointment to the living. When the other died, I yielded to the suggestions of my own feelings when I consented to lay her with her sister. And I confess that if I were now to listen to the dictates of feeling alone, I should consent to bury the father with his children. I may have been wrong in the first act. I acknowledge that I ought to have made your father aware that the reception of his child was to be no pledge to him that his own body should find its resting-place in the same church-yard. I acknowledge that it was ill considered not to have been thus explicit with the father. But there is

a great distinction to be drawn between the circumstances of those young children under teaching, and the father himself—the minister and teacher of a congregation of Independents. However, in so far as I have been instrumental in sundering them, I am desirous of repairing my fault, and as the penalty of former want of prudence, I will willingly charge myself with the expense attendant upon removing their remains to the same grave their parent is to occupy, if such should be the wish of the family.

“P. H.”\*

“JOHN OF BEVERLEY.”

*Note O, page 188.*

The memory of “*holy John of Beverley*” had, prior to this pretended miracle, been greatly honoured. From the time of his death, he had been held in repute. The distinguished antiquarian, Wood, tells us in his life (A. D. 1664) that

“Upon the taking up of a thick marble stone, lying in the middle of the choir of Beverley in Yorkshire, neare the entrance into the choir, was found under it a vault of squared free stone, five foot in length, two foot in breadth at the head, and one foot and a half at the foot. In this vault was discovered a sheet of lead, four foot in length, containing the dust of St. John of Beverley, as also six beades, three of which were cornelian, the other crumbled to dust. There were also in it three great brass pins, and four iron nayles. Upon this sheet of lead was fixed a plate of lead, whereon was this following inscription, a copie of which was sent to A. W.

‘Anno ab incarnatione Domini MCLXXXVIII, combusta fuit hæc ecclesia, in mense Sept, in sequenti nocte post Festum Sancti Matthæi Apostoli: et in anno MCXCVII. VI. Id Martii, facta fuit Inquisitio Reliquiarum Beati Iohannis in hoc loco, et inventa sunt hæc ossa in orientali parte Sepulchri, et hæc recondita, et pulvis cemento mixtus ibidem inventus et reconditus.’

“A box of lead, about seven inches in length, six inches broad, and five in height, did lay athwart the plate of lead. In this box were divers pieces of bones, mixt with dust, yielding a sweet smell.”†

\* Extracted from “the Life of the Rev. Thomas Guyer,” late of Ryde, Isle of Wight.

† *Athenæ Oxonienses*: published by the Ecclesiastical History Society, vol i., page 140.

By the additional aid Wood has here afforded us, we find ourselves conducted to a spot where three distinct periods in ecclesiastical history appear to meet. These periods are—the eighth century, during which John of Beverley lived, performed his cures, exhibited his many virtues, and died: the twelfth century, in which his dust was re-collected and re-deposited, with the veneration due to his acknowledged worth: and the fifteenth century, in which sinister persecutors avail themselves of the long-continued repute of this distinguished man; and foist upon the credulity of benighted men of the dark ages, a miracle greater than any one John himself ever performed during his life; or that his most ardent devotees ever believed would be attributed to him. Strange that the tomb of one man should thus exhibit the characteristic features of periods so remote from each other, but embracing within their range nearly seven hundred years. Piety, imperfect and hazardous as it was, might still have led to the development of the eighth century; it might also have largely mixed itself up with the acts of the same order of men in the twelfth century: but when we come to the fifteenth century, we trace in the character of the transaction nothing but the strongest marks of studied deception. The Church of that period had betrayed its trust both to God and man. Left to itself, it became self-deceived, and poured forth copious and odious streams of imposition upon others.

This memorial of John of Beverley, succeeding generations ought studiously to treasure up. It contains indubitable evidence of the fact that no one error of the church is harmless; but that every form of error, however it may for a time be mixed with certain portions of truth, will eventually disengage itself from truth; and form the precipitate of a deadly poison.

## "THE ALTAR AND THE GRAVE."

*Note W, page 274.*

Although there is little apparent connection between these two subjects, they have yet been made to unite. Canon law first cemented them together ; and in allowing it, to continue them, a way has been paved for re-establishing the full force of all its other injuries to Christianity.

A slight and partial impression has, however, recently been made upon some parts of the canonical law of burial. The 20th & 21st of Victoria, cap. 81, seeks to grapple with some of the difficulties which arise out of a new order of things respecting the burial of the dead. The old churchyards in the metropolis, and many other large towns in England, having been closed, cemeteries became necessary. These furnished a source of vexatious litigation in not a few instances ; in consequence of some of the diocesans refusing to consecrate certain portions, unless such a broad distinction was made between them and the unconsecrated parts as was deemed invidious, unnecessary, and unchristian. Section xi. of the above act therefore says, "It shall not be necessary to erect or maintain any wall or fence between the consecrated and the unconsecrated portions of any burial ground provided," either by the "previous acts," and "by this act or any of them:" only "the boundaries of such portions" shall be marked out by a "stone or iron," as shall "be sufficient" to show the respective limits. This provision thus removes one fruitful source of parochial strife. But as this was not the only source of evil, the 12th section furnishes a remedy for other mischiefs, arising from the refusal on the part "of any bishop to consecrate the" new ground. In this case, the archbishop may grant "a licence to use it, as if it had been consecrated." So far, then, consecration amounts to little or nothing intrinsically. Had this been all, the act would have proved unproductive of benefit. Section xiii. therefore provides, that any "incumbent, curate, or duly qualified person, if he think fit, may bury in such burial ground, *prior* to the



decision of the bishop or archbishop, upon the application for the consecration thereof."

This seeming relief is limited, feeble, and uncertain. Limited, because it is only "prior to the decision:" feeble, because the diocesan might withdraw the licence of the curate or incumbent who should "think fit" so to bury: and it is not likely he would thus involve himself in litigation with his bishop as to the full force of the words "it shall be lawful" for him to do the thing the bishop refuses to approve: and uncertain, inasmuch as the remedy simply shifts the burden of legal proceedings from the pre-existing parties, viz., the burial board and the bishop; and places it on to the incumbent or curate, and his bishop.

More than this. Those parishes which have not, because they need not, new cemeteries; continue exposed (and in small towns and villages the liability is great) to all the present unseemly and unchristian conflicts between canon law and the law of the land, upon this subject of burial. And still more, this act makes no provision against families being divided in death, even in the new cemeteries. A parent (for instance) may be interred in "the consecrated portion" of the ground: his offspring might be denied Christian burial in the same tomb or grave, if he were not a member of the Episcopal Church! and that by virtue of the authority of canon law. The whole code must therefore be abrogated, ere this stigma is removed from our legislation.

# INDEX.

## A

- Ability* and inspiration, distinguished in the ministrations at the altar. 136.
- Abstinence*, prior to and after the Communion. 37, 44.
- Abbot* (the) of Bangor: his reply to Augustine. xviii.
- Adoration* of the rood, or cross. 84, 183.
- " of the host. 151.
- " of "the King of Glory under cover of bread." 149.
- " said to be meant for Christ. 149.
- Adrian* (Pope): Submission of the civil power to him and his successors. 60, 62.
- Age*, "this enlightened," and the dark ages. 195.
- Agincourt*, Battle of: a miracle wrought at the tomb of John of Beverley. 187.
- Alfred* the Great, and penal laws. 68.
- Altar*, a national monument, and embodying the national character. v.
- " its influence upon society at large, both in ancient and modern times. vi.
- " the *one* point by which Christianity is now endangered. ix.
- " Pagan altars (see Pagan—model, notions, rites, law, and morality.)
- " motive power, it became: by reason of freedom being given at the altar. 32, 33.
- " "cloths," by whom to be washed. 158.
- " to be of stone. 122.
- " offerings for, presented as oblations by the people. 64.
- " "contempt of God's altar," charged against those priests who married. 127.
- " the, profits arising from, bought and sold. 143.
- Angels* present at the altar. 99.
- Anglo-Saxon* Dynasty: the progressive development of Eucharistic errors. 22 to 102.
- " " the influence of these errors upon Christianity. 109.
- " " the moral assimilation between the last of the Saxon laws and the present time. 110.
- Antiquity*, appeal to; ought to include the *whole* of a period. 10.
- Archbishops*, scuffle between two, at a council. 131.
- Arius* denounced. 83.
- Articles*, the Six Articles Act of Henry VIII. 191.
- " those of Edward VI. and Elizabeth placed in parallel columns. 233.
- "*Atoning* (the) celebration" offered for the quick and dead. 50, 52.
- " " arose out of misconceptions of the death of Christ. 53.
- " " assimilated to pagan notions. 54.

- Augustine*, his conferences with the British bishops and teachers. xvii.  
 " rejected by them. xviii.  
 " not the first to establish Christianity in England.  
 " canonized for having "first brought baptism and the rule of Christianity." xvi.  
 " his authority set aside (virtually) by Edward VI. 245.  
 " re-acknowledged by Elizabeth. 245, 246.  
*Authority* of the Bishop of Rome: when and how first established. 48, 61.  
 " renounced by Henry VIII. 193.  
 " the ulterior object towards which this authority was uniformly directed. 14, 17, 19.  
 " of Christ defeated by the laws respecting his table. 289.  
 " " (the sole) in his church. 294.  
 " " obedience to it, the only security for the church. 291-3-4.  
 " of the Scriptures. (See Scriptures.)

## B

- Baptism*: Augustine canonized for having brought it first. 309.  
 " (of infants): the first penal law known in these isles was the enforcement of infant baptism. 310.  
 " " if priest too drunk to baptize, punished for "the damnation of a soul." 310.  
 " " to be everywhere the same. 311.  
 " " not to pour water, but to immerse three times. 311.  
 " " administered in rivers. 34.  
 " " refusal to baptize, and the penalty. 311.  
 " " the chrism used at. 311.  
 " " children to be taught the Lord's Prayer. 318.  
 " " if administered by parents, dissolved their marriage; and yet they were bound to baptize their child. 314.  
 " " wherein its whole virtue consists. 315, 317, 200.  
 " " baptismal fonts. 315, 317, 200.  
 " " at what season to be administered, and why. 316.  
 " " the first PLANK OF SALVATION. 316, 322.  
 " " exorcism at. 317.  
 " " fillets. 318.  
 " " baptistry(the)sanctified afore any child was baptized. 319.  
 " " white garments put on at baptism and worn seven days. 319.  
 " " penal law under Elizabeth for refusing to have a child baptized. 320.  
 " " ministers who refused to baptize infants not to be restored. 321.  
 " " regenerative power of, dependent upon the intention of the priest. 322.  
*Beer* not to be used as the sacrifice. 122.  
*Bell* to be carried by or before the priest on his way to the sick. 139.  
 " to be tolled at the elevation of the host. 151.

- Beverley, John of*, miracle wrought at his tomb. 187.
- Bishops* (see episcopate.)
- Body of Christ* (the): "this is my body"—the rule of interpretation of the words. 2.
- „ „ designated "the Eucharist." 67.
- „ „ "a thing" eaten by the wicked. 245.
- „ „ "verily and indeed taken and received." 253.
- „ „ those who believed the bread changed into the body and blood of Christ excluded parliament. 267.
- „ "the body of God eaten with faith," said to be, in the time of Elfric. 84—the present opinion of many, 88—and so said also in the time of Elizabeth. 241.
- „ "body of man," a medicine for, repositied in the seven Sacraments. 150.
- „ "*preserve thy body* and soul," now used in giving the bread to communicants. 215.
- „ "the holy Sacrament of." 225.
- „ not to make the body of Christ a god, nor his Godhead a body. 225.
- „ the expression mixed up with others: viz., "the holy mystery," "holy housel," &c. 100.
- „ "the bread and wine by nature;" "the body and blood of Christ in mystery." 147.
- „ carried to the sick and dying; conflicts between the people and priests as to whether it was the *whole* body of Christ. 139.
- „ said to be "a sacrament and a sacrifice of a sacrament." 150.
- „ though given under "the species of bread," said to be "the whole living and true Christ"—the doctrine of concomitance, *i.e.*, the bread contained bread *and* wine. 151.
- „ reserved and renewed every week. 157.
- „ "Hoc est corpus meum"—the last syllable in "Hic est sanguis meus," the moment of the change taking place. 159. (This moment united with the "intention" of the priest.) 159.
- „ "the sweet body of Christ," carried by priest (or intended to be) to the sick, saved criminous priests from arrest (162-3); put the whole kingdom into a disturbance. Note in pp. 163-4.
- „ "the natural body of Christ" in the bread, *i.e.*, the flesh under the form of bread, contains the blood; the blood, under the form of wine, contains the flesh of Christ, as well apart as together; or the doctrine of concomitance repeated by Henry VIII., and those who denied it, burnt. 191 to 196.
- „ not received, "even then, when we receive the bread." 225.
- „ REPRESENTED by the bread. 227.
- „ COMMUNION of the body of Christ, and PARTAKING of the body of Christ: difference in the articles of Edward and Elizabeth. 236.
- „ "guilty of the body and blood of the Lord," who are: those only who are "despisers of the church of God." 237-9.
- Body*, change of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ *virtually* reaffirmed by Elizabeth (241), and by so doing linked the then past with the forthcoming future. 247.

- Body*, change of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ renounced by Edward VI. 240.
- Books* (the) "of the four Synods equal to the four books of Christ." 83.
- Bread*, reserved, the period when it was set apart as the Eucharist. 7.
- " offered by the people for the Eucharistic solemnity in the church. 9, 64.
- " "musty," priests censured for keeping it till it became so (84); to be burned in a clean fire. 95.
- " to be baked by the priest himself, or in his presence. 98.
- " not to be reserved above seven days. 135.
- Burial*, Christian rites at; the origin of church power as to burying the dead. 59.
- " in holy ground, first law respecting. 94.
- " the right of interment among pagans. 96.
- " honour paid to righteous men by burying them in churches. 101.
- " state of the graves in churches. 101.
- " monks (disobedient), first threat against them of not being buried in the churchyard, and why. 125.
- " denied to all persons who did not go to confession, and partake of the Eucharist thrice a year. 167.
- " assimilation to pagan laws; with which the laws of the church are compared. 168-9.
- " observations upon the whole subject. 169 to 174.
- " partial remedy, provided by statute, against the provisions of canon law. Note W, p. 349.

## C.

- Canon law*, when established. 71.
- " " the canons of 1603. 251.
- " " ought to be abolished. 300.
- " " of the mass, or the special words of consecration. 136.
- " " a separate order of jurisprudence. 266.
- " " the keys by which to open "the gates of grace and salvation to men." 19.
- " " the use made of them in this work. 19.
- Candles*, to be of wax, and why. 157.
- Canterbury*, the Church of St. Martin, in which Augustine first preached. 22.
- Canute*, the honour he paid the body of Elphage. 112.
- " his remarkable laws. 113.
- Catechism*, the short, of Edward VI. 222.
- " the present, as enlarged by James I. 253.
- Celibacy* of priests. 126.
- " " honours given to. 127.
- " effect of this doctrine, as to laymen and second marriages. 129.
- Christians* (the ancient Roman) left a church in which Augustine first preached. 22.
- " religion enforced. (See penal laws.)
- Christianity* and monarchy, united:
- " " under Alfred. 70.

*Christianity* and monarchy, under the King of Northumbria. 76.

” ” ” William the Conqueror. 119.

” so presented as to seem only a miniature exhibition of the moral government of God. 98.

*Chronological development of Eucharistic errors.*—The papal power having at its first establishment in this country made a compromise with paganism (p. 16), such compromise took effect, principally by means of the altar. The pagans had “deified the effect of God, as bread and wine” (p. 243), and were followed by the Church of Rome. Pagans believed in a real presence (p. 15), which Rome also adopted (see pagan) gradually and by almost imperceptible means.

The notion of a special character being imparted to bread and wine, did not, therefore, originate in Christianity; but was incorporated into its external institutions, with the view of establishing a *visible* government of Christ on earth. The only pathway to his throne, either of grace or of glory, being that which encompasseth his table. Hence the claim to the rights of a celestial empire. 18, 19.

The methods by which this claim were established and enforced, were by the following order of development, viz. :

By destroying the original household celebration (38); the proofs of the fact that the Lord’s supper was a daily observance, and formed part of domestic worship. 7 to 10.

By teaching that priests only might celebrate it as a “sacrifice in consecrated churches.” 38. That it was “the viaticum,” or only preparation for death. 40.

Priests only were to keep the reserved Eucharistic bread. 41, 43.

And give it to the dying. 40. And at Easter, Christmas, and Pentecost. 41.

By denying it to those who were not reconciled to their bishop. 45.

By teaching that priests should learn “the spiritual signification.” 50.

” that it was essential as a preservation against vice and sin in the living, and secured rest for the souls of the dead. 52.

” that “the Sacrament of Christ” was more carefully to be observed as to its celebration, than sacrifices under the law. 63.

” that it was *the* preparation for death. 65.

” that it imparted consecration to churches. 67.

” that it was changed by the priest into the body of Christ. 84.

” that it entitled the dead to lie in holy ground. 94.

” that it was to be “received with awe and reverence as a mystery.” 100 to 134.

” that not to take it, was contempt of the right law of God. 104.

” that it expelled devils, and attracted angels, to the altar. 113.

” that it was “*the* secret,” or mystery. 122.

” that a “lettered priest” only could celebrate it; and was the *pre-eminent Sacrament* of the church. 134.

” that an error in celebrating “endangered both the souls and bodies of men.” 135.

- By teaching that God inspires the priest at the celebration. 136.
- „ that it was to be kept under lock and key. 138.
- „ that it was “the King of Glory under cover of bread,” and to be adored wherever it was carried. 149.
- „ that it was “the whole living and true Christ.” 151.
- „ that “the whole court of heaven was present at the consecration, and after it is consecrated.” 157.
- „ that it was to shelter priests from arrest, so long as they were carrying it to the sick, or *intended* to do so. 163.
- „ that not to go to confession and receive the Eucharist at Easter, expose to the loss of “Christian burial when dead,” and denied entrance into church while men were alive. 167.
- „ that other opinions than those taught by the church were to be punished by the persons holding them being IMPRISONED. 176.
- „ And this last penalty having failed, heretics were to be BURNED as traitors. 180 to 191.

For the after developments at the “Reformation,” and the “Retrospection,” see under those words respectively.

- Church*, formed of persons, each possessing inward principles: where the Spirit of Christ is, there his church is. 5.
- „ in its corporate capacity, possesses no original power over the Lord's Supper. 5, 9.
- „ described by Edward VI. 226.
- „ a company of new people. 233.
- „ the *Primitive*—*i.e.*, “for five hundred years and more after the ascension of Christ.” 199.
- „ „ acknowledged by Edward VI. as his standard; and so repudiated all that had been done by Augustine and his successors. 199, 200.
- „ the *laws* by which it is to be governed. 226.
- „ „ but which it has itself transgressed. 239.
- „ the *Universal*—admits diversity without destroying unity, or “the communion of saints.” 202, 227.
- „ the *Anglo-Saxon*—meant to be self-relying, or independent of Rome, and how prevented. xix.
- „ „ additional proof by Bishop Burnet. 279.
- „ “the Church of *Malignants*”—erected by the Old Sophister. 183, 185.
- „ „ „ or those malignant spirits which were driven out by the Exorcist. 85.
- „ *Nonconformist Churches*—when first denounced. 139, 149, 165, 180, 251.
- „ „ ministers, deprived. 262.
- „ „ contrast between them and the priests, who in A.D. 950 were liable to the sanction of a penal law. 263.
- „ the *Scotch Episcopal*—repudiated. 67, 145.
- „ “the Church of God, the despisers of,” mentioned by the apostle Paul (1 Cor. xi. 22 and 27), “and their being guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.” 237, 239.

- Change* (the) of the bread and wine: how effected. No. 4 in Elfric's laws, page 84.
- "          "          "          denied. 240.
- "          "          "          the pagan belief of a change in bread and wine. 248.
- Compendium* of religion, in the one law of love to God and man. This the only and complete law for the Church. 287.
- Concomitance*, doctrine of; or the bread and wine given in the bread only. 151.
- Convocation*, acts of.
- "          at the time of Henry IV. 187
- "          "          Henry VIII. 191.
- "          (see Synoda.)
- " *Contempt of the right law of God*"—what, and the penalty for. 104.
- Constantine*, and a ladder to heaven. 329.
- Confession*, one to another. 65.
- "          the general. 214.
- "          to the priest. 167.
- "          to the minister. 210.
- "          why and how discouraged. 211.
- Confessors* and confessors. 154.
- Confessional* (the), or ecclesiastical cesspool. 167.
- "          its place in the church. 167.
- "          the guilty wife, or the guilty husband, at. 168.
- "          and Christian burial. 167.
- Consecration* of a church by laying up relics, or the Eucharist. 67.
- "          of water for baptism, and consecration of bread for the Eucharist, originally at the same time, 312.
- Consecrated* and unconsecrated wine. 136, 151.
- Communion*, to be given to the sick. 40, 151.
- "          if deprived by one bishop, not to be given by another. 45.
- "          the original designation of the Lord's Supper. 31, 26.
- "          "partakers of," and "partakers of the Lord's body." 236-9.
- "          frequenter of, stood higher in rank than non-communists. 27, 33.
- "          the number required to be present. 99.
- "          not to receive it according to the rites of the Church of England, exposes Episcopalians to a suit in the Ecclesiastical Courts. 246.
- "          (the) Book, and nonconformists. 251.
- Cuthbert*, Archbishop of Canterbury, the great corruptor of the Eucharist. 50.
- Cup*, the Sacramental, not to be touched by laymen. 99.
- Cycles*, in the moral as well as the physical creation; or the law of ecclesiastical rotation. 286.

## D.

- Daily observance* of the Lord's Supper at the principal meal, or the household character of the institution by Christ, and the celebration by the early Christians. 2-10.
- "          "          who might take "the Mystery" every day. 101—the substitute for this. 151.
- Dark Ages*, the. See Age.



- Death of Christ*, the design of, identical with the design of his life; sympathy with both, the means of our benefit. 53.
- „ „ misconception of the death of Christ, the groundwork of Eucharistic errors and practices. 54.
- “*Death*, (the sin unto”), and “the sin not unto death;” observations upon 1 John v. 16. 327.
- Dead*, “rest for the souls of.” 52.
- „ “the souls of the dead miserably defrauded.” 57.
- „ masses for the souls of the dead: the opinion nor practice, not harmless. 55.
- „ judgment pronounced upon both, by statute of Edward VI. 55.
- „ injury they proved to the state, in three principal institutions which sprung out of the opinion. 57.
- Die*, “not fearing to die for the Catholic faith.” 66.
- „ not fearing to die for the “Regality,” in opposition to the Bishop of Rome. 337.
- Dioclesian*, persecution under him in Britain, in the fourth century. 14.
- „ „ compared with that which occurred in the fifteenth century. 231.
- “*Divine Service*,” meaning of the phrase; *i.e.*, prayers, &c., offered on behalf of those who had made grants of land to the church. See Land.
- Dinorth*. (See Abbot.)
- Drunk*, if the priest so drunk as to be unable to baptize a child, the punishment. 310.
- Drunken* priests and bouts. 141.
- „ frolics, and violence in the churches at the Lord's Supper. 161, 164.
- Dynasties*, in England; laws grouped according to them, in relation to the Eucharist.
- „ the *Roman*. 24.
- „ the *Anglo-Saxon*. 22-111.
- „ the *Danes*, Canute. 112.
- „ the *Norman*. 118-126.
- „ *Saxons* restored and Plantaganets. 131.
- „ House of Lancaster. 171.
- „ House of Tudor,  
Henry VIII. 190.  
Edward VI. 196.  
Mary. 229.  
Elizabeth. 232.
- „ the *Stuarts*,  
James I. 248.  
The Commonwealth, 256.  
The Restoration. Charles II. 260  
The Revolution. 268.
- „ the House of Brunswick. 273.

## E.

- Easter*, the time of keeping, fixed. 41.
- „ Communion to be taken then. 41.

- Easter, Eucharist and Confession.* 167.
- "        "        "        if not both performed then, the penalty of non-observance. 167—9.
- "        imitation of Pagan notions and customs. 345.
- "        to be observed with equal devotion as the Lord's-day. 46.
- "        state of public morals, in connection with the feast of Easter and other feasts. 164
- " *Eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ,*" the meaning of the words uttered by Christ; and the meaning put upon them by the church. 52, and Note D, p. 333.
- Ecbriht, Archbishop of York, canons of.* 36.
- Edward the Confessor's dream.* 116.
- Edward VI., his statute relating to the Altar.* 196.
- "        his two Books of Common Prayer. 203.
- "        his short catechism. 224.
- "        his articles of faith, placed in parallel columns with those of Elizabeth. 232.
- "        his reign—to become the rallying point of effort. 281, 299.
- Ecclesiastical power,* (the) when it exhausted its own resources, to draw or drive men up to the altar. 173.
- "        "        the help it sought and obtained from the civil power. 175.
- "        "        sets up a claim to "imperial command." 17.
- "        "        instance in which this claim was exercised in England. 175.
- Elfric, Archbishop of Canterbury.* 80.
- "        the first who taught that the bread was *changed*. 84.
- "        the errors he taught, the result of the then past, as also the germ of the then future errors of the church upon transubstantiation. 85—9.
- Elizabeth, her articles relating to the Lord's Supper.* 232.
- " *Empire, the rights of a celestial,*" claimed by the key-keepers. 18.
- Episcopate, the—English bishops meet and confer with Augustine.* xvii.
- "        "        "        refuse to submit to the Bishop of Rome. xviii.
- "        "        "        meet at Hatfield, and submit. xx.
- "        "        "        "        their order, or rank; teachers being next as an order. xx.
- "        "        "        described as having the superintendence of spiritual affairs. Use made of this word six hundred years afterwards. 305.
- "        "        "        had no "jurisdiction," until after the introduction of the Roman or civil law. xviii.
- "        "        "        "        "judicial decrees," or Roman model. 327.
- "        "        "        "        succinct account of the evils arising from such power. 327.
- "        "        "        "        proof from Scripture that such power is fraught with imminent peril. 329.
- "        "        "        "        "        illustration of the fact. 329.
- "        the twelve bishops who met Cuthbert, and were said to be "*masters or teachers of others.*" 49.

- Episcopate*, Hedde, the third Bishop of Winchester, advises the first sacramental test. 25.
- " Elfric, Archbishop of Canterbury—several of the same name. Note in 81.
- " Bishop and Presbyter—Mass Priest or Elder—interchangeable terms. 85.
- " Bishops—council of held at Oxford, " for the recovery of the exercise of the Catholic religion." 103.
- " Bishops—scuffle between two Archbishops at a council. 131.
- " Episcopal synods, held yearly. 138—and half-yearly. 284.
- " Bishops complain to the King as to the arrest of priests. 163—as to heretica. 179.
- " " palm off a gross delusion as to John of Beverley. 187.
- " " advise the Six Articles' Act of Henry VIII. 191.
- " " appeal to the episcopal peers of the realm. 284.
- " " how they came to be ranked as Barons. 306.
- " " their ancient rights as Barons. 307.
- " " their efforts at three periods. 286.
- Episcopal* (the early) church, not lost its independent rights. 279, 280.
- " *Error*," an, in offices, fatal to bodies and souls. 135.
- " in ordination, fatal to orders. 160.
- " " the ignorance of priests plunges the people into error." 79.
- Eucharist*, the, or thanksgiving for food at the principal meal. 2.
- " the daily observance. 10.
- " said to be " whole of religion"—the error of this proved. 10.
- " in private houses interdicted. 7, 38, 75.
- " " " except in cases of necessity. 85.
- " to be given to the sick, lest they die without it. 41.
- " to be taken thrice in a year. 41, 167.
- " to be given to newly-baptized children. 46.
- " to be received according to the judgment of the priests. 65.
- " to be laid up with other relics at the consecration of a church. 67.
- " not to be sopt. 132.
- " not to be consecrated in any chalice not made of gold or silver, 133, 135.
- " to be reserved in a decent pyx. 136.
- " the three models, expressive of the character of the Episcopate at three different periods. 286.
- " " let to farm and set to sale." 141-3.
- " to be kept in a tabernacle. 148.
- " the alteration of the word, " Eucharist," and the substitution of the words, Sacrament, Mass, Holy Communion and Sacrifice. 150.
- " the last use of the word by canon law was when it had entirely failed to induce men to observe the customs of the church. 167.
- " the thanksgiving tribute of a portion of the principal food. 344.
- Esorcist*, an officer in the church. 85.
- Esorcism*, or expulsion of devils at the altar, 113.
- form of expulsion at baptism. 318.

- Exorcism* interdicted, except with the consent of the bishop. 318.  
 " *Exhalations* from the infernal pit"—what, or who. 149.  
 " *Exercise of Religion*," comprehensive use of the canon upon this subject, and how the generic term is restricted. 103.  
*Excommunication*—mass suspended during the reading of the service—and why. 166.

## F.

- " *Father*," prayer to be addressed only to him. 53.  
*Faith*, credence substituted for vital faith. 54.  
 ,, "the body of God eaten with Faith." 84.  
 ,, "the body of Christ taken and eaten in the Supper," by "the mean of faith." 241, 245.  
 ,, the faithful do verily take it. 253.  
 ,, the Catholic Apostolic. 66. Not fearing to die for it. 66, and Note G, page 337.  
*Families*, the character of, imparts the character to the church. 5, 10.  
 ,, "rights of," at Easter. 8.  
*Fasts*, custom of, and abstinence. 37.  
 ,, number of, reduced. 207.  
 ,, fasting, the Sacrament to be received fasting. 137.  
*Ferial Days*, or days set apart for private prayer in a church, rather than in any other place; custom among the Anglo-Saxons, Mahommedans, and is being revived in the present day. 110.  
*Fingers* (the), of priests, their washings, to be given to the sick. 139, 141.  
*Fire*, ordeal by. 78.  
 ,, bread (stale) to be burnt in a clean fire. 95.  
 ,, old corporals to be burnt. 138.  
*Fillets*, put on the head of children at baptism. 318.  
*Form* of words at giving the elements used by the papal and Protestant church of. 215. See also Words.  
*Freedom* given to slaves at the altar. 31.  
 ,, contrasted with republican slavery. 31.  
 ,, from taxes granted the church. 30.  
*Forcs*, in religion. 104, 119.  
 " *Friar John*," [Peckham, Archbishop of Canterbury], or "roaring John;" his remarkable laws. 141.  
*Friburgh*, or the bishop's family. 307.

## G.

- Goods*, confiscation of, for not baptizing a child. 310.  
 ,, ,, of heretics. 386.  
*Grace* conveyed by the Sacrament, but on one condition—162; and by an ineffable law. 162.  
*Godliness*. 226.  
*Good Works*, 226.  
*Government* of God; Christianity not a miniature exhibition of, however so regarded by many. 93.

- Government of Christ.* 252.  
 „ of God by Christ, upon what it depends. 332.  
 „ of the church; reason why God has changed the order of its government. 332.  
*Grace bounding back.* 153.

## H.

- “*Heaven, the whole court of,*” present at the consecration. 18, 157.  
*Heresy, when first the civil power, determined that it would entertain theological opinions, or what was, or was not, heresy.* 66. See also Penal Law.  
 „ the Pelagian; how suppressed in the fourth century. xv.  
 „ the Arian; how suppressed in the fifth century. xv.  
*Henry VIII, and his law defining transubstantiation.* 190, 196.  
*Heretics, first statute against them.* 175.  
 „ Lollards, the. 180, 186.  
*Hocus pocus, origin of the phrase.* 198.  
*Hospitality, and the celebration of the memorial of Christ.* 4.  
*Housel, the old Saxon word for the household thanksgiving, or observance of the Lord’s Supper, as a part of domestic religion.* 7.  
*Household, observance of the Lord’s Supper,*  
 „ original necessity for such observance. 2.  
 „ tenacity with which the people clung to such observance. 4.  
 „ advantage of it. 5.  
 „ proofs of the custom, taken from—  
 „ the practice of Apostles. 6.  
 „ the early church. 7.  
 „ the Saxon word, Housel. 7.  
 „ the English canon of 740. 7.  
 „ the statute of Henry VIII. 8.  
 „ the two Books of Prayer of Edward VI. 9.  
 „ use of the term, as descriptive of the church. 298.  
*Householders, the church borrowed from them, and not they derived from the church.* 9.  
 „ when and how they were finally excluded concurrent power in the government of the church. 77–8, and Note H.

## I and J.

- Inæ, West Saxon King—*  
 „ first sacramental test imposed by him. 26.  
 „ „ „ „ its operation. 27.  
 „ „ „ „ linked the altar with the land. 27, and Appendix, p. 329.  
 „ „ „ „ established tribute to the pope. 28.  
 „ turns saint, and dies at Rome. 29.  
 “*Indignation of God,*” against unworthy partakers of the Lord’s Supper. 201.  
*Innocency, the top of.* 228.

- Judas* not present at the Lord's Supper. 132, 201.  
*Inspiration* and ability. 136. See also "Intention."  
*Introit*, discountenanced by Edward VI. 220, 276. See also Music.  
*Intention*, doctrine of; or, the state of the priest's mind when performing divine offices,  
 " commencement of the doctrine. 114.  
 " enlarged by the claim to inspiration. 136.  
 " associated with its converse, or "reluctancy of mind," and the effect of such reluctancy in masses for the dead. 152.  
 " effect of, at the moment of pronouncing the last syllable at the consecration of the Eucharist. 159.  
 " " in ordination of priests. 160.  
 " " upon the *whole* credit of religion. 161.  
 " " at baptism. 322.

## K.

- "*Key Keepers*, the, of eternal life and death." 19.  
 "*King of Glory*," carried under cover of bread. 18, 149.  
 " " treason against. 192.

## L.

- Law* forms, as well as indicates, the character of a people. 27.  
 " reason, the life of, contravened by the sacramental laws of Charles II. 268.  
 " Roman law, introduced by Augustine, and adopted by Ethelbert. 23, and Note B, 326.  
 " " " pleaded. 181.  
 " the one law of Christ sufficient for all the purposes of the Church. 288.  
 " " " why set aside by the Church. 289.  
*Laiety* constitute the church. 282.  
 " their rights in the ancient Episcopal church, and the first direct inroad made upon them. 38.  
 " appointed and examined their priests. 39.  
 " taught in the church. 39.  
 " attended synods, and took concurrent part in the government of the church. 45.  
 " how and when deprived—77-80. Why they ought to recover their rights. 282.  
 " took part in the celebration of the Lord's Supper. 214.  
*Land*, when and how first linked in with the altar. 27, and Note C. Influence and effect of this. 329-333.  
*Laufranc* (121) orders a monk to be publicly whipped at Canterbury. 122.  
*Lancaster*, House of, the first to burn heretics. 179.  
*Lenten Vail* torn down by the people—and why. 69.  
*Liberty*, the, "left by authority of God's word to the church." 207.  
*Light of Life*, our perception and enjoyment of. 296.  
*Light*, a, to be brought by the people to the church on Saturday. 101.

- Light*, one, always to be burning in the church. 95. Reason for. 15.  
 „ two, to be used. 157.  
*Light and Lanthorn* to be carried before the priest by the deacon, on his way with the Eucharist to the sick and dying. 136, 157.  
*Liturgical Books*, the priest free to use such as were provided. 96.  
 „ „ divers sorts of Common Prayer. 204.  
 „ „ Liturgies of Edward VI., quoted in pages 183-4, 276, 280-2-6, 298, 301.  
*Life*, the Christian, how principally preserved. 233.  
 „ “no life in you;” instance of perverted meaning. 52, and Note D.  
*Lollards*, recapitulation of their acts. 180.  
 „ front of their offence. 184.  
 „ the taking of. 186.  
*Lord's Supper*, a household observance. 6-12. See Housel, Household; also, Eucharist, Communion, Sacrifice, Sacrament, Host, Mass, Viaticum.  
*Lord's-day*, placed upon an equality with Easter week. 46.  
 „ how to be kept after “the Holy Service.” 101.

## M.

- Marriage*, a sacrament; first sign of. 45.  
 „ second marriages, penalty of death for contracting. 129.  
*Mass*, whether one mass is as effectual for one thousand men as one thousand masses. 162.  
*Mary's reign*. 229.  
*Mercia*, kingdom of, submits to the Pope. 52.  
 „ laws made in, as to relics. 67.  
*Medicines*, the seven, for the body and soul. 150-2.  
*Memorial of Christ*, or the Lord's Supper, a simple “remembrance” of him. 3.  
 „ „ must correspond with the design of Christ. 293.  
 “*Mind* (the), of Christ;” its power over human minds by *itself*; without any conducting agent, as wine, &c. 5.  
*Modes of Baptism*. See Baptism,  
*Mouse*, not to eat the reserved bread. 7, 84.  
*Monasteries*. 56.  
*Monarchy and Christianity*, first intermixture of, under Alfred. 70.  
 „ „ second avowal of. 76.  
*Music*, a special object with the church of Rome in the seventh and eighth centuries, and sought to be revived in the nineteenth century. 277.\* See also Introit.

---

\* In addition to what is stated in the text, it may be here observed that the “monastic psalmody,” commended by Cuthbert was “to be everywhere followed, and nothing was to be read or sung which is not allowed by common use, but only what is derived from the authority of Holy Scripture, and what the custom of the Roman church permits.”—*Johnson's Ecclesiastical Laws*, A.D. 747 (the 15th).

- Musty bread.* 84. To be burned. 95.  
*Mystery, first use of the word.* 19, 44.  
 „ Greeks and Romans held the opinion. 16, 45.  
 „ “the invisible mystery of dedication,” 147.  
*Mysteries, created and explained by Rome.* 50.  
 „ of pagana. 69.  
 „ how Christ operates in them. 152.  
*Mystery and Sacrament, not the same.* 123.

## N.

- “*New people,*” described by Edward VI., in his articles upon the Lord’s Supper. 233.  
*Nice, Council of.* 43.  
*Noncommunicants* denied Christian burial. 59, 168, 172.  
*Northumbria, Christianity introduced.* 34.  
 „ priests of, laws made by them. 36.

## O.

- Oaths, and Sacrament upon them.* 26.  
 „ pagan and Roman, and forfeiture. 107.  
*Oblation, the.* 98.  
*Offerings of bread for the Lord’s Supper, given by householders.* 9, 64.  
*Oil, hallowed, for baptism.* 312.  
 „ phial of, given by the Virgin Mary, and poured on the head of Henry IV. 178.  
*Opus Operatum, contrast between the Articles of Edward VI. and Elizabeth on this point.* 234.  
*Ordeal and Housel.* 73.  
*Orders in the church, the.* 7, 85, 90.  
*Ordination, orders of, the Scotch Episcopalians rejected.* 67.  
 „ of the Roman church, acknowledged by the Protestant Episcopal church. 265.  
 „ by schismatics. 165, 251.  
 „ how that of the church of Rome is itself hazarded by the doctrine of Intention. 160.  
*Othe, his timid denunciation against those whom he designated “Farmers of the Altar.”* 143.  
*Othobon provides an effectual remedy.* 143.  
 „ his dogma about the inviolable mystery of dedication, and its effects upon the “Table.” 147.

## P.

- Pagan (Model), compromise with, by the Church of Rome.* 14, and Note A, p. 324.  
 „ notions. 15.  
 „ rites, conformity as to,  
 „ “the real presence.” 15.



- Pagan rites, conformity to, as—"the mystery."* 44, 69, 124.  
 " " " " "the quickening power." 51.  
 " " the time of celebrating. . .  
 " " the duty of abstinence. 37, 42.  
 " " the Deifying "the effect of God," as bread and wine. 243.  
 " " assimilation to, in respect of—  
     Processions. 51.  
     "Eye-witnesses of the mysteries." 69.  
     Burial rites. 96.  
     Salt. 97.  
     Burning the remains of the bread. 97.  
 " law, as to an action and oath, and forfeiture of money "sacramento." 107.  
 " " refusal to bury certain persons. 168.  
 " morality, compared with that of Rome. 174.  
 "*Partakers of the Body and Blood of the Lord.*" 236-9.  
*Paulinus, his labours in Northumbria.* 34.  
*People, their consent required, previous to any change in the customs of the early English church.* xvii.  
 " their concurrence *not* given or sought, when the clergy first submitted to the Pope. xxi.  
 " met in church councils. 30.  
 " first direct inroad made upon their rights. 38.  
 " how and when they lost their rights. 77.  
 " offered the bread for the Eucharistic solemnity in the church—and why. 9, 64.  
 " took part in the celebration of the Lord's Supper, by offering the general confession—form of directions for this act, in the time of Edward VI. and the present time. 214.  
 " betokened by the water mingled with the wine. 98, and last clause of I—  
 " received the unconsecrated wine. 136, 151.  
 " not to grind the Sacrament with their teeth—and the reason for. 151.  
*Penal Laws, relating to Sacraments—*  
 " the first for not baptizing infants. 310.  
 " Non-communicants first censured. 41.  
 " for not confessing at Easter. 167.  
 " for not believing in the real presence. 180-91.  
 " under Alfred. 70.  
 " " Ethelred. 104.  
 " " William the Conqueror. 119.  
 " " Richard II. 175.  
 " " Henry IV. 180.  
 " " Henry V. 186.  
 " " Henry VIII. 190.  
 " " Edward VI. 198.  
 " " Mary. 230.  
 " " Elizabeth. 246.  
 " " Charles II. 260.  
*Penance "sinks souls deeper in the abyss of damnation."* 154.  
*Peterborough, Abbot of, buys a dead saint for £500.* 103.

- Peterborough*, made "the shire of Christ." 331.
- Peter Pence*, a tribute paid to Rome— its first establishment, and after effects. 28.
- Plantagenets*. 131.
- Plough-land*, and the Communion. 26.  
 " number of acres. 26.
- Philosophy*, the, of the Altar. 5.  
 " mythological—its duration and influence. 297.  
 " scriptural—its duration and extent. 298.  
 " recessional—its present aspect. 298.
- POPE**, the, or Bishop of Rome.  
 " *Gregory* sends Augustine to England. 22.  
 " " his letter of compromise with pagans. 325.  
 " " his idea of abstinence borrowed from pagan Romans. 44.  
 " *Vitalian* sends presents to the King of Northumbria. 35.  
 " " introduced fasts and confessions, preparatory to the Lord's Supper. 37.  
 " *Adrian*, to whom the civil power submits. 60, 335.  
 " *Julius* declares Judas *not* present at the Lord's Supper. 132.  
 " authority of, rejected by the British churches. xviii.  
 " " submitted to by the clergy. xxi.  
 " " submitted to by the civil power. 48, 62.  
 " " rejected as authority, but canon law retained. 193.
- Poynet*, Bishop of Winchester, prepares the short catechism of Edward VI. 286.
- Presbyter* and *Bishop*, the same. 85.
- Praying for the dead*. 54-5.  
 " " continued till Edward VI.'s time. 212.  
 " " silently dropped. 212.  
 " in a church, privately, on fixed occasions—and why. 109.
- "*Pray for the King*," men left by law to do so of their own accord. 80.
- Prayer*, or the act of *teaching ourselves*. 301.  
 " (a) to be said by a child before learning its lesson at school. 233.
- Pre-eminence of the host*. 134.  
 " " injury arising from undue exaltation of the Lord's Supper. Note in page 134.
- Presence*, the real, believed in by pagans. 16.  
 " " renounced by Edward VI. 225.  
 " " virtually re-affirmed by Elizabeth. 241.
- Preparation* for receiving the Holy Mystery. 100.
- Primitive Church*, the period within which it is fixed by law. 199.  
 " " appealed to by Edward VI. 225.  
 " " originally independent. 279.
- Processions* required to be formed on certain occasions. 51.  
 " assimilated to those called *Pompa* among pagan Romans. 51.  
 " revived in some churches in the present day. 51.
- Priest* and *Bishop*, interchangeable terms. 85.  
 " to have his wife—if a child, to be baptized; or a man, houseled. 89.  
 " not to celebrate without book. 95.  
 " **NOR ALONE**. 98.  
 " to bake the Eucharistic bread himself. 98.

- Priest* said to propitiate the Lord. 113.  
 „ not to live with women. 127.  
 „ nor be married. 128.  
 „ not to celebrate twice a-day. 135.  
 „ the priest *inspired* at the Altar. 136.  
 „ to have a clean box for the Eucharist. 139.  
 „ not to kiss the host. 141.  
 „ made a bargain for the profits of the Altar. 143.  
 „ the prayer of the priest makes the bread and cup a solemn oblation. 146.  
 „ to have his surplice, lantern, and bell when carrying the Eucharist to the sick. 148.  
 „ only to use the sacrifice. 38.  
 „ examined and appointed by the people. 39.  
 „ not to celebrate in private houses. 38.  
 „ to give the viaticum. 40, 95.  
 „ to keep the bread and wine. 43, 148.  
 „ always to keep themselves prepared for the Holy Communion. 51.  
 „ not to celebrate the mass with naked legs. 63.  
 „ judgment of, to guide receiving the Eucharist. 65.  
 „ to hallow the ordeal by fire. 73.  
 „ fined twenty shillings if celebrated mass in an unhallowed house. 75, 85.  
 „ not to be trusted *alone* with the rights of the people or interests of religion. 79.  
 „ description of their moral habits. 94.  
 „ might be clipped against their will. 135.  
 „ their neglect to change the bread. 150-2.  
 „ to give the Sacraments to those in a frenzy. 152.  
 „ not to make office nauseous. 157.  
 „ not to be arrested. 163.  
 „ the place in the church where he was to hear confessions. 167.  
 „ insults offered them in the streets. 198.

## Q.

*Qualifications* for partaking of the Housel, or Sacrament: the two standards. 95.

## R.

- “*Real Presence*” (the) believed in by pagans. 15.  
 „ renounced by Edward VI. 240.  
 „ why such renunciation was discontinued by Elizabeth. 241.  
*Reformation* (the). 196 to 229, and 232 to 247.  
 „ denounced by statute. 299  
 „ must by statute be acknowledged. 299.  
*Relics*. 51, 67, 112.  
 “*Remembrance*” (the) of Christ: how this characteristic of the Lord's Supper was lost; and why. 12, 13.  
 „ the one point upon which the whole institution of the Supper now turns. 298 and xi.  
*Responsibility* (individual): Canute's law of. 114.  
 „ „ its bearing upon the whole of religion. 79.

- Reserved bread* (the). 84, 135. (See also bread and Eucharist.)
- Rights of the people*—first direct inroad made upon them. 38.
- "    "    how lost. 77.
- Roman law*—by whom introduced. 23.
- "    quoted as to taxation, 24.
- "    "    as to sacrilege. 181.
- "    "    as to satisfaction. 106.
- "    "    as to "communion." 237.
- "    "    as to "speciea." 342.
- Romans* (the ancient Christian) built the church in which Augustine first preached. 22.
- "*Resurrection*, the sign of." 224.
- Retgression*, under Mary. 229.
- "    under the Stuarts. 248.
- S.
- Sabbath*, how observed after "the holy service." 101.
- Sacraments*, the seven; or medicines for the body and soul of man. 150.
- "    the two. 233.
- "    the conflicts respecting them. 289.
- "    the injury they have proved. 290.
- Sacrifice*, the first use of this word in relation to the Lord's Supper; and its influence. 12.
- "    "the salutary;" to whom denied. 125.
- "    offered at the time of the Eucharist. 146.
- "    of a Sacrament. 150.
- "    the best Christian men can offer. 205.
- Salt* used at mass. 97.
- Salvation*, "the very true and perfect by the death of Jesus Christ," withheld from men for 800 years. 55.
- Saturday*, a preparation for the Sabbath. 101.
- Saxon monarchs* ensnared by Rome. 36.
- "    "    copied from each other. 70.
- "    (See also dynasties—the Saxon.)
- Schismatic* ordinations repudiated. 139, 251.
- Scotland*, the King of, refuses to receive a Legate from Rome. 145.
- "    the Episcopal Church in. 147.
- "    none of the "Scottish extract" to administer the Eucharist in England. 67, 145.
- Scripture*, authority of: in suppressing error. xv.
- "    "    in exciting devotion. 205.
- "    "    in extending "the liberty left to the Church of Christ." 207.
- "    "    in the use of psalmody. (See the note under Music in this index.)
- Secret* (the) of the mass. 123.
- Self-reliance*: inducing self-respect and personal improvement; the basis of Christianity. 79.
- Service of Christ* (the) taught by Augustine to be free. 31.

- Services of Christ* (the), how and when first made compulsory. 104.
- Simplicity* (the): that is in Christ Jesus. 294.
- " such as was used by the apostles. 301.
- Slaves* had their freedom given at the altar. 31.
- " inducement this offered to regard priests as their friends. 32.
- " the interest of slaves a prime object with the Anglo-Saxon Church. 33.
- Sonship* of Christ. 43.
- Souls*, rest of. 52-3-6.
- " to sing for, interdicted. 55.
- " pagans accustomed to the same thing. 55.
- Spiritual signification* of the Sacraments. 50, 242.
- Stigmata*. 118, 121.
- Submission* of the civil power to the bishop of Rome. 61.
- Swords*, the two; or the connecting link between theological error and secular persecution. 120.
- " enunciation of the principle. 119.
- " employment of the principle. 175.
- Synods*: who attended them. 45.
- " the six, or general councils; when their authority first established in England. 66.
- " the four books of, equal to the four books of Christ. 83.
- " Episcopal. 138.
- "    " revival of; a duty and an advantage. 283.

## T.

- Table* of the Lord (the): how the Church of Rome converted it into a means of gaining dominion. 13.
- Tabernacle* for the Eucharist. 148.
- Taverns* more frequented than churches. 164.
- Teachers*: a distinct order of, in the church at the time of Augustine. xvii.
- " also at the time of Theodore. xx.
- " virtually extinguished in the time of Ecbriht. 39.
- " unacknowledged by Elfric. 90.
- " order of, may be revived. 92.
- Teaching* ourselves by prayer. 301.
- Tests*: the first Sacramental test. 26.
- " the second, or municipal test. 260.
- " the clergy test. 262.
- " the parliamentary test. 266.
- Thene*, honour of, given to unmarried priests. 127.
- " why given. 306.
- Theocracy* (Christian): attempt to establish one. 13.
- "    " copied from the Jews and pagans. 14.
- "    " method by which it was sought to be established. 17, 20.
- "    " length of time during which the purpose was being brought about. 18.
- "    " not possible to establish it, unless the Christian Church possessed the land. 330.
- " completed form of, under Henry VIII. 192.

- Theocracy*, why the Jewish theocracy was set aside. 291, 332.  
*Theodore* : first submission of the English bishops to the pope. xx.  
 „ introduced the pagan customs of feasts and abstinence. 37.  
*Theodulf*. 97.  
*Time* : no time runs against the church. 170.  
*Tin* not to be used as a chalice; and why. 133.  
*Transubstantiation* : first development. 84. (No. 4.)  
 „ defined by Henry VIII. 191.  
 „ renounced by Edward VI. 240.  
 „ *virtually* retained under Elizabeth. 242.  
 „ retaliative law against those who believed it. 267.  
*Treason* against the Church. 192.  
*Truth* : "holding it in unrighteousness," or obstructing it in ourselves or others. 292.  
*Tudor*, House of:  
 „ Henry VIII. 190, 194.  
 „ Edward VI. 196.  
 „ Mary. 229.  
 „ Elizabeth. 232.

## U.

- Uniformity* Acts, of Edward VI. 204.  
 „ effects of their being repealed by Mary. 299.  
 „ of Charles II. 262, 266, 271.  
*Usages* of churches out of the kingdom. 202.  
*Unconsecrated* and consecrated hosts. 136.  
 „ „ wine. 151.  
*Unthrif*t, or dissolute men among pagans denied funeral rites. 168.

## V.

- Vail*, the Lenten, torn down by the people. 69.  
 " *Vary* " not from the Catholic faith: declared by Henry VIII. 193.  
*Viatikum* : given to the dying. 40.  
 „ assimilation to pagan rites. 40.  
 „ conflicts respecting. 139.  
*Vitalian*, Pope. 35.  
*Verulam*, martyrdom of St. Alban at. xiv.  
 „ public disputation at, respecting the Pelagian heresy. xv.

## W.

- Washings* of the priests fingers given to the sick. 139.  
*Water* mixed with the wine. 43, 95, 122, 134.  
 „ with which to rinse the cup. 141.  
 „ used in baptism, hallowed. 312.  
 „ the laws (penal) of, preceded those about the bread. 310.

- Wicked men eating the Sacrament.* 245.
- Wickliffe.* 182.
- Wighard*, a native of England, sent to Rome to be consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury; reason why he was sent. 35.
- Wihfred*, King of Kent, and freedom given at the altar. 31.
- William the Conqueror.* 118.
- West Saxons*: their penal laws. 70.
- Wine*, the unconsecrated; why given to the people. 151.
- Words of the canon*: how to be pronounced. 136, 138.
- „ of consecration, and the effect when the last syllable was uttered. 159.
- „ the effect of them. 86.
- „ „ in baptism. 158, 317, 319.
- „ remarkable difference in the words used in giving the elements to the communicant. 215.
- Worship*, public and domestic. 6.
- Women*, though learned, not to teach. 39.
- „ not to come near the altar. 95, 98.
- „ not to be subjected to such penance as should make her suspected of any secret crime against her husband, and *vice versa*. 168.

## Z.

- Zwingle*, how his difficulties about the real presence were overcome. 3.

WORKS RECENTLY PUBLISHED BY JUDD & GLASS,  
38 NEW BRIDGE STREET, & 16 GRAY'S INN ROAD.

 Remitted on receipt of Postage Stamps, by the Publishers, Post-free.

Just Published. Price 20s. with Coloured Chart. 400 pp. Demy 8vo.

**Altar Sins;** or, the Eucharistic Errors of England. By the Rev. EDWARD MUSCUTT.

Just Published. Cloth gilt, square 16mo. Price 2s. 6d.

**Blind Amos and his Velvet Principles;** or, Proverbs and Parables for the Young Folk. By the Rev. E. PAXTON HOOD.

Second Edition. 100pp. stitched, price 6d. In Cloth, 1s.

**The Perpetuity of a Seventh Day Ordinance.** By RICHARD BALL, Esq.

\*.\* The above Work is issued at considerably less than its cost; the Author's object being the Dissemination of the Truth.

Just Published. Fcap. 8vo., Price 3s. 6d. Illustrated with Wood Engravings.

**Voices from the Rocks;** or, a New Interpretation of the Phenomena of Geology; with Strictures on the late Hugh Miller's "Testimony of the Rocks."

Just Published. Second Edition. 416 pp. Crown 8vo. Price 4s.

**Ecclesiography;** or, the Biblical Church Analytically Delineated. By the Rev. JOHN G. MANLY, of Dublin.

SECOND EDITION. 260 pp. Crown 8vo. cloth. Price 2s. 6d.

AN INVALUABLE BOOK FOR YOUNG MEN.

A Cheap Edition, 1s. 6d. in Wrapper, will be ready in January. Not less than 100 Copies will be supplied, at 1s. per Copy, for gratuitous distribution, &c.

**Helps to Truth-Seekers;** Or, Christianity and Scepticism. An Exposition and a Defence. By the Rev. JOSEPH PARKER, Banbury.

In this work a NEW VIEW of the question, "Is it possible to make the best of both Worlds?" is given.

The aim of the volume is to lead the truth-seeker through the most popular objections of Modern Scepticism, and to establish his heart and intellect in the great principles of the Gospel. It is intended for Sunday School Teachers, City Missionaries, and all who are wishful to be able to give "a reason" for their faith and hope.


Just Published, 400 pp. Crown 8vo., Cloth bound, with Portrait of the Rev. W. Landels. Price 4s.

**The Congregational Pulpit.** Vol. IV., containing 24 Sermons from the MSS. of Nonconformist Divines; 30 Original Outlines; Six Portraits of Dissenting Ministers, and Copious Reviews of Biblical Literature.

THE FIRST VOLUME, containing Twenty-one Sermons, &c., can be had, price 3s. 6d.

THE SECOND VOLUME, containing Twenty-four Sermons, Copious Reviews, &c., price 4s.

THE THIRD VOLUME, containing Twenty-four Sermons by eminent Dissenting Ministers, Twenty-four Original Outlines, and Copious Reviews, &c., price 4s.

 It is published monthly, price 6d., and will be remitted Post-free, for Twelve Months, by the Publishers, on receipt of 6s. in Stamps, or otherwise. The back Numbers are in print, and can be had on application. A Volume is issued every Six Months.

Just Published. Post 8vo. cloth. Price 6s. With Portrait on Steel.

**The Autobiography and Literary Remains of the late Rev. Richard Cope,** LL.D., formerly Minister of Salem Chapel, Wakefield, of Castle Street, Launceston, and recently of New Street Chapel, Penryn, Cornwall, (Compiled from the Doctor's own MSS. by His Son.)

Just Published. Cloth antique, containing the substance of upwards of ONE HUNDRED DISCOURSES. Price 4s.

**Heads of Sermons made to Reach the Hearts of the People.** By a METHODIST PREACHER. Now first printed just as he wrote them; showing what helped to do the work of Methodism more than fifty years ago.—Dedicated to the Bishop of London.



Just Published. Crown 8vo., Cloth, 6s.

**Christ Our Study; or, a Practical Treatise upon Christ in His Official Character.** By the Rev. PETER M'LACHLAN, of the Free Church, Glasgow.

The aim of this Treatise is to give such a view of Christ's Person, Character, and Work, as may help to show His preciousness, and the guilt and danger of those who neglect Him,

SECOND AND CHEAPER EDITION. Fcap. 8vo. Price 2s. 6d.

**Italy as I Saw It.** Facts and Impressions of a Tour. By the Rev. W. SPENCER EDWARDS.

Just Published. Cloth gilt. Price 2s.

**Heart Effusions; Being Original Hymns and other Pieces.** By the Rev. A. GORDON LL.D.

Just Published. 120 pp. Royal 32mo. Cloth gilt, price 1s.

**Pietas Privata. Daily Prayers for the Closet and the Family, with occasional Prayers for Special Occasions.** By the late Rev. RICHARD COPE, LL.D., F.R.S. Author of "The Domestic Altar," &c., &c.

\* \* \* The above Prayers are accompanied by a suitable selection of portions of Scripture and Sacred Poetry.

Just Published. Second Edition, considerably improved. 8vo., Cloth flush, price 1s.

**Counsels to Authors.** A beautifully Illustrated Manual, containing (with numerous lithographic and woodcut illustrations) NEW and DETAILED PLANS of PUBLISHING, specimens of type and sizes of paper; mode of preparing copy; printers' correction marks; hints about binding and advertisements; and a variety of reliable information, indispensable to all about to print.

"Of great use to those of our readers who are anxious to enlighten the public by their mental cogitation. We are happy to bear testimony to the manner in which these spirited publishers get up their works."—*Freeman*.

"An interesting book; it is an excellent guide to the young author. Full of facts and figures. We cordially commend this book to every literary student, as a manual worthy of serious note; and shall be glad if the enterprising publishers succeed in establishing a new and healthier system of publishing—a system that shall profit all parties concerned in the issue of books."—*Christian Weekly News*.

Just Published. Gratis, and Free by Post.

**Plans of Publishing; with useful information for all about to print.**

Just Published, in Fcap. 8vo., with Engravings. Price 2s. 6d.

**Pickings on the Sea-Shore; or, Cliffs, Sands, Plants, and Animals.**

A Hand-Book for Brighton, Ramsgate, Folkestone, Dover, Hastings, the Isle of Wight, Scarborough, and other parts of the Coast. By the Rev. CHARLES WILLIAMS.

CONTENTS:—1.—Going to the Sea—2. The Ocean—3. The Sea-Beach—4. Cliffs and Caves—5. Sea-Weeds, Corallines, and Corals—6. Shells and their Inmates—7. Shrimps and their Relatives—8. Marine Birds—9. Fishes—Adventures of Fisherman—10. The Vivarium.

By the same Author.

Second Edition, with numerous Illustrations. Fcap. 8vo., Cloth Gilt. Price 2s. 6d.

**Silvershell; or, the Adventures of an Oyster.**

"Here is a treatise on an Oyster, full of science, relating to that animal; and all so pleasantly given that a child of seven years old may be expected to feel attraction from the beginning of the book to the end of it."—*British Quarterly Review*.

"Silvershell has entertained, amused, and instructed us greatly."—*Christian Weekly News*.

"This book is written in a pleasing style, and in a healthy tone, by a man of extensive reading, and varied information. It will be an acceptable book to youth; and persons of a maturer age, who have not lost the habit of thinking, will learn from its pages much they desire to know."—*Eclectic Review*.

Just Published. Demy 8vo. 424 pp. Price 12s.

**Essays on the Progressive Development of the Divine Purpose in Creation, Providence, Redemption.** By the Rev. EDWARD GEARE, A.M.

Just Published. Foolscap 8vo., Cloth gilt. Price 2s. 6d.

**The Book of Jonah; illustrated by Discoveries at Nineveh.** By the Rev. P. S. DESPREZ, B.D., Author of "The Apocalypse Fulfilled in the Consummation of the Mosaic Economy, and the Coming of the Son of Man;" "Babylon the Great neither Rome Pagan, nor Papal, but Jerusalem;" "Has the Second Advent already taken place, or must we look for another?" &c.

Just Published. Crown 8vo., Cloth. Price 1s. 6d.

**The Footprints of Jesus.** (SECOND SERIES.) By the Rev. GEORGE ALBERT ROGERS, M.A., Incumbent of Regent Square Church; Author of "Jacob's Well," "Bethany," &c., &c.

CONTENTS:—

Jesus near Tyre.	Jesus in a Village.	Jesus Teaching to Pray.
Jesus in Bethsaida.	Jesus Healing the Samaritan Leper.	Jesus Raising the Widow's Son.
Jesus Transfigured.	Jesus near Jericho.	Jesus in Bethany.
Jesus near Tabor.	Jesus Acquitting the Guilty.	
Jesus Paying Tribute.		

Just Published. Second Edition. Crown 8vo., Cloth. Price 1s. 6d.

**The Footprints of Jesus.** (FIRST SERIES.) By the Rev. GEORGE ALBERT ROGERS, M.A.

CONTENTS:—

Jesus in Bethlehem.	Jesus in the Wilderness.	Jesus in Sychar.
Jesus in Egypt.	Jesus in Cana.	Jesus at Bethsaida.
Jesus in Nazareth.	Jesus in the Temple.	Jesus in Capernaum.
Jesus in Jordan.	Jesus at Jacob's Well.	Jesus on the Sea.

The above are also issued as complete Tracts, at One Penny each,—40,000 of which have been circulated during the past twelvemonth. Upon direct application to JUDD & GLASS, large numbers are supplied at a great reduction.

Post 8vo., pp. 304. Price 6s.

**Memorials of a Wife.** Dedicated by her Husband to their Children. (By PROFESSOR HOPPUS, LL.D., F.R.S.) With Photographic Portrait by FENTON.

Just Published. Foolscap 8vo. Cloth, gilt. Price 1s. 6d.

**The Gathered Flower:** a Memoir of Miss SUSANNA BROMILEY (Daughter of the late Rev. John Bromiley, of East Bergholt, Suffolk), with Extracts from her Correspondence, Diary, and Unpublished Poems; and a SERMON preached at Kingsland Congregational Church, on the occasion of her Death, by the Rev. T. W. AVELING.

Crown 8vo. 300 pp. Price 5s.

**Gethsemane; and other Poems.** By the Rev. THOMAS GALLAND HORTON. This volume contains a large selection of Hebrew Odes, taken from the Old Testament, newly rendered into appropriate English Metre, and accompanied with copious Critical and Explanatory Notes.

By the same Author.

THIRD EDITION. Cloth. Price 2s. 6d.

**The True Theory of a Church;** or, the Right Principle of Christian Confederation Elicited and Developed.

Just Published. Second Edition. With considerable additions, &c.

MEMORIAL OF EMMA TATHAM,

(Author of the "Dream of Pythagoras and other Poems") containing many Original Pieces and Letters, her Early Life, an Account of her Last Hours, &c.

Handsomely bound in cloth, gilt edges. Price 2s. 6d.

**Etchings and Pearls.** By Mrs. J. COOKE WESTBROOK, of Redbourne.

Cloth, One Shilling. In Wrapper, Sixpence.

UPWARDS OF ONE THOUSAND

**Emendations of the Text of the Greek Testament.** For English Readers. Compiled from Tischendorf's Greek Testament. By S. R. ASBURY, B.A.

The present little work is intended for the use of Sunday-school Teachers, and others, who are themselves unable to consult the original text of the New Testament. It was commenced by the Compiler for his own convenience, but believing that there are many, who from want of means, or from limited attainments, are unable to make use of the critical editions of the New Testament, but to whom a knowledge of the results of the recent diplomatic researches in connection therewith would be valuable, he at length determined to lay it before the public.

Just Published. Crown 8vo., cloth. Price 1s. 6d.

**An Analytical Index to the Four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles.**

Designed to facilitate the Study of the Historical Books of the New Testament. By WILLIAM STROUD, M.D., Author of "A New Greek Harmony of the Four Gospels;" "A Treatise on the Physical Cause of the Death of Christ," &c.

Works by the Rev. R. M. MACBRAIR, M.A., Minister of Barbican Chapel.

Just Published. Fcap. 8vo. Price 2s. 6d.

**The Living Church: a Familiar Exposition.**

CONTENTS:—1. Introductory—2. Truth in the Church—3. Love in the Church—4. Unanimity in the Church—5. Diligence in the Church—6. Zeal in the Church—7. Edification of the Church—8. The Light of the Church—9. Power in the Church—10. Holiness in the Church.

Demy 8vo., Price 4s. 6d.

**The Goodness of Divine Providence Proved and Illustrated.**

"A more thorough, rational, and instructive treatise on Providence does not, we believe, exist in our language."—*Congregational Pulpit*.

Demy 8vo., Price 2s.

**Geology and Geologists; or, Visions of Philosophers in the Nineteenth Century.**

Demy 8vo., Price 6s.

**Sketches of a Missionary's Travels in Egypt, Syria, Western Africa, &c.**

"The volume contains an infinity of sketches, drawn by a vigorous hand, \* \* \* full of interest and information of an invaluable nature."—*Times*.

Small 8vo., cloth fash, 1s.

**Peniel: Or, the Angel Wrestling, and Jacob Prevailing. By the Rev. J. DENNISTON M.A.**

Just Published. Cloth fash. Price 1s.

**A Brief Memoir of the Life and Character of Mr. Luke White, (late of Bolton-upon-Dearne), who with Elizabeth, his wife, were murdered in December, 1856. By the Rev. JOHN HARROP.**

Just Published, in Wrapper 6d., Cloth fash 1s.

**Inspiration,—What is it? Where is it? How ascertained. In Three Lectures, by the Rev. A. E. PEARCE, Author of "Our Age and Our Country," "The Voice in Rama," &c., &c.**

Cloth fash, price 1s. 6d.

**Anti-Theism: its Moral and Philosophical Blindness in a World of Realities. By P. C. H. Dedicated by permission to the Right Hon. the EARL of SHAFTESBURY.**

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth. Price 1s. 6d.

**Spenser's Knight of the Red Cross. The best edition published of this remarkable evidence of Spenser's genius. Edited, with Notes, Preface, and Modern Phraseology. By the Rev. W. HORTON.**

94 pp. Cloth fash. Price 1s.

**The End of the World. A Reply to the Rev. Dr. Cumming's "Prophetic Chronology." Together with a Non-Sectarian interpretation of the SIXTH VIAL. By the Rev. J. WALKER. Second Edition, enlarged.**

Just Published, in Stiff Wrapper, price 6d. Cloth, 1s.

**Sorrow in the Hamlet. A Clergyman's Memorial of Four of his Youthful Parishioners, who died in one Year. By the Rev. Dr. BRIGHTON, late of Timsbury, Hants.**

8vo. Cloth. Price 2s. 6d.

**Reminiscences of Manningtree; with some reference to the Past history of the Town and Neighbourhood. With numerous Illustrations.**

Fcap. 4to. Price 10s. 6d. Frontispiece in Colours; Borders round Pages

**Flowers of Friendship. Original and Selected Poems exclusively on the subject of Christian Friendship, from its Springtide to its Consummation. By the Rev. J. FREDERIC THORPE, Theological Associate of King's College, London, and Chaplain to the Maidstone Union.**

Cloth, Gilt. Price 4s. 6d. Dedicated to Tourists.

**My Pocket Lyre.** The accompaniment of a Traveller's Evenings on the Continent; and the ROCK of NICE. With copious Historical and Topographical Notes. By the Rev. W. H. TOMLINSON.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth Boards. Price 1s. 6d.

**A Brand Plucked from the Burning: or, My Life.** By THOMAS SMITH, late of Leominster.

In Cloth Gilt, with Eight Illustrations, price 2s. 6d.

Young England's Illustrated Library: or Pictures and Books for Childhood and Youth. **Augustin and Wenonda; or, Overcome Evil with Good.**

---

### VALUABLE SCHOOL BOOKS.

For the use of Colleges, Schools, and for Private Tuition.

64 pp. Cloth fush. Price 1s.,

**The Etymology of Local Names**, with a short Introduction to the Relationship of Languages. By R. MORRIS, of Battersea Training College.

Second and Cheaper Edition. Cloth, Fcp. 8vo. Price 3s. 6d. To Teachers free, for 3s. in Stamps.

**Historiæ Sententiæ**: Or, the Contemporary Sovereigns of Europe placed at one view, at a given date, all over Europe, and generally in Asia and Africa, from the subversion of the Empire of Rome to the Reformation, with a Biographical Notice of each Potentate, facilitating greatly the acquirement of Contemporaneous and Universal History.

8vo., Cloth limp, 1s. 6d. *Second Edition in the Press.*

**The Educator's Instruments**; or, Hints on Method, School Government, &c. By G. C. DREW, *Master of the Model Training School, Homerton College.* Especially adapted to Pupil Teachers; and an invaluable aid for all engaged in the tuition of youth.

Strongly bound in Cloth. Price 9d.

To Schoolmasters by Publishers or Authors, at 6s. Dozen. A Specimen Copy for 7 Stamps.

**The Text Book of English Grammar.** By Messrs. BLEZARD & THOMPSON.

With Copious Appendix of Greek and Latin Roots.

84 pp., strongly bound in Cloth. Price 1s.,

To Schoolmasters, &c., 8s. per Dozen; or Specimen Copy for Nine Stamps.

**A Catechism of English Grammar**, on an entire New and Improved Principle. By T. MOODY, Principal of Charlton Adam Academy, near Somerton.

---

### IN THE PRESS, AND WILL BE READY IN JANUARY.

Handsomely produced in Post 8vo.

**Poems.** By EDWARD CHARLES MOGRIDGE, youngest son of the late "Old Humphrey."

Fcap. 8vo.

**Decision and Consistency**; exemplified and honoured in the History of Daniel and his Three Friends. By THOMAS COLEMAN.

---

### TRACTS AND PAMPHLETS.

\* \* \* Packets of not less than 1s. in value sent *post free* on receipt of stamps.

**The Leviathan; or, the Works of Man and the Ways of God.** A Discourse delivered at Kingsland Congregational Church. By the Rev. THOMAS AVELING. 24pp. 6d.

**England's Faults and India's Claims.** A Discourse delivered at Kingsland on the occasion of a Collection for the Sufferers in India. By the Rev. THOMAS AVELING. 16pp., 4d.

**The Young Man's Best Capital.** A Lecture. By the Rev. W. LEASK, D.D., Ware, Herts. 16pp., 3d.

**Little Fanny.** By the Rev. JAMES LUCAS, Sidmouth, Devon. Illustrated. 36pp., 2d. Fifth Thousand.

**Hymns for the Sunday School.** A new Selection of 216 Hymns, carefully arranged for ready reference. 172 pp., strong Roan. Price 6d.

**Hymns selected for Use at Open-Air Meetings and Special Services** for the Working Classes, Prayer Meetings, &c. By the Rev. J. METCALFE WHITE, B.A., Tisbury, Wilts. 1d.; or, direct from the Publishers, 6s. per 100, carriage free.

\*.\* This little book contains a short selection of Hymns suited for the above purposes, and it is believed will be found invaluable where an inexpensive work is required.

**The Sabbath School, and its aspects to the Church and the World.** By the Rev. DAVID THOMPSON. Square 32mo., 3d.

**Am I my Brother's Keeper?** or, God making Inquisition for Blood. A Sermon preached in Mansion House Chapel, High Street, Camberwell. By the Rev. W. P. TIDDY, for "The Early Closing Association." 16pp., 3d.

**The Banner Unfurled.** By the Rev. S. WILLS, D.D. 16pp., 3d.

**America the Tarshish of Holy Scripture.** 16pp., 3d.

Tenth Thousand. 8pp., 1d., 6d. per doz., or 4s. per 100; 32 pp. in wrapper, price 2d., 1s. per dozen, 8s. per 1000.

**Papers for the People.** Tracts addressed to the Working Classes. By ONEZIMUS. No. 1.—Position of the Working Classes. The Acquisition of Knowledge. No. 2.—Reading—Books—the Best Book. 24 pp., 2d. Specimen for 3 Stamps, or the Two Numbers for 4 Stamps.

**The Art-Adorned Temple:** or Ancient Art Treasures' Exhibitions. By the Rev. W. J. C. DRANE, Hanley, Staffordshire, 12 pp., 2d.

**Life and Godliness given unto the Saints.** By the Rev. HENRY QUICK, Bristol. 12 pp., 2d.

**Tracts for the Young,** in neat Wrappers. Twelve Copies for 6 Stamps. "The Doings of Miss N. T." "The Little Girl who could Fight." "How Freddy Talked to Himself." One Halfpenny each.

**A Christian Profession; its Design and Obligation.** By the Rev. FREDERICK S. WILLIAMS. 20 pp., 3d.

**The Cross of Christ of none Effect.** By the Rev. SAMUEL MARTIN, of Westminster. 1d., or 13 post-free for 1s. in stamps.

**The Death of Christ: a Sacrificial Oath, and a Sacrifice for Sin.** A Sermon preached before the Lancashire and Cheshire Association of Baptist Churches, at Waterbarn. With Notes. By CHARLES WILLIAMS, of Accrington. 16 pp., 3d.

**The Masses Without; or the Heathen Condition of the Masses who inhabit the alleys, courts, wynds, garrets, cellars, lodging-houses, dens, and hovels of our country; being the result of a Tour through the cities, towns, villages, and hamlets of our manufacturing, mining, and agricultural Districts: with an appeal for Open-Air Preaching, and other extraordinary efforts to reach the outside Masses of Society.** By JOHN KNOX. 82 pp., Sixpence.

**The Rest of Heaven, an Incentive to Work on Earth.** By the Rev. JOSHUA CLARKSON HARRISON. Preached before the London Missionary Society. 32pp., 4d.

**Expository Discourses on the Book of Exodus.** By the Rev. T. THOMAS, Wellingborough. Nos. 1 and 2. 16 pp., 4d.

**The Child in the Way.** A Sermon by JAMES ALEX. MACDONALD, Wesleyan Minister. 16 pp., 3d.

**Christ the Resurrection and the Life.** A Funeral Sermon. By the Rev. SAMUEL NEWNAM. 16 pp., 3d.

**The Pearl of Great Price.** How each may make it his own. A Sermon, preached before the Northamptonshire Association of Independent Ministers and Churches. By the Rev. WALTER SCOTT. 1jd., or 12s. per 100.

**The Way to the Cross; or, How to Become a Christian.** By the Rev. FREDERICK S. WILLIAMS. 16 pp. in Wrapper, 3d. The same is issued in Tract form for free distribution, at ½d. each, or 3s. 6d. per 100. The 15th Thousand is now selling.

**A Form of Marriage Service;** together with a few counsels to a newly-wedded couple, and some practical directions for those who may wish to be married in a Dissenting place of worship—such directions having reference to the new law which came into operation on the 1st of January, 1857. By a London Minister. 6d.

**The Gospel Entreaty—Be ye Reconciled to God.** By the Rev. THOMAS COLEMAN, Author of "The Redeemer's Final Triumph," "The Candidate for Christian Fellowship," &c., &c. 32 pp., 4d.

**Early Tendencies; or, the Connection Between Youthful Piety and after Character.** A Sermon addressed to the Young. By the Rev. ROBERT SIMPSON, Haverhill. 16 pp., 3d.

**The Great Election. An Appeal,** delivered by the Rev. S. COWDY, at Lake Street Chapel, Leighton, at the close of the late Election. Second Edition, with View of the Market Cross. 16 pp., 3d.

**The Rise and Progress of British Opium Smuggling. The Illegality of the East India Company's Monopoly of the Drug; and its Injurious Effects upon India, China, and the Commerce of Great Britain.** Five Letters addressed to the Rt. Hon. the Earl of Shaftesbury, by Major-General R. ALEXANDER, Madras Army. 80 pp., in Wrapper, 1s.

**The Pious Cabman.** By a BARRISTER. This Tract contains an authentic account of Mr. J. A—, who was formerly a London Cabman, then became a Missionary to the Cabmen in London, and afterwards emigrated to one of our Colonies, and has now risen, by God's blessing, to be a wealthy man. The profits, if any, to be divided equally between the "London City Mission," and "The Chinese Evangelization Society." 8 pp. 1d., or 4s. per 100; 32 pp. in Wrapper, 2d., or 8s. per 100.

**Christ's Successors in the World.** By the Rev. THOMAS G. HORTON. Preached at Reading, before the Berkshire and Oxfordshire Association. 16 pp., 3d.

**How do I know that the Bible is True?** By the Author of "How do I know that I ought to Pray?" 345th Thousand. One Halfpenny.

**How do I know that I ought to Pray?** By the Author of "How do I know that the Bible is true?" 225th Thousand. One Halfpenny.

**How do I know that I have the Holy Spirit?** By the same Author. 40th Thousand. One Halfpenny.

One dozen of each will be sent, *post free*, on receipt of 18 postage stamps; or 600 copies sorted on receipt of 21s., by Judd & Glass, Gray's Inn Road.

**Timely Warning. The Integrity of British Commerce Compromised, and its Safety Perilled. The Cause and the Cure.** 16 pp., 3d.

**The Signs of the Times. A Series of Papers by Eminent Writers.** Edited by JOHN KNOX. 190 pp., 1s.

**Christian Advice to the Young on the Conduct of Life.** By JOHN KNOX. 64pp. 4d.

**Mary's Choice; or, Counsels and Encouragements for the Young and Inquiring.** By the Rev. R. WALLACE, of Tottenham. 32 pp., 2d.

**Sons and Daughters: Counsels for Young Men and Young Women.** By the Rev. J. WILKES SIMMONS, Olney, Bucks. 32pp., 3d.

**The Lord's Supper. Two Discourses** Preached at Hoxton Academy Chapel. By the Rev. G. L. HERMAN. Fcap. 8vo. Stitched, 6d.; Cloth antique, 1s.

**Fragmentary Thoughts on the Subject of Preaching.** 2d.

**The Spirit of the Evangelical Ministry.** A CHARGE to the Rev. W. DORLING, of Brentwood, Essex. By the Rev. H. STOWELL, D.D. 16 pp., 3d.

**Has the Second Advent already taken place, or must we look for another?** By the Rev. P. S. DESPREZ, B.D., Author of "The Book of Jonah," &c., &c. 26 pp., 6d.

**M**utual Benediction. A Sermon preached by the Rev. HENRY CHRISTOPHERSON, on the commencement of his ministry in New College Chapel. 16 pp., 3d.

**A** Letter to the Congregational Union of England and Wales; in which a scheme is submitted to the members of that body for the support of Ministers incapacitated for official duty from age or other causes. By the Rev. A. GORDON, LL.D. 20 pp., 3d.

**M**y Class: or, the Experience of a Sunday School Teacher. A Tale. "Be not faithless, but believing." 32pp., 4d.

**T**he Joy of Conversion. The History of the Spiritual Conflicts and Religious Triumphs of a Retired Officer of the Indian Army. 32 pp., 4d.

#### THE SABBATH QUESTION.

**M**an and the Sabbath. By the Rev. R. WALLACE, of Tottenham, Author of "Mary's Choice." 32pp., 6d.

**A** Voice from Forty Years' Miracles about the Sabbath. By the Rev. G. ALBERT ROGERS. Handbill, 9d. per 100; 6s. 6d. per 1000.

**A** Holiday or Holy-day—which? Fifth Thousand. By the Rev. T. G. HORTON, Author of "The True Theory of a Church," &c. 16 pp., 3d.

**T**he Sabbath: Whose is it? By the Rev. G. ALBERT ROGERS, M.A., Incumbent of Regent Square Church; Author of "Footprints of Jesus," &c. 8pp. 1d. each; 25 for 1s. 4d.; 5s. per 100.

**S**unday Bands. By a **TEMPLAR**. A Sabbath Tract for the Working Classes. 2s. per 100.

#### PUBLICATIONS.

64 pp. in wrapper. Price 6d., or post free for 6s. the year, paid in advance. Monthly.

**T**he Congregational Pulpit. Containing Four Sermons from the MSS. of Nonconformist Ministers, Original Outlines, Biblical Criticisms, and Reviews of Religious Literature.

Illustrated with Portraits of Dissenting Ministers.

In Illustrated Wrapper, demy 8vo. Price One Penny. Monthly.

**T**he Chinese Missionary Gleaner. New Series, commencing January, 1856. Contains Interesting Accounts of Missionary Operations, Biographical Sketches, History of the Tea Plant, the Religious Opinions and Progress of the Insurgents, &c. The only periodical devoted to the cause of Missions in China.

The numbers constituting the first and second volumes can be had by remitting 24 stamps to the Publishers.

*Advertisements are received for insertion in all the above, excepting "The Footprints of Jesus." The terms may be had on application at 38 NEW BRIDGE STREET.*

Illustrated Wrapper. Price One Penny. 12 Nos. in packet, 1s. (post free). Monthly.

**T**he Footprints of Jesus. A Series of Tracts on some of the more Prominent Incidents in the Redeemer's Life. By the Rev. GEO. ALBERT ROGERS, M.A., Incumbent of Regent Square Church, Author of Jacob's Well," "Bethany," &c.

With Copious Illustrations. Price One Penny. Monthly.

**L**ittle England's Illustrated Newspaper. An interesting Paper, full of instruction for Boys and Girls. Commenced May, 1856.

Weekly. Price 4d. 48 Columns.

**T**he Literarium; or, Educational Gazette. A Journal of Education, Literature, Science, and Art. The only weekly publication devoted to the Scholastic Profession.

LONDON:

JUDD & GLASS, NEW BRIDGE STREET & GRAY'S INN ROAD.









