

# *Theology* on the *Web*.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



*Buy me a coffee*

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



**PATREON**

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbadshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

a good and blessed death. Let all who please learn from St. Peter, or other saints, how to die, or observe how good men close their lives. I will learn the lesson from Christ, and from none else. He is the pattern given me by God, according to which I am to act, and suffer, and die. He only it is Whom all men can follow, and in Whom holy living, suffering and dying, are prefigured to all, so that no one can act, or suffer, or die well, unless it be done conformably to Him, in Whose death that of all others are swallowed up." On the 28th December, three days after the festival of Christmas, 1524, Staupitz entered into rest. The master has been taken away, but the scholar far excels the master; and in the glory with which his splendid achievements in the Church encircle Luther, we see something of the lustre which, by the grace of God, shone upon the brow of the old Augustinian Vicar-General of Germany, "through whom the light of the Gospel first shone" into Luther's heart. Let us revere and honour his memory, for he had not a little to do in preparing the way for that greatest event of modern times, so fruitful of blessing to Europe and to the world—THE REFORMATION OF THE CHURCH.

WILLIAM COWAN.

Reviews.

*Plain Reasons against Joining the Church of Rome.* By R. F. LITTLEDALE, LL.D., D.C.L. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. *The One Offering.* By M. F. SADLER, Prebendary of Wells. London: Bell and Sons.

*The Church Quarterly Review*, No. 26. January, 1882.

*The Sacrificial Aspect of the Holy Eucharist: an Eirenicon.* By the Rev. E. F. WILLIS. Parker and Co.

WE have very recently witnessed in this Church of England what our fathers and our fathers' fathers would, we believe, have regarded as a somewhat remarkable phenomenon, the publication of a very able treatise on the Romish controversy, without a word about the Mass, either as regards the doctrine of the Presence or of the Sacrifice,—"Plain Reasons against Joining the Church of Rome," by an eminent controversialist of vast and varied learning, who, among the many "reasons" which he urges so forcibly, has found no space for so much as one reason pertaining to that which Dean Brevint (herein a faithful representative of the divines of the English Church) declared to be "no leaf or branch, but the main stem and bulk of" <sup>1</sup> Romanism.

<sup>1</sup> "Depth and Mystery of the Roman Mass," p. 244, edit. 1673.

And what makes this strange thing all the stranger is, that Dr. Littledale has not spared the mention of corrupt practices and uses appertaining to the Romish system in respect of the Mass, while the very doctrine of the Mass itself is thus left absolutely untouched.<sup>1</sup> The omission might perhaps have been accounted for by the limitations which the writer set to his subject. Here, however, we are constrained to see that that which pertains to this doctrine can hardly be beyond its limits. The Mass is in full view. Abuses of the Mass are exposed. For the Mass itself there is silence.

But we must add, with sorrow, that there is one thing which makes this strange thing stranger still. It is that this book cannot be put down simply to the eccentricity of an individual theologian. It has been published by a Society which has some sort of claim to be regarded as the literary agency of the English Church, and has the whole bench of English Bishops among its Vice-Presidents.

*This*, at other times, and in other circumstances—*this*, regarded as a matter of mere *incuria*—might be looked upon as a trifle, a trifle which it would be idle to notice; but *this*, when it is notorious that the minds of many (rightly or wrongly) have been panic-stricken at certain tendencies to assimilate the English Communion Service to the service of the Roman Church; and still more, *this*, when some are professing themselves anxious to bring back again the Mass into the Church of England; and yet more, *this*, while we hear perverts declaring that they are teaching the same doctrine of the Eucharist now, in the Church of Rome, which before they preached in the Church of their fathers—*this*, we say, can never be regarded as an indifferent trifle.

Of course we are not meaning to impute it to the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge that it knows no difference in the doctrine of the Eucharist between the Churches of England and of Rome. The Society still has on its list of publications a valuable treatise which shows this distinction clearly enough.<sup>2</sup> Of course we do not for a moment impute it to our Bishops that they are willing to lay aside the solemn protest of our Articles against the Sacrifices of Masses. We are quite sure such an imputation would be utterly unjust. But we do venture to say that, unless the view of the Mass which has till recently been held by

<sup>1</sup> It is due to Dr. Littledale to state that in his "Prefatory Note" he says: "This book makes no attempt to cover the whole area of the controversy to which it relates. . . . It is confined strictly to a few practical questions which affect all members of the Church, laity and clergy alike, and omits not only all purely speculative discussion, interesting to theologians alone, but also all matters of which it can fairly be said that Rome and England have any common ground of agreement, however they may differ in details, or in mode of expression."

We must leave our readers to judge for themselves (after looking through the table of contents) how far this statement may be accepted as furnishing a sufficient explanation of the omission spoken of in the text.

<sup>2</sup> In Bishop Bull's "Corruptions of the Chuch of Rome" (an edition of which is published by the S.P.C.K.), he says: "The first article I shall take notice of is this, 'I profess that in the Mass is offered to God,' etc. . . . Where this proposition, ('That in the Mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead,') having that other of the 'substantial presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist' immediately annexed to it, the meaning of it must necessarily be this, that in the Eucharist the very Body and Blood of Christ are again offered up to God as a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of men. Which is an impious proposition, derogatory to the one full satisfaction of Christ made by His death on the Cross, and contrary to express Scripture." (Works, vol. ii. p. 251, edit. Oxford, 1846.)

divines of our Church be altogether a mistake, it is an index of a change of opinion not lightly to be regarded, if not deeply to be lamented, that such a publication, with all its unquestionable excellences, should ever have been allowed to appear with the *imprimatur* of such a Society.

As for the plea that the book must be judged in view of its special object—which may possibly be to retain in our Communion clergy who are in danger of leaving it, because they are already imbued more or less with the eucharistic doctrine of Rome—our fathers would, we are persuaded, have made short work of it. They would have said, “Eradicate from them this corrupt doctrine of the Mass. If, by reason of a strong delusion,<sup>1</sup> you find it ineradicable, then let Rome have her own. Don’t let us have priests teaching in the Church of England, who (to use the words of Bishop Cosin), *be in it, and are not of it.*<sup>2</sup>

But now it is useless for us to conceal from ourselves the fact that Dr. Littledale’s singular omission is but one symptom out of many, indicating a state of things in the Church of England which urgently demands attention—increased attention—attention which it must have bestowed upon it sooner or later.

There is unquestionably coming over some men’s minds a suspicion (account for it how we may) that the repugnance to the Mass, which we have inherited from our fathers, is to be put down in good part to misconception, and in large part to prejudice; that the controversy concerning it has been looked at through a medium distorted by the feelings of indignation and passion kindled by the memory of our martyred Reformers. The thoughts of some men’s hearts are asking, “Is not the time come to let these animosities drop? Have not three long centuries sufficed to keep up the heat of this fire? Is it not fitting now that we should be ready willingly to acknowledge that there have been faults on both sides? And, seeing that Romanist divines are now volunteering the confession that, in the abuses of the Mass, there has been much to account for<sup>3</sup> or justify the attitude of Protestants towards it, may we not, too, the rather be moved on our side also to confess that, in the doctrine of the Mass itself, there is that which admits of being viewed at least in a far more favourable light than that in which divines of the Church of England have been wont to regard it? At any rate, let us hope that now at length we may be allowed more calmly to investigate the subject, and *that* with a desire rather to look for and to find the good than the evil in the Sacrifice of the Mass. And then, may we not hope that, in the end, we may be able (as many have done already) to arrive at the conclusion that the real differences of doctrine on the Eucharist between the

<sup>1</sup> See Jackson’s Works, vol. ix. p. 582.

<sup>2</sup> Bishop Cosin declares “That there be any such in the Church of England (unless they be *in it and are not of it*), who believe our Saviour hath left to His priests any such power of *real* sacrificing *His body*, etc., I am sure Dr. C—believes not; nor that *any such power . . . is pretended* by the Church of England. . . . I am well assured, likewise, that he believes none of all these: trusting well by the grace of God that none will be induced by these undue suggestions either to quit the Church of England, or to join in Communion with the Church of Rome in these new fancies.” (Works, A. C. L., vol. iv. pp. 284, 285.)

<sup>3</sup> Moehler says, “It ought not to be overlooked that the Reformers might be led into error through various, and some exceedingly scandalous, abuses, especially an unspiritual, dry, mechanical performance and participation in the most mysterious function.” (“Symbolism,” p. 239, Robertson’s Translation, 3rd edit.)

Churches of England and Rome may be reduced either to *nil*, or to something scarcely amounting to the shadow of a shade?"

Appeal is not unfrequently made to the earnest labours of Roman and of Romanizing priests as evidencing that their doctrine of the Mass cannot be the evil thing that some would make it. And sayings pass current from mouth to mouth to the effect that, whereas the Mass has been commonly misconceived as something which derogates from the Sacrifice of the Cross, as rightly conceived and understood by its own upholders and teachers (who should surely know best), it is that which in a very special manner honours and glorifies the Redemption of Christ.

Sentiments and utterances such as these, or more or less nearly resembling these, are more prevalent than many of us have any idea of; and they are not confined to those who are regarded as Romanizers. Are such thoughts to be regarded as healthy or dangerous symptoms?

No doubt in the examination of all religious questions it is most desirable that our minds should be free from the warping influences of groundless prejudices. No doubt heated feelings should be repressed, animosities should be excluded, and an atmosphere of judicial calmness should be sought. Only let it not be assumed that the result of such a calm and careful investigation of the subject must needs lead to a new view of the matter in dispute. What we most earnestly desire is that the doctrine of the Mass *may* be submitted afresh to the fullest and most careful scrutiny, in the clearest possible light, with the most searching examination of witnesses, and in the calmest and most judicial of atmospheres. It is a subject which pre-eminently requires to be *examined*, and examined not superficially, but with attention and study. It is a subject in the examination of which men specially need to be cautioned against allowing their minds to prejudge the conclusion after hearing the evidence and the special pleadings on one side of the case.

At the outset it should be well and clearly understood, that (whatever change may have come over us) Romanists are not changed at all in their attitude towards the doctrine of the Reformed Church of England. Whatever may be said of approachments on the side of Romish doctors to meet the approachments of some from the side of the Church of England, it would be a great mistake, indeed, to suppose that the doctrine of the English Church is not now as much as ever a heresy, in the view of those who regard it from the standpoint of the teaching of Rome. The divines of the school of Andrewes and Laud, as well as those of the school of Morton and Ussher; the Non-jurors not less than the Puritans, will all come under the same condemnation. If the doctrine of the Church of Rome is the true doctrine, then must the whole array of the divines whom the Church of England has delighted to honour—men whose names have stood high in the esteem of all Christian men for wisdom and learning and piety—all be accounted as heretics and impugners of the true faith of the Christian Church.

It must also be well and clearly understood that our fathers were not ignorant of the more favourable aspects of the Mass-Sacrifice which men would now bid us regard; as if now there were for us an altogether new light thrown upon the subject. It would be altogether a mistake to suppose that in former days, any more than in our own, Romish divines *professed* that their teaching of the Mass-Sacrifice derogated from the truth of the Sacrifice of the Cross, that they were not as ready then as now to set it forth in its fairest colours, and to represent it as establishing and exalting the one atoning Sacrifice of Christ.<sup>1</sup> All this, we say, would be a great mistake. And it would be equally a mistake to suppose

<sup>1</sup> See Jackson's Works, vol. ix. pp. 581, 582, 584, 585.

that our English divines were not perfectly familiar with all that Romish controversialists had urged in its behalf. It is a subject which has its peculiar difficulties and intricacies, its mazes and labyrinths ; but it is a subject of which our divines were thoroughly masters. They were familiar with all its windings. They knew it in all its details. There is no aspect of it which they had not considered ; no form it had assumed which they were not aware of. It might be well for us if, in our own days, we were as conversant with this controversy as those who have gone before us. We should then hardly be so ready to think that in our day we are able to stand on a height from which we may look down, with something like a feeling of pity, on the errors and misconceptions of our forefathers.

And it might be well for us, too, if then we would dispassionately ask —as to the brunt of the charge which our fathers brought against the Mass, against that which belongs to its essence and can never be explained away—Is it true, or is it false ? We are not to fix our attention on any such matters as the indefiniteness of its expiatory efficacy. We are here, indeed, in a cloudland of uncertainties, though it is certain that in its clouds live miserable delusions by which simple folk are led astray. We may find its propitiatory and satisfactory character asserted, indeed, and strongly insisted on ; but then, by theologians so surrounded with mist, that, in controversy, all becomes intangible, and sometimes almost or altogether lost to view. And we must not wonder at this. There is something very hard to grasp, very difficult to apprehend in Rome's teaching concerning the Mass. Romanists and others put it down to some want of clearness in the minds of Protestants that we find it full of perplexities.<sup>1</sup> But in truth the Mass doctrine as a whole, as set forth in the Canons and Catechism of the Council of Trent, and as expounded by Romish theologians, is nothing less than a cruel torture to the human understanding. The mind of man when it strains itself to attain to anything like a clear and distinct view of it as a whole, finds itself on a rack. And then, after all, finds that it has been racked to very little purpose. Is it possible that even Romish minds never suffer from this torture ?

Nevertheless, though there are slippery ambiguities in every one of these terms, commonly used in descriptions of the Mass doctrines—(1) proper ; (2) sacrifice ; (3) offered ; (4) propitiatory—ambiguities to be carefully noted in the study of this controversy—yet there are certain hard and prominent features in the doctrine, which are always to be recognised even in the mist.

There is something which the priest then and there does, and does to Christ then and there really present on the altar under the form of bread, which is a real sacrificial offering of Christ, and is of availing expiatory efficacy (in some sort) for the sins of the living and of the dead. And it is (according to high authority) for this—for the sake of this Sacrifice that Christ is really present in the Sacrament of the Altar. For Sacramental purposes—for the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ—the Sacramental signs, as in Baptism, without any such real Presence in the Elements (so we are told by Bellarmine) would suffice.<sup>2</sup> But for the real

<sup>1</sup> See Moehler, "Symb.," p. 232, Robertson's Translation, 3rd edit.

<sup>2</sup> " Nullum aliud sacramentum continet re ipsa corpus Christi, sed solum sunt sigma visibilis, continentia virtualiter gratiam sanctificationis : neque aliud requiritur ad rationem sacramenti, cum sacramenta nihil sint aliud, nisi instrumenta sanctificationis. Quare etiam Eucharistia potuisse vere et proprie sacramentum esse, etiamsi Christi corpus re ipsa non contineret. Quae igitur causa est cur debuerit necessario Eucharistia Christi corpus re ipsa continere, nisi ut

Sacrifice, such as is to be offered in the Mass, Christ must be really present to be sacrificed.<sup>1</sup> So much as this is, we believe, never really explained away,<sup>2</sup> however it may seem sometimes beclouded to Protestant eyes by assertions of identity with the Sacrifice of the Cross.

If the doctrine of the Mass is true, Christ in the Mass is *hypostatically* offered in Sacrifice to the Father. And in this doctrine of the Mass our Fathers have seen that which obscures and invalidates the One perfect Sacrifice, once offered for the sins of the world. And therefore they have not hesitated to pronounce the sacrifices of Masses to be blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.<sup>3</sup> Were they right or were they wrong?

posset vere, et proprie Deo Patri a nobis offerri, et proinde sacrificium esse vere ac proprie dictum?" (Bellarmine, "De Missa," lib. i. cap. 22; "Disputa," tom. iii. c. 1021. Ingol., 1601.)

<sup>1</sup> So Dr. Pusey also says, "The doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice depends upon the doctrine of the real objective Presence." ("Eirenicon," p. 25.)

<sup>2</sup> Even Du Pin, in his desire for reconciliation between the English and the Gallican Churches, felt difficulties in concessions on the thirty-first Article, and maintained "that the sacrifice of Christ is not only commemorated, but continued, in the Eucharist, and that every communicant offers Him along with the priest." See Mosheim's "Eccles. Hist." Soames's edit., vol. iv. p. 509. Dr. Pusey, quoting Du Pin, adds that Bishop Cosin also had said, "We still continue and commemorate that sacrifice which Christ once made upon the Cross." (Eirenicon, p. 230.) It is true these words are found in that early series of MSS. notes which contains (like the note from which these words are taken—see Works, A. C. L., vol. v. p. 106) large extracts from Maldonatus. But what Bishop Cosin would have said of the doctrine of Du Pin may be gathered from a note in his second series of notes on the Common Prayer: "Therefore Christ can be no more offered, as the doctors and priests of the Roman party fancy Him to be, and vainly think that every time they say Mass they offer up and sacrifice Christ anew, as properly and truly as He offered up Himself in His sacrifice upon the Cross. And this is one of the points of doctrine, and the chief one whereof the popish Mass consisteth, abrogated and reformed here by the Church of England according to the express Word of God." (Works, A. C. L., vol. v. p. 333.)

<sup>3</sup> That our Article was not originally directed against the language of the Council of Trent is, of course, true. But it is very hard to believe that it was not directed against just that teaching of the Church of Rome which was afterwards embodied in the Tridentine Canon, whose anathema is pointed directly against the teaching of our Article: "Si quis dixerit, missæ sacrificium tantum esse laudis, et gratiarum actionis, aut nudam commemorationem sacrificii in cruce peracti, non autem propitiatorium; vel soli prodesse sumenti; neque pro vivis et defunctis, pro peccatis, penitentia, satisfactionibus et aliis necessitatibus offerri debere: anathema sit."—Sess. xxii. Can. 3. (See Caput ii. and Canon iv.)

Bishop Beveridge has said: "The Papists . . . agree in the thing, avouching that in this Mass they offer up a true and perfect sacrifice to God, propitiatory for the sins of the people, even as Christ did when He offered up Himself to God as a propitiation for our sins. This, I say, is that which the Church of Rome confidently affirms, and which our Church, in this Article, doth as confidently deny." (On Art., p. 506.)

Moreover, it is scarcely possible to question the fact that the language of our Article was subsequently altered for the very purpose of bringing it into the most distinct contradiction to the language and the teaching of the Tridentine Canons. For, whereas the thirty-first Article of 1552 had contented itself with declaring that the sacrifices of Masses were "forged fables" (*figmenta*), and the Council of Trent in 1562 had decreed (Sess. xxii. Can. iv.), "Si quis dixerit, blasphemiam irrogari sanctissimo Christi sacrificio in cruce peracto, per missæ sacrificium, aut illi per hoc derogari: anathema sit," the revision of the English Articles in 1562-63, following close upon this, added the word "blasphema" to the Latin copy, making the Article read "blasphema *figmenta* sunt."

This is the question before us. Again we say, let it be investigated afresh, with all calmness of judicial inquiry. But do not let us be turned aside from the real issue. Let us remember that this is the real question concerning which we have to come to our conclusion.

Altogether apart from this is the question whether or not sacrificial language may rightly and properly be used in connection with the Eucharist. The question whether or not the Eucharist may be truly regarded as a Sacrifice is entirely distinct. No doubt there have been divines, and divines of the highest esteem in the Church of England, who, having their minds engrossed and absorbed in the grand view of that One Atoning Death, through which alone condemned man can approach to God, which alone meets the great need of a sinful world, and for which God the Son took upon Him our flesh; and regarding all other sacrifices as more or less designed to teach beforehand, and prepare the way, and lead (directly or indirectly) up to this—have reserved the term *sacrifice* to be applied in propriety of speech only to this one stupendous and transcendent event, and to its antecedent shadows.<sup>1</sup>

Many of our early Reforming divines might be quoted as supporting this view. But it is sufficient to name the great name of Richard Hooker, who has said that in the Christian Church we have now properly no Sacrifice.<sup>2</sup> And in harmony with this teaching of Hooker is the teaching of our Homilies respecting the Lord's Supper, “lest of the memory it be made a sacrifice” (p. 396), and which charges on the Romanists, that whereas “Christ commanded to His Church a Sacrament of His Body and Blood, they have changed it into a Sacrifice for the quick and the dead” (p. 414). But there are others, and many of them—men,

---

And in 1571, the English version was made to follow the same example, and the expression “forged fables” was changed into “blasphemous fables.”

These particulars have been very clearly stated by Dr. Stephens (in a note to his “Argument in the Bennett Case,” pp. 214-15), who further illustrates the language of the Article “in which it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ,” by showing that there was no authority for this saying in the Missal itself. “By the time that the erroneous doctrine of offering the Body and Blood of Christ came to be received by the Church of Rome, the Canon of the Mass had come to be considered too sacred to be altered, so that this new oblation of Christ by the priest was not made in express words, but only by the intention of the priest while offering the oblation of the Host or Consecrated Elements.” (P. 216.)

It may be added that not only was that which was “commonly said” without authority from the Missal, but it was against the authority of the most eminent Romish divines up to the date of the Council of Trent. See Field “Of the Church,” vol. ii. pp. 65, 72-96, E. H. S.; and Forbes, “Considerationes Modestæ,” vol. ii. p. 581 *sqq.*

<sup>1</sup> It is often urged that the Eucharist is, at any rate, as much a sacrifice as any of the Mosaic sin-offerings. But it should ever be remembered that each sacrifice of expiation under the law *did as a shadow take away a shadow of sin*, that by these shadows men's hearts might be taught in preparation for the truth of the One Real Atonement; and that, for the faith of the Christian Church, these shadows are all gone. (See Waterland, Works, vol. v. pp. 148, 164.) And when the shadows are gone, the reality which cast the shadows is not the Eucharist, but the sacrifice of Christ on the Cross; as Origen says, “Igitur sacrificium, pro quo hæc omnia sacrificia in typō et figurā præcesserant, unum et perfectum, immolatus est Christus.” (In Levit. Hom. iv. § 8. Op. edit. Migne, tom. ii. c. 442.)

<sup>2</sup> “The Fathers of the Church of Christ with like security of speech usually call the ministry of the Gospel *Priesthood* in regard of that which the Gospel hath *proportionable* to ancient sacrifices, namely the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ, although it hath properly now no Sacrifice.” “(Eccles. Pol.” b. v. ch. lxxviii. 2. vol. ii. pp. 471, 472, edit. Keble.)

some of them, of much learning, and as distinctly separate as any from the Romish doctrine<sup>1</sup>—who, noting that the Old Testament had sacrifices *not* of expiation, and having regard especially to the language of Christian antiquity, and the definition of “sacrifice” given by St. Augustine,<sup>2</sup> have claimed for the word “sacrifice” a much wider signification, and have largely insisted upon the Eucharist being regarded as a proper Sacrifice.<sup>3</sup>

Waterland, an able and faithful representative of this school of writers, has said of Hooker’s saying, “I presume he meant by *proper* Sacrifice, *propitiatory*, according to the sense of the Trent Council, or of the new definitions. In such a *sense* as that, he might justly say, that Sacrifice is no part of the *Church Ministry*, or that the Christian Church has *no* Sacrifice. But I commend not the use of such *new language*, be the meaning ever so right; the *Fathers* never used it.” (Works, vol. v. p. 140).

With some considerable diversity of expression, and some variety of doctrine, these theologians have generally not only insisted on the proper Sacrifice in the Eucharist, of alms and oblation, of praise and thanksgiving, and the offering of ourselves to be a living sacrifice; but regarding the Elements as ordained signs for the representation and commemoration before God of the Sacrifice of the Cross, have generally aimed at making prominent in their view of the rite what makes it in their language “a commemorative Sacrifice.”

Nevertheless, it may be confidently affirmed that with all their strong tendency to the use of sacrificial language, these writers made no real approaches to the doctrine of the Romish Mass. They recognised and kept clear of the great doctrinal gulf which stands between the sacrificial language of the Fathers, which they made their own, and the sacrificial doctrine of the Mass to which the Council of Trent had set its seal.

Writers on the Romish side of the controversy have not failed to see the broad distinction between these two sacrificial teachings, and to mark how utterly inadequate, from the Roman point of view, is the highest point attained by the teaching of any of these divines of the English Church.

Father Ryder, in his reply to Dr. Littledale, has perhaps somewhat

<sup>1</sup> See, *e.g.*, some examples adduced in Pilkington’s “Altare Christianum,” cap. xix. pp. 129-135.

<sup>2</sup> “Verum sacrificium est omne opus, quod agitur, ut sanctâ societate inhaeramus Deo.” (“De Civit. Dei.,” lib. x. § 6.) See Bunsen’s “Hippolytus,” vol. ii., appendix, pp. 389, 390, 394. Mede says, “In a word, a Sacrifice is *oblatio fæderalis*.” (Book ii. ch. vii., Works, p. 370.)

<sup>3</sup> Some, however, of those who have most earnestly contended for the sacrificial character of the Eucharist (especially among the earlier of these writers), have disclaimed for it the name of a Sacrifice in strict *propriety* of speech. For example, Bishop Andrewes writes: “By the same rules that theirs (the Jews) was, by the same may ours be, termed a sacrifice. In rigour of speech, neither of them; for, to speak after the exact manner of Divinity, there is but one only Sacrifice, *veri nominis*, ‘properly so called’: that is Christ’s death. . . . That only absolute; all else relative to it, representative of it, operative by it. . . . Hence it is that what names theirs carried, ours do the like, and the Fathers make no scruple at it, no more need we.” (Sermon vii., “On the Resurrection,” “Sermons,” vol. ii. pp. 300, 301, p. c. 2.)

And so Bishop Cosin, following Callistus, “In which regard [i.e. praise and thanksgiving], as in divers other besides, the Eucharist may by allusion, analogy, and extrinsical denomination be fitly called a Sacrifice, and the Lord’s table an altar; the one relating to the other; though neither of them can be strictly and properly so termed.” (Works, vol. v. p. 347, A. C. L.; see also p. 351.)

minimized the teaching of some of them. But he is assuredly right in the main, when he says of them : "When asked the precise question, 'What is it that is offered ?' they had but one answer, 'Bread and wine.' Indeed, there was no other answer they could make, whilst rejecting the doctrine of Trent (Sess. xiii. c. 1) that Christ is really present on the altar after consecration, and (Sess. xii. c. 2) is, indeed, offered up in the Sacrifice. They never answered 'Christ,' nor even 'the Body and Blood of Christ,' unless with the qualification, 'mystically present,' which they always took—at least except in the act of communion—in the sense of 'symbolically' represented" (pp. 274, 275, 3rd edit.). It is true, indeed, that as regards a few of the later writers (especially Johnson and Hickes), the words "symbolically represented" might convey a false or imperfect impression. But the question of what, in the view of Anglican writers, is offered, is not affected by the question of a higher or lower efficacy attributed by a few eccentric writers to the "legal fiction" <sup>2</sup> by which, in their view, the elements are made representatives of the Body and Blood of Christ.<sup>3</sup> The fact that, in their view, what is offered is not really the Body and Blood of Christ, makes the wide and impassable gulf between their doctrine and that of the Mass. And it is but a feeble attempt to assimilate things utterly and essentially diverse, to say of these divines, as the *Church Quarterly Review* has said, that "though they might . . . fall short of the whole truth, yet they taught something infinitely nearer to the true doctrine than Waterland's words imply : something which formed a perfectly natural and sufficient foundation for the development of the truth in times to follow, when prejudice should be less and Catholic feeling greater" (Jan. 1882, p. 488).

The doctrinal gulf,<sup>4</sup> deep and wide, is not thus to be bridged over by a few words of apology for what, in Rome's view, is heresy ; an apology

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Sadler ("One Offering," p. 149) seems unable to understand how Ridley could with consistency show such diligence in changing altars into tables, when he expressed himself so decidedly as to a sacrifice "offered after a certain manner, and in a mystery," (Works, P. S., p. 250). But his difficulty would vanish before a true understanding of that expression "in a mystery." It is nearly equivalent to "in a symbolical representation." Bishop Jewel said : "We deny not but it may well be said, Christ at His last supper offered up Himself unto His Father : albeit not *really* and *indeed*, but in a *figure*, or in a *mystery* ; in such sort as we say, Christ was offered in the sacrifices of the old Law, and as St. John says, 'The lamb was slain from the beginning of the world.' As Christ was *slain at* the table, so was He *sacrificed at* the table ; but He was not slain at the table *verily and indeed*, but only in a *mystery* ; therefore He was not sacrificed at the table *verily and indeed*, but only in a *mystery*." (Works, P. S., "Harding Thess.," p. 718.)

<sup>2</sup> See Hickes's Treatises, vol. ii. p. 159, A. C. L.

<sup>3</sup> It will be found that Waterland, in vol. v. p. 156, gives the full value to the doctrine of equivalence for sacrificial purposes, and (p. 159) forcibly animadverts upon it. It was utterly unknown, we believe, to Bishop Andrewes and the earlier Anglican divines.

<sup>4</sup> Father Ryder says : "There is something irresistibly amusing in the reproaches which the *Church Quarterly* addresses to the 'great apostle of development' for not applying its principles to their teaching on the Eucharistic Sacrifice as related to that of their predecessors. No theory of development that I ever heard of, certainly not Cardinal Newman's, could pretend to recognise the germ of a doctrine in a system which begins with a rejection of that doctrine in its fully developed form, with which it finds itself face to face. The gradual process by which Anglicans have worked their way back to the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice which they originally rejected may be regarded as a process of moral and intellectual recovery, but it certainly is not a development in the theological sense of the word, the gradual maturing and realization of a theological idea" (pp. 279, 280).

which even the most extravagant of these writers themselves would have been among the first to repudiate.<sup>1</sup>

The extract from Bishop Bull, which has been so wisely inserted in what is commonly spoken of as the "Bennett Judgment," admirably well marks the distinction between that view of the Eucharistic Sacrifice which is within, and that which is without the comprehension of the English Church.

"In the Eucharist, then, Christ is offered, not hypostatically, as the Trent fathers have determined (for so He was but once offered) but commemoratively only; and this commemoration is made to God the Father, and is not a bare remembering or putting ourselves in mind of Him. For every sacrifice is directed to God, and the oblation therein made, whatsoever it be, hath Him for its object, and not man. In the Holy Eucharist, therefore, we set before God the bread and wine 'as figures or images of the precious Blood of Christ shed for us, and of His precious Body' (they are the very words of the Clementine Liturgy), and plead to God the merit of His Son's sacrifice once offered on the Cross for us sinners, and in the Sacrament represented, beseeching Him for the sake thereof to bestow His Heavenly blessings on us." (Works, vol. ii. p. 252.)

It is the doctrine of the Presence, the Real Presence on the altar and in the elements, which underlies and impregnates the Romish doctrine of the Mass. Without this the real Sacrifice of the Mass cannot be. In this it has its being. Rome's teaching of the Presence, and Rome's teaching of the Sacrifice, are inseparably entwined one with another, and they lie at the very root of the corruptions of the Papacy. Truly was it said by Archbishop Cranmer, "The very body of the tree, or rather the roots of the weeds, is the Popish doctrine of Transubstantiation, of the Real Presence of Christ's flesh and blood in the Sacrament of the Altar (as they call it), and of the Sacrifice and oblation of Christ, made by the priest for the salvation of the quick and the dead. Which roots, if they be suffered to grow in the Lord's vineyard, they will overspread all the ground again with the old errors and superstitions. These injuries to Christ be so intolerable, that no Christian heart can willingly bear them."<sup>2</sup>

These doctrines, we must insist upon it, the Church of England has rejected. And in face of all attempts to reinstate them, we must over and over again reiterate the language of Hooker: "He cannot love the Lord Jesus with his heart, which lendeth one ear to apostles, and another to false apostles; which can brook to see a mingle-mangle of religion and

<sup>1</sup> Let Johnson himself be called to witness: "If any of us asserted the Sacrifice of the Mass, I would readily grant that no reproaches were too hard, no censures too severe against them, who were guilty of attempting to introduce so abominable a corruption. But, my lord, it is evident to any man that is not exceedingly prejudiced, that the Sacrifice of the Primitive Church, for which we plead, and that of the Church of Rome, are substantially and essentially distinct. The Sacrifice of the Primitive Church consists of bread and wine, consecrated into the Sacramental Body and Blood of Christ by the secret operation of the Holy Spirit. The Sacrifice of the Church of Rome consists (if we may believe the Papists) of the very substantial Body and Blood of Christ, together with His human soul and Divine nature, or, in a word, of the one very true Christ, both God and Man." (Works, A. C. L., vol. i. p. 5.)

Mede declared that the Churches of the Roman Communion "have depraved this mystery, and swerved from the Primitive pattern thereof; so have they for many ages disused the oblation of bread and wine, and brought in lieu thereof a real and hypostatical oblation of Christ Himself. This blasphemous oblation we have taken away, and justly." (Book ii. ch. viii., Works, p. 376.)

<sup>2</sup> Preface to edit. 1550, P. S., p. 6.

superstition, ministers and massing-priests, light and darkness, truth and error, traditions and Scriptures."<sup>1</sup>

In the language of Bishop Bilson we declare : "The Sacrifice which Christ offered upon the Cross for the sins of the world we believe with all our hearts, and reverence with all our might : accounting the same to be perfect without wanting, eternal without renewing, and this is our Sovereign Sacrifice. The Lord's Table, which Himself ordained to be the memorial of His death and passion, we keep and continue in that, manner and form that He first prescribed, and this may be called, and is a Sacrifice, both in respect of the thanks there given to God for the redemption of man, and the blood-shedding of our Saviour, expressed and resembled in that mystery. More than this no Catholic Father ever taught, and less than this our Churches do not receive."<sup>2</sup>

And this, we may add, can never be reconciled with the Romish doctrine of the Mass-Sacrifice.

AN ENGLISH PRESBYTER.

(*To be continued.*)

*Ye Olden Time. English Customs in the Middle Ages.* By EMILY S. HOLT. Pp. 220. John F. Shaw and Co.

Of the general reader class, few probably know much about the State Papers. In certain historical books they notice now and then allusions to Rolls, to Compotuses, Registers, and Probationes *Ætatis*; but of the difference between the Patent Rolls, the Close, Liberate, Wardrobe, and Issue Rolls, or of the nature of a Compotus or Register, they may know really nothing. To such readers the book before us will be a real help. It gives an explanation, brief and clear, of those documents—"State Papers"—to which from the date of King John we owe so much ; and it gives also many interesting illustrative quotations from each authority, with due comment. What the documents are, in fact, is shown by quotations. And these illustrative samples, wisely selected, are so happily arranged that we learn about christenings, funerals, marriages, travelling, paying wages, and divers "customs in the middle ages," in the easiest and most natural way. The peculiar charm of this book, and, we may add, its peculiar value, is its realness. For every particular quotation, page after page, the accomplished author gives the reference. "Chapter and verse" is the key-note. Thus the reader may fancy, so to say, that his own eyes are poring over parchments, and that he is finding the place in a State Paper with his own fingers. Miss Holt is not one of the second-hand historical or antiquarian writers. Any reader of her essay in the last *CHURCHMAN* will at a glance have perceived that. Every statement is founded upon fact, and is the result of patient inquiry. In footnotes may or may not be contained the references. In the present work, as a rule, the references are given. But everywhere one meets, in a very readable form, the tokens of intelligent investigation, and a remarkably clear insight together with literary skill of no mean rank.

If one opens the present volume, as the phrase is, at random, something instructive is sure to meet the eye. Let us look at a page here and there, and observe the method. For example, on page 43, occurs a statement as to the washing of poor men's feet on Maundy Thursday, viz., "The number of paupers always corresponded with the years of the washer." In proof of this is a quotation as to Henry IV., when Earl of Derby, washing the feet of fifteen poor men on that day in 1382, "because my Lord was aged fifteen years;" to each poor man his lordship gave a shilling in alms (Compotus *Henrici Com. Derb.*, 1381-82, fol. 4). On page

<sup>1</sup> Edit. Keble, vol. iii. p. 666.

<sup>2</sup> "True Difference," edit. 1585, p. 5.

62 we read that "princes and nobles washed in silver basins;" and a statement is quoted of Earl Humphrey of Hereford, in 1361, bequeathing "a silver basin, in which we are accustomed to wash our head," i.e. his face (*Testamenta Vetusta*. i. 67). On page 131 we read that spoons were often richly wrought and beautiful things, of very costly kind; and authorities accordingly are quoted. "Two spoons, one gold and one beryl," occur in the list of articles granted to the Princess Elizabeth in 1400; and in 1401 "two spoons, one gold, one beryl ornamented with gold." (*Patent Roll, 2 H. IV.*, pts. i. and iii.) On page 30 Miss Holt remarks: "The bridegroom always put money on the book at the words 'with all my worldly goods I thee endow,' . . . which the bride took to herself. Henry IV. thus put £2 on the book at his first marriage (*Register of John of Gaunt*, ii., fol. 486).

In the chapter on "Marriages" appear many choice quotations, and the whole chapter is informing and full of interest. "One important part of the bride's costume," says our author, "was the absence of any head-dress beyond a wreath, or a coronal of gems in the case of royal ladies. "The hair must be left flowing straight down (a relic of Saxon custom); "and this was often the last occasion on which a woman's hair was ever "seen in public. The wedding-ring, in four instances which have come "under my notice—Blanche Duchess of Lancaster,<sup>1</sup> Elizabeth Duchess of Clarence,<sup>2</sup> Elizabeth Countess of Pembroke,<sup>3</sup> and Mary Countess of Derby<sup>4</sup>—was always set with a single ruby, its cost being from 5 guineas "to 20. The fee given to a clerk at the Queen's Chapel for officiating at "these royal marriages was only £10. . . . Heralds and minstrels were "always present at a wedding of distinguished persons, and were re- "warded with large fees. Those given by John of Gaunt at the marriage "of his daughter Elizabeth were, according to present value, no less than "£150 to the heralds and £200 to the minstrels for making minstrelsy."

The chapter on "Religion" is exceedingly good. Some remarks on the ecclesiastical word "oblation" are supported by illustrative extracts. If we look into mediæval compotuses, says Miss Holt, we find that as "alms" signifies gifts made to the poor, so "oblations" signifies gifts made to God,—to the *Church*, and to the clergy.<sup>5</sup> This has been our own view with regard to the words "alms" and "oblations" in our Prayer Book.

The chapter on "Houses and Furniture" is excellent. The use of paper for walls, we read,

came into England in the reign of James I., flock-papers being the kind first known. But it was nearly a hundred years before they can be said to have become common. Previous to this, the walls were always hung round with tapestry made in large square pieces, and generally known as *arras*, from the great manufactory at Arras. As these hangings necessarily projected from the wall, "behind the arras" was the convenient station for eavesdroppers. The older mediæval term for these hangings was a "hall." . . . A black bed and hall were sent from Westminster to Bruseyard Priory for the funeral of Elizabeth Duchesse of Clarence in 1364, at a cost of sixteen shillings for carriage. The Black Prince gave to Canterbury Cathedral by will his hall of plumes of ostrich, and of red and black tapestry, bordered with swans and ladies' heads, for the purpose of celebrating his anniversary every year.<sup>6</sup>

In this chapter some interesting extracts are given from the Lisle Papers. For instance, Master James Basset, in 1538, we read, wrote to his

<sup>1</sup> *Issue Roll, Pasc.*, 33 Edw. III.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, *Michs.*, 16 Edw. III.

<sup>3</sup> *Reg. John of Gaunt*, ii. fol. 42 a.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* ii. fol. 48 b.

<sup>5</sup> *Wardrobe Roll*, fragment, uncalendared.

<sup>6</sup> *Register of Canterbury Cathedral*, *Arundel MS. 68*, fol. 28 b.

mother, Lady Lisle, to complain as to his bed and bedchamber ; and she sent her agent, Mr. Bekynshaw, to inquire into the matter. But worthy Bekynshaw was wroth to find that the young gentleman only made one of *three* in a bed which was "big enough for four great men." Privacy was an unknown luxury in those days. How many persons were stuffed into a bedchamber even nobles never cared to inquire.

It may be added that "Ye Olden Time" is well printed, and has a tasteful cover.



## Short Notices.



*Clerical Charities, and their Antidotes.* Being a catalogue of charities, general and diocesan, for the relief of the clergy, their widows and families. By E. GEOFFREY O'DONOGHUE, B.A., Assistant Curate of the parish church, Hampstead. Pp. 98. J. Hall, 13A Salisbury Square.

This is a timely and useful little book. A catalogue of some two hundred and twenty charities, it is dedicated to "the poor clergy of the richest of Churches ;" and the author draws a distinction between clerical poverty and clerical pauperism. Thirteen thousand of the clergy (beneficed and unbefited), he says, receive official incomes not exceeding £200 a year [are these figures exact ? do they reveal the whole truth, we wonder ?] ; and as to the clergy charities, they are isolated overlapping agencies, independent, general and diocesan, without any intercommunication of any sort. The author says :

I have elsewhere elaborated a scheme for amalgamating all the general clergy charities, and so far subsidizing the separate dioceses out of a common Church purse. But, perhaps, it may here be mentioned that there are ample funds, if properly used, for ensuring that *finality* which we desiderate.

For instance, at least £6,000 a year might be saved in "expenses of management." It is, however, mainly in the use of these funds, amalgamated or otherwise, that the antidotes to clerical pauperism are to be discovered. It will be something to abolish a system of doles and overlapping, but it will be of far greater service to set up a system (*compulsory* or otherwise) that will help a poor clergyman to purchase for himself a sick or superannuation allowance, and to secure for his wife and children a *right* to a pension. If this little compilation (for it is no more) can do anything to forward this ideal, if the necessity for a "List of Clergy Charities" should with this ideal realized cease to exist, my little book and I will accept our signal of dismissal, not without thankfulness.

Mr. O'Donoghue comments now and then on the *expenses of management*. For instance, on page 35, touching the Clergy Sons' School, Leatherhead, he writes : "The office expenses of this school seem to us "to furnish a complete corroboration of the preceding remarks, and we "have only, in introducing a transcript from the balance-sheet, to say "that we should like to see the first item of salaries split up into its "proper details :

Rent, salaries, and auditors	... £730
Furniture and fittings	... 37
Printing and stationery	... 250
Advertising and postage	... 93
Deputation expenses	... 26
Travelling, etc.	... 21
	£1,157