



7950

2-

SCS #1302

T. F. Torner

A
HARMONY OF ANGLICAN DOCTRINE
WITH
THE DOCTRINE
OF THE
CATHOLIC AND APOSTOLIC CHURCH OF THE EAST.

SCS #1302

A

HARMONY OF ANGLICAN DOCTRINE

WITH

THE DOCTRINE

OF THE

CATHOLIC AND APOSTOLIC CHURCH OF THE EAST,

BEING

THE LONGER RUSSIAN CATECHISM,

WITH AN

APPENDIX,

CONSISTING OF

NOTES AND EXTRACTS FROM SCOTTISH AND ANGLICAN
AUTHORITIES,

DESIGNED TO SHew THAT THERE IS IN THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION GENE-
RALLY, AND MORE PARTICULARLY AND PRE-EMINENTLY IN THE SCOTTISH
CHURCH, AN ELEMENT OF ORTHODOXY, CAPABLE BY A SYNODICAL ACT OF
DECLARING UNITY AND IDENTITY WITH THE CATHOLIC CHURCH OF THE EAST.

ABERDEEN,
A. BROWN AND CO.;
EDINBURGH, R. GRANT AND SON: LONDON, J. G. AND F. RIVINGTON:
OXFORD, J. H. PARKER.

M DCCC XLVI.

Οὐ περὶ τούτων δὲ ἐρωτῶ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τῶν πιστευσόντων διὰ τοῦ λόγου αὐτῶν εἰς ἐμέ. ἵνα πάντες ἐν ᾧσι· . . . ἵνα ὁ κόσμος πιστεύσῃ ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας.

Τὰ ἀδύνατα παρὰ ἀνθρώποις δυνατά ἐστι παρὰ τῷ θεῷ.

Αἰτεῖτε τὰ μέγαλα, καὶ τὰ μικρὰ προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν.

БҢЗ НДѢЖЕ ХОЩЕТЪ, ПОБѢЖДАЕТСЯ БС҃ТЕТВА
Ч҃ННЪ.

TO THE
MOST REVEREND THE PRIMUS,
AND TO THE
BISHOPS CLERGY AND LAITY
GENERALLY,
OF THE SCOTTISH CHURCH,
THESE PAGES
ARE BY PERMISSION DEDICATED,
AS TO THE ONLY EXISTING REPRESENTATIVES OF THAT CATHOLIC REMNANT
WHICH IN THE REIGN OF PETER THE FIRST HELD A CORRESPONDENCE
WITH THE EASTERN PATRIARCHS, AND WITH THE RUSSIAN SYNOD;
A CORRESPONDENCE, WHICH WAS DROPPED
ON THE DEATH OF PETER
WITH AN ASSURANCE FROM THE IMPERIAL GOVERNMENT,
THAT IT SHOULD BE RENEWED AT SOME FUTURE AND
MORE CONVENIENT OPPORTUNITY.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

CONTENTS.

PREFACE. ix

A FULL CATECHISM OF THE ORTHODOX CATHOLIC EASTERN CHURCH.

PRELIMINARY INSTRUCTION: On the meaning of the word Catechism: On the necessity of Faith and Good Works, and in the first place of Faith, p. 3. On Divine Revelation, p. 5. On Holy Tradition and Holy Scripture, p. 6. On Holy Scripture in particular, p. 9. The Composition of the Catechism, p. 15.

THE FIRST PART OF THE CATECHISM, ON FAITH.

On the Creed generally, and its origin, p. 16. On the Articles of the Creed, p. 18. On the First Article, p. 19. On the Second, p. 27. On the Third, p. 30. On the Fourth, p. 37. On the Fifth, p. 40. On the Sixth, p. 42. On the Seventh, p. 43. On the Eighth, p. 45. On the Ninth, p. 47. On the Tenth, p. 56. On Baptism, *ib.* On Unction with Chrism, or Confirmation, p. 59. On the Communion, p. 61. On Penitence, p. 66. On Orders, p. 67. On Matrimony, p. 68. On Unction with Oil, p. 69. On the Eleventh Article of the Creed, *ib.* On the Twelfth Article, p. 72.

THE SECOND PART OF THE CATECHISM, ON HOPE.

Definition of Christian Hope, its ground, and the means thereto, p. 74. On Prayer, *ib.* On the Lord's Prayer, p. 76. On the Invocation, or Preface, *ib.* On the First Petition, p. 77. On the Second, *ib.* On the Third, p. 78. On the Fourth, *ib.* On the Fifth, p. 79. On the Sixth, p. 80. On the Seventh, p. 81. On the Doxology, or Conclusion, *ib.* On the Doctrine of Blessedness or Beatitude, *ib.* On the First of our Lord's Beatitudes, p. 82. On the Second, p. 83. On the Third, p. 84. On the Fourth, *ib.* On the Fifth, p. 85. On the Sixth, p. 86. On the Seventh, p. 87. On the Eighth, p. 88. On the Ninth, *ib.*

THE THIRD PART OF THE CATECHISM, ON LOVE, OR CHARITY.

On the Union between Faith and Charity, p. 89. On the Law of God, and the Commandments, p. 90. On the Division of the Commandments into Two Tables, p. 92. On the First Commandment, p. 94. On the Second, p. 97. On the Third, p. 99. On the Fourth, p. 100. On the Fifth, p. 103. On the Sixth, p. 107. On the Seventh, p. 109. On the Eighth, p. 110. On the Ninth, p. 112. On the Tenth, p. 113.

CONCLUSION: APPLICATION OF THE DOCTRINE OF FAITH AND PIETY, p. 114.

APPENDIX.

NOTE	Page
I. The necessity of Faith and Works for Salvation.	117
II. Holy Tradition and Holy Scripture.	123
III. The Ecclesiastical, or Deutero-canonical Books.	131
IV. The Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Beatitudes and the Ten Com- mandments as instruments of teaching.	132
V. Of the Interpolation of the Œcumenical Creed.	133
VI. Seven Œcumenical Councils.	141
VII. Guardian Angels.	145
VIII. The Creation of Eve from Adam.	146
IX. Predestination.	ib.
X. Original Sin.	150
XI. The Fathers of the Elder Dispensations to be saved by faith in Christ.	151
XII. The Most Holy Mary Ever-Virgin;	154
XIII. Truly Mother of God;	155
XIV. And in rank and worship above every other created being.	ib.
XV. Of Universal Redemption; and of Free will.	156
XVI. The maintenance of the Latin doctrine on the Procession of the Holy Ghost no necessary impediment to Communion with the Eastern Church, so long as it be not interpolated in the Creed.	ib.
XVII. One Catholic and Apostolic Church.	163
XVIII. The Church on earth and the Church in heaven communicate together.	170
XIX. Mediatory or Intercessory Prayers of the Saints.	172
XX. Of Miracles wrought by Saints even after their departure; and of Relics.	177
XXI. Indefectibility or Infallibility of the Church.	180
XXII. The Sacraments or Mysteries are Seven.	182
XXIII. Baptism the means of Regeneration.	185
XXIV. The Sign of the Cross.	187
XXV. Unction with Chrism, or Confirmation.	188
XXVI. The Holy Communion the means of partaking of the very Body and Blood of Christ.	191
XXVII. Of the rehearsal of the words of Institution in the Liturgy, and of the Invocation of the Holy Ghost, which ought to follow after the Oblation.	198
XXVIII. Of the change or transubstantiation of the Bread and Wine by virtue of the Consecration.	209
XXIX. Of the rule of Annual Communion: of the necessary Preparation, &c. : and of the Adoration of Christ as present in the Eucharist.	
XXX. Penitence, with Confession and Absolution.	212
XXXI. Orders.	224
XXXII. Matrimony.	226
XXXIII. Virginity better than Wedlock.	227
XXXIV. Unction of the Sick with Oil.	228
XXXV. The Souls of the righteous are in light and rest after death.	231
XXXVI. The Souls of the Saints by special privilege enjoy Christ's presence.	232

NOTE

Page

xxxvii.	The Souls of such as have died with true faith and repentance, may still need something after death, and are holpen by the prayers of the living, and especially by the Oblation of the Bloodless Sacrifice.	233
xxxviii.	The wicked perish not by the will of God, but by their own fault. .	239
xxxix.	Bodily poverty undertaken voluntarily may serve to the perfection of spiritual.	ib.
xl.	Of hungering and thirsting after righteousness.	240
xli.	Faith without charity and good works profits nothing.	ib.
xlII.	Due honour is to be rendered to holy Angels and holy Men.	241
xlIII.	Due honour is to be rendered to the holy Pictures or other sacred Representations.	ib.
xlIV.	The Lord's Day and not the Sabbath is to be kept holy by Christians. Also, of the Festivals and Fasts of the Church.	243
	A List of Public Documents quoted in the foregoing Sections.	246
	A List of Bishops and Divines whose writings are quoted in the foregoing Sections.	250

P R E F A C E.

THE plan of the present publication is to set before the reader a systematic outline of Divinity, capable of being used as a Harmony or joint exposition of doctrine at once Eastern and British. For this purpose the Longer Russian Catechism, otherwise entitled, A Full Catechism of the Catholic and Apostolic Church of the East, has been taken as a convenient basis; the text of which, so far as it expresses a doctrine confessedly common to both Churches, needs no corroboration from Anglican sources, but is at once and of itself the Harmony desired. But wherever this is not the case, wherever, that is, any proposition occurs in the text of the Catechism, on which members either of the Eastern or of the British Churches might possibly suspect disagreement, or on which we are in point of fact divided among ourselves, in all such places references are added to Anglican Authorities which will be found subjoined in an Appendix, and which are intended to shew that, whatever some may think of present appearances, Anglican Divinity is not necessarily nor unequivocally, on any single point, irreconcilable with that of the Easterns. It is hoped that the reader will find no point passed over in silence, on which any well-informed member of either Communion would be likely to suspect disagreement. And so, either alone, or in conjunction with the Appendix, the Catechism may be read and used not merely as an Eastern or Russian document, but as equally our own, and as capable of being entitled simply, as indeed it has been sometimes entitled, without respect to rite or language, A Full Catechism of the Orthodox Christian Faith.

The compiler of the Appendix is far from pretending that the actual agreement of the two Communions, where they do

already agree, is in all points equally self-evident ; or that their eventual agreement upon other questions, where Angliean theology seems as yet to be undecided, and to admit of contrary opinions, will be in every case alike easy or certain. All that is maintained is this : that there has been in the Angliean Church, from the sixteenth century downwards, not only a Puritan or Protestant spirit and school, but also a contrary Catholic school ; and a tendency towards the recovery and reconstruction of that Orthodoxy, which was mutilated at the first through a weak submission to the civil power. Further it is very certain, indeed it must be perceived from the extracts now published, that the orthodox party have ever maintained a high tone of authority, as if they felt that they represented the mind and will of the Church : sometimes they have even succeeded in obtaining synodical acts in their favour, which have impressed a character upon the whole body. And this being so, there is nothing absurd in anticipating, that the same party may hereafter succeed in moving the Church again to do other similar and still more decisive acts in their favour ; so as to purge out the remaining leaven of Calvinism, and re-open to them the communion of the East. In the meantime, we may perhaps be thought by the Easterns to stand to them in a relation somewhat similar to that of the Armenian Church, which, like our own, seems to have had a double character from a remote period. And though any union which should be made at once with the Armenians, as they are, without change or explanation on their part, would be union with heresy ; still, if that Church were to do again what she has already more than once been on the point of doing, that is to say, explain her heretical language in an orthodox sense, and formally reject and disuse the language as well as the spirit of heresy for the future, unity being thus declared and ascertained, union would be no longer objectionable.

But there is one part of the Angliean Communion, which fairly claims to be distinguished from the rest. The Scottish Church, if she be considered by herself, seems even at

present to approach somewhat nearer towards Eastern orthodoxy, and to offer greater facilities for future reconciliation, than can be pretended of the English. Not only has she embodied in her Liturgy and Catechisms various doctrines still controverted in England, but she has also hitherto enjoyed the advantage of being at unity within herself. The original and native Scottish Church is a stranger to those parties which exist in the south. She has no chain of Puritan and Latitudinarian divines, whose testimonies can be opposed to those of the orthodox. Her Bishops are freely elected by the Clergy in each diocese, not nominated by parliamentary leaders. They can meet in Synods and make canons, without fearing any statute of Premunire. They feel themselves the Apostles of a Church which has suffered wrong, not the servants of a government which has done it. They are the successors of Martyrs and Confessors, not of time-serving and latitudinarian intruders; of prelates, who in former days aimed after a re-union of Churches, not after a comprehension of sects; who amended an imperfect Liturgy, without wishing themselves well rid of their Creed. It is true indeed that they preside over a poor and humble flock, not over a powerful and wealthy nation: they are unconnected with the state, and unendowed: but then they are the pastors of a believing minority, not of a multitude of political conformists: they are expected to teach the faith of their Church, not to dissemble it: to convert heretics and schismatics without, not to tolerate or flatter them within: to rebuke vice and error, not to frown upon orthodoxy and zeal. They are free to reform abuses, to restore discipline, to retain and remit sins: they are not obliged to worship popular traditions, nor to submit discipline to parliaments or newspapers, nor to give passive communion to all comers. To say all in few words, their Church has not made herself a partaker in the crying sins of a nation and its rulers, but intercedes for their repentance and forgiveness; and she is known to all men as the open

and uncompromising enemy, not as the courteous or dissembling sister of a Presbyterian Establishment.

These peculiarities of the Scottish Church are witnessed to alike by friends and enemies; and are of course variously regarded by conflicting parties. They are vehemently denounced by Puritan Bishops and Clergy in the name of the Southern, no less than by Presbyterian Ministers in the name of the Northern Establishment: but they are looked up to with thankfulness and hope by a minority in England, which has suffered severe disappointments. They are noticed perhaps with a smile or a sigh by some who secede to Rome, as curious relics of an unexplained after-growth, or of a retrograde political struggle, parasitical excrescences of a paper theology; but they may possibly excite other feelings of interest or expectation in the minds of brethren who have been separated for ages. In the meantime they seem to be attracting towards themselves that controversy which has hitherto been confined to the south of Britain: strenuous efforts are being made to force or persuade the Scottish Church to descend to the level of the English: and it is even thought not impossible, that such efforts may eventually succeed. Already, it is whispered, some individuals of her Clergy are beginning to feel the awkwardness of their position, and to look along a broad and easy road to the south, and to contemplate their own past history with more of embarrassment than satisfaction. Still it is hard for an individual, harder far for a whole community, to cut itself off from the past. It might even perhaps be more safe and more honourable for the Scottish Church to go forward, than to go back; to lead deep and kindred convictions, than to submit to the attacks of spiritual enemies or the persuasions of worldly friends. At any rate, till she do openly go back, those peculiarities which have been noticed justify the assertion, that even a single testimony of any one Scottish Bishop or Divine of note goes further to prove the doctrine of the Scottish Church, than a host of English quotations, or even public acts and documents can go, at present, to prove the doctrine of the

English. For the Scottish Church has had hitherto one definite and consistent character: in the English, whatever may be taught on paper, two contrary religions are practically maintained, with an understanding that they must tolerate each other. And thus in whatever degree it shall appear probable from the following pages, that even the Anglican Church herself may come eventually to harmonize with the Eastern, in the same, and in a still greater degree, will this conclusion have been established of the Scottish Church.

A few words are still needed on the method followed in the present compilation, and on the materials which have been used in it.

As regards the method pursued in the Appendix, the design being to shew the possibility of future reconciliation, *not the existence of actual agreement*, thus much only seemed requisite; first, that *an* Anglican doctrine similar to the Eastern should be shewn on every point to exist; and secondly, that this, if not already the formal doctrine of the Anglican Church, should *at least be uncondemned by her, and capable of becoming her formal doctrine hereafter*. For both these objects, the production of two or three credible witnesses on each topic might fairly be esteemed sufficient. If more have been alleged, it has been generally in order to notice different parts of the same subject, or else for some other particular reason, not with any idea of adding force by a multitude of quotations. Indeed it has not been thought necessary so much as to specify under each section the precise authority of the doctrine stated; nor how far opposite opinions on some points may be tolerated *or even taught or encouraged*: nor again, how far any public acts or formularies, as the XXXIX Articles, may seem to be inconsistent with passages adduced; and in what way such inconsistency may admit of reconciliation. Whatever light may be thrown on these or other like points, will be thrown on them only incidentally. However, in point of fact, where the doctrine of the Church is clear and undeniable, this will generally appear of itself. And in every case that at least which is essential, namely, that the orthodox opinion is as

yet uncensured and free to hold, will be rendered certain, it is hoped, by the very titles of the documents, or by the names, dignities, and characters of the witnesses which are cited.

As for the materials used, a table of the titles of public documents, and of the names and ages of all Bishops and Divines whose works are cited, will be found at the end. A better selection of passages might no doubt have been made; but circumstanced as the compiler was, he was obliged to content himself with whatever was most accessible. Here one document only requires to be specially noticed; and that is the earlier English Service-book, of the year 1548; which some might else think unfairly quoted for usages afterwards omitted and never yet restored. But in truth even the Crown and the Parliament which ordered those omissions to be made, bore witness at the same time that the things omitted were not condemned. The first book, they declared, was "*a very godly Order, agreeable to the Word of God and the primitive Church, very comfortable to all good people, and most profitable to the state of this realm:*" and whatever doubts had been raised about the same, "*proceeded rather from the curiosity of . . . mistakers, than of any other worthy cause.*" (Act of Unif. 1552.) And of the same book they had shortly before declared, that it was ordered by the most learned Bishops "*with one uniform agreement, and by the aid of the Holy Ghost.*"

In conclusion, thus much may be addressed generally to all members of our Communion. If there is here set forth a body of doctrine, which is consistent with itself as a whole, not a mass of heterogeneous opinions; which is of native, not of foreign growth; appealing rather to the sympathies of Catholics, than to the passions of sectaries; proceeding from the lips and pens of our own standard Bishops and Divines, not from those of hostile authorities; if this body of doctrine differs but little from the present theology of the Western, while it harmonizes entirely with that of the Eastern and of the primitive Church; if it courts even our prejudices in offering us a strong position against Rome, while it seconds

our best wishes in bringing us nearer to unity ; if, besides, it requires neither doubt, nor secession, nor re-baptism, nor re-ordination in order to be embraced, but is already our own, perfectly free for us to hold, the most consistent exponent of our actual position, needing only to be synodically asserted to restore us to communion with the East,—then, surely, they must be no light reasons, no mere indifference to truth, no mere bigotry to personal or popular habit, no mere reluctance to confess and amend what is wrong, which can justify us in refusing to such a body of doctrine the most attentive and friendly consideration.

A
FULL CATECHISM
OF THE
ORTHODOX CATHOLIC, EASTERN CHURCH,

EXAMINED AND APPROVED BY THE MOST HOLY GOVERNING SYNOD, AND
PUBLISHED FOR THE USE OF SCHOOLS, AND OF ALL ORTHODOX CHRIS-
TIAN, BY ORDER OF HIS IMPERIAL MAJESTY.

MOSCOW,
AT THE SYNODAL PRESS.

M DCCC XXXIX.

“ HOLD FAST THE FORM OF SOUND WORDS, WHICH THOU HAST HEARD OF
ME, IN FAITH AND LOVE, WHICH IS IN CHRIST JESUS.” 2 TIM. I. 13.

INTRODUCTION

TO THE

ORTHODOX CATECHISM.

PRELIMINARY INSTRUCTION.

Q. WHAT is an Orthodox Catechism?

A. An Orthodox Catechism is an instruction in the orthodox Christian faith, to be taught to every Christian, to enable him to please God, and save his own soul. INTROD.

Q. What is the meaning of the word Catechism?

A. It is a Greek word, signifying *instruction*, or oral teaching; and has been used ever since the Apostles' times to denote that primary *instruction* in the orthodox faith, which is needful for every Christian. Luke i. 4; Acts xviii. 25.

Q. What is necessary in order to please God, and to save one's own soul?

A. In the first place, a knowledge of the true God, and a right faith in Him; in the second place, a life according to faith, and good works.

Q. Why is faith necessary in the first place?

A. Because, as the word of God testifies, *Without faith it is impossible to please God.* Heb. xi. 6.

Q. Why must a life according to faith, and good works, be inseparable from this faith?

A. Because, as the word of God testifies, *Faith without works is dead.* James ii. 20.

INTROD.

Q. What is faith?

A. According to the definition of St. Paul, *Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen*; Heb. xi. 1: that is, a trust in the unseen, as though it were seen, in that which is hoped and waited for, as if it were present.

Q. What is the difference between knowledge and faith?

A. Knowledge has for its object things visible and comprehensible; faith, things which are invisible and even incomprehensible. Knowledge is founded on experience, on examination of its object; but faith on belief of testimony to truth. Knowledge belongs properly to the intellect, although it may also act on the heart; Faith belongs principally to the heart, although it is imparted through the intellect.

Q. Why is faith and not knowledge only necessary in religious instruction?

A. Because the chief object of this instruction is God invisible and incomprehensible, and the wisdom of God hidden in a mystery; consequently many parts of this learning cannot be embraced by knowledge, but may be received by faith.

Faith, says St. Cyril of Jerusalem, is the eye which enlighteneth every man's conscience: it giveth man knowledge. For, as the prophet says, If ye will not believe, ye shall not understand. Isaiah vii. 9; Cyr. Cat. v.

Q. Can you illustrate further the necessity of faith?

A. St. Cyril thus illustrates it. *It is not only amongst us, who bear the name of Christ, that faith is made so great a thing; but every thing which is done in the world, even by men who are unconnected with the Church, is done by faith. Agriculture is founded on faith; for no one, who did not believe that he should gather in the increase of the fruits of the earth, would undertake the labour of husbandry. Mariners are guided by faith, when they entrust their fate to a slight plank, and prefer the agitation of the unstable waters, to the more stable element of the earth. They give themselves up to uncertain expectations, and retain for themselves nothing but faith, to which they trust, more than to any anchors.* Cyr. Cat. v.

ON DIVINE REVELATION.

Q. Whenec is the doctrine of the orthodox faith derived ?

A. From Divine Revelation.

Q. What is meant by the words *Divine Revelation* ?

A. That which God Himself has revealed to men, in order that they might rightly and savingly believe in Him, and worthily honour Him.

Q. Has God given such a revelation to all men ?

A. He has given it for all, as being necessary for all alike, and capable of bringing salvation to all : but since not all men are capable of receiving a revelation immediately from God, He has employed special persons as heralds of His revelation, to deliver it to all who are desirous of receiving it.

Q. Why are not all men capable of receiving a revelation immediately from God ?

A. Owing to their sinful impurity and weakness both in soul and body.

Q. Who were the heralds of Divine Revelation ?

A. Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, and other Prophets, received and preached the beginnings of Divine Revelation : but it was the incarnate Son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, who brought it to earth in its fulness and perfection, and spread it over all the world by His disciples and Apostles.

The Apostle Paul says in the beginning of his Epistle to the Hebrews ; *God, who at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in times past unto the Fathers by the Prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son ; Whom He hath appointed heir of all things, by Whom also He made the worlds.*

The same Apostle writes as follows to the Corinthians : *But we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden things, which God ordained before the world unto our glory ; which none of the princes of this world knew. But God hath revealed them unto us, by His Spirit : for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God.* 1 Cor. ii. 7. 10.

INTROD. The Evangelist John writes in his Gospel; *No man hath seen God at any time: the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him.* John i. 18.

Jesus Christ Himself says; *No man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he, to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him.* Matt. xi. 27.

Q. Cannot man then have any knowledge of God without a special revelation from Him?

A. Man may have some knowledge of God by contemplation of those things which He has created; but this knowledge is imperfect and insufficient, and can serve only as a preparation for faith, or as a help towards the knowledge of God from His revelation.

For the invisible things of Him, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead. Rom. i. 20.

And He hath made of one blood all nations of men, for to dwell on all the face of the earth; and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation; that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after Him, and find Him, though He be not far from every one of us. For in Him we live, and move and have our being. Acts xvii. 26..28.

With regard to faith in God, it is preceded by the idea that God is; which idea we get from the things which have been created. Attentively examining the creation of the world we perceive that God is all-wise, all-powerful, and good: we perceive also all His invisible properties. By these means we are led to acknowledge Him as the Supreme Ruler. Seeing that God is the Creator of the whole world, and we form a part of the world, it follows that God is also our Creator. On this knowledge follows faith; and on faith adoration. Basil. Magn. Epist. 232.

ON HOLY TRADITION AND HOLY SCRIPTURE.

Q. How is Divine Revelation spread among men, and preserved in the true Church?

A. By two channels; holy Tradition², and holy Scripture.

Q. What is meant by the name *holy Tradition*?

INTROD.

A. By the name holy Tradition is meant the doctrine of the faith, the law of God, the sacraments, and the ritual as handed down by the true believers and worshippers of God by word and example from one to another, and from generation to generation.

Q. Is there any sure repository of holy Tradition?

A. All true believers united by the holy tradition of the faith, collectively and successively, by the will of God, compose the Church; and She is the sure repository of holy Tradition, or, as St. Paul expresses it, *The Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.* 1 Tim. iii. 15.

St. Irenæus writes thus: *We ought not to seek among others the truth, which we may have for asking from the Church. For in her, as in a rich treasure-house, the Apostles have laid up in its fulness all that pertains to the truth, so that whosoever seeketh, may receive from her the food of life. She is the door of life.* Adv. Hæres. l. iii. c. 4.

Q. What is that which you call holy Scripture?

A. Certain books written by the Spirit of God, through men sanctified by God, called Prophets and Apostles. These books are commonly termed the Bible.

Q. What does the word *Bible* mean?

A. It is Greek, and means *The books*. The name signifies that the sacred books deserve attention before all others.

Q. Which is the more ancient, holy Tradition, or holy Scripture?

A. The most ancient and original instrument for spreading Divine Revelation is holy Tradition. From Adam to Moses there were no sacred books. Our Lord Jesus Christ Himself delivered His Divine doctrine and ordinances to His disciples by word and example, but not by writing. The same method was followed by the Apostles also at first, when they spread abroad the faith and established the Church of Christ. The necessity of tradition is further evident from this, that books can be available only to a small part of mankind, but tradition to all.

INTROD.

Q. Why then was holy Scripture given?

A. To this end, that Divine Revelation might be preserved more exactly and unchangeably. In holy Scripture we read the words of the Prophets and Apostles precisely as if we were living with them and listening to them, although the latest of the sacred books were written a thousand and some hundred years before our time.

Q. Must we follow holy Tradition, even when we possess holy Scripture?

A. We must follow that tradition which agrees with the Divine Revelation and with holy Scripture, as is taught us by holy Scripture itself. The Apostle Paul writes; *Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word or our epistle.* 2 Thess. ii. 15.

Q. Why is Tradition necessary even now?

A. As a guide to the right understanding of holy Scripture, for the right ministration of the Sacraments, and the preservation of sacred rites and ceremonies in the purity of their original institution.

St. Basil the Great says of this as follows: *Of the doctrines and injunctions kept by the Church, some we have from written instruction, but some we have received from Apostolical tradition, by succession in private. Both the former and the latter have one and the same force for piety; and this will be contradicted by no one, who has ever so little knowledge in the ordinances of the Church. For were we to dare to reject unwritten customs, as if they had no great importance, we should insensibly mutilate the Gospel, even in the most essential points, or rather, for the teaching of the Apostles leave but an empty name. For instance; let us mention before all else the very first and commonest act of Christians; that they who trust in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, should sign themselves with the sign of the cross; who hath taught this by writing? To turn to the east in prayer: what Scripture have we for this? The words of invocation in the change of the Eucharistic bread and of the Cup of blessing; by which of the Saints have they been left us in writing? For we are not con-*

tent with those words which the Apostle or the Gospel records, INTROD. but both before them and after them we pronounce others also, which we hold to be of great force for the Sacrament, though we have received them from unwritten teaching. By what Scripture is it in like manner that we bless the water of Baptism, the oil of unction, and the person himself who is baptized? Is it not by a silent and secret tradition? What more? The very practice itself of anointing with oil; what written word have we for it? Whence is the rule of trine immersion? and the rest of the ceremonies at Baptism, the renunciation of Satan and his angels? from what Scripture are they taken? Are they not all from this unpublished and private teaching, which our Fathers kept under a reserve inaccessible to curiosity and profane disquisition, having been taught as a first principle to guard by silence the sanctity of the mysteries? For how were it fit to publish in writing the doctrine of those things, on which the unbaptized may not so much as look? Can. xcvi. De Spir. Sanct. c. xxvii.

ON HOLY SCRIPTURE IN PARTICULAR.

Q. When were the sacred books written?

A. At different times: some before the birth of Christ, others after.

Q. Have not these two divisions of the sacred books each their own names?

A. They have. Those written before the Birth of Christ are called the books of the *Old Testament*; while those written after are called the books of the *New Testament*.

Q. What are the *Old* and *New Testaments*?

A. In other words: the old and new Covenants of God with men.

Q. In what consisted the *Old Testament*?

A. In this, that God promised men a Divine Saviour, and prepared them to receive Him.

Q. How did God prepare men to receive the Saviour?

A. Through gradual revelations, by prophecies and types.

INTROD.

Q. In what consists the *New Testament*?

A. In this, that God has actually given men a Divine Saviour, His own only-begotten Son, Jesus Christ.

Q. How many are the books of the Old Testament?

A. St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Athanasius the Great, and St. John Damascene reckon them at *twenty-two*, agreeing therein with the Jews, who so reckon them in the original Hebrew tongue. Athanas. Ep. xxxix. De Test., J. Damasc. Theol. l. iv. c. 17.

Q. Why should we attend to the reckoning of the Hebrews?

A. Because, as the Apostle Paul says, *unto them were committed the oracles of God*: and the sacred books of the Old Testament have been received from the Hebrew Church of that Testament by the Christian Church of the New. Rom. iii. 2.

Q. How do St. Cyril and St. Athanasius enumerate the books of the Old Testament?

A. As follows: 1, The book of Genesis: 2, Exodus: 3, Leviticus: 4, The book of Numbers: 5, Deuteronomy: 6, The book of Jesus the son of Nun: 7, The book of Judges, and with it, as an appendix, The book of Ruth: 8, The first and second books of Kings, as two parts of one book: 9, The third and fourth books of Kings: 10, The first and second books of Paralipomena: 11, The first book of Esdras, and the second, or, as it is entitled in Greek, the book of Nehemiah: 12, The book of Esther: 13, The book of Job: 14, The Psalms: 15, The Proverbs of Solomon: 16, Ecclesiastes, also by Solomon: 17, The Song of Songs, also by Solomon: 18, The book of the Prophet Isaiah: 19, Of Jeremiah: 20, Of Ezekiel: 21, Of Daniel: 22, Of the Twelve Prophets.

Q. Why is there no notice taken in this enumeration of the books of the Old Testament of the book of the Wisdom of the son of Sirach, and of certain others?

A. Because they do not exist in the Hebrew.

Q. How are we to regard these last-named books?

A. Athanasius the Great says, that they have been appointed of the Fathers to be read by proselytes, who are preparing for admission into the Church³. INTROD.

Q. Is there any division of the books of the Old Testament, by which you can give a more distinct account of their contents?

A. They may be divided into the four following classes :

1. Books of *the Law*, which form the basis of the Old Testament.

2. *Historical* books, which contain principally the history of religion.

3. *Doctrinal*, which contain the doctrine of religion.

4. *Prophetical*, which contain prophecies, or predictions of things future, and especially of Jesus Christ.

Q. Which are the books of *the Law*?

A. The five books written by Moses ; Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy.

Jesus Christ Himself gives to these books the general name of *the Law of Moses*. Luke xxiv. 44.

Q. What in particular is contained in the book of Genesis?

A. The account of the creation of the world and of man, and afterwards the history and ordinances of religion in the first ages of mankind.

Q. What is contained in the other four books of Moses?

A. The history of religion in the time of the Prophet Moses, and the Law given through him from God.

Q. Which are the *historical* books of the Old Testament?

A. The books of Joshua the son of Nun, Judges, Ruth, Kings, Paralipomena, the book of Esdras, and the books of Nehemiah and Esther.

Q. Which are the *doctrinal*?

A. The book of Job, The Psalms, and the books of Solomon.

Q. What should we remark in particular of the book of Psalms?

A. This book, together with the doctrine of religion, contains also allusions to its history, and many prophecies of our

INTROD. Saviour Christ. It is a perfect manual of prayer and praise, and on this account is in continual use in the Divine service of the Church.

Q. Which books are *prophetical*?

A. Those of the Prophets; Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, and the twelve others.

Q. How many are the books of the New Testament?

A. Twenty-seven.

Q. Are there among these any which answer to the books of the *Law*, or form the basis of the New Testament?

A. Yes. The *Gospel*, which consists of the four books of the Evangelists, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John.

Q. What means the word *Gospel*?

A. It is the same as the Greek word *Evangelý*, and means good or joyful tidings.

Q. Of what have we good tidings in the books called the Gospel?

A. Of the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, of His advent and life on earth, of His miracles and saving doctrine, and finally, of His death upon the cross, His glorious resurrection, and ascension into heaven.

Q. Why are these books called the Gospel?

A. Because man can have no better nor more joyful tidings than these, of a Divine Saviour and everlasting salvation. For the same cause, whenever the Gospel is read in the Church, it is prefaced and accompanied by the joyful exclamation; *Glory be to Thee, O Lord, glory be to Thee.*

Q. Are any of the books of the New Testament *historical*?

A. Yes. One; the book of the *Acts of the holy Apostles*.

Q. Of what does it give an account?

A. Of the descent of the Holy Ghost on the Apostles, and of the extension through them of Christ's Church.

Q. What is an *Apostle*?

A. The word means a *messenger*. It is the name given to those disciples of our Lord Jesus Christ, whom He sent to preach the Gospel.

Q. Which books of the New Testament are *doctrinal*?

A. The seven General Epistles ; namely, one of the Apostle INTROD. James, two of Peter, three of John, and one of Jude : and fourteen Epistles of the Apostle Paul ; namely, one to the Romans, two to the Corinthians, one to the Galatians, one to the Ephesians, one to the Philippians, one to the Colossians, two to the Thessalonians, two to Timothy, one to Titus, one to Philemon, and one to the Hebrews.

Q. Are there also among the books of the New Testament any *prophetical* ?

A. Such is the book of the *Apocalypse*.

Q. What means this word *Apocalypse* ?

A. It is Greek, and means *revelation*.

Q. What are the contents of this book ?

A. A mystical representation of the future destinies of the Christian Church, and of the whole world.

Q. What rules must we observe in reading holy Scripture ?

A. First, we must read it devoutly, as the word of God, and with prayer to understand it aright ; secondly, we must read it with a pure desire of instruction in faith, and incitement to good works ; thirdly, we must take and understand it in such sense as agrees with the interpretation of the Orthodox Church and the holy Fathers.

Q. When the Church proposes the doctrine of Divine Revelation and of holy Scripture to people for the first time, what signs does she offer that it is really the word of God ?

A. Signs of this are the following :

1. The sublimity of this doctrine, which witnesses that it cannot be any invention of man's reason.

2. The purity of this doctrine, which shews that it is from the all-pure mind of God.

3. Prophecies.

4. Miracles.

5. The mighty effect of this doctrine upon the hearts of men, beyond all but Divine power.

Q. In what way are *prophecies* signs of a true revelation from God ?

INTROD.

A. This may be shewn by an example. When the Prophet Isaiah foretold the birth of the Saviour Christ from a virgin, a thing which the natural reason of man could not have so much as imagined, and when, some hundred years after this prophecy, our Lord Jesus Christ was born of the most pure Virgin Mary, it was impossible not to see that the prophecy was the word of the Omniscient, and its fulfilment the work of the Almighty God. Wherefore also the holy Evangelist Matthew when relating the birth of Christ, brings forward the prophecy of Isaiah: *But all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the Prophet, saying; Behold a Virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call His name Emmanuel, which, being interpreted, is, God with us.* Mat. i. 22, 23.

Q. What are *miracles*?

A. Acts, which can be done by no power or art of man, but only by the Almighty power of God; for example, to raise the dead.

Q. How do miracles serve for a sign that the word spoken is from God?

A. He who does true miracles works by the power of God; consequently he is in favour with God, and partaker of the Divine Spirit: but to such it must belong to speak only the pure truth; and so, when such a man speaks in God's name, we are sure that by his mouth there speaketh really the Word of God.

On this account our Lord Jesus Christ Himself owns miracles as a powerful testimony to His Divine Mission: *The works which the Father hath given Me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness of Me, that the Father hath sent Me.* John v. 36.

Q. Whence may we more particularly see the *mighty effect* of the doctrine of Christ?

A. From this; that twelve Apostles, taken from among poor and unlearned people, of the lowest class, by this doctrine overcame and subdued to Christ the mighty, the wise, and the rich; kings, and their kingdoms.

THE COMPOSITION OF THE CATECHISM.

Q. What may be a good order for setting forth a Catechetical instruction in religion?

A. For this we may follow the book of the Orthodox Confession, approved by the Eastern Patriarchs, and take as our basis the saying of the Apostle Paul, that the whole energies of a Christian during this present life, consist in these three; faith, hope, charity. *And now abideth faith, hope, charity; these three.* 1 Cor. xiii. 13.

And so the Christian needs; First, Doctrine on *faith* in God, and on the Sacraments which He reveals; Secondly, Doctrine on *hope* towards God, and on the means of being grounded in it; Thirdly, Doctrine on *love* to God, and all that He commands us to love.

Q. What does the Church use as her instrument to introduce us to the doctrine of faith?

A. The *Creed*⁴.

Q. What may we take as a guide for the doctrine of hope?

A. Our Lord's *Beatitudes*, and the *Lord's Prayer*.

Q. Where may we find the elements of the doctrine of charity?

A. In the *ten Commandments* of the Law of God.

THE FIRST PART
OF THE
ORTHODOX CATECHISM.
ON FAITH.

ON THE CREED GENERALLY, AND ON ITS ORIGIN.

FIRST
PART.

Q. What is the Creed?

A. The Creed is an exposition, in few but precise words, of that doctrine which all Christians are bound to believe.

Q. What are the words of this exposition?

A. They are as follows :

1. *I believe in one God the Father, Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible :*

2. *And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the only-begotten, begotten of the Father before all worlds, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made ;*

3. *Who for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was incarnate of the Holy Ghost, and of the Virgin Mary, and was made man ;*

4. *And was crucified also for us, under Pontius Pilate, and suffered, and was buried ;*

5. *And rose again the third day according to the Scripture ;*

6. *And ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father ;*

7. *And He shall come again with glory to judge the quick and the dead, whose kingdom shall have no end.* ON FAITH.

8. *And I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord, the Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father⁵, who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, who spake by the Prophets.*

9. *I believe one Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church.*

10. *I acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins.*

11. *I look for the resurrection of the dead ;*

12. *And the life of the world to come. Amen.*

Q. From whom have we this exposition of the faith?

A. From the Fathers of the first and second Œcumenical Councils.

Q. What is an Œcumenical Council?

A. An assembly of the Pastors and Doctors of the Catholic Church of Christ, as far as possible, from the whole world, for the confirmation of true doctrine and holy discipline among Christians.

Q. How many Œcumenical Councils have there been?

A. Seven⁶: 1, Of Nice; 2, Of Constantinople; 3, Of Ephesus; 4, Of Chalcedon; 5, The second of Constantinople; 6, The third of Constantinople; 7, The second of Nice.

Q. Whence is the rule for assembling Councils?

A. From the example of the Apostles, who held a Council in Jerusalem. Acts xv. This is grounded also upon the words of Jesus Christ Himself, which give to the decisions of the Church such weight, that whosoever disobeys them is left deprived of grace as a heathen. But the mean, by which the Œcumenical Church utters her decisions, is an Œcumenical Council.

Tell it unto the Church; but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man, and a publican. Mat. xviii. 17.

Q. What were the particular occasions for assembling the first and second Œcumenical Councils, at which the Creed was defined?

A. The first was held for the confirmation of the true doctrine respecting the Son of God, against the error of

FIRST
PART.

Arius, who thought unworthily of the Son of God : the second for the confirmation of the true doctrine respecting the Holy Ghost, against Macedonius, who thought unworthily of the Holy Ghost.

Q. Is it long ago that these Councils were held ?

A. The first was held in the year 325 from the birth of Christ, the second in 381.

ON THE ARTICLES OF THE CREED.

Q. What method shall we follow in order the better to understand the Œcumenical Creed ?

A. We must notice its division into twelve *articles* or *parts*, and consider each article separately.

Q. What is spoken of in each several article of the Creed ?

A. The first article of the Creed speaks of *God* as the prime origin, more particularly of the *first Person of the Holy Trinity*, God the *Father*, and of God as the *Creator* of the world ;

The second article, of the *second Person* of the Holy Trinity, Jesus Christ, the Son of God ;

The third article, of the *incarnation* of the Son of God ;

The fourth article, of the *suffering* and *death* of Jesus Christ ;

The fifth article, of the *resurrection* of Jesus Christ ;

The sixth article, of the *ascension* of Jesus Christ into heaven ;

The seventh article, of the *second coming* of Jesus Christ upon earth ;

The eighth article, of the *third Person* of the Holy Trinity, the Holy Ghost ;

The ninth article, of the *Church* ;

The tenth article, of *Baptism*, under which are implied the other *Sacraments* also ;

The eleventh article, of the future *resurrection of the dead* ;

The twelfth article, of the *life everlasting*.

ON THE FIRST ARTICLE.

ON
FAITH.

Q. What is it to believe in God?

A. To believe in God is to have a lively belief of His being, His attributes, and works; and to receive with all the heart His revealed word respecting the salvation of men.

Q. Can you shew from holy Scripture that faith in God must consist in this?

A. The Apostle Paul writes: *Without faith it is impossible to please God: for he that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him.* Heb. xi. 6.

The same Apostle expresses the effect of faith on Christians in the following prayer for them to God: *That He would grant you, according to the riches of His glory, to be strengthened with might by His Spirit in the inner man, that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith.* Eph. iii. 16, 17.

Q. What must be the immediate and constant effect of a hearty faith in God?

A. The confession of this same faith.

Q. What is the confession of the faith?

A. It is openly to avow that we hold the Orthodox faith, and this with such sincerity and firmness, that neither seductions, nor threats, nor tortures, nor death itself, may be able to make us deny our faith in the true God and in our Lord Jesus Christ.

Q. For what is the confession of the faith necessary?

A. The Apostle Paul witnesses that it is necessary for salvation. *For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.* Rom. x. 10.

Q. Why is it necessary to salvation not only to believe, but also to confess the Orthodox faith?

A. Because if any one, to preserve his temporal life, or earthly goods, shrink from confessing the Orthodox faith, he shews thereby that he has not a true faith in God the Saviour, and the life of happiness to come.

FIRST
PART.

Q. Why is it not said in the Creed simply, *I believe in God*, rather than with the addition, *in one God*?

A. In order to contradict the error of the heathen, who taking the creature for God, thought there were many gods.

Q. What does holy Scripture teach us of the unity of God?

A. The very words of the Creed on this point are taken from the following passage of the Apostle Paul: *There is none other God but one. For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or on earth, as there be gods many, and lords many, but to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in Him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by Him.* 1 Cor. viii. 4, 5, 6.

Q. Can we know the very essence of God?

A. No. It is above all knowledge, not of men only, but of Angels.

Q. How does holy Scripture speak on this point?

A. The Apostle Paul says, that God *dwelleth in the light, which no man can approach unto, Whom no man hath seen, nor can see.* 1 Tim. vi. 16.

Q. What idea of the essence and essential attributes of God may be derived from Divine revelation?

A. That God is a Spirit, eternal, all-good, omniscient, all-just, almighty, omni-present, unchangeable, all-sufficing to Himself, all-blessed.

Q. Shew all this from holy Scripture.

A. Jesus Christ Himself has said, that *God is a Spirit.* John iv. 24.

Of the eternity of God David says; *Before the mountains were brought forth or ever the earth and the world were made, Thou art from everlasting and world without end.* Psalm xe. 2. In the Apoealypse we read the following doxology to God, *Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come.* Apoe. iv. 8. The Apostle Paul says, that the Gospel was made manifest *according to the commandment of the everlasting God.* Rom. xvi. 26.

Of the goodness of God Jesus Christ Himself said: *There is none good but one, that is God.* Mat. xix. 17. The Apostle

John says; *God is Love.* 1 John iv. 16. David sings; *The Lord is gracious and merciful, long-suffering, and of great goodness. The Lord is loving unto every man, and His mercies are over all His works.* Psalm cxlv. 8, 9.

Of the omniscience of God the Apostle John says; *God is greater than our heart, and knoweth all things.* 1 John iii. 20. The Apostle Paul exclaims; *O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom, and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out.* Rom. xi. 33.

Of the justice of God David sings; *The righteous Lord loveth righteousness, His countenance will behold the thing that is just.* Psalm xi. 8. The Apostle Paul says that *God will render to every man according to his deeds, and that there is no respect of persons with God.* Rom. ii. 6. 11.

Of the almighty power of God the Psalmist says; *He spake, and it was done; He commanded, and it stood fast.* Psalm xxxiii. 9. The Archangel says in the Gospel; *With God nothing shall be impossible.* Luke i. 37.

The omnipresence of God David describes thus: *Whither shall I go from Thy Spirit? or whither shall I go from Thy presence? If I climb up into heaven, Thou art there; if I go down to hell, Thou art there also: If I take the wings of the morning, and remain in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there shall Thy hand lead me, and Thy right hand shall hold me: If I say, Peradventure the darkness shall cover me; then shall my night be turned to day. Yea the darkness is no darkness with Thee, but the night is as clear as the day; the darkness and light to Thee are both alike.* Psalm cxxxix. 6.. 11.

The Apostle James says, that *With the Father of lights there is no variableness, neither shadow of turning.* James i. 17.

The Apostle Paul writes, that *God receiveth not worship of men's hands as though He needed any thing, seeing He giveth to all life, and breath, and all things.* Acts xvii. 25. The same Apostle calls God *The blessed and only potentate, the King of kings and Lord of lords.* 1 Tim. vi. 15.

Q. If God is a *Spirit*, how does holy Scripture ascribe to Him bodily parts, as *heart, eyes, ears, hands?*

FIRST
PART.

A. Holy Scripture in this suits itself to the common language of men ; but we are to understand such expressions in a higher and spiritual sense. For instance, the heart of God means His *goodness* or love ; eyes and ears mean His *omniscience* ; hands, His *almighty power*.

Q. If God is every where, how do men say that God is *in heaven*, or *in the church* ?

A. God is every where : but in heaven He has a special presence manifested in everlasting glory to the blessed spirits : also in churches He has, through grace and Sacraments, a special presence devoutly recognised and felt by believers, and manifested sometimes by extraordinary signs.

Jesus Christ says ; *Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them.* Mat. xviii. 20.

Q. How are we to understand these words of the Creed, *I believe in one God the Father* ?

A. This is to be understood with reference to the mystery of the Holy Trinity ; because God is One in substance but Trine in persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, a Trinity consubstantial and undivided.

Q. How does holy Scripture speak of the Blessed Trinity ?

A. The chief texts on this point in the New Testament are the following : *Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* Mat. xxviii. 19. *There are Three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost : and these Three are One.* 1 John v. 7.

Q. Is the Holy Trinity mentioned in the Old Testament also ?

A. Yes ; only not so clearly. For instance ; *By the Word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the hosts of them by the Breath of His mouth.* Psalm xxxiii. 6. *Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord of Hosts : the whole earth is full of His glory.* Isaiah vi. 3.

Q. How is one God in three Persons ?

A. We cannot comprehend this inner mystery of the Godhead ; but we believe it on the infallible testimony of the

word of God. *The things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God.* 1 Cor. ii. 11.

ON
FAITH.

Q. What *difference* is there between the Persons of the Holy Trinity?

A. God the Father is neither begotten, nor proceeds from any other Person: the Son of God is from all eternity begotten of the Father: the Holy Ghost from all eternity proceeds from the Father.

Are the three Hypostases or Persons of the Most Holy Trinity all of equal majesty?

A. Yes: All of absolutely equal Divine majesty. The Father is true God; the Son equally true God; and the Holy Ghost true God; but yet so, that in three Persons there is only one Tri-personal God.

Q. Why is God called the *Almighty*, *Παντοκράτορα*?

A. Because He upholds all things by His power and His will.

Q. What is expressed by the words of the Creed, *Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible*?

A. This, that all was made by God, and that nothing can be without God.

Q. Are not these words taken from holy Scripture?

A. They are. The book of Genesis begins thus; *In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.*

The Apostle Paul speaking of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, says; *By Him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by Him, and for Him.* Coloss. i. 16.

Q. What is meant in the Creed by the word *invisible*?

A. The *invisible* or *spiritual world*, to which belong the *Angels*.

Q. What are the *Angels*?

A. Incorporeal Spirits, having intelligence, will, and power.

Q. What means the name *Angel*?

A. It means, a *Messenger*.

Q. Why are they so called?

A. Because God sends them to announce His will. Thus

FIRST
PART.

for instance, Gabriel was sent to announce to the Most Holy Virgin Mary the conception of the Saviour.

Q. Which was created first, the *visible* world or the *invisible*?

A. The invisible was created before the visible, and the Angels before men. Orthod. Confess. P. i. Q. 18.

Q. Can we find any testimony to this in holy Scripture?

A. In the book of Job God Himself speaks of the creation of the earth thus : *Who laid the corner-stone thereof? When the stars were created, all My Angels praised Me with a loud voice.* Job xxxviii. 6, 7.

Q. Whence is taken the name of *Guardian Angels*?

A. From the following words of holy Scripture ; *He shall give His Angels charge over thee, to guard thee in all thy ways.* Psalm xci. 11.

Q. Has each one of us his *Guardian Angels*?

A. Without doubt. Of this we may be assured from the following words of Jesus Christ ; *Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones : for I say unto you, that in heaven their Angels do always behold the face of My Father, which is in heaven.* Mat. xviii. 10.

Q. Are all Angels good and beneficent?

A. No. There are also evil angels, otherwise called devils.

Q. How came they to be evil?

A. They were created good ; but they swerved from their duty of perfect obedience to God, and so fell away from Him into self-will, pride, and malice. According to the words of the Apostle Jude, they are *the Angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation.* Jude 6.

Q. What means the name *devil*?

A. It means, *slanderer* or *deceiver*.

Q. Why are the evil angels called devils, that is, slanderers or deceivers?

A. Because they are ever laying snares for men, seeking to deceive them, and inspire them with false notions and evil wishes.

Of this Jesus Christ speaking to the unbelieving Jews says ; *Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye*

will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own, for he is a liar and the father of it. John viii. 44. ON
FAITH.

Q. What has holy Scripture revealed to us of the creation of the world?

A. In the beginning God created from nothing the heaven and the earth: and the earth was without form and void. Afterwards God successively produced: on the *first day* of the world, light: on the *second*, the firmament or visible heaven: on the *third*, the gathering together of waters on the earth, the dry land, and what grows thereupon: on the *fourth*, the sun, moon, and stars: on the *fifth*, fishes and birds: on the *sixth*, four-footed creatures living on the earth, and lastly, man. With man the creation finished: and on the *seventh* day God rested from all his works. Hence the seventh day was called the *sabbath*, which in the Hebrew tongue means *rest*. Gen. ii. 2.

Q. Were the visible creatures created such as we see them now?

A. No. At the creation every thing was *very good*, that is, pure, beautiful, and harmless.

Q. Are we not informed of something particular in the creation of man?

A. God in the Holy Trinity said; *Let Us make man in Our image, and after Our likeness*. Gen. i. 26. And God made the body of the first man, *Adam*, from the earth; breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; brought him into Paradise; gave him for food, beside the other fruits of Paradise, the fruit of the tree of life; and lastly, having taken a rib from Adam while he slept, made from it the first woman, *Eve*. Gen. ii. 22.

Q. In what consists the *image of God*?

A. It consists, as explained by the Apostle Paul, *In righteousness and holiness of truth*. Eph. iv. 24.

Q. What is the *breath of life*?

A. The soul, a substance spiritual and immortal.

FIRST
PART.

Q. What is *Paradise*?

A. The word Paradise means a *garden*. It is the name given to the fair and blissful abode of the first man, described in the book of Genesis as like a garden.

Q. Was the Paradise in which man first lived material, or spiritual?

A. For the body it was material, a visible and blissful abode; but for the soul it was spiritual, a state of communion by grace with God, and spiritual contemplation of the creatures. Greg. Theol. Serm. xxxviii. 42; J. Damase. Theol. l. 2. c. xii. 3.

Q. What was the *tree of life*?

A. A tree, by feeding on whose fruit man would have been, even in the body, free from disease and death.

Q. Why was Eve made *from a rib* of Adam?

A. To the intent that all mankind might be by origin naturally disposed to love and defend one another⁸.

Q. With what design did God create man?

A. With this, that he should know God, love, and glorify Him, and so be happy for ever.

Q. Has not that will of God, by which man is designed for eternal happiness, its own proper name in theology?

A. It is called the *predestination* of God.

Q. Does God's predestination of man to happiness remain unchanged, seeing that now man is not happy?

A. It remains unchanged; inasmuch as God, of His foreknowledge and infinite mercy, hath predestined to open for man, even after his departure from the way of happiness, a new way to happiness, through His only-begotten Son Jesus Christ.

He hath chosen us, in Him, before the foundation of the world, are the words of the Apostle Paul. Eph. i. 4.

Q. How are we to understand the predestination of God, with respect to men in general, and to each man severally?

A. God has predestined to give to all men, and has actually given them preventing grace, and means sufficient for the attainment of happiness.

Q. What is said of this by the word of God?

A. For whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate.
Rom. viii. 29.

ON
FAITH.

Q. How does the Orthodox Church speak on this point?

A. In the exposition of the faith by the Eastern Patriarchs it is said: As He foresaw that some would use well their free will, but others ill, He accordingly predestined the former to glory, while the latter He condemned. Art. iii.

Q. What Divine energy with respect to the world, and especially to man, follows immediately upon their creation?

A. Divine providence.

Q. What is Divine providence?

A. Divine providence is the constant energy of the almighty power, wisdom, and goodness of God, by which He preserves the being and faculties of His creatures, directs them to good ends, and assists all that is good; but the evil that springs by departure from good He either cuts off, or corrects it, and turns it to good results.

Q. How does holy Scripture speak of God's providence?

A. Jesus Christ Himself says; Behold the fowls of the air, for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns, yet your Heavenly Father feedeth them: Are ye not much better than they? Mat. vi. 26. From these words is shewn at once God's general providence over the creatures, and His special providence over man.

The whole of the ninety-first Psalm is a description of God's special and manifold providence over man.

ON THE SECOND ARTICLE.

Q. How are we to understand the names *Jesus Christ, the Son of God*?

A. Son of God is the name of the second Person of the Holy Trinity in respect of His Godhead: This same Son of God was called *Jesus*, when He was conceived and born on earth as man: *Christ* is the name given Him by the Prophets, while they were as yet expecting His advent upon earth.

Q. What means the name *Jesus*?

A. Saviour.

FIRST
PART.

Q. By whom was the name Jesus first given?

A. By the Angel Gabriel.

Q. Why was this name given to the Son of God at His conception and birth on earth?

A. Because He was conceived and born to *save* men.

Q. What means the name *Christ*?

A. *Anointed*.

Q. Whence came the name *Anointed*?

A. From the anointing with holy ointment, through which are bestowed the gifts of the Holy Ghost.

Q. Is it only Jesus the Son of God who is called *Anointed*?

A. No. *Anointed* was in old time a title of *Kings*, *High Priests*, and *Prophets*.

Q. Why then is Jesus the Son of God called *The Anointed*?

A. Because to His manhood were imparted without measure all the gifts of the Holy Ghost; and so He possesses in the highest degree the *knowledge* of a Prophet, the *holiness* of a High Priest, and the *power* of a King.

Q. In what sense is Jesus Christ called *Lord*?

A. In this sense, that He is *very God*: for the name *Lord* is one of the names of God.

Q. What says holy Scripture of the Divinity of Jesus Christ, the Son of God?

A. *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.* John i. 1.

Q. Why is Jesus Christ called The Son of God, *Only-begotten*?

A. By this is signified, that He only is The Son of God begotten of the substance of God the Father; and so is *of one substance* with the Father; and consequently excels beyond comparison, all holy Angels and holy men, who are called sons of God *by grace*. John i. 12.

Q. Does holy Scripture call Jesus the *Only-begotten*?

A. It does. For instance, in the following places of the Evangelist John: *The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the Only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth.* John i. 14. *No man hath*

seen God at any time: the Only-begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him. ib. 18.

ON
FAITH.

Q. Why in the Creed is it said further of the Son of God that He is *begotten of the Father*?

A. By this is expressed that personal property, by which He is distinguished from the other Persons of the Holy Trinity.

Q. Why is it said that He is begotten *before all worlds*?

A. That none should think there was ever a time when He was not. In other words, by this is expressed that Jesus Christ is the Son of God from everlasting, even as God the Father is from everlasting.

Q. What mean in the Creed the words *Light of Light*?

A. Under the figure of the visible light they in some manner explain the incomprehensible generation of the Son of God from the Father. When we look at the sun, we see light: from this light is generated the light visible every where beneath: but both the one and the other is one light, indivisible, and of one nature. In like manner, God the Father is the everlasting *Light*: 1 John i. 5: of Him is begotten the Son of God, Who also is the everlasting Light: but God the Father and God the Son are one and the same everlasting Light, indivisible, and of one Divine nature.

Q. What force is there in the words of the Creed, *Very God of very God*?

A. This, that the Son of God is called God in the same proper sense as God the Father.

Q. Are not these words from holy Scripture?

A. Yes. They are taken from the following passage of John the Divine: *We know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us [light and] understanding, that we may know the true God, and be in Him that is true, in His Son Jesus Christ: This is the true God and eternal life.* 1 John v. 20.

Q. Why is it further added of the Son of God in the Creed that He is *begotten, not made*?

A. This was added against Arius, who impiously taught that the Son of God was made.

FIRST
PART.

Q. What mean the words, *Of one substance with the Father?*

A. They mean that the Son of God is of one and the same Divine substance with God the Father.

Q. How does holy Scripture speak of this?

A. Jesus Christ Himself speaks of Himself and of God the Father thus: *I and the Father are one.* John x. 30.

Q. What is shewn by the next words in the Creed, *By Whom all things were made?*

A. This; that God the Father created all things by His Son, as by His eternal Wisdom and His eternal Word.

All things were made by Him, and without Him was not any thing made which was made. John i. 3.

ON THE THIRD ARTICLE.

Q. Of whom is it said in the Creed, that He *came down from heaven?*

A. Of the Son of God.

Q. How came He down from heaven, seeing that as God He is every where?

A. It is true that He is every where; and so He is always in heaven, and always on earth: but on earth He was before invisible; afterwards He appeared in the flesh: in this sense it is said that He *came down from heaven.*

Q. How does holy Scripture speak of this?

A. I will repeat Jesus Christ's own words: *No man hath ascended up to heaven, but He that came down from heaven, even the Son of man, which is in heaven.* John iii. 13.

Q. Wherefore did the Son of God come down from heaven?

A. For *us men*, and for our salvation, as it is said in the Creed.

Q. In what sense is it said that the Son of God came down from heaven for *us men?*

A. In this sense, that He came upon earth not for one nation nor for some men only, but for *us men* universally.

Q. To save men from what did He come upon earth?

A. From sin, the curse, and death.

Q. What is *sin*?

A. Transgression of the law. *Sin is the transgression of the law.* 1 John iii. 4. ON
FAITH.

Q. Whence is sin in men, seeing that they were created in the image of God, and God cannot sin?

A. From the devil. *He that committeth sin, is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning.* 1 John iii. 8.

Q. How did sin pass from the devil to men?

A. The devil deceived Eve and Adam, and induced them to transgress God's commandment.

Q. What commandment?

A. God commanded Adam in Paradise not to eat of the fruit of the *Tree of the knowledge of good and evil*, and withal told him, that so soon as he ate thereof he should surely die.

Q. Why did it bring death to man to eat of the fruit of the *Tree of the knowledge of good and evil*?

A. Because it involved disobedience to God's will, and so separated man from God and His grace, and alienated him from the life of God.

Q. What propriety is there in the name of the *Tree of the knowledge of good and evil*?

A. Man through this tree came to know by the act itself what good there is in obeying the will of God, and what evil in disobeying it.

Q. How could Adam and Eve listen to the devil against the will of God?

A. God of His goodness, at the creation of man, gave him a *will* naturally disposed to love God, but still *free*; and man used this freedom *for evil*.

Q. How did the devil deceive Adam and Eve?

A. Eve saw in Paradise a serpent, which assured her that if men ate of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, they would know good and evil, and would become as gods. Eve was deceived by this promise, and by the fairness of the fruit, and ate of it. Adam ate after her example.

Q. What came of Adam's sin?

A. The curse, and death.

FIRST
PART.

Q. What is the *curse*?

A. The condemnation of sin by God's just judgment, and the evil which from sin came upon the earth for the punishment of men. God said to Adam, *Cursed is the ground for thy sake.* Gen. iii. 17.

Q. What is the *death* which came from the sin of Adam?

A. It is twofold: *bodily*, when the body loses the soul which quickened it; and *spiritual*, when the soul loses the grace of God, which quickened it with the higher and spiritual life.

Q. Can the soul then die, as well as the body?

A. It can die, but not so as the body. The body, when it dies, loses sense, and is dissolved; the soul, when it dies by sin, loses spiritual light, joy, and happiness, but is not dissolved nor annihilated, but remains in a state of darkness, anguish, and suffering.

Q. Why did not the first man only die, and not all as now?

A. Because all have come of Adam since his infection by sin, and all sin themselves. As from an infected source there naturally flows an infected stream, so from a father infected with sin, and consequently mortal, there naturally proceeds a posterity infected like him with sin, and like him mortal¹⁰.

Q. How is this spoken of in holy Scripture?

A. *By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.* Rom. v. 12.

Q. Had man any benefit from the fruit of the tree of life after he had sinned?

A. After he had sinned he could no more eat of it, for he was driven out of Paradise.

Q. Had men then any hope left of salvation?

A. When our first parents had confessed before God their sin, God, of His mercy, gave them a hope of salvation.

Q. In what consisted this hope?

A. God promised, that the *seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head.* Gen. iii. 15.

Q. What did that mean?

A. This, that Jesus Christ should overcome the devil who

had deceived men, and deliver them from sin, the curse, and death.

ON
FAITH.

Q. Why is Jesus Christ called *the seed of the woman*?

A. Because He was born on earth *without man*, from the Most Holy Virgin Mary.

Q. What *benefit* was there in this promise?

A. This, that from the time of the promise men could *believe* savingly in the Saviour that was to come, even as we now believe in the Saviour that has come¹¹.

Q. Did people in fact in old time believe in the Saviour that was to come?

A. Some did, but the greater part forgot God's promise of a Saviour.

Q. Did not God repeat this promise?

A. More than once. For instance, He made to Abraham the promise of a Saviour in the following words: *In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed.* Gen. xxii. 18. The same promise He repeated afterwards to David in the following words: *I will set up thy seed after thee, and I will establish His throne for ever.* 2 Kings vii. 12, 13.

Q. What do we understand by the word *Incarnation*?

A. That the Son of God took to Himself human flesh without sin, and was made man, without ceasing to be God.

Q. Whence is taken the word *Incarnation*?

A. From the words of the Evangelist John; *The Word was made flesh.* John i. 14.

Q. Why in the Creed, after it has been said of the Son of God that He *was incarnate*, is it further added that He *was made man*?

A. To the end that none should imagine that the Son of God took only *flesh* or a body, but should acknowledge in Him a *perfect man* consisting of body and soul.

Q. Have we for this any testimony of holy Scripture?

A. The Apostle Paul writes: *There is one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.* 1 Tim. ii. 5.

Q. And so is there only one nature in Jesus Christ?

A. No: there are in Him without separation and without

FIRST
PART.

confusion *two natures*, the Divine and the human, and answering to these natures two wills.

Q. Are there not therefore also two persons?

A. No : *One person*, God and man together ; in one word, a *God-man*.

Q. What says holy Scripture of the incarnation of the Son of God by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary?

A. The Evangelist Luke relates that when the Virgin Mary had asked the Angel, who announced to her the conception of Jesus, *How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?* the Angel replied to her, *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee : therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.* Luke i. 34, 35.

Q. Who was the Virgin Mary?

A. A holy virgin of the lineage of Abraham and David, from whose lineage the Saviour, by God's promise, was to come ; betrothed to Joseph, a man of the same lineage, in order that he might be her guardian ; for she was dedicated to God with a vow of perpetual virginity.

Q. Did the Most Holy Mary remain in fact ever a virgin?

A. She remained and remains a virgin before the birth, during the birth, and after the birth of the Saviour ; and therefore is called *ever-virgin*¹².

Q. What other great title is there, with which the Orthodox Church honours the Most Holy Virgin Mary?

A. That of *Mother of God*¹³.

Q. Can you shew the origin of this title in holy Scripture?

A. It is taken from the following words of the Prophet Isaiah : *Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a Son, and they shall call His name Immanuel, which being interpreted, is, God with us.* Isaiah vii. 14 ; Mat. i. 23.

So also the righteous Elizabeth calls the Most Holy Virgin *The Mother of the Lord* ; which title is all one with that of Mother of God. *Whence is this to me, that the Mother of my Lord should come to me ?* Luke i. 43.

Q. In what sense is the Most Holy Virgin called Mother of God?

A. Although Jesus Christ was born of her not after His Godhead, which is eternal, but after the manhood, still she is rightly called the Mother of God; because He that was born of her was both in the conception itself, and in the birth from her, as He ever is, *very God*.

Q. What thoughts should we have of the exalted dignity of the Most Holy Virgin Mary?

A. As Mother of the Lord she excels in grace and nearness to God, and so also in dignity, every created being¹⁴: and therefore the Orthodox Church honours her far above the cherubim and seraphim.

Q. What is there further to be remarked of the birth of Jesus Christ from the Most Holy Mother of God?

A. This, that since this birth was perfectly holy and void of sin, it was also without pain: for it was among the penalties of sin that God ordained Eve *in sorrows to bring forth children*. J. Damasc. Theol. l. iv. 14. § 6.

Q. What tokens had God's providence prepared, that men might know the Saviour, when He was born to them?

A. Many exact predictions of various circumstances of His birth, and life on earth. For instance, the Prophet Isaiah foretold that the Saviour should be born of a virgin. Is. vii. 14. The Prophet Micah foretold that the Saviour should be born in Bethlehem; and this prophecy the Jews understood even before they heard of its fulfilment. Mat. ii. 4..6. The Prophet Malachi, after the building of the second temple at Jerusalem, foretold that the coming of the Saviour was drawing nigh, that He should come to this temple, and that before Him should be sent a forerunner like unto the Prophet Elias, clearly pointing by this to John the Baptist. Mal. iii. 1; iv. 5. The Prophet Zachariah foretold the triumphal entry of the Saviour into Jerusalem. Zach. ix. 9. The Prophet Isaiah with wonderful clearness foretold the sufferings of the Saviour. Is. liii. David, in the twenty-second Psalm, described the sufferings of the Saviour on the

FIRST
PART.

cross with as great exactness as if he had written at the foot of the cross itself. And Daniel, 490 years before, foretold the appearance of the Saviour, His death on the cross, and the subsequent destruction of the temple and of Jerusalem, and abolition of the Old Testament sacrifices. Dan. ix.

Q. Did men in fact recognise Jesus Christ as the Saviour at the time that He was born and lived upon earth?

A. Many did recognise Him by various ways. The wise men of the East recognised Him by a star, which before His birth appeared in the East. The shepherds of Bethlehem knew of Him from Angels, who distinctly told them that the Saviour was born in the city of David. Simeon and Anna, by special revelation of the Holy Ghost, knew Him when He was brought, forty days after His birth, into the temple. John the Baptist, at the river Jordan, at His baptism, knew Him by revelation, by the descent of the Holy Ghost upon Him in the form of a dove, and by a voice from heaven from God the Father; *This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.* Mat. iii. 17. A like voice was heard of Him by the Apostles Peter, James, and John, at the time of His transfiguration on the mount; *This is My beloved Son, in Whom I am well pleased; hear Him.* Mark ix. 7. Besides this, very many recognised Him by the excellence of His doctrine, and especially by the miracles which He wrought.

Q. What miracles did Jesus Christ work?

A. People suffering under incurable diseases, and possessed by devils, were healed by Him in the twinkling of an eye, by a single word, or by the touch of His hand, and even through their touching His garment. Once with five, at another time with seven loaves He fed in the wilderness several thousand men. He walked on the waters, and by a word calmed the storm. He raised the dead: the son of the widow of Nain, the daughter of Jairus, and Lazarus on the fourth day after his death.

Q. You said that the Son of God was incarnate for our salvation: in what way did He effect it?

A. By His doctrine, His life, His death, and resurrection.

Q. What was Christ's doctrine?

A. The Gospel of the kingdom of God, or, in other words, the doctrine of salvation and eternal happiness, the same that is now taught in the Orthodox Church. Mark i. 14, 15.

ON
FAITH.

Q. How have we salvation by Christ's doctrine?

A. When we receive it with all our heart, and walk according to it. For, as the lying words of the devil, received by our first parents, became in them the seed of sin and death; so, on the contrary, the true word of Christ, heartily received by Christians, becomes in them the seed of a holy and immortal life. They are, in the words of the Apostle Peter, born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God which liveth and abideth for ever. 1 Pet. i. 23.

Q. How have we salvation by Christ's life?

A. When we imitate it. For He says, If any one serve Me, let him follow Me; and where I am, there shall also My servant be. John xii. 26.

ON THE FOURTH ARTICLE.

Q. How came it to pass that Jesus Christ was *crucified*, when His doctrine and works should have moved all to reverence Him?

A. The elders of the Jews and the scribes hated Him, because He rebuked their false doctrine and evil lives, and envied Him, because the people, which heard Him teach and saw His miracles, esteemed Him more than them; and hence they falsely accused Him, and condemned Him to death.

Q. Why is it said, that Jesus Christ was crucified *under Pontius Pilate*?

A. To mark the time when He was crucified.

Q. Who was Pontius Pilate?

A. The Roman governor of Judæa, which had become subject to the Romans.

Q. Why is this circumstance worthy of remark?

A. Because in it we see the fulfilment of Jacob's prophecy; The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come: and He is the desire of the nations. Gen. xlix. 10.

FIRST
PART.

Q. Why is it not only said in the Creed that Jesus Christ was *crucified*, but also added that He *suffered*?

A. To shew that His crucifixion was not only a semblance of suffering and death, as some hereticks said, but a real suffering and death.

Q. Why is it also mentioned that He was *buried*?

A. This likewise is to assure us that He really died, and rose again; for His enemies even set a watch at His sepulchre, and sealed it.

Q. How could Jesus Christ suffer and die, when He was God?

A. He suffered and died, not in His Godhead, but in His manhood; and this not because He could not avoid it, but because it pleased Him to suffer.

He Himself had said; *I lay down My life, that I may take it again. No man taketh it from Me, but I lay it down of Myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again.* John x. 17, 18.

Q. In what sense is it said, that Jesus Christ was *crucified for us*?

A. In this sense, that He, by His death on the cross, delivered us from *sin*, the *curse*, and *death*.

Q. How does holy Scripture speak of this deliverance?

A. Of deliverance from sin; *In whom we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of His grace.* Ephes. i. 7.

Of deliverance from the curse; *Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us.* Gal. iii. 13.

Of deliverance from death; *Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same, that through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil, and deliver them, who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage.* Heb. ii. 14, 15.

Q. How does the death of Jesus Christ upon the cross deliver us from sin, the curse, and death?

A. That we may the more readily believe this mystery, the

word of God teaches us of it, so much as we may be able to receive, by the comparison of Jesus Christ with Adam. Adam is by nature the head of all mankind, which is one with him by natural descent from him. Jesus Christ, in whom the Godhead is united with manhood, graciously made Himself the new almighty Head of men, whom He unites to Himself through faith. Therefore as in Adam we had fallen under sin, the curse, and death, so we are delivered from sin, the curse, and death in Jesus Christ. His voluntary suffering and death on the cross for us, being of infinite value and merit, as the death of one sinless, God and man in one person, is both a perfect satisfaction to the justice of God, which had condemned us for sin to death, and a fund of infinite merit, which has obtained him the right without prejudice to justice, to give us sinners pardon of our sins, and grace to have victory over sin and death.

God hath willed to make known to His saints, what is the riches of the glory of this mystery of the Gentiles, which is Christ in you, the hope of glory. Col. i. 26, 27.

For if by one man's offence death reigned by one, much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ. Rom. v. 17.

There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh but after the spirit. For the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death. For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit. Rom. viii. 1..4.

Q. Was it for us all, strictly speaking, that Jesus Christ suffered?

A. For His part, He offered Himself as a sacrifice strictly for all, and obtained for all grace and salvation; but this benefits only those of us, who, for their parts, of their own free-will, have *fellowship in His sufferings, being made conformable unto His death*¹⁵. Philipp. iii. 10.

FIRST
PART.

Q. How can we *have fellowship in the sufferings and death of Jesus Christ?*

A. We have fellowship in the sufferings and death of Jesus Christ through a lively and hearty faith, through the Sacraments, in which is contained and sealed the virtue of His saving sufferings and death, and lastly, through the crucifixion of our flesh with its affections and lusts.

I, says the Apostle, through the law, am dead to the law, that I may live unto God. I am crucified with Christ : nevertheless I live : yet not I, but Christ liveth in me : and the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave Himself for me. Gal. ii. 19, 20.

Know ye not, that as many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into His death? Rom. vi. 3.

For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death, till He come. 1 Cor. xi. 26.

They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts. Gal. v. 24.

Q. How can we *crucify the flesh* with the affections and lusts?

A. By bridling the affections and lusts, and by doing what is contrary to them. For instance, when anger prompts us to revile an enemy and to do him harm, but we resist the wish, and, remembering how Jesus Christ on the cross prayed for His enemies, pray likewise for ours; we thus crucify the affection of anger.

ON THE FIFTH ARTICLE.

Q. What is the first proof and earnest given by Jesus Christ, that His sufferings and death have wrought salvation for us men?

A. This, that He rose again, and so laid the foundation for our like blessed resurrection.

Now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first-fruits of them that slept. 1 Cor. xv. 20.

Q. What should we think of the state in which Jesus Christ was after His death, and before His resurrection?

A. This is described in the following hymn of the Church : ON
FAITH.
In the grave as to the flesh, in hades with Thy soul, as God, in paradise with the thief, and on the throne wert Thou, O Christ, together with the Father and the Spirit, filling all things, Thyself uncircumscribed.

Q. What is *hades* or *hell*?

A. Hades is a Greek word, and means a place *void of light*. In divinity by this name is understood a spiritual prison, that is, the state of those spirits which are separated by sin from the sight of God's countenance, and from the light and blessedness which it confers. Jude i. 6, Oetoch. ton. v., Stielir. ii. 4.

Q. Wherefore did Jesus Christ descend into hell?

A. To the end that He might there also preach His victory over death, and deliver the souls which with faith awaited His coming.

Q. Does holy Scripture speak of this?

A. It is referred to in the following passage: *For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that He may bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the Spirit: in which also He went and preached unto the spirits in prison.* 1 Pet. iii. 18, 19.

Q. What is there for us to remark on the next words of the Creed; *and rose again the third day according to the Scripture?*

A. These words were put into the Creed from the following passage in the Epistle to the Corinthians: *For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins, according to the Scripture; and that He was buried, and that He rose again the third day, according to the Scripture.* 1 Cor. xv. 3, 4.

Q. What force is there in these words, *according to the Scripture?*

A. By this is shewn, that Jesus Christ died and rose again, precisely as had been written of Him prophetically in the books of the Old Testament.

Q. Where, for instance, is there any thing written of this?

FIRST
PART.

A. In the fifty-third chapter of the book of the Prophet Isaiah, for instance, the suffering and death of Jesus Christ is imaged forth with many particular traits; as, *He was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon Him; and with His stripes we are healed.* liii. 5.

Of the resurrection of Christ the Apostle Peter quotes the words of the sixteenth Psalm: *For why? Thou shalt not leave My soul in hell, neither shalt Thou suffer Thy holy one to see corruption.* Acts ii. 27.

Q. Is this also in the Scripture of the Old Testament, that Jesus Christ should rise again precisely *on the third day*?

A. A prophetic type of this was set forth in the Prophet Jonah: *And Jonah was in the belly of the fish three days and three nights.* Jon. i. 17.

Q. How was it known that Jesus Christ had risen?

A. The soldiers who watched His sepulchre knew this with terror, because an angel of the Lord rolled away the stone which closed His sepulchre, and at the same time there was a great earthquake. Angels likewise announced the resurrection of Christ to Mary Magdalene and some others. Jesus Christ Himself on the very day of His resurrection appeared to many; as to the women bringing spices, to Peter, to the two disciples going to Emmaus, and lastly, to all the Apostles in the house, the doors being shut. Afterwards He oft-times shewed Himself to them during the space of forty days; and one day, He was seen of more than five hundred believers at once. 1 Cor. xv. 6.

Q. Why did Jesus Christ after His resurrection shew Himself to the Apostles during the space of forty days?

A. During this time He continued to teach them the mysteries of the kingdom of God. Acts i. 3.

ON THE SIXTH ARTICLE.

Q. Is the statement of our Lord's ascension in the sixth article of the Creed taken from holy Scripture?

A. It is taken from the following passages of holy Scrip-

ture: *He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that He might fill all things.* Eph. iv. 10. ON
FAITH.
We have such a High-Priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the majesty in the heavens. Heb. viii. 1.

Q. Was it in His Godhead or His manhood that Jesus Christ ascended into heaven?

A. In His manhood. In His Godhead He ever was and is in heaven.

Q. How does Jesus Christ *sit at the right hand of God the Father*, seeing that God is every where?

A. This must be understood spiritually; that is, Jesus Christ has one and the same majesty and glory with God the Father.

ON THE SEVENTH ARTICLE.

Q. How does holy Scripture speak of Christ's coming again?

A. *This Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven.* Acts i. 11. This was said to the Apostles by angels at the very time of our Lord's ascension.

Q. How does it speak of His future judgment?

A. *The hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation.* John v. 28, 29. These are the words of Christ Himself.

Q. How does it speak of His kingdom which is to have no end?

A. *He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David, and He shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of His kingdom there shall be no end.* Luke i. 32, 33. These are the words of the angel to the Mother of God.

Q. Will the second coming of Christ be like His first?

A. No, very different. He came to suffer for us in great humility, but He shall come to judge us *in His glory, and all the holy angels with Him.* Mat. xxv. 31.

FIRST
PART.

Q. Will He judge all men?

A. Yes. All without exception.

Q. How will He judge them?

A. The conscience of every man shall be laid open before all, and not only all deeds which he has ever done in his whole life upon earth be revealed, but also all the words he has spoken, and all his secret wishes and thoughts. *The Lord shall come, who will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the heart: and then shall every man have praise of God.* 1 Cor. iv. 5.

Q. Will He then condemn us even for evil words or thoughts?

A. Without doubt He will, unless we efface them by repentance, faith, and amendment of life. *I say unto you, that every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment.* Mat. xii. 36.

Q. Will Jesus Christ soon come to judgment?

A. We know not. Therefore we should live so as to be always ready. *The Lord is not slack concerning His promise, as some men count slackness; but is long-suffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance. But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night.* 2 Pet. iii. 9, 10. *Watch, therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of man cometh.* Mat. xxv. 13.

Q. Are there not however revealed to us some signs of the nearer approach of Christ's coming?

A. In the word of God certain signs are revealed, as the decrease of faith and love among men, the abounding of iniquity and calamities, the preaching of the Gospel to all nations, and the coming of antichrist. Mat. xxiv.

Q. What is *Antichrist*?

A. An adversary of Christ, who will strive to overthrow Christianity, but instead of doing so shall himself come to a fearful end. 2 Thess. ii. 8.

Q. What is Christ's kingdom?

A. Christ's kingdom is, first, the whole world; secondly, all believers upon earth; thirdly, all the blessed in heaven.

The first is called the kingdom of *nature*, the second the kingdom of *grace*, the third the kingdom of *glory*.

Q. Which of these is meant when it is said in the Creed, that of Christ's kingdom *there shall be no end*?

A. The kingdom of glory.

ON THE EIGHTH ARTICLE.

Q. In what sense is the Holy Ghost called *the Lord*?

A. In the same sense as the Son of God, that is, as very God.

Q. Is this witnessed by holy Scripture?

A. It is plain from the words spoken by the Apostle Peter to rebuke Ananias: *Why hath Satan filled thine heart, to lie to the Holy Ghost?* and further on, *Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God.* Acts v. 3, 4.

Q. What are we to understand by this, that the Holy Ghost is called *the giver of life*?

A. That He, together with God the Father and the Son, giveth life to all creatures, especially spiritual life to men.

Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. John iii. 5.

Q. Whence know we that the Holy Ghost *proceedeth from the Father*?

A. This we know from the following words of Jesus Christ Himself: *But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, He shall testify of Me.* John xv. 26.

Q. Does the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father admit of any change or supplement?

A. No. First, because the Orthodox Church, in this doctrine, repeats the very words of Jesus Christ; and His words, without doubt, are an exact and perfect expression of the truth. Secondly, because the second Œcumenical Council, whose chief object was to establish the true doctrine respecting the Holy Ghost, has without doubt sufficiently set forth the same in the Creed; and the Catholic Church has acknowledged this so decidedly, that the third Œcumenical Council in its seventh canon forbade the composition of any new Creed.

FIRST
PART.

For this cause John Damascene writes ; *Of the Holy Ghost, we both say that He is from the Father, and call Him the Spirit of the Father ; while we no wise say that He is from the Son, but only call Him the Spirit of the Son*¹⁶. Theol. lib. i. c. ii. v. 4.

Q. Whence does it appear that the Holy Ghost is equally *with the Father and the Son, and together with them, to be worshipped and glorified ?*

A. It appears from this, that Jesus Christ commanded to *baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*. Mat. xxviii. 19.

Q. Why is it said in the Creed that the Holy Ghost *spake by the prophets ?*

A. This is said against certain heretics, who taught that the books of the Old Testament were not written by the Holy Ghost.

Q. Does holy Scripture witness that the Holy Ghost really spake by the prophets ?

A. The Apostle Peter writes ; *For prophecy came not in old time by the will of man ; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost*. 2 Pet. i. 21.

Q. Did not the Holy Ghost speak also by the Apostles ?

A. Certainly He did. *Unto the prophets*, says also the Apostle Peter, *it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us they did minister the things, which are now reported unto you by them that have preached the Gospel unto you by the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven*. 1 Pet. i. 12.

Q. Why then is there no mention of the Apostles in the Creed ?

A. Because when the Creed was composed none doubted of the inspiration of the Apostles.

Q. Was not the Holy Ghost manifested to men in some very special manner ?

A. Yes. He came down upon the Apostles in the form of fiery tongues, on the fiftieth day after the resurrection of Jesus Christ.

Q. Is the Holy Ghost communicated to men even now likewise ?

A. He is communicated to all true Christians. *Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?* 1 Cor. iii. 16. ON
FAITH.

Q. How may we be made partakers of the Holy Ghost?

A. Through fervent prayer, and through the Sacraments.

If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask Him? Luke xi. 13.

But after that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which He shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour. Tit. iii. 4.. 6.

Q. What are the chief gifts of the Holy Ghost?

A. The chief and more general are, as reckoned by the Prophet Isaiah, the following seven; the spirit of the fear of God, the spirit of knowledge, the spirit of might, the spirit of counsel, the spirit of understanding, the spirit of wisdom, the spirit of the Lord, or the gift of piety and inspiration and in the highest degree. Isaiah xi. 2.

ON THE NINTH ARTICLE.

Q. What is the Church?

A. The Church is a divinely instituted community of men, united by the orthodox faith, the law of God, the hierarchy, and the Sacraments¹⁷.

Q. What is it to believe in the Church?

A. It is piously to honour the true Church of Christ, and to obey her doctrine and commandments, from a conviction that grace ever abides in her, and works, teaches, and governs unto salvation, flowing from her One only everlasting Head, the Lord Jesus Christ.

Q. How can the Church, which is visible, be the object of faith, when faith, as the Apostle says, is *the evidence of things not seen?*

A. First, though the Church be visible, the grace of God

FIRST
PART.

which dwells in her, and in those who are sanctified in her, is not so; and this it is which properly constitutes the object of faith in the Church.

Secondly, the Church, though visible so far as she is upon earth, and contains all Orthodox Christians living upon earth, still is at the same time invisible, so far as she is also partially in heaven, and contains all those that have departed hence in true faith and holiness.

Q. On what may we ground the idea that the Church is at once upon earth and in heaven?

A. On the following words of the Apostle Paul, addressed to Christians: *Ye are come unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and Church of the first-born which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus Christ the mediator of the new covenant.* Heb. xii. 22. 24.

Q. How are we assured that the grace of God abides in the true Church?

A. First, by this, that her Head is Jesus Christ, God and man in one person, *full of grace and truth*, who fills His body also, that is, the Church, with like grace and truth. John i. 14, 17.

Secondly, by this, that He has promised His disciples the Holy Ghost to *abide with them for ever*, and that, according to this promise, the Holy Ghost appoints the pastors of the Church. John xiv. 16.

The Apostle Paul says of Jesus Christ, that God the Father gave Him to be head over all things to the Church, which is His body. Eph. i. 22, 23. The same Apostle says to the pastors of the Church; *Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you Bishops, to feed the Church of our Lord and God, which He hath purchased with His own blood.* Acts xx. 28.

Q. How are we further assured that the grace of God abides in the Church even till now, and shall abide in it to the end of the world.

A. Of this we are assured by the following sayings of Jesus Christ Himself and His Apostle: *I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.* Mat. xvi. 18. *I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.* Amen. Mat. xxviii. 20. *Unto Him, God the Father, be glory in the Church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end.* Amen. Eph. iii. 21.

Q. Why is the Church *one*?

A. Because she is one spiritual Body, has one Head, Christ, and is animated by one Spirit of God. *There is one body and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism; one God and Father of all.* Eph. iv. 4..6.

Q. Are we still more expressly assured that Jesus Christ is the one only Head of the one Church?

A. The Apostle Paul writes, that for the Church, as *the building of God, other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.* 1 Cor. iii. 10, 11. Wherefore the Church, as the Body of Christ, can have no other Head than Jesus Christ.

The Church being to abide through all generations of time needs also an ever-abiding Head; and such is Jesus Christ alone.

Wherefore also, the Apostles take no higher title than that of *ministers of the Church.* Col. i. 24, 25.

Q. What duty does the unity of the Church lay on us?

A. That of *endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.* Eph. iv. 3.

Q. How does it agree with the unity of the Church, that there are many separate and independent Churches, as those of Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, Constantinople, Russia?

A. These are particular Churches, or parts of the one Catholic Church: the separateness of their visible organization does not hinder them from being all spiritually great members of the one body of the Universal Church, from having one Head, Christ, and one spirit of faith and grace. This unity is expressed outwardly by unity of Creed, and by communion in Prayer and Sacraments.

FIRST
PART.

Q. Is there likewise unity between the Church on earth, and the Church in heaven?

A. Doubtless there is, both by their common relation to one Head, our Lord Jesus Christ, and by mutual communion with one another¹⁸.

Q. What means of communion has the Church on earth with the Church in heaven?

A. The prayer of faith and love. The faithful who belong to the Church militant upon earth, in offering their prayers to God, call at the same time to their aid the Saints who belong to the Church in heaven; and these, standing on the highest steps of approach to God, by their prayers and intercessions purify, strengthen, and offer before God the prayers of the faithful living upon earth, and by the will of God work graciously and beneficently upon them, either by invisible virtue, or by distinct apparitions, and in divers other ways.

Q. On what is grounded the rule of the Church upon earth to invoke in prayer the Saints of the Church in heaven?

A. On a holy tradition, the principle of which is to be seen also in holy Scripture. For instance, when the Prophet David cries out in prayer, *O Lord God of Abraham, Isaac, and of Israel our fathers*; he makes mention of Saints in aid of his prayer, exactly as now the Orthodox Church calls upon *Christ our true God, by the prayers of His most pure Mother and all His Saints*¹⁹. See 1 Chron. xxix. 18.

Cyril of Jerusalem in his explanation of the Divine Liturgy says; *We make mention also of those who are before departed, first, of the Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, and Martyrs, that by their entreaties and intercession God may receive our prayers.* Cat. Myst. v. c. 9.

Basil the Great, in his sermon on the day of the Forty Holy Martyrs, says; *Whoever is afflicted has recourse to the Forty, and whoever is joyful runs to the same; the one that he may find relief from his sorrows, the other that he may keep his happiness. Here the pious wife is to be seen praying for her children: another asks the return of her absent husband: another the restoration of health to the sick. Yes. Let your petitions be with the Martyrs.*

Q. Is there any testimony of holy Scripture to the *meditative prayer* of the Saints in heaven?

A. The Evangelist John, in the Revelation, saw in heaven an Angel, to whom *was given much incense, that he should offer it, by the prayers of all Saints, upon the golden altar which was before the throne; and the smoke of the incense ascended up by the prayers of the Saints out of the hands of the Angel before God.* Rev. viii. 3, 4.

Q. Is there any testimony of holy Scripture to *beneficent apparitions of Saints* from heaven?

A. The Evangelist St. Matthew relates, that after the death of our Lord Jesus Christ upon the cross, *many bodies of the Saints which slept arose, and came out of the graves, after His resurrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many.* Mat. xxvii. 52, 53. And since a miracle so great could not be without some adequate end, we must suppose that the Saints which then arose appeared for this, that they might announce the descent of Jesus Christ into hell, and His triumphant resurrection; and so move men born in the Church of the Old Testament to pass over the more readily into that of the New, then opened.

Q. What testimonies are there to confirm us in the belief that *the Saints*, after their departure, *work miracles* through certain earthly means²⁰?

A. The fourth book of Kings testifies that by touching the bones of the Prophet Elisha a dead man was raised to life. 4 Kings xiii. 21.

The Apostle Paul not only in his own immediate person wrought healings and miracles, but the same was done also in his absence by handkerchiefs and aprons taken from his body. Acts xix. 12. By this example we may understand that the Saints, even after their deaths, may in like manner work beneficently through earthly means, which have received from them holy virtue.

Gregory the Divine in his first discourse against Julian says; *Thou reveredst not the sacrifices offered for Christ, nor fearedst the great athletes, John, Peter, Paul, James, Stephen,*

FIRST
PART.

Luke, Andrew, Thecla, and the rest, who before and after these suffered for the truth; who withstood both fire, and sword, the torturers, and all sufferings present or threatened, as if their bodies were not their own, or they had had no bodies at all. For what? That they might not, so much as by a word, betray their religion. To whom also great honours and triumphs are with just reason awarded: By whom devils are expelled, and diseases healed: Who appear in visions; and prophecy: Whose very bodies, though separate, when touched or revered, have like power with their holy souls; and drops of whose blood, those least tokens of their suffering, like power with their bodies.

John Damascene writes thus: *The relics of the Saints have been given us by our Lord Christ as salutary springs, from which manifold blessings flow.* And as if in explanation of this, he remarks, that *through the mind their bodies also were inhabited of God.* Theol. lib. iv. cap. xv. 3, 4.

Q. Why is the Church *holy*?

A. Because she is sanctified by Jesus Christ through His passion, through His doctrine, through His prayer, and through the Sacraments. *Christ loved the Church, and gave Himself for it; that He might sanctify it, having cleansed it with the washing of water by the word, that He might present it to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy, and without blemish.* Eph. v. 25 . . 27.

In His prayer to God the Father for believers, Jesus Christ said amongst other things: *Sanctify them through Thy truth: Thy word is truth. And for their sakes I sanctify Myself, that they also may be sanctified in truth.* John xvii. 17, 19.

Q. How is the Church *holy*, when she has in her sinners?

A. Men who sin, but purify themselves by true repentance, hinder not the Church from being *holy*; but impenitent sinners, either by the visible act of Church authority, or by the invisible judgment of God, are cut off from the body of the Church: and so she is in respect of these also kept *holy*.

Put away from among yourselves that wicked person. 1 Cor. v. 13. *Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure,*

having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are His. And, Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity. ON
FAITH.
2 Tim. ii. 19.

Q. Why is the Church called *Catholic*, or, which is the same thing, *Universal*?

A. Because she is not limited to any place, nor time, nor people, but contains true believers of all places, times, and peoples.

The Apostle Paul says that *the word of the gospel is in all the world; and bringeth forth fruit.* Coloss. i. 5, 6. and that in the Christian Church *there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian nor Scythian, bond nor free: but Christ is all, and in all.* ib. iii. 11. *They which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham.* Gal. iii. 9.

Q. What great privilege has the Catholic Church?

A. She alone has the sublime promises *that the gates of hell shall not prevail against her; that the Lord shall be with her even to the end of the world; that in her shall abide the glory of God in Christ Jesus throughout all generations for ever; and consequently that she shall never apostatize from the faith*²¹, nor sin against the truth of the faith, or fall into error.

We undoubtingly confess as sure truth, that the Catholic Church cannot sin, or err, nor utter falsehood in place of truth: for the Holy Ghost ever working through His faithful ministers the Fathers and Doctors of the Church preserves her from all error. Missive of the Eastern Patriarchs on the Orthodox Faith. Art. 12.

Q. If the Catholic Church contains all true believers in the world, must we not acknowledge it to be necessary for salvation, that every believer should belong to her?

A. Exactly so. Since Jesus Christ, in the words of St. Paul, *is the Head of the Church, and He is the Saviour of the Body; it follows that to have part in His salvation, we must necessarily be members of His Body, that is of the Catholic Church.* Ephes. v. 23.

The Apostle Peter writes that *baptism saveth us* after the

FIRST
PART.

figure of *the ark of Noah*. All who were saved from the general deluge, were saved only in the ark; so all who obtain everlasting salvation, obtain it only in the one Catholic Church.

Q. What thoughts and remembrances should we associate with the name of The *Eastern Church*?

A. In Paradise, planted in the East, was founded the first Church of our Parents in innocence; and in the East, after the fall, was laid a new foundation of the Church of the redeemed, in the promise of a Saviour. In the East, in the land of Judea, our Lord Jesus Christ having finished the work of our salvation, laid the foundation of His own proper Christian Church: from thence she spread herself over the whole universe; and to this day the Orthodox Catholic Œcumenical faith, confirmed by the seven Œcumenical Councils, is preserved unchanged in its original purity in the ancient Churches of the East, and in such as agree with them, as does by God's grace the Church of Russia.

Q. Why is the Church called *Apostolic*?

A. Because she has from the Apostles without break or change both her doctrine and the succession of the gifts of the Holy Ghost, through the laying on of consecrated hands. In the same sense the Church is called also *Orthodox*, or *Rightly-believing*.

Ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the Saints, and of the household of God; and are built on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone. Ephes. ii. 19, 20.

Q. What does the Creed teach us, when it calls the Church *Apostolic*?

A. It teaches us to hold fast the *Apostolical doctrine and tradition*, and eschew such doctrine and such teachers, as are not warranted by the doctrine of the Apostles.

The Apostle Paul says, *Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle.* 2 Thess. ii. 15. *A man that is an heretic after the first and second admonition reject.* Tit. iii. 10. *For there are many unruly, vain talkers, and deceivers, especially they of*

the circumcision, whose mouths must be stopped; who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake. Tit. i. 10, 11. But if thy brother neglect to hear the Church, let him be to thee as an heathen man and a publican. Mat. xviii. 17.

ON
FAITH.

Q. What Ecclesiastical Institution is there through which the succession of the Apostolical ministry is preserved?

A. The Ecclesiastical *Hierarchy*.

Q. Whence originates the Hierarchy of the Orthodox Christian Church?

A. From Jesus Christ Himself, and from the descent of the Holy Ghost on the Apostles; from which time it is continued in unbroken succession, through the laying on of hands, in the sacrament of Orders. *And He gave some, Apostles; and some, Prophets; and some, Evangelists; and some Pastors and Teachers; for the perfecting of the Saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the Body of Christ. Eph. iv. 11, 12.*

Q. What hierarchical authority is there, which can extend its sphere of action over the whole Catholic Church?

A. An Œcumenical Council.

Q. Under what hierarchical authority are the chief divisions of the Catholic Church?

A. Under the Orthodox Patriarchs, and the Most Holy Synod.

Q. Under what ecclesiastical authority are lesser orthodox provinces and cities?

A. Under Metropolitans, Archbishops, and Bishops.

Q. What rank in the hierarchy is held by the Most Holy Synod?

A. The same rank with the Most Holy Orthodox Patriarchs. See the Letters of the M. H. Patriarchs on the institution of the M. H. Synod.

Q. If any one desire to fulfil his duty of obedience to the Church, how may he learn what she requires of her children?

A. This may be learned from holy Scripture, from the canons of the holy Apostles, the holy Œcumenical and Provincial Councils, and the holy Fathers, and from the Books of Ecclesiastical Rules and Rubrics.

FIRST
PART.

ON THE TENTH ARTICLE.

Q. Why does the Creed mention Baptism?

A. Because faith is sealed by Baptism, and the other Mysteries or Sacraments.

Q. What is a *Mystery* or Sacrament?

A. A Mystery or Sacrament is a holy act, through which *grace*, or, in other words, the saving power of God, works *mysteriously* upon man.

Q. How many are the Sacraments?

A. Seven²²: 1. Baptism; 2. Unction with Chrism; 3. Communion; 4. Penitence; 5. Orders; 6. Matrimony; 7. Unction with Oil.

Q. What virtue is there in each of these Sacraments?

A. 1. In Baptism man is mysteriously born to a spiritual life.

2. In Unction with Chrism he receives a grace of spiritual growth and strength.

3. In the Communion he is spiritually fed.

4. In Penitence he is healed of spiritual diseases, that is, of sin.

5. In Orders he receives grace spiritually to regenerate, feed, and nurture others, by doctrine and Sacraments.

6. In Matrimony he receives a grace sanctifying the married life, and the natural procreation and nurture of children.

7. In Unction with Oil he has medicine even for bodily diseases, in that he is healed of spiritual.

Q. But why does not the Creed mention all these Sacraments, instead of mentioning Baptism only?

A. Because Baptism was the subject of a question, whether some people, as heretics, ought not to be rebaptized; and this required a decision, which so came to be put into the Creed.

ON BAPTISM.

Q. What is Baptism?

A. Baptism is a Sacrament, in which a man who believes, having his body thrice plunged in water in the name of God

the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, dies to the carnal life of sin, and is born again of the Holy Ghost to a life spiritual and holy²³. *Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.* John iii. 5.

Q. When and how began Baptism?

A. First, *John baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on Him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus.* Acts xix. 4. Afterwards, Jesus Christ by His own example sanctified Baptism, when He received it from John. Lastly, after His resurrection, He gave the Apostles this solemn commandment; *Go ye and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* Mat. xxviii. 19.

Q. What is most essential in the administration of Baptism?

A. Trine immersion in water, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

Q. What is required of him that seeks to be baptized?

A. Repentance, and faith; for which cause also before Baptism they recite the Creed. *Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.* Acts ii. 38. *He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved.* Mark xvi. 16.

Q. But why then are children baptized?

A. For the faith of their parents and sponsors, who are also bound to teach them the faith, so soon as they are of an age to learn.

Q. How can you shew from holy Scripture that we ought to baptize infants?

A. In the time of the Old Testament infants were circumcised when eight days old; but Baptism in the New Testament takes the place of circumcision; consequently infants should also be baptized.

Q. Whence does it appear that *Baptism* takes the place of *circumcision*?

FIRST
PART.

A. From the following words of the Apostle to believers :
Ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, by the circumcision of Christ, buried with Him in Baptism. Coloss. ii. 11, 12.

Q. Why are there sponsors at Baptism ?

A. In order that they may stand sureties before the Church for the faith of the baptized, and after Baptism may take him in charge, to confirm him in the faith. See Dion. Areop. on the Eccl. Hier. c. ii.

Q. Why before baptizing do we use *exorcism* ?

A. To drive away the devil, who since Adam's fall has had access to men, and power over them, as his captives and slaves.

The Apostle Paul says, that all men, without grace, *walk according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience. Ephes. ii. 2.*

Q. Wherein lies the force of exorcism ?

A. In the name of Jesus Christ, invoked with prayer and faith. Jesus Christ gave to believers this promise, *In My name shall they cast out devils. Mark xvi. 17.*

Q. What force has *the sign of the cross* used on this and other occasions ?

A. What the name of Jesus Christ crucified is when pronounced with faith by motion of the lips, the very same is also the sign of the cross when made with faith by motion of the hand, or represented in any other way²⁴.

Cyril of Jerusalem writes ; *Let us not be ashamed to confess the Crucified ; let us boldly make the sign of the Cross on the forehead, and on every thing ; on the bread which we eat ; on the cups from which we drink ; let us make it at our going out, and coming in ; when we lie down to sleep, and when we rise, when we journey, and when we rest : It is a great safeguard, given to the poor without price, to the weak without labour. For this is the grace of God ; a token for the faithful, and a terror for evil spirits. Cat. Lect. xiii. 36.*

Q. Whence have we the use of the sign of the Cross ?

A. From the very times of the Apostles. See Dion. Arcop. on the Eeel. Hier. e. ii., and v. also Tertull. de Coron. cap. iii., de Resurr. cap. viii.

Q. What means the *white garment* which is put on after Baptism?

A. The purity of the soul, and of the Christian life.

Q. Why do they hang upon the baptized a *Cross*?

A. As a visible expression and continual remembrance of Christ's command; *If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow Me.* Mat. xvi. 24.

Q. What means the *procession* of the baptized round the font with a *light*?

A. Spiritual joy, joined with spiritual illumination.

Q. How is this to be understood, that in the Creed we are made to confess *one* Baptism?

A. In this sense, that Baptism cannot be repeated.

Q. Why cannot Baptism be repeated?

A. Baptism is spiritual birth: a man is born but once; therefore he is also baptized but once.

Q. What is to be thought of those, who sin after Baptism?

A. That they are more guilty in their sins than the unbaptized, since they had from God special help to do well, and have thrown it away.

For if after they have escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, they are again entangled therein and overcome, the latter end is worse with them than the beginning. 2 Pet. ii. 20.

Q. But is there not any way even for such as have sinned after Baptism to obtain pardon?

A. There is. Penitence.

ON UNCTION WITH CHRISM.

Q. What is *Unction with Chrism*?

A. Unction with chrism is a Sacrament, in which the baptized believer, being anointed with holy chrism on certain parts of the body, in the name of the Holy Ghost, receives

FIRST
PART.

the gifts of the Holy Ghost for growth and strength in spiritual life²⁵.

Q. Is this Sacrament mentioned in holy Scripture?

A. The inward grace of this Sacrament is spoken of by the Apostle John, as follows: *But ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things. And the anointing which ye have received of Him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you; but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie; and even as it hath taught you, abide therein.* 1 John ii. 20, 27.

In like manner the Apostle Paul also says; *Now He which stablisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God: Who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts.* 2 Cor. i. 21, 22.

Hence are taken the words pronounced at the Unction, *The seal of the gift of the Holy Ghost.*

Q. Is the outward form of Unction with Chrism mentioned in holy Scripture?

A. It may well be supposed that the words of St. John refer to a visible as well as to an inward unction; but it is more certain, that the Apostles, for imparting to the baptized the gifts of the Holy Ghost, used *imposition of hands*. Acts viii. 14, 16. The successors of the Apostles, however, in place of this, introduced unction with chrism, drawing, it may be, their precedent from the unction used in the Old Testament. Exod. xxx. 25; 3 Kings i. 39; Dion. Areop. de Eccl. Hier. cap. iv.

Q. What is to be remarked of the *holy Chrism*?

A. This, that its consecration is reserved to the heads of the Hierarchy, as successors of the Apostles, who used the laying on of their own hands to communicate the gifts of the Holy Ghost.

Q. What is specially signified by *anointing the forehead*?

A. The sanctification of the mind, or thoughts.

Q. What by anointing the *chest*?

A. The sanctification of the heart, or desires.

Q. What by anointing the *eyes, ears, and lips*?

A. The sanctification of the senses.

Q. What by anointing the *hands* and *feet*?

A. The sanctification of the works, and whole walk of the Christian. ON
FAITH.

ON THE COMMUNION.

Q. What is the *Communion*?

A. The Communion is a Sacrament, in which the believer, under the forms of bread and wine, partakes of the very Body and Blood of Christ, to everlasting life²⁶.

Q. How was this Sacrament instituted?

A. Jesus Christ immediately before His passion consecrated it for the first time, exhibiting in it by anticipation a lively image of His sufferings for our salvation; and after having administered it to the Apostles, He gave them at the same time a commandment ever after to perpetuate this Sacrament.

Q. What is to be noticed of the Sacrament of the Communion in regard to Divine Service in the Church?

A. This, that it forms the chief and most essential part of Divine Service.

Q. What is the name of that Service, in which the Sacrament of the Communion is consecrated?

A. The Liturgy.

Q. What means the word *Liturgy*?

A. *Common service*: but the name Liturgy is specially appropriated to that Divine Service, in which the Sacrament of the Communion is consecrated.

Q. What is to be noted of the *place*, where the Liturgy is celebrated?

A. It must always be consecrated in a *temple*, the *table* in which, or at least, if there be no such table, the *antimense* on which the Sacrament is consecrated, must have been consecrated by a Bishop.

Q. Why is the *temple* called a *church*?

A. Because the faithful, who compose the Church, meet in it for prayer and Sacraments.

Q. Why is the table, on which the Sacrament of the Communion is consecrated, called *the throne*?

FIRST
PART.

A. Because on it Jesus Christ, as King, is mystically present.

Q. What general *order of parts* may be remarked in the Liturgy?

A. This, that first the elements are prepared for the Sacrament; secondly, the faithful are prepared for the Sacrament; lastly, the Sacrament itself is consecrated.

Q. What is the name for that part of the Liturgy, in which the elements are prepared for the Sacrament?

A. *Proskomidè*, προσκομιδὴ.

Q. What is the meaning of the word *Proskomidè*?

A. *Offertory*.

Q. Why is this name given to the first part of the Liturgy?

A. From the custom of the primitive Christians to offer in the Church bread and wine for the celebration of the Sacrament. On the same account this bread is called *prosphora*, which means *oblation*.

Q. In what consists the Offertory, as a part of the Liturgy?

A. In this, that with mention made of the prophecies and types, and partly also of the events themselves, relating to the birth and suffering of Jesus Christ, a portion is taken from the *prosphora* for use in the Sacrament, and likewise a portion of wine mixed with water is poured off into the holy chalice, while the celebrator makes commemoration of the whole Church, honours the glorified Saints, prays for the living and the departed, especially for the ruling powers, and for those who, of their own faith and zeal, have brought *prosphoræ*, or oblations.

Q. Of what kind should be the *bread* for the Sacrament?

A. Such as the name itself of bread, the holiness of the Mystery, and the example of Jesus Christ and the Apostles all require; that is, leavened, pure, wheaten bread.

Q. What is signified by this, that the *bread* or loaf which is strictly to be used for the Communion is only *one*?

A. It signifies, as the Apostle explains, that *we, being many, are one bread, and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread.* 1 Cor. x. 17.

Q. Why is the bread, when prepared for the Communion, called *the Lamb*?

A. Because it is the figure of Jesus Christ suffering, as was in the Old Testament *the Paschal Lamb*.

Q. What was the Paschal Lamb?

A. The Lamb which the Israelites, by God's command, killed and ate in memory of their deliverance from destruction in Egypt.

Q. Why is the *wine* for the Sacrament of the Communion mixed *with water*?

A. Because the whole of this celebration is ordered so as to figure forth the sufferings of Christ; and when He suffered, there flowed from His pierced side *blood and water*.

Q. What name has that part of the Liturgy, in which the faithful are prepared for the Sacrament?

A. The ancients called it the *Liturgy of the catechumens*; because, besides baptized communicants, the catechumens also, who are preparing for Baptism, and the penitents, who are not admitted to communion, may be present at it.

Q. With what does this part of the Liturgy begin?

A. With the Blessing, or glorification of the Kingdom of the Most Holy Trinity.

Q. In what consists this part of the Liturgy?

A. In prayers, singing, and reading from the books of the Apostles, and from the Gospel.

Q. With what does it end?

A. With the order given to the catechumens to go out and leave the Church.

Q. What is the name for that part of the Liturgy, in which the Sacrament itself is celebrated and consecrated?

A. The *Liturgy of the faithful*; because the faithful only, that is, the baptized, have the right to be present at this Service.

Q. What is the most essential act in this part of the Liturgy?

A. The utterance of the words which Jesus Christ spoke in instituting the Sacrament; *Take, eat, this is My Body*;

FIRST
PART.

Drink ye all of it, for this is My Blood, of the New Testament ; Mat. xxvi. 26, 27, 28 ; And after this the invocation of the Holy Ghost, and the blessing the gifts, that is, the bread and wine, which have been offered²⁷.

Q. Why is this so essential ?

A. Because at the moment of this act, the bread and wine are changed, or transubstantiated²⁸, into the very Body of Christ, and into the very Blood of Christ.

Q. How are we to understand the word *transubstantiation* ?

A. In the exposition of the faith by the Eastern Patriarchs, it is said that the word transubstantiation is not to be taken to define the manner in which the bread and wine are changed into the Body and Blood of the Lord ; for this none can understand but God ; but only thus much is signified, that the bread truly, really, and substantially becomes the very true Body of the Lord, and the wine the very Blood of the Lord. In like manner John Damascene, treating of the Holy and Immaculate Mysteries of the Lord, writes thus : *It is truly that Body united with Godhead, which had its origin from the Holy Virgin ; not as though that Body which ascended came down from heaven, but because the bread and wine themselves are changed into the Body and Blood of God. But if thou seekest after the manner how this is, let it suffice thee to be told, that it is by the Holy Ghost ; in like manner as, by the same Holy Ghost, the Lord formed flesh to Himself, and in Himself, from the Mother of God ; nor know I aught more than this, that the word of God is true, powerful, and almighty, but its manner of operation unsearchable.* l. 4. cap. xiii. 7.

Q. What is required individually of every one, who desires to approach the Sacrament of the Communion ?

A. To examine his conscience before God, and to cleanse it from sin by penitence ; for doing which he has helps in fasting and prayer.

Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup ; for he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's Body. 1 Cor. xi. 28, 29.

Q. What benefit does he receive, who communicates in the Body and Blood of Christ?

A. He is in the closest manner united to Jesus Christ Himself, and, in Him, is made partaker of everlasting life.

He that eateth My Flesh, and drinketh My Blood, dwelleth in Me, and I in him. John vi. 56. Whoso eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood, hath eternal life. v. 54.

Q. Ought we to communicate often in the holy Mysteries?

A. The primitive Christians communicated every Lord's Day; but now few have such purity of life as to be always prepared to approach so great a Mystery. Our Mother the Church calls on all, who would live religiously, to confess before their ghostly Father, and communicate in the Body and Blood of Christ, four times yearly, or even every month, but requires all without exception to receive it at the least once in the year²⁹. See *Orthod. Confess. P. i. Q. 90.*

Q. What part can they have in the Divine Liturgy, who only hear it, without approaching the holy Communion?

A. They may and should take part in the Liturgy by prayer, and faith, and especially by a continual remembrance of our Lord Jesus Christ, who expressly has commanded us to *do this in remembrance of Him. Luke xxii. 19.*

Q. What should we remember at that time in the Liturgy, when they make the Proceession with the Gospel?

A. Jesus Christ appearing to preach the Gospel. So also while the Gospel is reading, we should have the same attention and reverence, as if we saw and heard Jesus Christ Himself.

Q. What should we remember at that time in the Liturgy, when they make the Proceession with the Gifts from the table of preparation to the altar?

A. Jesus Christ going to suffer voluntarily, as a victim to the slaughter, while more than twelve legions of Angels were ready around to guard Him as their King.

The King of kings, and Lord of lords, cometh to be slaughtered. Hymn for the Liturgy on the Great Sabbath.

Q. What should we remember at the moment of the con-

FIRST
PART.

seeration of the Sacrament, and while the clergy are communicating within the altar?

A. The mystical supper of Jesus Christ Himself with His Apostles, His suffering, death, and burial.

Q. What is set forth after this, by the drawing back of the veil, the opening of the royal doors, and the appearance of the holy Gifts?

A. The appearance of Jesus Christ Himself after His resurrection.

Q. What is figured by the last shewing of the holy Gifts to the people, after which they are hid from view?

A. The ascension of Jesus Christ into heaven.

Q. Will the use of the Sacrament of the holy Communion continue ever in the true Church of Christ?

A. Assuredly it will ever continue, even to Christ's coming again, agreeably to the words of the Apostle Paul; *For as oft as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew forth the Lord's death, till He come.* 1 Cor. xi. 26.

ON PENITENCE.

Q. What is *Penitence*?

A. Penitence is a Sacrament, in which he who confesses his sins is, on the outward declaration of pardon by the Priest, inwardly loosed from his sins by Jesus Christ Himself³⁰.

Q. What is the origin of this Sacrament?

A. They who came to John the Baptist, who *preached the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins, confessed their sins.* Mark i. 4, 5. The Apostles were promised by Jesus Christ power to forgive sins, when He said; *Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven;* Mat. xviii. 18. And after His resurrection He actually gave them this power, saying; *Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained.* John xx. 22, 23.

Q. What is required of the Penitent?

A. Contrition for his sins, with a full purpose of amend-

ment of life, faith in Jesus Christ, and hope in His mercy.

ON
FAITH.

For godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation not to be repented of. 2 Cor. vii. 10. *But if the wicked turn from his wickedness, and do that which is lawful and right, he shall live thereby.* Ezek. xxxiii. 19. *To Him, that is to Jesus Christ, give all the Prophets witness, that through His name whosoever believeth in Him shall receive remission of sins.* Acts x. 43.

Q. Are there not besides certain preparations and aids to Penitence?

A. Such are fasting and prayer.

Q. Is there not besides these a certain special mean used by holy Church for cleansing and giving peace to the conscience of the Penitent?

A. Such a mean is the *epitimia*, or penance.

Q. What is the *epitimia*?

A. The word means *punishment*. See 2 Cor. ii. 6. Under this name, are prescribed to the penitent, according as may be requisite, divers particular exercises of piety, and divers abstinences or privations, serving to efface the unrighteousness of sin, and to subduc sinful habit; as, for instance, fasting beyond what is prescribed for all, or for grievous sins suspension from the holy Communion for a given time.

ON ORDERS.

Q. What are *Orders*?

A. Orders are a Sacrament, in which the Holy Ghost, by the laying on of the bishop's hands, ordains them that be rightly chosen to minister sacraments, and to feed the flock of Christ³¹.

Let a man so account of us, as of the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the Mysteries of God. 1 Cor. iv. 1.

Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which He hath purchased with His own Blood. Acts xx. 28.

Q. What is it to feed the Church?

FIRST
PART.

A. To instruct the people in faith, piety, and good works.

Q. How many necessary *degrees* are there of Orders?

A. Three; those of *Bishop, Priest, and Deacon.*

Q. What difference is there between them?

A. The Deacon serves at the Sacraments: the Priest hallows Sacraments in dependance on the Bishop: the Bishop not only hallows the Sacraments himself, but has power also to impart to others, by the laying on of his hands, the gift and grace to hallow them.

Of the Episcopal power the Apostle Paul thus writes to Titus : *For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city; Tit. i. 5.* And to Timothy; *Lay hands suddenly on no man.* 1 Tim. v. 22.

ON MATRIMONY.

Q. What is Matrimony?

A. Matrimony is a Sacrament, in which, on the free promise of the man and woman before the Priest and the Church to be true to each other, their conjugal union is blessed to be an image of Christ's union with the Church, and grace is asked for them to live together in godly love and honesty, to the procreation and christian bringing up of children³².

Q. Whence does it appear that Matrimony is a Sacrament?

A. From the following words of the Apostle Paul: *A man shall leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh. This Sacrament is great: but I speak concerning Christ and the Church.* Eph. v. 31, 32.

Q. Is it the duty of all to marry?

A. No. Virginity is better than wedlock, if any have the gift to keep it undefiled.

Of this Jesus Christ has said expressly; *All men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it.* Mat. xix. 11, 12.

And the Apostle says; *I say therefore to the unmarried and widows, It is good for them if they abide even as I; but if*

they cannot contain, let them marry...He that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please the Lord; but he that is married careth for the things that are of the world, how he may please his wife...He that giveth his virgin in marriage doeth well; but he that giveth her not in marriage doeth better³³. 1 Cor. vii. 8, 9. 32, 33. 38.

ON
FAITH.

ON UNCTION WITH OIL.

Q. What is Unction with Oil?

A. Unction with Oil is a Sacrament, in which, while the body is anointed with oil, God's grace is invoked on the sick, to heal him of spiritual and bodily infirmities³⁴.

Q. Whence is the origin of this Sacrament?

A. From the Apostles, who having received power from Jesus Christ, *anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them.* Mark vi. 13.

The Apostles left this Sacrament to the Priests of the Church, as is evident from the following words of the Apostle James: *Is any sick among you? let him call for the Elders of the Church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him.* James v. 14, 15.

ON THE ELEVENTH ARTICLE.

Q. What is the *resurrection of the dead*, which, in the words of the Creed, we *look for* or expect?

A. An act of the almighty power of God, by which all bodies of dead men, being reunited to their souls, shall return to life, and shall thenceforth be spiritual and immortal.

It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body. 1 Cor. xv. 44. *For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality.* Ib. 53.

Q. How shall the body rise again after it has rotted and perished in the ground?

A. Since God formed the body from the ground originally, He can equally restore it after it has perished in the ground. The Apostle Paul illustrates this by the analogy of a grain of

FIRST
PART.

seed, which rots in the earth, but from which there springs up afterwards a plant, or tree. *That which thou sowest is not quickened except it die.* 1 Cor. xv. 36.

Q. Shall all strictly speaking rise again?

A. All, without exception, that have died; but they, who at the time of the general resurrection shall be still alive, shall have their present gross bodies changed in a moment, so as to become spiritual and immortal.

We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. 1 Cor. xv. 51, 52.

Q. When shall the resurrection of the dead be?

A. At the end of this visible world.

Q. Shall the world then too come to an end?

A. Yes; this corruptible world shall come to an end, and shall be transformed into another incorruptible.

Because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. Rom. viii. 21. *Nevertheless we, according to His promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.* 2 Pet. iii. 13.

Q. How shall the world be transformed?

A. By fire. *The heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same, that is, by God's word, are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men.* 2 Pet. iii. 7.

Q. In what state are the souls of the dead till the general resurrection?

A. The souls of the righteous are in light and rest, with a foretaste of eternal happiness³⁵; but the souls of the wicked are in a state the reverse of this.

Q. Why may we not ascribe to the souls of the righteous perfect happiness immediately after death?

A. Because it is ordained that the perfect retribution according to works shall be received by the perfect man, after the resurrection of the body and God's last judgment.

The Apostle Paul says ; *Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day : and not to me only, but unto all them also that love His appearing.* 2 Tim. iv. 8. And again ; *We must all appear before the Judgment-seat of Christ ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.* 2 Cor. v. 10.

ON
FAITH.

Q. Why do we ascribe to the souls of the righteous a foretaste of bliss before the last judgment ?

A. On the testimony of Jesus Christ Himself, who says in the parable that the righteous Lazarus was immediately after death carried into Abraham's bosom. Luke xvi. 22.

Q. Is this foretaste of bliss joined with a sight of Christ's own countenance ?

A. It is so more especially with the Saints³⁶, as we are given to understand by the Apostle Paul, who *had a desire to depart, and to be with Christ.* Philipp. i. 23.

Q. What is to be remarked of such souls as have departed with faith, but without having had time to bring forth fruits worthy of repentance ?

A. This ; that they may be aided towards the attainment of a blessed resurrection by prayers offered in their behalf, especially such as are offered in union with the oblation of the Bloodless Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, and by works of mercy done in faith for their memory³⁷.

Q. On what is this doctrine grounded ?

A. On the constant tradition of the Catholic Church ; the sources of which may be seen even in the Church of the Old Testament. Judas Maccabæus offered sacrifice for his men that had fallen. 2 Macc. xii. 43. Prayer for the departed has ever formed a fixed part of the Divine Liturgy, from the first Liturgy of the Apostle James. St. Cyril of Jerusalem says ; *Very great will be the benefit to those souls, for which prayer is offered at the moment, when the holy and tremendous Sacrifice is lying in view.* Lect. Myst. v. 9.

St. Basil the Great in his prayers for Pentecost says, that the Lord vouchsafes to receive from us propitiatory prayers

FIRST
PART.

and sacrifices *for those that are kept in Hades*, and allows us the hope of obtaining for them *peace, relief, and freedom*.

ON THE TWELFTH ARTICLE.

Q. What is *the life of the world to come*?

A. The life that shall be after the resurrection of the dead and the general judgment of Christ.

Q. What kind of life shall this be?

A. For those who believe, who love God, and do what is good, it shall be so happy, that we cannot now even conceive such happiness. *It doth not yet appear what we shall be.* 1 John iii. 2. *I knew a man in Christ*, says the Apostle Paul, *who was caught up unto Paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter.* 2 Cor. xii. 2, 4.

Q. Whence shall proceed this so great happiness?

A. From the contemplation of God in light and glory, and from union with Him. *For now we see through a glass darkly, but then face to face: now I know in part, but then shall I know, even as also I am known.* 1 Cor. xiii. 12.

Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun, in the kingdom of their Father. Mat. xiii. 43. *God shall be all in all.* 1 Cor. xv. 28.

Q. Shall the body also share in the happiness of the soul?

A. Yes; it too will be glorified with the light of God, as Christ's body was at His transfiguration on Mount Tabor.

It is sown in dishonour, it is raised in glory. 1 Cor. xv. 43. *As we have borne the image of the earthly, that is, of Adam, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly.* Ib. 49.

Q. Will all be equally happy?

A. No. There will be different degrees of happiness, in proportion as every one shall have profited here in faith, love, and good works. *There is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars: for one star differeth from another star in glory.* So also is the resurrection of the dead. 1 Cor. xv. 41, 42.

Q. But what will be the lot of unbelievers and transgressors?

A. They will be given over to everlasting death, that is, to everlasting fire, to everlasting torment, with the devils.

Whosoever was not found written in the book of life, was cast into the lake of fire. Rev. xx. 15: And, That is the second death. Rev. xx. 14. Depart from Me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels. Mat. xxv. 41. And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal. Ib. 46. It is better for thee to enter into the kingdom of God with one eye, than having two eyes to be cast into hell fire; where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. Mark ix. 47, 48.

Q. Why will such severity be used with sinners?

A. Not because God willed them to perish, but they of their own will *perish, because they receive not the love of the truth, that they might be saved*³⁸. 2 Thess. ii. 10.

Q. Of what benefit will it be to us to meditate on death, on the resurrection, on the last judgment, on everlasting happiness, and on everlasting torment?

A. These meditations will assist us to abstain from sin, and to wean our affections from earthly things; they will console us for the absence or loss of worldly goods, incite us to keep our souls and bodies pure, to live to God and to eternity, and so to attain everlasting salvation.

THE SECOND PART

OF THE

ORTHODOX CATECHISM.

ON HOPE.

DEFINITION OF CHRISTIAN HOPE, ITS GROUND,
AND THE MEANS THERETO.

SECOND
PART.

Q. WHAT is *Christian hope*?

A. The resting of the heart on God, with the full trust that He ever cares for our salvation, and will give us the happiness He has promised.

Q. What is the ground of Christian hope?

A. The *Lord Jesus Christ* is our hope, or the ground of our hope. 1 Tim. i. 1. *Hope to the end for the grace that is to be brought unto you by the revelation of Jesus Christ.* 1 Pet. i. 13.

Q. What are the means for attaining to a saving hope?

A. The means to this are; first, prayer; secondly, the true doctrine of blessedness, and its practical application.

ON PRAYER.

Q. Is there any testimony of God's word to this, that prayer is a mean for attaining to a saving hope?

A. Jesus Christ Himself joins the hope of receiving our desire with prayer: *Whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in My name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son.* John xiv. 13.

Q. What is *prayer*?

A. The lifting up of man's mind and heart to God, manifested by devout words.

Q. What should the Christian do, when he lifts up his mind and heart to God?

A. First, he should *glorify* Him for His divine perfections; secondly, *give thanks* to Him for His mercies; thirdly, *ask* Him for what he needs. So there are three chief forms of prayer; *Praise*, *Thanksgiving*, and *Petition*.

Q. Can a man pray without words?

A. He can; in mind and heart. An example of this may be seen in Moses before the passage through the Red Sea. Exod. xiv. 15.

Q. Has not such prayer a name of its own?

A. It is called *spiritual*, or prayer of the *heart* and *mind*, in one word, *inward* prayer; while, on the other hand, prayer expressed in words, and accompanied by other marks of devotion, is called *oral* or *outward* prayer.

Q. Can there be outward prayer without inward?

A. There can; if any man utter words of prayer without attention or earnestness.

Q. Does *outward* prayer alone suffice to obtain grace?

A. So far is it from sufficing to obtain grace, that contrariwise it provokes God to anger.

God has Himself declared His displeasure at such prayer: *This people draweth nigh unto Me with their mouth, and honoureth Me with their lips, but their heart is far from Me: but in vain do they worship Me.* Mat. xv. 8, 9.

Q. Does not inward prayer alone suffice without outward?

A. This question is as if one should ask, whether soul alone might not suffice for man without body? It is idle to ask this, seeing that God has been pleased to make man consist of soul and body: likewise idle it is to ask, whether inward prayer alone may not suffice without outward. Since we have both soul and body, we ought to *glorify God in our bodies, and in our souls, which are God's*: this being besides natural, *that out of the abundance of the heart the mouth*

FIRST
PART.

should *speak*. Our Lord Jesus Christ was spiritual in the highest degree, but even He expressed His spiritual prayer both by words, and by devout gestures of body; sometimes, for instance, lifting up His eyes to heaven, sometimes kneeling, or falling on His face to the ground. 1 Cor. vi. 20; Mat. xii. 34; John xvii. 1; Luke xxii. 41; Mat. xxvi. 39.

ON THE LORD'S PRAYER.

Q. Is there not a prayer which may be termed the common Christian prayer, and pattern of all prayers?

A. Such is the Lord's Prayer.

Q. What is the *Lord's Prayer*?

A. A prayer which our Lord Jesus Christ taught the Apostles, and which they delivered to all believers.

Q. Repeat it.

A. *Our Father, which art in heaven;*

1. *Hallowed be Thy Name;*

2. *Thy kingdom come;*

3. *Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth;*

4. *Give us this day our bread for subsistence;*

5. *And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors;*

6. *And lead us not into temptation;*

7. *But deliver us from evil.*

For Thine is the kingdom, the power, and the glory, for ever and ever. Amen. Mat. vi. 9.. 13.

Q. In order the better to consider the Lord's Prayer, how may we divide it?

A. Into the *invocation*, seven *petitions*, and the *doxology*.

ON THE INVOCATION.

Q. How dare we call God *Father*?

A. By faith in Jesus Christ, and by the grace of regeneration.

As many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name; which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. John i. 12, 13.

Q. Must we say, *Our Father*, even when we pray alone?

A. Certainly we must.

Q. Why so?

A. Because Christian charity requires us to call upon God, and ask good things of Him, for all our brethren, no less than for ourselves.

Q. Why in the invocation do we say, *Who art in heaven?*

A. That, entering upon prayer, we may leave every thing earthly and corruptible, and raise our minds and hearts to what is heavenly, everlasting, and Divine.

ON THE FIRST PETITION.

Q. Is not God's Name holy?

A. Doubtless it is holy in itself. *Holy is His Name.* Luke i. 49.

Q. How then can it yet be hallowed?

A. It may be hallowed in men; that is, His eternal holiness may be manifested in them.

Q. How?

A. First, when we, having in our thoughts and heart the Name of God, so live as His holiness requires, and thus glorify God; secondly, when others also, seeing our good lives, glorify God.

Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in Heaven. Mat. v. 16.

ON THE SECOND PETITION.

Q. What is the *kingdom* of God, spoken of in the second petition of the Lord's Prayer?

A. The kingdom of *grace*, which, as St. Paul says, is *righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.* Rom. xiv. 17.

Q. Is not this kingdom come already?

A. To some it has not yet come in its full sense; while to others it has not yet come at all, inasmuch as *sin still reigns in their mortal bodies, that they should obey it in the lusts thereof.* Rom. vi. 12.

Q. How does it come?

SECOND
PART.

A. Secretly, and inwardly. *The kingdom of God cometh not with observation; for behold, the kingdom of God is within you.* Luke xvii. 20, 21.

Q. May not the Christian ask for something further under the name of God's kingdom.

A. He may ask for the kingdom of *glory*, that is, for the perfect bliss of the faithful.

Having a desire to depart, and be with Christ. Philipp. i. 23.

ON THE THIRD PETITION.

Q. What means the petition, *Thy will be done?*

A. Hereby we ask of God, that all we do, and all that befalls us, may be ordered not as we will, but as pleases Him.

Q. Why need we ask this?

A. Because we often err in our wishes; but God unerringly, and incomparably more than we ourselves, wishes for us all that is good, and is ever ready to bestow it, unless He be prevented by our wilfulness and obstinaey.

Unto Him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us, unto Him be glory in the Church. Ephes. iii. 20, 21.

Q. Why do we ask that God's will be done in earth *as in heaven?*

A. Because in heaven the holy Angels and Saints in bliss, all without exception, always, and in all things, do God's will.

ON THE FOURTH PETITION.

Q. What is *bread for subsistence?*

A. The bread which we need in order to subsist or live.

Q. With what thoughts should we ask of God this bread?

A. Agreeably with the instruction of our Lord Jesus Christ, we should ask no more than *bread for subsistence*; that is, necessary food, and such clothing and shelter as is likewise necessary for life; but whatever is beyond this, and serves not so much for necessity as for gratification, we should leave to the will of God; and if it be given, return thanks to Him; if it be not given, we should be content without it.

Q. Why are we directed to ask for bread for subsistence only for *this day*?

A. That we may not be too anxious about the future, but trust for that to God. *Take therefore no thought for the morrow, for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself: sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof.* Mat. vi. 34. *For your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things.* Ib. 32.

Q. May we not ask for something further under the name of bread for subsistence?

A. Since man is made of both a bodily and a spiritual substance, and the substance of the soul far excels that of the body, we may and should seek for the soul also that bread of subsistence, without which the inward man must perish of hunger. See Cyril. Hier. Lect. Myst. iv. 15. Orthod. Confess. P. ii. Q. 19.

Q. What is the bread of subsistence for the soul?

A. The word of God, and the Body and Blood of Christ.

Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God. Mat. iv. 4. *My Flesh is meat indeed, and my Blood is drink indeed.* John vi. 55.

ON THE FIFTH PETITION.

Q. What is meant in the Lord's Prayer by *our debts*?

A. Our sins.

Q. Why are our sins called debts?

A. Because we, having received all from God, ought to render all back to Him, that is, subject all to His will and law; which if we do not, we are left debtors to His justice.

Q. But who are *our debtors*?

A. People who have not rendered us that which they owed us by the law of God; as, for instance, have not shewn us love, but malice.

Q. If God is just, how can we be forgiven our debts?

A. Through the mediation of Jesus Christ. *For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and man, the man Jesus Christ, who gave Himself a ransom for all.* 1 Tim. ii. 5, 6.

SECOND
PART.

Q. What will be the consequence, if we ask God to forgive us our sins without ourselves forgiving others?

A. In that case neither shall we be forgiven.

For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you; but if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive you your trespasses. Mat. vi. 14, 15.

Q. Why will not God forgive us, if we do not forgive others?

A. Because we hereby shew ourselves evil, and so alienate from us God's goodness and mercy.

Q. What disposition then must we have, to use aright those words of the Lord's Prayer, *we forgive our debtors*?

A. These words absolutely require that when we pray we should bear no malice nor hatred, but be in peace and charity with all men. *Therefore if thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift. Mat. v. 23, 24.*

Q. But what am I to do, if I cannot readily find him who hath aught against me, or if he shew himself unwilling to be reconciled?

A. In such a case it is enough to be reconciled with him in heart, before the eyes of the all-seeing God. *If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men. Rom. xii. 18.*

ON THE SIXTH PETITION.

Q. What is meant in the Lord's Prayer by *temptation*?

A. Any conjuncture of circumstances in which there is imminent danger of losing the faith, or falling into great sin.

Q. Whence come such temptations?

A. From *our flesh*, from the *world*, or other people, and from the *devil*.

Q. What do we ask in these words of the prayer, *Lead us not into temptation*?

A. First, that God suffer us not to be led into temptation; secondly, that if it be needful for us to be tried and purified

through temptation, He give us not up wholly to temptation, nor suffer us to fall.

ON
HOPE.

ON THE SEVENTH PETITION.

Q. What do we ask in these words of the prayer, *deliver us from evil*?

A. We ask for deliverance from all evil that can reach us in the *world*, which since the fall *lieth in wickedness*; 1 John v. 19; but especially from the evil of sin, and from the evil suggestions and snares of the spirit of evil, which is the devil.

ON THE DOXOLOGY.

Q. Why after the Lord's Prayer do we subjoin the *Doxology*?

A. First, that when we ask mercies for ourselves from our heavenly Father, we may at the same time render Him that honour which is His due; secondly, that by the thought of His everlasting *kingdom, power, and glory*, we may be more and more established in the hope, that He will give us what we ask, because this is in His power, and makes to His glory.

Q. What means the word *Amen*?

A. It means *verily, or so be it*.

Q. Why is this word added to the Doxology?

Q. To signify that we offer the prayer in faith, and without doubting, as we are taught to do by the Apostle James. i. 6.

ON THE DOCTRINE OF BLESSEDNESS.

Q. What must we join with prayer, in order to be grounded in the hope of salvation and blessedness?

A. Our own exertions for the attainment of blessedness.

Of this point the Lord Himself says; *Why call ye Me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?* Luke vi. 46. *Not every one that saith unto Me Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of My Father, which is in heaven.* Mat. vii. 21.

Q. What doctrine may we take as our guide in these exertions?

A. The doctrine of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is briefly set forth in His *Beatitudes*, or sentences on blessedness.

SECOND
PART.

Q. How many such sentenees are there?

A. The nine following :

1. *Blessed are the poor in spirit : for theirs is the kingdom of Heaven.*

2. *Blessed are they that mourn : for they shall be comforted.*

3. *Blessed are the meek : for they shall inherit the earth.*

4. *Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness : for they shall be filled.*

5. *Blessed are the merciful : for they shall obtain mercy.*

6. *Blessed are the pure in heart : for they shall see God.*

7. *Blessed are the peacemakers : for they shall be called the children of God.*

8. *Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake : for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.*

9. *Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for My sake. Rejoice, and be exceeding glad : for great is your reward in heaven. Mat. v. 3..12.*

Q. What is to be observed of all these sentenees, in order to their right understanding?

A. This ; that the Lord proposed in these sentenees a *doctrine* for the attainment of blessedness, as is expressly said in the Gospel ; *He opened His mouth, and taught :* but, being meek and lowly of heart, He proposed His doctrine not in the form of commandment, but of blessing to those, who should of their own free will receive and fulfil it. Consequently in each sentence or Beatitude we must consider, first, the doctrine or precept, secondly, the blessing or promise of reward.

ON THE FIRST BEATITUDE.

Q. What is the Lord's first precept of blessedness?

A. They who would be blessed must be *poor in spirit.*

Q. What is it to be *poor in spirit*?

A. It is to have a spiritual conviction that we have nothing of our own, nothing but what God bestows upon us, and that we can do nothing good without God's help and

grace, thus counting ourselves as nothing, and in all throwing ourselves upon the mercy of God : in brief, as St. Chrysostom explains it, *spiritual poverty is humility*. Hom. in Mat. xv.

Q. Can the rich too be poor in spirit?

A. Doubtless they can; if they consider that visible riches are corruptible and soon pass away, and can never compensate for the want of spiritual goods. *What is a man profited, if he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?* Mat. xvi. 26.

Q. May not bodily poverty serve to the perfection of spiritual?

A. It may, if the Christian chooses it voluntarily, for God's sake³⁹. Of this, Jesus Christ Himself said to the rich man; *If thou wilt be perfect, go, sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come follow Me*. Mat. xix. 21.

Q. What does our Lord promise to the poor in spirit?

A. The kingdom of heaven.

Q. How is the kingdom of heaven theirs?

A. In the present life inwardly, and inchoately, by faith and hope; but in the life to come perfectly, by their being made partakers of everlasting blessedness.

ON THE SECOND BEATITUDE.

Q. What is the Lord's second precept for blessedness?

A. They who would be blessed must *mourn*.

Q. What is meant in this precept by the word *mourn*?

A. Sorrow and contrition of heart, with unfeigned tears, for that we so imperfectly and unworthily serve the Lord, or even rather deserve His anger by our sins. *For godly sorrow worketh repentance unto salvation not to be repented of; but the sorrow of this world worketh death*. 2 Cor. vii. 10.

Q. What special promise does the Lord make to mourners?

A. That they *shall be comforted*.

Q. What comfort is here to be understood?

A. That of grace, consisting in the pardon of sin, and in peace of conscience.

SECOND
PART.

Q. Why is this promise joined with a precept for mourning?

A. In order that sorrow for sin may not reach to despair.

ON THE THIRD BEATITUDE.

Q. What is the Lord's third precept for blessedness?

A. They who would be blessed must be *meek*.

Q. What is *meekness*?

A. A quiet disposition of spirit, joined with care neither to offend any man, nor be offended at any thing one's self.

Q. What are the special effects of Christian meekness?

A. These; that we never murmur against God, nor even against men, when any thing falls out against our wishes, nor give way to anger, nor set ourselves up.

Q. What is promised by the Lord to the meek?

A. That they *shall inherit the earth*.

Q. How are we to understand this promise?

A. As regards Christ's followers generally it is a prediction which has been literally fulfilled: for the ever-meek Christians, instead of being destroyed by the fury of the heathen, have inherited the universe, which the heathen formerly possessed. But the further sense of this promise, as regards Christians both generally and individually, is this, that they shall receive an inheritance, as the Psalmist says, *in the land of the living*; that is, where men live and never die; in other words, that they shall receive everlasting blessedness. See Psalm xxvii. 15.

ON THE FOURTH BEATITUDE.

Q. What is the Lord's fourth precept for blessedness?

A. They who would be blessed must *hunger and thirst after righteousness*.

Q. What is meant here by the word *righteousness*?

A. Though this word may well stand for every virtue, which the Christian ought to desire even as his meat and drink, yet should we here specially understand that righteousness, of which in the book of Daniel it is said, *An everlasting righteousness shall be brought in*; that is, the justifica-

tion of guilty man through grace and faith in Jesus Christ.
Dan. ix. 24.

ON
HOPE.

The Apostle Paul speaks thus: *The righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all, and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference: for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His blood, to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past.* Rom. iii. 22 . . 25.

Q. Who are they that *hunger and thirst after righteousness*?

A. They who, while they love to do good, yet count not themselves righteous, nor rest on their own good works, but acknowledge themselves sinners and guilty before God; and who, by the wish and prayer of faith, hunger and thirst after the justification of grace through Jesus Christ, as after spiritual meat and drink⁴⁰.

Q. What does the Lord promise to them who hunger and thirst after righteousness?

A. That they *shall be filled*.

Q. What is meant here by *being filled*?

A. As the filling or satisfying of the body produces, first, the cessation of the sense of hunger and thirst, secondly, the strengthening the body by food, so the filling of the soul means, first, the inward peace of the pardoned sinner, secondly, the acquisition of strength to do good, given by justifying grace. The perfect filling, however, of the soul created for the enjoyment of endless good, is to follow in the life eternal, according to the words of the Psalmist; *When I awake up after Thy likeness, I shall be satisfied with it.* xvii. 15.

ON THE FIFTH BEATITUDE.

Q. What is the Lord's fifth precept for blessedness?

A. They who would be blessed must be *merciful*.

Q. How are we to fulfil this precept?

A. By works of mercy, corporal and spiritual; for, as

SECOND
PART.

St. Chrysostom says, *the forms of mercy are manifold, and this commandment broad.* Hom. in Mat. xv.

Q. Which are the *corporal works of mercy*?

A. 1. To feed the hungry.

2. To give drink to the thirsty.

3. To clothe the naked, or such as have not necessary and decent clothing.

4. To visit them that are in prison.

5. To visit the sick, minister to them, and forward their recovery, or aid them to a Christian preparation for death.

6. To shew hospitality to strangers.

7. To bury them that have died in poverty.

Q. Which are the *spiritual works of mercy*?

A. 1. By exhortation to convert the sinner from the error of his way. James v. 20.

2. To instruct the ignorant in truth and virtue.

3. To give our neighbour good and seasonable advice in difficulty, or in any danger of which he is unaware.

4. To pray for others to God.

5. To comfort the afflicted.

6. Not to return the evil which others may have done us.

7. To forgive injuries from our heart.

Q. Is it not contrary to the precept of mercy for civil justice to punish criminals?

A. Not in the least; if this be done as of duty, and with a good intent, that is, in order to correct them, or to preserve the innocent from their crimes.

Q. What does the Lord promise to the merciful?

A. That they *shall obtain mercy.*

Q. What mercy is here to be understood?

A. That of being delivered from everlasting condemnation for sin at God's Judgment.

ON THE SIXTH BEATITUDE.

Q. What is the Lord's sixth precept for blessedness?

A. They who would be blessed must be *pure in heart.*

Q. Is not *purity of heart* the same thing as sincerity?

A. Sincerity, which feigns not any good dispositions foreign to the heart, but shews the really good dispositions of the heart by good deeds, is only the lowest degree of purity of heart. This last a man attains by constant and strict watchfulness over himself, driving away from his heart every unlawful wish and thought, and every affection for earthly things, and ever keeping there the remembrance of God and our Lord Jesus Christ with faith and charity.

Q. What does the Lord promise to the pure in heart?

A. That they *shall see God*.

Q. How are we to understand this promise?

A. The word of God compares the heart of man to the eye, and ascribes to perfect Christians *enlightened eyes of the heart*. Ephes. i. 18. As the eye that is clear can see the light, so the heart that is pure can behold God. But since the sight of God's countenance is the very source of everlasting blessedness, the promise of seeing God is the promise of the highest degree of everlasting blessedness.

ON THE SEVENTH BEATITUDE.

Q. What is the Lord's seventh precept for blessedness?

A. They who would be blessed must be *peace-makers*.

Q. How are we to fulfil this commandment?

A. We must live friendly with all men, and give no occasion for disagreement: if any arise, we must try all possible ways to put a stop to it, even by yielding our own right, unless this be against duty, or hurtful to any other: if others are at enmity, we must do all we can to reconcile them, and if we fail, we must pray to God for their reconciliation.

Q. What does the Lord promise to peace-makers?

A. That they *shall be called the Sons of God*.

Q. What is signified by this promise?

A. The sublimity both of their office and of their reward. Since in what they do they imitate the only-begotten Son of God, who came upon earth to reconcile fallen man with God's justice, they are for this promised the gracious name

SECOND PART. of Sons of God, and without doubt a degree of blessedness answering thereto.

ON THE EIGHTH BEATITUDE.

Q. What is the Lord's eighth precept for blessedness?

A. They who would be blessed must be ready *to endure persecution for righteousness' sake*, without betraying it.

Q. What qualities are required by this precept?

A. Love of righteousness, constancy and firmness in virtue, fortitude and patience, when one is subjected to calamity or danger for refusing to betray truth and virtue.

Q. What does the Lord promise to those who are persecuted for righteousness' sake?

A. The *Kingdom of heaven*, as if in recompense for what they lose through persecution; in like manner as the same is promised to the poor in spirit, to make up for the feeling of want and privation.

ON THE NINTH BEATITUDE.

Q. What is the Lord's ninth precept for blessedness?

A. They who would be blessed must be ready *to take with joy reproach, persecution, suffering, and death itself, for the name of Christ, and for the true Orthodox faith*.

Q. What is the name for the course required by this precept?

A. The course of *Martyrdom*?

Q. What does the Lord promise for this course?

A. *A great Reward in heaven*; that is, a special and high degree of blessedness.

THE THIRD PART

OF THE

ORTHODOX CATECHISM.

ON CHARITY.

ON THE UNION BETWEEN FAITH AND CHARITY.

Q. WHAT should be the effect and fruit of true faith in the Christian? ON
CHARITY.

A. Charity or love, and good works conformable thereto.

In Jesus Christ, says the Apostle Paul, neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but faith which worketh by love. Gal. v. 6.

Q. Is not faith alone enough for a Christian, *without love and good works?*

A. No; for faith without love and good works is inactive and dead, and so cannot lead to eternal life⁴¹.

He that loveth not his brother, abideth in death. 1 John iii. 14. What doth it profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath faith, and have not works? can faith save him? For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also. James ii. 14. 26.

Q. May not a man on the other hand be saved by love and good works, *without faith?*

A. It is impossible that a man who has not faith in God should really love Him: besides, man, being ruined by sin,

THIRD
PART.

cannot do really good works, unless he receive through faith in Jesus Christ spiritual strength, or grace from God.

Without faith it is impossible to please God: for he that cometh to God, must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him. Hcb. xi. 6.

For as many as are of the works of the law, are under the curse: for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things, which are written in the book of the law to do them. Gal. iii. 10. For we through the spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith. Ib. v. 5.

For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast. Ephes. ii. 8, 9.

Q. What is to be thought of such love as is *not accompanied by good works*?

A. Such love is not real: for true love naturally shews itself by good works. Jesus Christ says; *He that hath My commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth Me: if a man love Me, he will keep My word. John xiv. 21. 23.*

The Apostle John writes; *For this is the love of God, that we keep His commandments. 1 John v. 3. Let us not love in word, neither in tongue, but in deed and in truth. Ib. iii. 18.*

ON THE LAW OF GOD AND THE COMMANDMENTS.

Q. What means have we to know good works from bad?

A. The *inward law of God*, or the witness of our conscience, and the *outward law of God*, or God's commandments.

Q. Does holy Scripture speak of the inward law of God?

A. The Apostle Paul says of the heathen; *Which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another. Rom. ii. 15.*

Q. If there is in man's heart an *inward law*, why was the *outward* given?

A. It was given because men obeyed not the inward law, but led carnal and sinful lives, and stifled within themselves the voice of the spiritual law, so that it was necessary to put

them in mind of it outwardly through the commandments. *Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of* ^{ON} CHARITY. *transgressions.* Gal. iii. 19.

Q. When, and how, was God's outward law given to men?

A. When the Hebrew people, descended from Abraham, had been miraculously delivered from bondage in Egypt, on their way to the promised land, in the desert, on mount Sinai, God manifested His presence in fire and clouds, and gave them the law, by the hand of Moses, their leader.

Q. Which are the chief and general commandments of this law?

A. The following *ten*; which were written *on two tables of stone*:

1. *I am the Lord thy God: thou shalt have none other gods beside Me.*

2. *Thou shalt not make unto thyself any graven image, nor the likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the waters under the earth: thou shalt not bow down to them, nor serve them.*

3. *Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.*

4. *Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy: six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath to the Lord thy God.*

5. *Honour thy Father and thy Mother, that it may be well with thee, and that thy days may be long upon the earth.*

6. *Thou shalt not kill.*

7. *Thou shalt not commit adultery.*

8. *Thou shalt not steal.*

9. *Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour.*

10. *Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house, nor his land, nor his man-servant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any of his cattle, nor any thing that is thy neighbour's.* Exod. xx. 1..17. Deut. v. 6..21.

Q. You said that these commandments were given to the people of Israel: must we then also walk by them?

A. We must: for they are in substance the same law,

THIRD
PART.

which, in the words of St. Paul, has been *written in the hearts* of all men, that all should walk by it.

Q. Did Jesus Christ teach men to walk by the ten commandments?

A. He bade men, if they would attain to everlasting life, to *keep the commandments*; and taught us to understand and fulfil them more perfectly, than had been done before He came. Mat. xix. 17. and v.

ON THE DIVISION OF THE COMMANDMENTS INTO
TWO TABLES.

Q. What means the division of the ten commandments into *two tables*?

A. This; that they contain *two kinds of love*, love to God, and love to *our neighbour*; and prescribe two corresponding kinds of duties.

Q. Has not Jesus Christ said something of this?

A. When asked, *Which is the great commandment in the law?* He replied; *Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it: Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.* Mat. xxii. 36.. 40.

Q. Are all men our *neighbours*?

A. Yes, all; because all are the creation of one God, and have come from one man: but our neighbours in faith are doubly neighbours to us, as being 'children of one heavenly Father by faith in Jesus Christ.

Q. But why is there no commandment of love *to ourselves*?

A. Because we love ourselves naturally, and without any commandment. *No man ever yet hated his own flesh, but nourisheth and cherisheth it.* Ephes. v. 29.

Q. What relative order should there be in our love to God, our *neighbour*, and *ourselves*?

A. We should love ourselves not for our own but for God's sake, and partly also for the sake of our neighbours: we should love our neighbour for the sake of God: but we should love

God for Himself, and above all. Love of self should be sacrificed to the love of our neighbour; but both should be sacrificed to the love of God. ON
CHARITY.

Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends. John xv. 13.

He that loveth father or mother more than Me, saith Jesus Christ, is not worthy of Me: and he that loveth son or daughter more than Me, is not worthy of Me. Mat. x. 37.

Q. If the whole law is contained in *two* commandments, why are they divided into *ten*?

A. In order the more clearly to set forth our duties towards God, and towards our neighbour.

Q. In which of the ten commandments are we taught our *duties towards God*?

A. In the first four.

Q. What are these duties?

A. In the first commandment we are taught to *know* and *worship* the true God.

In the second, to abstain from *false* worship.

In the third, not to sin against God's worship even by *word*.

In the fourth, to keep a certain order in the *time* and *acts* of God's worship.

Q. In which of the ten commandments are we taught our *duties towards our neighbour*?

A. In the last six.

Q. What are these duties?

A. In the fifth commandment we are taught to love and *honour* those of our neighbours who are nearest to us, beginning from our parents.

In the sixth, not to hurt the *life* of our neighbour.

In the seventh, not to hurt the *purity* of his morals.

In the eighth, not to hurt his *property*.

In the ninth, not to hurt him by *word*.

In the tenth, not to *wish* to hurt him.

Q. Do not the ten commandments include also *our duties towards ourselves*?

A. Yes; these duties are implied in the commandments

THIRD PART. of the second table relating to our neighbours; for our duty is to love our neighbour *as* ourselves.

ON THE FIRST COMMANDMENT.

Q. What mean these words, *I am the Lord thy God?*

A. By these words God as it were points Himself out to man, and so commands him to *know* the Lord his God.

Q. What particuler duties may we deduce from the commandment to know God?

A. 1. We must *seek to learn the knowledge of God*, as being the most essential of all knowledge.

2. We must listen attentively to *instructions* on God and on His works in church, and to *religious conversations* on the same at home.

3. We must read or hear read books of instruction in the knowledge of God; and in the first place *holy Scripture*, secondly *the writings of the holy Fathers*.

Q. What are we taught in the words, *Thou shalt have none other gods but Me?*

A. We are taught to turn and cleave to the one true God, or in other words, devoutly *to worship* Him.

Q. What duties are there which refer to the *inward worship of God?*

A. 1. *To believe* in God.

2. *To walk before* God; that is, to be ever mindful of Him, and in all things to walk circumspectly, because He seeth not only our actions, but even our most secret thoughts.

3. *To fear* God, or stand in awe of Him; that is, to think the anger of our heavenly Father the greatest ill that can befall us, and therefore strive not to offend Him.

4. *To trust* in God.

5. *To love* God.

6. *To obey* God; that is, to be ever ready to do what He commands, and not to murmur when He deals with us otherwise than we could desire.

7. *To adore* God, as the supreme Being.

8. *To glorify* God, as being all-perfect.

9. *To give thanks* to God, as our Creator, Provident Sustainer, and Saviour.

10. *To call upon* God, as our all-good and almighty helper, in every good work which we undertake.

Q. What duties are there which refer to the *outward* worship of God?

A. 1. *To confess* God; that is, to acknowledge that He is our God, and not deny Him, although for confessing Him we may have to suffer, or even die.

2. To take part *in the public Divine Service* enjoined by God and appointed by the Orthodox Church.

Q. In order the more exactly to understand and keep the first commandment, we must know further what sins there may be against it?

A. 1. *Atheism*; when men whom the Psalmist justly calls fools, wishing to rid themselves of the fear of God's judgment, *say in their heart, There is no God.* Ps. xiii. 1.

2. *Polytheism*; when instead of the one true God, men acknowledge a number of false deities.

3. *Infidelity*; when men who admit the existence of God, disbelieve His providence and His revelation.

4. *Heresy*; when people mix with the doctrine of the faith opinions contrary to Divine Truth.

5. *Schism*; that is, wilful departure from the unity of Divine worship, and from the Orthodox Catholic Church of God.

6. *Apostasy*; when any deny the true faith from fear of man, or for worldly advantage.

7. *Despair*; when men give up all hope of obtaining from God grace and salvation.

8. *Sorcery*; when men leaving faith in the power of God, put their trust in secret and for the most part evil powers of creatures, especially of evil spirits; and seek to work by their means.

9. *Superstition*; when men put faith in any common thing as if it had Divine power, and trust in it instead of trusting in God, or fear it instead of fearing God; as, for instance, when they put faith in an old book, and think they can be

THIRD
PART.

saved by none other, and must not use a new one, though the new book contain the very same doctrine, and the very same form of Divine Service.

10. *Sloth*, in respect of learning religion, or in respect of prayer, and the public Service of God.

11. *Love of the creature more than of God*.

12. *Men-pleasing*; when any seek to please men, so as for this to be careless of pleasing God.

13. *Trusting in man*; when any one trusts in his own means and strength, or in the means and strength of others, and not in the mercy and help of God.

Q. Why must we think that men-pleasing, and trusting in man, are against the first commandment?

A. Because the man, whom we please, or in whom we trust, so as to forget God, is in some sort to us *another God*, in place of the true God.

Q. How does holy Scripture speak of men-pleasing?

A. The Apostle Paul says; *For if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ*. Gal. i. 10.

Q. How does holy Scripture speak of trusting in man?

A. *Thus saith the Lord, Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm, and whose heart departeth from the Lord*. Jer. xvii. 5.

Q. In order to succeed the better in fulfilling his duties to God, how must a man act *by himself*?

A. He must deny himself. *Whosoever will come after Me, says Jesus Christ, let him deny himself*. Mark viii. 34.

Q. What is it to *deny oneself*?

A. Basil the Great explains it thus: *He denies himself, who puts off the old man with his deeds, which is corrupt, according to the deceitful lusts: who renounces also all worldly affections, which can hinder his intention of godliness. Perfect self-denial consists in this, that he cease to have any affection even for life itself, and bear the judgment of death in himself, that he may not trust in himself*. Can. Long. Resp. 8.

Q. What consolation is there for him, who by denying himself loses many natural gratifications.

A. The consolation of grace; a Divine consolation, which even sufferings themselves cannot impair. *For as the sufferings of Christ abound in us, so our consolation also aboundeth by Christ.* 2 Cor. i. 5. ON
CHARITY.

Q. If the first commandment teaches us to worship religiously God alone, how does it agree with this commandment *to honour Angels and holy men?*

A. To pay them due and rightful honour is altogether agreeable to this commandment; because in them we honour the grace of God, which dwells and works in them, and through them seek help from God⁴².

ON THE SECOND COMMANDMENT.

Q. What is a *graven image*, as spoken of in the second commandment?

A. The commandment itself explains that a graven image, or idol, is the likeness of some creature, in heaven, or earth, or in the waters, which men bow down to and serve instead of God⁴³.

Q. What is forbidden then by the second commandment?

A. We are forbidden to bow down to graven images or idols, as to supposed deities, or as to likenesses of false gods.

Q. Are we not hereby forbidden to have any sacred representations whatever?

A. By no means. This very plainly appears from hence, that the same Moses, through whom God gave the commandment against graven images, received at the same time from God an order to place in the Tabernacle, or moveable Temple of the Israelites, sacred representations of Cherubim in gold, and to place them too in that inner part of the temple to which the people turned for the worship of God.

Q. Why is this example worthy of remark for the Orthodox Christian Church?

A. Because it illustrates her use of holy Icons.

Q. What is an Icon?

A. The word is Greek, and means an *image* or representation. In the Orthodox Church this name designates sacred

THIRD
PART.

representations of our Lord Jesus Christ, God incarnate, His immaeulate Mother, and His Saints.

Q. Is the use of holy Ieons agreeable to the second eommandment?

A. It would then and then only be otherwise, if any one were to make gods of them; but it is not in the least contrary to this eommandment to honour Ieons as saered representations, and to use them for the religious remembrance of God's works and of His saints: for when thus used Ieons are books, written with the forms of persons and things instead of letters. See Greg. Magn. Ep. l. ix. Ep. 9. ad Seren. Epise.

Q. What disposition of mind should we have, when we reverence the Ieons?

A. While we look on them with our eyes, we should mentally look to God and to the Saints, who are represented on them.

Q. What general name is there for sin against the second eommandment?

A. *Idolatry.*

Q. Are there not also other sins against this eommandment?

A. Besides gross idolatry there is yet another sort more subtle, to which belong;

1. *Covetousness.*

2. *Belly-service or sensuality, gluttony, and drunkenness.*

3. *Pride*, to which belongs likewise *vanity*.

Q. Why is eovetousness referred to idolatry?

A. The Apostle Paul expressly says that *covetousness is idolatry*, Col. iii. 5; because the eovetous man serves riches rather than God.

Q. If the second eommandment forbids the love of gain, what contrary duties does it thereby neecessarily enjoin?

A. Those of *contentedness* and *liberality*.

Q. Why is belly-service referred to idolatry?

A. Because belly-servers set sensual gratification above every thing; and therefore the Apostle Paul says that *their God is their belly*; or, in other words, that the belly is their idol. Philipp. iii. 19.

Q. If the second commandment forbids belly-service, what contrary duties does it thereby enjoin? ON
CHARITY.

A. Those of *temperance* and *fasting*.

Q. Why are pride and vanity referred to idolatry?

A. Because the proud man values above every thing his own abilities and excellencies, and so they are his idol: the vain man wishes further that others also should worship the same idol. These proud and vain dispositions were exemplified even sensibly in Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon, who first set up for himself a golden idol, and then ordered all to worship it. Dan. iii.

Q. Is there not still another vice which is near to idolatry?

A. Such a vice is *hypocrisy*; when a man uses the outward acts of religion, as fasting, and the strict observance of ceremonies, in order to obtain respect from the people, without thinking of the inward amendment of his heart. Mat. vi. 5. 7.

Q. If the second commandment forbids pride, vanity, and hypocrisy, what contrary duties does it thereby enjoin?

A. Those of *humility*, and *doing good in secret*.

ON THE THIRD COMMANDMENT.

Q. When is *God's name taken in vain*?

A. It is taken or uttered in vain, when it is uttered in vain and unprofitable talk, and still more so, when it is uttered *lyingly* or *irreverently*.

Q. What sins are forbidden by the third commandment?

A. 1. *Blasphemy*; or daring words against God.

2. *Murmuring*; or complaining against God's Providence.

3. *Profaneness*; when holy things are jested on, or insulted.

4. *Inattention in prayer*.

5. *Perjury*; when men affirm with an oath what is false.

6. *Oath-breaking*; when men keep not just and lawful oaths.

7. *Breach of vows* made to God.

8. *Common swearing*; or thoughtless oaths in common talk.

Q. Are not such oaths specially forbidden in holy Scripture?

A. The Saviour says; *I say unto you, Swear not at all, but*

THIRD
PART.

let your communication be, Yea, yea ; Nay, nay ; for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil. Mat. v. 34. 37.

Q. Does not this go to forbid all *oaths in civil matters* ?

A. The Apostle Paul says ; *Men swear by the greater ; and an oath for confirmation is to them an end of all strife : wherein God, willing more abundantly to shew unto the heirs of promise the immutability of His counsel, confirmed it by an oath. Hcb. vi. 16, 17.* Hence we must conclude, that if God Himself for an immutable assurance used an oath, much more may we on grave and necessary occasions, when required by lawful authority, take an oath or vow religiously, with the firm intention of not breaking it.

ON THE FOURTH COMMANDMENT.

Q. Why is it commanded to keep the *seventh*, rather than any other day, holy to God ?

A. Because God in six days made the world, and on the seventh day rested from the work of creation.

Q. Is the *Sabbath* kept in the Christian Church ?

A. It is not kept, strictly speaking, as a holy day ; but still in memory of the creation of the world, and in continuation of its original observance, it is distinguished from the other days of the week by a relaxation of the rule for fasting.

Q. How then does the Christian Church obey the fourth commandment ?

A. She still to every six days keeps a seventh, only not the last of the seven days, which is the Sabbath, but the first day in every week, which is the *Day of the Resurrection*, or *Lord's Day*⁴⁴.

Q. Since when do we keep the Day of the Resurrection ?

A. From the very time of Christ's Resurrection.

Q. Is there any mention in holy Scripture of keeping the Day of the Resurrection ?

A. In the book of the Acts of the Apostles it is mentioned that the disciples, that is the Christians, came together *on the first day after the sabbath*, which was the first day of the week or day of the Resurrection, *for the breaking of bread*, that is

to say, for the celebration of the Sacrament of the Communion. Acts xx. 7. The Apostle and Evangelist John also in the Apocalypse mentions the *Lord's Day*, or the *Day of the Resurrection*.

Q. Is there not yet something more to be understood under the name of the seventh day, or Sabbath?

A. As in the Church of the Old Testament the name Sabbath was understood to include divers other days appointed like the Sabbath for festivals or fasts, as *the festival of the Passover*, and *the day of Atonement*; so likewise are we now in the Christian Church bound to keep besides the Lord's day certain others also, which have been appointed as *festivals* to the glory of God and the honour of the Blessed Virgin and other Saints, or as *days of fasting*⁴⁵. See Orth. Confess. P. iii. Q. 60. P. i. Q. 88.

Q. Which are the chief festivals?

A. Those appointed in memory of the chief events relating to the Incarnation of the Son of God for our salvation, and to the Manifestation of the Godhead: after these, those appointed in honour of the Most Holy Mother of God, as the instrument of the mystery of the Incarnation. Such, in the order of the events, are the following:

1. The day of the birth of the Most Holy Mother of God.
2. The day of her being brought to the Temple to be dedicated to God.
3. The day of the Annunciation; that is, when the Angel announced to the Most Holy Virgin the Incarnation of the Son of God of her.
4. The day of the birth of Jesus Christ.
5. The day of the baptism of our Lord, and the Epiphany, or Manifestation of the Most Holy Trinity.
6. The day of our Lord's being met in the temple by Simeon.
7. The day of our Lord's Transfiguration.
8. The day of our Lord's entry into Jerusalem.
9. Pasch or Easter: the feast of feasts, the anticipation of the everlasting feast of everlasting blessedness.
10. The day of our Lord's Ascension into Heaven.

THIRD
PART.

11. The feast of Pentecost; in memory of the descent of the Holy Ghost, and in honour of the Most Holy Trinity.

12. The day of the Elevation of the Cross of our Lord discovered by the Empress Helena.

13. The day of the Rest of the Most Holy Mother of God.

Q. What is the chief fast?

A. The *great fast*; that is, *Lent*, or *Quadragesima*.

Q. Why is it called Quadragesima?

A. Because it continues forty days, besides the week of Christ's Passion.

Q. Why has it been appointed that the great fast should continue forty days?

A. After the example of Jesus Christ Himself, Who fasted forty days. Mat. iv. 2.

Q. Why has it been appointed to fast on the *Wednesday* and the *Friday*?

A. On Wednesday, in memory of the betrayal of our Lord Jesus Christ to suffer; and on Friday in memory of His actual suffering and death.

Q. For what cause are the fasts before the Nativity, the Rest of the Blessed Virgin, and the Day of the Holy Apostles?

A. The first two as preparatory exercises of abstinence, the better to honour the ensuing feasts of the Nativity and the Assumption; the last not only for like reason, but also in imitation of the Apostles, who fasted to prepare themselves for the work of preaching the Gospel. Acts xiii. 3.

Q. How should we spend our time on Sundays and the other greater holy days, in order to keep the fourth commandment?

A. First, on these days we should not *labour*, or do worldly and temporal business; secondly, we should keep them holy, that is, use them for holy and spiritual works, to the glory of God.

Q. Why are we forbidden to work on holy days?

A. That we may with the less hindrance employ them in holy and godly works.

Q. What particular things is it fit to do on holy days?

A. First, to go to *church*, for public worship, and for

instruction in the word of God: secondly, when at home, to give ourselves to *prayer* and reading, or edifying conversation: thirdly, to dedicate to God a portion of our means, expending it on the necessities of the Church and her Ministers, and in *alms* to the poor, to visit the sick and prisoners, and to do other works of Christian charity. ON
CHARITY.

Q. But should we not do such things on work-days also?

A. It is well, if any can; but he whom business prevents, should at any rate devote holy days to such works. But as regards prayer it is certainly our bounden duty to use it every day, morning and evening, before and after both dinner and supper, and, as far as possible, at the beginning and ending of every work.

Q. What are we to think of those, who on holy days allow themselves in indecent plays and shows, idle songs, and intemperance in meat and drink?

A. Such people greatly desecrate holy days. For if even works innocent and useful for this present life are unfit for holy days, much more such as these, which are unprofitable, carnal, and vicious.

Q. When the fourth commandment speaks of working six days, does it not thereby condemn those who do nothing?

A. Without doubt it condemns all who on common days do not give themselves to works befitting their calling, but spend their time in idleness and dissipation.

ON THE FIFTH COMMANDMENT.

Q. What special duties are prescribed by the fifth commandment in regard to *parents*, under the general phrase of honouring them?

A. 1. *To behave respectfully to them.*

2. *To obey them.*

3. *To support and comfort them in sickness and age.*

4. After their death, as well as during their lives, *to pray* for the salvation of their souls; and faithfully to fulfil their *last wills*, so far as they are not contrary to law, divine or civil. See 2 Mace. xii. 43, 44. Jerem. xxxv. 18, 19. J. Damasc. Serm. de Mort.

THIRD
PART.

Q. What degree of sin is there in undutifulness to parents?

A. In proportion as it is easy and natural to love and honour parents, to whom we owe our being, the more grievous is the sin of undutifulness towards them: for this cause in the law of Moses he that cursed father or mother was to be put to death. Exod. xxi. 17.

Q. Why has this particular commandment to honour parents a promise added to it of prosperity and long life?

A. That men by a visible reward might be the more moved to fulfil a commandment, on which the good order first of families and afterwards of all social life depends.

Q. How is this promise fulfilled?

A. The examples of the old Patriarchs or Fathers shew that God gives special force to the blessing of parents. Gen. xxvii. *The blessing of the father establisheth the houses of the children.* Ecclus. iii. 9. God of His wise and just providence specially protects the life and promotes the prosperity of such as honour their parents upon earth: but for the perfect reward of the perfect virtue He gives everlasting life and blessedness in the heavenly country.

Q. Why in those commandments which teach love to our neighbours is mention made first of all of parents?

A. Because parents are naturally nearer to us than all others.

Q. Are there not others also to be understood in the fifth commandment under the name of parents?

A. Yes; all who in different relations stand to us in the place of parents.

Q. Who stand to us in the place of parents?

A. 1. Our *Sovereign* and our *country*: for an empire is a great family, in which the sovereign is father, and the subjects children of the sovereign and their country.

2. Our *Spiritual Pastors* and *Teachers*: for they by their doctrine and by the Sacraments beget us to spiritual life, and nurture us up in it.

3. Our *Elders* in age.

4. Our *Benefactors*.

5. Our *Governors*, or superiors, in different relations.

ON
CHARITY.

Q. How does holy Scripture speak of the honour due to the sovereign?

A. Let every soul be subject to the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God. Rom. xiii. 1, 2.

Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake. Ib. 5.

My son, fear God, and the king, and oppose neither of them. Prov. xxiv. 21.

Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God, the things that are God's. Mat. xxii. 21.

Fear God, honour the king. 1 Pet. ii. 17.

Q. How far should love to our sovereign and country go?

A. So far as to make us ready to lay down our life for them. John xv. 13.

Q. How does holy Scripture speak of the duty of honouring spiritual Pastors and Teachers?

A. Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves; for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account; that they may do it with joy, and not with grief: for that is unprofitable for you. Heb. xiii. 17.

Q. Is there in holy Scripture any particular injunction to honour elders in age as parents?

A. The Apostle Paul writes to Timothy thus: Rebuke not an elder, but entreat him as a father; younger men, as brethren; elder women, as mothers. 1 Tim. v. 1, 2.

Thou shalt rise up before the hoary head, and honour the face of the old man, and fear the Lord thy God. Levit. xix. 32.

Q. How may we be assured that we ought to honour benefactors as parents?

A. By the example of Jesus Christ Himself, who was subject to Joseph; although Joseph was not His father, but only His guardian. Luke ii. 51.

Q. Besides these, who are our superiors, whom we must honour after parents, and like them?

THIRD
PART.

A. They, who in place of parents take care of our education, as *Governors in schools, and Masters*; They who preserve us from irregularities and disorder in society, as *civil Magistrates*; They who protect us from wrong by the power of the law, as *Judges*; They to whom the sovereign entrusts the guardianship and defence of the public safety against enemies, as *military Commanders*; and lastly, *Masters*, so far as relates to those who serve them, or belong to them.

Q. What does holy Scripture prescribe as to our duty with respect to *Authorities* generally?

A. Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honour to whom honour. Rom. xiii. 7.

Q. How does holy Scripture speak of the obedience due from servants and serfs to their Masters?

A. Servants, be obedient to them that are your masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart, as unto Christ; not with eye-service as men-pleasers, but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart. Ephes. vi. 5, 6.

Servants, be subject to your masters with all fear, not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward. 1 Pet. ii. 18.

Q. If holy Scripture prescribes duties towards parents, does it not likewise prescribe *duties towards children*?

A. It does. *Fathers, provoke not your children to wrath, but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.* Ephes. vi. 4.

Q. How does holy Scripture speak of the duty of Pastors towards their spiritual flock?

A. Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof not by constraint, but willingly, and according to God; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock. 1 Pet. v. 2, 3.

Q. How does holy Scripture speak of the duty of them that are in *authority*, and of *Masters*?

A. Masters, give unto your servants that which is just and

equal, knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven.
Coloss. iv. 1.

ON
CHARITY.

Q. How ought we to act, if it fall out that our parents or governors require of us any thing contrary to the faith or to the law of God?

A. In that case we should say to them, as the Apostles said to the rulers of the Jews; *Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye*: and we should be ready, for the sake of the faith and the law of God, to endure the consequences, whatever they may be. Acts iv. 19.

Q. What is the general name for that quality or virtue, which is required by the fifth commandment?

A. *Obedience.*

ON THE SIXTH COMMANDMENT.

Q. What is forbidden by the sixth commandment?

A. *Murder*; that is, taking away the life of our neighbour in any manner whatever.

Q. Is it in all cases murder, and against this commandment, to kill?

A. No: it is not murder, nor against this commandment, when life is taken in the execution of duty; as, when a criminal *is punished* with death, by just judgment; or, again, when an enemy is killed *in war*, in defence of our sovereign and country.

Q. What is to be thought of involuntary homicide, when a man is killed accidentally and unintentionally?

A. The man who is guilty of involuntary homicide cannot be reckoned blameless, unless he took all proper precautions against the accident; at any rate, he needs to have his conscience cleansed according to the Canons of the Church.

Q. What cases must be reckoned as murder, and as breaches of this commandment?

A. Besides direct murder, by whatever means, the same sin may be committed in the following, and in similar cases:

1. When a judge *condemns* a prisoner, whom he knows to be *innocent*.

THIRD
PART.

2. When any one *conceals* or *sets free a murderer*, and so gives him opportunity for fresh crime.

3. When any one can save his neighbour from death, but does *not save* him; as, when a rich man suffers a poor man to die of hunger.

4. When any one by excessive burdens and cruel punishments *wears out* those under him, and so hastens their death.

5. When any one through intemperance or other *vices shortens his own life*.

Q. What are we to think of *suicide*?

A. That it is the most criminal of all murders. For if it be contrary to nature to kill another man like unto ourselves, much more is it contrary to nature to kill our own selves. Our life is not our own, but God's, who gave it.

Q. What are we to think of *duels*, to decide private quarrels?

A. Since the decision of private quarrels belongs to government, while the duellist, instead of having recourse to law, wilfully determines on an act which involves manifest danger of death both to himself and his opponent, it is evident that a duel implies three dreadful crimes; rebellion, murder, and suicide.

Q. Besides murder of the body, is there not such a thing as *spiritual murder*?

A. A kind of spiritual murder is the *causing of offence*; when any one causes his neighbour to fall into infidelity or into sin, and so subjects his soul to spiritual death.

The Saviour says; *Whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in Me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea.* Mat. xviii. 6.

Q. Are there not still some more subtle forms of murder?

A. To this sin are more or less referable all acts and words against charity; all which unjustly affect the peace and security of our neighbour; and, lastly, all inward *malice* against him, even though it be not shewn openly. *Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer.* 1 John iii. 15.

Q. When we are forbidden to hurt the life of our neighbour, ON CHARITY.
what positive duty is thereby enjoined?

A. That of doing all we can to secure his life and well-being.

Q. What duties follow from hence?

A. Those of, 1. Helping the poor; 2. Ministering to the sick; 3. Comforting the afflicted; 4. Alleviating the distress of the unfortunate; 5. Behaving in a gentle, affectionate, and edifying manner to all; 6. Reconciling ourselves with those that are angry; 7. Forgiving injuries, and doing good to our enemies.

ON THE SEVENTH COMMANDMENT.

Q. What is forbidden by the seventh commandment?

A. *Adultery.*

Q. What forms of sin are forbidden under the name of adultery?

A. The Apostle Paul would have Christians not even to speak of such impurities. Ephes. v. 3. It is only of necessity, to forewarn people against such sins, that we shall here name some of them. Such are;

1. *Fornication*; or irregular carnal love between unmarried persons: 2. *Adultery*; when married persons unlawfully give that love which they owe each other to strangers: 3. *Incest*; when near relations enter into an union like that of matrimony.

Q. What does our Saviour teach us to think of adultery?

A. He has said that *Whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.* Mat. v. 28.

Q. What should we do in order to guard against falling into this subtle *inward adultery*?

A. We should avoid every thing that may excite impure feelings in the heart; as wanton songs and dances, lewd conversation, immodest games and jokes, immodest sights, and the reading of books which contain descriptions of impure love. We should strive, according to the Gospel, not even to look on that which may cause us to fall. *If thy right eye*

THIRD
PART.

offend thee, pluck it out and cast it from thee; for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell. Mat. v. 29.

Q. Must we then literally *pluck out the offending eye*?

A. We must pluck it out, not with the hand, but with the will. He who has firmly resolved not even to look upon that which causes him to offend, hath already plucked out the offending eye.

Q. When the sin of adultery is forbidden, what contrary virtues are thereby enjoined?

A. Those of *conjugal love* and *fidelity*; and, for such as can receive it, perfect *purity* and *chastity*.

Q. How does holy Scripture speak of the *duties* of *man* and *wife*?

A. *Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the Church, and gave Himself for it. Ephes. v. 25. Wives submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord: for the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the Church; and He is the Saviour of the body. Ib. 22, 23.*

Q. What motives does holy Scripture set before us, to make us flee fornication and live chastely?

A. It bids us keep our bodies in purity, because they are the *members of Christ*, and *temples of the Holy Ghost*; while, on the other hand, he who *committeth fornication sinneth against his own body*; that is, corrupts it, infects it with diseases, and, further, hurts his mental faculties, such as imagination and memory. See 1 Cor. vi. 15. 18. 19.

ON THE EIGHTH COMMANDMENT.

Q. What is forbidden by the eighth commandment?

A. *To steal*, or in any way appropriate to ourselves that which belongs to another.

Q. What particular sins are forbidden hereby?

A. The chief are;

1. *Robbery*; or the taking of any thing that belongs to another openly, by force.

2. *Theft*; or taking what belongs to another privily.

3. *Fraud*; or appropriating to ourselves any thing that is another's by artifice; as when men pass off counterfeit money for true, or bad wares for good; or use false weights and measures, to give less than they have sold; or conceal their effects, to avoid paying their debts; or do not honestly fulfil contracts, or execute wills; when they screen others guilty of dishonesty, and so defraud the injured of justice.

4. *Sacrilege*; or appropriating to ourselves what has been dedicated to God, or belongs to the Church.

5. *Spiritual sacrilege*; when one sinfully gives and another fraudulently obtains any sacred office, not of desert, but for gain.

6. *Bribery*; when men receive a bribe from those under them in office or jurisdiction, and for gain promote the unworthy, acquit the guilty, or oppress the innocent.

7. *Eating the bread of idleness*; when men receive salary for duty, or pay for work, which they neglect, and so in fact steal both their pay, and that profit, which society, or he whom they served, should have had of their labour: in like manner when they who are able to support themselves by work, instead of so doing live upon alms.

8. *Extortion*; when under the show of some right, but really against equity and humanity, men make their own advantage of the property, the labours, or even the misfortunes of others: as when creditors oppress their debtors by usury; when masters wear out their dependants by excessive imposts or tasks; when in time of famine men sell bread at an exorbitant price.

Q. When these sins are forbidden, what contrary virtues are thereby enjoined?

A. Those of 1. *Disinterestedness*; 2. *Good faith in performing engagements*; 3. *Justice*; 4. *Mercy* to the poor.

Q. Does he then who is not merciful to the poor sin against the eighth commandment?

A. Certainly he does; if he has the means of assisting them: for all that we have belongs properly to God, and our abundance is given us by His Providence for the assistance

THIRD
PART.

of the poor : wherefore, if we do not impart to them of our abundance, we do in fact thereby rob and defraud them of their right, and the gift of God.

Q. Is there not yet a higher virtue contrary to sins against the eighth commandment ?

A. Such a virtue is *absolute poverty*, or the renunciation of all property ; which is proposed by the Gospel not as a duty for all, but as a counsel for them that would be perfect.

If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor ; and thou shalt have treasure in heaven. Mat. xix. 21.

ON THE NINTH COMMANDMENT.

Q. What is forbidden by the ninth commandment ?

A. *False witness* against our neighbour, and all lying.

Q. What is forbidden under the words *false witness* ?

A. 1. *False witness in a court of justice* ; when men bear witness, inform, or complain falsely against any one.

2. *False witness out of court*, when men *slander* any one behind his back, or *blame* him to his face unjustly.

Q. But is it allowable to censure others when they are really to blame ?

A. No: the Gospel does not allow us to judge even of the real vices or faults of our neighbours, unless we are called by any special office to do so, for their punishment or amendment.

Judge not, that ye be not judged. Mat. vii. 1.

Q. Are not such lies allowable, as involve no purpose of hurting our neighbour ?

A. No: for they are inconsistent with love and respect for our neighbour, and unworthy of a man, much more of a Christian, who has been created for truth and love.

Wherefore putting away lying, speak every man truth with his neighbour : for we are members one of another. Eph. iv. 25.

Q. If we would avoid sins against the ninth commandment, what rule must we follow ?

A. We must *bridle our tongue*. *He that will love life, and see good days, let him refrain his tongue from evil, and his lips, that they speak no guile. 1 Pet. iii. 10. If any man among*

you seem to be religious, and bridled not his tongue, but deceiveth his own heart, this man's religion is vain. James i. 26.

ON
CHARITY.

ON THE TENTH COMMANDMENT.

Q. What is forbidden by the tenth commandment?

A. All *wishes* inconsistent with charity to our neighbour, and *thoughts* which are inseparable from such wishes.

Q. Why are we forbidden not only evil deeds, but also evil wishes and thoughts?

A. First, because when the soul entertains any evil wishes or thoughts, it is already impure in God's sight, and unworthy of Him; as Solomon says; *The unjust thought is an abomination to the Lord.* Prov. xv. 26. And therefore we must needs cleanse ourselves also from these inward impurities also, as the Apostle teaches; *Let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of the Lord.* 2 Cor. vii. 1.

Secondly, because, to prevent sinful acts, it is necessary to crush sinful wishes and thoughts, from which, as from seeds, such actions spring; as it is said; *For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies.* Mat. xv. 19. *Every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed. Then, when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin; and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death.* James i. 14, 15.

Q. When we are forbidden to desire any thing of our neighbour's, what passion is hereby condemned?

A. *Envy.*

Q. What is forbidden by the words, *Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife?*

A. All lustful thoughts and wishes, or inward adultery.

Q. What is forbidden by the words, *Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house, nor his land, nor his man-servant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any of his cattle, nor any thing that is his?*

A. All thoughts of avarice and ambition.

Q. What positive duties, corresponding to these prohibitions, are prescribed by the tenth commandment?

THIRD
PART.

A. First, to keep purity of heart ; and, secondly, to be content with our lot.

Q. What is indispensable for the cleansing of the heart ?

A. The frequent and earnest invocation of the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ.

CONCLUSION.

APPLICATION OF THE DOCTRINE OF FAITH AND PIETY.

Q. How must we apply the doctrine of faith and piety ?

A. We must act according to our knowledge ; and keep before our eyes the fearful judgment threatened for disobedience.

If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them. John xiii. 17. That servant which knew his Lord's will, and prepared not himself, neither did according to His will, shall be beaten with many stripes. Luke xii. 47.

Q. What must a man do, when he is conscious of any sin ?

A. Not only should he immediately repent, and firmly resolve to avoid the same sin for the future, but also strive, as far as possible, to repair the scandal or injury that he has wrought by contrary good deeds.

Thus it was that Zaccheus the Publican acted, when he said to the Lord, Behold, Lord, the half of my goods I give to the poor ; and if I have taken any thing away from any one by false accusation, I restore him fourfold. Luke xix. 8.

Q. What caution do we need, when we seem to ourselves to have fulfilled any commandment ?

A. We must then dispose our hearts according to the words of Jesus Christ ; When ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants ; we have done that, which was our duty to do. Luke xvii. 10.

THE END.

A P P E N D I X :

CONSISTING OF

NOTES TO THE FOREGOING CATECHISM,

WITH

EXTRACTS FROM PUBLIC DOCUMENTS

OF THE

SCOTTISH AND ANGLICAN CHURCHES,

AND

FROM THE WRITINGS

OF

SOME OF THEIR MOST CELEBRATED DIVINES;

DESIGNED TO SHEW THAT THERE IS IN THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION
GENERALLY, AND MORE PARTICULARLY AND PREEMINENTLY IN THE
SCOTTISH CHURCH, AN ELEMENT OF ORTHODOXY, CAPABLE, BY A
SYNODICAL ACT, OF DECLARING UNITY AND IDENTITY WITH THE
EASTERN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Οὐ περὶ τούτων δὲ ἐρωτῶ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τῶν πιστευσόντων διὰ τοῦ λόγου αὐτῶν εἰς ἐμέ· Ἵνα πάντες ἔν ᾧσι· . . . Ἵνα ὁ κόσμος πιστεύσῃ ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας.

Τὰ ἀδύνατα παρὰ ἀνθρώποις, δυνατά ἐστι παρὰ τῷ θεῷ.

Αἰτεῖτε τὰ μέγαλα, καὶ τὰ μικρὰ προστιθήσεται ὑμῖν.

Бѣзъ нѣѣже хѣщѣтъ, поѣѣждѣтъ ѣсѣтъ вѣ
чѣнъ.

NOTE I.

Q. What is necessary in order to please God, and to save one's own soul? *A.* In the first place, a knowledge of the true God, and a right faith in Him; in the second place, a life according to this faith, and good works.—*The Orthodox Catechism*, p. 3.

I. The Baptismal Offices of the Church of England:—

In these Offices the Priest declares that “all men are conceived and born in sin, and they that are in the flesh cannot *please God*, and that our Saviour Christ saith, None can enter into the kingdom of God, except he be regenerate and born anew of water and the Holy Ghost.” And afterwards, he recites Christ's commandment to His Disciples, “Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that *believeth*, and is baptized, shall be *saved*; but he that believeth not shall be damned.” And this being done, he shortly after addresses himself to the person to be baptized, and tells him that “he must for his part promise that he will renounce the devil and all his works, and constantly *believe* God's holy word, and obediently *keep His commandments* ;” And then interrogates him thus; “*Q.* Dost thou renounce, &c.? *A.* I renounce them all. *Q.* Dost thou *believe* in God the Father Almighty, &c. [and so on to the end of the Creed]? *A.* All this I stedfastly believe. *Q.* Wilt thou be baptized *in this Faith*? *A.* That is my desire. *Q.* Wilt thou then *obediently keep God's holy will and commandments, and walk in the same all the days of thy life*? *A.* I will endeavour so to do, God being my helper.” Upon this the Priest baptizes him: And thereupon immediately affirms, that “he is now by Baptism regenerate;” and renews his prayers to God, that the person thus baptized “and regenerate,” may “lead the rest of his life according to this beginning;” may “continue God's servant, and attain His promises.” And lastly, after having admonished the Godfathers and Godmothers, he charges the newly baptized himself, that having “now by baptism put on Christ, it is his part and duty also, being made the child of God and of the light, *by faith in Jesus Christ*, to walk *answerably to his Christian calling*, . . . continually mortifying all evil and corrupt affections, and *daily proceeding in all virtue and godliness of living*.”

NOTE
I.

II. The Catechism of the Church of England:—

“Q. What is your name? A. N. or M. Q. Who gave you this name? A. My Godfathers and my Godmothers in my Baptism; wherein I was made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven. Q. What did your Godfathers and Godmothers then for you? A. They did promise and vow three things in my name. First, that I should renounce the devil and all his works, the pomps and vanity of this wicked world, and all the sinful lusts of the flesh. Secondly, that I should *believe all the Articles of the Christian Faith*. And thirdly, that I should *keep God’s holy will and commandments, and walk in the same all the days of my life*. Q. Dost thou not think that thou art bound to *believe and to do*, as they have promised for thee? A. Yes, verily; and by God’s help so I will. And I heartily thank our heavenly Father that *He hath called me to this state of salvation*, through Jesus Christ our Saviour. And I pray unto God to give me His grace, that I may continue in the same unto my life’s end.”

III. Bishop Nicholson, in his Exposition of the Catechism of the Church of England, writes as follows:—

“The first duty of a Christian is, that he *believe*. For it is not possible that he should obey God’s commandments, or pray unto Him, or expect the performance of any promise from Him, or desire by the Sacraments to have them sealed to him, except he hath faith, trust, affiance and confidence in God. Whence the Apostle saith, ‘Without faith it is impossible to please God; for he who comes to God must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him.’”—Oxford ed. p. 26.

And again, of “Justifying Faith:”—

“This is a gift of God, and is wrought inwardly by His Holy Spirit, and outwardly by the revelation of His word. The subject in which this faith is, is the heart, which comprehends the understanding, the will, and the affections: which being regenerated in every true believer, 1. The understanding is enlightened with knowledge; 2. The will is inclined to assent to, and receive what we know; 3. And the affections bent to love it. Which three when they meet in any Christian soul, then the man is said to believe, and to be endued with the habit or quality of faith. Now whether this faith be true or no is thus discerned. 1. By an earnest, serious, and constant desire proceeding from a contrite heart, not so much of salvation, as of reconciliation, or to be at peace with God through Christ: they hunger after righteousness: whence the act of the Patriarchs’ faith is commended for this, ἀσπασάμενοι, they kissed, saluted, or embraced the promises: and the promise made to them was of the Woman’s Seed, which was Christ, who was to reconcile all things in heaven and in earth. 2. By the influence it hath upon our lives, conforming the whole man to the discipline of Jesus Christ, which the Apostle

calls 'the obedience of faith.' For there is a dead faith, which is separated from a holy life; and this justifies no man: and there is a living faith, which works by love, or *faith keeping the commandments of God*, which *alone* is powerful unto salvation. Now with this faith it is that a Christian vows *in his baptism* to believe."—Ib. p. 17, &c.

NOTE
I.

IV. Dr. William Forbes, First Bishop of Edinburgh:—

"Justifying faith, to speak distinctly and theologically, is nothing else than a firm and sure assent of the mind produced by the Holy Ghost through the word; by which we acknowledge as most true all that God has revealed in holy Scripture, especially the mystery of our redemption and salvation through Christ. And so, considered in itself and in its essence, it is no other thing than the Catholic Faith (i. e. the faith of the Catholic Church), which of itself also beyond all doubt justifies a man, if *all those other things which are necessary to justification* are joined with it."—Consid. Modest. p. 7.

And again: "Very many of the Fathers assert that we are justified by faith only. Orig. in cap. 3. ad Rom. circ. fin. &c. &c." (citing a great number of passages.) "But if all these and other like passages which might be found, be read fairly and honestly, the reader will plainly see that the Fathers by the word *only*, or *alone*, never thought of excluding simply all works of faith and grace from being causative of justification and eternal life: but, 1. The law of nature, and the Mosaic law: 2. all works done of man's own power and will, without faith in Christ and God's preventing grace: 3. a false faith, or heresy; to which, and not to good works, they then oppose faith, (i. e. true faith:) 4. the absolute necessity of outward works even of grace, as outward works of charity or repentance, the receiving of the Sacraments, &c., (that is, when the possibility or opportunity is wanting), for in such cases faith alone suffices without external works; but yet not even then without those good affections of penitence and love to God, which are inward works: 5. all vain confidence and boasting in our own works, of whatever kind or whensoever done they may be, not only such as precede faith, but also such as follow it, whether of the outward or inward kind."—Ib. p. 24.

Again: "This conclusion then, that good works are necessary to salvation not only by reason of their being necessarily present, but also by reason that they are in some degree *causative* thereof, and that works no less than faith are in their own way referred to salvation, is admitted, as we have shewn, to be most true by very many of the most learned Protestants: and as for us, we think this controversy between the two sides vain and useless, and for the most part a mere logomachy."—Ib. p. 130.

Again: "The more rigid Protestants do very ill in rejecting the commonly received distinction of justification into *primary* and *secondary*. For to say nothing now of that first justification, which consists in the re-

NOTE I. mission of all precedent sins and the gift of sanctifying grace" [so are joined in the Baptismal Office these two expressions of '*washing*' and '*sanctifying*'] "we must necessarily acknowledge and admit a secondary or posterior justification, which consists in the progression, increase, and perfecting (according to the state of life) of that justice which has been given in the first instance, and in the remission of those faults into which even the just fall daily. Of this the Scriptures speak. (Apocal. last ch.) 'He who is justified, let him be justified still. (Qui justus est, justificetur adhuc.) &c.'"—Ib. p. 168.

V. And lastly, the same Bishop Forbes quotes a passage from the Book entitled "A Necessary Doctrine, &c.," set forth by the Bishops of the Church of England in the year 1543; to which Cranmer also himself appealed shortly before his death, as still retaining its force. The following is abridged from the article on Justification:—

"All men since the fall of Adam are born in original sin, and further are born with concupiscence, and are guilty to everlasting death and damnation, from which they can in no wise be delivered by any strength or power that is in them . . . Wherefore God sent His Son to deliver us, and to be the very means of our reconciliation and of our justification. . . . Albeit God is the principal cause and chief worker of this justification in us, yet so it pleaseth His wisdom, that man, prevented by His grace, shall be also a worker by His free consent and obedience to the same, in the attaining of his own justification, and so continuing, come to the perfect end thereof by such means and ways as God hath ordained. . . . Although Christ offered Himself on the Cross a sufficient redemption for the sins of the world, and hath made Himself an open way for all only by His own merit, and calleth all, yet, for all this, none shall be saved by Him but they that take such ways thereto as He hath taught and appointed; i. e., for them that are of age, and have use of reason before they be christened, God's will is that all such (if they will be saved) shall at hearing give stedfast faith and assent to His word, as St. Paul saith, 'He that cometh to God must *believe*;' and by that faith they must conceive repentance for their sins, with trust to have forgiveness of them by Christ. And joining thereunto a full purpose of amendment of forsaking sin and serving God as long as they live, they must then receive the Sacrament of Baptism. And this is the very plain ordinary way, by which God hath determined that men being of age and coming to Christendom should be justified. For as for infants, it is to be believed that their justification is wrought by the secret operation of the Holy Ghost *in their baptism*. . . . And this justification whereof we have hitherto spoken, may be called the *first* justification. But if it chance us after our baptism to be overthrown of our enemies and cast into mortal sin, then there is no remedy, but for the recovering of our former justification which we have lost, to arise by penance, therein pro-

ceeding with sorrow and much lamentation, with fasting, alms, prayer, and the doing of all that God requires: and so, being thus restored to our justification, we must go forward in our battle aforesaid, in mortifying our concupiscence and in our daily spiritual renovation, in doing good works and abstaining from sin, being armed with faith, hope, and charity; to the intent we may attain our final justification, and so be glorified in the day of judgment with the reward of everlasting life. . . . Wherefore when we have once received our justification in baptism, or be restored thereunto by true penance, we must continually walk after Christ, bearing our Cross, and increasing in His grace by good works; and so doing, proceed, go forward, and increase in our justification, according to the saying of St. John, 'He that is just, let him be more justified.' For as the grace of God and the gifts thereof, i. e. faith, repentance, dread, hope, charity, and the like, do increase in us, so do we wax and increase in our justification. . . . And therefore it is plain that *not only* faith, *as it is a distinct virtue or gift by itself*, is required to our justification, but also the other gifts of the grace of God, with a desire to do good works proceeding of the same grace. And whereas in certain places of scripture our justification is ascribed to faith, without any further addition or mention of any other virtue or gift of God, it is to be understood of faith in the second sense" (as explained in a former part), "wherein the fear of God, repentance, hope and charity, are included and comprised; all which must be joined together in our justification. So that no faith is sufficient to our justification or salvation, but such a faith as *worketh* by charity, as is plainly expressed by St. Paul in his epistle to the Galatians: and that also our good works that we do, being once justified, by faith and charity, avail *both* to the conservation and refection of the said virtues in us, and *also* to the increase and end of our justification and everlasting salvation. . . . And although we can never be justified without these gifts of the Holy Ghost, faith, repentance, hope, charity, with desire and study to bring forth good works, yet nevertheless we are justified gratis, inasmuch as all gifts or works, whereby our justification is wrought or accomplished, come of the free mercy and grace of God, and not of our desert: so that our pride and glory in ourselves, and our own worthiness, is utterly excluded. For we are not able of ourselves, as of ourselves, so much as to think any good thing; but our ability and sufficiency is of God."—P. 363. ed. 1825.

VI. Nor is the above doctrine at all at variance with the letter of the xxxix Articles, whatever spirit they may be asserted by some to breathe. In them we find the following doctrine:—

All men are born in original sin, which deserves God's wrath and damnation: (Art. ix.) Have no power of *themselves* to please God, nor to prepare themselves to faith or calling on God. (Art. x.) The name of Jesus Christ is the only name given, whereby men must be saved. (Art. xviii.) In the Old and

NOTE New Testament alike everlasting life is offered to mankind in Christ, who
 I. — is the only Mediator; and the old Fathers looked forward by faith to the same salvation. (Art. vii.) They that be called of God, and through grace obey the calling, are justified freely, (Art. xvii.) and accounted righteous before God only for the merit of Jesus Christ, by faith, and not for their own works or deservings (whether of natural or legal justice); and so they are justified by faith only: (Art. xi.) and that in Baptism; (as is taught by the Homily on Justification referred to by the same Article, which uses indifferently the terms “baptized or justified.”) And to such as thus “believe and are baptized,” and are “regenerate,” or “Baptizati,” there is no condemnation. (Art. ix.) They are conformed to the image of Jesus Christ; they walk religiously in good works. (Art. xvii.) Their good works please God. (Art. xii.) They may fall however after Baptism even into deadly sin; and yet be pardoned: they may after they have received the Holy Ghost depart from grace given, and fall into sin; and by the grace of God arise again and amend their lives, and be forgiven both by God and by the Church, through Penitence: (Art. xvi.) And so, at length, by God’s mercy again walking religiously in good works they attain to everlasting felicity. Art. xvii.

VII. The Scottish Catechism of the Diocese of Brechin:—

“A. We all inherit from our first parents a nature corrupt and mortal, tainted with sin, and prone to evil, and therefore under condemnation. Q. Could man do any thing to recover himself from this state? A. ‘The condition of man after the fall of Adam is such, that he cannot turn or prepare himself by his own natural strength and good works, to faith and calling upon God.’ (quoting from the tenth of the xxxix Articles.) Q. Did God leave man in this miserable state? A. No; He provided a Redeemer for us. Q. Who is that Redeemer? A. The Lord Jesus Christ, the eternal Son of God. Q. What has He done for our recovery from sin and death? A. He took upon Him our nature, and by His meritorious righteousness and sufferings, obtained for us the pardon of our sins, the gift of the Holy Spirit, and eternal Life. Q. Are these blessings freely offered to all? A. Yes; in the Gospel they are freely offered to all, who truly repent *and believe* in our blessed Saviour. Q. What is this plan of redemption called? A. The Gospel, or covenant of Grace. Q. When did this covenant commence? A. It commenced immediately after the fall; it was prefigured under the Patriarchal and Jewish dispensations; and in the fulness of time it was completely unfolded under the Gospel. Q. How are we admitted into the covenant of Grace? A. *By the Sacrament of Baptism*, which Christ ordained for that purpose: and therefore, the Church begins her Catechism with an explanation of the privileges and obligations of Baptism. Q. What were you made in your Baptism? A. ‘I was made a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven;’ . . . Q. Is Baptism alone sufficient for Salvation? A. ‘It is certain by God’s

word that children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved.' Q. But are not adults required to improve the grace of Baptism to the renewal of their nature? A. Yes. . . . Q. Can Christian Faith and practice be separated? A. No."—pp. 6. 11. 100.

In another similar Catechism composed by Bishop Jolly, for the use of the Scottish Church, and republished in the year 1837 in the Diocese of Aberdeen, we read as follows: Q. "What does the Christian religion in general require of us? A. It requires of us these things; first, that we should *believe* what God has revealed; secondly, that we should *perform* what He has commanded."—P. 13.

N O T E
I.

NOTE II.

Q. How is Divine Revelation spread among men, and preserved in the true Church? A. By two Channels; holy Tradition, and holy Scripture.—*Orthodox Catechism*, p. 6.

I. This is indeed either virtually or avowedly the doctrine of all Christian Sects, no less than of the Apostolical Church, however some of them may seem to reject the word Tradition, and all other human authority beside their own. For if any teacher ceased to teach, or any member, of whatever sect, ceased to profess the tradition of his sect, he would no longer even be called by its name.

With respect to the British Churches we have seen already that in their Baptismal Offices they teach first orally, not the necessity of reading Scripture, but the necessity of believing their own definite tradition; requiring from the person to be baptized the profession of the Creed or Symbol of Faith; "Dost thou believe in God the Father, &c?" and then, "Wilt thou be baptized in this Faith?" and teaching in their own name (by tradition) in the Catechism that Christians are bound to continue in that faith which they promised to believe at their Baptism, if they would remain in the state of Salvation; "Dost thou not think that thou art bound to believe as they have promised for thee? &c."

And again, in the 'Creed of St. Athanasius,' which is sung in all the British Churches, they declare thus that it is necessary to keep whole and undefiled the traditionary faith of the Catholic Church; "Whosoever would be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic Faith: which faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly, &c."

And after Baptism and Confirmation the members of the British

NOTE II. Churches hear the Scriptures read in the Mattins and Vespers and Liturgy of the Church, and are bidden to join in the repetition of the Psalter, but they are nowhere required by the Church even to learn to read, or to possess the holy Scriptures, themselves. It is only when any come to be ordained Priests or Bishops, that they are required to study the holy Scripture, and to promise to teach the previously-received and traditionary Faith of the Church which ordains them, agreeably to the same.

With regard to holy Scripture, the British Churches declare in the xxxix Articles, That the Church is the witness and keeper of it; and that she also has authority in all controversies of faith: that nevertheless she holds herself bound to teach and require nothing to be believed, as of necessity to salvation, which she does not either plainly read, or fairly infer and prove from the sacred books. Art. xx, xxi. vi.

The following citations will shew what importance the British Churches assign to holy Tradition:—

II. From the books entitled “The Institution,” and “A Necessary Doctrine, &c.,” agreed on by the Bishops in England, A.D. 1537 and 1543:—

“All those things which were taught by the Apostles, and have been by a whole universal consent of the Church of Christ ever since that time taught continually, and taken always for true, ought to be received, accepted, and kept as a perfect doctrine Apostolic.” And in the same books it is declared, that all Christians must take the articles of the Creed, “and interpret all the same things, according to the self-same sentence and interpretation, which the words of Scripture do signify, and the holy approved doctors of the Church do agreeably entreat and defend.”—P. 222. ed. 1825.

III. From a Canon made by a Synod in England, A.D. 1571:—

“Let Preachers above all things be careful that they never teach aught in a sermon to be religiously held and believed by the people, except that which is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testaments, and which has been collected from the same doctrine by the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops.”

IV. From a work of Archbishop Bramhall, entitled “Schism Guarded:”—

“We do not only admit oral traditions in general, as an excellent introduction to the doctrine of saving truth, and a singular help to expound the holy Scriptures, but also particular unwritten traditions, derived from the Apostles, and delivered unto us by the manifest testimony of the primitive Church, being agreeable to the holy Scriptures. The Apostles did speak by inspiration, as well as write; and their tradition, whether by word or writing, indifferently, was the Word of God, into which Faith was

resolved. . . . St. Augustine setteth us down a certain rule, how to know a true genuine Apostolical tradition: 'Whatsoever,' saith he, 'the universal Church doth hold, which has not been instituted by Councils, but always received, is most rightly believed to have been delivered by Apostolical authority.'"—Oxford ed. p. 382.

NOTE
II.

And again, in his Answer to M. De La Militiere, written in the name of the Anglican Church by command of King Charles II.:—

"We receive not your upstart supposititious traditions, nor unwritten fundamentals: but we admit genuine, universal, Apostolical traditions; as, the Apostles' Creed, the perpetual Virginity of the Mother of God, the anniversary Festivals of the Church, the Lenten Fast. . . . We believe Episcopacy to an ingenuous person may be proved out of Scripture without Tradition; but to such as are froward, the perpetual practice and tradition of the Church renders the interpretation of the text more authentic, and the proof more convincing."—Oxford ed. p. 53.

V. Bp. Gunning On the Lent Fast, a book published by the King's express command:—

"St. Augustine is cited to say, 'Non invenimus in litteris Novi Testamenti evidenter præceptum,' of this or any other certain days of necessary fasting; and hereupon, as St. Basil of another matter spake, 'they clamour, and call for demonstrations from written testimonies, and send away with disgrace, as nothing worth, the unwritten witness of the Fathers.' And again; 'But they cease not up and down clamouring, that this is not witnessed in any written word of God.' Yet . . . St. Augustine would never have allowed them so to abuse his words; as shall now appear. This holy Father thus writeth, speaking of a certain custom of the Church; 'Which custom I believe to have come from tradition of the Apostles; as *many things, which are not found in their writings*, nor in the Councils of following times, and yet, because they are observed through the Church universal, are believed to have been by them delivered and commended:' for, 'that custom, which even then men looking back upward did not observe to have been instituted by any following ages, is most rightly believed to have been a tradition delivered by the Apostles.' And in another place; 'Those things which we keep, being not written but handed down by tradition, such at least as are observed throughout the whole world, we must understand to be retained as commanded and appointed either from the Apostles themselves, or from plenary' (i. e. Œcumenical) 'Councils, whose authority in the Church is most wholesome; as for example, that the passion of the Lord, and His resurrection, and ascension, are celebrated by anniversary solemnities.' Again, to learn that St. Augustine thought some things may be 'non evidenter præcepta ab Apostolis,' (i. e. not evidently commanded by the Apostles,) nor yet in their writings at all commanded, and yet really com-

NOTE
II.

manded by the Apostles, and rightly so believed, see his words; ‘Apostoli &c.’ ‘The Apostles indeed *commanded nothing in this matter*; but that custom is to be believed to have taken its beginning from their tradition: as there are many things, which the universal Church observes, and which for this cause are rightly believed *to have been commanded* by the Apostles, although they be not found written.’ Here you see ‘commanded by them,’ and ‘not commanded by them,’ in several senses: therefore his expression elsewhere, ‘non evidentè præceptum,’ is by himself reconciled here to himself in the many other testimonies above produced. Upon these grounds therefore St. Augustine elsewhere pronounces, that ‘to dispute against that which the universal Church observes *insolentissimæ est insaniæ*.’ St. Basil perfectly agrees hereto: ‘But this also is Apostolical; *Hold fast the traditions which ye have received, whether by word or by Epistle*: of which latter this present is one; which they who from the beginning did constitute or appoint it, delivered to those that followed after, and so, as the usage proceeded on ever with time, rooted it firmly by long custom in the Churches.’ The same Father tells us of certain things received in the Church ‘by a silent and mystical or secret tradition;’ and gives us instances, ‘*And the rest of the ceremonies at Baptism, the renunciation of Satan and his angels? from what Scripture are they taken?*’ Add to these Leo the Great, of near time to St. Augustine, ‘It is not to be doubted, O most beloved, but that each Christian observance’ (i.e. of the Christian Church generally) ‘hath been taught of God; and whatever hath been received by the Church into the practice of her devotion, doth derive itself from tradition Apostolical, and from the teaching of the Holy Spirit.’ And lastly, Fulgentius Ferrandus, the Deacon, of the next age: ‘Let every one, who glorieth that he belongs unto the Church, live by the laws of the Church, especially those, which antiquity hath confirmed. Whence also custom without a law, which yet the tradition of the holy Church’ (i.e. universal) ‘hath delivered to be observed by posterity for ever, seems to have a claim to be observed with the same reverence, and in no way to be set aside, when it is not contrary to the true faith.’ It were easy to add numerous testimonies from St. Jerome, Epiphanius, Tertullian, Chrysostom, and others; but these are sufficient. Only be it here well noted, that neither St. Augustine, St. Basil, Leo, Ferrandus, or others, here do speak of matters of faith, or of essential moral duties, or of the essence of Sacraments; all which we are taught indeed by the consent of these same Fathers to be contained expressly in the holy Scriptures; and so their testimonies in that behalf are reconcileable with these; but of ritual observances; which being visible, and as it were legible, in the universal Church’s constant practice, needed not to be set down in her written rule, or those which are therein set down, not necessarily so evidently, but that they might need the interpretation of such the Church’s practice.”—Oxford ed. p. 100.

VI. From a Treatise On the Church by a living writer, the Rev. W. Palmer, of Worcester College Oxford:—

“In England the supremacy and sufficiency of Scripture was most rightly maintained, not against a Catholic tradition teaching the *same doctrines as Scripture itself*, and therefore strictly confirmatory of Scripture, but against a Tradition imagined to convey *articles of faith, in addition* to those which Scripture contains. The title of Dr. Smyth’s book ‘*De Veritatibus non scriptis*’ sufficiently shews the principle of the Papal party. The Roman Controversialists founded some of their *Articles of Faith* on unwritten tradition *merely*. Against them it was maintained, that for every *Article of Faith* there ought to be scriptural proof; but it was never supposed that particular Churches were at liberty to affix whatever meaning they pleased to Scripture, contrary to the doctrine of the Catholic Church in all ages: still less was it imagined that private individuals might lawfully hold whatever doctrines they should themselves devise, without paying reverence to the authority of that branch of the Church in which they should abide, and entire obedience to that of the Church universal in all ages.”—Vol. i. p. 377.

VII. From the Catechism of the Diocese of Brechin in Scotland:—

“Q. What should be the object of most anxious inquiry to every Christian? A. To discover what he must *believe*, and *do*, in order *to obtain everlasting life*. Q. Whence is this knowledge to be learned? A. From the revealed will of God.” And elsewhere, (p. 23.) it is said, that for the preservation of the knowledge and worship of the true God, and for the dispensation of His holy word and Sacraments, for the salvation of mankind, Christ has constituted the Church; which is universal, or Catholic, in doctrine as well as in space and time, (p. 60.) receiving and teaching all truth; and Apostolic, in that it has continued from the beginning of Christianity, and will continue to the end of the world, to hold and teach ‘the faith which was once delivered to the Saints,’ the pure and uncorrupted doctrine which it has received from the Apostles, and duly to administer the Sacraments. Again (p. 98.) it is said, that the Church has been instituted by Christ to the end, that She “should minister to the salvation of man through the whole of this his state of trial.” After which the following: “Q. What is the first step which the Church takes to promote our Salvation? A. In holy Baptism she brings us (i. e. us, who were baptized in our infancy, which implies the previous preaching to and conversion of adults,) to Christ; that being united to Him we may be delivered from sin and condemnation, and receive the Holy Spirit to be the principle of a new and heavenly life. Q. (p. 90.) Has the Church made provision for the instruction of her members in the Faith? A. She teaches us in the Creeds the (same) truths (as are also) revealed in Scripture. Q. (p. 12.) What (after renunciation) did your Sponsors promise for you at your Baptism? A. That I should believe all the

NOTE
II.

Articles of the Christian Faith. *Q.* (p. 15.) Rehearse the Articles of the Christian Faith. *A.* ‘I believe in one God &c.’ *Q.* (p. 13.) Why is it called the Apostles’ Creed? *A.* Because it is a short account of those things which the Apostles preached, and which all Christians ought to believe. *Q.* (p. 49.) What care does the Church take of her members in their youth? *A.* In the Catechism she provides for their instruction in all those things, which a Christian ought to know and believe to his soul’s health.” And, at p. 100. it is said, that besides “teaching us how we are to live” the Church also “takes care of our being instructed in what we are to believe;” and that not only, as we have seen above, at the very commencement of our Christianity in baptism, by teaching us the Creed, but also afterwards by “instructing us in the true interpretation of Scripture,” (i. e. as many of us as may have learned to read, and possess the volume of the Scriptures; or at least, after we are old enough to reflect on what we hear read in the Church.) And, at p. 89. “*Q.* Whence arises that endless variety of opinion, as to what the Bible teaches us to believe and do? *A.* From men’s forsaking the means which God hath appointed for their guidance, and following their own private fancies and devices. *Q.* What guide hath God appointed for us in the interpretation of His Word? *A.* The Church; which is ‘the Pillar and ground of the Truth,’ a witness and keeper of Holy Writ, instituted by Christ to be the means of preserving and conveying the Truth through the several ages to come. *Q.* How should this influence our conduct? *A.* It should lead us humbly to listen to the teaching of the Church.”—P. 89, &c.

VIII. From a Pastoral Letter addressed in the year 1839, by the Synod of the Scottish Bishops to the Clergy and Laity of their Church:—

“We are specially guided to the truth as it is in Jesus, and guarded against the errors opposed to it, by the well matured system which gives to the uninterrupted succession of Catholic Tradition the regulated authority and just influence which belong to it. The external evidence of the authority and authenticity of Scripture is traditional; and it is in the history and in the uniform practice of the Christian Church that we ascertain, with certainty, matters of very considerable importance not expressly decided in Scripture, and which therefore, without the Tradition of the Church, would be doubtful, and liable to dispute. . . . The Church of England (as well as our own) has ever maintained the authority of Scripture in the clearest terms; but she requires us to take along with us, in reading and interpreting Scripture, all the necessary aids, by which we may best attain its import. In this view she has ever regarded not the spurious and fallacious traditions of the Church of Rome, but the pure and primitive Tradition of the Catholic Church.”—P. 14.

IX. Dr. Hammond, Chaplain to King Charles I, as cited by Dr. Thomas Brett, writes on the same subject as follows:—

“Although Scripture is the most certain and safe rule of belief, yet there being no less veracity in the *tongues* than in the *hands*, in the *preachings* than the *writings* of the Apostles; nay, *prior sermo quam liber, prior sensus quam stilus*, saith Tertullian, (the Apostles *preached* before they *writ*, *planted Churches*, before they addressed *Epistls* to them,) on these grounds I make no scruple to grant that *Apostolical traditions*, such as are truly so, as well as *Apostolical writings*, are *equally the matter of that Christian's belief*, who is equally secured by the *fidelity* of the *conveyance*, that as the one is *Apostolical writing*, so is the other *Apostolical tradition*. Next then, the inquiry must proceed by examining what is the equal way of conveyance, common to both these, upon the strength of which we become obliged to receive such or such a tradition for Apostolical. And this again is acknowledged to be *not* by any Divine testimony; for God hath nowhere affirmed in Divine Writ, that the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans, consisting of so many periods as now it is in our Bibles, was ever written by that Apostle, nor are there any inward characters or signatures, or beams of light in the writing itself, that can be admitted, or pretended as testimonies of this, any more than the like may exact to be admitted as witnesses, that the Creed called the Apostles' was indeed in the full sense of it delivered to the Churches. It remains then that herein on both sides we rest content with human testimonies of undoubted authority, or such as there is not any rational motive to distrust, and of which alone the matter is capable. For as in the case of the question concerning the Epistle to the Romans, the only regular way of satisfying it is, first, by devolution, or appeal to the authority of those Fathers and Councils, to whom it was *de facto* sufficiently testified and approved, and so secondly, and by consequence, by appeal to the very original records and proofs of undoubted fidelity; so the way of trial of any tradition pretended to be Apostolical, whether it be such or no, is by devolving it to the same, or the like Fathers and Councils, which having occasion and facility to examine the truth of the matter by the records or testimonies of those Churches to which it was delivered, found it sufficiently testified by them, that it was in truth even as is pretended. Now then comes the upshot of the inquiry, what qualifications there are of a testimony or testifier, without which it or he may not be thus deemed credible, worthy to be believed by a sober Christian; and where these qualifications are to be found; which when we have once resolved, it will also be possible for us to pass some judgment of traditions duly styled Apostolical, which, as such, must be allowed to be the object of our faith. And herein I shall hope also that the resolution will be unquestionable, if it be bounded by those three terms of Vincentius Lirinensis, *universality, antiquity, consent*.”

And again: “Whatsoever *one Church* professeth to have received from the *Apostle* that planted it, is of itself sufficient, without the *confirmation* of all others, to beget and *establish belief* in him, to whom it thus testi-

NOTE
II.

fies: whereupon Tertullian refers the inquirer to that *Apostolic Church*, that is *next* him, be it Corinth, if he *live in Achaia, Philippi, or Thessalonica; Ephesus, if Asia; or if he be in Italy, Rome*. But this is no further to be extended, than while we *suppose*, without *inquiry*, that other *Apostolical Churches* have *received*, and are ready to *testify* the same; which *presumption* or supposal must then cease, when upon *inquiry* we find the *contrary*.”—Works, vol. i. § 3, 4. p. 545.

And the same author, in another place: “Q. But what if the particular Church wherein I was baptized shall fall from its own steadfastness, and by authority, or law, set up that, which if it be not contrary to plain words of Scripture, is yet contrary to the doctrine or practice of the Universal Church of the first and purest times; what will meekness require me to do in that case? A. Meekness will require me to be very wary in passing such judgment on that Church: but if the light be so clear, and the defection so palpably clear and discernible to all, that I cannot but see and acknowledge it, and in case it be true that I am actually convinced that the particular Church wherein I live is departed from the Catholic Apostolic Church; then, it being certain that the greater authority must be preferred before the lesser, and that next to the Scripture, the Catholic Church of the first and purest times, (especially when subsequent ages do also accord with that for many hundreds of years) is the greatest authority; it follows that meekness requires my obedience and submission to the Catholic Apostolic Church, and not to the particular Church, wherein I live: so far, I mean, as that I am to retain that Catholic and Apostolic, and not this novel, corrupt, not-Catholic doctrine. And if, for my doing so, I fall under persecution of the rulers of that particular Church, meekness then requires me patiently to endure it, but in no case to subscribe to or act any thing, which is contrary to this Catholic doctrine. . . . Q. But what if they should excommunicate me? has the doctrine of meekness any salvo for me then, or any thing which it requires of me? A. Yes; meekly to lie under the censure, supposing that I am not excommunicated from the Catholic Apostolic Church of Christ by any such censure, but rather so much the more firmly united to it by this means: &c.”—Practical Catechism, lib. ii. § 1.

X. The Scottish Bishop Rattray of Dunkeld has the following:—

“The (first) Ages were faithful in delivering the original Revelations, without corrupting or misinterpreting them, at least in any thing of importance, either in faith or practice. ‘In the ancient Church alone,’ says St. Clement of Alexandria, (Str. vii, p. 888.) ‘is the most exact knowledge, &c.’ ‘And it is our duty by no manner of means to transgress the Ecclesiastical rule.’ (Ib. p. 887.) ‘He loses the character of being a man of God, and remaining a faithful servant to the Lord, who hath kicked over the Tradition of the Church.’ (Ib. p. 890.) And in such things as were not necessary to be

inserted in those writings in which the Revelations are contained, as being of daily public practice, and so obvious to every one concerned, and which could not be easily altered of a sudden, and that universally, without observation, what is by them (the first ages) delivered as the tradition and practice of the original Deliverers of the Revelation, must necessarily have been so; since it was not possible for them to have been mistaken in matters of this nature, at so near a distance from the fountains of Tradition. Nay, considering that it is only on their testimony that we receive the Writings themselves, *and that these Traditions were fully as well known to them as the Writings, and are equally, at least, attested by them, they must require from us an equal degree of assent.* And lastly, since all the consequences of a proposition must be as true as the proposition itself, therefore all the necessary consequences from the doctrines originally revealed must be as certain as the doctrines themselves; and whatsoever is inconsistent with them must be as certainly false, as they are true. This will again require the use of accurate reasoning in drawing such consequences, and in discovering such inconsistencies.”—*Essay on the Nature of Man*, § iii. p. 117.

NOTE
II.

NOTE III.

Q. How are we to regard the Book of Wisdom and certain other books, which are not enumerated in the canon of the Old Testament? A. Athanasius the Great says, that they have been appointed of the Fathers to be read by proselytes, who are preparing for admission into the Church.—*Orthodox Catechism*, p. 11.

I. In like manner the British Churches teach in the xxxix Articles:—

“The other Books (as Jerome saith) The Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners; but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine.”

And in fact, those books are appointed to be read in the Mattins and Vespers of the daily course in the British Churches, and are so all read through to the people, except the books of the Maccabees, which are omitted for want of time. Nor does the Church hesitate to attribute to these books a certain inferior degree of inspiration, as we see by very many places, in which they are quoted both in her Homilies, and in her

NOTE III. best Authors, often with the addition "the Holy Ghost thus speaketh;" or, "as we read in holy Scripture;" or, "in the Word of God."—See Hom. B. I. x. 1. II. ii. 3. iv. 2. xi. 1, 2.

NOTE IV.

Q. What does the Church use to introduce us to the doctrine of faith? A. The Creed. Q. What may we take as a guide for the doctrine of hope? A. Our Lord's Beatitudes, and the Lord's Prayer. Q. Where may we find the elements of the doctrine of Charity? A. In the Ten Commandments of God's Law.—*Orthodox Catechism*, p. 15.

I. Bishop Nicholson's Exposition of the Catechism of the Church of England:—

After having gone through the Preface or Introduction, the Bishop writes of its general composition and order as follows: "In the body of the Catechism are contained four things, according to the four main duties required of a Christian: 1. Faith; 2. Obedience; 3. Prayer; 4. The receiving of the Sacraments. . . . Which being his main duties, and no man being able to do any duty rightly and certainly without a rule to direct him; that the Christian should not want a rule for his direction in every one of these duties, it pleased the Church to set him a rule, by which he is to try every one of them. 1. The rule for his faith is the Creed: 2. For his obedience the Ten Commandments: 3. For his Prayers, the Lord's Prayer: 4. For the Sacraments, the doctrine here delivered. . . . The intent then of the Catechism is to deliver these rules, and to explain them easily and briefly: that no person pretend ignorance, or have to seek what to believe, or what to do, in the matter of religion." Upon which follows; "Part I. of the Catechism; On the Creed or Rule of Faith:" and so on with the other Parts, through the book.—P. 25. ed. 1844.

II. Scottish Catechisms:—

In the Scottish Catechism by Bishop Innes printed in the diocese of Aberdeen, (p. 46.) we find the same division of the whole duty of a Christian as in the Introduction to the Russian Catechism, and in the Orthodox Confession: "Q. To how many virtues may all our duty be referred? A. To three; viz. Faith, Hope, and Charity." And in another Scottish Catechism, that of the Diocese of Brechin, The Sermon of our Lord upon the Mount, which begins with the Beatitudes, is

joined with the Ten Commandments of God's Law, as the source from whence we may most readily learn "what God's holy will and commandments are." There is not however in any British Catechism the same arrangement of the Beatitudes and the Lord's Prayer under the head of Hope.

NOTE
IV.

NOTE V.

"I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord, the Giver of life, Who proceedeth from the Father."—*Orthodox Catechism*, p. 17.

The Creed commonly used by the British Churches both at Baptism and on other occasions is the Creed of the Church of Aquileia, commonly called in the West the Apostles' Creed. In this the only words relating to the Holy Ghost are these, "I believe in the Holy Ghost." But in the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed, which also is sung or said in all the British Churches during the Liturgy, there are these words, "Which proceedeth from the Father and the Son:" and in the Creed *called* 'the Athanasian,' *as it is now said or sung* in the English and Scottish Churches on many Festivals during Matins, there is the following verse; "The Holy Ghost is of the Father and the Son, neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding." And lastly, in the xxxix Articles, which are subscribed by all the British Clergy, we read; "The Holy Ghost proceeding from the Father and the Son, &c." So that it is plain the doctrine and the Creed of the British Churches differ in this point from the doctrine and the Creed of the Easterns. These two questions however, of the doctrine in itself, and of its interpolation in the Œcumenical Creed, are on no account to be confounded together. The former of the two shall be treated at length below, under Section xvi.; where it shall also be shewn that the mere maintenance of the Latin doctrine and phraseology is no necessary impediment to communion with the Eastern Church. Here the formal question only, of the insertion of the word *Filioque* into the Creed, shall be considered. And with regard to this, there are some signs that the British Churches might possibly be induced to omit the interpolation, if they could do so without seeming to renounce language used by orthodox Latin Fathers, and without endangering any part of the truth.

I. Dean Field, On the Church, writes as follows:—

"This Creed was confirmed in the Council of Ephesus; and all they accursed, that should add any thing unto it; meaning, as it may well be thought, to condemn such addition as might make any alteration, and not such as might serve for a more full and definite explication. But, howsoever, this Nicene Creed thus enlarged in the Council of Constantinople, without any further addition, was confirmed and proposed to the Christian world

NOTE
V.

for a rule of faith in all the general Councils that ever were holden; and was so publicly received in sundry Christian Churches, in their Liturgies. But in time the Bishops of Spain began to add the proceeding from the Son; and the French, not long after, admitted the same addition; but the Romans admitted it not. Whereupon, Charles the Great in his time called a Council at Aquisgranum, in which it was debated, whether the Spaniards, and after them the French, had done well in adding to the Creed the proceeding of the Holy Ghost from the Son; and whether, supposing the point of doctrine to be true, it were fit to sing and recite the Creed in the public service of the Church with this addition, the Church of Rome and some other Churches refusing to admit it. Besides this, some were sent to Leo the Third about this matter: but he would by no means allow of this addition, but persuaded them that had given way unto it, by little and little to put it out, and to sing the Creed without it. The same Leo caused the Creed to be written out in a table of silver, in such sort as it had been delineated in the Councils, placed the same behind the altar of St. Peter, and left it to posterity ‘*amore et cautelâ orthodoxæ fidei*,’ as he professed. Neither was this the private fancy of Leo only: for after his time John the Eighth shewed his dislike of this addition likewise: for writing unto Photius Patriarch of Constantinople he hath these words; (*vide Pithæum*) ‘That we may give you satisfaction touching that addition in the Creed,’ (And from the Son) ‘we let you know, that not only we have no such addition, but also we condemn them as transgressors of the direct word, that were the first authors of this addition.’ And afterwards he addeth: ‘We carefully labour, and endeavour to bring it to pass, that all our bishops may think as we do; but no man can suddenly alter a thing of such consequence: and therefore it seemeth reasonable to us that no man be violently constrained by you to leave out this addition.’—P. 53. ed. 1628.

II. M. Antonio De Dominis, Archbishop of Spalatro, Primate of Croatia and Dalmatia, and afterwards (without any abjuration or conversion) Dean of Windsor in the Church of England, in his treatise *De Republicâ Ecclesiasticâ*, has the following passages:—

“The Greeks therefore, admitting as they do the Proceession of the Spirit from the Father according to the Gospel, and not admitting this proceession from the Son, but yet confessing that the Spirit is the Third Person in the Deity, very God, and of the same substance with the Father and the Son, and that the Spirit Himself is also the Spirit of the Son, are not to be condemned as guilty of any heresy; nor can on this account be justly rejected by the Latins from their Communion: and this, not only if they merely stand to a negative, and refuse to admit this article of the Proceession from the Son, but even though they positively deny it, and assert that the Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Son, but from the Father only. For to deny an article, which is not *de fide*, cannot be heresy. . . . Yet neither

can the Greeks, on the other hand, lawfully or prudently make a schism, or separate from the Latin Church, for this controversy about the Procession. For though they may allege two grounds, 1. that it is heresy to teach that the Holy Ghost proceeds also from the Son; and, 2. that the Latins have interpolated and corrupted the public Creed, and also the Confession of Athanasius; still, neither of these grounds is sufficient to justify them for separating from us. The first is not, because the asserting any thing to be *de fide* which is not really so, is not heresy of itself, unless that which is asserted be *contrary* to some real article of faith. To make such an assertion is indeed an error, even if the proposition asserted be true, but is not heresy. . . . Let the Latins therefore abound in their own sense; &c. . . . Nor again can their second ground excuse the Greeks; though I cannot see either how we Latins can stand excused from a huge error, and from the disgrace of being interpolaters and falsifiers. First, we do not so much as know, by whom, when, or where, or by what authority, the clause *Filioque* was added to the two Creeds. . . . The Occidental Church might indeed, if she had so pleased, and had judged there was good reason for it, have made a particular Creed or Confession of her own with the *Filioque*, taking the rest of the words either from the Constantinopolitan, or from any other source; as there have been at various times and in various Churches such particular Confessions. But as it is, our writers pretend either some unknown Council, or the supreme authority of the Pope. But even if this were so, we cannot name the Pope, or the Papal decree which did it, any more than the Council. . . . As for the Athanasian Creed, it has neither ever been defined, nor could be defined even by the whole Church, that it should be interpolated, and read with the interpolation *as the Creed of St. Athanasius*. For this is simply an untruth: this is nothing else than to interpolate and corrupt the writings of others; which has never been lawful, nor can be. *By all means, then, if we desire what is just, we ought to restore both Creeds to their original state*, till such time as there may be a legitimate consultation of the Church concerning the addition, as made, or to be made: that so the Greeks may be invited to union, without this preliminary ground of dissension and pretext for refusal lying in the way. For this restoration of the Creed it was, which the Greeks mainly and repeatedly urged in the Synod of Florence. (Sess. 8. 12.) ‘Even though,’ say they, ‘that position, (of the Procession from the Son) should be acknowledged true, we yet contend that it should be written any where else, rather than in the Creed; as is known to have been done (in similar cases) by General Councils. We judge therefore that it should be removed from the Creed itself; that so there may be a union of all Christians, who are now since so long a time for this cause divided.’ *Nor do I see any escape for our side, so that they could avoid this demand.*

“Perhaps they may say that the Council of Florence, which did nothing else but discuss this point in presence of the Greeks as well as Latins, has given us a firm and conclusive definition. But neither can I easily say this. I see

NOTE
V.

that in that Council the Greeks disputed most sharply against the Procession from the Son, and were drawn or forced in a manner against their will into that discussion by our side: as they themselves professed, that they should be satisfied to make peace and union *on this condition alone*, that the Creed should be restored to its original and proper form, and then the Latins, otherwise than in the Creed, might freely write, read, sing, and believe as they liked best touching this point of the Procession from the Son. But the Latins on our side evaded the difficulty about the restoration of the Creed, by forcing on a discussion about the Procession itself. In which wholly scholastical dispute when at length the Greeks wearied out, and hoping to obtain temporal aid for the Eastern Empire against the Turks, did yield to the Latins, they did so only thus far (and that against the constant opposition of the Archbishop of Ephesus), as to *permit* the belief and the assertion that the Holy Spirit proceeds also from the Son, on this ground, that the Latin Fathers asserted it, whom they supposed to have been moved and governed by the same Spirit, as moved and governed their own Greek Fathers, who teach that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father. But that they were themselves convinced either by Scripture, or authority of antiquity, or legitimate tradition, and so yielded and consented to a joint definition of the doctrine, is more than can with truth be asserted.”—Lib. vii. c. 10.

III. Dr. Heylin On the Creed; and Archbishop Laud:—

“Robert Grossthead, the learned and renowned Bishop of Lincoln, as he is cited by Scotus, a famous Schoolman, (Scotus in Sent. l. i. d. 11. qu.) delivereth his opinion touching this great controversy thus: ‘The Grecians,’ saith he, ‘are of opinion, that the Holy Ghost is the Spirit of the Son, but that He proceedeth not from the Son, but from the Father only, yet by the Son; which opinion seemeth to be contrary to ours. But, haply, if two wise and understanding men, the one of the Greek Church, and the other of the Latin, both lovers of the truth, and not of their own expressions, did meet to consider of this seeming contrariety, it would in the end appear that the difference is not real, but verbal only.’ Azorius the great casuist goeth further yet, and upon due examination of the state of the question (Azor. Inst. Moral. l. viii. c. 20.) not only freeth the Greeks from heresy, but from schism also. By consequence the Church of Rome hath run into the greater and more grievous error, in condemning every Manndy Thursday in their Bulla Cœnæ the whole Eastern Churches; which, for ought any of her own more sober children are able to discern upon deliberation, are fully as orthodox as herself in the truth of doctrine, and more agreeable to antiquity in their forms of speech. . . . But, as my Lord of Canterbury (Archbishop Laud) hath right well observed in his learned Answer unto Fisher, ‘It is a hard thing to *add* and to anathematize too.’”
—Ed. 1654. p. 361.

IV. John Pearson, Bishop of Chester, On the Creed :—

NOTE
V.

“After he (Photius) was restored again, in the time of Pope John the Eighth, in the eighth General Council, as the Greeks call it, it was decreed that the addition of Filioque, made in the Creed, should be taken away; as says Marcus Ephesius in the Council of Florence. After this, the same complaint was continued by Michael Cerularius, and Theophylact, in as high a manner as by Photius. . . . Thus did the Oriental Church accuse the Occidental for adding Filioque to the Creed, contrary to a General Council, which had prohibited all additions, and that without the least pretence of the authority of another Council. And so the schism between the Latin and the Greek Church began and was continued, *never to be ended, until those words καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, or Filioque, are taken out of the Creed*: the one relying upon the truth of the doctrine contained in those words, and the authority of the Pope to alter any thing; the other either denying or suspecting the truth of the doctrine, and being very zealous for the authority of the ancient Councils. This therefore is much to be lamented, that the Greeks should not acknowledge the truth, which was acknowledged by their ancestors in the substance of it; and that the Latins should force the Greeks to make an addition to the Creed, without as great an authority as hath prohibited it, and to use that language in the expression of this doctrine, which never was used by any of the Greek Fathers.”—Ed. 1662. p. 358.

V. As all the British Divines above quoted, as well as others who have treated of the same subject, in common with all Eastern writers, attach great weight to the decision of Pope Leo III., and refer more or less at length to his conference with the Legates of the Council held at Aquisgranum, it may not be amiss to subjoin here some account both of the occasion which led to the controversy at that time, and of the conference itself; the first taken from Father Le Quien's Dissertations prefixed to his edition of the Works of St. John Damascene, (vol. I. viii.) the latter abridged from the relation of the Abbot Smaragdus, as quoted in the Treatise of Adam Zoernikaff:—

“In the year DCCCIX, certain Frankish monks on Mount Olivet at Jerusalem, having been publicly accused of heresy by a Monk of St. Sabba, named John, because they recited the Creed with the addition of the word ‘Filioque,’ and having defended themselves at the time by alleging that they followed the faith of the Roman Church, wrote a long and lamentable Letter of complaint to Pope Leo III.; in which Letter, besides quoting other authorities, they mentioned that they had heard the Creed sung in the Chapel of the Emperor Charles the Great with that addition, and besought the Pope to communicate with the Emperor upon the subject, and to send them a distinct answer. Whereupon the Pope wrote to the Emperor Charlemagne, telling him of the complaint which had been made, and adding, that he had received at the same time a letter from Thomas,

NOTE
V.

Patriarch of Jerusalem, and had sent back a declaration of his own faith to serve them all as a rule: and a copy of this his declaration to the Easterns he sent together with his Letter to Charlemagne." (See below, Section xvi.)

Charlemagne, on the receipt of Pope Leo's Letters, caused a Council to be held at Aquisgranum, A.D. DCCCIX.: and delegates were sent in consequence to Rome, to obtain the Pope's consent to the insertion of the clause 'Filioque' into the Constantinopolitan Creed. The following are some passages of the Conference of these delegates with Pope Leo, as related by Smaragdus, Abbot of St. Michael's in Lorraine. (Tom. vii. Conc. col. 1194.)

'*Delegates.* But since, as you say, this is most certainly to be believed, and most firmly held, and in case of necessity most constantly defended, must it not be right to teach it to all who as yet know it not, and on those that know it to impress it still more? *The Pope.* Even so. *D.* If so, suppose any one be ignorant of this, or believe it not, can he be saved? *P.* Whosoever by his more subtle understanding is able to attain unto this, and, being able, refuses to know it, or knowing to believe it, he cannot be saved. For there are many things, and this among others, which are of the deeper mysteries of our holy faith, to the searching out of which many have sufficiency, but many others, being hindered by defect of age or understanding, have not sufficiency. And therefore, as I have said already, he who can and will not, he cannot be saved. *D.* If then it is so, or rather, since it is so, and this is to be believed, and not kept back in silence, why may it not be sung, and be taught by being sung? *P.* It may, I say, it may be sung in teaching, and be taught by being sung: but neither by writing nor by singing may it be unlawfully inserted into that, which it is forbidden us to touch. *D.* Since then we both know that for this reason ye think or declare it unlawful to insert those words as to be sung or written in the Creed, that they who made the same Creed did not put them in like the rest, and the subsequent great Synods (i.e. the Fourth of Chalcedon, and the Fifth and Sixth of Constantinople) forbade that any man under any pretext of necessity or devotion for the salvation of men should make any new Creed, or take away, add, or change any thing from the old, we must not waste time any longer on this point. But this I inquire: this I beg you to declare: since this thing is good to be believed, if they had inserted it, would it in that case have been good to sing too, as now it is good to believe? *P.* Good, assuredly, and very good, as being so great a mystery of faith, as no man may disbelieve, who can attain unto it. *D.* Would not those same makers of the Creed have then done well, if by adding only four syllables they had made clear to all following ages so necessary a mystery of faith? *P.* As I dare not to say that they would not have done well if they had done so, because, without doubt, they would have done with it as with the rest which they either omitted or put in, knowing what they did, and being enlightened not by human but divine wisdom, so neither do I dare to say that they understood this point less

than we: on the contrary, I say that they considered why they left it out, and why, when once left out, they forbade either it or any thing else to be added afterwards. Do thou consider, what ye think of yourselves: for as for me, I say not that I will not set myself up above (those holy Councils), but God forbid that I should either equal myself to them.

D. God forbid, O Father, that we either should think or say any thing of such a kind, either of pride, or through desire to be praised of men in divine things, as if we either preferred or equalled ourselves to them; but it is only from a sense of the quality of these times, and from a charitable compassion for the weakness of our brethren: For if your Fatherhood knew how many thousands now know it, because it is sung, who would else have never known it, perhaps ye would hold with us, and even let it be sung with your own consent.

P. Suppose for the moment that I consented, still, I pray, answer me this: Are all such like mysteries of faith, which are not contained in the Creed, and without which whoever hath sufficiency thereto cannot be a Catholic, are all such, I say, to be put into the Creed, and added at will, for the compendious instruction of the more simple?

D. By no means: for all points are not equally necessary.

P. If not all, yet certainly there are very many of this kind, that they who are capable must believe them, or cease to be Catholics.

D. Will ye mention any one, I will not say higher, but at least such as may be compared with this, which is wanting in the Creed?

P. In truth that I will, and without any difficulty.

D. Mention first one, and if need be, then add a second.

P. Since what we now do, we do by way of friendly contention, and what we seek is for the spiritual good of both sides, (and would that in all such questions, whether lesser or greater, pertaining to the interests of the Church and Catholicism, inquiry were always carried on in this way, with a mind for peace, and without perverseness!) lest we should chance to say any thing rashly concerning such venerable mysteries, ye shall let us have space to consider, and then we will give you whatever the Lord shall have given us on this point.” And the delay of a night having been allowed as sufficient, the Pope said thus: “Is it more to salvation to believe, or more dangerous not to believe, that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son as well as from the Father, than it is to believe that the Son is Divine Wisdom begotten of Divine Wisdom, that He is Divine Truth begotten of Divine Truth, and yet that Both are but One and the same Divine Wisdom, and One and the same Divine Truth, essentially One God? while yet it is certain that this has not been put by the holy Fathers into the aforesaid Creed? If then these two truths which I have alleged are enough to satisfy you, as they should satisfy wise men, and make you agree with us, and acknowledge that all those Catholic Fathers our elders, who either put not your clause into the Creeds, or forbade the putting of it or of any thing else into them, left it not out, nor forbade its insertion, either from ignorance at the time, or from negligence in providing

NOTE
V.

for the future,—if so, I say, I will very gladly omit to heap up further testimonies. Ye must know however, that not only with respect to the Divine essence, but also with respect to the mystery of the Lord's Incarnation, we have by God's help, and from the authority of the same Fathers, so many and so signal points to instance, as are enough not only to satisfy wise men, but also to confound the unwise. . . . *D.* . . . Yet . . . it is one thing by arrogant overstepping to despise what is good, another thing of good will to make what is good better. *P.* That too, though sometimes good to do, yet needs caution, and is not to be done every where; as might be proved by many testimonies: but it is clear of itself, how much better it is, that every one should take care that what is good be also so, as is profitable: or if ever he strive to make that which is good better, let him look first and take great heed, lest by presuming beyond his duty he make even that which was salutary in itself hurtful by corrupting it. Unless, may be, any one will pretend of this present or other similar points, which he may without any danger to himself teach and learn, that the lawful order of teaching is to be left, and they are to be then and so introduced, that never afterwards either the teacher or the learner shall be innocent, but both shall always and deservedly be judged blameable of the crime of transgression. Which, perhaps, if thou dost not disdain to listen to me, touches thee not undeservedly, who art for bringing it to pass that whereas hitherto every one who had wisdom in the Church of God might know this truth for himself and teach it to them that had not wisdom without thought of any fault, now, for the future, I say not only the simple shall be unable to learn it, but even he that hath wisdom shall not be able to sing it without transgression, or teach it, as ye would have done, to any other; and while ye choose to seek to profit many by an unlawful road, ye leave none, in this point at least, whom, if he follow you, ye shall not hurt. For as for what ye said before, that he who should do any such thing of devotion, seeking edification, is not to be taken or judged of in the same way as he, who should presume to make a contumacious order of so doing; this excuse, or rather, if ye will let me say it, this subterfuge, makes not to the point: it is not to your purpose. For the Fathers made no such distinction as this in their decree: nor did they allow the well-intentioned, and forbid only the ill-intentioned to do this; but simply and absolutely forbade, that any should do it. *D.* Hast thou not thyself given the permission to sing that same Creed in the Church? Or is it from us that this custom of singing it hath proceeded? For it is from hence that the custom of singing it came to us; not from us hither: and so we sing it even to this day. *P.* I gave permission to sing it; but not in the singing to add, take away, or change any thing. And to speak somewhat more expressly, since ye compel me, as long as ye were content in this point with what the holy Roman Church holds, as to singing or celebrating in such holy mysteries as these, there was no manner of need that either we should trouble ourselves in such matters,

or force upon others occasion of trouble. But as for what ye say, that ye sing it thus for this cause, that ye heard others in those parts so sing it before yourselves, what is this to us? For we do not sing that Creed at all, but read it only, and use to teach it by reading: and yet we presume not in reading or teaching to add any thing by way of insertion to the same Creed. But whatever truths are understood to be wanting from the said Creeds though all but fit to be there, these we presume not, as I have repeatedly said, to insert into them; but at fit time and place we take care to minister and teach them to those who are capable. *D.* So then, as I see, this is the judgment of your Fatherhood, that first of all these words on which our question turns, be taken out of the Creed, and then afterwards it may freely and lawfully, whether by singing or delivery, be learned and taught of all. *P.* Such doubtless is our judgment: and we by all means urge that ye for your parts adhere to the same.’

NOTE
V.

“The same Pope further set up two silver tablets having the Creed engraved on them in Greek and Latin without the addition in the Church of St. Peter, with a notice in these words, ‘*Hæc Leo posui amore et cautelâ orthodoxæ fidei* :’ that all might know that the Roman Church agreed not to those, who altered this common Confession of the faith by any addition or explanation.”—Tract. Zoernikavii, vol. i. p. 381. ed. 1774.

VI. In accordance with the above judgment of Pope Leo, those British Bishops who treated with the Eastern Patriarchs and with the Russian Synod between the years 1716 and 1725, distinctly offered to restore the Creed to its Canonical form. For in the MS. copy of their Liturgy, which they sent in Greek to the Easterns, and which is still preserved in the Archives of the Russian Synod, there is a marginal note added at the words ‘*καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Ὑιοῦ*’ in the Creed, to this effect:—

“These words *shall be left out*, as soon as ever by the grace of God the union of the Churches shall be declared.”

NOTE VI.

Q. Whence have we this Creed? *A.* From the Fathers of the First and Second Councils. Q. How many Œcumenical Councils have there been? *A.* Seven.—*Orthodox Catechism*, p. 17.

I. Proposals of the British Bishops to the Easterns, A.D. 1716:—

“We agree in the twelve Articles of the Creed, as delivered in the First and Second General Councils, which we take to be sufficient for faith.”

II. With regard to the number of the Œcumenical Councils, there can

NOTE
VI.

be no doubt that the first six have ever been received by the British Churches. Without multiplying quotations, it is enough to give the words of the British Bishops in their Reply to the Easterns:—

“We willingly declare, that we receive the Faith decreed in the Six General Councils.”

But with regard to the Seventh General Council, commonly called the Second of Nice, it seems to have been rejected by a great Council held at Frankfort in the West A.D. 794. And although the Gallican and British Churches, which then agreed in rejecting it, came gradually to acquiesce in its decisions, yet upon the schism between England and the Pope of Rome in the sixteenth century, the British Bishops, and indeed the British Church, seemed to reject it again, and that strongly, and to return to their former mind, pleading against it the decrees of the Council of Frankfort never yet, as they contend, formally abrogated by those Western Churches which concurred in them when they were first made.

Notwithstanding this difference, there may be found signs in the writings of later British Divines, that upon explanations being made, abuses guarded against, and misconceptions removed, there would be no real difference of opinion between the British and the Easterns on this point, nor any real obstacle to the acknowledgment of the Second Nicene Council.

III. Thorndike writes thus of this Second Council of Nice:—

“That the decree of the Council enjoins no idolatry, notwithstanding whatsoever prejudice to the contrary, I must maintain as unquestionable. So far is it from leaving any room for the imagination of any false God-head, that it expressly distinguisheth that honour done to the image of our Lord Christ to be *equivocally* called worship, i. e. to be only so called, but not to signify the esteem of God. He that believes the Holy Trinity, can no way attribute the latter; and therefore, if he puts off his hat, and bows the knee to the image of our Lord, it shall be no idolatry.”—Epilogue, iii. p. 363.

IV. The British Bishops themselves, in their Proposals to the Easterns, seem to concede, that with some explanation, they could bring themselves to receive the Council:—

“We propose therefore, that the ninth article of the Second Council of Nice concerning the worship of Images be so *explained* by the wisdom of the Bishops and Patriarchs of the Oriental Church, as to make it inoffensive.”

Now in point of fact, no Protestant writers can go farther than the Doctors of the Eastern Church, and indeed the Church herself has gone, in explaining the Nicene decree, and in guarding against all superstitious and idolatrous worship of Images. The reader may consult the Russian Catechisms; both those now published in English, and that published at London in the reign of Peter I.: also the Orthodox Doctrine of Platon, published at Edinburgh in 1810; and the Spiritual Regulation, as given

by Consett, A.D. 1729. And the truth is, that when the respect to be paid to sacred pictures or images is so taught and explained, as it is by the Eastern Church, there is no Protestant who must not confess upon reflection, that he himself both allows and pays the very same kind of respect, both inward and outward, to various inanimate representations and substances, for the sake of the associations which belong to them.

NOTE
VI.

V. The following quotation is to the point. It is from a little book entitled *An Apology for the Greek Church, by Edward Masson, one of the Judges in the Supreme Court of Areopagus, and formerly Attorney General for the Morea.* (London, 1844.) The Author is a Scottish Presbyterian, and an admirer of what is called the Free Kirk:—

“The Greek Church expressly declares all *worship*” (λατρεία, or divine worship, the author means) “of pictures to be idolatry. On the principle that the sight of the portrait of a venerated or beloved individual awakens the respectful or affectionate remembrance of the absent or deceased original, she permits in her members a simple expression of respect for the originals at the sight of the portraits of such distinguished fellow Christians, as by their lives and deaths have glorified God. Any thing beyond this she condemns. The decree of the Seventh Council, which authorized the admission of pictures into Churches, distinctly limits the signification of the word προσκύνησις, declaring it to be exactly synonymous with ἀσπασμὸς or φίλημα, salutation, or kiss. It is true, the word προσκύνησις is applied also to God; and hence the necessity of fixing its meaning, as taken in connection with pictures. The same word is in use at the present day in Greece to express various degrees of respect, from the worship of God down to the ordinary salutation of a friend or neighbour.”—P. 31.

And again: “It is a remarkable fact that the decision of the Second Nicene Council was at the time misunderstood by most of the Churches of the West; and by most historians is still entirely misrepresented. The Council of Frankfort and the British Churches condemned what they erroneously supposed to be the import of the Nicene decree; and unconsciously but explicitly sanctioned its real purport. They condemned the *worship* (λατρεία) of images, but deprecated the fury of the Iconoclasts. ‘The Churches of France, Germany, England, and Spain,’ says Gibbon, ‘steered a middle course between the adoration and the destruction of images, which they admitted into their temples, not as objects of worship, but as lively and useful memorials of faith and history.’ Now this ‘middle course’ certainly comprehends all that the Nicene decree was really intended to convey. . . . The declaration of the English (British) bishops to the Synod of Russia (and the Eastern Patriarchs,) that they distinctly rejected the opinion of the Iconoclasts, admitted the use of pictures in Churches, and by no means denied that pictures, like all other things connected with religion, ought to receive a *certain* respect and rever-

NOTE
VI.

ence, would undoubtedly have been regarded by the Second Nicene Council as a full and satisfactory adhesion to what good Archbishop Usher calls the Second Nicene Council's 'base decree:' All misconceptions of the principle adopted in the Second Nicene Council, and held by the Greek Church, have arisen partly from the ambiguity of the terms *προσκύνησις*, *cultus*, *worship*, and partly from various gesticulations in religious worship, peculiar to the East, and emanating from the lively imagination of Orientals, and not unconnected with the humiliating (that is, Christianizing) political despotism to which the Eastern nations have always been subjected. *Προσκύνησις*, *cultus*, *worship*, all express a *certain respect*, the degree being fixed by the circumstances of the case or the context. *Προσκύνησις*, when used by the Greek Church in reference to Saints or their pictures, is exactly equivalent to the now antiquated meaning of the word *worship*, 'Your Worship,' . . . 'The right Worshipful,' &c. To assert that the Greek Church actually sanctions picture-worship, is in fact as absurd, as it would be to accuse the Church of England of enjoining *wife-worship*, because every Anglican, when married, solemnly promises to '*worship*' his wife. In the *Όρος* or decree of the Second Nicene Council the meaning of *προσκύνειν* is fixed by *ἀσπάζεσθαι*; and in the Epistle which the Council addressed to the Empress Irene and her son, both these words are declared to be exactly synonymous with *φιλεῖν*, in reference to the ordinary expression of mutual regard, 'the salutation with a holy kiss,' of the ancient Christians. The same Epistle points out many passages of the Septuagint, in which *προσκυνέω* signifies to make a bow, to do reverence. Abraham bowed to the children of Heth; Jacob and his family bowed to Esau; David to Jonathan; &c. &c." (In the Latin the word is '*adorare*;' as also in the passage '*And all the people worshipped God and the King.*') "The word *προσκυνέω* occurs in the Second Commandment, but coupled with *λατρεύω*, which fixes its meaning. To use *προσκυνέω* coupled with *λατρεύω* in reference to the pictures of Saints, would be regarded by the Greek Church as revolting blasphemy. To imprint a kiss on the memorial of a beloved object may be a harmless expression of natural feeling. The Turk, who abominates the admission of pictures into places of worship, never takes a Firman of the Sultan into his hand, without putting it to his lips, and then on his brow. Xenophon's representing Panthea as kissing the departing chariot of her gallant husband, appears natural and touching. Prostrations in worship are used by Orientals in general, by Turks, by Armenians, as well as by Greeks, whether in the presence of pictures or not."—Ib. p. 83.

See also Section XLII., and Sections XIX., and XLI., on this same subject, of the reception of the decrees of the Seventh General Council.

NOTE VII.

Q. Has each one of us his Guardian Angels? A. Without doubt. (Matt. xviii. 10.)—*Orthodox Catechism*, p. 24.

I. So also the Scottish Catechism of Bishop Jolly printed at Aberdeen in the year 1837 teaches, referring to the same text:—

“We are assured of the ministering aid of those Angels, who behold the face of our Father who is in heaven.”—P. 54.

II. And in the Offices of the British Church, for the Day of St. Michael and all Angels, there is the following Collect:—

“Almighty God, who hast ordained and constituted the services of Angels and men in a wonderful order; mercifully grant, that as Thy holy Angels always do Thee service in heaven, so by Thy appointment they may succour and defend us on earth; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.” . . . And the Gospel which is read on that day in the Liturgy is taken from St. Matthew, ch. xviii. 1; and ends with those words referred to in the Russian and Scottish Catechisms; “*For I say unto you that their Angels do always behold the face of My Father which is in heaven.*” . . . And in the Matins for the same day a Lesson is read, (from Acts 12, to v. 20.) in which, after the account of the delivery of Peter from prison by an Angel, it is related, that they who were gathered together praying in the house of Mary the mother of John, upon hearing that Peter stood before the gate, believed not that it was so, but said “It is his Angel.”

III. Richard Montague, Bishop of Norwich, in his Treatise on the Invocation of Saints, as quoted by Forbes the First Bishop of Edinburgh, has the following passage:—

“It is an opinion received, and hath been long, that if not every man, each son of Adam, yet sure each Christian man regenerate by water and the Holy Ghost, at least from the day of his regeneration and new birth unto God, if not from the time of his coming into the world, hath by God’s appointment and assignation an Angel Guardian to attend upon him at all assayes, in all his ways, at his going forth, at his coming home . . . ‘Parum est fecisse Angelos tuos, fecisti et Custodes parvulorum,’ who continually behold the face of their Father in Heaven . . . This being supposed to be so, . . . I see no absurdity in nature, no incongruity unto analogy of faith, no repugnancy at all to Sacred Scripture, much less impiety, for any man to say, ‘Sancte Angele Custos, ora pro me.’”—Consid. Modest. p. 327.

NOTE
VIII.

NOTE VIII.

Q. Why was Eve made from a rib of Adam? A. To the end that all mankind might be by origin naturally disposed to love and defend one another.—*Orthodox Catechism*, p. 26.

I. Besides this reason, another and a higher is signified by the Apostles and by the Fathers in those passages of their writings, in which they notice the analogy which was designed between the two Creations of Nature and of Grace, and the subordination of the first to the second. This higher reason is, that the formation of the first woman Eve, the mother of all living, from the first man Adam, and their union in matrimony, might be a type as well as an instrumental preparation for the creation of the Spiritual Eve from the side of the Second Adam, and her mystical union or marriage with that Husband, who is the Uncreated Image of the Father. So in the English Office for Matrimony we find the following words:—

“O God, who by Thy mighty power hast made all things of nothing; who also (after other things set in order) didst appoint that out of man (*created after Thine own image and similitude*) woman should take her beginning; . . . O God, who hast consecrated the state of Matrimony to such an excellent Mystery, that in it is signified and represented the Spiritual Marriage and Unity betwixt Christ and His Church, &c.”

NOTE IX.

Q. How does the Church speak of Predestination? A. Thus: ‘As He foresaw that some would use well their free will, but others ill, He accordingly predestined the former to glory, while the latter He condemned.’ . . . Q. In what sense is it said, that the Son of God came down from heaven ‘for us men?’ A. In this, that He came ‘for us men’ universally.—*Orthodox Catechism*, p. 27. 30.

I. George Bull, Bishop of St. Asaph, in his “*Examen Censuræ, &c.*”—

“Let us listen to the learned Bishop Overall: ‘Concerning the death of Christ,’ he says, ‘so plain and consistent is the opinion of our Church that our Lord Jesus Christ died for all men whatsoever, or for all the sins of all men, that it is wonderful how any have dared to controvert this point.’ In Art. vii. (of the xxxix.) ‘Both in the Old and New Testament everlasting

life is offered to *mankind* by Christ.' In Art. xv. 'Christ came to be the Lamb, who should take away the sins of *the world*.' In Art. xxxi. 'The offering of Christ is that perfect propitiation for *all the sins of the whole world*, both original and actual.' The same is taught in the common Catechism, as the plainest meaning of the Second Article of the Creed, in which every one is to believe in God the Son, 'who redeemed him *and all mankind*.' So in the Nicene Creed, 'Who for *us men*, and for our salvation, &c.' And in many places of our Liturgy; as in the Consecration of the Eucharist, . . . 'God, who didst give Thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption; who made there by His one oblation . . . a full perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of *the whole world*,' &c."—Ed. 1843. p. 331.

NOTE
IX.

And again: "Granting these two positions, 1. that Christ has truly redeemed even those who perish; and, 2. that it is possible for those who really believe in Christ and have been justified by Him, thoroughly to fall away from faith and justification, and to perish everlastingly; and these are plain and undoubted doctrines of our Church; the whole system and machinery of what is called Calvinism falls to the ground. . . . It is of no use to refer here to the Article on Predestination; nor shall I enter into any controversy with any one on any predestination of God so maintained, as not to overturn these two fundamental points clearly laid down by our Church. I contend for this one thing only; that on account of the uncertain and various ideas and speculations of God's secret predestination, we must not deny such clear and established doctrines both of Scripture and of our own, and of the Catholic Church, as these are; but rather believe that these secret things are so to be explained by what is revealed and plain to us, that the one may be consistent with the other. Our Church in her Seventeenth Article has so cautiously given the doctrine of Predestination, that no Catholic can have any cause for rejecting the Article. But even after she has so prudently and cautiously explained this doctrine, she altogether draws away her sons from any speculation respecting it, and disallows that our life is to be directed by any conception concerning Predestination, as by a rule. On the contrary, she teaches, 'that God's promises must be received in such wise, as they be generally set forth to us in holy Scripture; and in our doings that will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared to us in the Word of God.' (Art. xvii.) In truth, for the first four centuries no Catholic ever dreamed about that Predestination, which many at this day consider the basis and foundation of the whole Christian religion. . . . Touching the providence of God, they were satisfied in believing, that God *knows beforehand all the actions of all men*, and that He also rules and disposes the same as seemeth best to His wisdom, justice, and goodness, saving always that liberty which He has given to man ever continuing unenroached upon. Whether from those more minute definitions of the predestination of God, which were made in

NOTE
IX.

the heated controversy of St. Augustine with Pelagius, any gain accrued to Catholic truth, Christian piety, and the peace of the Church, or whether we have not rather thence to lament over schism, and very grievous errors, (as those of the Predestinarians), and a falling off in the morals of men, let those well taught in the history of the Church decide."

And he quotes thereupon the following passage from St. Prosper: "Ancient opinions on this matter being reviewed, nearly all were found to agree upon the way in which they should understand the purpose and predestination of God *according to His foreknowledge*; namely, that God had made some vessels to honour, some to dishonour, for this reason, *because He foresaw the end of each, and foreknew what would be his will and actions* under the help of His grace."—Ib. p. 341.

II. The difference between the (Presbyterian, or Calvinistic) Kirk and the (true) Church of Scotland exemplified, by the Rev. Robert Calder:—

"The Presbyterians are great perverters of the holy Scriptures, which may be proved by many instances. . . . They make no scruple of charging God with their own sins, by their Turkish doctrine of Predestination. . . . We, on the other hand, do adhere to the holy Scriptures in their own genuine sense. As for Predestination, we hold that there being neither first nor second as to time in God, who seeth what is past, present, and to come with one view, therefore there is no such thing as Predestination *strictly taken*; and that the words in holy writ, from which they infer the Calvinistic Predestination, are only *ad captum nostrum*; just as God is said to have *eyes, ears*, or to *repent*. We hold that men may fall from grace *finally*; and that sin does always *pollute* the sinner; and that nothing less than the blood of Christ can wash it off. Also we hold that faith to be *naught*, which does not produce good *works*: and that faith is a giving credit to God's revealed will, as it is a body of divine laws, fitly adapted to the promoting of God's honour and glory by us, and our own salvation."—P. 19. Reprint of 1841, from the ed. of 1712.

III. The difference stated between the Presbyterian Establishment and the Episcopal Church of Scotland by the Rev. James Milne, Priest of St. Andrew's Chapel, Banff:—

"The Presbyterian Establishment professes Calvinism, and teaches, that 'none are redeemed by Jesus Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified, and saved, but the elect only; that the Holy Spirit, in drawing the elect out of a state of sin and death, exerts His influences on subjects altogether passive, and by His Almighty power determines them to what is good; that the elect can neither totally nor finally fall away from a state of grace; &c.' On the other hand, the Church teaches, that 'God has predestinated to life all who perform the conditions of the Gospel Covenant; &c.' The system of the Presbyterian (or Calvinistic) Establishment is built

on the doctrine of absolute irrespective Predestination ; whereas, the system of the Church is built on the doctrine of universal Redemption, and *conditional* salvation.”—Ed. of 1811. p. 41, 44. NOTE
IX.

IV. Ford, on the xxxix Articles, A.D. 1720 :—

“And besides that, as we thus see, our Church is quite averse from the doctrine of absolute Predestination, we know well that all antiquity is contrary to this opinion : there being none to be found of all the old Fathers, who wrote before Augustine, who has ever any where interpreted God’s decrees of the salvation and condemnation of man in any other sense than this, that God has decreed everlasting rewards or punishments for each according as He had foreseen that their lives would be holy or wicked ; and had also foreseen the cause : teaching distinctly, that the cause that any miss eternal happiness and fall into the torment of hell is not in God, but in the men themselves : nor did Augustine himself differ from the rest in this, at least before he had waxed warm in the Pelagian Controversy. ‘Nemo eligitur, nisi jam distans ab illo qui rejicitur. Unde quod dictum est, quia elegit nos Deus ante mundi constitutionem, non video quomodo sit dictum, nisi *præscientiâ* scilicet *meritorum*, i. e. fidei, et operum pietatis.’” (Aug. ad Simp. ix. 2.)—P. 143.

V. A Friendly Address on Baptismal Regeneration, by Alexander Jolly, late Bishop of Moray in Scotland, A.D. 1826 :—

“Redemption, then, is *universal*, the accomplishment of an *absolute* promise. But *salvation* is *conditional*, to be enjoyed upon terms ; and by failing to comply with them, we may come short of it. Our Lord, of His boundless love, would have all men to be saved ; but although He made and redeemed us without ourselves, He will not save us without ourselves. Having made perfect our redemption by His death, He became the Author of eternal salvation to all them that obey Him. ‘Blessed, then, are they that do His commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life.’”—P. 8. ed. 1841.

VI. The Scottish Catechism of Aberdeen, A.D. 1829 :—

“Q. Did Jesus Christ die for all mankind, or only for a few? A. He died for all mankind. Q. But are there not some conditions required on man’s part, in order to his being saved by the death of Christ? A. Yes ; there are several conditions, &c.”—P. 7.

And the Catechism of the Diocese of Brechin :—

“A. The Lord Jesus Christ, the eternal Son of God, for our recovery from sin and death, took upon Him our nature, and by His meritorious righteousness and sufferings obtained for us the pardon of our sins, the gift of the Holy Spirit, and eternal life. Q. Are these blessings freely offered to all? A. Yes ; in the Gospel they are freely offered to all, who truly repent and believe in our blessed Saviour.”—P. 7.

NOTE
X.

NOTE X.

Q. Why did not the first man only die, and not all as now? *A.* Because all have come of Adam since his infection by sin; &c.—*Orthodox Catechism*, p. 32.

I. Preface to the Offices for the Baptism of Infants and for the Baptism of Adults in the Church of England:—

“Forasmuch as all men *are conceived and born in sin*, (and that which is born of the flesh is flesh), and they that are in the flesh cannot please God, but live in sin, committing many actual transgressions; and that our Saviour Christ saith, None can enter into the kingdom of God, except he be regenerate, and born anew of water and of the Holy Ghost; &c.”

And the Catechism: “*Q.* What is the inward and spiritual grace? (of Baptism.) *A.* A death unto sin and a New Birth unto righteousness; for *being by nature born in sin*, we are hereby made the children of grace.”

II. The Scottish Catechism of Aberdeen, by Bishop Jolly:—

“*Q.* Were all mankind propagated from Adam and Eve after the commission of this fatal transgression? *A.* It is certain they were, and therefore could inherit no other nature from their parents, than what they had to give. *Q.* What nature then do we inherit from our first parents? *A.* A corrupt and mortal nature, estranged from God and goodness, tainted with sin and guilt, and thereby under the condemnation of death and misery. In this condition mankind are now by nature.”—P. 20. ed. 1837.

And the Catechism of the Diocese of Brechin:—

“*Q.* Has the sin of our first parents affected all their descendants? *A.* We all inherit from them a nature corrupt and mortal, tainted with sin and prone to evil, and therefore under condemnation. *Q.* Could man do any thing to recover himself from this state of sin and condemnation? *A.* (From Art. x. of the xxxix) ‘The condition of man after the fall of Adam is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself, by his own natural strength and good works, to faith and calling upon God.’ *Q.* Did God leave man in this miserable state? *A.* No; in the counsels of His infinite wisdom, He provided a Redeemer.”—P. 6.

And again; “*Q.* You say that in Baptism you were made ‘a member of Christ, &c.’ Were you not then born in that state by nature? *A.* No; all mankind are ‘by nature born in sin, and children of wrath.’ *Q.* What do you mean by ‘being born in sin, and children of wrath?’ *A.* I mean that we are by nature in that state of depravity and condemnation, into which the fall of our first parents brought mankind. *Q.* How does Art. ix.

(of the xxxix) express this awful truth? *A.* ‘Original sin is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam; and in every person born into this world it deserves God’s wrath and damnation.’—*Ib.* p. 9. NOTE
X.

NOTE XI.

Q. What benefit was there in the promise given after the Fall, that the seed of the woman should bruise the Serpent’s head? *A.* This, that from the time of the promise men could believe savingly in the Saviour that was to come, even as we now believe in the Saviour that has come.—*Orthodox Catechism*, p. 33.

I. Article VII, of the Thirty-nine, has the following words:—

“Both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and man, being both God and Man. Wherefore they are not to be heard, which feign that the old Fathers did look only for transitory promises.”

And the Book of Homilies; Part II. of the Sermon on Faith:—

“All these Fathers, Martyrs, and other holy men, whom St. Paul spake of, had their faith surely fixed in God. . . . And although they were not named Christian men, yet was it a Christian faith that they had; for they looked for all benefits of God the Father, through the merits of His Son Jesus Christ, as we now do. This difference is between them and us, that they looked when Christ should come, and we be in the time when He is come. ‘Therefore,’ saith St. Augustine, ‘the time is changed, but not the faith. For we have both one faith in Christ.’”—P. 32.

II. The Scottish Catechism of the Diocese of Brechin:—

“*Q.* What is the plan of redemption called? *A.* The Covenant of Grace. *Q.* When did this Covenant commence? *A.* Immediately after the Fall. It was prefigured under the Patriarchal and Mosaic dispensations; and in the fulness of time it was completely unfolded under the Gospel.”—P. 7.

III. The Scottish Bishop Rattray, of Dunkeld, writes as follows:—

“That principle which is in Scripture opposed to the flesh, is called ‘*spirit*,’ and as it is derived from the *Λόγος*, is sometimes called ‘*Λόγος*,’ and ‘*Christ*,’ as being that spirit by which the *Λόγος* communicateth His influences to us: and it is chiefly to be considered in three respects: First, as the light that enlighteneth every man that cometh into the world; in

NOTE
XI.

which respect all who have the use of their reason do more or less partake of it, as the light of the rational faculty: Secondly, as it was communicated to the Patriarchs, and those who lived under the Jewish Dispensation, whereby they were endued with that faith so much celebrated in the New Testament, and enabled by their good works flowing from it to please God; and in this respect it was also, according to the doctrine of the ancients, in some measure communicated even to the pious heathens themselves, who are therefore said to have lived *κατὰ λόγον*, as following the conduct thereof: Thirdly, as it is given under our Christian Dispensation to the members of the Church as members of the Body of Christ, as a principle of new and immortal life to that Body, living and abiding in every particular member of it, as that by which we are united to Christ our Head, and to one another; as a Spirit of Adoption, whereby we become the sons of God; by which we are made *συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνης τοῦ υἱοῦ*, as He is *ἐν μορφῇ* of the Father; by which we bear the image of Christ, as He is the image of the invisible God; by which we become the brethren of Christ, and He the first-born among many brethren; as it is the principle of Regeneration, the incorruptible seed by which we are born again, which is said *ἐκπορεύεσθαι* from the Father, and is opposed to that corruptible seed from which we receive our first birth; as it is the seal, *σφραγίς*, by which the divine image is impressed, by which we are sealed after we believed, and sealed to the Day of Redemption; from whence Baptism as including under it what we now call Confirmation, came to be called by this name in the earliest monuments of the Church; as it is a *θέλα φύσις*, a *λόγος ἔμφυτος*, a *καὶνὴ κτίσις*, a new man; as it is that which entitles us to the resurrection of our bodies, and is the earnest of our inheritance, as being by it made sons, and if sons, then heirs and co-heirs with Christ, our elder Brother of the heavenly inheritance."

"In this respect it is never said to be given, since the forfeiture of it by our first parents, till it was purchased again by our Saviour, and by Him bestowed upon the Church as a triumphal largess upon His Ascension. Therefore the Evangelist saith, 'This He spake of the Spirit which they that believe on Him should receive, *ἐμελλον λαμβάνειν*;' and he gives this as the reason why they were only to receive it afterwards, *οὕτω γὰρ ἦν πνεῦμα ἅγιον*, 'nondum enim erat spiritus datus,' (Vulg.) 'for the Holy Ghost was not yet given' (as the ellipsis is very well supplied); for it cannot be understood of the Spirit itself, which as being God, is from eternity. And the reason why it was not yet given, is because Jesus was not yet glorified: and the Apostle saith, that this Spirit was not given by the works of the Law, but by the hearing of faith: and the Scriptures are very plain that the Spirit is only given in this respect in our Christian Sacraments, by which we are made and continued members of that Church which is the Body of Christ."

"It is a very great, though too commonly prevailing error, not to distinguish betwixt these so different communications of the Spirit; and to

suppose that all pious persons, as well without as within the Church, as well before as since our Saviour's Ascension, had the Spirit in the sense last mentioned, and were thereby immediately entitled to all the glorious privileges ascribed to it in this respect. The Spirit, as given before our Saviour's Ascension, was only to enable them to live up to the design of the Dispensation under which they then lived; and the Apostle observes, that the Law was only a pedagogue to lead us to Christ; and the moral Philosophy is supposed by Clemens Alexandrinus to have performed the same office to the Gentiles: but neither Jews nor Gentiles could receive those better promises of the New Covenant, till it was established by Jesus, the Mediator of it. Therefore, though our Saviour says, that there had not formerly arisen a greater prophet than John the Baptist, yet he preferreth to him the least in the Kingdom of Heaven. Therefore also all the Patriarchs and holy persons so much celebrated by the Author to the Hebrews, are said to have died 'not having received the promise; and that because God had provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect;' (the Spirit being that which, according to the Scriptures and ancient Fathers, constituteth the perfect man, who is called by the Apostle *ἁλοτελής* and *ἁλόκληρος*, as consisting of spirit, as well as body and soul;) and that 'the Law, as being only the shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things themselves, could not make the comers thereunto perfect, being only the bringing in of a better hope, by which we draw near to God.' For this Spirit being a principal part of the testament of Jesus, could not take place till the death of the testator: and it is for this reason that the Apostolical Hermas makes the Apostles to have preached to those righteous persons who had died before the coming of our Saviour; and not only so, but also to have baptized them in *ἕδης*. . . . It is probable that St. Peter had it in his view in his first Epistle: (ch. iv. 6.) 'For this cause was the Gospel preached also to them that are dead.' And the other passage of the same Apostle concerning our Saviour's preaching to the spirits in prison, is thus understood by the ancients."

"From what has been said, I think it plainly appears, that the Spirit, as a principle of new and immortal life, as it is the Spirit of Adoption, and the earnest of the heavenly inheritance, was never given to any person, how pious soever, before the coming of our Lord; and that the influences of the Spirit, then communicated, only prepared for the reception of the Gospel: and even after His coming, none, how devout or just soever, were believed to have any title to the Kingdom of Heaven, till they were admitted into the Church by baptism."

"The Gospel generally requires teachableness, and other good dispositions, in its hearers, to qualify them for embracing it. These dispositions are the 'Israelitism indeed,' which is *ἔδολος*; the circumcision of the heart and of the ears; the sheep-like and child-like disposition; the good ground

NOTE XI. fit to receive the seed sown, so as to bring forth fruit: and the having these good dispositions is the being *τεταγμένοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον*. But though these dispositions be most certainly the effects of the Divine Spirit, and therefore called the Drawing of the Father; yet none were thereby supposed to have received that quickening Spirit, which is the image of the second Adam, the Lord from heaven, till he received it in our Christian Baptism of the Spirit; which is therefore called Regeneration, as being that in which this new life is first infused into us.”—*Essay on the Nature of Man*, p. 127. . 38.

NOTE XII.

Q. Did the Most Holy Mary remain in fact ever a Virgin?

A. She remained and remains a Virgin before the birth, during the birth, and after the birth of the Saviour; and therefore is called Ever-Virgin.—*Orthodox Catechism*, p. 34.

I. Bishop Andrewes, in his *Private Devotions*, which are in many places taken from the Greek *Ἐκτένεια*, and which he used himself both in Greek and Latin, has these following words:—

“Making mention of the all-holy, undefiled, and most-blessed Mary, Mother of God and Ever-Virgin, with all Saints, let us commend ourselves, and each other, and our whole life, unto Christ our God.”

II. In like manner John Bramhall, Archbishop of Armagh:—

“We admit genuine, universal, Apostolical traditions; as the Apostles’ Creed, the perpetual virginity of the Mother of God, &c.”—*Works*, ed. 1842. vol. i. p. 53.

III. And Jeremy Taylor, Bishop of Down and Connor:—

“She received the honour of being Mother to the Son of God, and ever a Virgin; and all generations shall call her Blessed.”—*Heber’s ed.* xv. p. 21.

IV. John Pearson, Bishop of Chester, *On the Creed*:—

“We believe the Mother of our Lord to have been not only before and after His Nativity, but also for ever, the most Immaculate and Blessed Virgin. . . . And although it may be thought sufficient, as to the mystery of the Incarnation, that when our Saviour was conceived and born, His Mother was a Virgin; . . . yet the peculiar eminency and unparalleled privilege of that Mother, the especial honour and reverence due unto that Son, and ever paid by her, and the power of the Highest, Who overshadowed her, and the singular goodness and piety of Joseph, to whom She was espoused, have persuaded the Church of God in all ages to believe that She still continued in the same Virginity, and therefore is to be acknow-

ledged the Ever-Virgin Mary. As if the Gate of the Sanctuary in the Prophet Ezekiel were to be understood of her: ‘This gate shall be shut; it shall not be opened, and no man shall enter in by it; because the Lord, the God of Israel, hath entered in by it, therefore it shall be shut.’” (Ezek. xliv. 2.)—P. 193, ed. 1662.

NOTE
XII.

NOTES XIII., AND XIV.

Q. What other great title is there, with which the Orthodox Church honours the Most Holy Virgin Mary? *A.* That of Mother of God. *Q.* What thoughts should we have of the exalted dignity of the Most Holy Virgin Mary? *A.* As mother of the Lord she excels in grace and nearness to God, and so also in dignity, every created being.—*Orthodox Catechism*, p. 34, 35.

I. See the passages quoted above under the last preceding Note, XII. Also the following, which are to the same effect:—

II. From the Liturgy sent in Greek by the British Bishops to the Eastern Patriarchs and the Russian Synod, A.D. 1722:—

“And here we do give unto Thee most high praise and hearty thanks for the wonderful grace and virtue declared in all Thy Saints, from the beginning of the world; and particularly in the glorious and ever Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of Thy Son Jesus Christ, our Lord and God; &c.”

The same appears also in the Older Communion Office of the Church of England, authorized in the year 1548.

III. Bishop Pearson, in his Treatise on the Creed:—

“It was her own prediction, ‘From henceforth all generations shall call me Blessed;’ but the obligation is ours to call her, to esteem her so. If Elizabeth cried out with so loud a voice, ‘Blessed art thou among women,’ when Christ was but newly conceived in her womb, what expressions of honour and admiration *can we think sufficient*, now that Christ is in heaven, and that Mother with Him? Far be it from any Christian to derogate from that special privilege granted Her, which is incommunicable to any other. We *cannot bear too reverend a regard* unto the Mother of our Lord, so long as we give her not *that* worship, which is due unto the Lord Himself.”—P. 199.

IV. Alexander Jolly, Bishop of the Diocese of Moray in the Scottish Church, in his Treatise on the Sunday Services:—

“Among all the Saints, the first place is undoubtedly due to the Blessed Virgin-Mother of our Lord, the most highly favoured, and eminently exalted *of all creatures*, yet most lowly in her own eyes.”—Ed. 1840. p. 303.

NOTE
XIII, XIV.

And again, the same Bishop, in another of his works:—

“The Blessed Virgin Mother is undoubtedly the most highly exalted and honoured *of all creatures*; the Second Person of the all-glorious Trinity having assumed her substance, and united it with the human soul, in One Person with His Divinity, never to be divided. She may therefore without hesitation be called, as she is by the Church, ‘the Mother of God.’ She is so named by the third General Council at Ephesus: and her cousin Elizabeth, by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, called her in terms equivalent, when, meeting her, she cried in rapture, ‘Whence is this to me, that the Mother of my Lord’ (who is God our Saviour,) ‘should come to me.’ All generations, according as her divine Canticle foretold, do ‘call her Blessed.’ And certainly *the highest honour that can be paid to a creature is due to Her.*”—Treatise on the Eucharistic Sacrifice, p. 94.

NOTE XV.

A. Jesus Christ, for His part, offered Himself as a Sacrifice for all, and obtained for all grace and salvation; but this benefits only those of us, who for their parts of their own free will, have ‘fellowship in His sufferings, being made conformable to His death.’ Philippi. iii. 10.—*Orthodox Catechism*, p. 39.

See above, under Notes IX. and XI. And below, under Notes XXXVIII. and XLI.

NOTE XVI.

Q. Does the doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Ghost admit of any change, or supplement? A. No: &c. For this cause John Damascene writes; “We nowise say that He is from the Son, but only call Him the Spirit of the Son.”—*Orthodox Catechism*, p. 45, 46.

There can be no doubt that the British Churches agree with the Easterns in teaching, that the words of Christ Himself and of the Œcumenical Councils respecting the Procession of the Holy Ghost admit of no “change” or correction, as if they were erroneous, nor of any “supplement,” as if they were in themselves imperfect, or inadequate for that end for which they were chosen.

However, the Eastern Church herself does not think it either “change” or

“supplement” to teach besides, that while the Father is the one sole cause or principle both of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, (of the Son by generation, of the Holy Ghost by procession), He produces the Son, *not in time but in order*, second, from His own substance, and the Holy Ghost third, *after* the Son, and so from His own substance as now already the substance of the Son, and numerically one in Both. And, consequently, she teaches that the Holy Ghost ‘receives substantially of the Son,’ and ‘is the proper Spirit of the Son in respect of His substance’ (while the Son, though reciprocally consubstantial, yet ‘cannot be called reciprocally the Son of the Spirit’); that the Holy Ghost ‘is the true Image of the Son,’ and His ‘Word,’ or ‘Expression;’ that He ‘rests naturally and inherently in Him;’ and ‘is emitted, or shines forth, or is manifested, through the Son eternally from the Father.’

In this also the British Churches beyond all doubt agree with the Easterns, and find in the above propositions no real “change” nor “supplement” to what is unchangeable and perfect in itself, but only lawful inferences and explanations.

But besides this, it is further true that the British Churches fully receive the Latin clause ‘Filioque’ (in Greek *καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ*): and it is not at all likely that they will ever yield to the Greeks so far as to proscribe language which comes to them from their own orthodox Fathers, and which they think by no means inconsistent with the sense of the Greek Fathers themselves, even of those who most distinctly refuse to admit that phraseology.

I. Abp. Laud, in his Conference with Fisher, cites Thomas Aquinas as admitting that the Procession from the Son is “*mediatè tantùm, saltem ratione Personarum Spirantium.*” The words referred to are these.—

“In every act two things may be considered, viz. the subject acting, and the virtue by which it acts; as, *fire* warms, *by heat*. If then in the Father and the Son we consider that *virtue* by which they breathe the Holy Ghost, there is no room to speak of mediateness or mediation: for this their virtue is one and the same virtue numerically in Both. But if we consider *the Persons themselves* that breathe, then, at the same time that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son in common, He is perceived to proceed from the Father *immediately*, in so far as He is from the Father, and *mediately*, in so far as He is from the Son. . . . He is sometimes said to proceed principally or properly from the Father, because it is from the Father that the Son has this virtue.” (*Summa Theol. Q. xxxvi. Art. 3.*)—Conference with Fisher, ed. 1839. p. 20.

II. From an Explication of the Catechism of the Church of England by the Rev. Gabriel Towerson :—

“Shall I go one step farther? It may perhaps be thought a bold adventure; but truth (no more than other things) is not to be attained without

NOTE
XVI.

it. For what if I should say, that there is evidence, even from the *Creed*, of this *Spirit* of God's proceeding from the *Son*, as well as from the Father, which is the utmost that is affirmed concerning Him? As perhaps I may say, if we consider this the Spirit of God's receiving His divine essence from another, and the *order* wherein He here stands as to the other Persons of the Trinity. For supposing Him to be third in the order of nature, as He is there placed, and accordingly, that the Son, though not *in time*, is *in order of nature* before Him, we shall find ourselves obliged to grant that He derives this His essence from the Son, as well as that He derives it from the Father. For the Father communicating His Godhead to the Son antecedently, in the *order of nature*, to His communicating it to the Holy Ghost, we must also suppose, (because thereby, as our Saviour speaks, He makes that which is *His own* to become the *Son's* also), that there must be a concurrence in the Son to that communication, which is made of the same Godhead to the Holy Ghost; because in *order of nature*, though not of time, it is *after* that which is made of it to Himself. For how can the Son be supposed not to have an interest in the communication of that Divine Nature, which by being the Son of God He is already as fully vested in, as that Father from whom He has Himself received it?"

And again: "Supposing, as we may, and as I think I have before shewn, that One of these Hypostases (Persons) acts with some subordination to the other, the difficulty will appear far less than it doth, if indeed it do not perfectly vanish: because so, though distinct Hypostases, they will be but as *one principle* to that operation, to which they concur."—P. 289.

III. William Beveridge, Bishop of St. Asaph, in his Treatise on the xxxix Articles, Art. v. has the following:—

"The Spirit proceeds from the Son as well as from the Father; only with this distinction, that the Father hath the Spirit proceeding from Him of Himself, but the Son hath the Spirit proceeding from Him of the Father; who communicating His own individual essence, and so whatsoever He is, (His paternal relation to Him excepted) to the Son, could not but communicate this to Him also, even to have the Spirit proceeding from Him, as He hath it proceeding from Himself. So that as whatsoever else the Father hath originally in Himself, the Son hath it also by communication from the Father, so hath the Son likewise this, the Spirit proceeding from Him, by communication from the Father, as the Father hath the Spirit proceeding from Him originally in Himself."

And he quotes the following from St. Augustine: "Nec de quo genitum est Verbum, nec de quo procedit principaliter Spiritus Sanctus, nisi Deus Pater: Ideo autem addidi principaliter, quia et de Filio Spiritus Sanctus procedere reperitur. Sed hoc quoque Illi Pater dedit, non jam existenti et nondum habenti, sed quicquid Unigenito Verbo dedit, gignendo dedit. Sic ergo Eum genuit, ut etiam de Illo Donum commune procederet, et Spiritus Sanctus Spiritus esset Amboꝝum."—De Trin. L. xv. c. 26. vol. viii. p. 988.

Now as when the Easterns say that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father in order *by* or *after* the Son, they seem to our Divines to agree with us, that in a certain sense He proceeds from the one common substance of the Father and the Son, or, to use the Latin language, from the Father and the Son, Who are in respect of their one common substance but one principle, (for the unity of substance may be distinguished in thought from the abstract Personalities of Both;) so, in like manner, when we Latins allow that in respect of the distinct Personalities (the *Ipsa Subjecta* of Aquinas) of the Father and the Son, as taken abstractedly, and distinguished from their one common substance, and substantial property (*virtus productiva*,) the Holy Ghost proceeds immediately, properly, or principally, from the Father, but mediately only from the Son, we may be said to agree with the Easterns, that in a certain sense the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father *only*, and *not* from the Son. For the Son, we say, receives from the Father His own being, and by consequence all properties of that being, of which we believe this to be one, ‘*habere virtutem productivam Spiritûs Sancti*.’ The Person of the Father therefore, who gives, is by the force of the terms themselves confessed to have this virtue, not in time indeed, but in order and relation, before the Person of the Son, who receives it: and since to have this virtue and to exercise it is all one, there being no respect to time, it may be said that the Father, as to His distinct Personality, is understood to produce the Holy Ghost before the Son produces Him. But such production being perfect as soon as it is conceived at all, and admitting not of division or duality, he who thinks of the abstract Person of the Father as producing first or principally, will scarcely afterwards assert a secondary or communicated production from the Son; but will rather say that the Spirit ‘rests in the Son,’ ‘receives of Him substantially,’ ‘is dependant upon Him,’ and ‘inseparable from Him as to His substance,’ being the third in order, after the interposition of Him who is second.

And thus perhaps the Greek and Latin tenets may be so represented, as not only not to contradict, but even mutually to imply each other; the Greek, if taken only with respect to the two distinct Personalities of the Father and the Son, which are not numerically one principle; the Latin, if taken only with respect to that common nature and substance of the Father and the Son, which is numerically one principle in Both. And yet these distinctions apply merely *ad modum concipiendi et loquendi*. For though we even say with the Greeks that the Father alone, and not the Son, produces the Holy Ghost, still we mean not that the Personality of the Father is really separable from His essence; nor that this one essence, now already common to the Son, is separable from the Personality of the Son. Nor on the other hand when we say as Latins, that the Father and the Son together as one principle produce the Holy Ghost, (having respect to that one common essence and its operation, which is numerically one in Both) do we mean that this one common essence and operation is really

NOTE
XVI.

separable from the Personalities of the Father and the Son; or that these two distinct and abstract Personalities, are *as such* one principle; or that the latter of these two Personalities is not absolutely, with all its attributes, to be referred to the Father, as to the sole first principle and cause.

But whatever may be thought of any such attempts as the above to reconcile the two contrary modes of expression, thus much at least is certain, that the Eastern Church has never yet refused to the Latins the liberty of holding to their own doctrine, and language; nor has ever required of them to condemn and reject the expression 'Filioque' as it comes to them in the writings of their own Fathers: all that they have required, and still require, is this, that the Latin doctrine should not be interpolated into the Œcumenical Creed. This will sufficiently appear from the following testimonies:—

IV. At the very beginning of the Controversy, Pope Leo the Third, on being appealed to for protection by the Latin monks on Mount Olivet, though he strenuously forbade the interpolation of the Creed as has been shewn above, (Section v.) yet no less distinctly proclaimed his own agreement with the Latin language and opinion; and sent the following Letter, as it is said, to all the Eastern Churches:—

“Leo, Bishop, Servant of the servants of God, to all the Eastern Churches. We send you this confession of the orthodox faith, that both ye and all the world may hold according to the right and undefiled faith of the holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church. We believe the Holy Trinity, that is, the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost, one God Almighty, of one substance, of one essence, of one power, the Creator of all creatures, from Whom are all things, through Whom are all things, in Whom are all things: the Father in Himself, not from any other; the Son begotten of the Father, very God, of very God, very light of very light, yet not two lights, but one light; the Holy Ghost proceeding equally from the Father and the Son, and consubstantial (*ceterum*) with the Father and the Son: The Father is perfect God in Himself; the Son perfect God begotten of the Father; the Holy Ghost perfect God, proceeding from the Father and the Son. . . . From thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead: Whom the wicked shall see as their Judge in that same form in which He was crucified; not in that humility in which He was unjustly judged, but in that brightness in which He shall justly judge the world; the beholding of Whose majesty is the everlasting bliss of all Saints. Whosoever believes not according to this faith is condemned by the holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, which is founded by Jesus Christ Himself, our Lord, to Whom be glory for ever.”

“Thus Leo, as it seems, although he respected the authority of the holy Fathers, and further thought the doctrine of the Procession from the Son to be such, that ‘not every one could attain to it,’ still took care to guard

against any damage to the credit of that doctrine, in his own Confession addressed to the Eastern Bishops. Nor, be it remarked, did this his declaration cause the separation of any single Eastern See from the See of Rome.”—Le Quien, Dissert. Damasc. I. xiv, xv. p. viii.

NOTE
XVI.

. The above is given, as not being inconsistent with the known sentiments of Pope Leo. The text of his Letter to the Easterns rests upon the authority of Le Quien, to whom it was furnished by Baluzius “ex veteri codice S. Martialis Lemovicensis.” At the same time, as this document would read perfectly well, and even better, without those words which express the Latin doctrine, and as there are other manifest difficulties to be accounted for, if we admit their genuineness, no opinion is here hazarded as to the value of this testimony. Only thus much may be said, that *if* the text be genuine, the Letter of Pope Leo is of too great importance to be passed over unnoticed; and until it be shewn to be otherwise, the names of Le Quien and Baluzius are deserving of respect. At any rate it cannot be amiss to have called the attention of the learned to the question.

With regard to all that follows there can be no doubt:

V. In none of those repeated renewals of communion which took place, as is well known, after the first formal rupture in the time of Photius, did the Greeks ever require from the Latins any retractation or condemnation of their doctrine on the Procession, but only the omission of the interpolated clause from the Creed. It is unnecessary to enlarge upon the circumstances of each of these temporary reunions; but a few testimonies shall be here adduced, to shew that the Easterns have ever down to the present time professed for themselves, and have been understood by others to profess a willingness to communicate with the Westerns upon these same terms:—

VI. Theophylact, Archbishop of Acrida in Bulgaria in the eleventh century, as quoted by John Beccus, uses the following words:—

“*On other occasions I will grant you (the Latins) the use of the expression, of the Holy Ghost proceeding from the Father and the Son, as may suit your speech; in common discourses, I mean, and in Sermons in the Church, if ye please; but in the Creed, and in that alone, I will not grant it you.*”

VII. Again, in the year 1249, when overtures were made by the Emperor John Ducas for a union of the Eastern and Roman Churches, the Easterns would have been willing to agree to it on the following conditions: “that the Pope should be prayed for in the Liturgy: that the Latins should not countenance or assist those who had seized Constantinople: that the interpolation should be put out of the Creed, but might be retained and read in any other form.” (Pachymeres, Hist. book the fifth, ch. xii.):—

“The Emperor (Michael Palæologus) brought forward those precedents of ancient memory which they had found in history; especially the example of the Emperor John Ducas, and the Bishops of his time,

NOTE
XVI.

who with the Patriarch Manuel consented, and promised, and even sent Bishops expressly to pledge themselves to communicate with the Latins in the holy Liturgy, and pray therein for the Pope by name, if only he would abstain from assisting those who had seized the city. In proof of which fact the Register of the Church, in which all was written, was produced; and the Emperor enlarged upon it, drawing a comparison between the circumstances of that time and those of the present. He appealed also to the written declarations of the Primates of that time authenticated by subscription, which he said ought to be owned and allowed even as their own by those (the Patriarchs and Bishops) who were now in the same place: bidding them take notice how those Fathers, as appeared from the documents produced, had entirely abstained from taxing the Italians with impiety or heresy on account of their attempt to interpolate the Creed, and had merely demanded that the words added should be put out; leaving them free liberty both to retain them and read them as they pleased any where else.”—Tractat. Zoernicavii, vol. ii. p. 948.

VIII. And the same writer, Pachymeres, (B. v. ch. xi.) gives us to understand that the Emperor Michael Palæologus (A.D. 1273,) found the Greek Bishops and Clergy ready enough to offer union again on the same terms:—

“To this the Prelates of our Church answered; That peace was indeed honourable and desirable; no one denied that; especially between Churches so conspicuous . . . but still this peace was to be sought and made on just and safe terms; not recklessly, on any terms whatsoever: for that no little danger was theirs, who should err from the straight path, whether on the one side or the other. . . . It would therefore be good and convenient, that thou shouldest bring about the peace of the Church, by endeavouring with a sincere zeal, as thou professest, that it be moved for on such principles as make most fairly and directly to that end; namely, that thou shouldest use thy wisdom and authority and influence with the Italians to induce them to take away the scandal . . . of innovation in changing the Creed.”—Tract. Zoernicavii, vol. ii. p. 972.

IX. And in the Council of Florence, Mark, Archbishop of Ephesus, the great champion of the Greeks, held the following language, as may be seen in the Acts of the Council, and as he is quoted by Michael Ducas:—

“*Expunge this clause from the Creed, and then place it where ye will, and sing it in your Churches on occasion, as is sung ‘Ο Μονογενῆς Λόγος, κ.τ.λ.’*”

X. That this has ever been the sense and disposition of the Eastern Church, however much her Divines may seem sometimes to attack the Latin Doctrine in itself, or tax the Latins with heresy on account of it, has been understood and noticed by the most learned writers both of the Roman-Catholic and of the Anglican Communions; as, for instance, by Marcus Antonio De Dominis, sometime Archbishop of Spalatro, and

Primate of Dalmatia and Croatia, and afterwards Dean of Windsor in the Church of England; and by Father Michael Le Quien, in the Dissertations prefixed to his edition of the Works of St. John Damascene printed at Paris, A.D. 1712. Both of these writers, among other things to the same purpose, quote those words of Mark of Ephesus in the Council of Florence which have been given above.

NOTE
XVI.

XI. And lastly, so far as the Eastern Church herself is concerned, the most learned theologians of that Communion, who have treated the subject of the Procession since the Council of Florence, continue to repeat the same thing; as Adam Zoernikaff, vol. ii. tract. xix. p. 1016:—

“The chief controversy between the Churches was and still is concerning the Interpolation. Mark of Ephesus then confessed, and the Easterns too confessed after him, that there could at any time be made a true and lasting union between the Churches, if the Interpolation of the Creed were laid aside:” And again: *“The chief point in this controversy is about the addition made to the Creed. In the General Synod assembled under Photius no mention at all was made of the Doctrine considered in itself: only the Interpolation was condemned: after the Schism had arisen between the Churches it was at all times alleged by the Easterns as the chief cause of the same Schism against the Latins, that they used the Creed with the addition. If only this one thing were reformed, Mark of Ephesus declared at Florence in the name of his Church, the Easterns could receive the Latins to their communion.”*—Ibid. vol. i. p. 398.

XII. But that the Scottish and other British Bishops, who corresponded in the last century with the Easterns, were willing to restore the Creed to its original and canonical form, we have shewn above, under Note v., (page 133, &c.); where may be seen other testimonies also on the same point.

NOTE XVII.

Q. What is the Church? A. The Church is a divinely instituted community of men, united by the orthodox faith, the law of God, the hierarchy, and the Sacraments.—*Orthodox Catechism*, p. 47.

I. The Scottish and other British Churches in like manner believe “One holy Catholic and Apostolic Church” which is not invisible only but also visible “throughout all the world.” (The Creeds, and the Te Deum.) “The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered.”

NOTE
XVII.

(Art. XIX.) This Church “is the Spouse and Body of Christ, the pillar and ground of the truth;” and “against it the gates of hell shall never prevail:” (Ordinal, and Scottish Catechisms.) “In it from the Apostles’ time there have ever been these three Orders of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons;” (Preface to the Ordinal.) who have committed to them the ministry “of the Doctrine, and Sacraments, and Discipline of Christ:” (Ordinal.) “to which Offices no man may presume, unless he be first called and ‘coopted’ and ordained thereto by lawful Episcopal authority.” (Preface to Ordinal, Ord. and Art. XXIII. and XXXVII.) “The Church is moreover the teacher and witness of Holy Writ, and has ‘authority’ to ‘teach’ and ‘decree rites and ceremonies’ and to ‘decide controversies of faith;’ It contains within itself certain chief sees, as those of ‘Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, &c.’ (Art. XIX.) and is represented by ‘General Councils or Synods.’ (Art. XXI.) “Further, the *Doctrine* of the Church, as founded on the authority of the Scripture, being fixed and immutable, ought to be uniformly received and adhered to, at all times and in all places. The same is to be said of its *government* in all those essential parts of its constitution, which were prescribed by its adorable Head; but in the *Discipline*, which may be adopted for furthering the purposes of Ecclesiastical Government, regulating the solemnities of public worship, as to time, place, and form, and restraining and rectifying the evils occasioned by human depravity, this character of immutability is not to be looked for. The *Discipline* of the Church is to be determined by Christian wisdom, prudence, and charity. (Preface to the Scottish Canons, subscribed by all the Bishops, A.D. 1838.) However even with regard to those things which are in their own nature changeable, “whosoever through his private judgment, willingly and purposely, doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church which be not repugnant to the Word of God, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly,” (Art. XXXIV.) and if need be “excommunicated.” (Canons, A.D. 1602.) And lastly, “that person who by open denunciation of the Church is rightly cut off from the unity of the Church, and excommunicated, ought to be taken of the whole multitude of the faithful as a heathen and publican, until he be openly reconciled by penance, and received back into the Church by a judge that hath authority thereto;” that is by absolution.—Art. XXXIII.

II. From Bishop Nicholson’s Exposition of the Catechism of the Church of England, A.D. 1661:—

“To believe the Catholic Church, is to believe that there is a society of Christians dispersed into all quarters of the world, who are united under Christ their head, formalized and moved by His Spirit; matriculated by Baptism; nourished by the Word and Supper of the Lord; ruled and continued under Bishops and Pastors lawfully called to these offices, who succeed those upon whom the Holy Ghost came down, and have the

power of the keys committed to them, for administration of doctrine and discipline; and who are bound to preach the Word, to pray with and intercede for the people, to administer the Sacraments, to ordain ministers, and to use the Church censures.”—Oxford ed. p. 60.

NOTE
XVII.

III. From the Proposals sent by the British Bishops to the Eastern Patriarchs, in the year of our Lord 1716:—

“We agree, that there is no other foundation[†] of the Church but Christ alone; and that the Prophets and Apostles are no otherwise to be called so, but in a less proper and secondary sense, respectively only.”—Prop. vii.

“We agree, that Christ alone is the Head of the Church; which title ought not therefore to be assumed by any one; much less by any Secular Power, how great soever; and that Bishops under Him have a vicarious headship, as His proper representatives, and vicegerents; being thence subject in spirituals to no power on earth.”—Prop. viii.

“We agree, that every Christian ought to be subject to the Church; and that the Church is by Christ sufficiently instructed and authorized to examine the writings and censure the persons of her subjects or ministers, though never so great.”—Prop. ix.

“We agree, that the Holy Ghost assisteth the Church in judging rightly concerning matters of faith; and that both general and particular orthodox Councils, convened after the example of the first Council of Jerusalem, may reasonably expect that assistance in their resolutions.”—Prop. v.

IV. From the Scottish Catechism of the Diocese of Aberdeen:—

“Q. What is the Church? A. The whole Body or Society of the Faithful, under one and the same Head. Q. Who are the Faithful? A. Those who profess the true Religion. Q. Which is the true Religion? A. That which God Himself has taught. Q. What are the marks of the Church of Christ? A. That it is One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic. Q. How is it *One*? A. By being united under one only Head. Q. Who is its Head? A. Jesus Christ. Q. Who are Heretics? A. They who teach a different faith from that of the Church. Q. Who are Schismatics? A. They who form a separate Church by themselves. Q. How is this Church *Holy*? A. By its Doctrine, its Sacraments, and its Head, Who is Jesus Christ. Q. Are all its members holy? A. No; it is made up of good and bad to the end of the world. Q. What means the ‘*Catholic*’ Church? A. It means the Universal Church. Q. How is it universal? A. By its extending to all times, from the creation of the world. Q. Does it extend likewise to all places? A. Yes; it is the same Church ‘throughout the world.’ Q. What means ‘*Apostolic*’? A. It means that the Church preserves the Doctrine of the Apostles. Q. And what else? A. That its Pastors are the Successors of the Apostles. Q. Whom did the Apostles appoint to succeed them in the government of the Church? A. The Bishops; &c. Q. Was not the Christian Priesthood typified and prefigured

NOTE
XVII.

by the Jewish? *A.* Yes; the Bishop is the Christian High-Priest; and the Presbyters and Deacons answer to the Priests and Levites. *Q.* Whom does the Christian High-Priest represent? *A.* He represents Jesus Christ, the invisible Bishop and Head of the whole Church. *Q.* Ought not then every Christian to be subject to his Bishop? *A.* Yes; as to the visible Head, or High-Priest in his own Diocese... *Q.* What is the Communion of Saints? *A.* It is the mutual communication of all good things in the Church. *Q.* Who partake of it? *A.* All that are in the Church, and live as becomes the Gospel. *Q.* Can Schismatics or excommunicated persons partake of it? *A.* They cannot, any more than Infidels. *Q.* Whom do you mean by excommunicated persons? *A.* Those who are cast out of the Church by the governors of it. *Q.* Whom do they cast out of the Church? *A.* Those who have committed great sins, and will not submit to Penance for them."—P. 16, 19. See also the Scottish Catechism of Bishop Jolly, p. 31, &c. ed. 1837.

V. From the Scottish Catechism of the Diocese of Brechin:—

"*Q.* What are we taught in the Creeds to believe concerning the Church? *A.* We are taught to profess our belief in One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church. *Q.* What is the Holy Catholic Church? *A.* That Spiritual Society of Christians, which Christ constituted, to preserve the knowledge and worship of the true God, and to dispense His holy Word and Sacraments, for the Salvation of mankind. (P. 23.) *Q.* What do you mean by professing this belief? *A.* I profess to believe that, according to God's word and promise, there has been from the beginning of Christianity, and will be to the end of the world, a Church possessing these characters. *Q.* What do the Scriptures say concerning the *unity* of the Church? *A.* They describe it as one temple or House of God, having one Foundation, one Corner Stone, one Fold under one Shepherd; as having one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one Hope; as being one Body or Society, all whose members should speak the same thing, and with one mind and one mouth glorify God. *Q.* How is the Church *Holy*? *A.* Because it is united to Christ, the Holy One, as its Head, by whose appointment it enjoys many holy Privileges; and because its principal use is to sanctify those who are in it, and who are called Saints, that is, holy persons. *Q.* Why is the Church called *Catholic*? *A.* Because, unlike the Jewish Church, it is universal in regard to time and place, taking in people of all nations, and in all ages; and because it is universal in regard to doctrine, teaching and receiving all truth. *Q.* Why is the Church called *Apostolic*? *A.* Because it continues in the Apostles' Doctrine and Fellowship. *Q.* What do you mean by continuing in the Apostles' Doctrine? *A.* I mean holding and teaching 'the Faith which was once delivered to the Saints,' the pure and uncorrupted doctrine which it has received from the Apostles, and duly administering the Sacraments

which Christ committed to their care. Q. What is meant by continuing in the Apostles' Fellowship? A. I mean holding communion with those Pastors, who are the Successors of the Apostles in the government of the Church. Q. Is the Church then a regularly organized Society or Body? A. Yes; it is a regular and permanent Society, constituted by Christ, having a settled government, and duly appointed officers, a form of admission, and peculiar privileges. Q. Is there not a tendency to overlook the fact of the Church being thus constituted? A. Yes; this is a prevailing fault of the present day. Q. And what is the natural result of this error? A. People lose sight of the Church as the Means, Instrument, or Organ, through which their spiritual blessings are appointed to flow. (1 Tim. iii. 15.) . . . Q. What promise did our Lord make to the Apostles respecting the continuance of their office? A. 'Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.' (Matt. xxviii. 20.) . . . Q. Have the three Orders of the Ministry been regularly continued in the Church? A. Yes; they have been regularly continued to the present day. (P. 59, 63.) Q. What effect should the belief of this Article of our Faith produce? A. It should unite all Christians more closely in the bonds of peace, love, and unity. (P. 24.) Q. Does our Blessed Lord speak on the same subject? A. In the affecting Prayer, which He offered up to the Father, the night before He was crucified, for all that should believe in Him, one of the chief petitions is '*that they all may be one.*' (John xvii. 21.) Q. What is the best way of answering the end of this Divine Prayer? A. To adhere in the unity of the Spirit, and in the bond of peace, to the Communion of the Holy Catholic Church. Q. Must not all to whom the Gospel is preached become members of the Church? A. Yes; for it is said, (Acts ii. 47.) 'The Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved;' which shews that the appointed road to heaven lies through the Church of Christ upon earth. Q. What respect and obedience do the people owe to their Pastors in Spiritual matters? A. 'Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves; for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account.'" (Heb. xiii. 17, &c.) See also under Notes II. XXI.

VI. The Scottish Bishop Rattray, of Dunkeld, has the following:—

"No moral duties whatsoever that can be performed by any person out of the Communion of the Church, (however the assistance of the Holy Spirit, as an external principle, be necessary to produce them,) can ever give an immediate title to the Kingdom of Heaven. For these inferior communications of the Spirit, as a principle only extrinsical to our nature, which were still continued to mankind, even after the loss of the Spirit Itself by the Fall, and which are more or less given to all men as they cultivate them by a right use of their free-will (not only as being necessary in order to the government of the world even with respect to this life, but likewise to fit and dispose us for the embracing of the offers of the Gospel

NOTE
XVII.

Covenant); these inferior communications, I say, are not of themselves sufficient to entitle to or enable us to attain that eternal Life, which is the gift of God, and noways due to our nature, or to our best performances; they being only some remainders and footsteps of that Divine Image, which was itself necessary even to our first parents themselves in the state of innocency to exalt them to that supernatural immortality for which God designed them, and consequently is much more so with regard to their fallen posterity: for it is only the inhabitation of the Spirit as an internal principle united to our nature, living and abiding in us for ever, and making us partakers of the Divine nature, and not any inferior communications of it as a principle external to our nature, that constituteth this Divine Image, by which alone we become the sons of God, and as being sons, heirs, and co-heirs with Jesus Christ, our elder Brother, of the heavenly inheritance. Now this Divine Image, and the sonship consequent on it, which the Apostle so much admires as a most surprising instance of the love of God towards us Christians, (1 John iii. 1.) being one of the ‘exceeding great and precious promises’ of the New Covenant which Christ hath purchased for His Church, can never be obtained by any other means but those which He hath prescribed in the Gospel for the conveying of it; and they are none other than the Christian Sacraments, by which this new Covenant itself is transacted and maintained, and by which we are made and continued members of the Church. Hence our blessed Saviour Himself assures us, that except we be born again of Water, and of the Spirit, we cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven; and that Baptism, as well as faith, is necessary to Salvation; and likewise, that unless we eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His Blood, in the Eucharist, we can have no life in us; and that it is by our eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood that He dwelleth in us by the inhabitation of His Spirit, and we in Him, as members of His Body, the Church; and that thereby we have eternal life, and He will raise us up at the last Day, by this quickening Spirit, which thus dwelleth in us, and shall quicken our mortal bodies. From whence it appears, that as the Baptism of water, and that of the Spirit, which is given in Confirmation, are necessary in order to that Regeneration whereby this new life is first infused into us, and the Divine Image, which we lost in Adam, re-implanted in us; so a constant participation in the Sacrifice of the Eucharist is as necessary for our continuance and growth in this divine life of the Spirit, as our bodily food is for the support of our natural life.

“Now the design of God in thus conferring the benefits of the Christian Covenant, and particularly the conveyance of this divine Spirit by these external Symbols, is not only to heighten our devotion by these sensible representations; or to teach us that they are, as hath been proved, supernatural favours, which He bestows on us purely of His own free grace and bounty; but principally to confederate us into a visible Society, under

visible Governors authorized and commissioned by Him, (which is what the Scriptures and the primitive Fathers always mean by the Church, which is inserted into our Creed as a necessary Article of Faith;) such a visible Society being necessary to preserve and continue down to the end of the world that Faith which was once delivered to the Saints, which must otherwise have been extinguished and swallowed up long ere now, by those many heresies from within, and persecutions from without, with which Christianity hath been infested from the beginning; on which account the Church is by St. Paul called ‘the Pillar and Ground of the Truth;’ and also to keep us stedfast in the performance of those exalted duties which the Gospel requires from us; and to prevent the growth of licentiousness and immorality by the just severity of its discipline.

“That this was indeed the thing chiefly intended by God in this confinement, will appear from its being so necessary a consequence thereof. For if we cannot have the Spirit, or any other of the benefits of the Christian Covenant (which are necessary in order to our attainment of that supernatural reward of everlasting salvation) without an external participation in those Sacraments by which this Covenant is transacted and maintained, and which God has appointed as the only ordinary means of conveying them to us; and if these Sacraments derive their whole efficacy, not from their own nature, but from their Consecration; and if this power of consecrating them must be derived from God, Who only has the disposal of the benefits conferred by them, so that none can validly consecrate them without an authority derived from Him for that effect; and if none can lay any just claim to this authority, but they who have received it from those who had power to give it them, in a continued succession from the Apostles, who at first received it from Christ; this will necessarily oblige us, as we value our eternal salvation, to a strict dependance upon, and submission to them, who thus have alone this power of consecrating the Sacraments. . . . And this obligation will extend to all cases wherein we cannot expect, nay and be sure of, God’s supplying the want of these ordinary means, which Himself hath appointed, by extraordinary and uncovenanted favours. But this is what we can have no reasonable ground to hope for, but upon a perfect impossibility, either physical or legal, of obtaining them; which can never be pretended, while they may be had by any moral diligence, or by any not unlawful compliance.

“Now this obligation to submit to all un sinful conditions, how hard or imprudent soever we may think them, which may be required from us, in order to the obtaining of these Sacraments, by those who alone have the power of consecrating them, will necessarily give them a power of government over us; and consequently make the Christian Church a visible society under visible governors: which therefore (since God cannot be supposed to have given them this power unawares, but designedly) must have been the thing chiefly intended in this whole contrivance.

NOTE
XVII.

“And indeed, the Christian Church being instituted for purely spiritual purposes, and not designed to interfere with the civil societies of this world, but to subsist distinctly from, and independently on them, nay, even in a state of persecution from them; as its being a visible society was necessary for this end, so the rewards and punishments of it could not have been of a civil, but spiritual nature; and the most proper, or rather indeed the only way, so far as we can conceive, whereby the governors of this society could have had the power of such spiritual rewards and punishments, even in this life, (which yet is necessary for them to have in order to a government in this life,) could only be by confining the spiritual privileges of it to external symbols, and putting the whole power of dispensing these symbols, with any legal validity, into their hands, after the manner above laid down: which plainly shews us both the wisdom of this contrivance, and the end for which it was designed.

“It was on a full persuasion of this truth, then deeply rooted in the minds of all Christians, that an exclusion from the Sacraments and from the Communion of the Church was in consequence an exclusion from the covenant and promises of God which are confined to them, and so from the means of salvation, that the Discipline of the primitive Church was wholly founded. This was the thing which made them then dread the Ecclesiastical Censures more than all the punishments which the civil magistrate could inflict, or than any evil whatsoever that could reach no further than this life; and so made them willing to atone for their scandalous offences by many years austerities, inflicted on them by the governors of the Church. And it was the exactness and severity of this discipline that made those happy times so glorious and exemplary.

“This Discipline therefore, which was then exercised with so great severity, and yet everywhere submitted to, is a plain and unanswerable proof that this doctrine of the necessity of an external participation of the Sacraments, in the visible Communion of the Catholic Church, in order to salvation, was then universally believed. Which it is impossible it could have been in the very age next to the Apostles, if it had not been delivered by the Apostles themselves as a fundamental doctrine of Christianity to the Churches planted by them.”—Preface to Instructions &c. p. xxiii.

NOTE XVIII.

Q. Is there likewise unity between the Church on earth and the Church in heaven? A. Doubtless there is.—*Orthodox Catechism*, p. 50.

I. The Scottish Bishop Rattray, of Dunkeld, has left us a whole Dissertation in proof of the following proposition;—

“That the habits contracted in this life, and with which we depart out

of it, are not extinguished altogether by death, but that we carry them along with us into the state of separation.”—Bp. Keith’s work, p. 539. NOTE
XVIII.

II. From the Scottish Catechisms :—

That of Aberdeen : “*Q.* Does the Communion of Saints extend to the other world ? *A.* Yes ; the Church upon earth and the Church in Paradise communicate together by mutually praying for each other.”—P. 19.

And that by Bishop Jolly : “*Q.* But is this life the boundary of our connexion with Christ, or with one another ? *A.* No ; death cannot dissolve those bonds which divine grace has formed, or separate us from the love of Christ. *Q.* What do you infer from this ? *A.* Since the union between Christ and His Church cannot be dissolved even by death, it is reasonable to think that a communion still subsists between the Church on earth and the Saints in Paradise, as being still united to the same Head, their common Lord and Saviour. *Q.* And how is this communion maintained or kept up ? *A.* By mutual prayer and thanksgiving.”—P. 35.

And the Catechism of Brechin : “*A.* I believe that this communion with Christ, and through Him with one another, is not dissolved by death ; but that the Saints departed and the Saints on earth make One Family, which is named of our Lord Jesus Christ.” (Eph. iii. 15.)—P. 24.

III. From the Liturgy of the Scottish and Anglican Churches :—

“Therefore *with Angels and Archangels, and with all the Company of heaven*, we laud and magnify Thy glorious Name, evermore praising Thee, and saying, Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Hosts, &c.”

IV. From Bishop Nicholson’s Exposition of the Catechism :—

“It is our duty, 4. to pray with and for one another ; 5. to praise God with and for one another ; 6. to imitate the Saints in heaven, that praise God and pray in general for the Militant Church on earth : for it cannot be conceived, that they being united to the Saints on earth in charity, (which must needs be heightened by their glorification, and by the beatifical vision,) will omit this special duty of charity.”—P. 63.

V. Bishop Montague, in his book on the Invocation of Saints :—

“It is in confesso, that all the Saints departed, each and several Saint departed and with God, do and doth incessantly invoke the high Majesty of heaven ‘*pro nobis miseris peccatoribus.*’”—P. 190.

VI. From the Proposals of the British Bishops to the Easterns :—

“The souls of the Faithful remain until the resurrection in certain mansions appropriated to them, waiting in hope for the revelation of that Day, and joining in the prayers and praises of the Militant Church upon earth offered up in faith.” And again : “We believe that both Saints and Angels have joy in the conversion of one sinner, and in the progress of a Christian ; and we desire to join with them in spirit.”—Prop. xii.

NOTE XIX.

Q. On what is grounded the rule of the Church upon earth to invoke in prayer the Saints of the Church in heaven? A. On a holy tradition, the principle of which is to be seen also in holy Scripture. For instance, when David cries out "O Lord God of Abraham, Isaac, and of Israel, our Fathers;" he makes mention of Saints in aid of his prayer, exactly as now the Orthodox Church calls upon "Christ our true God, by the prayers of His most pure Mother and all His Saints."—*Orthodox Catechism*, p. 50.

The above passage of the Russian Catechism identifies all lawful Invocations of Saints *in principle* with the *oblique* form, about which there can be no doubt, that it is admitted by the British Churches :

I. From Bishop Andrewes' Private Devotions:—

"Making mention of the all-holy, immaculate, and most blessed Mother of God and ever-Virgin Mary, let us commend ourselves, and one another, and our whole life, unto Christ our God."—Oxford ed. 1843, p. 92.

II. Dean Field in his treatise on the Church:—

"Prayer wherein the Church desireth God to be gracious to her, and to grant the things she desireth the rather for that the Saints in heaven also are suppliants for her, will not be found to contain any point of doctrine disliked by us."—Append. to B. iii. p. 223.

III. From Archbishop Bramhall's Answer to M. De la Militiere:—

"We do sometimes meet in ancient authors with the intercession of Saints in general, which we also acknowledge; or an oblique invocation of them, (as you term it,) that is, a prayer directed to God, that He will hear the intercession of the Saints for us, which also we do not condemn."—Vol. I. p. 58. Oxford ed. 1842.

IV. From a Collect in the original Service for the Day of King Charles the First's Martyrdom, put forth by authority in the year 1661:—

"We beseech Thee to give us all grace to remember and provide for our latter end by a careful imitation of this Thy blessed Saint and Martyr, and all other Thy Saints and Martyrs that have gone before us; that we may be made worthy to receive benefit by their prayers, which they in communion with Thy Church Catholic offer up unto Thee for that part of it here militant, and in fight with, and in danger from the flesh."

V. From Thorndike's book entitled "The Epilogue":—

"I will distinguish three sorts of prayers to Saints. The first is of those

that are made to God, but to desire His blessings by and through the merits and intercession of His Saints; as (the following) ‘By whose merits and prayers grant that in all things we may be guarded by Thy protection and help:’ ‘We pray Thee, Lord, by the merits of the Saints, whose relics are here, and all Saints, that Thou wouldest vouchsafe to release me all my sins:’ And again; ‘that we, who believe her truly the Mother of God, may be helped by her intercession with Thee.’ . . . This first kind seem to me utterly agreeable with Christianity, importing only the exercise of that communion, which all members of God’s Church hold with all members of it.”—B. iii. p. 356, &c.

NOTE
XIX.

VI. From the work of Dr. Thomas Brett, one of the Bishops who corresponded with the Eastern Patriarchs, A.D. 1716, 1724:—

“If they, (the Saints departed) still hold the Communion of Saints, and it is an Article of our Creed that they do so, we cannot doubt of their praying for us. And if they do pray for us, is it unlawful for us to pray that God would hear their prayers for us? Is it a corruption in a Liturgy to have such a petition in it? I can by no means think so. The Apostle speaking of our praying one for another, adds, that ‘the effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much.’ Now I cannot doubt but the Saints departed are righteous men, and therefore cannot doubt but their effectual fervent prayer for their brethren on earth availeth much; consequently, that it is lawful for any private Christian, or any congregation of Christians, to pray that their prayers may be available to them in this particular. We know well that there is *but one Mediator betwixt God and man, the man Christ Jesus*; but then we know also that this must be understood of *one Mediator of redemption*, because God has so frequently commanded us to pray one for another, that is, to be intercessors or mediators of *intercession* for each other. For these reasons I can by no means think it amiss to *pray, that we may obtain a place at God’s right hand by the intercessions and supplications of the Saints*. . . . For if the prayers of the righteous, which they make for others, avail much, there is no question but they help forward and further the salvation of those for whom they are made: and therefore it cannot be unlawful or unfit for those for whom these prayers are made by the Saints departed, that is, the whole Church on earth, to beg of God that the prayers of His Saints now in Paradise, which they make for their brethren here on earth, may be heard, and that we may receive the benefits prayed for, and particularly the great benefit of all, *a place at God’s right hand in that terrible and just Day*. As such intercessions of one Christian, or one part of the Church for another, are so far from being unlawful, that they are necessary, and our bounden duty to each other, so they can be no affront to the mediatorial office of Christ, because such intercessions are made in His name, and in virtue of His merits. And if the intercessions themselves are necessary,

NOTE
XIX.

and for the honour of Christ, Who requires them of us, to pray that such intercessions may be heard, or that we may be heard or receive benefit by them, even the greatest benefit of all, the salvation of our souls, can be no fault. . . . That prayer, wherein God is desired to grant unto His people ‘*a place at His right hand, by the intercessions and supplications of the Virgin Mary, and all His Saints,*’ though it be not in the Clementine Liturgy, yet cannot be judged an interpolation in a Liturgy ascribed to St. Basil; forasmuch as . . . St. Cyril, who was twenty years St. Basil’s senior, testifies that the Church in his time prayed, that *God would receive their requests by virtue of the prayers and intreaties of the Saints.* Which is as old as any testimony we have during the first four or five centuries for the use of the Lord’s Prayer in the Eucharistic Service.”—P. 360, &c.

VII. And it is important to remark that the Eastern Patriarchs distinctly offered to make union with the British, so long as they would go thus far with them, even though they declined, through what they deemed a pious though mistaken caution, to make any direct addresses to the Saints:—

“We may here fairly cry out with David ‘They were in fear where no fear was:’ . . . for we do not pay them (the Saints) the same honour that is due to the King alone, but such as is proper for the friends of the King. Nevertheless, if this offend you, ye may forbear saying, ‘*Holy Mother of God help us,*’ and instead of it ye may say, ‘*O merciful and almighty Lord, assist us by the intercessions of Thine immaculate Mother, the blessed Virgin Mary, and all Thy Saints.*’”—Answer to Prop. ii.

And again, on the Invocation of Angels:—

“What we said above will serve as a reply to this Proposition: but as to the jealousy ye speak of, it seems like the zeal of those, of whom the Apostle says, that ‘they have a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge:’” And at length, exhorting them “to shake off all prejudice, and follow unhesitatingly the uniform tradition of the Church, which is not contrary to holy Scripture,” they conclude thus: “Ye give us great expectations (even in this Proposition) of the wished for and much desired happy union and agreement: which do Thou O Christ, our King, speedily effect, by Thine Almighty help, for the intercession of Thine immaculate Mother and all Thy Saints! for we earnestly, and from the bottom of our souls desire it.”—Answer to Prop. iii.

But besides the admission of those *oblique* Invocations, which alone the Eastern Patriarchs required as absolutely necessary in order to a union, and besides poetical and spiritual Apostrophes, whether inviting to prayer or praise, which occur in the Hymns of the Anglican Ritual, and even in the Psalter itself, testimonies may be found to prove the possibility of a still closer agreement on this subject:

VIII. Bishop Latimer (apud Foxe), writes as follows:—

“Take Saints for inhabitants of heaven, and worshipping of them for

praying to them, I never denied but they might be worshipped, and be our mediators, though not by way of redemption (for so Christ alone is a whole mediator, both for them and for us) yet by way of intercession.”

NOTE
XIX.

Like admissions to this may be seen quoted and set forth at length, not only from other British Divines but from many of the most celebrated and learned writers of the Protestants, in the book of Dr. William Forbes, first Bishop of Edinburgh. (Consid. Modest. p. 322, &c.) He quotes very distinct passages from Luther, J. Œcolampadius, M. Bucer, Joachim Camerarius, The Author of the Enchir. Col., on the Decalogue, J. Casaubon, Jo. Gerhard, Andr. Fricius, and others; which the reader may consult.

IX. Bishop Montague writes as follows:—

“I see no absurdity in nature, no incongruity unto analogy of faith, no repugnancy at all to sacred Scripture, much less impiety, for any man to say, ‘*O Sancte Angele Custos, ora pro me.*’” . . . In like manner he defends the Virgin Justina mentioned by St. Gregory Nazianzen as imploring the help of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and says that “against such a manner of invoking Saints, joined with faith in Christ, he would not contend.”—Forbes, Consid. Modest. p. 327.

X. Antonio De Dominis, (lib. vii. c. xii.) owns, that he “finds the custom of thus invoking the Saints, to pray for us, or rather with us, to be most ancient, and never blamed in the Church, but rather the contrary condemned in Vigilantius by St. Jerome, with the applause of all;” and that “resting thus upon ancient prescription and approved practice, it ought not to be done away.” . . . And again: “Let not then this custom of Invocation be a cause for schisms: but let those who invoke the Saints take care to warn the people against giving any undue or idolatrous honour; and let the other side leave off absolutely condemning Invocations, as if they were evil in themselves, when used with caution.”—Vol. III. p. 287.

XI. Archbishop Bramhall writes as follows:—

“A *comprecation* both the Grecians and we allow; an *ultimate invocation* both the Grecians and we detest:” (Works, p. 418.) alluding to a passage in the Answers of the Patriarch Jeremiah to the Lutherans, (In Cens. de Præcipuis, &c. c. xxi.) which is also quoted with approbation by Bishop Forbes, (p. 298.) “We say that Invocation strictly and properly belongs to God alone, and is due to Him in the first place and in the most absolute sense, while that made to the Saints is not invocation *properly so called*, but per accidens only, and in a certain sense, by a certain grace and privilege. For it is not Peter or Paul that of himself hears any of those who invoke him, but that grace and gift which they have according to that promise of Christ, ‘I am with you even to the end of the world.’”

XII. Thorndike writes thus:—

“The second kind of Invocations is the ‘*ora pro nobis*,’ and the ‘*te rogamus audi nos*,’ directly addressed to the Blessed Virgin and the

NOTE
XIX.

Saints." Of this kind he pronounces, that "it is not idolatry;" and that the greatest "lights of the Greek and Latin Church, Basil, Nazianzen, Nyssen, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Chrysostom, both the Cyrils, Theodoret, Fulgentius, Gregory the Great, and Leo, &c., who lived from the time of Constantine, have all of them spoken to the Saints departed, and desired their assistance." And again: "After Constantine," he says, "when the Festivals of the Saints, being publicly celebrated, occasioned the confluence of Gentiles as well as Christians, and innumerable things were done, which seemed miracles done by God to attest the honour done them, and the truth of Christianity which it supposed, I acknowledge those great lights did think fit to address themselves to them as petitioners."—Epilogue, B. iii. p. 356, &c.

XIII. Dr. William Forbes, Bishop of Edinburgh, has exhausted the whole subject in his book entitled "*Considerationes Modestæ, &c.*" The third chapter of his treatise is devoted to prove the following Proposition:—

"The mere Invocation or addressing of Angels and Saints, asking them to join us in praying, and to intercede for us to God, is neither to be condemned as unlawful, nor as useless."—P. 299.

Again: "Though there be no command nor formal example to be found for it in Scripture, the invocation of Angels and Saints to pray with us and for us to God is not on this account to be rejected as unlawful, as the Protestants now-a-days commonly contend.".. "It is enough, the thing being not an essential, but to be placed among the ἀδιάφορα, that it be not repugnant to holy Scripture, but agreeable thereto; as we see that many other things have been received by the Fathers as lawful and pious, and are still so received by the Church of England, though they have no express command nor even example of Scripture: &c."—P. 305, and p. 307.

"Further, though in the Fathers of the first three centuries there is no clear passage for direct addresses in prayers to Angels or Saints, (p. 308.) still, neither on this account is the usage of addressing Angels and Saints to be rejected or condemned. For many lawful and profitable rites, as is well known, have been introduced into the Church by the Fathers and Councils of subsequent ages, especially by those of the fourth and fifth centuries, about which nothing is to be read in the writers of earlier times. For the Church of the fourth century had like and equal right with that of the three preceding to institute such rites as she might judge lawful and profitable. No man in his senses, I suppose, will deny this."—P. 310.

And lastly, before bringing an overwhelming mass of testimony from the Protestants themselves, he concludes thus: "In fine, for very many ages now past, throughout the Universal Church, in the East no less than in the West, and in the North also among the Muscovites, it is a received usage to sing '*St. Peter, &c., pray for us:*' but to despise or condemn the universal consent of the whole Church is most dangerous presumption."—P. 322.

XIV. The same Bishop, among other admissions of later times, quotes with approbation the following from a book entitled “*Pia et Catholica Christiani Hominis Institutio*,” in English and Latin, put forth by the Bishops of the Church of England in the year 1537, and afterwards again in the year 1543, (the Latin in 1544,) and never hitherto retracted or condemned:—

NOTE
XIX.

“To pray unto Saints to be intercessors with us and for us to our Lord in our suits which we make unto Him, and for such things as we can obtain of none but Him, so that we esteem not, or worship not them as givers of those gifts, but as intercessors for the same, is received and approved by the most ancient and perpetual use of the Catholic Church: but if we honour them any other ways than as the friends of God, dwelling with Him, and established now in His glory everlasting, and as examples which were requisite for us to follow in holy life and conversation, or if we yield unto Saints the adoration and honour which is due unto God alone, we do, no doubt, break the commandment.”—*Formul. of Faith*, ed. Lloyd, pp. 141, and 351. And Forbes, *Consid. Modest.* p. 328.

XV. But if any question the sufficiency of these testimonies, let him consider what has been recently alleged by a living writer of the Presbyterian or Calvinistic persuasion.—Masson, *Apology for the Greek Church*, p. 30, and p. 108, &c.

NOTE XX.

Q. What testimonies are there to confirm us in the belief that the Saints after their departure work miracles through certain earthly means? A. The bones of the Prophet Elisha raised a dead man to life, . . The Apostle Paul by handkerchiefs and aprons, . . St. Peter by his shadow, . . &c. (And then St. Gregory the Divine and St. John Damascene are quoted.)—*Orthodox Catechism*, p. 51.

I. The Calendars of the Scottish and English Churches still commemorate on certain Days the discovery of Relics, and their Translations; as, May III, the Invention of the Cross by the Empress St. Helena; June XX, the Translation of the Relics of St. Edward; July IV, the Translation of those of St. Martin; September XIV, the Holy Cross; &c.

II. In the Book of Homilies we have the following admission:—

“It is testified that ‘Epiphanius being yet alive, did work miracles; and that after his death, devils being expelled at his tomb, did roar.’”—P. 159.

III. Hooker, among other “considerations for which Christian Churches

NOTE XX. rightly took their names at the first from Saints," states this, that in respect of certain places; "It pleased God by the ministry of Saints to shew there some rare effect of His power."—Eccl. Pol. v. xiii. 3.

VI. The following passage is from Bishop Andrewes:—

"For Relics, were we sure they were true and uncounterfeit, we would carry to them the regard, that becometh us."—Respons. ad. Card. Perr.

V. The following, to the same effect, from Bishop Montague:—

"Their Relics, remains, and memorials, and whatsoever there be of that kind genuine and uncounterfeit, . . . we most willingly receive, and are ready to pay them that due and proper veneration which belong to them. So let only this be attended to, and we shall easily agree upon the veneration of the Relics of the Saints."—Orig. Eccl. vol. i. p. 39.

Again: "They inclosed the bones of the Saints, their ashes and Relics, in golden cists, and wrapped them in precious stuffs. And assuredly, I, for one, will with Constantine wrap those Relics in stuffs, will set them in gold, to carry about; I will raise them to my lips, and hang them around my neck, and continually look upon and handle them."—Antidiall. p. 17.

VI. Archbishop Bramhall writes thus:—

"Abundant love and duty doth extend an honourable respect from the person of a dear friend or noble benefactor to his posterity, to his memory, to his monument, to his Relics, to every thing that he loved, even to the earth that he did tread upon, for his sake."—Oxford ed. p. 44.

VII. Thorndike thus:—

"We believe that we are most sincerely to honour the bodies of the Saints, specially the Relics of the Martyrs. If any man do otherwise, he is no Christian, but a follower of Eunomius and Vigilantius. . . Nay, though St. Jerome says that those poor women, who lighted candles in honour of them, 'had a zeal of God not according to knowledge,' yet why should this seem an unfit ceremony. If Vigilantius could not endure this, I cannot endure Vigilantius."—Epilogue, iii. p. 360.

VIII. Bishop Bull, (Def. Fid. Nic. ii. 12. 2.) speaking of the Exposition of faith which is said to have been revealed to St. Gregory Thaumaturgus by an apparition of the Blessed Virgin with St. John, observes that;—

"It ought not to seem incredible to any man that such an incident should have happened to such a man; of whom we are assured by all Ecclesiastical writers who have mentioned him, (and who is there that has not mentioned him?) by all, I say, with one consent, and as it were with one mouth, that his whole life was filled with notable revelations and miracles."

IX. From Bishop Hall's treatise "Of the Invisible World:"—

"The trade that we have with good spirits is not now discerned by the eye, but is like to themselves, spiritual; yet not so, but that even in bodily

occasions we have many times insensible helps from them in such manner, as that by the effects we can boldly say, ‘Here hath been an Angel, though we see him not.’ Of this kind was that no less than miraculous cure, which at St. Madern’s in Cornwall was wrought upon a poor cripple, John Trelille, whereof (besides the attestation of many hundreds of the neighbours) I took a strict and personal examination in that last Visitation, which I ever did or ever shall hold. This man, that for sixteen years together was fain to walk upon his hands, by reason of the close contraction of the sinews of his legs, upon three monitions in his dream to wash in that well, was suddenly so restored to his limbs, that I saw him able to walk and get his own maintenance. I found here was neither art nor collusion; the thing done, the author invisible.”—Lib. i. § 8.

NOTE
XX.

An account of this miracle, related more at large, is taken ex R. P. Franeisei Coventr. Paralipom. Philosoph.: “I will relate,” says he, “one miracle more done in my own country, to the great wonder of the neighbouring inhabitants, but a few years ago, to wit, about the year 1640. The process of the business was told the King when at Oxford, which he commanded to be further examined; and it was this. A certain boy of twelve years old, called John Trelille, in the county of Cornwall, not far from the Land’s End, as they were playing at foot-ball after the manner of that country, snatching up the ball ran away with it: whereupon a girl in anger struck him with a stick on the back bone; and so bruised or brake it, that for sixteen years after he was forced to go ereeping on the ground. In this condition, arrived to the twenty-eighth year of his age, he dreamed that if he did but wash in St. Madern’s well, or in the stream running from it, he should recover his former strength and perfection. This is a place in Cornwall, from the remains of ancient devotion frequented still on the Thursdays in May, and especially on the Thursday of Corpus Christi: near to which well is a Chapel dedicated to St. Madern, where is yet an altar, and right against it a grassy hillock, by the country people every year made anew, which they call St. Madern’s Bed. The Chapel roof is quite decayed, but a kind of thorn of itself shooting forth of the old walls, so extends its boughs, as that it, strangely, covers the whole Chapel, and supplies as it were a roof to it. So one Thursday in May, assisted by one Periman, his neighbour, nourishing great hopes from his dream, thither he crept; and lying before the altar and praying very fervently, that, as it was related to him in his dream, he might regain his health and the strength of his limbs, he washed his whole body in the stream that flowed from the well and ran through the Chapel: after which, having slept about an hour and an half on St. Madern’s bed, through the extremity of pain he felt in his nerves and arteries, he began to cry out; and his companion helping and lifting him up, he perceived his limbs and his joints somewhat extended, and himself become stronger; insomuch that partly with his feet, partly with his hands,

NOTE
XX.

he went much more erected than before. And before the next Thursday he got two crutches, resting on which he could make a shift to walk, (which before he could not,) and coming then to the Chapel, as formerly, after having bathed himself, he slept again on the same bed, and at last awakened, found himself much stronger and more upright, and so leaving one crutch in the Chapel, he went home with the other. The third Thursday he returned to the Chapel, and bathed as before, slept, and when awake, rose up quite cured; yea grew so strong, that he wrought day labour amongst other hired servants, and four years after, listed himself a soldier in the King's army, where he behaved himself with great stoutness both of mind and body. At length in 1644 he was slain at the siege of Lime. What fiction can be here, I see not."—Cap. ix. p. 68.

X. In like manner Bishop Montague, while speaking of the Sign of the Cross, and saying that he "could tell some experimental effects thereof, some experimental effects of his own knowledge," adds, that even though miracles have in some sense ceased, yet in another sense they may well be thought so far to remain, "that God both can, and may, and will, and doth sometimes work miracles even in these days."—Appeal, p. 275, &c.

NOTE XXI.

Q. What great privilege has the Catholic Church?

A. She alone has the sublime promises 'that the gates of hell shall not prevail against her;' that the Lord shall be 'with her even to the end of the world;' &c.; and consequently, that she shall never apostatize from the faith, nor sin against the truth of the faith, or fall into error. Q. If so, must it not be necessary for salvation that every believer should belong to her? A. Certainly:—*Orthodox Catechism*, p. 53.

I. Dean Field, in his treatise *On the Church*:—

"As we hold it impossible the Church should ever by apostasy and misbelief wholly depart from God, . . . so we hold it never falleth into any heresy."—B. iv. c. 2.

II. So also Archbishop Laud, in his Conference with Fisher:—

"It is true that a General Council, *de post facto*, after it is ended, and admitted by the whole Church, is then infallible."—P. 291. ed. 1839.

III. And Hammond, following Bp. Montague and Archbishop Laud:—

"I shall number it among the things that piety will believe, that no General Council, truly such, 1. duly assembled, 2. freely celebrated, and

3. universally received, either hath erred, or ever shall err, in matters of faith."—Of Heresy, Sect. ix. NOTE
XXI.

IV. Archbishop Bramhall writes as follows:—

"We hold and teach; first, that the gates of hell shall never prevail against the Universal Church. Secondly, we believe that the Catholic Church is the faithful Spouse of Christ, and cannot be guilty of idolatry, which is spiritual adultery. Thirdly, we neither say nor think that the Œcumenical Church of Christ is guilty of tyranny. It is principled to suffer wrong, to do none, and by suffering to conquer, as a flock of unarmed sheep in the midst of ravening wolves."—Answer to De la Militiere, p. 42.

V. Dr. Saywell has the following passage:—

"St. Paul admonishes the bishops, that of themselves should men arise speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them: and this may happen even in large Councils. But nothing like this can be said of the College of Pastors, or of Councils truly Œcumenical, received and approved by the Catholic Church: nor may any one oppose Scripture and the tradition of the Church to the tradition of an Œcumenical Council universally received and approved: for they teach the same thing, and equally declare the evangelical faith: nor do the Pastors, either when dispersed abroad or collected in a really free Council, bear a discordant testimony. The same truth is contained in Scripture, in tradition, in Œcumenical Synods. It cannot be that an Œcumenical Council, or the free and true testimony of the College of Pastors, should be contrary to the Tradition of the Church: nor can any doctrine be confirmed by the tradition of the Church, which is repugnant to sacred Scripture; since among all traditions none is more certain than that of Scripture. Therefore let the Scripture retain its perspicuity and sufficiency, Tradition its firmness and constancy, the Pastors and Œcumenical Synods their authority and reverence: nor let any one set them in opposition to each other: since the same faith, the same doctrine, in all things necessary to salvation, is taught in its own method and order by each; and each has its own use and authority in handing down and preserving the truth."—Præfat. ad Epist. Launoi, Cantab. 1689.

VI. From the Proposals of the British Bishops to the Easterns:—

"We agree that the Holy Ghost assisteth the Church in judging rightly concerning matters of Faith, and that both general and particular orthodox Councils, convened after the example of the first Council of Jerusalem, may reasonably expect that assistance in their resolutions." And again: "We agree that every Christian ought to be subject to the Church, and that the Church is by Christ sufficiently instructed and authorized to examine the writings and censure the persons of her subjects or ministers, though never so great."—Heads v. and ix. of Agreement.

VII. See also above, Note II, and Note XVII: especially the passages

NOTE
XXI. quoted from the Scottish Catechism of the diocese of Brechin, (p. 90.)
“The Church is the pillar and ground of the truth, instituted to preserve and convey the truth through the several ages to come.” And (p. 61.) “I am with you always even to the end of the world; &c.” And in the Ordinal, “Against it the gates of hell shall never prevail.” And in the Scottish Catechism above referred to; “Q. Must not all to whom the Gospel is preached become members of the Church? A. Yes; for it is said, ‘*The Lord added daily to the Church such as should be saved*,’ which shews that the appointed road to heaven lies through the Church of Christ upon earth.”—P. 68.

VIII. From the Preface to the Scottish Canons of 1837:—

“The Doctrine of the Church, as founded on the authority of Scripture, being fixed and immutable, ought to be uniformly received and adhered to in all times, and at all places.”

IX. In the Proposals of the British Bishops to the Easterns (A.D. 1716.) besides the Patriarchal Church of Jerusalem, the other Patriarchal Churches also “of Antioch, Alexandria, and Constantinople, with the Bishops thereof, are recognized as to all their ancient canonical rights, privileges, and preeminences.” Prop. ii. and iii. In Prop. iv. the Roman Bishop is alluded to as being first in order of the five.

On this subject see also Notes II, and XVII.

NOTE XXII.

Q. What is a Mystery? (i. e. Sacrament.) A. A Mystery is a holy act through which grace, or, in other words, the saving power of God, works mysteriously upon man. Q. How many are the Mysteries? A. Seven.—*Orthodox Catech.*, p. 56.

I. The XXXIX Articles, the Catechism, and the Homilies of the Church of England assert that in the strictest sense of the word, and according to one certain definition of its sense, the Sacraments of the Gospel are “Two only;” but the First English Ritual plainly, and even the present Act of Uniformity by implication, allows more than two; as do also the Homilies, expressly drawing the distinction between the stricter and the laxer definitions. So the present English Ritual still calls Matrimony “*an excellent Mystery*,” or Sacrament.

II. On this subject Bishop Andrewes writes as follows:—

“We deny not, but that the title of Sacrament hath sometimes been given by the Fathers unto all the (other) five, in a larger signification. . . . The whole matter is a mere λογολαλία.”—Ans. to Card. Perr.

III. And Bishop Montague:—

NOTE
XXII.

“Bellarmine saith that Calvin admitteth Ordination for a Sacrament, and Bellarmine doth not belie Calvin, for he doth so indeed. . . . ‘*Impositionem manuum Sacramentum esse eoneedo.*’ (l. iv. c. xix. § 31.) How that is, he expresseth himself elsewhere, (ib. c. iv. § 20.) ‘*non invitus patior vocari Sacramentum . . . inter ordinaria Sacramenta non numero.*’ No Papist living, I think, will say or desire more. It is not for *all* (*ordinarium*), but for *some*. Which saying of his is similarly expressed in our Communion Book, where . . . it is said, . . . ‘*Two only as generally necessary,*’ (i. e. necessary to all men,) not excluding others from that *name* and *designation*, though from the *prerogative*, and *degree*.”—Appello Cæs. c. xxxiii.

IV. Thorndike writes as follows:—

“The name and notion of a Sacrament, as it hath been duly used by the Church and approved writers, extendeth to all holy actions done by virtue of the office with which God hath trusted His Church, in hope of obtaining the grace which He promiseth. Baptism and the Eucharist are actions appointed by God in certain creatures utterly powerless to work grace without His appointment, best fit to signify all the grace which the Gospel promiseth, &c.; both of them antecedent for their institution to the foundation of the Church. . . . The rest are actions appointed to be solemnized in the Church by the Apostles, not always every where precisely with the same ceremonies, but such as always may reasonably serve to signify the graces which it prays for. . . . Nor am I solicitous to make that construction, which may satisfy the decrees of the Councils of Florence and Trent, who have first taken upon them to decree under anathema the conceits of the Schoolmen in reducing them to the number of Seven; but seeing the particulars so qualified by ancient writers in the Church, and the number agreed upon by the Greek Church as well as the Latin, I have acknowledged that sense of their sayings, which the primitive order of the Catholic Church enforceeth.”—P. 349.

Again, to the following effect: “Truly, of all the controversies which the Reformation hath occasioned, I see in none less reason for either side to make a difficulty than in this, which all turns upon the name ‘Sacrament,’ a name which is not found to be attributed in the Scriptures either to Seven, or to Two. For this name being taken up and commonly used by the Church, that is to say, by those writers, whom the Church alloweth and honoureth, what reason is there to deny the Church liberty to attribute it to any thing, which the power given to the Church enableth it to appoint and to use for the obtaining God’s blessing upon Christians? Why should not any action appointed by the Church to obtain God’s sanctifying grace by virtue of any promise which the Gospel containeth be counted a Sacrament? At least, supposing it to consist in a ceremony fit to signify that blessing which it is to procure.”—Epilogue, B. iii. p. 342.

NOTE
XXII.

And again: "For the justifying of ceremonies, why should I allege any thing but those Offices of the Church, which the Fathers have called Sacraments, as well as Baptism and the Eucharist? . . . That which I am to say of them here, consists of two points. That they are Offices necessary to be ministered to all Christians concerned in them; and that they are to be solemnized with those ceremonies, for which they are, without any cause of offence, called Sacraments by the Fathers of the Church."—Just Weights and Measures, p. 118.

After which he proceeds to speak of each of the Seven in order, as shall be instanced below in different Notes.

V. From the Proposals of the British Bishops to the Easterns:—

"We agree that Baptism and this, (the Eucharist,) are of *general necessity to salvation* for all the faithful; and that *the other Holy Mysteries* instituted by Christ or appointed by the Apostles, which are not so generally necessary to all, ought nevertheless to be received and celebrated with due reverence, according to Catholic and immemorial practice."—Head xi. of Agreement.

Of this Article together with three others the Patriarchs say in their answer that "they are true, and speak our sense; wherefore we receive them in the sense in which we judge they are to be taken. . . . We hold likewise, that the holy Sacraments are Seven in number, but two only exceed in necessity, and are such as that no one can be saved without them. For as for Baptism, it is our Lord's saying, that 'Except a man be born again of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God;' and of the Eucharist He says, 'Unless ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His Blood, ye have no life in you.' However, the Sacrament of the Priesthood is one of the most necessary, for without this how shall the Sacrament of the Eucharist be performed, of which the Lord said unto His Apostles, 'Do this in remembrance of Me;' and how shall Christians have the participation of the Sacrament of His precious Body and Blood, if there be no Priest to consecrate and perform the sacred ministration? For without a Priest not all the Princes and Kings of the earth together can perform this supernatural Mystery, and distribute it to the faithful. The other Four, and especially that of Chrism, (i. e. Confirmation) and that of Penitence, are vastly profitable to salvation; for without Chrism, (Confirmation) none can be a perfect Christian, that being the Seal of the Gift of the Holy Ghost, which was held and imposed as necessary both in the ancient and present Church. And since Baptism cannot be repeated, how shall they who fall after Baptism obtain forgiveness without repentance and confession, and without a person endued with the power of binding and loosing?" To all which the British in their Rejoinder signified their full assent.

VI. Agreeably with all the above, the learned Dr. Thomas Rattray,

Bishop of Dunkeld in Scotland, in his Treatise intitled "Some particular Instructions concerning the Christian Covenant, and the Mysteries by which it is transacted and maintained," speaks not only of Baptism and the Eucharist, but also of "the other Sacraments," besides these. (p. 15.) The reader may consult the Treatise at length. See also the Scottish Catechism of Bishop Innes, (p. 36.) where a *Sacrament* is defined generally to be "*a sacred thing*;" and a *Mystery* is defined to be "*something hidden or concealed*;" and both words are said "in the language of the Church" to "signify the same thing," and are applied to more than Two. And the Catechism of Bishop Jolly, p. 56.

NOTE
XXII.

NOTE XXIII.

A. Baptism is a Sacrament in which a man who believes, having his body thrice plunged in water in the Name of God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, dies to the carnal life of sin, and is born again to a life spiritual and holy.—*Orthodox Catechism*, p. 56.

I. See above, under Note I.: and the Baptismal Offices of the British Churches. In the English Catechism there are the following Questions and Answers on this subject:—

"Q. How many parts are there in a Sacrament? A. Two; the outward visible sign, and the inward spiritual grace. Q. What is the outward visible sign, or form in Baptism? A. Water, wherein the person is baptized, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Q. What is the inward and spiritual grace? A. A death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness: for being by nature born in sin, and the children of wrath, we are hereby made the children of grace." See also the Preface to the same Catechism: and the Scottish Catechisms of Bishop Innes; (pp. 7, 8, 9, 36.) of Bishop Jolly; (pp. 3, 36, 57, 58.) and of Bishop Moir; pp. 7, 11. 43, 46. 99.

II. Dr. Rattray, Bishop of Dunkeld in Scotland, has the following:—

"We are first entered into this society of the Church, and made members of this, which is Christ's Body, by Baptism; in which the baptized person 1. renounceth, &c.; 2. gives himself up to Christ's service, &c.; 3. professes his belief of Christ's doctrine, promising to hold fast that profession; and 4. engageth to live in obedience to His laws: upon which, God granteth him 1. a full remission of his original sin, and of all his antecedent actual transgressions, if he hath committed any, cleansing him from all stain and pollution of them in the water of Baptism. 2. He giveth him a title to the Holy Spirit, as a principle of new life to the Mystical

NOTE
XXIII.

Body of Christ, derived from Him the Head: 3. and by this Spirit he is entitled to the Resurrection of his body, &c.; and 4. to a happy Immortality, if he continues stedfast in the performance of the conditions undertaken by him. 5. God promises to accept of a sincere though imperfect obedience to His laws, provided it be universal, and that he keep free from all heinous and mortal sin, and still be improving and going on to perfection. And, lastly, 6. if he shall be so unhappy as to pollute his baptism by any such heinous and mortal sin, God is graciously pleased in this covenant to promise, that upon a laborious and thoroughly practical repentance, He will pardon his lapse, and receive him again into favour.

“The symbol by which this covenant is transacted is Water, in which the person is baptized” (by trine immersion, or affusion; See Rubric of the Baptismal Office in the English Ritual, 1548.) “to signify his being washed from all stain of sin. And he is thus baptized in or into the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; whereby is signified his being made the disciple of the Blessed Trinity in the School of *Christ*, the Doctrine of *Christ* being that of the Father, and the Holy Spirit receiving it from Christ, to teach it to His Church; and likewise his being made a member of that Body, of which the Father and the Son are the Heads, the One in subordination to the other, and the Holy Spirit the Bond of unity, and principle of spiritual life to it, derived from the Father, by or through the Son. And by his being dipped in this water, (or, in case of necessity, having it poured upon him,) is represented, and consequently in this symbolical way of covenanting, effected, on God’s part, his being buried with Christ into His death; the death of Christ being applied to him, as made a member of that Body, for which He suffered as the Head. And being thus dead, and buried with Christ, with respect to the former life of the old man, by his going under the water, he is, by his rising out of it again, made partaker of Christ’s Resurrection, 1. to a new and spiritual life, which is mystically a new creation, or formation of him, his regeneration or second birth, whereby he is made a pure and holy temple, fitted for the inhabitation of the Holy Spirit, the principle of this new life; by which Spirit he is 2. to be raised also to a glorious immortality at the Last Day. And on the part of the baptized person is signified, and thereby undertaken, that he shall ‘reckon indeed himself to be dead unto sin, so as not to let it reign any more in his mortal body, but alive unto God in Jesus Christ our Lord, by walking in newness of life:’ and likewise that he shall be ready, if God in His providence call him to it, not only to part with whatever is dearest to him here, but also to die for the name of the Lord Jesus; seeing that if we suffer with him, we shall also partake of the glory of His Resurrection.”—P. 6, &c. § vi. and vii.

III. For Baptism of Children, Sponsors, and Exorcism before Baptism, and the Chrysom or White Garment, see the First and Present English

Rituals. For Exorcism, as still recognized by the British Church, see the Canon, (A.D. 1602.) forbidding any to Exorcise without first obtaining the license of their Bishops. NOTE
XXIII.

NOTE XXIV.

Of “the force of the Sign of the Cross used at Baptism and on other occasions.”—*Orthodox Catechism*, p. 58.

I. In the First English Ritual the Sign of the Cross is prescribed to be used both at Baptism and on other occasions; as at Confirmation, the consecration of the Eucharist, the benediction of Matrimony, and the Unction of the Sick with oil, the Coronation of Kings, &c. The retention of the order for its use at Baptism giving great offence to the Puritan or Calvinizing party, the Church of England in 1603 framed a canon expressly to defend this usage, from which the following is an extract:—

“The honour and dignity of the name of the Cross begat a reverent estimation even in the Apostles’ times of the Sign of the Cross, which the Christians shortly after used *in all their actions*: . . . and this Sign they did not only use themselves with a kind of glory, when they met with any Jews, but signed therewith their children, when they were christened: . . . And this use of the Sign of the Cross in Baptism was held in the primitive Church, as well by the Greeks as the Latins, with one consent and great applause. At which time, if any had opposed themselves against it, they would certainly have been censured as enemies of the name of the Cross, and consequently of Christ’s merits, the Sign whereof they could no better endure. This continual and general use of the Sign of the Cross is evident by many testimonies of the ancient Fathers.”—Can. xxx.

II. It is related of Archbishop Laud, that before the Coronation of King Charles I. “finding the old Crucifix among the regalia, he caused it to be placed upon the altar, as in former times.” (Heylin’s Life, p. 144.) He restored too the broken Crucifix in Lambeth Chapel.—State Trials, i. 423.

III. “By the Sign of the Cross,” writes Bishop Montague, quoting the words of Athanasius, “‘all magic spells are disappointed, sorcery and witchcraft coming to nothing, all idols are abandoned and forsaken.’ . . . ‘We have also spiritual conjurations;’ saith Chrysostom, ‘the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the power of the Cross.’ I could tell,” continues the Bishop, “some experimental effects thereof, some experimented effects of my own knowledge. What, if upon divers extremities I have found ease and remedy by using that ejaculatory prayer of our Litany, ‘Per Crucem, &c.’ and when I said it, what if I made the Sign of the Cross? . . . The

NOTE
XXIV.

Cross of our Saviour, in the external Sign thereof, being as much vilified and despised by furious Puritans in these days, as ever it was by frantic Pagans of old, why may not God, to teach men better manners, and to check this exorbitancy against the Sign of our dear Redeemer's death, do now, as He hath done in the days of old, and shew some sign and token to magnify the thing so much despised."—Appeal, p. 275, &c.

And again, to the charge of the Puritans, that he used the Sign of the Cross "not only in Baptism," but elsewhere, he rejoins thus:—

"‘Not only in Baptism,’ ye say: tell me then, are ye come so far towards the Church of England, as to allow signing with the Cross in Baptism? . . . There is hope you may grow in time, upon better advice, in love and practice with the Sign of the Cross in the forehead and elsewhere. If it be not superstitious to sign it in the forehead, why is it to sign any other part of the body? Why more out of Baptism, than in Baptism? What hindereth but that I may sign myself with the Sign of the Cross in any part of the body, at any time; at night, when I go to bed, in the morning, when I rise; at my going out, or at my returning home? The ancient Church so used it out of Baptism, ordinarily; and so may we."—Ibid.

IV. Dean Hicke writes thus, expressing his regrets for the loss of the ordinary use of this Sign of the Cross:—

"As for the transient Signs of the Cross which in the pure ancient times were used in religious worship, I very much approve of the use of them; as we do in Baptism; and as I would have done in Anointing the Sick with oil, and persons Confirmed with Chrism, were we so happy as to have those primitive religious rites and usages restored."—Supplement of Additions to the Third Edit. of Dr. Hicke's Two Treatises, p. 46.

NOTE XXV.

A. Unction with Chrism is a Mystery, in which the baptized believer, being anointed with holy Chrism on certain parts of the body, in the Name of the Holy Ghost, receives the Gifts of the Holy Ghost for growth and strength in spiritual life.—*Orthodox Catechism*, p. 59.

I. According to the First English Ritual Confirmation was administered both by Unction with Chrism and by the Imposition of the Bishop's Hands: by that now in use the Imposition of the Bishop's Hands alone is retained, prayer being made at the same time for the seven-fold Gifts of the Holy Ghost. And it is acknowledged in the Russian Catechism that the Apostles themselves conferred the Gift of the Holy Ghost in this way.

II. Thorndike, going over the Five lesser Sacraments in order, speaks thus of Confirmation: "The Gift of the Holy Ghost, which Baptism promiseth, dependeth upon the Bishop's blessing."—P. 118.

NOTE
XXV.

III. The Scottish Bishop Rattray has the following:—

"As in the first creation, God first made Man, and then breathed into him the Breath of Life; so in this New Creation or Regeneration, after our death unto sin, and burial with Christ, by going under the water, we are raised out of it again pure and clean, as created anew in Christ Jesus, and made a holy temple for the divine Spirit to dwell in. And being thus regenerated in Baptism, the Holy Ghost, the principle of this New Life, answering to the Breath of Life in the first creation, is infused into this His temple by Confirmation." And then he continues thus:

"The Symbol by which this Spirit was conferred in the primitive Church, *from the very days of the Apostles, was Chrism*, with the Sign of the Cross, and the Laying on of the Hands of the Bishop: and the Spirit itself, as thus conferred in Confirmation, is called Unction, and is the Seed of the Father, the Spirit of Adoption, by which we cry Abba, Father, and have freedom to draw near unto God in full assurance of faith; by which we become the sons of God, and if sons, then heirs, and co-heirs with Christ, our elder Brother, of the heavenly inheritance. And thus our Baptismal regeneration is completed by our being born again both of Water and of the Spirit."—Instructions, &c. p. 17. § ix. and x.

IV. The same writer quotes as follows from Dr. Hickes' Translation of St. Pacian, To the Catechumens:—

"For neither will he seem to be admitted into the Church, who has not believed, or to be begotten by Christ, who has not received the Spirit. . . But these things cannot be accomplished otherwise than by the Sacrament of Baptism, and Chrism, and the Bishop. For they are purged from Sin by Baptism; by Chrism the Holy Ghost is shed upon them; and both these we obtain by the hand and mouth of the Bishop. And so the New Man is born again, and is renewed in Christ.' (P. 536.) The same excellent Dr. Hickes to Mr. Nelson writeth thus: 'Pray, Sir, do but recollect upon how many subjects I was invited to discourse by this very citation of St. Pacian, concerning the way whereby fallen man recovers the supernatural principle of the Spirit of God, by which we are regenerated, and made new men. If you can remember no more than what from thence I discoursed on the subject of the moral Shechina, from the New Testament and the Book of Wisdom; of receiving the Spirit by the ministration and prayer of the Priest or Bishop in Baptism, and by Imposition of the Bishop's hands, *and by Chrism*; and in discoursing of which I gave you my reasons, for which I thought it a Rite of the Apostolical age, and *wished it restored to the Church*; and what I wrote of Repentance, by which we recovered the Spirit again, when we had lost it by deadly sin after

NOTE
XXV.

Baptism and Confirmation, I hope you will discharge me from the labour of making my discourses upon them again.”—Thus far Dr. Hiekes, as quoted by Bishop Rattray.

V. In the Scottish Catechism of Aberdeen, we have the following :—

“Q. What is the next thing (after a valid Baptism) necessary to qualify us for the holy Communion? A. Confirmation by a Bishop of the Catholic Church. Q. Why is this necessary? A. To implant that Principle of spiritual life in us, which the holy Eucharist is designed to nourish.”—P. 41.

And again :—“Q. What is Confirmation? A. The Seal or completion of Baptism. Q. What is its effect? A. The being Anointed with the Holy Ghost, in order to be perfect Christians. Q. How is this blessing to be obtained? A. Every baptized person is to be presented to the Bishop. Q. When? A. *As soon after Baptism as may be.* Q. How does the Bishop convey the Holy Ghost to him? A. By Laying his Hands upon him, and praying that he may receive the Holy Ghost. Q. Was there no outward sign or symbol anciently used at Confirmation? A. Yes; the Person Confirmed was signed or sealed with the Sign of the Cross, *and anointed with Holy Ointment?* Q. What was the signification of the Chrism or Ointment? A. It represented the inward Unction of the Holy Ghost. (See John ii. 20. 27.) Q. How do you know that all Christians were Confirmed? A. Because Confirmation, or the Laying on of Hands, is placed among the Fundamentals of Religion, as well as Baptism.”—(Heb. vi. 1, 2.)—P. 30.

VI. And in the Catechism of Bishop Jolly, used in the Scottish Church :

“Q. How does the Holy Spirit operate in that sacred Institution, by which we are made Christians? A. He sanctifies the waters of Baptism to the mystical washing away of sin, and thereby prepares for Himself a temple to dwell in. Q. And by what means does He enter more fully into this His temple? A. By prayer, and the Laying on of Hands in Confirmation, which, being used by our Lord’s Apostles, has been wisely continued by the Church. Q. For what end is the Holy Spirit thus given to Christians? A. To be a principle of spiritual life within them, the sacred bond, which unites them as members to Christ their Head.” (p. 30.) And at pp. 57, and 58, Confirmation is called a “Mystery” and a “Sacrament;” and is said “to have spiritual efficacy, conveyed in a supernatural way by virtue of Christ’s institution.” And again: “Q. What account does the Scripture give us of that Apostolic Ordinance? A. We are told, that the Apostles, by direction of the Holy Ghost, and in imitation of our Lord’s own practice, did Lay their Hands upon baptized Christians, ‘that they might receive the Holy Ghost.’ Q. And did such Christians receive the Holy Ghost in a miraculous manner? A. Not always in a miraculous manner, but in an ordinary way, for all the purposes of Sanctification. Q. And is this benefit of very great consequence to Christians? A. Surely

it is; because in the sixth chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, it is mentioned next after Baptism *among the fundamentals of our religion.* NOTE
XXV.

Q. How do you distinguish the respective benefits of Baptism and Confirmation? *A.* By Baptism we are made members, by Confirmation we become living and animated members of Christ's Mystical Body, and are sealed as His unto the day of redemption."—P. 59.

VII. And lastly, in the Scottish Catechism of Brechin, we are taught that; "The ordinance of Confirmation has always been considered as the Seal or Completion of Baptism." And afterwards more fully: "*Q.* What is the purpose of Confirmation? *A.* It is to confirm and perfect that which the grace of God's most holy Spirit has already begun in Baptism. *Q.* What particular grace, or spiritual benefit, is conveyed in Confirmation? *A.* They, who receive it rightly. . . . receive an increase of the manifold gifts of the Holy Ghost the Comforter, to strengthen and establish them in the faith and obedience of the Gospel. *Q.* What authority does the Church furnish for the use of this Rite? *A.* Ecclesiastical history proves that it has been practised by the whole Christian Church from the earliest time, and that the ancients deemed it necessary to the completion of Baptism. *Q.* What (besides miraculous gifts in some cases) did all receive by the Laying on of Hands? *A.* All, who were duly qualified, received a Gift more precious than the power of working miracles, namely, the ordinary graces of the Holy Spirit, which ever were, and ever will be needful for the sanctification and salvation of Christians."—P. 54, &c.

NOTE XXVI.

A. The Communion is a Sacrament in which the believer, under the forms of bread and wine, partakes of the very Body and Blood of Christ, to everlasting life.—*Orthodox Catechism*, p. 61.

I. In the first English Liturgy we have the following rubric:—

"Men must not think less to be received in part" (of the consecrated Bread) "than in the whole, but in each of them the whole Body of our Saviour Jesus Christ."

II. From the Catechism of the Church of England:—

"*Q.* What is the outward part, or sign in the Lord's Supper? *A.* Bread and Wine, which the Lord hath commanded to be received. *Q.* What is the inward part, or thing signified? *A.* The Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken, and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper. *Q.* What are the benefits, whereof we are partakers thereby? *A.* The strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the Body and Blood of Christ, as our bodies are by the bread and wine."

NOTE
XXVI.

III. Bishop Nicholas Ridley:—

“Both you and I agree in this, that in the Sacrament is the very true and natural Body and Blood of Christ, even that which was born of the Virgin Mary, &c.”—Foxe, Acts and Monuments, p. 1598. whence the same is quoted by Archbishop Laud in his Conference with Fisher. § 35.

IV. Bishop Andrewes, quoting from Durandus with approbation, says:—

“Verbum audimus, motum sentimus, modum nescimus, præsentiam credimus.”—Resp. ad Apol. Card. Bell. c. i. p. 11.

V. Hooker writes as follows:—

“These Holy Mysteries, received in due manner, do instrumentally both make us partakers of the grace of that Body and Blood, which were given for the life of the world, and besides also impart in true and real though mystical manner, the very Person of our Lord Himself, whole, perfect, and entire, as hath been shewed.”—Eccles. Polit. v. c. 67.

VI. Bishop Overall, who drew up that part of the English Catechism which relates to the Sacraments, has left the following:—

“Before consecration we call them God’s ‘creatures of bread and wine;’ now we do so no more, after consecration. . . . And herein we follow the Fathers, who after consecration would not suffer it to be called bread and wine any longer, but the Body and Blood of Christ.”

And again: “It is confessed by all Divines, that upon the words of the Consecration, the Body and Blood of Christ is really and substantially present, and so exhibited and given to all that receive it; and all this not after a physical and sensual, but after a heavenly and incomprehensible manner. But there yet remains this controversy among some, whether the Body of Christ be present only in the use of the Sacrament, and in the act of eating, and not otherwise? They that hold the affirmative, as the Lutherans (in Confess. Sax.) and all the Calvinists, do seem to me *to depart from all Antiquity*, which place the presence of Christ in the virtue of the benediction used by the Priest, and not in the use of eating the Sacrament. And this did most Protestants grant and profess at first, though now the Calvinists make Popish magic of it in their licentious blasphemy.”—From the “Additional Notes to Nicholls’ Comment. on the Common Prayer.”

VII. Dr. Sutton has these words:—

“The Son of God, respecting our weakness, hath conveyed unto us His Body and Blood, after a divine and spiritual manner, under the forms of Bread and Wine.” And so the Advertisement at the end of The First Book of Homilies “under the forms of Bread and Wine.”

VIII. Bailly, in his Practise of Piety:—

“How can those bodies, which have been nourished with the Body and Blood of the Lord of life, but be raised up again at the last day?”

IX. And Bishop Montague:—

NOTE
XXVI.

“Our formal words are, ‘This is My Body:’ ‘This is My Blood:’ This is more than, ‘This figureth or designeth:’ A bare sign is but a phantasm. He gave *substance*, and really subsisting essence, Who said, ‘This is My Body:’ ‘This is My Blood.’ And our Catechism saith expressly, ‘The Body and Blood of Christ are taken and eaten,’ not ‘the figure and sign of His Body and Blood,’ which can neither be taken nor eaten.”—Answer to Gagger, &c. § 36.

X. Bishop Cosin writes as follows:—

“Our faith does not cause or make that presence, but apprehends it as most truly and really effected by the Word of Christ. . . . In this mystical eating, by the wonderful power of the Holy Ghost, we do invisibly receive the substance of Christ’s Body and Blood, as much as if we should eat and drink both visibly.”—Hist. of Trans. ch. iii. § 5.

XI. Bishop Taylor says, that we admit and use the word ‘*real*’ of the Eucharistic presence: that “when the *real presence* is denied, the word ‘*real*’ is taken for ‘*natural*,’ and does not signify *transcendenter*, or in its just and most proper signification. But the word ‘*substantialiter*’ is also used by us in this question, which may be the same with that which is in the Article of Trent, ‘*Sacramentaliter præsens Salvator substantiâ suâ adest?*’” Which words, he says, “if they might be understood in the sense in which we use them, that is, ‘really,’ ‘truly,’ without fiction or the help of fancy, but ‘in rei veritate,’ so as Philo calls spiritual things, *ἀναγκαϊόταται οὐσίαι*, ‘most necessary, useful, and material substances,’ might become an instrument of united confession.” And again: “That which seems of hardest explication is the word ‘*corporaliter*,’ . . . but the expression may become warrantable, and consonant to our doctrine.”—Of the Real Presence, &c. Sec. i. 8.

And again, in the same place as above:—“When the holy man stands at the Table of Blessing, and ministers the rite of Consecration, then do as the Angels do, who behold, and love, and wonder that the Son of God should become food to the souls of His servants; that He, who cannot suffer any change or lessening, should be broken into pieces and enter into the body to support and nourish the spirit, and yet remain in heaven, while He descends to thee upon earth, &c.”

“When any of our Divines or any of the Fathers deny that Body which was born of the Virgin, and was crucified, to be eaten in the Sacrament, as Ratramn, as St. Jerome, as Clement of Alexandria expressly affirm, the meaning is easy: they intend, that it is not eaten in a *natural* sense.”—Worthy Communicant, vii.

XII. Bishop Beveridge, in his Treatise on the xxxix Articles:—

“The Fathers are very frequent in repeating this truth. I shall instance but a few. St. Cyril of Jerusalem: ‘With all certainty let us partake of

NOTE XXVI. it as of the Body and Blood of Christ; for under the type of bread His Body is given to thee, and under the type of wine His Blood is given unto thee; that partaking of the body and blood of Christ, thou mayest be of one body and blood with Him.' So that we so partake of the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament, as that we are thereby made one body and blood with Himself. Therefore saith St. Hilary, 'Of the truth of the Flesh and Blood there is no place left to doubt; for now by the profession of the Lord Himself it is truly flesh, and truly blood; and these being received and taken down, cause that we should be in Christ, and Christ in us.'—On Art. xxxviii.

XIII. Thorndike writes as follows:—

"If it be manifest that by the Sacrament of the Eucharist God pretends to tender us the communion of the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross, then is there another presence of the Body and Blood of our Lord in the Sacrament, beside that spiritual presence in the soul, which living faith effecteth without the Sacrament, as well as in the receiving of it."—Just Weights and Measures, p. 10.

XIV. The Scottish Bishop Forbes writes thus:—

"The doctrine of those seems most safe and true, who most firmly believe that the Body and Blood of Christ is truly, really, and substantially present in the Eucharist, and received, but in a manner incomprehensible in respect of human reason, and ineffable, known to God alone, and not revealed to us in the Scriptures, not corporal, yet neither in the mind alone, or through faith alone, but in another way, known to God alone, and to be left to His omnipotence."—Cons. Modest. de Euch. I. i. 7.

XV. Proposals of the British Bishops to the Easterns:—

"We believe a perfect Mystery in the holy Eucharist, through the invocation of the Holy Ghost upon the elements, whereby the faithful do verily and indeed receive the Body and Blood of Christ."—Prop. iv.

XVI. The Scottish Catechism of Aberdeen teaches;—

"That the oblation of bread and wine is solemnly offered by the Priest to God as the great Christian Sacrifice: that God accepts this Sacrifice and returns it to us again to feast upon: for that upon the Priest's praying to God the Father to send the Holy Spirit upon them, the Bread and Cup are made by the Holy Spirit to be the Spiritual, Life-giving Body and Blood of Christ: that they are not destroyed, but sanctified: that they are changed into the Sacramental Body of Christ: that they are at once bread and wine and the Body and Blood of Christ, but not in the same manner; bread and wine by nature, the Body and Blood of Christ in Mystery; bread and wine to our senses, the Body and Blood of Christ to our understanding and faith."—P. 39, 40, 33, 41.

XVII. The Scottish Catechism of Bishop Jolly has the following :—

N O T E
XXVI.

“Q. Does not our spiritual life, once given, (in Baptism) require proper nourishment to support it? A. Yes; it must be frequently nourished and supported by proper supplies of grace and strength, as our natural life is supported by our daily food. Q. What has God provided for the support of our spiritual life? A. He has provided for His Church, or people, in every age, a spiritual meat and a spiritual drink, suited to their particular situation. The people of God in the wilderness, on their way to the promised land, were refreshed by bread from heaven, and water out of the mystical rock, which rock was Christ. And their condition at that time was a figure of the Christian Church on its way to the heavenly Canaan. For now also, while the Church sojourns in the wilderness of this world, the same Christ is still the food and nourishment of it, communicated by the Bread of Life and the Cup of Salvation, which He has appointed for this purpose.”—P. 59, 60. and 62, 64, 65. See also the Scottish Catechism for the Diocese of Brechin, p. 48.

XVIII. On the subject of the Liturgy generally, the Scottish Bishop Rattray of Dunkeld writes as follows :—

“When we are initiated into the Christian Covenant, regenerated both by water and the Holy Ghost, and made living members of Christ’s mystical body the Church, we have then access to the Father by Him, and freedom to draw near unto God, and join with the Church in offering to Him the Sacrifice of the holy Eucharist, the proper worship of the faithful, and communicating in the Divine Mysteries of His holy altar; which is as necessary for continuing and maintaining our interest in this covenant, as Baptism is for entering us into it; and by which we are nourished and grow up into the spiritual life, which must languish and decay without this heavenly food, in the same manner as our animal life would do without our daily bread. . . Now that we may have a right understanding of this tremendous and mystical Service, we must observe,

I. That our Lord Jesus Christ, as our High Priest after the order of Melchisedeck, in the same night in which He was betrayed, did (while at His own liberty, and before He was in the hands of His enemies) offer up Himself a free and voluntary sacrifice to His Father, to make satisfaction for the sins of the world, under the symbols of bread and wine, the bread representing His Body and the wine His Blood: And having eucharistized or blessed them, that is, not only given thanks to God over them, and praised Him as the Creator and Governor of the world, and the Author of bread and all other fruits of the earth, for His making such plentiful provision of good things for the use of man, and for the signal instances of His providence, towards the Jewish nation in particular, as was the custom of the Jews, and towards all mankind in general, especially for their redemption by His own death, but likewise offered them up to

NOTE God as the symbols of His Body and Blood, and invoked a blessing,
XXVI. even the Divine power of the Holy Spirit, to descend upon them; having, I say, thus eucharistized, or blessed them, He gave them to His disciples as His Body broken, and His Blood shed for them and for many, even as many as should believe and obey Him, for the remission of sins :

II. That this Sacrifice of Himself, thus offered up by Him as a High Priest, was immediately after slain on the Cross, and after He had by the power of the Spirit raised Himself from the dead, He entered into heaven, the true Holy of Holies, there to present this His Sacrifice to God the Father, and in virtue of it to make continual intercession for His Church, whereby He continueth a Priest for ever :

III. That He commanded the Apostles and their successors, as the priests of the Christian Church, to do (i. e. to offer) this (bread and cup) in commemoration of Him, or as the memorial of this One Sacrifice of Himself Once Offered for the sins of the world, and thereby to plead the merits of it before His Father here on earth, as He doth continually in heaven ; and appointed it to be the only sacrifice of prayer and praise in the Christian Church, instead of the manifold sacrifices, whether bloody or unbloody, under the Law :

IV. That therefore in celebrating this Christian Sacrifice the people are to bring the oblation of bread and wine, which the priest receiving presenteth in their name to God on His altar, thereby offering to Him a part of His own of what He hath given them, as a tribute to Him, and an acknowledgment of His right over them and all they enjoy. The priest having thus placed the bread and wine on the altar, and called to the people to *lift up their hearts*, and they having answered, '*We lift them up unto the Lord,*' he proceeds to give praise and thanks to God for the creation of the world and all things therein, visible and invisible ; for all His benefits and the gracious effects of His providence towards mankind ; for preparing them for the coming of Christ, particularly by the Law and the Prophets ; and for sending Him in the fulness of time to take our nature upon Him, and to redeem us by His death. And in this act of praise and thanksgiving, the people are to join with the priest in repeating that Seraphic Hymn, '*Holy, Holy, Holy, &c.*' which in all Liturgies ever made a part of it. Then the priest rehearseth the history of the Institution, not only to shew the authority by which he acteth, contained in the words, '*Do this* (i. e. offer this bread and cup) *in commemoration of Me ;*' but also, that by pronouncing over them these words, '*This is My Body,*' '*This is My Blood,*' he may consecrate this bread and cup to be the symbols and antitypes of the Body and Blood of Christ. Then, as Christ offered up His Body and Blood to God the Father under the symbols of bread and wine, as a Sacrifice to be slain on the Cross for our redemption, so there the priest offereth up this bread and cup as the symbols of this Sacrifice of His Body and Blood thus once offered up by Him ; and thereby com-

memorath it before God with thanksgiving. After which, He prays that God would favourably accept this Commemorative Sacrifice by sending down upon it His Holy Spirit, that by His descent upon them He may make this bread and this cup (already so far consecrated as to be the symbols or antitypes of the Body and Blood of Christ, and offered up as such) to be *verily and indeed* His Body and Blood; the same Divine Spirit by which the Body of Christ was formed in the womb of the Blessed Virgin, and which is still united to it in heaven, descending on, and being united to these elements, and invigorating them with the virtue, power, and efficacy thereof, and *making them One with It*. Then the priest maketh intercession, in virtue of this Sacrifice thus offered up in commemoration of, and union with the One great personal Sacrifice of Christ, for the whole Catholic Church, and pleadeth the merits of this One Sacrifice in behalf of all estates and conditions of men in it, offering this memorial thereof not for the living only, but for the dead also, in commemoration of the Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, and of all the Saints who have pleased God in their several generations from the beginning of the world; and for rest, light, and peace, and a blessed resurrection, and a merciful trial in the day of the Lord to all the faithful departed:

V. That this Bread and Cup being thus offered up to God as the symbols and antitypes of the Body and Blood of Christ, and returned back by Him invigorated with the life-giving power thereof by the descent of the Holy Spirit upon them, whereby they are made that very Body and Blood in virtue and effect, are as such first received by the Priest himself, and then by him, or the Deacons as ministering to him, distributed in the name of God to the people; who by being thus entertained by God on what had been offered up to Him, and feasting together at His table, do (according to the manner of transacting covenants used from the beginning) renew their covenant with Him and with one another; and by these pledges are assured of His being reconciled to them, and of their being in a state of favour with Him, and of peace and friendship one with another; and by thus partaking of the Sacrifice of Christ have a title to all the benefits purchased by it, which are the conditions on God's part of the New Covenant, of which He is the Mediator; and by eating and drinking His Body and Blood are made one body and one spirit with Him (it being the Spirit of Christ descending upon, and united to the bread and wine, which makes them His Body and Blood) and thereby our bodies, as united to and nourished by His Body, have a title to a glorious resurrection, being to be quickened by His Spirit, which thus dwelleth in us. And thus we have union and communion with the Father and the Son, in the Holy Spirit (as the bond of this mystical unity), and with one another also, even all our fellow-members of Christ's mystical Body, the holy Catholic Church."—Instructions Concerning the Christian Covenant, p. 27.

NOTE XXVII.

Q. What is the most essential act in this part of the Liturgy? A. The utterance of the words which Jesus Christ spake in instituting this Sacrament, (Matt. xxvi. 26, 27, 28.) and after this the Invocation of the Holy Ghost and the Blessing the Gifts, that is, the bread and wine which have been Offered.—*Orthodox Catechism*, p. 63.

I. Here shall be transcribed first some portion of the Consecration Prayer from the present Liturgy of the Scottish Church:—

“For in the night that He was betrayed, He 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 the remission of sins; do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of Me.” . . . [The Oblation.] “Wherefore, O Lord, and heavenly Father, according to the institution of Thy dearly-beloved Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, we Thy humble servants, do celebrate and make here before Thy Divine Majesty with these Thy holy gifts, WHICH WE NOW OFFER UNTO THEE, the memorial Thy Son hath commanded us to make; having in remembrance His blessed passion, and precious death, His mighty resurrection, and glorious ascension; rendering unto Thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same.” . . . [The Invocation.] “And we most humbly beseech Thee, O merciful Father, to hear us, and of Thine almighty goodness vouchsafe to bless and sanctify with Thy Word and Holy Spirit these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, *that they may become* the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son.” . . . “And we earnestly desire Thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, most humbly beseeching Thee to grant, that by the merits and death of Thy Son, Jesus Christ, and through faith in His Blood, we, *and all Thy whole Church*, may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His passion. And here we humbly offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto Thee, beseeching Thee, that whosoever shall be partakers of this holy Communion, may worthily receive the most precious Body and Blood of Thy Son, Jesus Christ, and be filled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction, and made one Body with Him, that He may dwell in them, and they in Him. And

although we are unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto Thee any sacrifice, yet we beseech Thee to accept this our bounden duty and service, not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences, through Jesus Christ our Lord ; by Whom, and with Whom, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honour and glory be unto Thee, O Father Almighty, world without end, *Amen.*" . . . After which, there follow immediately solemn Prayers by the consecrating Bishop or Priest for the whole Church, and for all estates and conditions of men.

NOTE
XXVII.

II. With respect to the virtue of the words of Institution and the Invocation of the Holy Ghost, Bishop Sparrow, in his *Rationale of the Book of Common Prayer*, has the following passage :—

"‘The holy Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper,’ says St. Chrysostom, ‘which the Priest now makes, is the same that Christ gave to His Apostles, &c.’ . . . Again : ‘Christ is present at the Sacrament now, that first instituted it. He consecrates this also ; It is not man, that makes the Body and Blood of Christ by consecrating the holy Elements, but Christ, that was crucified for us. The words are pronounced by the mouth of the Priest, but the elements are consecrated by the power and grace of God. *This is*, saith He, *my Body*, &c. ; by this word the bread and wine are consecrated.”—Oxford ed. 1840. pp. 211. 216, 220.

III. From Dr. Brett’s *Dissertation on the Liturgies* :—

"Tertullian says, ‘He made His Body by saying *This is My Body*. But if Tertullian did mean that the whole consecration was really to be made by these words only, (though I do not think that he did, or that his words necessarily imply it) he is perfectly singular in his opinion. For as Mr. Johnson (*Unbloody Sacrifice*, P. I. p. 234.) has very fully proved, though the Church always believed that there was very great force and energy in those words, yet they did not believe that the recital of those words by the priest was all that was necessary to the consecration of the Eucharist. He plainly proves that they judged three things to be necessary to the consecration of this Sacrament: 1. The reciting the Words of Institution: 2. The Oblation of the Symbols: 3. The Prayer of Invocation. All these three . . . in all the ancient Liturgies follow each other in the order here mentioned: and each of them was believed to contribute towards the consecration of the elements. . . . St. Chrysostom, as cited by Mr. Johnson, says much the same that Tertullian does, only he explains a little more fully. ‘The priest,’ says he, ‘fulfilling his office, stands pronouncing those words, but the power and grace is of God: that word, *This is my body*, &c., changes the gifts laid in open view. And as the word that says *Increase and multiply*, was but once pronounced, but is virtually operative upon our nature ever since, so that voice, once pronounced, has its effects on the prepared Sacrifice on the table of the Churches from that time to this, and

NOTE
XXVII.

until His own advent.' Here St. Chrysostom plainly teaches that this word of Christ, *This is my body*, operates as the word of God does in other cases, particularly as it operates in the words, *Increase and multiply*. As therefore the words *Increase and multiply* do not operate but when those rites are performed which God has appointed for that purpose, so neither, according to St. Chrysostom, do the words *This is my body*, but when those things are done which Christ did and commanded. What those things are, I shall shew more particularly, when I come to speak of the Oblation and Invocation."—Dissertation on the Liturgies, p. 183.

Again: "Mr. Wheatley, a learned Divine, who has taken a great deal of useful pains to explain and defend the English Liturgy, says expressly, that *none he yet knows, except the Church of Rome, ever attributed the consecration to the bare pronouncing of these words only*."—Ib. p. 193.

And again: "Renaudotius observes that 'a learned man, Richard Simon, who has wrote much upon this subject, affirms, that all the Orientals are of this opinion; which he seems to acknowledge is no other than what is commonly attributed to them; that is, *that the consecration is made not by the sacramental words of our Lord Christ, but by the invocation of the Holy Ghost*. But this opinion,' he says, 'is wrongfully accused of error; because it is not a matter of faith to believe that the Eucharist is consecrated by our Lord's words only, neither has it been determined by the Church; forasmuch as not a few divines have without censure opposed that doctrine; which he proves chiefly by the authority of Ambrosius Catharinus, and Christopher de Capite Fontium.' (Renaudot. Comment. ad Liturg. Copt. St. Basil, p. 246.) Renaudotius seems afraid to speak so plain himself in this case as father Simon has done, knowing that the Missal of the Church of Rome clearly attributes the whole force of consecration to the words, *This is my body*, &c. However, he shews that this opinion was not condemned in the Council of Florence, . . . and that it was so far from being determined in that Council both by Greeks and Latins, as is pretended, that *the consecration of the Eucharist was perfected by the words of institution only*, that not only the Greeks declared the direct contrary, but even the Pope himself would not permit it to be so decreed. (Renaudot. ib. p. 246, 7.)"—P. 242, &c.

IV. Speaking of the words of Institution, and referring to Chrysostom, (De Prod. Judæ, Tom. v. p. 63.) the Scottish Bishop Rattray observes;—

"It is by virtue of these words spoken by Christ, that the following Prayer of the Priest is made effectual for procuring the Descent of the Holy Ghost upon the Bread and the Cup."—Instructions, &c. p. 23.

And he refers to a passage in Bingham's Antiquities: "In the Mozarabic Liturgy and the old Gothic Missal published by Mabillon, there are prayers for the descent of the Holy Ghost to sanctify the Gifts, and make them the Body and Blood of Christ, even after the repetition of the words,

‘This is My Body,’ and ‘This is My Blood;’ which evidently shews that the ancient formers of the Liturgy did not think the consecration to be effected by the bare repetition of those words, but by prayer for the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the bread and wine.”—B. xv. ch. iii. § 31. NOTE
XXVII.

See the passage which is quoted at length from the same Bishop Rattray on the subject of the Eucharist, under Note xxvi. Also the Scottish Catechisms; that of Aberdeen, pp. 38, 39; and that by Bishop Jolly, p. 63.

Here it will be proper to treat of the *Great Oblation*, which is made between the rehearsal of the words of Institution and the Invocation of the Holy Ghost, and which continues to be referred to in those prayers for the whole Church which follow immediately after the Consecration in the Scottish Liturgy. The points to be shewn are; 1. That there is in the Eucharist a Sacrifice, true, proper, and propitiatory, available both for the living and the departed: 2. That the Great Oblation itself *ex parte nostrâ* consists in the Bread and Wine, the antitypes of the Body and Blood of Christ, Offered *after* the rehearsal of the Words of Institution and *before* the Invocation of the Holy Ghost: 3. That the Sacrifice is consummated or perfected by the Holy Ghost Himself, Who descends and changes the Elements: 4. That a special efficacy attaches, in virtue of the change and consummation of the Sacrifice, to those commemorations and prayers for all estates in the Church both living and departed, which are made immediately after: 5. That the Sacrifice of the Eucharist is in a certain sense one and the same with that once for all made upon the Cross: 6. That it is in a certain sense true to say that Christ is offered or sacrificed in the Eucharist.

V. Bishop Andrewes on this subject writes as follows:—

“We hold with St. Augustine, ‘*Quod hujus Sacrificii Caro et Sanguis ante adventum Christi per victimas similitudinum promittebatur; in passione Christi per ipsam veritatem reddebatur; post adventum Christi per Sacramentum memoriæ celebratur.*’—Ans. to Card. Perr.

VI. Bishop Overall, who drew up the last Section of the Catechism of the Church of England, has left us the following comment on those words of the English Liturgy, “sufficient Sacrifice of that His precious Blood:”—

“If we compare the Eucharist with the Sacrifice once made upon the Cross with reference to the killing or destroying of the Sacrifice, or with reference to the visibility of it, in that sense we call it only a *commemorative* Sacrifice, as the Fathers do. (Chrys. Hom. Contr. Jud. part 2. Sentent. lib. 4. dist. 12.) But if we compare the Eucharist with Christ’s Sacrifice made once upon the Cross as concerning the effect of it, we say that (of the Cross) was a *sufficient* Sacrifice; but at the same time that this (of the Eucharist) is a true, real, and *efficient* Sacrifice, and both of them *propitiatory* for the sins of the whole world. . . . Neither do we call this Sacrifice of the Eucharist an *efficient* Sacrifice, as if that upon the Cross

NOTE
XXVII.

wanted efficacy; but because the force and virtue of that Sacrifice would not be profitable unto us, unless it were applied and brought into effect by this Eucharistical Sacrifice, and other the holy Sacraments and means appointed by God for that end: but we call it *propitiatory*, both this and that, because they have both force and virtue in them to appease God's wrath against this sinful world. Read Mald. de Sac. p. 323. Therefore this is no new Sacrifice, but the same which was once offered, and which is every day offered to God by Christ in heaven, and continueth here still upon earth by a mystical representation of it in the Eucharist. And the Church intends not to have any new propitiation or new remission of sins obtained, but to make that effectual and in act applied unto us, which was once obtained by the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross. Neither is the Sacrifice of the Cross, as it was once offered up there *modo cruento*, so much remembered in the Eucharist, (though it be commemorated,) as regard is had to the perpetual and daily offering of it by Christ now in Heaven in His everlasting Priesthood: and thereupon it was, and should be still the *juge Sacrificium*, observed here on earth, as it is in Heaven, the reason which the ancient Fathers had for their daily Sacrifice. (St. Chrysostom in 10. Heb. St. Augustin de Civ. Dei, lib. 10. c. 20.)"—Additional Notes on the Book of Common Prayer, Nicholls's Commentary, p. 46.

Again, on the words of the Liturgy, "This our sacrifice of praise, &c.:"—

"So the ancient Fathers are wont to call this Sacrifice, *Sacrificium laudis et gratiarum actionis*; not exclusively, as if it were no other Sacrifice but that; for they called it also, *Sacrificium Commemorationis*, and *Sacrificium Spiritûs*, and *Sacrificium obsequii*, &c.; and, which is more, *Sacrificium verum et propitiatorium*."

VII. Mason on the same subject writes as follows:—

"So often as we celebrate the Eucharist, so often do we offer Christ in a mystery, and sacrifice Him by way of commemoration or representation."—Vindication of the Church of England, b. v. p. 470.

VIII. And to the same effect Bishop Jeremy Taylor:—

"As Christ is a Priest in heaven for ever, and yet does not sacrifice Himself afresh, (nor yet without a sacrifice could He be a Priest,) but by a daily ministration and intercession represents His Sacrifice to God, and offers Himself as sacrificed, so He does upon earth, by the ministry of His servants. He is offered to God, that is, He is by prayers and the Sacrament represented and offered up to God, 'as sacrificed;' which, in effect, is a celebration of His death, and the applying it to the present and future necessities of the Church by a ministry like to His in heaven. It follows then, that the celebration of this sacrifice be, in its proportion, an instrument of applying the proper sacrifice to all the purposes, which it first designed. It is propitiatory, it is Eucharistical, it is impetratory: &c."—Life of Christ, Disc. xix. Works, vol. iii. pp. 296, 298.

Again: "The Church is the image of heaven; the Priest the Minister of Christ; the holy Table a copy of the Celestial Altar; and the eternal Sacrifice of the Lamb slain from the beginning of the world is always the same. It bleeds no more after the finishing of it upon the Cross; but it is wonderfully represented in heaven, and graciously represented here; by Christ's action there, by His commandment here."—Worthy Comm. i. § iv.

NOTE
XXVII.

IX. John Fell, sometime Bishop of Oxford:—

"His Melchisedeckian or eternal Priesthood joined with Kingship was consummated in His resurrection, and is now continued in His service in the heavenly Sanctuary. In which heavenly sanctuary, He perpetually offers His Blood and Passion to God, and as Man makes perpetual prayers and intercessions for us. . . . As also He hath instituted the same Oblation of His holy Body and Blood, and commemoration of His Passion, to be made in the holy Eucharist to God the Father by His Ministers here on earth, for the same ends, viz., the application of all the benefits of His sole meritorious death and sacrifice on the Cross, till His second return out of the heavenly Sanctuary." On Heb. v. 10.

X. Bishop Bull has the following passage:—

"This is the constant language of the ancient Liturgies, 'We offer by way of commemoration.' . . . 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 the 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 this Sacrament represented, beseeching Him for the sake thereof to bestow His heavenly blessings upon us."—Works, vol. ii. p. 250.

XI. Johnson, in his Treatise on the Unbloody Sacrifice:—

"It seems clear, that the one personal Oblation performed by our Saviour Himself is not to be confined to any one instant of time, but commenced with the Paschal solemnity, and was finished at His ascension into heaven, there to appear in the presence of God for us. And if our adversaries will restrain the Oblation to the Cross alone, then they must exclude Christ's Sacerdotal entry into Heaven, as the Holy of Holies, and say that the Oblation was finished before the blood of the Sacrifice was brought into the most holy place, and there offered; contrary to what the Apostle teaches us (Heb. ix. 7); and therefore, few, I suppose, will presume thus far. And if it was consistent with the unity of the Oblation to be made in the Holy of Holies as well as upon the altar, in heaven as well

NOTE XXVII.—as on the Cross, then I cannot conceive why the Oblation made in the Eucharist should make the Oblation cease to be one, any more than the double offering it on the Cross and in the Holy of Holies already mentioned.”—Unbloody Sacrifice, p. 93.

XII. Dr. Gloucester Ridley, treating of this same subject of the Sacrifice of the holy Eucharist, asserts that, “The Lord’s Supper instituted in memory of Christ’s death was itself a Sacrifice, as much as any of the Jewish Sacrifices were.”—The Christian Passover, p. 46.

XIII. Alexander Jolly, Bishop of Moray in Scotland writes thus:—

“Our resort must ever be to the Sacrifice of the death of Christ, which was prefigured, for the support of man’s hope, by instituted typical sacrifices from the beginning (as we see in Adam’s family); looking forward to it *before* its actual accomplishment; and *now* perpetuating the sacrificial remembrance of it in that Divine Institution, which He Himself ordained to shew it forth before God, and plead its merit, till He shall come again to judge the quick and the dead.”—Christian Sacrifice, p. 183.

XIV. Dr. Henry Philpotts, the present Bishop of Exeter:—

“In the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, the Commemorative Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, the action and suffering of our great High Priest are represented and offered to God on earth, as they are continually by the same High Priest Himself in heaven; the Church on earth doing, after its measure, the same thing as its Head in heaven; Christ in heaven presenting the Sacrifice and applying it to its purposed end properly, and gloriously; the Church on earth commemoratively and humbly, yet really and effectually, by praying to God, with thanksgiving, in the virtue and merit of that Sacrifice which it thus exhibits.”—Charge to the Clergy of his Diocese, A.D. 1836. p. 43.

XV. Dr. Hicke, in his “Christian Priesthood Asserted:”—

“The Eucharist is a proper Sacrifice, or Offering, in which the bread and wine are offered in a proper and literal sense, and by consequence the ministers of it are, properly and literally speaking, ‘Offering Priests.’ . . The primitive Christians believed . . . this commemorative Sacrifice of bread and wine . . . to be that *mincha purum*, that ‘pure offering’ foretold by the prophet Malachi . . . a pure and unbloody sacrifice . . of divine institution. . . Besides the first offering of all, there were two other Oblations of the elements in the Eucharist; one before the consecration, in which they were presented to God the Father upon the Altar as the first-fruits of His creatures, . . . the other at the Consecration, when they were offered to Him as the symbols of Christ’s Body and Blood, to represent that Oblation He made of both upon the Cross, and to obtain the benefits of His death and passion.”—P. 116, &c.

XVI. Johnson, in his Treatise on the Unbloody Sacrifice:—

NOTE
XXVII.

“We have the judgment of the ancients with us, who do generally assert that Christ did offer bread and wine in the Eucharist, and offered them as a Melchisedeckian Priest, and as symbols of His Body and Blood; and that in and by these symbols He did mysteriously devote His natural Body to suffer according to the will of God. And this is a certain proof, that the Fathers took ‘*given*,’ *διδόμενον*, not only as expressing, but as meaning and intending the time then present. . . . Whatever Christ did Himself, the same He commanded us to do. If therefore He offered His own Sacramental Body and Blood in the Eucharist, He has positively commanded us to do the same. . . . ‘*Do this &c.*’”—P. 90.

XVII. Bishop Wilson writes as follows:—

“He then, at that instant, (of the Institution,) gave His Body and His Blood a Sacrifice for the sins of the world. He then offered as a Priest Himself under the symbols of bread and wine: and this is the Sacrifice which His priests do still offer.”—On Matt. xxvi. 28.

And the same Bishop in his “*Sacra Privata*,” has the following directions: [Upon first placing the Elements on the Altar,] “Vouchsafe to receive these Thy creatures from the hands of us sinners, O Thou self-sufficient God.” [And immediately after the beginning of the Consecration, i. e. after the rehearsal of the Words of Institution,] “We offer unto Thee, our King and our God, this Bread, and this Cup. . . . We give thanks to Thee for these and for all Thy mercies, beseeching Thee to send down Thy Holy Spirit upon this Sacrifice, that He may make this bread the Body of Thy Christ, and this cup the Blood of Thy Christ; and that all we who are partakers thereof, may thereby obtain remission of our sins and all other benefits of His Passion.” . . . “And together with us, remember, O God, for good *the whole mystical Body of Thy Son*; that such as are yet alive may finish their course with joy; and that we, with all such as are dead in the Lord, may rest in hope and rise in glory, for Thy Son’s sake, Whose death we now commemorate.” . . . “May I atone Thee, O God, by offering to Thee the pure and unbloody Sacrifice, which Thou hast ordained by Jesus Christ. Amen.”—Works, vol. ii. pp. 226, 228.

A similar Form was used by Bishop Jeremy Taylor, when the English Liturgy was proscribed by Parliament during the Great Rebellion, and may still be found printed with his other works.

XVIII. Dr. Grabe in his *Adversaria* writes as follows:—

“The Oblation of bread and wine to God the Father, partly to agnize Him as the Creator and supreme Lord of all the world, partly to represent before Him the Oblation of Christ’s Body and Blood on the Cross, to the intent that He might be propitious to them that offered, and for whom it was offered, and make them partakers of all the benefits of Christ’s Passion; such action, I say, hath in all Christian Churches throughout the world

N O T E
XXVII.

ever been performed by Catholic Priests, even in the Apostles' time, as also by the heretics that had any Eucharist; and hath been observed under the notion that Christ did it Himself in the first institution of that holy Sacrament."—*Adversaria*, in *Bibliothecâ Bodl.*

XIX. Dr. Brett, in his "Christian Altar and Sacrifice:"—

"An unbloody Sacrifice instituted by God instead of the many bloody Sacrifices of the Law." And again: "By taking the bread and giving of thanks Christ plainly made an oblation of it to God, before He brake it and pronounced it to be His Body. We ought therefore, as He did, to make an oblation of the Elements to God, before we consecrate or pronounce them to be the Body and Blood of Christ."—P. 23, 25.

The same author in his *Essay on the Primitive Liturgies* has the following passage respecting the mixture of the cup with water:—

"*'Likewise also mixing the cup with wine and water, and blessing it, He gave it to them, &c.'* Thus this most ancient Liturgy (the Clementine) not only testifies that it was the practice of the Church to mix water with the eucharistical wine, but teaches us that Christ Himself did so also, thereby informing us of the necessity of such a mixture, since it is necessary that we should offer the same elements which Christ offered, or we do not do as He did, and commanded us to do. All the Liturgies take notice of this mixture, and either direct by some rubric that water should be mingled with the wine, or make express mention of such a mixture in the recital of the Words of Institution, as the Clementine Liturgy has here done."—P. 193.

XX. Bishop Overall, on those words of the Liturgy which occur *after the Consecration*, "That by the merits and death of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in His blood, we and all Thy whole Church, &c.:"—

"This is a plain oblation of Christ's death once offered, and a representative Sacrifice of it for the sins and for the benefit of the whole world, of the whole Church; that both those which are here on earth, and those that rest in the sleep of peace, being departed in the faith of Christ, may find the effect and virtue of it. And if the authority of the ancient Church may prevail with us, as it ought to do, there is nothing more manifest, than that it always taught as much: and it is no absurdity to say, Here is an Oblation made for all, when it is not only commemorated to have been once offered, but solemn prayers are here also added, and a request made, that it may be effectual to all. (St. Chrys. 18 Matt. Hom. 72. in Johan.) . . . And in this sense it is not only an Eucharistical, but a *propitiatory* Sacrifice: and to prove it a Sacrifice propitiatory, always so acknowledged by the ancient Church, there can be no better argument than that it was offered up not only for the living, but for the dead, and for those that were absent, for them that travelled, for Jews, for heretics, &c., who could have no other benefit of it, but as it was a propitiatory Sacrifice. And that thus they did

offer it, read a whole army of Fathers, apud Mald. de Sac. p. 342. *Nos autem ita comparati sumus, ut cum tam multis et magnis autoribus errare malimus, quam cum Puritanis verum dicere.* Not that it makes any propitiation as that of the Cross did, but only that it obtains and brings into act that propitiation, which was once made by Christ.”—Ib. pp. 49, 50. NOTE
XXVII.

XXI. Mede, in his work entitled “The Christian Sacrifice:”—

“The Sacrifice of Christians is nothing but that One Sacrifice of Christ once offered upon the Cross, again and again commemorated. Which is elegantly expressed by those words of St. Andrew recorded in the History of His passion written by the Presbyters of Achaia; where Ægeas the proconsul requiring of him to sacrifice to idols, he is said to have answered thus; ‘I sacrifice daily to Almighty God, but what? not the smoke of frankincense, nor the flesh of bellowing bulls, nor the blood of goats. No; but I offer daily the unspotted Lamb of God on the Altar of the Cross; whose Flesh and Blood though all the faithful eat and drink of, yet all this notwithstanding, the Lamb that was sacrificed remains entire and alive still.’”—P. 379.

XXII. And Herbert Thorndike, in his book entitled “The Epilogue:”—

“Having shewed the presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist, because in it is appointed that the faithful may feast upon the Sacrifice of the Cross, we have already shewed by the Scriptures that it is the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross in the same sense and to the same effect, as it containeth the Body and Blood of Christ.”—B. iii. c. v. p. 38.

And again: “Inasmuch as the Body and Blood of Christ is in the Eucharist, in so much it is the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross, &c. . . . Certainly the sacrifices of the old Law ceased not to be sacrifices, because they were figures and prophecies of that One Sacrifice upon the Cross, which mankind was redeemed with. And why should the commemoration and representation of that One Sacrifice upon the Cross be less properly a Sacrifice, in dependence upon and denomination from that One which the name of Sacrifice upon the Cross was first used to signify?”—P. 40.

And again: “But whether the Eucharist, not only in regard of this Oblation, but also in regard of the Consecration, may be called a propitiatory Sacrifice, this, I perceive, is yet a question:” . . . [and then resolving this question, he proceeds:] “I maintain, that the Consecration of the Eucharist is indeed a Sacrifice, whereby God is rendered propitious.” . . . (pp. 41, 43.) “For having maintained that the Elements are really changed from ordinary bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, mystically present, as in a Sacrament; and that in virtue of the consecration, not by the faith of him that receives, I must admit and maintain whatsoever appears duly consequent to this truth, namely that the elements so consecrated are *truly* the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross, inasmuch as the Body and Blood of Christ Crucified are contained in them, (and that

NOTE
XXVII.

not as in a bare sign), but yet not *properly* the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross, because that is a thing that consists in action, and motion, and succession, and therefore, once done, can never be done again. . . . I say then, having proved the Consecration of the Eucharist to be the production of the Body and Blood of Christ Crucified (or the causing them to be mystically present in the Elements thereof, as in a Sacrament representing them separated by the crucifying of Christ), and the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross being necessarily propitiatory and impetratory both, it cannot be denied that the Sacrament of the Eucharist, inasmuch as it is the same Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross (as that which representeth or tendereth, and not merely signifieth, is truly said to be the thing which it representeth) is also both propitiatory and impetratory, by virtue of the Consecration of it, whereby *it becometh the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross*. For is it not all the reason in the world that, if the Eucharist be the Sacrifice of Christ Crucified, the consecration of the Eucharist, i. e. the causing the Elements to become this Sacrifice, should be, and be accounted, and called the *Sacrificing of Christ?* . . . Again: "As for the sayings of the Fathers, whereby the Eucharist is declared to be a Sacrifice in regard of the consecration, I do no way doubt that they are utterly innumerable: &c."—P. 47.

XXIII. Johnson, in his Treatise on the Unbloody Sacrifice:—

"The other end of this Sacrifice is to procure divine blessings, and especially pardon of sin. In the first respect it is propitiatory; in the second expiatory, by virtue of its principal the grand Sacrifice. . . . The Liturgies are very full of proof to this purpose . . . and therefore they put up prayers for their deceased brethren in the most solemn part of the Eucharistical Office, *after the Symbols had received the finishing Consecration*. For as no desires are more sincere or affectionate than those which we conceive in behalf of our deceased friends, so certainly the ancients addressed these desires to God in such a manner as they thought *most prevalent*, that is, *by virtue of the Eucharistical Sacrifice, then lying in open view*."

"In some cases," he says, "the ancients were of opinion that the application of the merits of Christ's death might be made by virtue of the Oblation only, without eating and drinking the Eucharistical Body and Blood; as for instance to those who by banishments, imprisonment for Christ's sake, or other violent means, were debarred from the privilege of actual Communion, &c."—P. 305.

XXIV. Dr. Grabe in his Adversaria has the following passage:—

"This prayer, in which through the Body and Blood of Christ represented (i. e. made present, and offered through the mystical consecration) on the altar, God is entreated to be propitious to us, and to bestow upon men all good things, is that 'propitiatory Sacrifice' or 'unbloody immo-

lation and propitiatory Sacrifice of Christ,' of which very frequent mention occurs in the writings of the holy Fathers."

NOTE
XXVII.

Again: "The English Divines teach that in the holy Eucharist the Body and Blood of Christ, under the species, that is, the signs of bread and wine, are offered to God, and become a representation of the Sacrifice of Christ once made upon the Cross, whereby God may be rendered propitious."—*Adversaria*, in *Bibliotheca Bodleiana*.

XXV. Dr. William Forbes, first Bishop of Edinburgh:—

"The holy Fathers very often say that the very Body of Christ is offered and sacrificed in the Eucharist, as is clear from innumerable passages, but not properly and really, with all the properties of a sacrifice preserved; but by (1) a commemoration and representation of that which was once accomplished in that One Sacrifice of the Cross, whereby Christ our High Priest consummated all other sacrifices; and (2) by pious supplication, whereby the Ministers of the Church, for the sake of the eternal Victim of that One Sacrifice, which sitteth in heaven at the right hand of the Father, *and is present also on the Holy Table in an unspeakable manner*, humbly beseech God the Father, that He would grant that the virtue and grace of this eternal Victim may be effectual and salutary to His Church for all the necessities of body and soul."—*Consid. Modest.* l. iii. p. 451.

XXVI. On the whole subject of this Note see also above, Notes xxvi, and xxviii; and below, Note xxxvii: especially the passage quoted at length from the Scottish Bishop Rattray of Dunkeld, which stands at the end of Note xxvi.

NOTE XXVIII.

A. At the moment of this act (*viz.* the utterance of the words of Institution and the Invocation of the Holy Ghost after the Oblation) the bread and wine are changed, or transubstantiated, into the very Body of Christ, and into the very Blood of Christ.—*Orthodox Catechism*, p. 64.

The common language of Anglican and Scottish Divines is to allow a change, but to deny that there is any change of substance or transubstantiation. Nevertheless, some of that Communion have maintained and still maintain that their Church means only to reject '*a carnal or physical Transubstantiation*;' while in a higher and transcendental sense it is no less true to say that the Bread is '*transubstantiated*,' than to say that it is '*transmuted*,' '*transclemented*,' or '*transformed*.' Indeed the very relation which there is between the creature which is fed and the food which feeds, and between the two creations, of nature and of grace,

NOTE XXVIII. seems to require this. For if man himself is born again and supernaturally changed by Baptism into a new creature, it is only in due analogy if the bread also be supernaturally changed in the Eucharist into a new food. In whatever sense it is true that the former change is not accidental only but substantial, the latter must be a change of substance no less: while on the other hand, if the man is not physically changed in Baptism, nor the natural creature destroyed by the superaddition and change of grace, so neither will there be any carnal or physical change, nor any destruction of the natural creatures, by the change or transubstantiation of the bread and wine in the Eucharist.

I. The Book of Ratramn the Priest, the substance of which, as embodied in Ælfric's Homily for Easter, was solemnly acknowledged and subscribed to by the Bishops of the Church of England in the time of Queen Elizabeth, contains many such passages as the following:—

“A little before He suffered He was able to change the *substance of bread* and the creature of wine into His own Body which was about to suffer, and into His own Blood which was shortly to be shed.” (§ xxviii.) “Ye are to understand that bread and wine truly changed by a mystery into the *substance of My Body and Blood* are to be received by believers.” (§ xxx.) “That Bread which by the ministry of the Priest is made the Body of Christ.” (§ ix.) “After the mystical consecration it is called neither bread nor wine, but the Body and Blood of Christ.”—§§ x, xiv, xv, xvi.

II. Bishop Poynt, in his Diallaeticon, writes thus:—

“The Body of Christ is at once truth and a figure: truth, in as much as the Body and Blood of Christ is virtually made from the *substance* of the bread and wine, but that which outwardly meets the senses is a figure.” . . “About the word Transubstantiation, though it be barbarous and quite unnecessary, *we would not contend*, if only it were explained to mean *such* a change of the substances, as the ancients acknowledged; viz., one sacramental and mystical, in opposition to an organical and palpable change.” . . “It is only *σαρκοφαγία*, i. e. the eating of natural flesh (which they themselves allow not, but condemn as absurd and impious,) which we reject, as being inconsistent with the Scriptures, inconsistent with the interpretation of the Fathers, and diametrically opposed to the true faith.”

III. Bishop Montague says; “No man denieth a *change, an alteration, a transmutation, a transelementation.*” And Bishop Cosin, admitting “a *conversion*,” does not deny the change of the *substance* of the bread and wine altogether, but that it is “changed in *such sort, that the bare accidents do alone remain.*”—Hist. of Trans. p. 61.

IV. And Herbert Thorndike, in his book entitled The Epilogue:—

“All Ecclesiastical writers do with one mouth bear witness to the presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist. Nor will any

one of them be found to ascribe it to any thing but the consecration, or that to any faith, but that upon which the Church professeth to proceed in the celebrating of it. . . . They all acknowledge the elements to be *changed, translated, and turned into the substance* of Christ's Body and Blood, though as in a Sacrament, that is, mystically." . . . Again: "The Elements are really changed from ordinary bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ mystically present; and that in virtue of the consecration, not by the faith of him that receives."—Epilogue, B. iii. cc. iv. v. NOTE
XXVIII.

V. Dr. William Forbes, First Bishop of Edinburgh, writes thus:—

"Many Protestants argue most dangerously and presumptuously, that God could not change bread substantially into the Body of Christ. God can do many things above the conception both of men and Angels; *nay many things that we firmly believe are no less impossible and contradictory on principles of reason, than Transubstantiation*, e. g. the resurrection of the body. Let us ever have magnificent, vast, immeasurable conception of the ineffable omnipotence of God."—Consid. Modest. pp. 388, 396.

VI. Brett, one of the Bishops who corresponded with the Easterns:—

"We pray that the bread may be made the Body, and the cup the Blood of Christ, *without any manner of restriction*. . . . We pray that the Holy Ghost may make them Christ's Body and Blood; which implies as if we expected some extraordinary change to be made in the Elements, requiring an omnipotent power to produce it. And I freely confess, for my own part, (and I believe I may say the same for my brethren in communion with me) that I do believe so."—Collection of Liturgies, p. 256.

VII. Here shall be cited some passages from the work of a living English writer, the Rev. W. Palmer of Worcester College, Oxford:—

This writer, in his Treatise on the Church, speaking of the book entitled "A Necessary Doctrine," put forth by the English Convocation A.D. 1543, and never yet revoked or condemned, observes as follows: "It may be concluded, that at that time" (during the reign of Edward VI.) "*the mode* of the presence was held undecided by the Church of England, as in fact she had avoided the term Transubstantiation in the Necessary Doctrine, and *while a change of substance was there strongly asserted*, this might be understood in several senses," . . . (e. g. *not a physical*, but a spiritual or sacramental change.) . . . And a few pages further on, he has the following: "In 1562 the Convocation authorized the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, the only formulary of doctrine established by competent authority in England since the publication of the Necessary Doctrine in 1543. It may be well to remark the points of doctrine in which the two formularies agreed and differed." [And then while shewing that there is no very marked or irreconcilable difference upon other points, he thus compares the two on the point of Transubstantiation:] "If the Necessary Doctrine

NOTE
XXVIII.

maintains *a change of substance* in the Eucharist, without affirming Transubstantiation" (i. e. a *carнал or physieal* Transubstantiation), "the Article in denying 'Transubstantiation,' does not condemn absolutely all change of substance in *any sense*, but the particular change called by the Romanists 'Transubstantiation,' which supposes the bread to cease to exist." (i. e. again, a *carнал or physieal* Transubstantiation.)—Ib. p. 399, 400.

The same writer in another part of his work has the following: "Archbishop Platon says 'Ecclesia Catholica Orientalis, et Græco-Russica, admittit quidem vocem Transubstantiatio, Græcè μετασσίωσις; *non physieam* illam transubstantiationem *et carnalem*, sed sacramentalem et mysticam; eodemque sensu hanc vocem Transubstantiatio accipit, quàm quo antiquissimi Ecclesiæ Græcæ Patres has voces μεταλλαγή, μετάθεσις, μεταστοιχείωσις accipiebant.' See the Answer of Platon, Archbishop of Moseow, to M. Dutens, on the Doctrine of the Oriental Church.—Dutens, *Œuvres Mélees*, part ii. p. 171, ed. 1797. This Answer is referred to as of high authority by Methodius, Archbishop of Tver, in his *Liber Historicus de Rebus Primitivæ Ecclesiæ*."—Treatise on the Church, p. 172. vol. i. ed. iii.

VIII. And lastly, Dr. Donne has the following:—

"We refuse not the words of the Fathers, in which they have expressed themselves on this Mystery; not Irenæus' '*est corpus*;' not Tertullian's '*Fecit corpus*;' not St. Cyprian's '*mutatus*,' that the bread is changed; not 'Damascene's '*supernaturaliter mutatus*,' supernaturally changed; no, nor Theophylact's '*transformatus est*,' (which seems to be the word that goes furthest of all). For this 'transforming' cannot be intended of the outward form and fashion; for that is not changed: but be it of that internal form *which is the very essence and nature* of bread, *so it is transformed; so the bread hath received a new nature*."—LXXX Sermon. ed. 1640. Sermon. iv. On the Nativity. See also above, under Notes xxvi, and xxvii.

NOTE XXIX.

A. Our Mother the Church calls on all, who would live religiously, to confess before their ghostly Father, and communicate in the Body and Blood of Christ four times in the year, or even every month; but requires all without exception to receive it at the least once in the year.—*Orthodox Catechism*, p. 65.

I. At the end of the present Liturgy of the Church of England there is the following Rubric: "Every Parishioner shall communicate at the least three times in the year, of which Easter to be one." And Canons xxi, xxii, and cxii, (A.D. 1603.) enforce the same order; and direct, that

the Curate “shall yearly, within forty days after Easter, exhibit to the Bishop, or his Chancellor, the names and surnames of all the Parishioners, as well men as women, which being of the age of sixteen years, received not the Communion at Easter before.”

NOTE
XXIX.

II. As to the conditions requisite for a due and worthy receiving of the Holy Communion, it is ordered in the Ritual of the Church of England, that “So many as intend to be partakers of the Holy Communion shall signify their names to the Curate, *at least* some time the day before.” And in the Order for the Visitation of the Sick the Priest is required, *before giving the sick person the Holy Communion*, to examine him, and “move him to make a special confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter.” Upon which Rubric Wheatley and Bishop Sparrow comment to this effect, that “every *deadly* or excommunicable sin” should be felt to be “a weighty matter.” And Bishop Cosin, in the Treatise entitled “Regni Angliæ sub Elizabethâ Religio Catholica &c.,” (cap. xiii.) writes as if the Rubric for the giving in of the names to the Curate before Communicating was at that time acknowledged to imply not only the right but the duty on his part of examining the consciences of the parties, as is prescribed elsewhere in respect of the sick, so far at least as to ascertain that they are free from “weighty matters,” i. e. from deadly or excommunicable sins: “The Eucharist is celebrated with us religiously and with the greatest reverence: and on the greater Festivals, and in some cases on every Lord’s Day, the Holy Communion is administered to those who have been previously *examined*, (*explorati*) *absolved*, or *found worthy*.” By “found worthy” he means such as are found, on examination, to be free from all mortal or excommunicable sins.—P.18, ed. 1729.

III. The Scottish Bishop Rattray writes as follows:—

“The holy Eucharist being the highest Mystery of the Christian religion, and it being the greatest privilege of a Christian to be admitted to the participation of it, it is therefore necessary to be duly qualified and prepared for Communicating worthily in it. And this due preparation consists in the following particulars: I. A valid Baptism in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, administered by a person authorized by and representing God; for the Eucharist is the highest instance of drawing near to God; and in order to that approach it is required that we have ‘our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water;’ and in it the members of Christ’s mystical Body have Communion with Him their Head, and with one another, which none can have a title to, who do not belong to this Body, into which we cannot be initiated but by Baptism, as no Jew could be admitted to eat of the Passover, which was a type of it, till he was first Circumcised: II. Confirmation by a Catholic Bishop, for conferring the Holy Spirit, whereby the baptismal Regeneration is completed, by our being born again

NOTE
XXIX.

both of water and of the Spirit: III. In all adult persons, a competent knowledge of the nature of this sacred Mystery, and of the baptismal Covenant: IV. The having kept our Baptism undefiled. And it is then undefiled, when we have from our Baptism forward, 1. held constantly and professed that Faith which was once delivered to the saints; . . 2. lived in the Communion of the Church, which is that one Body of Christ into which we are baptized, and to which only all the benefits of the New Covenant do belong; and 3. in the love of God and our Blessed Saviour above all things, expressing this our love by an universal obedience to all His laws and ordinances, without any exception or reserve. . . . If we be thus sincere in our love to God, and to our neighbour for His sake, and have respect to all the commandments of God, keeping ourselves free from Heresy and Schism, and from all *heinous* and *mortal* sin, or *habits* of sin, then is our Baptism undefiled, notwithstanding such sins of frailty and daily infirmity as are committed through ignorance, inadvertency, or surprise. For it is only to those *heinous* and *mortal* sins that God hath threatened eternal damnation in the Scriptures.

“The keeping our Baptism undefiled, is the true and proper preparedness for this holy Sacrament: But if any has been so unhappy as to pollute it, he is by no means fit, nay, it is a matter of the greatest danger for him to approach the Table of the Lord, till by undergoing a course of severe and penitential mortification, suited to the nature of his crime, he hath expressed his sincere and thorough repentance for it.”—P. 28, et seq. To the same effect is also the Scottish Catechism of Aberdeen, p. 41, 42, 43. See besides what is given below in Note xxx, on Penitence.

IV. According to the present Ritual of all the British Churches the Holy Communion, (which is consecrated in *leavened* bread), is administered to the faithful under *both* kinds. This is insisted upon in Article xxx, of the Thirty-nine. And in the Proposals of the British Bishops to the Eastern Patriarchs we find the following passage:—

“The Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ ought to be administered to the faithful in both kinds: and the Latin Church has transgressed the institution of Christ by restraining the Laity from one kind.”

For the dispositions of body and mind with which the holy Communion is to be approached and received, we may take the following:

V. Bishop Sparrow in his *Rationale of the Book of Common Prayer* says, “This Sacrament is to be received Fasting.”—Oxford ed. 1840. p. 216. Compare also the Rubric prefixed to the Order for Baptizing Adults.

VI. And Bishop Taylor (with many other writers) to the same effect:—

“Let us receive the consecrated Elements with all devotion of body and spirit, and do this honour to It, that it be the first food we eat, and the first beverage we drink that day; and that your body and soul be pre-

pared for Its reception with abstinence from secular pleasures, that you may better have attended fastings and preparatory prayers."

NOTE
XXIX.

Again: "Place thyself upon thy knees in the devoutest and the humblest posture of worshippers, and think it not much in the lowest manner to worship the King of men and Angels, the Lord of heaven and earth, the great lover of souls, and the Saviour of the body, Him, whom all the Angels of God worship. . . . For if Christ be not there after a peculiar manner, Whose Body do we receive? But if He be present not in mystery only, but in blessing also, why do we not worship? But all the Christians *always did so* from time immemorial. 'No man eats this Flesh, unless He first adores,' said St. Austin; 'For the wise men and barbarians did worship this Body in the manger with very much fear and reverence: let us therefore, who are citizens of heaven, at least not fall short of the barbarians. But thou seest Him now not in the manger, but on the Altar; thou beholdest Him not in the Virgin's arms, but represented by the Priest, and brought to thee in Sacrifice by the Holy Spirit of God.' So St. Chrysostom argues."—Worthy Communicant, c. vii. 10.

VII. Bishop Beveridge writes thus; (Necessity of Freq. Comm. p. 107.):—

"How can I by faith behold my Saviour coming to me, and offering to me His own Body and Blood, and not fall down and worship Him?"

VIII. From Proposals of the British Bishops to the Easterns:—

"So that every one may freely according to Christ's own institution and meaning receive the same," (the holy Eucharist), "and also worship Christ in Spirit as verily and indeed present."—Proposition iv.

IX. Forbes, Bishop of Edinburgh, says, quoting the Abp. of Spalatro;—

"Christ in the Eucharist is to be adored with divine worship, inasmuch as His living and glorified Body is present therein."

And again: "Those rigid Protestants, who deny that we should adore Christ in the Eucharist, or say that we should only adore Him internally and mentally, not with any external sign of adoration, such as bending the knee, or some other bodily movement, are guilty of a monstrous error. Such persons are commonly heterodox on the doctrine of Christ's presence in the Sacrament altogether. To condemn as unlawful that external adoration, which *all Christians, from the very time of the Apostles*, have paid in receiving the Eucharist, is the very extreme of rashness and presumption."—Consid. Modest. p. 440, and p. 438.

X. Herbert Thorndike on the same subject writes as follows:—

"It is not *necessarily* the same thing to worship *Christ in the Sacrament of the Eucharist*, as to worship *the Sacrament of the Eucharist*; yet in the sense which reason of itself justifieth, it is. For the Sacrament of the Eucharist is neither the visible kind, nor the invisible grace of Christ's Body and Blood, (separately), but *the union of both*. So that he who worships

NOTE XXIX. the one, worships the other: he who worships *Christ in the Sacrament*, (the invisible grace), worships *the Sacrament* (the visible kind.)—Epilogue, p. 352.

And again: “I suppose *that the Body and Blood of Christ may be adored, wheresoever they are, and must be adored by a good Christian* where the custom of the Church requires it; adored in consideration of the Godhead, to which it remains inseparably united. The Body and Blood of Christ is necessarily to be honoured, because necessarily united to that, which is honoured, viz. the Godhead. *And the presence thereof in the Sacrament of the Eucharist is a just occasion to express by the bodily act of adoration that inward honour.* I do believe that it was so practised and done in the ancient Church.”—Epilogue, iii. p. 350.

XI. Of the participation of sinners Bishop Taylor writes thus:—

“No man must dare to approach to the Holy Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, if he be in a state of any one sin: . . . and he *that receiveth Christ into an impure soul or body*, first turns his most excellent nourishment into poison, and then feeds upon it.”—Holy Living, § x. c. iv.

XII. Jackson (on the Creed) has the following passage:—

“All that are partakers of this Sacrament eat Christ’s Body and drink His Blood sacramentally; that is, they eat that Bread, which sacramentally is His Body, and drink that Cup, which sacramentally is His Blood, whether they eat or drink faithfully, or unfaithfully. For *all* the Israelites (1 Cor. x.) *drank of the same spiritual rock, which was Christ*, sacramentally; all of them were partakers of His presence, when Moses smote the rock: Yet with many of them God was not well pleased, because they did not faithfully either drink, or partake of His presence. And more displeased He is with such as eat Christ’s Body and drink His Blood unworthily, though they eat and drink them sacramentally: for eating and drinking so only, that is, without faith, or due respect, they eat and drink to their own condemnation, because they do not discern or rightly esteem Christ’s Body or presence in the Holy Sacrament. Must we say then that Christ is really present in the Sacrament as well to the unworthy, as to the faithful receivers? *Yes, this we must grant*: yet we must add withal, that He is really present with them in a quite contrary manner: really present He is, because virtually present to both; because the operation or efficacy of His Body and Blood is not metaphorical, but real in both.”—B. xi. c. 4.

XIII. In conclusion, with regard to the Reservation of the Holy Communion for the sick, it may be noticed that this is directed by the First English Ritual: and that the usage was proposed to be restored by a Rubric appended to that Liturgy, which was sent in Greek by the British Bishops to the Eastern Patriarchs and to the Russian Synod in the early part of the eighteenth century, and the original MS. of which, together with the rest of the Correspondence, is still preserved in the Synodal Archives at St. Petersburg.

NOTE XXX.

A. Penitence is a Mystery, in which he who confesses his sins, is, on the outward declaration of pardon by the Priest, inwardly loosed from his sins by Jesus Christ Himself.—*Orthodox Catechism*, p. 66.

I. Both the first and the present English Ritual prescribe the following Form, as that by which the Priest is to absolve Penitents who confess their sins privately to him: "Our Lord Jesus Christ, Who hath left power to His Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him, of His great mercy forgive thee thine offences: And by His authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

II. From the "Institution of a Christian Man," A.D. 1537:—

"Absolution given by the Priest was instituted of Christ to apply the promises of God's grace and favour to the penitent. Wherefore as touching Confession, we think it convenient that all Bishops and preachers shall teach the people that they ought and must certainly believe that the words of Absolution pronounced by the priest be spoken by the authority given to him by Christ in the gospel. . . . Item. That the people may in no wise contemn this auricular Confession, which is made unto the ministers of the Church; but that they ought to repute the same as a very expedient and necessary mean, whereby they may require and ask this Absolution at the Priest's hands, at such time as they shall find their consciences grieved *with mortal sin*, and have occasion so to do, to the intent that they may thereby attain certain comfort, and consolation of their consciences. . . . As touching the third part of penance (amendment of life) . . . all men truly penitent, contrite, and *confessed*, must needs also bring forth the fruits of penance, that is to say, prayer, fasting, and almsdeed, with much mourning and lamenting for the sins before committed."—Formularies of Faith, &c., Oxford ed. p. 97, 100. Compare also "A Necessary Doctrine," p. 257, &c.

III. Bishop Overall, in Nicholl's Add. Notes on the Common Prayer:—

"'Let him come to me, &c.' Confession of sins must necessarily be made to them, to whom the dispensation of the Mysteries of God is committed. For so they which in former times repented among the Saints are read to have done." And again: "Venial sins, which separate not from the grace of God, need not so much to trouble a man's conscience. If he have committed any *mortal sin*, then we require Confession of it to a Priest, &c."

IV. On the same subject Hooker has the following passage:—

"For private Confession and Absolution, it standeth thus with us: that

NOTE the Priest's power to Absolve is publicly taught and professed; and
 XXX. the Church not denied to have authority either of abridging or enlarging the use and exercise of that power."—Ecc. Pol. vi. 4. 15.

V. And Bishop Montague in his "Appeal":—

"The ancient and pious manner of Confession, for the help and furtherance of men's true repentance, and for the continuing of them in amendment of life, *is*, may be, and *ought to be urged*."—Heading of ch. xxxii. p. 297.

Again: "Doth he (the Curate) especially exhort them to make Confession of their sins to himself, or some other learned, grave, and discreet Minister, especially in Lent, against that holy time of Easter; that they may receive comfort and Absolution, so as to become worthy receivers of such Sacred Mysteries?"—Articles of Inquiry in his Diocese, Tit. vii. 4.

VI. Dr. Donne, in his Sermons, has the following; A.D. 1573—1662:—

"This is the Sacrament of Confession. So we may call it with a safe meaning; that is the Mystery of Confession: for Confession is a Mysteries thing. . . . If God had appointed His Angels or His Saints to absolve me, as He hath His Ministers, I would confess unto them. . . . Men come not willingly to this manifestation of themselves. . . . The more I find Confession, or any religious practice, repugnant to mine own nature, the further I will go in it."—Serm. lxiii. vol. i. p. 582, &c.

VII. Dr. Heylin, in his "Theologia Veterum," A.D. 1600—1662:—

"For Confession to be made to the Priest, it is agreeable both to the doctrine and intent of the Church of England, though not so much in practice as it ought to be. And again: According to the Scriptures and the primitive Fathers, satisfaction also must be given to God."—P. 455.

VIII. And Bishop Jeremy Taylor writes thus:—

"The Church of God in all ages hath commanded, and in most ages hath enjoined, that we confess our sins, and discover the state and condition of our souls to such a person whom we or our superiors judge fit to help us in such need. . . . And the shame of opening such ulcers may restrain your forwardness to contract them."—Holy Living, iv. § ix.

IX. Bishop Sparrow, in his Rationale, on the Visitation of the Sick:—

"Here shall the sick person be moved to make a special Confession, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter. It should be considered whether *every deadly sin be not a weighty matter*."—P. 266.

X. Dr. George Hickes, A.D. 1642—1715:—

"For my part, I am thoroughly persuaded that this most wholesome discipline was not invented by the Bishops, but instituted by Jesus Christ Himself, for the comfort and salvation of our souls. And indeed I clearly perceive that the Christian religion can never shine with her own native brightness, till, by the pious severity of the Clergy, this sacred discipline

be revived. . . . It is most certain that the primitive Church never accounted a sinner to be justified, however humble and contrite, till he had obtained sacerdotal Absolution. All men allow the same thing in the sacrament of Baptism. No person is worthy to come to Baptism, unless he be of a pure and clean heart, one that from his soul abominates all kind of sin, and is most stedfastly resolved to conform his life to the law of the Gospel. And yet even all this does not justify him in the sight of God. Baptism is still wanting; without which remission of sins cannot be obtained in the ordinary way. . . . And why may we not judge the same concerning Repentance? Hence it is, that the ancient Fathers were wont to call Repentance *a second Baptism*" (or rather 'an imitation of Baptism,' or '*as it were* a second Baptism,' 'a plank after shipwreck.') "But I shall give you the opinion of the most holy Fathers in the words of Morinus. . . . 'God therefore is the author of reconciliation; and the priest is the minister of it. What does the priest effect? That, which God, by the working of His Holy Spirit, had begun in the penitent before reconciliation, the Priest does by Absolution ministerially finish, according to that ministerial power committed to him in these words, *Whatsoever ye shall bind, &c.*; and *such as are worthy of divine absolution* he does actually and visibly absolve.' Thus Morinus. And that this was the opinion of the primitive Church is most abundantly manifest from Tertullian, St. Cyprian, St. Pacianus, and St. Ambrose."—Two Treatises. See also Art. xvi.

NOTE
XXX.

XI. Dr. Jeremiah Collier, in his Ecclesiastical History, P. II. b. iv.:—

"Can we imagine that words so plain (*Whosoever sins ye remit, &c.*) in the expression, and so solemn in the occasion, are void of weight and signification? Not to mention the right they imply of admitting into the Church, and excluding from it, not to mention this, they must amount to this meaning at the lowest, that those who *neglect* this ordinance of God, and *refuse* to apply for Absolution to persons thus authorized, shall *not* have their sins forgiven, *though otherwise not unqualified*."—Vol. 5. p. 262.

XII. Marshall, on the Penitential Discipline of the Primitive Church:—

"The private Confession is manifestly of old standing, and approaches very near the *fountain*; and though, as far as I have yet been able to learn of it, it had, till the time of Pope Leo, an apparent reference to the outward or public Discipline of the Church, yet every case which was in secret revealed to the Priest, did not, it is evident, come upon the public stage, nor had *public* penance assigned to it, but only such sins were so treated, as the Priest, upon knowledge of them, should judge proper for publication. . . . Wherefore then should either the man or the doctrine be exploded, which pleads for the continuance of such a practice; or which would recommend to us the advantages derivable from it?"—P. 218.

XIII. Bingham, On the necessity of the several sorts of Absolution:—

"If we would be secure, we must use God's ordinances as He has

NOTE
XXX.

appointed them ; join the outward and inward act together ; let the repentance and obedience of our souls prepare the way for the ministry of His Priests ; and then what sins they remit upon earth shall be remitted in heaven.”—Works, vol. viii. Sermon. ii. p. 442.

XIV. Thorndike, in his “Just Weights and Measures,” writes as follows :

“If it be the power of the Keys that makes the Church, *it will be hard to shew the face of a Church*, where the blessing of the Church and the Communion of the Eucharist is granted, and yet no power of the Keys at all exercised. Nay, it will appear a lamentable ease to consider, how simple innocent Christians are led on till death in an opinion, that they want nothing requisite for the pardon and absolution of their sins, when it is manifest that they want the Keys of the Church ; as it is manifest that the Keys are not used for that purpose.”—P. 118.

“Further, God having provided these means (viz. Penance, Confession, and Absolution) of procuring and assuring the pardon of sin by the Church, hath also *obliged all Christians to make use of the same, by bringing their secret sins to the knowledge of the Church*, so far and inasmuch as they ought to stand convicted that the ministry of the Church is requisite to procure in them that disposition, which by the Gospel entitles them to forgiveness.”—Epilogue, B. iii. On the Laws of the Church, c. ix. p. 74.

And again : “I must freely glorify God by freely professing, that in my judgment no Christian kingdom or state can maintain itself to be that which it pretendeth more effectually, than by giving force and effect *to the law of private Confession once a year*.”—Epilogue, B. iii. p. 104.

XV. Abridged from the Scottish Catechism of Aberdeen :—

“It is absolutely necessary that they who receive the holy Eucharist be duly qualified and prepared for it. Q. What is the first Qualification necessary for this purpose? A. A valid Baptism; . . . Q. What is the next thing necessary? . . . A. Confirmation; . . . Q. What is the next thing necessary? . . . A. That every adult person have a competent knowledge of the nature of this sacred Mystery. Q. And what is the last thing necessary, to fit us for the holy Communion? A. That we have kept our Baptism undefiled, *or else have cleansed ourselves by sincere Repentance*. Q. What is it that breaks or defiles our Baptismal Covenant? A. Any gross, wilful, or habitual sin. Q. Do we not all sin daily? A. Yes; through unavoidable weakness, and human infirmity. Q. Do these sins of infirmity defile our Baptism, or turn us out of God’s favour? A. No; they do not, provided we are sorry for them, and strive earnestly and constantly against them. Q. What, if our sins are of a more heinous nature? A. Then we must not presume to approach the holy Eucharist, till we have more particularly repented of them. Q. Why so? A. Because it would be a great profanation of that holy Mystery, to the infinite danger of our own souls. Q. What does Repentance consist of? A. Of Examination, Contri-

tion, Confession, and Penance. If a Christian has been guilty of any gross and scandalous sin, he must submit to the public Discipline of the Church, which consists in the power of depriving him of all the benefits and privileges of Baptism by the Lesser and Greater Excommunication. By the Lesser Christians are excluded from the participation of the Eucharist; by the Greater they are totally expelled the Church, and separated from all communion in holy offices with her; so that all Christians ought to shun and avoid them even in common conversation. This Greater Excommunication is inflicted upon none but the obstinate and refractory. *Q.* But if Christians are submissive and penitent, what must they do? *A.* They must make their public Confession to God in the face of the Church. *Q.* And what follows? *A.* The Bishop, or a Priest commissioned by him, prescribes them a suitable Penance: and when the penitent has performed his penance, he receives the great benefit of Absolution, i. e. a solemn Prayer for pardon with Imposition of Hands; and so he is re-admitted to the holy Eucharist.”—P. 45.

NOTE
XXX.

XVI. And to the same effect is the Catechism of Bishop Jolly:—

“*A.* The power of forgiving sins belongs originally and inherently to God alone. *Q.* Did God then and Christ make over any delegated power to the Church for this purpose? *A.* Yes; He made the Apostles and their successors instruments for conveying His pardon and forgiveness to such as duly apply and are properly qualified for it. (John xx. 23.) *Q.* By what means then is this benefit to be obtained? *A.* By the Absolution of the Church; . . . *Q.* But even in the most regular use of these means, is there not something further required in order to forgiveness? *A.* Yes; on the sinner’s part, hearty and sincere repentance.”—P. 36.

XVII. In the Order for the Ordination of Priests in all the British Ordinals these words, amongst others, are used at the Imposition of Hands:—

“Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the word of God, and of His holy Sacraments; &c.”

XVIII. Lastly, shall be added an Instruction at some length on the same subject by the Scottish Bishop Rattray of Dunkeld:—

“The keeping our Baptism undefiled, is the true and proper preparedness for the holy Eucharist. But if any has been so unhappy as to pollute it, he is by no means fit, nay, it is a matter of the greatest danger for him to approach the Table of the Lord, till by undergoing a course of severe and penitential mortification, suited to the nature of his crime, he hath expressed his thorough repentance for it. Now the sins that defile Baptism are,

First; A wilful apostasy from Christianity. This is not only to pollute, but to renounce Baptism, and is the sin described by the Apostle, Heb. vi. And such as thus fall away, though they pretended to repent, were not to be

NOTE
XXX.

received again to Communion. The case of the Lapsers in the primitive persecutions was different from this, as being the effect not of choice, but of fear and frailty; yet it was a pollution of their Baptism, and a sin of a very heinous nature, as being against our baptismal obligation to lay down our life for the Faith, and a communion with those demons, or evil spirits, who were worshipped by the heathens as gods, but solemnly renounced by the Christians in Baptism:

Secondly; Heresy, or any error in doctrine contrary to, or inconsistent with, that Faith which was once delivered to the Saints, when obstinately persisted in against the admonitions of superiors:

Thirdly; Schism, or separation from the Communion of the Church, and withdrawing obedience from the rightful governors thereof, the Bishops, who have derived their authority in a continued succession from the Apostles, (when nothing is enjoined as a condition of Communion contrary to the primitive faith, or to the commands of Christ), and that either by forsaking all public religious assemblies, or by setting up, or joining in assemblies, or in any act of communion opposed to the Communion of their rightful ecclesiastical superiors, within whose jurisdiction they live:

Fourthly; Any one or more acts of such *heinous* and *mortal* sins to which eternal damnation is threatened in the Scriptures; such as those reckoned up 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10. 'Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived; neither *fornicators*, nor *idolaters*, nor *adulterers*, nor *effeminate*, nor *abusers of themselves with men*, nor *thieves*, nor *covetous*, nor *drunkards*, nor *revilers*, nor *extortioners*, shall inherit the kingdom of God.' And Rev. xxi. 8. 'But the *fearful* and *unbelieving*, and the *abominable*, and *murderers*, and *whoremongers*, and *sorcerers*, and *idolaters*, and all *liars*, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death.' And Rom. i. 29, 32. 'Being filled with all unrighteousness; *fornication*, *wickedness*, *covetousness*, *maliciousness*; full of *envy*, *murder*, *contention*, *deceit*, *malignity*; *whisperers*, *evil speakers*, *haters of God*, *despiteful*, *proud*, *boasters*, *inventors of evil things*, *disobedient to parents*, *without understanding*, *covenant-breakers*, *without natural affection*, *implacable*, *unmerciful*; who knowing the judgment of God, that they who commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but also have pleasure in them that do them.' Where these sins are reckoned as the effects of a reprobate mind even in the Gentiles; and they who commit them are said to be '*worthy of death*.' And Gal. v. 19, 20, 21. 'Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these, *adultery*, *fornication*, *uncleanness*, *lasciviousness*, *idolatry*, *witchcraft*, *enmities*, *contentions*, *emulations*, *wrath*, *strife*, *seditions*, *heresies*, *envyings*, *murders*, *drunkenness*, *revellings*, and *such like*; of which I tell you before-hand, as also I have told you in time past, that they who do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God.' And the Apostle, by adding the words '*and such like*,' plainly signifies, that

all such sins as are of the like heinous nature, are to be reckoned in with these here mentioned by him :

NOTE
XXX.

Fifthly; Even lesser sins, whether of omission or commission, when through sloth and a stupid negligence they become habitual, and are indulged without remorse, or any serious and hearty endeavours to avoid them: For *sloth is a mortal sin*; and our Saviour Himself has told us the doom of that servant who neglected to improve the talent committed to him: Nay,

Sixthly; Even a single act of sin, however otherwise it may seem venial in its own nature, yet if committed deliberately and premeditatedly, with the full consent of the will, becomes *mortal*: For pride and contempt of the Divine authority, or an obstinate impenitence, even in the smallest sins, so aggravates their guilt, as to turn them into the heinous crime of rebellion: And, in a word, every sin becomes mortal to him who doth not seriously endeavour to shun every sin.

Such as have in *any* of these instances *defiled their Baptism*, are by no means fit to Communicate in this high and holy Mystery, till they have undergone a Repentance suited to the nature of their crime.

Now, that Repentance which is necessary in the case of mortal sins, is very different from that which is required for such as are only venial: For our venial sins are pardoned upon our daily humble confession of such of them in particular as may be any way observed by us, and of the rest in general; nor is it necessarily required that we should never more commit them, but only that we should seriously endeavour against them: For it is hardly possible to keep ourselves wholly free from them, while we are in this state of frailty; and there are very few, if any, even of the best of men, who do not more or less continue in them, even to the time of their death, without losing thereby the Divine favour, or hazarding their eternal salvation. But in the case of mortal sins, their Repentance must be laborious, and accurately and thoroughly practical; that is, they must not only confess them to God with broken and contrite hearts, humble themselves in His sight, acknowledging that they have made themselves justly obnoxious to His Divine wrath, and with earnest supplications implore His mercy and pardon; but they must also undergo a long and severe course of Penitential mortification, exercising themselves in frequent fastings, and other austerities, abstaining even from lawful and innocent pleasures; to which must be added alms-giving, and other the like acts of mercy and bounty (now-a-days, alas! too much neglected and despised): they 'must redeem their sins with alms, and their iniquities by shewing mercy to the poor,' as far as their circumstances will in any way possibly allow: and if they have in any way injured their neighbour, they must give him all reasonable satisfaction, and make restitution to him to the utmost of their power: and they must continue under these penitential mortifications till they have wrought up their minds to a fixed hatred of

NOTE
XXX.

sin, and a true love of God, and of that virtue which is according to godliness, and *perfectly shaken off the habit* of the sin or sins which they have been so unhappy as to fall into, and of all mortal sin whatsoever; so as not only never more to commit them, but to be free from all affection for or desire after them, and put on firm and stedfast purposes of obedience, and greater zeal in the exercise of all the duties of Christianity, especially those that are opposite to the sins they have been guilty of. And *more-over, they ought to apply to a pious and judicious Priest, and Confess their sin*, and lay open the state of their soul to him; that they may be assisted by his counsel and advice, and sacerdotal intercession for them; and when they have gone through such a course of Penance as he shall direct, may be received again to peace by the Imposition of his Hands, and prayer to God for Absolution; and *thus* being regularly admitted to the participation of this holy Sacrament, wherein they solemnly renew their covenant with God, may have the pardon of their sins sealed to them by the Body and Blood of Christ, and so be restored again to their former station, and to the favour of God, which they had forfeited. And *this they ought to do, even though the sins they have committed be known only to God and their own conscience*: For *if they be public*, the Priest ought to repel them till he hath represented their case to the Bishop, that he may prescribe such *public Penance* as he shall judge proper, if he hath not already provided for it by Ecclesiastical Canons.”—Some Particular Instructions concerning the Christian Covenant, p. 28, &c.

NOTE XXXI.

A. Orders are a Mystery, in which the Holy Ghost by the laying on of the Bishop's hands ordains them that be rightly chosen to minister Sacraments, and to feed the flock of Christ.—*Orthodox Catechism*, p. 67.

I. On this subject see at length the Ordinal of the Church of England, in the Preface to which, among other things, it is said that;—

“It is evident unto all men diligently reading the holy Scripture and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. . . And therefore, to the intent that these Orders may be continued . . no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in the Church of England, or suffered to execute any of the said Functions, except he be called, tried, examined and admitted thereunto, according to the Form hereafter following, or hath had formerly *Episcopal* Ordination.”

And in the Ordinal itself, the Bishop Ordains a Deacon (who must be

over twenty-three years of age) by Imposition of hands and prayer “in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” And a Priest he ordains in like manner, saying these words; “Receive the Holy Ghost for the Office and work of a Priest in the Church of God now committed to thee by the Imposition of our hands: Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the word of God, and of His holy Sacraments; &c.” But a Bishop is ordained by three or more other Bishops, the Archbishop or chief Consecrator saying as follows; “Receive the Holy Ghost for the Office and work of a Bishop in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the Imposition of our hands; In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen. And remember that thou stir up the grace of God, which is given thee by this Imposition of our hands: For God hath not given us, &c.”

NOTE
XXXI.

II. In the Office of Institution of the Anglo-American Church there is a prayer or Collect beginning thus: “O holy Jesus, who hast purchased to Thyself an universal Church; and hast promised to be with the Ministers of Apostolic succession to the end of the world; &c.”

III. Bishop Taylor, to give one such example only, writes thus:—

“Certainly he could upon no pretence have challenged the appellation of Christian, who had dared either himself to invade the holy rites within the cancels, *ἐντος τοῦ βήματος*, or had denied the power of celebrating this dreadful Mystery (of the Eucharist) to belong only to Sacerdotal ministration. For either it is said to be but common bread and wine; and then, if that were true, indeed any body may minister it: but they that say so are blasphemous; they count the Body of the Lord and the ‘Blood of the Covenant or New Testament,’ a profane or common thing; they discern not the Lord’s Body; they know not that the Bread which is broken is the communication of the Lord’s Body: But if it be a holy, separate, divine, and mysterious thing, who can make it, (ministerially, I mean) and consecrate or sublime it from common or ordinary bread, but a consecrate, separate, and sublimed Person? Certainly there is not in the world a greater degree of power, than to remit and retain sins, and to consecrate the Sacramental Symbols into the Mysteriousness of Christ’s Body and Blood; nor a greater honour, than that God in heaven should ratify what the Priest does on earth, and should admit him to handle the Sacrifice of the world, and to present the same, which in heaven is presented by the Eternal Jesus.”—Clerus Domini, The Divine Institution and Necessity of the Office Ministerial, written by command of King Charles I. § v.

IV. Thorndike, in the place quoted above under Note xxii, shewing that Orders are truly a Mystery or Sacrament conferring grace, argues;—

“If the profession of Christianity infer the grace of Baptism, shall not

NOTE
XXXI.

the profession of that Christianity which the estate of the Clergy in general, or that particular degree to which every man is ordained, importeth, infer the grace, which the discharge of it requireth?"

V. From the Scottish Catechism of Aberdeen:—

"The Church is called in the Creed *Apostolic*, 1. Because it preserves the Doctrine of the Apostles; and 2. Because its Pastors are the successors of the Apostles. For they appointed the Bishops to succeed them in the government of the Church. Q. What is the Office of a Bishop? A. To govern the Clergy and people, to ordain the Clergy, to administer the Sacraments, and perform all holy offices. Q. Are there any other Orders of Clergy than the Bishops? A. Yes; under the Bishops there are Priests and Deacons? Q. What is the Priests' office? A. To govern the people committed to their charge, to administer Baptism and the holy Eucharist, and perform other holy Offices. Q. Can they do these things as well as the Bishops? A. Yes; but then it is in dependence upon, and subordination to their Bishops. Q. Can Priests ordain others? A. No; it is only the Bishops, who have power to ordain others. Q. What is the Office of a Deacon? A. To be a servant to the Bishops and Priests in their functions, and to take care of the poor. Q. Was not the Christian Priesthood typified or prefigured by the Jewish? A. Yes; the Bishop is the Christian High Priest, and the Presbyters and Deacons answer to the Priests and Levites. Q. Whom does the Christian High Priest represent? A. Jesus Christ, the invisible Bishop and Head of the whole Church. Q. Ought not then every Christian to be subject to his Bishop? A. Yes; as to the visible Head, or High Priest in his own Diocese." (p. 18.) And again: "Q. Who can consecrate the Eucharist? A. None but a Bishop or Priest."—P. 38. Passages to the same effect are to be found in the Scottish Catechism of Bishop Jolly, p. 32, 33, 34. 56, 57. And in the Catechism of the Diocese of Brechin, § ii. p. 60, 67.

VI. On the subject of this Note see also Notes II, XVII, and XXI.

NOTE XXXII.

Q. What is Matrimony? A. Matrimony is a Mystery (i. e. Sacrament) &c.—*Orthodox Catechism*, p. 68.

I. The Order for the solemnization of Matrimony in the English Ritual contains a Prayer, in which occur the following words:—

"O God, who hast consecrated the state of Matrimony to *such an excellent Mystery*, that in it is signified and represented the spiritual marriage and unity betwixt Christ and His Church; &c.:" In like manner the Book of Homilies also more than once speaks of "the *Sacrament of Matrimony*."

II. Thorndike, as quoted above under Note xxii, has the following :—

NOTE
XXXII.

“As for Marriage, the solemnity of the Blessing, the Ring, the Sacrament of the Eucharist, with which, according to the custom of the whole Church, it ought to be ministered, will easily make it a Sacrament.”

NOTE XXXIII.

A. Virginitie is better than wedlock, if any have the gift to keep it undefiled. (And again :) He that giveth his virgin in marriage doeth well; but he that giveth her not in marriage doeth better.—*Orthodox Catechism*, p. 68.

I. So in the Ritual of the Church of England, in the Order for the solemnization of Matrimony, one cause for the institution of that ordinance is said to have been “as a remedy against sin; that such persons as have not *the gift* of continency, might marry:” Where the word ‘*gift*’ plainly marks that Virginitie is superior.

II. Accordingly, Bishop Andrewes in his Private Devotions, after the “Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Evangelists, and Martyrs,” gives thanks to God for “the Ascetics,” and for “the Beauty of Virgins.” And in prayer he mentions first “those who are in Virginitie, and purity, and Ascetic life;” and then “those also, who live in honourable marriage.”

III. Bishop Montague has the following passage :—

“Touching *Evangelical Counsels*, I know no doctrine of our English Church against them. I do believe there are, and ever were, *Evangelical Counsels*, such as St. Paul mentioneth in his ‘*Consilium autem do*’ (concerning Virginitie); such as our Saviour pointed at and directed unto in His ‘*Qui potest capere capiat*’ (on the same subject). If any man, not knowing or not considering the state of the question, hath otherwise written, or preached, or taught, what is that to me, or to the doctrine of the Church of England? His ignorance, or fancy, or misapplying, is not the doctrine of antiquity, which *with universal consent* held *Evangelical Counsels*; nor of our Church, in which our Gamaliel hath told us that ‘many vows may be freely made and performed to God, which are not commanded by God.’ ‘We allow,’ says Bishop Morton, ‘the distinction between precepts and counsels.’”—Montague’s Appeal, p. 215.

IV. To the same effect Bishop Jeremy Taylor :—

“Virginitie is a life of Angels, the enamel of the soul, the huge advantage of religion, the great opportunity for the retirement of devotion; and being empty of cares, it is full of prayers; being unmingled with the world,

NOTE
XXXIII.

it is apt to converse with God; and by not feeling the warmth of a too forward and indulgent nature, flames out with holy fire, till it be burning like the Cherubim and the most extasied order of holy and unpolluted spirits.”—Works, vol. iv. p. 71. Heber’s edition.

V. And Thorndike says, that notwithstanding “that horrible act of abolishing the Monasteries by King Henry VIII., . . . no son of the Church of England is bound to disown the whole Church in maintaining, as she has, the Monastic life to be agreeable with Christianity, and expedient to the intent of it.”—Epilogue, iii. p. 371.

And again: “It might seem that the ordinary state of those who are engaged in the world is of more perfection than monastic life, as furnishing greater opportunities for the exercise of that charity, wherein our Christianity chiefly consisteth. To which I answer, that though the occasions of the world minister more opportunities of exercising charity, yet the engagements, which a man that liveth in the world hath, make it more difficult for him. In the profession of monastic life there is ground for presuming, that those who live in it come nearer what our Baptism professeth, by the means thereof, than others can do.”—Ibid p. 372. See also below, under Note xxxix.

NOTE XXXIV.

A. Unction with Oil is a Mystery, in which, while the body is anointed with oil, God’s grace is invoked on the sick, to heal him of spiritual and bodily infirmities.—*Orthodox Catechism*, p. 69.

I. In the present English Ritual there is an Order for the Visitation of the Sick with solemn Prayers to be made for him by the Priests of the Church. And in the First Ritual, of 1548, it is further directed that “if the sick person desire to be Anointed, the Priest shall then Anoint him, . . . making the Sign of the Cross, saying thus;—

“As with this visible Oil thy body outwardly is Anointed, so our heavenly Father, Almighty God, grant of His infinite goodness that thy soul inwardly may be Anointed with the Holy Ghost, who is the Spirit of all strength, comfort, relief, and gladness: And vouchsafe, for His great merey, if it be His blessed will, to restore unto thee thy bodily health and strength, to serve Him: And send thee release of all thy pains, troubles, and diseases, both in body and mind. And howsoever His goodness, by His Divine and unsearchable Providence, shall dispose of thee, we, His unworthy ministers and servants, humbly beseech the eternal Majesty to do with thee according to the multitude of His innumerable mercies, and to pardon thee all thy

sins and offences committed by all thy bodily senses, passions, and carnal affections: Who also vouchsafe mercifully to grant unto thee ghostly strength, by His Holy Spirit, to withstand and overcome all temptations and assaults of thine adversary; that in no wise he prevail against thee; but that thou mayest have perfect victory and triumph against the devil, sin, and death; through Christ our Lord, Who by His death hath overcome the prince of death, and with the Father and the Holy Ghost evermore liveth and reigneth, God, world without end. Amen.”

NOTE
XXXIV.

II. Thorndike, in the place quoted above under Section XXII, has the following passage, designed to shew that the Unction of the Sick with Oil is rightly taught to be a Mystery or Sacrament:—

“St. James ordaineth that the Presbyters of every Church pray for the sick, with a promise of pardon for their sins: . . . He requireth them also *to anoint the sick with oil*, promising recovery upon it. . . . Neither is there any cause why the same benefit should not be expected, but the decay of Christianity in the Church. So the Unction of the Sick is to recover health, not to prepare for death, (as the Church of Rome now useth it.)”

III. Bishop Hickee on the same subject writes thus:—

“As for the . . . Signs of the Cross used in religious worship, I very much approve of the use of them, as we do in Baptism, and as I would have done in *Anointing the Sick with Oil*, and persons Confirmed with Chrism, were we so happy as to have those primitive religious rites and usages restored.”—Suppl. to the 3rd Ed. of Dr. Hickee’s Two Treatises, p. 46.

IV. Of Dr. Grabe, Jeremiah Collier, one of the British Bishops who corresponded with the Eastern Patriarchs, writes as follows:—

“The learned Dr. Hickee, his intimate acquaintance, reports that he did not think every thing in the then existing Ritual of the English Church to be in the best or most primitive situation, but while he commended several points, marked others in his MSS. as *DESIDERATA*. . . . Amongst these the same Dr. Hickee (with his own approbation) mentions the mixing of water with the wine in the Eucharistic cup; the abstinence from blood and things strangled; the ancient practice of Immersion in Baptism; the Oblation, and Prayer of Invocation to send down the Holy Spirit upon the Gifts when offered in the Eucharist; the use of Chrism in Confirmation; of Confession, and Judicial Absolution; of Prayer for the souls of the faithful deceased; of the ancient Commemoration of the Saints in the Holy Eucharist; of *Anointing the sick with Oil*. . . . On his death-bed he Communicated by the First English Liturgy; Dr. Hickee, who administered the Holy Eucharist, *Anointed him with Oil*; and he left legacies to be remembered in his friends’ prayers.”—Abridged from Collier’s Appendix to Moreri, vol. iv. ‘Grabe.’ (The late Bishop Jolly held similar sentiments, and was always prepared to Anoint any sick person with Oil, that should desire it.)

NOTE
XXXIV.

V. Lastly Dr. Brett, another of the Bishops who corresponded with the Eastern Patriarchs, writes on the same subject as follows:—

“I know indeed it is said by some, that this Oil was used in the days of St. James to work miraculous cures; and therefore it is superstitious to use it now, when no such miraculous cures are to be expected. But all this is said without proof: and it does not appear from the holy Scriptures, that Oil was ever used after our Saviour’s resurrection, by any of the Apostles or others, to work a miraculous cure. Neither does the Apostle here promise a miraculous cure, but only says, ‘*the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up.*’ Here is nothing so much as intimated, that a miraculous operation is to be expected; or any thing, which may not as reasonably be hoped for now miracles are ceased, (as the Bishop speaks), as then when miracles were frequent. ‘*The prayer of faith shall save the sick:*’ that is; when the Priests have prayed over the sick person, and Anointed him with Oil, according as is prescribed, he may then expect the blessing of a restoration to his health, if God sees it most expedient for him. But it is not said, ‘the Lord shall cure him *miraculously*,’ but ‘the Lord shall *raise him up*,’ which if it be done by God’s blessing on the physician’s skill and prescriptions, or by any natural means, (neither of which can operate without God’s blessing), the promise is fulfilled.

“But then it is objected, that here is no promise made to the *Anointing with Oil*, but only to the *prayer of faith*; if therefore, *prayer alone* be the means to procure health to the sick, the *Anointing* is insignificant. But this objection makes Anointing the sick not only to be useless at this time, but also to have been always so, even at the very time when St. James required it, that is, in the age when miracles were wrought; for that Apostle plainly speaks of his own times as well as these, when he says, ‘*the prayer of faith shall save the sick.*’ This argument therefore is of no force, since it proves too much, and makes the Unction of the Sick as insignificant when it was confessedly required, as now, when they pretend it is not required. In the next place, we ought to consider, that the ‘*prayer of faith*’ is *such* a prayer as is offered according to the will and direction of the Holy Ghost, for which we have some word of promise to rely upon, that we shall be heard and answered: and therefore, the Holy Ghost having required by the pen of the Apostle, that *Unction* should accompany this *prayer*, it may be questioned, whether in this case that is to be called the ‘*prayer of faith*,’ which is *not* so accompanied. At least he that uses the *Unction*, may be more *secure*, that he does offer up the ‘*prayer of faith*,’ when he omits nothing that the Holy Ghost has enjoined on this occasion.”

Again: “I plead that it should be used as the Apostle appointed, as it was used in the Primitive Church, and as it is still used in the Greek Church, and all other Churches, that were never subject to the Roman, for the recovery of the sick.”—Vindication, &c. p. 41.

And again: "I shall endeavour, as far as in me lies, to persuade the governors of the Church of England to make good the Declaration of this Church in her 30th Canon of 1603, that 'her purpose was not to forsake and reject the Churches of Italy, France, Germany, or any such like Churches, . . . except in those points, wherein they were fallen both from themselves in their ancient integrity, and from the Apostolical Churches which were their first founders.' Now it is very certain, that these and all other Churches of that Communion have *not* 'fallen either from themselves in their ancient integrity, or from the Apostolic Churches, which were their first founders,' in the use of Chrism at Confirmation, in mixing water with the Sacramental wine, in the Eucharist as a proper Sacrifice, *in the Unction of the Sick*, and in Praying for the Faithful Departed. . . . This is a matter of fact obvious to all: and therefore the Church of England has indeed *obliged herself* to restore these and other primitive practices observed by those Churches, before they fell from their integrity: *otherwise she stands self-condemned by her own declaration.*"—Necessity of Tradition.

NOTE
XXXIV.

NOTE XXXV.

A. The souls of the righteous (after death) are in light and rest, with a foretaste of eternal happiness: but the souls of the wicked are in a state the reverse of this.—*Orthodox Catechism*, p. 70.

I. Here it might be enough to quote the first words of one of the Prayers contained in the English Order for the Burial of the Dead:—

"Almighty God, with Whom do live the Spirits of them that depart hence in the Lord, and with Whom the Souls of the faithful, after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, are in joy and felicity; &c."

II. Bishop Bull on the same subject writes thus:—

"I affirm the consentient and constant doctrine of the primitive Church to be this: that the souls of all the faithful, immediately after death, enter into a place and state of bliss, far exceeding all the felicities of this world, though short of that most consummate perfect beatitude of the kingdom of heaven, with which they are to be crowned and rewarded in the resurrection: and so, on the contrary, that the souls of the wicked are presently after death in a state of very great misery, and yet dreading a far greater misery at the day of judgment." . . . And then he quotes St. Clement of Rome: "'All the generations from Adam to this day are passed and gone; but they that have finished their course in charity, according to the grace of Christ, possess *the region of the godly, &c.*'" And

NOTE
XXXV.

the Clementine Liturgy, in the Office for the Dead: “‘The region of the godly released from their bodies; the bosom of Abraham Isaac and Jacob, and of all those that have pleased God and obeyed His will from the beginning of the world; where all sorrow and grief and mourning is banished.’ And again, ‘the land of those that see the glory of Christ.’ Of the same region of godly souls Justin Martyr plainly speaks in his Dialogue with Trypho; ‘That the souls of the godly’ (after death till the resurrection) ‘remain in a certain better region; and unrighteous and wicked souls in an evil one.’”—Serm. iii. On the Middle State. p. 65, 66.

III. The Scottish Bishop Rattray, of Dunkeld, has left a MS. Dissertation in proof of the two following Propositions:—

“That the proper rewards and punishments proposed by the Christian religion are not to take place till after the resurrection and general judgment:” and “That in the interval betwixt death and the resurrection, the soul is not in a state of insensibility, but remains in certain invisible regions, expecting the resurrection and the judgment.”—Keith’s Scottish Bishops, ed. 1824, p. 539.

NOTE XXXVI.

Q. Is this foretaste of bliss joined with a sight of Christ’s own countenance? A. It is so more especially with the Saints; as we are given to understand by the Apostle Paul, who had a desire “to depart and to be with Christ.” (Philipp. i. 23.)—*Orthodox Catechism*, p. 71.

I. The same passage is quoted by Bishop Bull in the Sermon above referred to. Also 2 Cor. v. 6, 7, 8. “Therefore we are always confident, . . . willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord.”—P. 55.

Again, he writes thus: “The ‘region of the godly’ St. Clement with reference to St. Peter” (and his martyrdom) “calls ‘the place of glory;’ because, according to the exposition of the Clementine Liturgy, . . . they that are there behold the glory of Christ, though not in that full brightness, wherein it shall be seen in the day of His glorious appearance. And presently after, he terms the same place, speaking of St. Paul there, ‘the holy place,’ not ‘the most holy Place,’ ‘the Holy of Holies.’ He altogether seems therefore to have thought ‘the region of the godly deceased’ to be a part of the heavenly region, as the Holy Place was a part of the Temple. . . . Upon this account some of the Fathers, as St. Cyprian, St. Ambrose, and others, stuck not to call the place of the spirits of good men by the name of ‘heaven,’ or ‘the heavens,’ meaning, as it appears, *not* the Adytum,

or inmost apartment of the heavens, where *the throne of the Majesty on high* is seated, and the *unapproachable light* shines, but a heavenly mansion near to it. . . . ‘under the throne of glory,’ as the ancient Hebrews were wont to say.”—P. 66.

NOTE
XXXVI.

And again: “Remarkable is the Catholic consent here. . . . Irenæus tells us that ‘the souls in Paradise begin there their incorruptible state,’ viz. of bliss. Again, in his fifth book, ch. 36, he expressly indeed distinguisheth ‘*paradise*’ from ‘*the kingdom of heaven* ;’ and reckons it a lower degree of happiness ‘*to enjoy the delights of paradise*,’ than ‘*to be counted worthy to dwell in heaven* :’ but yet he acknowledgeth that in both our Saviour shall be seen, ‘according as they shall be worthy or meet, who see Him.’ Which the author of the Questions and Answers to the Orthodox, (in his Answer to Q. 75.) thus explains; ‘That the souls in Paradise do enjoy the conversation and sight of angels and archangels, and also of our Saviour Christ, by way of vision ; viz. such in its kind, though in degree far more excellent, as whereby the prophets saw Him of old. . . . But to return to Irenæus : he concludes his discourse in that chapter thus ; that it is the divine ordination and disposition, that those that are saved should per gradus proficere, ‘proceed by degrees’ to their perfect beatitude ; that is, that they should, as St. Ambrose speaks, ‘through the refreshments of Paradise, arrive to the full glories of the heavenly kingdom.’”—P. 68.

NOTE XXXVII.

Q. What is to be remarked of such souls as have departed with faith, but without having had time to bring forth fruits worthy of repentance? A. This ; that they may be aided towards the attainment of a blessed resurrection by Prayers offered in their behalf, especially such as are offered in union with the Oblation of the Bloodless Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, and by works of mercy done in faith for their memory.—*Orthodox Catechism*, p. 71.

Under this Note extracts shall be given referable to three heads ; viz., 1. Prayer for the faithful deceased, generally ; 2. Prayer for them, as joined with the Eucharistic Oblation ; And 3. Prayers, Oblations, and Alms, as offered for the pardon and refreshment of less perfect souls, which have been taken off suddenly ; or have repented late ; or at any rate have departed, though otherwise believing and penitent, with venial sins which need God’s mercy and forgiveness.

NOTE
XXXVII.

I. Bishop Andrewes, in his *Private Devotions*, has the following:—

“Grant, O Lord, that we may all find mercy and favour with all Thy Saints, who from the beginning of the world have pleased Thee in their several generations, Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, and every just spirit made perfect in the faith of Thy Christ, from righteous Abel even unto this day. Do Thou give them and us rest in the region of the living, in the bosoms of our holy Fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, whence sorrow, grief, and lamentation are banished away, where the light of Thy countenance visits and shines continually; and vouchsafe to bring them and us to the full enjoyment of Thy Heavenly Kingdom.”

And again: “Thou Who art Lord both of the living and of the dead, . . . Give to the living mercy and grace, and to the dead rest and light perpetual.”

II. Bishop Overall, commenting on the *English Prayer Book*:—

“The Puritans think here is Prayer for the Dead allowed and practised by the Church of England; and so think I: but we are not both in one mind for censuring the Church for so doing. They say it is popish and superstitious: I for my part esteem it pious and Christian. . . . Besides, Prayer for the Dead cannot be denied but to have been universally used of all Christians in the ancientest and purest time of the Church, and by the Greek Fathers, who never admitted any Purgatory, no more than we do, and yet pray for the dead notwithstanding.”—*Additional Notes to Nichols’ Commentary on the Book of Common Prayer*.

III. Herbert Thorndike, in his *Epilogue*, writes as follows:—

“Since unity has not been obtained by parting with the law of the Catholic Church, in mine opinion, for the love of it, I continue my resolution to bound Reformation by the rule of the Catholic Church; allowing that it may be matter of Reformation to restore the Prayers that are made for the Dead to the original sense of the whole Church, but maintaining that to take away all Prayer for the Dead is not paring off abuses, but cutting to the quick.”—*B. iii. ch. 28. p. 337*.

IV. And Dean Hiekes, testifying that he is of the same mind, writes;—

“I am heartily of Mr. Thorndike’s opinion, and as truly zealous, as you may imagine he was, for praying for the dead who depart in the faith and fear of God, and in the peace of the Church.”—*Supplement to the Third Edition of Dr. Hiekes’ Two Treatises, p. 46*.

V. Collier maintains in his *Ecclesiastical History* (P. ii. b. iv.) that;—

“The recommending the dead to the mercy of God is no innovation of the Church of Rome, but a constant usage of the Primitive Church.”

VI. In the *First English Ritual*, of 1548, there are in several places express Prayers for the Departed; as in the *Order for Burial*;—

“From the gates of hell deliver their souls, O Lord.” And again:

“Grant unto this Thy servant, that the sins which he committed in this world be not imputed to him; but that he, escaping the gates of hell, and pains of eternal darkness, may ever dwell in the region of light, with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the place where is no weeping, sorrow, nor heaviness; and when that dreadful day of the general resurrection shall come, make him to rise also with the just and righteous, and receive this body again to glory, . . . Set him on the right hand; &c.” And in the Liturgy, after commemorating “all the Saints from the beginning of the world, and chiefly the glorious and most Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of Thy Son Jesu Christ, our Lord and God, and the holy Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, and Martyrs,” the Priest mentions the other faithful departed thus: “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 all together be set on His right hand, and hear that His most joyful voice, &c.”

VII. The like to the above Prayers were also restored, and are still to be seen in the Archives of the Russian Synod, in that copy of their Liturgy which the British Bishops sent in Greek to the Easterns. Also in the *present* Liturgy of the Scottish Church prayer is made for the departed. And this doctrine is *taught in the Scottish Catechisms*; as in that of Aberdeen: “A. The Church on earth and the Church in Paradise communicate together by mutually praying for each other. Q. Why do we pray for them? A. Because their present condition is imperfect, and therefore capable of improvement; and because they are to be judged at the Last Day, and will then stand in need of mercy.”—P. 19. Also in the Catechism of Bishop Jolly, in like manner, p. 36.

VIII. Dr. William Forbes, first Bishop of Edinburgh, writes thus:—

“What I have so repeatedly affirmed in this Chapter, viz., that the Sacrifice which is performed in the Lord’s Supper is not only Eucharistical, but may also with truth be termed propitiatory, and that it is profitable to numbers not of the living only, but also to the departed, even as Prayer itself, of which this Sacrifice is a kind, (as Cassander writes) is propitiatory; this, I say, is confirmed by Bellarmine himself. (*De Missâ*, l. ii. c. 5.) ‘Sacrifice,’ he writes, ‘is like unto Prayer in respect of its efficacy: for prayer profiteth not only him who prays, but them also for whom he prays. And so the consumption of the Eucharist by the Priest, in that it is the receiving of the Sacrament, profits only him who receives; but in so far as it is also the consummation of the Sacrifice, it profits all those, for whom the Sacrifice has been offered.’—*Consid. Modest.* p. 463.

And again: “The custom of making Prayers and Oblations for the Departed is most ancient, and most unanimously received throughout the

NOTE
XXXVII.

whole Church of Christ, even from the very times of the Apostles ; and so should no longer be rejected, as it now is by the Protestants, as though it were either unlawful, or at least useless and superfluous."—Ib. p. 267.

IX. Herbert Thorndike writes as follows:—

"The practice of the Church in interceding for them" (the departed) "at the celebration of the Eucharist is so general, and so ancient, that it cannot be thought to have come in by imposture ; otherwise the same aspersion will seem to take hold of our common Christianity itself."—Just Weights and Measures, p. 106. See the same Author further quoted below, XII.

X. Dr. Brett, on the same subject has the following passage:—

"The Scripture requires us to *pray for all Saints*, and also plainly teaches us that the faithful departed come into that number. Therefore, we disobey the Scripture, when we exclude the faithful departed from our prayers. This the ancients never did ; but, as appears from all their Liturgies, and the testimony of the Primitive Fathers, they always remembered them in this particular, whenever they celebrated the holy Eucharist."—Dissertation on the Primitive Liturgies, p. 284. See also below, XIV.

XI. And to the like effect Dr. Nathaniel Spinckes writes:—

"To censure Prayer for the Dead, because not expressly enjoined by the Scriptures, is inconsistent with the doctrine of the Scriptures themselves ; (2 Thess. ii. 15. 1 Cor. vii. 17, &c.) and with reason : because the Christian religion being planted in all places by word, order, and practice, and *nowhere by writing*, and planted by so many several persons in so many several places, and all agreeing in the use of it in the most solemn part of Christian worship from the beginning, and so unanimously, that I never yet could meet with any competent evidence of any one Church which ever received it after their first foundation, or from any other than their founders, it thus stands upon equal evidence with the Scriptures themselves."—Observ. on an Essay towards Catholic Communion, p. 103.

XII. Dean Field, in his Treatise on the Church, professes that ;—

"We pray for the resurrection, public acquittal at the Day of Judgment, and the perfect consummation and bliss of them that rest in the Lord, and the *perfecting of whatsoever is yet wanting unto them*."—App. to b. iii. p. 221.

XIII. And Thorndike, in his book entitled, "Just Weights and Measures:"

"In the meantime, what hinders them to receive *comfort*, and *refreshment*, *rest*, and *peace*, and *light*, (by the visitation of God, by the consolation of His Spirit, by His good Angels,) to sustain them in the expectation of their trial, and the anxieties they are to pass through during the time of it? And though there be *hope* for those that are *most solicitous* to live and die good Christians, that *they* are in no such suspense, but within the bounds of the heavenly Jerusalem ; yet because their condition is *uncertain*,

and where there is *hope of the better, there is fear of the worse*, therefore the Church hath always *assisted them with the prayers of the living* both for their *speedy trial*, (which all blessed souls desire,) and for their easy absolution, and discharge with glory before God, together with the accomplishment of their happiness in the receiving of their bodies.”—P. 107.

NOTE
XXXVII.

XIV. Dr. Brett, in his Dissertation on the Liturgies, writes thus:—

“A third reason for praying for the departed was, because they justly conceived all men to die *with some remainder of frailty and corruption*, and therefore desired that God would deal with them according to His mercy, and not in strict justice according to their merits. . . . St. Augustine discourses excellently upon this point in the case of his mother Monica, after this manner: ‘I now pour out unto Thee, my God, another sort of tears for Thy handmaid, flowing from a trembling spirit, in consideration of the danger that every soul is in, that dies in Adam. For although she was made alive in Christ, and lived so in the days of her flesh, as to bring glory to Thy Name by her faith and practice, yet I dare not say, that from the time she was regenerated by Baptism no word came out of her mouth against Thy commands; and Thou hast told us by Him, Who is truth itself, that *whosoever shall say to his brother, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire*. And woe to the most laudable life of man, if thou shouldst sit and examine it without mercy. But because Thou art not extreme to mark what is done amiss, we have hope and confidence to find some place and room for indulgence with Thee. But whosoever reckons up his true merits before Thee, what does he more than recount thine own gifts? O that all men would know themselves, and they that glory, glory in the Lord! I therefore, O my Praise, and my Life, the God of my heart, setting aside a little her good actions, for which I joyfully give Thee thanks, now make intercession for the sins of my mother. Hear me, through the medicine of His wounds, Who hanged upon the tree, and now sitteth at Thy right hand to make intercession for us.’ He adds a little after, that he believed God had granted what he asked; yet he prays, that ‘the lion and the dragon might not interpose himself, either by his open violence or subtlety; for she would not answer, that she was no debtor, lest the crafty adversary should convict her, and lay hold upon her; but she would answer that her sins were forgiven her by Him, to Whom no man can return what He gave to us without any obligation. Let her therefore rest in peace with her husband. And do Thou, my Lord God, inspire all those Thy servants that read this, to remember Thy handmaid Monica at Thy altar with Patricius her consort.’”—P. 324.

XV. Even of Purgatory Bishop Andrewes says; “Let it *keep its place* among the opinions of the Schools;” And Bishop Forbes of Edinburgh; “Let not Protestants condemn it as impious or heretical.” The latter goes so far as to approve of the notion of “an expiatory Purgatory, a kind of

NOTE
XXXVII.

middle place, in which, without the pains of hell, the souls of the faithful perfect themselves in the love of God with fervid and deep sighs."

And he quotes with approbation from the "Institutio Christiani Hominis," a book published by authority of Convocation, A.D. 1544: "Inasmuch as the book of the Maccabees and the writings of the old doctors of the Church and common charity declare that it is a pious and wholesome custom to pray for the dead, we ought therefore to think that prayers for the dead are pleasing to God, and by no means inefficacious. It is also agreeable to Christian charity and the custom of the Church, that we should make memorial of our departed brethren in the celebration of Masses, and in funerals, and that alms should be offered for them. For these acts, we must hope, both bring positive advantage to them, and also prove our own love. But the place where the souls of the dead live, and its name, and their state and condition are uncertain."—Cons. Mod. p. 261.

He does not scruple to allow the opinion of Antonio De Dominis (Archbishop of Spalatro, and sometime Dean of Windsor in the Church of England): "Prayers and oblations of the holy Mysteries for the dead ought not to be condemned; for though not found in Scripture, they are agreeable to a most ancient practice of the Church, which the holy Fathers refer to Apostolical tradition. And though no Purgatory, strictly speaking, can be collected thence, yet we may gather that there is a certain place assigned to the souls of the departed, in which they may obtain a mitigation of the penalties of sin, through the prayers of the Church."—Cons. Mod. p. 268.

XVI. From the Rejoinder of the British Bishops to the Easterns:—

"We believe the prayers of the living together with the Eucharistic Sacrifice are serviceable to the dead for the improvement of their happiness during the interval between death and the Resurrection."

XVII. The Scottish Bishop Rattray of Dunkeld writes thus:—

"Since the intercessions of our great High Priest at the heavenly Altar, in virtue of His original Sacrifice of Himself, ought certainly to be the rule of our intercessions at our Christian Altars on earth, in virtue of this Memorial thereof; and since His intercessions must be as extensive as the merits and efficacy of His Sacrifice; and we are sure that the dead stand in need thereof, as well as the living, because they still stand in need of that mercy, which is to be found even at the Day of Judgment, (2 Tim. i. 18.), till which time they are not to receive their crown of reward, nor to enter into the joy of their Lord; therefore, as there can be no doubt but that His intercessions are extended to them, so, in consequence, must ours be likewise. And accordingly, Prayers for the Dead, *especially at the Altar*, have always been the practice of the Catholic Church from the beginning; nor was there ever any ancient Liturgy without them: and Tertullian testifies that it was an immemorial practice in his time, which will carry it up to the Apostolical age itself; since he lived within a hundred years of

the last surviving Apostles: and therefore it must certainly have been derived from them, as it was then believed to be: and it is plainly founded on Scripture Doctrine.”—Instructions, &c., p. 25. See also on this subject Notes xxvi, xxvii, xxxiv, xxxv, and xxxvi. NOTE XXXVII.

NOTE XXXVIII.

A. Sinners shall be tormented for ever, not because God willed them to perish; but they of their own will perish, because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. (2 Thess. ii. 10.)—*Orthodox Catech.*, p. 73.

See above, under Note ix. And compare Notes i, x, xi, and xli.

NOTE XXXIX.

A. Bodily poverty may serve to the perfection of spiritual, if the Christian chooses it voluntarily, for God's sake.—*Orthodox Catechism*, p. 83.

I. See above, under Note xxxiii, concerning *Counsels of Perfection*; and more particularly concerning *Asceticism*, and *Monasteries*.

II. Hooker has these words: “That comment has need of a very favourable reader and a tractable, that should think it plain construction, when to be *commanded* in the Word of God, and *grounded on the Word* are made all one;” instancing St. Paul's Counsel of Virginity.—Eccles. Pol. iii. viii.

III. On voluntary Poverty, Bishop Montague writes as follows:—

“‘*If thou wilt be perfect, go sell what thou hast.*’ It is true I do grant it a *counsel*, and no imperious *precept*, at least to all men; a *kind* of mandate, though not properly. And yet” (addressing the Puritans or Calvinists, who would not allow of Counsels) “*you are tied to do it: it is sin to you not to do it:* for you are persuaded it is a precept: but you neither obey it, nor will you suffer others to obey it, that would; for you would account and style him a papist, that would do it; you would begge him, *that should put it in use and practice; for such opinion you hold of the ancient Monks and Ascetæ, as St. Anthony and others, that did practise it.*” Then, after quoting St. Augustine and St. Chrysostom, he proceeds: “You cannot deny this constant resolution of antiquity. Change therefore your manners, or your minds. Be papists with me, or rebels without me. If St. Chrysostom and his fellow ancients be papists, be it so; I am contented to be so accounted; for I mean to be a papist with them, rather than a *Noveller* with you.”—Montague's Appeal, p. 219.

NOTE
XL.

NOTE XL.

Q. Who are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness? *A.* They, who, while they love to do good, yet count not themselves righteous, nor rest on their own good works, but acknowledge themselves sinners, and guilty before God; and who, by the wish and prayer of faith, hunger and thirst after the justification of grace through Jesus Christ, as after spiritual meat and drink.—*Orthodox Catechism*, p. 85.

I. See above, under Note I. at p. 14; where among other marks of a true faith, this also is said to be one, that there be “an earnest, serious, and constant desire, proceeding from a contrite heart, not so much of salvation, as of reconciliation, or to be at peace with God through Christ. They hunger after righteousness. Whence the act of the Patriarchs’ faith is commended for this, ἀσπασόμενοι, they kissed, saluted, or embraced the promises. And the promise made to them was of the Woman’s Seed, which was Christ, Who was to reconcile all things in heaven and in earth.”—Bishop Nicholson, *On the Catechism of the Church of England*, p. 17.

II. Bishop Bull on the same subject writes as follows:—

“We must not expect to ‘reap in mercy,’ unless we ‘sow in righteousness;’ that is, we must not hope for the gracious reward which God hath promised, without the practice of those works of righteousness which God hath commanded. . . . When we have sown in righteousness, that is, done righteous works, we must not plead any merit of our own in having so done, but must look for the reward of our righteousness only from the free grace and mercy of God.”—*Works*, ed. 1827. vol. i. p. 5.

NOTE XLI.

Q. Is not faith alone enough for a Christian, without love and good works? *A.* No; for faith without love and good works is inactive and dead, and so cannot lead to eternal life.—*Orthodox Catechism*, p. 89.

I. In the Book of Homilies we find the following passage:—

“Here ye have heard the mind of St. Chrysostom; whereby you may perceive, that neither is faith without works, (having opportunity thereto), nor works can *avail to everlasting life* without faith.” . . . And again,

quoting Didymus Alexandrinus: "Forasmuch as faith without works is dead, it is not now faith; as a dead man is not a man."—Hom. i. v. NOTE
XLI.
p. 51. and iv. p. 37.

II. The Scottish Bishop Rattray of Dunkeld writes thus:—

"The Christian virtues are *necessary, to entitle us to the kingdom of heaven as the reward promised on account of our obedience to the commands of God enjoining them.*"—Bishop Keith's Scottish Bishops, App. p. 539.

III. But see above, under Note I; where the same subject is illustrated more at length. Compare also Notes xv, and xxxviii.

NOTE XLII.

A. To pay due and rightful honour to Angels and holy Men is altogether agreeable to the first Commandment; because in them we honour the grace of God, which dwells and works in them, and through them seek help of God.—*Orthodox Catechism*, p. 97.

See above under Notes vii, xviii, xix, and xx.

NOTE XLIII.

Q. Is the use of holy Icons (Images or Pictures) agreeable to the second Commandment? *A.* It would then, and then only, be otherwise, if any one were to make gods of them: but it is not in the least contrary to this Commandment to honour Icons as sacred representations, and to use them for the religious remembrance of God's works, and of His Saints.—*Orthodox Catechism*, p. 98.

I. See above, under Note vi. Also compare Note xx.

II. Of Images Bishop Montague writes thus:—

"Images have three uses assigned by the Schools. Stay there. So we will go no further, and we charge you not with idolatry. The Pictures of Christ, of the blessed Virgin, and of the Saints, may be had in houses, and set up in Churches: respect and honour may be given to them; the Protestants give it: you say they must not have Latria; so say we: you give them Dulia; I quarrel not with the term, though I could. There is a respect

NOTE due to the Pictures of Christ and His Saints. If you call *this* Dulia, *we*
 XLIII. *give it too*; let doctrine and practice go together; we agree."—Gagger
 gagged, p. 300.

III. Thorndike, on the same subject, has the following passage:—

"Now granting that Epiphanius and the Council of Elvira did hold all Images in Churches dangerous for idolatry, (of which there is an appearance), it is manifest that they were afterwards admitted all over. And there might be jealousy of offence in having Images in the Church before Idolatry was quite rooted out, of which afterwards there might be no appearance. But no appearance (is there) that Images in history should occasion idolatry to those Images in them that hold them the Images of God's creatures, such as are those Images which represent histories of the Saints out of the Scriptures, or other relations of unquestionable credit. The second Council of Nice seems to have brought in or authorized addresses to solitary Images of Saints placed on pillars for that purpose, whereof there is much mention in the records of it. But to the Images of Saints there *can be no idolatry, so long as* men take them for Saints, that is God's creatures, much less to the Images of our Lord. For it is the honour of our Lord, and not of His Image.

"For indeed and in truth it is not the *Image* but the principal that is honoured by the honour that is said to be done to the Image, because it is done before the Image. The Fountain and utensils of the Church were honoured in the spotless times of the Church as consecrated to God's service; though the honour of them, being incapable of honour for themselves, was manifestly and without any scruple the honour of God. But Images, so long as they are used to no farther intent than the ornament of Churches, the remembrance of holy histories, and the raising devotion thereby, (as at the first they were used by the Church), came in the number of things consecrated to God's service. And that Council was never of force in the West till the usurped power of the Pope brought it in by force." (But see above, under Note VI.) "Nor did the Western Church, when it refused the Council, discharge the having of Images in Churches upon those reasons and to those purposes which I have declared. So far they remain still justifiable. For he that sees the whole Church on one side and only Calvin on the other side, hath he not cause to fear, that they who make them idolaters without cause will themselves appear Schismatics in the sight of God for it? For what are they else, who please themselves in a kind of negative superstition, that they cannot serve God if they serve Him with visible signs of reverence? Who hate the Images, because they hate the Saints themselves, and their Christianity? And therefore, that it be not thought that we are tied to those terms of distance which ignorant preachers drive their factions with, it is necessary to declare the grounds of truth, though it displease."—Just Weights and Measures, p. 127.

IV. And lastly, even Archbishop Tenison writes thus:—

NOTE
XLIII.

“The article of Trent is this: ‘I most firmly profess that the Images of Christ and of the Mother of God, ever a Virgin, as also those of other Saints, are to be had and retained, especially in Churches; and that due honour and veneration are to be given to them.’ ‘Due honour and veneration’ are in themselves modest words; and where we admit the Pictures and Images of Christ, *we refuse not the honour that is due to them.*”

NOTE XLIV.

Q. How does the Christian Church obey the fourth Commandment? A. She still to every six days keeps a seventh; only, not the last of the seven days, which is the Sabbath, but the first day in every week, which is the Day of the Resurrection, or Lord’s Day.—*Orthodox Catechism*, p. 100.

I. So the Scottish Catechism of Aberdeen:—

“Q. What means the Sabbath Day in the fourth Commandment? A. A day of rest. Q. Are we Christians bound to rest on the Seventh Day? A. No; the command to rest on that day belonged peculiarly to the Jews. Q. What then are we obliged to? A. To observe the Lord’s Day, in memory of our Saviour’s Resurrection. Q. What are the duties of that Day? A. To Offer and receive the holy Eucharist, and to attend all the public Offices of the Church.”—P. 25. To the same effect are the Scottish Catechisms by Bishop Jolly; (p. 45.) and by Bishop Moir; p. 31.

II. Bishop Jolly, in his “Introduction to the Sunday Services” writes;—

“Thus, in the true spirit of it, we shall Christianly keep the fourth Commandment, religiously observing the Lord’s Day, a most sacred day, although *not the Sabbath Day.*” (p. 54.) And again: “Christ rested from His work of redemption on the seventh day, His blessed body lying the whole Sabbath Day in His grave, and thereby fulfilled the type of the Jewish Sabbath. The Sabbath Day therefore, as a prefiguring sign, came to its end; and was left dead and buried in His grave. Accordingly the Apostle (Col. ii.) writes, ‘Let no man, therefore, judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath Days, which are a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ.’ When the substance appeared, the shadow vanished; and with the Jewish Sabbath Day the name was antiquated, the new Day receiving a new name; ‘The Day following the Sabbath,’ ‘in the end of the Sabbath,’ ‘the First Day of the Week,’ ‘the Lord’s Day,’ the Day of ‘His

NOTE XLIV. triumphant Resurrection,' early called 'Sunday.'" Ib. p. 42. So also Bishop Nicholson, in his Exposition of the Catechism, p. 97. ed. 1844.

III. Besides the Lord's Day, the Rituals of the Scottish and Anglican Churches prescribe the observance of various other Days, which have been appointed either as Festivals to the glory of God, and the honour of the Blessed Virgin and other Saints, or as Days of Fasting.

The chief Festivals which are thus observed by the British Churches, and which have proper Lessons, Collects, Epistles and Gospels, &c. in the Vespers, Matins, and Liturgy are, in the order of events, the following: 1. The Day of the Annunciation; 2. The Day of the Nativity of our Lord Jesus Christ, commonly called Christmas Day; 3. The Octave of Christmas Day, being the Circumcision; 4. The Epiphany; 5. The Purification of the Blessed Virgin, or the Presentation of our Saviour Christ in the Temple; 6. Easter Day, the Day of our Lord's Resurrection; 7. Ascension Day; 8. Pentecost, or Whit-Sunday; and 9. The Octave of Pentecost, called Trinity Sunday. Besides the Chief Festivals, there are special Offices for all the ordinary Sundays throughout the year; for the Festivals of St. John the Baptist; of the Holy Innocents; of the First Martyr St. Stephen; of St. Peter and St. Paul; and of the other eleven Apostles: also of St. Barnabas; of the Evangelists St. Mark and St. Luke; of St. Michael and all Angels; and of All Saints. Many other Commemorations are to be found in the Calendar, but without having any special Office assigned. Such are those of the Transfiguration, August vi; of the Conception of the Blessed Virgin, Dec. viii; her Nativity, Sept. viii; her Visitation, July ii; of St. Anne, July xxvi; of St. Mary Magdalene, July xxii; of the Invention of the Holy Cross, May ii; of the Exaltation of the Cross, Sept. xiv; of St. Clement, St. Cyprian, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, St. Augustine, St. Nicholas, St. George, St. Gregory the Great, and many more. Also those of the Translation of the Relics of King Edward, June xx; and of the Martyrdom of King Charles I. by the Calvinists, Jan. xxx. . . . In the Calendar of the University of Oxford, the Assumption or Rest of the Blessed Virgin is still marked Aug. xii; as are also Corpus Christi Day, and the Day of St. Thomas à Becket; which are no longer to be found in the general Calendar of the Church.

The Days of Fasting, or of Abstinence, which are prescribed for observance in the Rituals of the British Churches are as follows: I. The Forty Days of Lent or Quadragesima: II. The Ember Days at the Four Seasons, when the Ordinations of Clergy are held in each Diocese, being the Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday, after the First Sunday in Lent; after the Feast of Pentecost; after September xiv; and after December xiii: III. The three Rogation Days, being the Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, before Holy Thursday, or the Ascension of our Lord: IV. All the Fridays in the year, except Christmas Day, if that should fall on a Friday: (the same

holding, doubtless, of other Days, according to their rank.) . . . Besides these, the Evens or Vigils before sixteen different Festivals in the course of the year. Lastly, it is to be noted that some traces are still preserved of the observance of Wednesday as well as Friday in every week, as being a Day of Abstinence, or at least as having, like Friday, somewhat of a Penitential Character. For a Penitential Litany is appointed to form part of the daily Morning Service on Wednesdays as well as on Fridays throughout the year: and in many places, where the people have ceased to frequent daily Service throughout the week, they still go to Prayers and to the Litany in the churches on Wednesdays and Fridays. Accordingly, in the Scottish Catechism of the Diocese of Brechin we find the following Question and Answer: "*Q.* Why are Wednesdays and Fridays distinguished from the other days of the week by more extended and solemn devotions? *A.* They have been so distinguished from the earliest times as the Days whereon our Blessed Saviour was Betrayed, and Crucified." p. 84.

NOTE
XLIV.

It may further be noticed, that the Services of the Church mark a period of three weeks as a preparation for the Great Fast of Lent, beginning from the Sunday called Septuagesima. Also, some traces may be found both in books of devotion and in the practice of individuals of the ancient observance of the four weeks preceeding Christmas, called the Season of Advent, as a time of special Fasting and mortification: But generally speaking, it must be confessed that even those Fasts which are most strictly enjoined by the Church are neglected.

THE END OF THE HARMONY.

A LIST OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS QUOTED IN THE FOREGOING PAGES.

I. "*The Institution of a Christian Man, &c.*;" a Book subscribed by the Archbishops and Bishops in England in the year 1537; commonly called *The Bishops' Book*; reprinted in 1543 in a somewhat varied form under the title of *A necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man*. A Latin translation appeared in 1544 under the title of *Pia et Catholica Christiani Hominis Institutio*, which is often quoted with approbation by Bishop Forbes of Edinburgh in his *Considerationes Modestæ*. The Book itself is recognised as of authority by Archbishop Crammer writing to the King in 1546; and appealed to by Gardiner in 1551 against Crammer's opinion on the Eucharist, which had then become Zwinglian, as containing "the doctrine confessed by the whole Clergy of England in an open Council, and never hitherto by any public Council or any thing set forth by authority impaired." (Palmer on the Church, vol. i. p. 389. third ed.) It may indeed have been modified in some points by the enactment of the xxxix Articles in 1662; but this is a matter for private judgment to decide, on comparing the two Formularies. Certainly the *Institution of a Christian Man* has never yet by any public act been repudiated or condemned: and not only such men as Bishop Forbes and Bishop Jolly in Scotland, but even the disciples of Crammer himself (and that too after his latest change of opinion, and after his death,) and the English Annalist Strype concur in speaking of it as "a very godly book of religion."

II. "*The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, after the use of the Church of England*;" authorized by the Synod or Convocation of the Clergy in the year 1548; revised, and reprinted with some alterations and omissions in 1552; again in 1559, after the accession of Queen Elizabeth; in 1604, under King James I.; and finally, after the Restoration, in 1662. In these different revisions several of the alterations and omissions of the year 1552 have been modified or restored, so that the present English Prayer-book, which was settled by the Convocation of 1662, approaches somewhat nearer to the original Book of 1548 than any intermediate edition.

In the foregoing pages both the *First English Prayer-book of 1548*, and *That now in use, since 1662*, are occasionally quoted. Besides the *Vespers*, *Matins*, *Litany*, and *Liturgie* or *Communion Office*, and the *Orders for administering the other Sacraments* and *Occasional Offices*, these Books contain also *The Catechism of the Church of England*; the latter part of which,

concerning the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, was added in the time of King James I., and was drawn up by Bishop Overall.

III. "*The Ordinal*;" or Book containing "*The Form and Manner of Making, Ordaining, and Consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, according to the Order of the Church of England*." By the Convocation of 1662 this Book (which was first authorized in 1552, and had since received some additions), was attached to the Book of Common Prayer, and is now generally to be found joined with it even in those editions which are printed for common use among the Laity.

IV. "*The Book of the XXXIX Articles*;" first drawn up by Archbishop Cranmer (assisted probably by Bishop Ridley), with the idea no doubt of conciliating and uniting the different parties and opinions of all those, whether followers of Luther, Melancthon, Calvin, or Zwingli, who were then contending for a Reformation. It must further be admitted that Archbishop Cranmer's own opinions had then already gone very far towards Zwinglianism on the subject of the Eucharist, and about the same time shewed their influence in the changes and omissions of the Prayer-book of 1552. Early in the year 1553 the Articles were published, being then in number XLII; but were of no authority, not receiving the sanction of any Synod or Convocation till after the accession of Queen Elizabeth; when they were revised, reduced to their present number, and with some slight modifications accepted by the Convocation, in the year 1562. It was not however till 1571 that the Clergy generally were required to subscribe them by decree of Convocation. Afterwards, as the Puritans took advantage of their apparent spirit, and strove to develope out of them the doctrines of Calvinism, a Declaration was prefixed at the instance of Archbishop Laud, requiring that all persons should subscribe them only in their "*plain, literal, and grammatical sense*." The Scottish Church, after having been long subjected to severe civil penalties in consequence of the Revolution of 1688, obtained an Act of Toleration from the British Parliament in 1791, on condition of their Clergy subscribing the xxxix Articles, like the Clergy of England. For the sense in which they consented to do this, see below under the notice of Bishop Jolly, p. 155. LII.

V. "*The First and Second Books of Homilies*;" often called together *The Homilies*; appointed to be read in Churches; and approved, as to their general substance and purport, by Article xxv. of the Thirty-nine. (A.D. 1571.) The *First Book* was published under King Edward VI., in 1547; and republished after the accession of Queen Elizabeth, in 1560. The *Second Book* was published in 1564: since which time the Two have ever been published together.

VI. A Book entitled "*A Testimony of Antiquity, shewing the ancient Faith of the Church of England, touching the Sacrament of the Body and*

Blood of the Lord, here publicly preached, and also received, in the Saxon time, above seven hundred years ago." This book consists of a *Homily* and portions of two *Epistles* of the Anglo-Saxon Abbot Ælfrie, embodying the substance of the *Treatise of Ratramn the Priest, De Eucharistiâ, written at the desire of Charles the Bald*. It was printed in English by Archbishop Parker in the time of Queen Elizabeth, A.D. 1566, and subscribed by the two Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and thirteen other Bishops, in testimony of their faith, and the faith of their Church. It is important, as shewing that the English Bishops and the Church of England in Queen Elizabeth's time, though they had admitted the xxxix Articles, were yet far from intending thereby to deny the doctrine of the Real Presence, or even that of a *change of substance*, in a certain sense, in the Eucharist.

VII. *The Canons of the Synod or Convocation held in the year 1571*: Of which Synod it is remarkable, that while it was the first which required all the Clergy to subscribe the xxxix Articles, it at the same time framed a Canon requiring all Preachers to take Catholic Tradition, or the consent of Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops, as their rule for the interpretation of holy Scripture; thus shewing, that the principle upon which, and the sense in which, they received the xxxix Articles were at any rate not *intended* to be Anti-Catholic. See above, Note II. iii. p. 20.

VIII. *The Canons of the Synod or Convocation held in the year 1601*. These are in number cxli; and are now generally to be found appended to the *Book of Homilies*.

IX. *The Order for the Coronation of a King or Queen according to the use of the Church of England*. This was first used in its present form and in the English language at the Coronation of King Charles I., A.D. 1626. It is important, as shewing the sense and doctrine of the Church both on the subject of the Oblation and Real Presence in the Eucharist, and also on the mutual relation of the Sacerdotal and Regal Offices.

X. *An Order of Divine Service for the Day of the Martyrdom of King Charles I.*; put forth by the Archbishop of Canterbury, upon the Restoration, A.D. 1661, under King Charles II., and appointed by authority to be used for that year in all churches throughout England.

XI. *The Scottish Liturgy or Communion Office*; first compiled (some years after the restoration of the Episcopal Order in Scotland) by the Scottish Bishops, in concert with Archbishop Laud and the Bishops of England. It followed rather the First English Liturgy of 1548, than that in use at the time in England, the earlier form being confessed by the English Prelates to be the better. It was afterwards at different times revised; and finally brought to its present state in the year 1761.

XII. *A Liturgy in MS., slightly differing from the above, sent in Greek to the Eastern Patriarchs and to the Russian Synod by certain Scottish and*

English Bishops, during a Correspondence which took place between the years 1716 and 1725. This MS., together with the originals of the whole Correspondence, is still preserved in the Archives of the Russian Synod.

XIII. *The Correspondence referred to under the last head, as having taken place between the years 1716 and 1725.* The names of the Bishops who took part personally, at one time or another, in this Correspondence, so far as the present writer has been able to learn, were the following: The Scottish Bishop Campbell, then residing in London, and acting as the representative of his brethren for what related to their Communion, was the originator of the whole affair; and was assisted in it by two other Scottish Bishops, Gadderar and Rattray, the latter of whom seems to have taken part in translating the Proposals and other Documents into Greek. Nor was either the whole or any part of what they did in this matter ever blamed or disowned by their Church; or, so far as it appears, by any one of its other Bishops, for whom they acted. Of the English Nonjurors, Bishops Collier, Spinkes, Hawes, Brett, Gandy, and Griffin joined in it. All these owed their Consecration to the Scottish Bishops above mentioned, and to the English Bishop Hiekes, who died in 1715. The Documents of this Correspondence are quoted in the foregoing pages from an English version left by Bishop Brett, and preserved in Scotland, among the papers of the late Bishop Jolly. A copy has been communicated to the present writer by the kindness of J. R. Hope, Esq., of the Temple, London.

XIV. *The Scottish Catechism composed by Bishop Innes between 1778 and 1781, and since reprinted at various times.* The edition quoted in the foregoing pages is that published at Aberdeen in 1829; and it is often cited simply as *The Catechism of Aberdcen*.

XV. *The Scottish Catechism composed by Bishop Jolly of Moray, "for the use of the Scottish Church."* The edition quoted is that of 1837.

XVI. *The Scottish Catechism composed by the present Bishop of Brechin, Dr. Moir, for the use of his Diocese; published at Brechin in 1841.* This is cited as *The Catechism of the Diocese of Brechin*.

XVII. *The Canons of the Church of Scotland; as revised and enacted by a Synod held at Edinburgh, A.D. 1838, with an Introduction or Preface subscribed by all the Bishops and other Clergy present at the Synod.*

XVIII. *A Pastoral Letter, addressed by the Scottish Bishops to the Clergy and Laity of their Communion, A.D. 1839.*

XIX. *The Prayer-book of the Anglo-American Church; in which the Liturgy resembles that of the Scottish Church in respect of the Form of Consecration.* There is also a *Form of Institution* peculiar to the American branch of the Anglican Communion; In other respects it more nearly resembles the present English Prayer-book.

A LIST OF BISHOPS AND DIVINES WHOSE WRITINGS
ARE QUOTED IN THE FOREGOING PAGES.

I. *Hugh Latimer*: b. 1470; as a Priest and member of the University of Cambridge was at first strongly opposed to all Reformation, but afterwards preached eloquently, though roughly, in favour of it: was made Bp. of Worcester in 1535; but in 1538, on the passing of the Act of the Six Articles, he resigned his See. He was imprisoned during the last six years of King Henry's reign: On the accession of Edward VI. in 1547 he refused to return to his See, and resided with Abp. Cranmer. In 1555 he was burned at Oxford together with Abp. Cranmer and Bp. Ridley.

II. *Nicholas Ridley*: b. about 1505; educated at Pembroke Hall, Camb.; took the degree of B.A. in 1523; was Chaplain to Abp. Cranmer, and to K. Henry VIII.; in 1541 Prebend. of Canterbury; in 1547 Bp. of Rochester; assisted in ordering the first English Prayer-book, 1548; was transl. to London, 1550; aided Abp. Cranmer in drawing up the Articles in 1551. He was burned at Oxford under Queen Mary, in 1555.

III. *John Poynt*: b. about 1516; a member of King's Coll., Camb.; in 1546, Bp. of Rochester; in 1551 transl. to Winchester: on Queen Mary's accession in 1553 he retired to Strasburgh; where he died, in 1556. When abroad, he wrote a treatise entitled, 'Dialecticon viri boni et literati de veritate, naturâ, atque substantiâ Corporis et Sanguinis Christi in Eucharistiâ;' which was published the year after his death.

IV. *John Donne*: b. 1553; ordained Priest in 1621; Dean of St. Paul's in 1624; chosen Prolocutor of the Lower House of Convocation; d. 1631.

V. *Richard Hooker*: b. 1554; educated under the patronage of Bishop Jewell at Corpus Christi College, Oxford; in 1581 was ordained Priest; in 1584 was made Master of the Temple, where he became engaged with the Puritan Travers in a controversy, which gave occasion to his great work 'Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity:' d. 1600.

VI. *Lancelot Andrewes*: b. 1555; Chaplain to Queen Elizabeth 1589; Dean of Westminster 1601; Almoner to K. James I., and Bp. of Chichester 1605; Bp. of Ely, (and Privy Councillor) 1609; Bp. of Winchester, and Dean of the Chapel Royal, 1618: d. 1626. He left behind him a book of his own *Private Devotions* in MS., in Greek and Latin, the pages of which were, as is related by his biographer, 'worn through by his fingers, and stained and wetted with his tears.' He was a great Preacher, and author of several learned works: he exercised both during his lifetime and after his death a very blessed influence upon the character of English Divinity.

VII. *John Overall*: b. 1559; Fellow of Trinity Coll., Camb.; in 1596 Regius Professor of Divinity, and soon after Master of Catherine Hall; in

1601 Dean of St. Paul's: on the accession of K. James I. he was chosen Prolocutor of the Lower House of Convocation: in 1614 he was made Bp. of Lichfield and Coventry; and in 1618 transl. to Norwich; where he d. 1619. Wood observes, that "he had the character of being the best scholastic Divine in the English nation." Bp. Cosin, who had been his Secretary, put into an Inscription for his monument in 1669 these words; "Vir undequaque doctissimus, et omni encomio major."

VIII. *Richard Field*: b. 1561; in 1598 Chaplain to Q. Elizabeth, and Prebendary of Windsor: he was also Chaplain to K. James I.: in 1610 he was made Dean of Gloucester; and was selected to be Bp. of Oxford; but died before he was appointed, in the year 1616.

IX. *Christopher Sutton*: b. about 1565; educated at Lincoln Coll., Oxf.; in 1605 made Prebend. of Westminster by K. James I.: d. 1629.

X. *Francis Mason*: b. 1566: Chaplain to K. James I., and Archdeacon of Norfolk: d. 1622. He left in MS. a book entitled, "*Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*," afterwards printed, in 1625, and dedicated to the King.

XI. *Marcus Antonio De Dominis*: b. 1566; as Abp. of Spalatro, sided with the Venetians against Paul V.: after 1615 came to England, and there printed his work, "*De Republicâ Ecclesiasticâ*." King James I. gave him the Deanery of Windsor, and other preferments, which he held without any abjuration, or change of religion. Being vexed by the Puritans, who were then numerous in England, and being offered an amnesty by the Pope, in 1622, he returned to Rome; but was there imprisoned; and died in 1624, some say by poison. His body was disinterred and burned.

XII. *William Laud*: b. 1573; Fellow, and afterwards President of St. John Baptist's College, Oxford; where he contended strenuously against the Puritans then dominant. In 1611 he was made Chaplain to K. James I.; and in 1616 Dean of Gloucester: in 1617 he accompanied the King into Scotland, to endeavour to bring that kingdom to conform to the English Church: in 1621 he was made Bp. of St. David's: in 1626 he officiated as Dean of Westminster at the Coronation of King Charles I.; and in the same year was transl. to the See of Bath and Wells; and in 1628 to London: In 1630 he was elected Chancellor of the University of Oxford: In 1633 he succeeded the Puritan Archbishop Abbot in the Metropolitan See of Canterbury; and the very same morning received the offer of a Cardinal's Hat from the Pope; which offer was repeated a fortnight afterwards: his answer both times was, that "something dwelt within him which would not suffer that, till Rome were other than it is." In 1640 his Palace at Lambeth was attacked by a mob; and in 1641 he was seized by the Parliament and imprisoned in the Tower for three years, suffering all manner of indignities: In 1644 he was brought to a mock trial, in which nothing was even alleged against him, but his opposition to Calvinism and rebellion; and in 1645 he was by order of the Parliament beheaded. He

left behind him, besides other works and papers, 'A Conference with Fisher the Jesuit,' a 'Diary,' and 'Private Devotions.' His body was recovered by his friends, and buried under or near the Altar of his College of St. John Baptist in the University of Oxford.

XIII. *Joseph Hall*: b. 1574; Fellow of Emmanuel Coll., Camb., 1595; made Dean of Worcester by James I., 1616; and in 1627 Bishop of Exeter: in 1641 transl. to Norwich: imprisoned and impeached by the rebel Parliament in 1642; and soon after ejected from his Cathedral. He died in 1656. His works were published in 1808 in 10 vols. 8vo.

That preternatural cure, for which Bp. Hall's testimony has been cited above, under Note xx, is by no means the only one of the kind which is related by credible witnesses as having occurred within our Communion even since the schisms of the sixteenth century. One still more to the purpose of Section xx, and resting equally on episcopal testimony, has been noticed to the writer by a friend since the foregoing sheets were sent to press. It is recorded in Evelyn's Diary. "On the 16th of September, 1685," (Evelyn himself being then one of the Commissioners of the Privy Seal in the absence of the Earl of Clarendon, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland;) he waited, as he tells us, "on the King at Winchester, and heard Bishop Ken" (of that See,) "inform His Majesty of a *great miracle* happening in that city *to his certain knowledge*, of a poor miserably sick and decrepit child, who immediately on his Baptism recovered; as also of the *salutary effect* of King Charles the Martyr's blood, in healing one that was blind."

XIV. *Lewis Bayley*: b. probably about 1576: about 1611 he was Chaplain to Prince Henry: in 1613 he took the degree of D.D.; and being much celebrated as a Preacher, he was appointed Chaplain to K. James I.: in 1616 he was made Bishop of Bangor; where he died in 1632. His fame rests chiefly on his work entitled, 'The Practice of Pietie;' of which the 59th edition was published in 1735.

XV. *Richard Montague*: b. 1578; Fellow of King's Coll., Camb.; and afterwards of Eton College; where he assisted Sir Rich. Savile in preparing his edition of St. Chrysostom: After the death of Casaubon, in 1615, being then Chaplain to K. James I., he was desired to write some Animadversions upon the Annals of Baronius: In 1617 he was made Archdeacon of Hereford: he was also Canon of Windsor; where he preached the Theological Lecture in the Royal Chapel for eight years: In 1625, soon after the accession of Charles I., being accused by certain Calvinists to the Parliament, which encouraged that faction, he published his "Appello Cæsarem:" however, he was proceeded against by both the Parliaments of 1625 and 1626: extracts from his writings were censured; and an Address presented to the King, that he might be punished, and his books burned. The King on the contrary, in 1628, made him Bishop of Chichester. In 1638 he was transl. to Norwich; and died in 1641. Among his works are, 'Origines

Ecclesiasticæ; and ‘*Versio et Notæ in Photii Epistolas.*’ He materially assisted Abp. Laud in rooting up the doctrine of the Dordrecht Calvinists upon the Quinquarticular Controversy out of the Church of England.

XVI. *Thomas Jackson* : b. 1579 ; Fellow of Corpus Christi Coll., Oxf., 1606 ; D.D. 1622 ; President of Corpus Coll. 1630 ; Chaplain to K. Charles I., and Prebend. of Winchester, 1635 ; Dean of Peterborough, in 1638 ; d. 1640. His works were published in 1672, in 3 vols. fol.

XVII. *William Forbes* : b. 1585, at Aberdeen in Scotland : in 1603 he went to study abroad in Germany and Belgium, and in England, where he was for a short time Professor of Hebrew at Oxford : in 1608 he returned to Aberdeen in Scotland, where he was received with public honours. For 24 years he discharged the duties of a Presbyter in the Scottish Church, partly at Edinburgh (whence he was driven out by the Calvinism of the people, who had however at first themselves invited him) but chiefly at Aberdeen, where he was greatly esteemed. When K. James I. came into Scotland, he was appointed with other Divines to meet the King at St. Andrews, and was there noticed by him with honour. Soon after he became Principal of the Marischal College at Aberdeen, where he taught Hebrew and Theology : next, he was by the Bishop and the Senate of the University made Dean of the Faculty of Theology there ; and after that, Rector of the University itself. In 1633, Charles I. came to Edinburgh, and was there crowned King of Scotland ; at which time he determined, with the consent of the Archbishop of St. Andrews, to found an Episcopal See at Edinburgh, hoping thereby to repress Calvinism and to promote orthodoxy. The King of himself named Forbes to be the first Bishop, saying that “ he deserved well that a new See should be founded expressly for him.” Thereupon he was consecrated by the Archbishop ; but before he had sat many months, he fell sick ; and finding himself to be dying, confessed his sins, and received Absolution ; and so, with the viaticum of the Body and Blood of Christ, departed out of this world in peace, in the 44th year of his age, A.D. 1634. His “ *Considerationes Piæ Modestæ et Pacificæ* ” were published after his death, in a small volume in 12mo. Perhaps no writer of our Communion has shewn so much charity, patience, learning, impartiality, reasonableness, and love of truth.

XVIII. *Joseph Mede* : b. 1586 ; educated at Christ’s College, Cambridge, and chosen a Fellow through the interest of Bishop Andrewes : he twice refused the Provostship of Trinity College, Dublin, which was offered him in 1627, and again in 1630, by the influence of Abp. Usher : d. 1638. He left, among other learned works, various ‘ *Treatises concerning Churches, and the Worship of God therein* ; ‘ *Of the Christian Sacrifice* ;’ in nine chapters ; ‘ *Of the name Altar, or Θυσιαστηριον, given to the Holy Table* ;’ a ‘ *Concio ad Clerum*,’ &c. ; which exercised a very considerable influence afterwards upon the Anglican Divinity on those subjects.

XIX. *William Nicholson* : b. 1589 ; educated at St. Mary Magdalene College, Oxford ; in 1629 had a Cure of Souls in Caermarthenshire ; and was afterwards Canon of St. David's, and Archdeacon of Brecknock : was ejected by the rebels : in 1661, was made Bp. of Gloucester : d. 1671.

XX. *John Bramhall* : b. 1593 ; Chaplain to K. Charles I., 1631 ; Bp. of Londonderry, 1634 : in 1644 he fled to Brussels ; where he remained till 1648 : was proscribed by the rebel Parliament in 1652 : on the Restoration, in 1661, was made Abp. of Armagh and Primate of Ireland : d. 1663.

XXI. *John Cosin* : b. 1594 : Dean of Peterborough 1640 : but soon ejected by the rebel Parliament : on the Restoration in 1661 he was made Bp. of Durham : d. 1671. He had been Secretary to Bp. Overall. Besides other learned works, he was author of a book entitled, 'Regni Angliæ sub imperio Elizabethæ Religio et Gubernatio Ecclesiastica.'

XXII. *Peter Heylin* : b. 1600 ; Fellow of St. Mary Magdalene Coll., Oxf. : in 1629 Chaplain to the King : was ejected from his benefices by the rebel Parliament, and proscribed : on the Restoration he would have been promoted in the Church, but died in 1662. He published, amongst other works, a 'History of the Reformation in England ;' a 'History of the Presbyterians ;' and the Life of his patron, Archbishop Laud.

XXIII. *Herbert Thorndike* : b. about 1600 ; Fellow of Trinity Coll., Camb., in 1642 ; in 1638 Proctor of that University ; in 1643 elected Master of Sidney College ; but obliged to give way to another : soon after he was ejected from his benefice by the Puritan rebels : on the Restoration he was made Prebend. of Westminster. He assisted Dr. Walton in the Polyglot Bible. His works are voluminous, all directed to the bringing back of men's minds to the laws and religion of the Primitive Church. He was one of the Commissioners at the Savoy Conference in 1661 : he died in 1672 ; and was buried in Westminster Abbey. In his last Will there were these words ; "As for my body, I charge my executors to write these words upon my grave-stone : 'Hic jacet corpus Herberti Thorndike, Prebendarii hujus Ecclesiæ, qui vivus veram reformatæ Ecclesiæ rationem ac modum precibusque studiisque prosequabatur. Tu, lector, requiem ei et beatam in Christo resurrectionem precare.'"

XXIV. *Henry Hammond* : b. 1605 ; Of St. Mary Magdalene Coll., Oxf. : in 1643 Archdeacon of Chichester : proscribed by the rebel Parliament : in 1645 Canon of Christ-Church at Oxford ; and afterwards Public Orator of the University. He attended King Charles I. as his Chaplain during his confinement by the rebels ; was ejected by them in 1648 from Christ Church ; and imprisoned for ten weeks : on the Restoration he was to have been Bp. of Worcester ; but died April 25, 1660.

XXV. *Jeremy Taylor* : b. between 1600 and 1610 ; Fellow of All Souls' Coll., Oxf., 1636 ; Chaplain to K. Charles I. 1642 : ejected from his benefice by the Puritan rebels : on the Restoration in 1661 made Bp. of Down

and Connor in Ireland, and Privy Councillor: he died in 1667, leaving voluminous works, with the reputation of having been one of the most eloquent and learned of English Divines.

XXVI. *Peter Gunning*: b. 1613; ejected from his College at Cambridge by the rebel Parliament: at the Restoration made Prebend. of Canterbury, and Head successively of Corpus Christi and St. John's Colleges at Cambridge; also Regius Professor of Divinity in that University. He was one of the Committee of Convocation which made the last revision of the Prayer-book in 1661. In 1669 he was made Bp. of Chichester; and in 1674 was transl. to Ely: d. 1684. He wrote in favour of conformity in all things to the rules of the Primitive Church; particularly in Praying for the Dead, in the use of Oil, and other ritual observances. The titles of two of his works are, 'A View and Correction of the Common Prayer;' and, 'The Paschal or Lent Fast Apostolical and Perpetual.'

XXVII. *John Pearson*: b. 1613; Fellow of King's Coll., Camb.; soon after the Restoration made Prebendary of Ely and Archdeacon of Surrey; in 1661 one of the Commissioners appointed by Convocation to revise the Book of Common Prayer; in the same year appointed Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge; and in 1662 Master of Trinity College: in 1672 made Bp. of Chester: d. 1686. He was one of the greatest Scholars of his age. He published an 'Exposition of the Creed,' which has become a classical book of English Divinity; and the 'Vindiciæ Ignatianæ:' he was also one of the Editors of the 'Critici Sacri;' and he compiled the 'Annales Cyprianici,' prefixed to Bishop Fell's edition of St. Cyprian in 1682. Other writings of his were published by his nephew after his death; viz., 'De Serie et Successione primorum Romæ Episcoporum Dissertationes duæ; Quibus præfiguntur Annales Paulini, et Lectiones in Acta Apostolorum, &c.' His minor Theological works have recently been collected and edited by the Ven. Archdeacon E. Churton.

XXVIII. *William Saywell*: b. 1644? Fellow of St. John's Coll., Camb.; D.D.; Master of Jesus Coll., and Preb. of Ely, 1679: d. 1720.

XXIX. *Anthony Sparrow*: b. probably about 1620; Fellow of Queen's Coll., Camb.; whence he was ejected in 1643 by the Puritan rebels: after the Restoration he was Archdeacon of Sudbury, and Prebend. of Ely: about 1667 he was chosen Master of Queen's College: in Nov. 1667 he was made Bp. of Exeter; and in 1678 was transl. to Norwich; where he died in 1685. He is the Author of the 'Rationale of the Book of Common Prayer,' 1657; of a 'Sermon on Confession and Absolution;' and of a 'Collection of Articles, Injunctions, Canons, Orders, Ordinances, &c.' 1671. 4to.

XXX. *John Fell*: b. 1625; expelled from his benefice by the rebel Parliament in 1648; on the Restoration in 1660 made Canon of Christ-Church, and soon after Dean; and Chaplain to the King: from 1666 to 1669 he was Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford; in 1676 Bp. of Oxford: d. 1686. He is well known by his edition of St. Cyprian.

XXXI. *Thomas Tenison* : b. 1630 ; Bp. of Lincoln in 1692 ; and in 1695 raised to be Abp. of Canterbury : he was a strenuous opponent of 'Popery,' and a useful servant of the Revolution of 1688 : he died in 1715.

XXXII. *George Bull* : b. 1634 ; educ. at Exeter Coll., Oxf. ; retired from the University to avoid taking the oath to the rebels in 1649. For his '*Judicium Ecclesiæ Catholicæ*,' published in 1694, he received through Bossuet the thanks of the Gallican Church assembled in Convocation at St. Germain's. In 1705 he was made Bp. of St. David's. His '*Harmony of St. Paul and St. James, on Justification*,' has become the standard authority for the Doctrine of the Church of England on that subject. He died in 1710.

XXXIII. *Gabriel Towerson* : b. about 1636 ; in 1660 Fellow of All Souls' Coll., Oxf. ; in 1677 D.D. : was a distinguished Preacher : d. 1697. He published '*An Explication of the Catechism of the Church of England*.'

XXXIV. *William Beveridge* : b. 1637 : in 1672 dedicated his '*Synodicon*' to Abp. Sheldon ; in 1689 refused to be intruded into the See of Bath and Wells ; in 1704, under Queen Anne, Bp. of St. Asaph : d. 1708.

XXXV. *George Hickeys* : b. 1642 ; successively a member of St. John's College, St. Mary Magdalene College, Magdalene Hall, and Lincoln College, Oxford : In 1677 he accompanied the Duke of Lauderdale, then High-Commissioner, into Scotland as his Chaplain ; and received the Degree of D.D. from the University of St. Andrews, which was conferred upon him at the instance of Abp. Sharp : In 1680 the King made him Prebend. of Worcester : In 1681 he was Chaplain to the King ; and in 1683 Dean of Worcester. At the Revolution in 1688, refusing to take the oaths to the Revolution Government, he was ejected from his benefices. In 1694 he was consecrated by the ejected Bishops Suffragan Bishop of Thetford : d. 1715.

XXXVI. *Jeremiah Collier* : b. 1650 ; educated at Caius Coll., Camb. ; ordained Deacon by Bp. Gunning of Ely in 1676 ; and Priest in 1677 : after 1688 he refused to take the oaths to the Revolution Government ; was imprisoned ; and outlawed : he published many works, especially an '*Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain*.' He was in 1713 consecrated a Bishop in the Communion of the Ejected or Nonjuring English Bishops and of the Scottish Church. He took an active part in the Correspondence with the Easterns between the years 1716 and 1725 ; and died in 1726.

XXXVII. *Nathaniel Spinkes* : b. 1653 ; Scholar of Jesus Coll., Camb., 1673 ; Chaplain to the Duke of Lauderdale in 1681 ; Prebend. of Salisbury, 1687 ; deprived of his benefices in 1690, for refusing to take the oaths to the Revolution Government. In 1713 he was cons. a Bishop in the Communion of the English Non-juring and of the Scottish Church ; He took part in the Correspondence with the Easterns between 1716 and 1725 : he died in 1727. He was a man of great learning, and published various works.

XXXVIII. *Robert Calder* : b. perhaps about 1660 : ordained at Edinburgh in 1684 : on the Revolution was ejected by the Presbyterians from his benefice : and soon after the whole Scottish Church, with all its Bishops

and Clergy, was disestablished by the Revolution Government, and Presbyterianism established as the National Religion of Scotland in its stead. He was imprisoned 11 months; and prosecuted for treason, as it was then called, (i. e. for disapproving the Revolution.) He suffered many persecutions; and published various works; among others one entitled, "The True Difference betwixt the principles and practice of the 'Kirk' and the Church of Scotland exemplified, &c.," 1172.

XXXIX. *John Johnson*: b. 1662; in 1687 was presented by Abp. Sancroft to the Cure of Boughton: after 1688 he refused to take the oaths to the Revolution Government: in 1707 he was collated by Abp. Tenison to the vicarage of Cranbrook: in 1710, and again in 1713, he was chosen by the Clergy of the diocese of Canterbury to be one of their Proctors for the Convocation. He died in 1725. He published, with other works, 'The Clergyman's Vade-Mecum;' 'Propitiatory Oblation in the Eucharist;' 'The Unbloody Sacrifice;' and 'A Collection of Ecclesiastical Laws.'

XL. *Thomas Wilson*: b. 1663; educated at Trinity Coll., Dublin; in 1697 was made Bp. of the Isle of Man. He was zealous in enforcing Discipline; and in 1722 having interdicted the wife of the Governor of the Island from the Holy Communion, he was with his two Vicars General thrown into prison, and there kept for some time with great severity: he died in 1755. His works were published in 1780, in 2 vols. 4to.; and reprinted soon after in folio. His fame was so great, and he was so universally respected, not only within his own Diocese and the British Dominions, but even abroad, that it is related of Cardinal Fleury the French Minister, that in time of war between the two countries, he forbade the French Cruisers to make any descent on the Isle of Man, merely to shew his respect for the Apostolic virtues of its Bishop.

XLI. *William Nichols*: b. 1664; Fellow of Merton Coll., Oxf., 1684; presented to the benefice of Selsey in Sussex, 1691: d. 1712. He published a 'Comment on the Book of Common Prayer' in 1710; and, in 1711, a 'Supplement' to the same: he wrote many other works.

XLII. *John Ernest Grabe*: b. at Königsberg in 1666; renounced Lutheranism in 1695; came to England, and was ordained Deacon in the Anglican Church in 1700; received the degree of D.D. from the University of Oxford, 1706; and d. 1711. His chief works are, his edition of the Septuagint; 'Spicilegium SS. Patrum;' 'Justini Apologia Prima;' 'Irenæus adv. Hæreses, Libri V.;' 'De Formâ Consecrationis Eucharistiæ, Hoc est, Defensio Ecclesiæ Græcæ contra Romanam;' and a beautiful edition of Bishop Bull's Works. He left also many unpublished MSS., which are preserved in the Bodleian Library. It is remarkable that a Treatise, 'De Erroribus et Schismate Lutheranorum,' has been torn out from among these MSS, and stolen, though the first leaf as well as the Title in the Catalogue remain to mark the theft.

XLIII. *Thomas Brett*: b. 1667; being convinced by Bishop Hicles

of the unlawfulness of taking the oaths to the Revolution Government, he gave up the benefices which he held in the English Church: he was consecrated a Bishop about 1714 by Bp. Hickee, and two Scottish Bishops of the Nonjuring Communion. He took part in the Correspondence with the Easterns between the years 1716 and 1725; and d. in 1743. He left many works, especially one 'On the Primitive Liturgies.'

XLIV. *Joseph Bingham*: b. 1668; Fellow of University Coll., Oxf., 1689; Tutor to Abp. Potter; in 1695 presented to the Rectory of Headburn Worthly, in Hants; in 1722 completed the publication of his 'Antiquities of the Christian Church,' which were in 1724 translated and published in Latin, with a Lutheran preface, by Grischovius, at Halle: d. in 1723.

XLV. *Nathaniel Marshall*: b. 1680; educated at Emmanuel Coll., Camb.; D.D. 1717; Chaplain to the King, 1715; Prebend. of Windsor 1721: d. 1729. He published in 1714 his 'Penitential Discipline of the Primitive Church;' and in 1717 a 'Translation of St. Cyprian.'

XLVI. *Charles Wheatley*: b. 1686; a member of St. John's Coll., Oxf.; presented to the vicarage of Furneaux Pelham in Herts, 1728: d. 1742. He published a valuable 'Commentary on the Book of Common Prayer.'

XLVII. *Randolph Ford*: Priest, and Curate of St. Mary-la-bonne. He published a Latin Treatise on the xxxix Articles, in 1720.

XLVIII. *Thomas Rattray*: b. 1687; Bp. of Dunkeld in the Scottish Church, 1727: In 1739 he succeeded Bp. Freebairn as Primus: d. 1743. He published 'The Ancient Liturgy of St. James, with an English Translation, Notes, and an Appendix;' also, an 'Essay on the Nature of the Church;' and 'Some Particular Instructions concerning the Christian Covenant, and the Mysteries by which it is transacted and maintained'; together with other pieces, concerning Confirmation, and the Nature of Man. He has also left various MSS., which are as yet unpublished.

XLIX. *Gloucester Ridley*: b. 1702; a member of New College, Oxf.; took the degree of D.D.; a learned Divine. In 1763 he published a 'Life of Bp. Ridley;' was made Prebend. of Salisbury in 1768; and d. 1774.

L. *George Innes*: Cons. Bp. of Brechin in Scotland 1778; d. 1781. He was the Author of a Catechism, for which see the List of Documents, xiv.

LI. *James Milne*: Presbyter in the Scottish Church: The 2nd ed. of his Tract, 'The Difference Stated betwixt the Presbyterian Establishment and the Church of Scotland,' was published at Aberdeen in 1811.

LII. *Alexander Jolly*: b. 1756: for ten years Priest at Turriff in the Diocese of Aberdeen; the civil law prohibiting at that time the celebration of the Service of the Church even in any private house in Scotland, in presence of more than four persons, on pain of six months' imprisonment for the first offence, and transportation for the second; and imposing a fine of £5. upon every person who should be present at any such illegal meeting, without giving information to the nearest magistrate.

Upon the extinction of the line of K. James II., in 1788, the Bishops Clergy and Laity of the Scottish Church declared publicly their recognition of King George the Third as their Sovereign *de jure*, as well as *de facto*; and prayed for him as such by name in their Congregations. In 1791 the Penal Statutes affecting them were repealed by an Act of the British Parliament; but only on condition of the Scottish Bishops and Clergy taking the Oaths to the Crown required in England, and also subscribing the xxxix Articles in the same manner as the English Clergy. When this was resolved upon, and had been notified beforehand to the then Primus, Bp. Skinner of Aberdeen, he replied, that “he believed the Scottish Clergy had no objection to the *general Doctrine* of the xxxix Articles, although they *might not altogether approve of some particular expressions made use of in them.*” On this head he received for answer, that “it was *only the general doctrine* of the several Articles, to which the subscription was required even in England; that *many expressions in them might no doubt be altered for the better;*” &c. Thirteen years after the passing of the Act, in the year 1804, the Scottish Bishops convoked a Synod or Convocation, in which it was resolved, in compliance with the terms offered by the Act of Parliament, to adopt the xxxix Articles. On this occasion Bp. Jolly (having been in 1786 consecrated to the See of Moray) made an Address to the Convocation, which is preserved in the Archives of the Scottish Church, and in which he declared fully for himself and his brethren in what sense the xxxix Articles were then received; viz., I. In such sense as was consistent *with the substantial unity and identity of the Faith of the Church in all ages*; II. In such sense, as made the Articles themselves *consistent with the First English Liturgy*, composed, as an Act of Parliament expresses it, ‘by the aid of the Holy Ghost,’ and by the same persons as drew up the Articles; and III. In that ‘*plain, literal, and grammatical sense*’ which was enforced by Abp. Laud and K. Charles I. against the Puritans, who wished to go beyond the letter, and to develop out of them the doctrines of Calvinism. The following are extracts from the concluding part of his Address, as published by Mr. Skinner, now Bp. of Aberdeen and Primus, from the MSS. of his Father and Predecessor the late Primus, who presided at the Convocation in question:—

“From the writings of Abp. Craumer, and others his contemporaries, it has been proved that the expressions in the Articles which Calvinistic divines lay hold of, and misinterpret, do not, in their original meaning, favour their peculiar tenets. The ‘*Institution and Erudition of a Christian Man*,’ with the ‘*Reformatio Legum, &c.*,’ drawn up by those first Reformers, explain and amplify here and there what is more condensed and less perspicuous in the Articles. And, happily, we too in Scotland have of late got our authentic ‘*Institution of a Christian Man*’ in a book called, ‘*A Layman’s Account of his Faith and Practice*, published with the approbation of the Bishops of the Church.’ In adopting therefore the Articles of the united Church of England and Ireland we must be candidly understood as

taking them in unison with that Book, and not thinking any expressions, with regard to the Lord's Supper, in the least inimical to our practice at the Altar in the use of the Scottish Communion Office; in which we are supported by the first reformed Liturgy of England, not to look back to all the ancient Liturgies, which prevailed long before the corruptions of popery had a being. Some of the greatest Divines of the Church of England, Poyntet, Andrewes, Laud, Heylin, Mede, Taylor, Bull, Johnson, and many others, have asserted and maintained the doctrine which in that Office is reduced to practice. Yet these Divines did all subscribe the xxxix Articles; and must therefore have understood them consistently with their belief of the Commemorative Sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist, using the present Liturgy of the Church of England as comprehending it. Our subscribing them in Scotland cannot then be justly interpreted as an inconsistency with it, &c." And again: "The learned Mr. Daubeny, in his work above referred to, agrees with those who acknowledge that some of the Articles '*might have been better expressed,*' and that . . . they are '*an improvable form of sound words.*' *Much more might we in Scotland claim our right of expressing that true sense of them, which he, and other worthy Churchmen, have so fully evinced in words less liable to be misunderstood.*"—Skinner's Annals of Scottish Episcopacy, p. 215, 346. and Appendix III.

Bishop Jolly died in 1838. The aim of his whole life, to quote from Mr. Cheyne and Mr. Pressley, his biographers, had been to realize the spirit of the Church; and he followed humbly and earnestly in her ways; observing religiously the Vigils of the Saints, and other Fasts, and keeping Lent especially with great strictness; reciting the canonical Offices of the Church morning and evening, and using more particularly for his private exercises such books as Bp. Andrewes' '*Private Devotions,*' Dr. Hickeys' edition of Austin's '*Devotions, &c.,*' '*The Church of England Man's Companion, &c.*' edited by Dr. Spinkes, Deacon's '*Collection of Prayers,*' Sherlock's '*Practical Christian,*' &c. He used special Prayers for the Wednesday as well as for the Friday in every week; and certain short ejaculations for the different Hours of each day. It is related of him, that his habit was never to begin any work, or the reading of any book, without a prayer to God for the assistance of His grace; nor to enter into conversation with any of his friends, without first mentally invoking the Divine blessing upon the person with whom he was conversing. While composing himself to rest, he used continually to repeat the 51st Psalm. He published an '*Address on Baptismal Regeneration,*' a tract '*On the Constitution of the Church,*' '*Observations on the Sunday Services,*' and '*The Christian Sacrifice.*'

LIII. LIV. Besides the above, two Living writers are quoted in the foregoing pages, the present Bishop of Exeter, Dr. Philpotts, formerly of St. Mary Magdalene Coll., Oxf., and the Rev. W. Palmer, of Worcester Coll., Oxf.

