

ber of the Church of England, however extreme his sacramentarian views, holds this doctrine in its full import and undisguised repugnance; no "Anglican priest" would venture to assert it openly, in defiance of the twenty-eighth Article, which declares, "The body of Christ is given, taken and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper, is faith." But there is a manner of speaking of the mystery of the spiritual presence of Christ in and under the outward symbols, and of the effects which follow the act of consecration, which tends to inculcate views of the Holy Sacrament very closely approaching these which this Article so strongly condemns. For example, in the Manual of the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament, I find such language as this, "O my beloved Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, I firmly believe, because thou hast said, 'This is My Body; This is My Blood,' that in this blessed Sacrament Thou art truly present, Thy Divinity and Thy Humanity, with all the treasures of Thy merits and Thy grace; that Thou art Thyself mystically offered for us in this Holy oblation; and dost through Thy Own Presence communicate the virtues of Thy most precious Death and Passion to all Thy Faithful, living and departed." And again "I adore Thee O Lord my God, Whom I now behold veiled beneath these earthly forms. Prostrate I adore Thy Majesty." In the "Litany of our Lord present in the Holy Eucharist," in the same Manual, amongst many like allusions to a corporeal presence, occurs this Suffrage, which seems to symbolize with the heresy of the Sacrifice of the Mass, "That by this adorable Sacrifice we may acknowledge our perpetual dependence upon Thee;" and again in the "Litany of Reparation," "O sacred Victim, consumed on the altar by us and for us; Have mercy upon us." Once more, in the "Office for Spiritual Communion," the direction is given, "Here meditate devoutly on the Passion and Death of Jesus Christ, or on the Real Presence of His Sacred Body and Blood in the Holy Eucharist, or on the Holy Sacrifice of Himself therein continually offered before the Father." It is of course possible, by the exercise of an extreme charity, to believe that persons who hold such language may persuade themselves, by some ingenuity of reasoning, that they mean nothing more than is taught by our Church; but it seems to me that no plain simple folk could understand from it anything else than the assertion of the bodily presence of the crucified Christ in the consecrated bread and wine, and of the repetition in every act of Communion of that atoning sacrifice of Himself which Scripture tells us was made once for all.

So utterly subversive of the Protestant doctrine of our Church on a matter of vital importance do I consider such teaching, that I will never knowingly grant my license to officiate in this Diocese to any Clergyman who is a member of this Confraternity—or, conspiracy, as it has been called, to undermine our Reformed Faith. And I earnestly hope that in preaching or teaching concerning the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, our Clergy will carefully guard against all such language as may give color to a belief that is so repugnant to the spirit and teaching of the Church.

But it is not teaching only that may suggest this doctrine of the Real Presence—there is a serious danger of leading the unstable into the same error, by the practices, the attitudes and gestures which have been introduced into the act of Communion.

Those who no doubt from a sense of deep reverence, have adopted the practices I refer to, verge very closely upon the violation of the last clause of the article already quoted:—"The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped." The consecrating of the elements with the celebrant's back turned to the people, so that they are unable to see what is done, the elevation of the consecrated bread above his head, the prostration of the Communicant before the Holy Table, the receiving of the elements with every manifestation of a profound obeisance to them as possessing an imparted virtue by the act of consecration, and non-communicating attendance—all these practices, neither enjoined in nor deducible

from the Rubrics, have the semblance of a superstitious adoration of the sacred symbols. They may be innocent in intent, but the danger is lest they lead on the worshipper from step to step to the fatal error of believing that by virtue of the Priest's Act, the very Body and Blood of Christ are offered up afresh on the altar, an oft-repeated sacrifice for sin.

You will remember how careful the Church has been to guard the reverential posture she enjoins on recipients against this misconception. At the first revision of the Prayer Book in fifteen hundred and fifty-two, the Royal Council added a declaration concerning kneeling at the Communion, which, having been omitted since the reign of Elizabeth, was again subjoined, with certain modifications, in its present form at the last revision in 1661. "It is hereby declared, That hereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread or wine there bodily received, or unto any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood. For the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored; for that were idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians."

By all means let us inculcate upon our communicants, both in precept and by example, the utmost devotion of heart and reverence of demeanor in approaching these Holy Mysteries, in drawing near to the Spiritual presence of our adorable Saviour than in any other ordinance; but, as we love the truth, let us shun everything that savors of or conduces to superstition.

I could have wished, had space permitted to address you fully on the subject of Ritualism. For the present but a few words must suffice. Our Church is distinguished above other reformed Churches in possessing a beautiful and has throughout her history not thought it unworthy to call in to her aid the handmaid arts of music, architecture and decoration, to promote her service of prayer and praise, at once promotive of devotional feeling in the worshipper and becoming the glory and majesty of Him worshipped. For my part I should grieve to see our beautiful liturgy robbed of all that makes it impressive, as the service of the sanctuary, and reduced to the barren coldness of a cheerless, puritan worship.

A comely, well-appointed house of prayer, with all the furniture and vessels for the use of God's service, designed with taste and kept in scrupulous cleanliness and order, good music of a Church character and a hearty, responsive service, I believe to be not only calculated to attract worshippers, but profitable to interest their hearts in the worship. In all these matters the rule should be "that which is good for the use of edifying." The one only plea for the improving of ritual must be the promoting of reality, earnestness and spirituality in worship. And of our reformed Church, as contrasted with idolatrous Rome, the character of her ritual should be the dignity, genuineness and beauty of simplicity, as opposed to the frivolous, tawdry tinsel of outward pomp and pageant. Simplicity should be the glory of all our services, simplicity that is the natural expression of sincerity, not that bald and dull simplicity which is begotten of indifference and slovenliness. But unhappily some, in their fondness for the externals of religion, or their leanings to symbolism and aesthetic modes of worship, or their excessive zeal for ceremonial have far exceeded the rule of simplicity, and by the introduction of excessive decorations, floral and symbolic, continued bowings and genuflections, candles lighted in broad day, peculiar shaped vestments and other colored stoles and otherwise what has been called "the mimicry of the outside Rome" have given serious offence to the sober common-sense of their people, and aroused suspicions in them that something dangerous lurks behind. Indeed, while these practices find favor with a few of extreme ecclesiastical tastes, it cannot but be conceded that they have been the means of alienating the affections of great numbers of the plain simple people from our Church, and driving them into schism to join themselves to dissenting communions. "Why" it has been asked, "should any clergyman wish to make his church such, that a common man placed suddenly within it, would not be able to say whether he was in a Church of England or a

Romish place of worship?" Our Church has provided in her rubrics, a ritual which gives ample scope for a solemn, beautiful, chaste, and hearty service; the vestments sanctioned by long prescriptive usage, the decent white surplice with sleeves, the black stole and the hood belonging to the degree, furnish a priestly garment sufficiently expressive of the holiness of the office and of a simple dignity and comeliness to satisfy the purest taste; the music that has been created by the Church of England through 300 years, and is the exponent of the genius of her service, offers a repertoire, extensive and varied enough to supply the demands of the most cultivated and critical taste, and possesses compositions of sacred and solemn beauty that have justly made themselves dear to the hearts as well as to the ears of church-going people; and all these may be legitimately made the most of to render the service a real help to the soul's spiritual emotions. Everything beyond these must be regarded in the light of an innovation; and innovations in ritual and worship, it is my duty to set my face against, and, as far as my authority extends to check and resist. With regard to church decorations, which may be innocuous in themselves, I must earnestly warn my younger brethren of the clergy especially, against pushing them to dangerous extremes. To take one familiar example,—the emblem of the cross, which is unquestionably the most ancient and appropriate of Christian devices—suppose that the use of it is the cause of offence to a weak member of your flock. What is your duty as a Christian man and a Pastor of the flock? to insist upon the ornament as inoffensive, and retain it to gratify your taste, and so alienate your brother or wound his weak conscience, or to yield your predilections to his scruples? You admit that no principle is involved, no law of the Church nor precept of the Gospel enjoins that crosses should be set up over the holy table or on the walls; and surely the spirit of tender charity that was the rule of the large-hearted apostle will prompt you to decide, "I will set up no cross while I live, lest I make my brother to offend." This leads me to offer one thought, which should tend to soften the animosity of such differences, before I leave this subject. I am convinced that a large part of the suspicions and objections entertained by many of our excellent Christian laymen against the teaching and practices of their clergy is attributable to want of understanding, (may I venture to say ignorance?) on their part, of the formularies of the Church and the definitions and literature of Theology. The recollection of this should have a twofold effect on the clergy to make them tender towards the scruples and difficulties of their people, and diligent to instruct them more fully and accurately; and on the laity to make them more patient towards anything they cannot quite reconcile in their pastor's teaching, and less hasty to conclude unfavorably until they are better informed; and to all of us as Churchmen, in our differing views on Church matters, it should be the less surprise to us that we cannot see eye to eye, the less cause for suspicion one of another and alienation one from another to know that even among our most eminent divines of the 16th and 17th centuries, to whom we are accustomed to look as authorities on contested points, the same and quite equal difference of view exists. And yet we can accord to them all our loving, grateful esteem, as learned, pious and faithful teachers—the nursing fathers of the Church. A conviction is very strong upon my mind that much mischief has been unconsciously done by our clergy, by the injudicious use of language in their teaching which is not understood by their people; and is therefore regarded by them with suspicion—by what I may call the affectation of an ecclesiastical terminology. I would advocate most strenuously a strict adherence to such words and phrases only as are sanctioned by the usage of the Holy Scriptures and the Book of Common Prayer, and through them have become familiar and dear to the ears of our people. For I feel quite sure that many a statement which sounds most alarming and formidable, quite Romish, when dressed in unfamiliar ecclesiastical phraseology, if translated into the vernacular of the Prayer Book or the inimitable pure Saxon of the Bible, would prove to be perfectly harmless. Above all things let us avoid increasing the