

## THE RITUALISTS AND THE REFORMATION.

BY THE REV. H. E. HALL, M.A., WITH A NOTE OF INTRODUCTION BY THE REV. T. T. CARTER, M.A., HON. CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD.

[The writers who now take the side in opposition to the author of this pamphlet, rest their conclusions on certain Reformers who took part in its earliest stage, and on what was put forth when foreign Reformers had unhappily acquired a great influence in England. But rightly to view the Reformation as an English movement, we must extend our view to the time when the last revision of the Prayer Book took place. The Prayer Book of 1549 was the first expression of the Church's mind in respect of the Blessed Sacrament, and the second Prayer Book, that of 1552, marked a sad decline, owing to the influence alluded to of foreign divines. This was the lowest point reached in the progress of the movement, but there soon came the recovery, and if authorities are to be quoted as to what the Reformation in England really meant, they are to be sought, not among those who were influenced by foreign Reformers, but among the Divines of the reign of Elizabeth, and those who are known as the Caroline Divines. The last revision of the Prayer Book in 1662 marks the outcome of the English Reformation movement, as far as our services are concerned, and the expression of our belief which they embody.—T. T. CARTER.]

A charge has lately been made in the pages of a public review, that those members of the Church of England who are commonly termed Ritualists, and who claim for themselves a true inheritance in the Church of England, are really and in disloyalty, teaching doctrines repudiated by her, and are thereby and therein undoing the work of the Reformation.

The charge is made with an apparent earnestness which I have no reason, and certainly no wish, to doubt. At the same time it has caused, and cannot fail to cause, dismay and distress to a very large number not only of clergy, but also of faithful lay folk, who fear that doctrines are being aimed at, which they hold, though not necessarily in the form in which the objectors have stated them, believing them simply because they feel convinced that they have read them fairly, honourably, and positively in the Prayer Book. I desire, therefore, in the following pages to restate, as clearly as I can, what High Churchmen as a rule do hold on the points in question. I cherish the hope that in doing so temperately and courteously, I may succeed to a great extent in disarming the hostile criticism which, I think, rests mainly on misunderstanding, and may also comfort some, whose sensitive and loving hearts have been distressed by the charge of disloyalty, and may also encourage, on my own side, as great caution and accuracy as possible in all doctrinal statements. I lay no claim to any exceptional qualifications for this task, beyond the fact that I have been born and bred in the High Church school, and have through accidental circumstances, for which I cannot help feeling thankful, been brought into intimate personal contact with some of our greatest teachers, from Dr. Pusey downwards. From childhood I have been taught my religious belief from the Prayer Book, as being the Church's commentary on the Divine Revelation contained in Holy Scripture. We were taught to study Holy Scripture with the guidance of the Prayer Book, and to seek for the corroboration of the teaching of the Prayer Book in Holy Scripture. Such was Mr. Keble's instruction; such also was Dr. Pusey's "rule of faith for a plain man," as he once wrote to me in a private letter.

The charges made against us are under three heads—

Sacerdotalism.  
Transubstantiation.  
Sacramental Confession.

A. By Sacerdotalism, of course, is meant the teaching which we give concerning the character of the ministry of the clergy. It is admitted that the Church calls the second order of the clergy, priests, but it is contended that we have introduced into the word a meaning not intended by the Church and contrary to the spirit of her formularies. Now the following is the ordinary teaching given by us concerning our office:—

a. It has been our Lord's will that the Society which he created and called His Church should have an executive ministry appointed by Himself.

b. That all the corporate acts of approach to God of that Society should be led by that ministry.

c. That all God's dealings with that Society as such, or with individuals through that Society, should be executed by that ministry.

Put in a familiar form, the clergy appointed by succession from the Apostles, who were appointed by our Lord, are—

i. To lead the worship of the congregation towards God.

ii. To minister the Sacraments and Word of God to the people.

But this twofold office is the same office as our

Lord exercises between God and man, and on account of which He is called a Priest for ever. Our ministry is therefore a participation in His. We are His deputies on earth, and so priests, as exercising by delegation from Him the twofold office in which His Priesthood consists:

His office as leader of the people.

His office as minister for God.

His Priesthood is His own, inherent, inviolable, never, that is, to be passed out of His Hands, so that He should come to an end and some one take His place. Our Priesthood is not our own, but derived by delegation from Him.

Our doctrine rests on the English Ordinal, in which our duty of ministering the Word and Sacraments is mainly dwelt on, and in which we are termed messengers, watchmen, stewards, and on Article XXVI. And as regards the necessity of authority from above for the due exercise of the ministry, we rest alike on the introduction to the Ordinal and Article XXVI. I confidently invite the comparison of my statement of doctrine with those parts of the Prayer Book to which I have referred.

As regards the name priest, it stands as is admitted throughout our formularies, and is used in distinction to the more general title of minister, as a rule, when indicating some part of a service which may be done only by a priest and not by a deacon. The name, however, is not the important point, except that we have no right to separate ourselves in such a matter from the whole of Catholic Christendom, both past and present. The real issue is, what is the thing which we have to do? and if our office is such as I have stated above, we are priests in the historic Catholic sense of the word.

B. The second charge is that we teach Transubstantiation.

Now with Transubstantiation we have nothing practical to do. There is a doctrine of Transubstantiation mentioned in our Article, which we reject; and there is the Tridentine definition of Transubstantiation drawn up after our Article, and which some maintain to be different from the doctrine we reject; still, since it was not known to the early Church, the Church of England declines to accept it. The Tridentine doctrine of Transubstantiation penetrates into a sphere of thought concerning Christ's presence in the Holy Communion which the Church universal has not entered nor unfolded, viz., the mode in which the Sacramental union of the inward and outward parts of the Sacrament is brought about.

From all such discussions we stand aloof.

Let me set out the position quite clearly:

a. The Tridentine doctrine of Transubstantiation asserts the fact of Christ's Presence, and asserts an explanation of the mode.

b. The Anglican doctrine, as it presents itself to us, asserts the fact of Christ's Presence, but does not define the mode, simply guarding against possible errors by asserting that it is not after the manner of the bodily presence of natural bodies, but is in a heavenly way.

Now unless it can be shown that in addition to asserting the fact of the Real Presence, we go on to declare and to teach as *de fide*, that the Presence is effected by means of Transubstantiation, the main charge brought against us under this head falls to the ground. By us, the Tridentine definition, if it be quite clearly shown to be different from the doctrine we have positively rejected, can only be regarded as an opinion, never as a binding dogma. If at any time an individual clergyman has done more than express his approval of it as an opinion, he would find no support from the two chief societies of High Churchmen, the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament, or the English Church Union; nor, I feel I may confidently assert, from the influential exponent of High Church principles in the press, the "Church Times." My own disposition, and that of those with whom I am most in contact, is to refrain from all speculation, beyond the simple assertion of the fact of the Presence itself.

What then do we teach about the Real Presence? I answer, exactly what the Prayer Book teaches:

a. The Church Catechism. The Sacrament consists of two parts, the inward part being the Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.

b. The Communion Service. The manual acts and words in the Consecration Prayer, being the means by which the Holy Spirit acts, are the Consecration, or making of the Sacrament, causing, that is, the Presence of the Inward Part, or the Body and Blood of Christ.

c. The rubric at the end of the Communion Service, and Article XXVIII. The Body and Blood are not present after the manner in which a natural body is present in any place, but in a heavenly way, and yet, objectively, i.e., independently of the communicant, for they are given and taken, conveyed, that is, from one to another, as well as eaten.

Here we may observe the accurate distinction which is often passed over between Holy Baptism

and Holy Communion, and which very strongly confirms our belief in the Objective Presence. Both Sacraments consist of two parts, an outward and an inward part. Now in Holy Baptism the outward part is water, and the inward part is the effects of Baptism. Whereas in Holy Communion, the outward part is bread and wine, but the inward part is not any effect, but the Body and Blood of Christ. The benefit or effect of Holy Communion is treated of separately and by a fresh question. This is an important instruction, and entirely disposes of the argument sometimes made, and lately restated by a correspondent in the "Guardian," that since in Baptism no one asserts an Objective Sacramental union between the element and Christ, neither should we in Holy Communion. We do not assert such an objective union in Baptism, because the Church does not, but we do in Holy Communion, because the Church does.

(To be Continued.)

## Home &amp; Foreign Church News

FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENTS.

## NOVA SCOTIA.

COW BAY.—The season of Lent is being conscientiously observed by the Church in this parish, and the rector is endeavouring to make it a season of much spiritual good to his people and himself. Daily morning and evening prayer is said in the parish church, with a reading at 9.15 and 4.30, and an additional evensong and address at 7 on Wednesdays and Thursdays at the outlying churches. The Holy Communion is celebrated every Thursday morning, and the children's "Band of Worship" have a special service with catechism and children's study every Saturday afternoon. A course of sermons on the subject of "Restoration of the Sinner" is being delivered on Sunday evenings. The congregation of St. Luke's, Big G. Bay, purpose removing the glass from the six side windows of their little church, and filling them with neat memorials of cathedral glass with coloured margins and medallions. The first has been ordered by the rector and will bear the inscription:—"Charles Croucher, Priest, 1882," with chalice and paten in medallion. Fifty missionary boxes have been given to the children for their Lenten offerings in the interests of the Indian homes. Rev. A. A. Bryant is spending a month or two with his friends at the rectory, and is assisting the rector in parochial work. We are much pleased to have him with us. The interior of the parish church has received considerable attention during the winter. The ceiling on the old plaster has been completed, and when oiled and shellacked will present a good appearance.

## NEWFOUNDLAND.

TRINITY.—Parish of St. Paul's.—The beautiful new church in this picturesque little village is fast approaching completion, and when ready for consecration in July next it will be the finest church in the diocese. The missionary in charge, Rev. W. Weaver, and the congregation, are very much pleased with the results of their efforts, and to know that when the building is finished it will also be free of debt. An altar of walnut and ash, beautifully made by Messrs. Gordon & Keith, Halifax, has just been sent as an offering to God, and for use in the church, to which is attached a brass plate bearing the inscription:—

To the glory of God,

By six priests, born in this parish,  
"Giving Him thanks."

A pipe-organ is to be placed in the church in memory of the late Dean Bullock, the writer of the well-known hymn, "We love the place, O God," etc. This hymn was written by Rev. Mr. Bullock whilst in charge of this parish, and was sung from manuscript at the opening of the church which preceded the present one, built on the same site. This hymn will probably be the first one sung at the consecration of the new church, as also Rev. Dr. Bullock (son of the late Dean, and one of the six priests) will probably preach the consecration sermon.

## MONTREAL.

Synod Hall, Mid-Lent, 3rd March.—Rev. Principal Rexford's lectures to our S. S. teachers, which began in Advent, continue to attract a numerous attendance. "Nothing draws people together like the exposition of Scripture"—is the opinion of a local divine. In treating on Esau's folly in selling his birthright, Mr. Rexford, in his last lecture, made a well-timed point, viz., Eve's temptation, Esau's temptation and Christ's temptation all appealed to appetite:—"O Lord, who for our sakes didst fast forty days and forty nights, give us grace to use such