

forced into his measures, and the clergy coerced by the most severe penalties.—Men were found in the end to take possession of the places of those who were ejected for opposition to his views, but men will be always found to undertake and follow out any work, however base, to which those in power will succeed in crushing opposition. If the acts of such men, introduced by fraud into the ministry; introduced expressly for their accordance with the views of the reformers, or coerced into a pliant servility, is to be denominated the act of the English church, be it so; but it is an act that must divest it of every respect in the eyes of every christian, who has any notion what the duty of a church should be, and will forever brand such a church with a stigma fatal to any claim of being guided by these principles which always directed the church of God.

I remain, Rev. Sir, respectfully,

Your obedient servant,

CATHOLICUS.

From the Dublin Review.

DID THE ANGLICAN CHURCH REFORM HERSELF?

(Continued)

[In our last number, the reader has seen the result of the Reformation during the reign of Henry VIII. The papal supremacy, stigmatized as an intolerable tyranny, was suppressed, and a still more intolerable tyranny, under the name of the king's supremacy, was established.]

On the 27th of January, 1517, Henry died, and was succeeded by his only son Edward, little more than nine years old. From that moment the Reformation proceeded rapidly, without interruption or impediment. There was no longer a monarch on the throne, whose theological knowledge or prejudice kept in awe the spirit of innovation; the headship of the Church, with all its duties and cares, all its powers and prerogatives, had fallen on a child; and that child was a mere puppet in the hands of the metropolitan and his associates of the council,—all of them patrons of the new learning, as it was called, either through belief in its doctrines, or the expectation of profit from its ascendancy: Cranmer could now command, even while he appeared only to obey; he could enjoin in the name of the sovereign what would have been rejected by the episcopal bench, had it come to them under no other authority than his own. His first step was to draw them into a recognition of the same spiritual supremacy in the young prince, which they had before admitted in his father. On the ground that his own commission had expired with the monarch who gave it, he solicited and obtained from Edward another commission within a week from the proclamation of the new sovereign. His example proved to his brethren what was expected from them; and the successors of the apostles crowded round the boy on the throne, acknowledging, as their leader had done, that he was "the only source of all manner of temporal and spiritual jurisdiction within the realm," and receiving from his hand new commissions,

with the reward of their powers, in the very same words, which, as we have already noticed, so deeply shocked the orthodoxy of Mr. Palmer in the case of Bonner, in the last reign. The same consequences followed. To prove the sincerity of the bishops, they were suspended from the exercise of their jurisdiction, till the king should think proper to restore it; and several classes of commissioners, mostly laymen, were appointed to visit their different dioceses. In a short time, injunctions with respect to images, ceremonies, holidays, and church service, were issued in the name of the head of the Church; inquisitors of heretical pravity were commissioned by him; illegal courts were established for the deprivation of refractory prelates; vacant benefices and bishoprics were filled with professors of the "new learning," a reformed manner of administering the sacrament was ordered to be observed; the old liturgy was superseded by a new one; the old ordinal by a new one; the old articles of doctrines by new ones; and six years later, when Edward died, nothing was wanting to complete the Reformation but a new code of canon law; and that was ready for the press, but had not yet received the king's signature or royal approbation.

By comparing the state of the English church at the accession of Henry, with the state of the Church at the death of Edward, we should be able to judge, whether both can, with any appearance of reason, be taken for the same Church; whether the Reformation in England was only (that we may return to the elegant illustration of Dr. Hook,) the washing of a person's face in the morning, or in reality the substitution of one individual for another, with very different figure, features, and complexion.

It is no easy matter to discover what is requisite, in the opinion of the Oxford teachers, to constitute the identity of a church. Locality is out of the question; if that were sufficient, the Presbyterian Church of Scotland at the present day would be the same with the prelate Church of Scotland of Catholic times. To us it appears, that, since a certain form of government, and of worship, and of doctrine, is essential to the existence of every church, sameness of government, and worship, and doctrine, are requisite to establish the identity of a local church at different periods. Certain we are, that when no such sameness in any one of these three branches has been suffered to remain, the so-much boasted identity will, in the judgment of every reasonable man, have also ceased to exist.

1st. Now, then, with respect to church government:—the Church of England, at the commencement of Henry's reign, admitted in the bishop of Rome, a primacy of order and jurisdiction throughout the Catholic Church, and consequently within this realm; the church at the close of Edward's reign had abjured the spiritual supremacy of the pontiff, as an usurpation and a tyranny; and had transferred it to the crown, whosoever might wear that crown, young or old, male or female, in-

fel or believer. In the former church it was acknowledged that the bishops inherited from Christ the spiritual authority requisite for the government of their respective dioceses, and that they were bound in duty to exercise it independently of any temporal authority. In the more recent church, the bishops were the mere creatures of the Crown, appointed like civil officers by patent. The instrument ran in these words:—"We name, make, create, constitute, and declare N. bishop of N. to have and to hold to himself the said bishopric during the term of his natural life, if for so long a time he behave himself well herein; and we empower him to confer orders, to institute to livings, to exercise all manner of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and to do all that appertains to the episcopal or pastoral office, over and above the things known to have been committed to him by God in the Scriptures, in place of us, in our name, and by our royal authority." He was next consecrated after a new form devised by the archbishop, a form, however, the validity of which was warmly disputed; and then suffered to enter on his episcopal duties; but still liable to be suspended at any moment from the exercise of his authority, at the pleasure of the royal visitors, and under the obligation of conforming, and of making others conform, to any injunctions on spiritual matters, which might be delivered to him as emanating from the head of the church. With bishops of this description it is plain that the whole government of the church was in the hands of those who had possession of the infant king.

2nd. *Sameness of worship.* The old Church followed, in the public worship, certain well known forms, which had been in constant use for many centuries. In the new church, every thing was altered. The ancient ceremonies were with few exceptions abolished; the habits of the officiating ministers were thrown aside, the service was read from another part of the church, the altar was turned into a table, the former ordinal was superseded by a new one, and the sacrifice of the mass, though authorized at first, was expelled to make room for a new liturgy.—We have no concern here with the merit or demerit of these changes; our object is merely to remind our readers that they were made, and that of course the sameness of worship, was destroyed. In virtue of an order with the royal signature, a book of common prayer was also composed, the king recommended it to the notice of the lords and commons in parliament; both Houses joined in attributing it to the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and the use of it in every church was enjoined, and opposition to it forbidden, under penalties increasing in amount for every repetition of the offence. The next year it was published with a few alterations; still it did not satisfy the reforming zeal of Bucer, Peter Martyr, John Alasco, and other foreign divines, whose influence over the accommodating mind of Archbishop Cranmer Mr. Palmer feelingly deprecates; and in less than four years it came forth again in a new edition, with new and im-

portant alterations, which caused it to differ still more widely from the old liturgy, and from every other liturgy that had ever existed, either in the western or eastern church. Prayer for the dead was now dropped out of the communion service, and of the office for burial; several unctious and ceremonies in the administration of baptism, and confirmation, and the visitation of the sick, were omitted; and great care was taken to exclude from the liturgy the several allusions which it still retained to the real presence of Christ in the eucharist. In this shape the book was republished, and enjoined to be used for the daily service. Certainly it would be difficult to devise two forms of worship more widely different than that of the old and this of the new church.

3rd. *Sameness of doctrine.* With respect to the doctrine of the old Church there can be no doubt. All agree that she taught the very same doctrines which were afterwards embodied in the creed of Pius IV. "Those very points," says Dr. Bramhall, "which Pius IV., comprehended in a new symbol or creed, were obtruded upon us before, by his predecessors, as necessary articles of the Roman faith, and required as necessary articles of their communion." The doctrines of the new Church may be learned from the forty-two articles published in the last year of the reign of Edward. Compare the two, and you will find, that if they agree in several points, they also contradict each other in several, and that religious opinions a few sanctioned in the latter, which would have subjected their advocates to the penalties of heresy during the prevalence of the former. But here we are unexpectedly met by the new theologians, denying the authority of the forty-two articles, and declaring that "no new formulary of doctrine whatever, was published by authority of the Church during the whole reign of Edward. What! were they not published under the title of "Articles, which were agreed to in the synod of London, in the year 1552, by the bishops and other godly and learned men, to root out discord of opinions, and establish the agreement of true religion?" Undoubtedly they were, but this title they tell us, was a pious fraud, employed by the council to induce a belief that the articles had been approved in convocation, whereas they were only approved by some of the members, whilst the convocation was sitting: a fraud of which the archbishop of course was innocent, and which he severely condemned.

Well, be it so, to our argument it matters little. Certain it is, that the articles were published by authority of the head of the church, and at the petition of the archbishop; that the clergy of every diocese were ordered to subscribe them; and that the universities were forbidden to admit any man to his degree, till he had sworn that "he would look upon them as true and certain, and would defend them in all places as agreeing with the word of God." What better authority than this, was there for most of the religious innovations which had been established? Nor can it avail Mr. Palmer, to assert as he does, that the articles were "only subscri-