

ishness is predominant in the Masters and contrivers of their ceremonies, yet this outward state and glory being well disposed, doth ingender, quicken, increase, and nourish the inward reverence, respect, and devotion which is due unto sovereign majesty and power. And, although I am not ignorant that many men well reputed have embraced the thrifty opinion of that disciple, who thought all to be wasted that was bestowed upon Christ in that sort, and that it were much better bestowed upon the poor, (yet with an eye, perhaps, that themselves would be his quarter-Almoners,) notwithstanding I must confess, it will never sink into my heart, that in proportion of reason, the allowance for furnishing out of the Service of GOD should be measured by the scant and strict rule of mere necessity, (a proportion so low, that Nature to ether most bountiful, in matter of necessity hath not failed, no not the most ignoble creatures of the world,) and that for ourselves, no measure of heaping but the most we can get, no rule of expense, but to the utmost pomp we list. Or that GOD himself hath so enriched the lower parts of the world with such wonderful varieties of beauty and glory, that they might serve only to the pampering of mortal man in his pride; and that in the service of the High Creator, Lord and Giver (the outward glory of whose higher palace may appear by the very lamps we see so far off burning gloriously in it) only the simpler, baser, cheaper, less noble, less beautiful, less glorious things should be employed. Especially seeing as in Princes' Courts, so in the Service of GOD also, this outward state and glory being well disposed, doth, (as I have said) ingender, quicken, increase and nourish the inward reverence, respect, and devotion, which is due to so Sovereign Majesty and Power: which those whom the use thereof cannot persuade, into, would easily, by the want of it, be brought to confess; for which cause I crave leave to be excused by them herein, if in zeal to the common Lord of all, I choose rather to commend the virtue of an enemy, than to flatter the vice and imbecility of a friend."

These remarks were not written, as would appear from an examination of dates, by Sir Edwin Sandys, Archbishop of York, although he was a strenuous Protestant, and a sufferer in the cause, but by his son Sir Edwin, author of a work of which the title was "*Europæ Speculum*, or a view or survey of the state of Religion in the Western parts of the world: wherein the Roman Religion and the pregnant policies of the Church of Rome to support the same are notably displayed."

The remarks of Chillingworth which follow his extract from Sir E. Sandys, relate to a question which is revived with much heat in our own day,—the question of using the word *Altar* to describe the Communion-table. A matter, as I apprehend, indifferent in itself, although when the word is employed in any quarter with a leaning to superstitious views, it may be prudent to decline the adoption of it, (as the Church herself has done in the *Liturgy*). The words of Chillingworth are as follows:—

Again, what if the names of *Priests* and *Altars*, so frequent in the ancient Fathers, though not in the Popish sense, be now resumed and more commonly used in England than of late times they were: that so the colorable argument of their conformity, which is but nominal, with the ancient Church, and our