

they assuredly will not be contented if they are brought to such an issue as the Bishop's prosecutors desire. An Established Church in which such men as Pusey and Keble and Drs. Liddon and Church and Bishop King could find no place would not hold together a twelvemonth, and I may venture to say would not be worth preserving."

### EPISCOPAL ORDINATION.

#### THE STATUTE OF 1571 AND ACTION TAKEN UNDER IT.

(From the *Church Eclectic*).

In the course of the late discussion concerning the admission of Orders other than those ministered by Bishops, a great deal has been said about a Statute passed by Parliament in 1571, entitled "An Act for the Ministers of the Church to be of sound religion." This Statute contained the following passage:

Every person, under the degree of a Bishop, which doth or shall pretend to be a Priest or minister of God's Holy Word and Sacraments by reason of any other form of institution, consecration or ordering, than the form set forth by Parliament in the time of the late King Edward VI. or now used, shall, in the presence of the Bishop or Guardian of the Spiritualities of some one diocese where he hath or shall have ecclesiastical living, declare his assent and subscribe to all the Articles of religion which only concern the confession of the true Christian Faith, and the doctrine of the Sacraments.

On the one hand it is assumed and then asserted, that this Statute was passed to enable those who had been ordained on the Continent of Europe or in Scotland to be admitted to service in the Church of England without ordination by a Bishop. It is not claimed so by any Bishop in England. Indeed, as no such ordinations had, probably, occurred at the time when the Statute was enacted, it is difficult to see how such a claim could be advanced.

On the other hand, it is held that the Act was intended to apply to those of the clergy who had been ordained by the Roman Pontifical in the reign of Mary, and that no reference was intended to the persons above mentioned. What are the grounds for this interpretation of the Statute?

1. Archdeacon Hardwick shows that subscription to the Articles of Religion was "abandoned for a period of eighteen years;" i. e. from 1553, the year of Mary's accession, till 1571, the date of the Statute in question. Before the last named date, "the clergy on entering their benefices very generally accepted a test of doctrine embodied in the "Eleven Articles," set forth by the Bishop in 1559. But this appears to have been all "that was required."

2. But was there any reason for requiring subscription in 1571 from persons ordained in Mary's reign, which does not apply before that date? In April, 1570 Pius V. had issued his bull "*Regnum in Excelsis*," by which Elizabeth was excommunicated, and her subjects absolved from their allegiance and forbidden "to obey her, or her monitions, mandates and laws." This bull was formally published in England in 1571; and from this date there were "daily successions from the Church at the beck of the Roman Pontiff." Naturally then, at such a time attention would be directed to deacons and priests ordained in Mary's reign, and it would be an equally natural proceeding to subject them to something more stringent than what had hitherto been imposed.

3. The Puritan party looked with no favour on this Statute, as they surely would have done had it been regarded as opening a door for bringing into England persons ordained abroad; and thus increase their own numbers and influence. In their first "Admonition to

Parliament," in 1574, they make great complaint of the Act of 1571, and beg that something may be done for those who are unwilling to subscribe. If the action invoked by them may seem strange in view of the fact that it would favor the Marian clergy, to whom they were specially antagonistic, it may be well to remember, that if this was the first it certainly had not been the last time that Puritanism has been ready to favor Popery so long as the Church of England was harmed.

4. A document, written by one Percival Wyburn, describing the "State of the Church of England," is extant and may properly be referred to here. This person had been an exile in Mary's time, had returned to England and been ordained by Bishop Grindal in 1559, and was deprived for non-conformity in 1564. During the summer 1566 he was on the Continent of Europe, and placed, as he himself states, in the hands of Bullinger "two schedules." In one of these he says, "The English clergy consists, partly of the popish priests, who still retain their former office, and partly of ministers lately ordained by some Bishop there, at his pleasure."

Had there been, at this time, persons of foreign ordination holding cures in England, is it likely that a person of Wyburn's sympathies would have failed to note it?

5. But, it may be said, this Statute of 1571 was intended to change the condition of things, as Wyburn describes it, in 1566, and to admit to service those who were previously excluded. This theory is ingenious, no doubt, but it will not bear examination.

In the first place, if such were the intention of the Statute it went directly in the teeth of not only the law of the Church but the law of the Realm; and that without any intimation of a purpose to repeal either.

The law of the Church, as contained in the preface to the Ordinal was, that "no man (not being at this present Bishop, Priest or Deacon) shall execute any of [the functions of these Orders] except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted, according to the form hereafter following;" and that form required ordination by a Bishop.

What was thus the law of the Church was, also, the law of the Realm. For the Prayer Book of 1559, had, by the Act of Uniformity of that year, become part of such law. And when the unreal objection was raised that the Ordinal was not specifically mentioned in that Act, another Act was passed in 1566, by which the Ordinal, specifically mentioned, was declared to be a part of the law of the Realm. Is it at all likely that the Act of 1571 could have been intended to contradict and annul the virtual enactment of 1559, and the specific one of 1566?

But, secondly, we are not left to conjecture or balancing of probabilities in this matter. There are adjudicated cases which interpret the Statute in question; and that not in the way now so confidently claimed.

1. The case of William Whittingham, Dean of Durham, who had been ordained abroad. A commission was appointed in 1578—a previous one having affected nothing—to consider his case; and among other things charged was "that he was neither deacon or minister, but a mere layman—*mere laicus*."

The Statute of 1571 was not pleaded as covering his case. He died, however, while the process was pending.

2. In 1581, Robert Wright, a domestic chaplain to Lord Rich, who had been ordained by the Antwerp Presbytery, was cited before Aylmer, Bishop of London, who "refused to allow his Orders, and pronounced him a layman, and incapable of holding any living in the Church." Again there was no appeal to the Statute of 1571.

3. The case of Walter Travers was mentioned in the last number of the *Eclectic*. Archbishop Whitgift refused his consent to making him Master of the Temple, on the ground of

the insufficiency of his ordination by the Presbytery of Antwerp. Later on he was brought before the High Commissioner which inhibited him from preaching; and the first reason given for the inhibition was, "that he was *no lawful* ordained minister according to the Church of England."

Travers appealed to the Privy Council, and pleaded the Statute of 1571, as covering his case. His appeal was not sustained; his interpretation of the Statute not accepted; and the decision of the High Commission was not reversed.

If all this does not show that the Statute of 1571 cannot be fairly interpreted as the attempt is now made to interpret it, it is difficult to see what proof could do it.

No doubt the law was sometimes violated or sometimes evaded, by persons who, for political purposes, or opposition to the Church, would have been glad to have blotted it out. But to reason from violations or evasions of a law to its non-existence is, to say the least, a curious sort of logic.

### CANNON MEYRICK ON THE EUCHARIST.

Canon Meyrick's treatise on the Holy Communion is introduced to the reader by Bishop Harold Browne in a highly laudatory preface and is in the Theological Honour course in T. C. D.: (Trinity College Dublin). He sums up the mystery of the Eucharist in its several aspects as follows.

"The Holy Communion is a Remembrance, a Sacrifice, a means of Feeding, a means of Incorporation, a Pledge.

"It is a Remembrance in so far as its object is to recall to the minds of Christians the love of Christ as exhibited in the sacrifice of His death, in so far as it commemorates by an outward act that divine sacrifice, and in so far as it is a memorial of Christ and His death before man and before God.

"It is a Sacrifice, inasmuch as it is an offering made to God as an act of religious worship—*spiritual* sacrifice, as being a sacrifice of prayer and praise to God for the benefits received by the sacrifice of the death of Christ; a *material* sacrifice, in so far as the bread and wine are regarded as gifts of homage to God in acknowledgement of His creative and sustaining power; a *commemorative* sacrifice, inasmuch as it commemorates the great Sacrifice of the Cross; the words commemorative sacrifice meaning, in this acceptation a commemoration of the sacrifice. But it is not a sacrifice of Christ to His Father, whereby God is propitiated and man's sins expiated.

"It is a means of Feeding upon Christ; but this feeding is not affected by the elements to be eaten being changed into Christ—an hypothesis which grew up in the ninth century among a rude and uninstructed populace, forced its way into the theology of the Western Church in the eleventh century although opposed to the tradition of the Church, the true interpretation of Scripture, and the tenets of philosophy—an hypothesis which has led to the practices of Reservation, Procession of the Sacrament, Elevation, Adoration, Communion in one kind, Fasting Reception (when imposed as of necessity), and the belief that Christ's Body is eaten by the wicked.

"Nor is our Feeding on Christ effected by our eating His material Body, together with the bread and wine, which is the theory of Consubstantiation.

"But it is effected by the spiritual Presence of Christ, and the benefits of His bloodshedding on the Cross being conveyed to the soul of the humble recipient qualified by faith and love towards God and man.

"It is a means of Incorporation, inasmuch as by it we are more and more made part of the