

impression," said Simeon, in 1792, "that it must be established for the advancement of true religion, or what the world would call Methodism. Hence it is not to be wondered at, that it should be regarded with jealousy by some, and with contempt by others, and that young gowmsmen, who even in their own chapels showed little more reverence for God than they would in a play-house, should often enter in to disturb our worship." "For many years (I speak from my own personal knowledge)," writes Mr. Gunning, "Trinity Church and the streets leading to it were the scenes of the most disgraceful tumults."



#### ART. VI.—SOME RITUALISTIC MANUALS.

1. *Some Strictures on a book entitled "The Communicant's Manual," with two Prefaces by the Rev. E. King, D.D., Regius Professor of Pastoral Theology in the University of Orford and Canon of Christ Church.* By C. J. ELLIOTT, M.A., Vicar of Winkfield, Berks, and Hon. Can. of Christ Church. Third Edition. London: Murray. 1879.
2. *Some Remarks upon a Letter to the Rev. C. J. Elliott, by the Rev. E. King, D.D., together with further Strictures upon certain Devotional Works written or adapted for the use of Members of the Church of England.* By the Rev. C. J. ELLIOTT, M.A. Vicar of Winkfield.

MR. ELLIOTT has done good service by drawing public attention to the subtle and insidious way in which the laity of the Church of England are being gradually imbued with teaching that is virtually identical with that of the Church of Rome in books of devotion put forth under the authority of responsible names, as he has done in the two pamphlets of which the titles are given above. It is well, also, that they are introduced to public notice by the countenance and commendation of so honoured a house as that of Mr. Murray. This of itself goes a long way to take them out of the category of mere party missives.

"It is one of the characteristic signs of the days in which we live," says the writer of the above pamphlets, "that those distinctive tenets of the Church of Rome, against which the Articles of the Reformed Church of England are specially directed, are being propagated, and more particularly amongst the young, by means of books of devotion; such books being either composed by members of the Church of Rome, and adapted for the use of members of the English Church, or else composed by members

of the English Church, but inculcating the tenets of the Church of Rome."

After showing how largely this is the case with "The Communicant's Manual" in manifold ways, it is not much to be wondered at that Dr. King should have felt himself moved to reply; but although he might "possibly desire to alter here and there an expression or two," he professes himself "quite prepared to abide by the general teaching" of his book, believing it to be in perfect harmony with Holy Scripture and the teaching of the Church. In fact, the charges Mr. Elliott has preferred against "The Communicant's Manual," of inculcating or sanctioning semi-Roman doctrines and practices remain unanswered, and therefore it is no just cause for surprise that the laity of the Oxford diocese are anxiously inquiring whether the teaching of Cuddesdon College is that of the English Church or that of "The Communicant's Manual," and of the books which that Manual recommends. As a specimen of this teaching, take the lines of a hymn recommended for use immediately after the Prayer of Consecration:—

Devoutly I adore Thee, Deity unseen,  
Who Thy glory hidest 'neath these shadows mean;  
Lo! to Thee surrendered, my whole heart is bowed,  
Tranced as it beholds Thee, shrined within the cloud.

or yet further the passage on p. 49 of the Manual:—

The consecration is the most solemn and central act of the service, by which the bread and wine are made, through the power of God the Holy Ghost, verily and indeed the Body and Blood of Christ, and are offered to God the Father as the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

Well may Mr. Elliott write in his second pamphlet, p. 17:—

(1) I must enter my protest against the salutations addressed to the "Most Holy Flesh of Christ," and to "the Heavenly Drink of Jesu's Blood," which follow immediately upon "the Act of Consecration," (p. 84). (2) I object to the "Acts of Adoration" after the Prayer of Consecration on p. 85: "I adore Thee, O Lord my God, whom I now behold veiled beneath these earthly forms. Prostrate I adore Thy Majesty, &c." (3) I object to the "Acts of Devotion" which I find at pp. 98 and 99, more particularly to that numbered vi., ascribed to *St. Ambrose*, in which I find the following words:—"I pray Thee for the souls of the faithful departed (especially N), that this great Sacrament of Thy Love may be to them health and salvation, joy and refreshment." (4) I object, again, to the words which I find at p. 104: "At every Altar of Thy Church, where Thy blessed Body and Blood are being offered to the Father." (5) I object once more to the "Litany of our Lord present in the Holy Eucharist" (pp. 110 and 111), more particularly to the following clauses:—"Jesu, our wonderful God, who vouchsafest to be present upon the altar when the

Priest pronounces the words of Consecration : And " Jesu, who, in this August and Venerable Mystery, art Thyself both Priest and Victim."

We think these objections perfectly valid, and believe that all true Churchmen will share them with him.

It is manifest that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is peculiarly fitted, from the position it holds in the English Offices, and notably in the teaching of those who exalt the function of the Church in the scheme of salvation, to be the means of disseminating among the young the principles advocated in "The Communicant's Manual." There is everything in the mystery of first Communion, regarded as the ultimate goal of catechetical and Confirmation instruction, to appeal to the imagination and sensitiveness of the young, and, consequently, whatever can be instilled into their minds by association with the deepest of all mysteries, stands in a position of especial favour for being zealously embraced and tenaciously held. Wisely, therefore, do they act who would seek to make the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper the vehicle of instruction in specific and definite principle for the young, the tender, and the hopeful. It is, moreover, certain that all classes of Christians generally, of whatever denomination, must agree in regarding the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper as an ordinance of unique and special importance in the Christian scheme. All who have any love for the Lord Jesus must admit the paramount significance of His last act before He suffered, and confess that what He commanded to His Apostles, with His dying breath, cannot be otherwise than essentially dear to all who desire to abide in their doctrine and fellowship. As a matter of fact, therefore, there can hardly be much divergence between the most opposite phases of Christian thought in the attention, importance, and regard that attaches and is due to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Consequently, the divergence, which also as a matter of fact could hardly be much greater than it is, must arise elsewhere than in the loving estimate of reverence with which it is regarded. Depreciation of the Sacraments is a very common charge that is brought against those who are zealous for Gospel principles by those who glory rather in their relation to, and union with, the Catholic Church. But as long as the sacraments are acknowledged as the solitary ordinances of a positive character established by Christ Himself, as all must acknowledge them to be, it is hardly possible that any Christian who gives the matter a moment's thought can intentionally depreciate these ordinances ; and, indeed, the point of divergence will be found to consist not in the dignity with which these ordinances are regarded, but in the function that is ascribed to them. They are commonly spoken of under a title which, however legitimate, is not to be found in Scripture, namely, "means of grace." The Church of Rome

advances the Sacraments as the paramount and, in some respects, as the exclusive means of grace. The Church of Rome holds that there can be no union with Christ except by and through the sacraments, and it is this function of the sacraments which is recognised and magnified by all those who boast themselves in their relation to that Church and in their collateral descent with it from the primitive Church. In this theory the sacraments are not only rites ordained by Christ, but they are also means by which alone the grace of Christ is conveyed (ordinarily) to the soul. Nor is there any one who would deny that the sacraments are lawfully to be regarded as means of grace, and that they were ordained by Christ to be so. The danger does not arise till their exclusive function in this respect is asserted, and then the way is clear for exalting that function of the sacraments which is characteristic of the Church of Rome. It must surely have struck every one who has wandered from time to time into the churches abroad, in Roman Catholic countries, and witnessed the celebration of the Mass, that the degree of likeness between the pompous and imposing ceremony there enacted and the details of the Last Supper as given in the Evangelists is reduced to a minimum, if it has not vanished altogether. Often, at such times, have we endeavoured to recall the scene in the upper chamber at the Last Supper and been unable to perceive the resemblance thereto in the stately process of the Mass. It is simply impossible to detect in it any compliance with the precept, "This do in remembrance of Me," and the reason is because the aspect of the incident which is perpetuated in the Mass is altogether different from that which is preserved to us in the narrative of the Evangelists. It is not the Lord's Supper as a feast of charity, nor even as an act of communion or a means of grace which is there repeated, but rather the enactment of the great mystery of redemption itself which that supper, while it did not cease to be a supper, was declared to represent. There is no question but that the sacrificial aspect of our Lord's last supper with His disciples is the one which predominates in the Mass, almost to the exclusion of any other, and it is this aspect which the modern developments of High Church teaching have been so careful to render prominent and effective. There can, however, be no question, even among moderate High Churchmen, but that it is this aspect which the office of the Church of England has rendered subordinate to another, if it has not actually obscured it, that other being the aspect of reunion and fellowship with Christ as He held it with His disciples in the Last Supper. Thus the Mass of the Romish Church became the Communion of the English Church, and if the Mass is the characteristic feature of the Church of Rome

the substitution of the Communion for it may be said to be the characteristic feature of the Reformed Church of England. It is not a little significant of the retrograde action of our younger Churchmen that among themselves they freely adopt the phrase of "going to Mass" as they have recently made common the innovation, for such it certainly is in the English Church, of being present at the communion without communicating. There is, however, one cause for thankfulness, that except in the most extreme development of what is called Catholic doctrine and practice in our own Church, the communion aspect of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is after all the one which is most distinctive and prominent. Whatever may have been done to emphasise the sacrificial character and meaning of it, that which may be said to be the most conspicuous and popular is the one which it presents as the special means of communion with Christ. So effectual was the work of the Reformation in the Church of England in this respect that unparalleled efforts of a counter-reformation tendency have not availed, even among extreme High Churchmen, to convert the Anglican Communion into the Romish Mass. In spite of themselves, and true to the traditions of many generations, the religious public of the Church of England do not cease to regard the communion aspect of the Eucharist as virtually and practically the most prominent and distinctive, and this is surely a valid cause for sincere thankfulness.

It is, however, on what may be called the practical and popular side of the Holy Sacrament that, as we believe, much mischievous and erroneous teaching has prevailed, for the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is a means of grace, as all must be prepared to admit. In what sense is it a means of grace, and is there any sense in which it is the exclusive means? There can be no question but that the New Testament represents man's access to Christ as direct and immediate, and it knows nothing of any means of grace, still less of the Communion as such a means, whereby mediately and indirectly we may draw nigh to Christ. The invitation of Christ is "come unto *Me*," and the blessing promised is no less direct, "I will give you rest." Nothing is said there of any sacrament or means, nor was this sacrament instituted till long after this invitation was given. If therefore it was possible to have access direct and immediate to Christ then, it was possible without the sacrament, nor can the sacrament be supposed to have made it more possible. Let us not be misunderstood to seem to affirm that the sacraments are superfluous, and therefore may be dispensed with. If they were superfluous our Lord would not have appointed them. That they were ordained by One who knew our needs, to strengthen, assist, and sustain faith, cannot for a moment be questioned, and any view of their

character which does not fully recognise this feature of them must be defective and false. But it is abundantly possible to recognise the Sacraments as efficient aids to faith without making them substitutes for faith. It is quite possible to regard the Sacraments in this light, and yet not to place them between Christ and the soul in such a way as to make us rest in them or to hinder us from immediate access to Christ. When the eye looks at any object through a glass, whether microscope, telescope, or what not, the object is not distinctly perceived until the medium through which it is beheld is lost. The purpose of the instrument or medium is to bring the eye, so to say, into contact with the object beheld. It is exactly so with the Sacraments—they are means whereby we are to have access to Christ. Their object is defeated unless such access is obtained. If the Sacraments are used as graduated steps by which we may approach more and more nearly to a distant Christ, who is, after all, still distant, they resemble the mysterious line which, though perpetually approaching, yet never touches the curve, rather than effectual means of grace by which the actual contact is achieved; and it is this aspect of the Lord's Supper which is to be found open to objection in the treatment of it that is advocated by works of the school of the "Communicants' Manual." It is assumed that the ultimate participation of Christ is in the Eucharist; that there is no other drawing nigh to Him which is at all comparable to this, that therefore the oftener we thus draw nigh to Him the closer our communion with Him, which is not to be experienced otherwise. Probably none will say that we have now misrepresented the high sacramental theory. But none the less are we sure that that theory is a perverted view of the Gospel and of the Sacrament itself. The Gospel uniformly represents faith as the only means by which we lay hold of Christ, and consistently therewith the Article of the English Church declares that the means whereby we partake of Christ in the Lord's Supper is faith. There is all the difference in the world therefore between coming to Christ by faith and partaking of Him in His ordinance, and coming to His ordinance with faith in *it* as the means whereby we partake of Him. There is then a necessary, though perhaps imperceptible, transference of the object of faith from Christ to the ordinance of Christ. Instead of our faith going forth towards and resting directly and personally in Christ, it goes forth towards and rests in His ordinance. The direct exercise of faith is not towards Christ but towards the ordinance of Christ. And this can hardly be otherwise so long as the ordinance of Christ is represented as the means whereby we lay hold of Christ, in the same sense as we lay hold of Him by faith. It is important that our younger Churchmen should clearly determine for themselves in what

sense faith is a means and in what sense the sacrament of the Lord's Supper is a means, and decide whether we approach to and lay hold of Christ by the one or by the other, and whether it is by faith in and through the sacrament, or whether it is by the sacrament with faith in it rather than a faith that rises through it, and does not rest till it rests in Christ. The charge that we bring against the sacramental theory, and the use of the sacraments that it implies and encourages, is just this,—that it unavoidably fosters a tendency to make the sacraments means, in the sense in which faith is the only means, and so have the effect of leading the soul away from direct and simple trust in Christ by disposing it to rely on the repetition of the act of communion, instead of entering into that communion at once and for all by the simple act of faith.

We have dwelt thus at length on what appear to us the true principles of communion, because it is not possible otherwise to understand the subtle misconception which underlies the teaching which Mr. Elliott has rightly exposed. If the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper once becomes identified with Christ in such a way as to be itself the object of faith, there is no end to the perversion and grossness which will characterise the adoration paid to it. Idolatry is a subtle error, and a misconception of the mind may be an idol as much as a carved image of wood or stone. If the true function of the sacrament of Christ's body and blood is misconceived, that will infallibly become an idol; and that its function is misconceived is an undoubted fact, as soon as faith in the sacrament is allowed in the slightest degree to obscure faith in Christ.

In his strictures on the "Communicants' Manual," Canon Elliott specifies four heads of complaint: (1) The devotional books recommended; (2) the teaching of it on Confession and Absolution; (3) its teaching about Christ's presence in the Eucharist; and (4) the invocations contained in it to the soul, body, and blood of our blessed Lord. We will confine ourselves to the third and fourth of these heads as bearing chiefly on the remarks already made. The Manual teaches that the presence of Christ in the sacrament is a localised presence "at every altar," before which presence, thus localised, the oblation of the personal self is to be made, and that "the operation of the Holy Ghost in the act of consecration is analogous to His operation in the Incarnation." Rightly is this teaching condemned by Mr. Elliott; but it seems to us that its real condemnation lies in the certain absence of spirituality betrayed. No one who truly apprehends the spirituality of God's presence can endure the travesty of that presence here spoken of as grossly localised. The spiritual freedom of the emancipated soul is chained down to the beggarly elements of an imaginary and limited presence. It is not God

that is represented as present, but an idea of God that has been substituted for Him and imagined to be present. We can only say that if, under these circumstances, the elements are not the objects of worship, at all events the idea of a sacramental presence is, which has first to be predicated as existent, but which is at least altogether unlike anything presented to our contemplation in Scripture. If it were not that the modern school of Ritualists had advanced far beyond the state of reverence for the great 17th century divines, one might confront them with the passage Mr. Elliott quotes from Bishop Bull (page 25 of his first pamphlet), and ask whether it is not as applicable in their case as in that of the Romanists to whom it immediately refers. But in point of fact our modern Ritualists are callous to all such considerations, and take refuge in the belief that had these divines lived in the 19th century instead of the 17th, they would have thought and been like them. Mr. Elliott suggests that the invocations found on page 59 of the Manual—"Soul of Christ, sanctify me!" "Body of Christ, save me!" "Blood of Christ, inspirit me!"—may be charitably construed so as to be cleared from the charge of actual idolatry. We are, for our part, less careful to decide this point, because we are sure that the ejaculations themselves, however interpreted, are utterly inconsistent with a true conception of *who* the Christ is, thus apostrophised. Any adequate thought of the presence of the Divine Being incarnate and glorified would surely raise the mind above the trivial and unworthy puerilities of a special and separate invocation to His soul, or body, or blood. The thing is branded with its own condemnation.

Space forbids us to follow Mr. Elliott in the several details of his controversy with Canon King. No unbiassed mind can hesitate for a moment as to the justice with which that controversy was raised, or as to its general merits; but we are more desirous to direct attention to the broad issue involved in it than to the technical merits of the controversy itself. It is of course to be expected that those who think with Canon King, and see the matter as he sees it, will continue to see and to think so for anything we or others may say; but for all that there will be those who will, sooner or later, become alive to the very deplorable and alarming condition of thought which is evidenced by the dissemination of doctrinal works such as Canon King's. It is not that we fear the consequences resulting from such a condition of things, and are in that sense alarmists, but that we greatly deplore and shudder at the materialism and want of spirituality of which it is the certain index. We frequently meet with supineness and indifference, with incredulity and contempt, when any apprehension is expressed at the rapid increase of Romanism and Romanising doctrine in this country; but it can



only arise from those who have not duly weighed and estimated the matter, and do not rightly apprehend its bearing. It is an obvious fact that the Church of England is permeated with a strong infusion of teaching that is virtually and intrinsically Roman. The essence of this teaching is a particular estimate of the Sacraments, and especially of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, which makes it one of the indispensable elements in our approach to Christ, for that without them we cannot have access to Him, and that we cannot properly use them without truly having access to Him. The proof of this position is the authoritative putting forth by responsible persons of such books as this *Manual*. And again we profess our honest conviction that all who expose their unfaithful teaching and its pernicious tendency, as Mr. Elliott has done, deserve well of those who believe and know the truth.



#### ART. VII.—THE NEW MISSIONS IN AFRICA.

A GLANCE at the maps of Africa current twenty years ago affords a startling revelation of the progress of modern geographical knowledge. At first sight, it seems scarcely credible that they can really belong to so recent a date. That in the days of the Indian Mutiny, of Lord Palmerston's Premiership, of Napoleon III.'s Italian campaign—the period covered by the last-published volume of the Prince Consort's Life—the now familiar names of the great Central African lakes were absolutely unknown in England, is hard to believe. But so it was. Tanganyika was discovered by Burton and Speke in 1858. The Victoria Nyanza was seen by Speke in the same year, but its vast size not guessed at till 1862. Livingstone discovered Nyassa in 1859, and Sir S. Baker the Albert Nyanza in 1864. And in each case a year later must be taken as the time when the discovery was known in this country. Since then we have had Livingstone's later journeys, and those of Cameron and Stanley, Schweinfurth, Nachtigal, Pinto, and others; and now a good map of Africa does not differ very much in general appearance from a map of Europe, if allowance be made for two or three still remaining blanks, and for the absence of railways and of defined territorial divisions.

It is sometimes said, and very truly said, that war is a great teacher of geography. The Crimea, Virginia, Lorraine, Bulgaria, Afghanistan, Zululand, are conspicuous instances. But our knowledge of Central Africa is due not to war, but, primarily,