

LIBERTY AND LOYALTY

TWIN WATCHWORDS OF
THE CATHOLIC POSITION

A CHARGE
BY

THE RT. REV. A. C. A. Hall, D.D.
BISHOP OF VERMONT

DELIVERED AT THE ANNUAL CONVENTION
OF THE DIOCESE 1916

WITH AN APPENDED NOTE ON THE
CANON OF RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES.

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.
FOURTH AVENUE & 30 STREET, NEW YORK
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON
BOMBAY, CALCUTTA, AND MADRAS
1916

CONTENTS

PREFATORY NOTE

A CHARGE

LIBERTY AND LOYALTY, TWIN WATCHWORDS OF THE CATHOLIC POSITION

I. WITH REGARD TO DOCTRINE

II. AND WORSHIP

1. Prayers for the Departed
2. The Invocation of Saints
3. Reservation of the Sacrament
4. Unction of the sick

III. AND DISCIPLINE

1. Confession
2. The Marriage Law
3. Restriction of the Ministry to persons episcopally ordained
4. Fasting Communion
5. Fast-days

NOTE ON QUOTATIONS FROM ANGLICAN DIVINES CONCERNING EUCHARISTIC ADORATION

APPENDED NOTE ON THE CANON OF RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE

CANON OF THE GENERAL CONVENTION

PREFATORY NOTE

To avoid cumbering these pages with references I have ventured under each topic here treated to name some previous publication of my own where authorities are cited, and for the same purpose I have; generally mentioned one or two other easily procurable books.

Doctrine. Facts affirmed by the Creed. A. C. A. H. (Gorham.)

The New Theology and the Old Religion. C. Gore. (Murray.)

Prayers for the Departed. The Christian doctrine of Prayer. A. C. A. H. (Longmans.) Pp. 61-66.

Purgatory, the State of the Faithful Departed, Invocation of Saints. A. J. Mason. (Longmans.) Lect. I and II.

The Invocation of Saints. As above, A. C. A. H. Pp. 86-92, and Mason, lect. III.

The Holy Catholic Church; the Communion of Saints. H.B. Swete. (Macmillans.) Pp. 210-244.

Confession. Preaching and Pastoral Care. A. C. A. H. (Longmans.) Pp. 82 102.

Unction. As above, A. C. A. H. Pp. 77-81.

The Anointing of the Sick and the Numbering of the Sacraments. F. W. Puller. (S.P.C.K.)

Marriage Law. Ecclesiastical Discipline. A. C. A. H. (Longmans.) Pp. 21-20.

The Confirmation rubric. As above. Pp. 27-32.

The Ministry. As above. Pp. 31 34, and The Apostolic Ministry. A. C. A. H. (Longmans.) Orders and Unity. C. Core. (Murray.)

Reservation of the Sacrament. The Eucharist. A. C. A. H. (Longmans.) Pp. 19-22, and Appendix K. The Christian doctrine of Prayer. A. C. A. H. (Longmans.) Pp. 84, 85. The Body of Christ, C. Gore (Murray). 130-142, 298-300.

Fasting Communion. The Eucharist. A. C. A. H. (Longmans.) App. I.

LIBERTY AND LOYALTY

A CHARGE

I HAVE not delivered a formal Charge since 1910. My illness and consequent disability have interfered with the discharge of this duty,¹ and the preoccupation of the diocese in deciding on the provision of additional episcopal ministration. Now that this, please God, is well settled, and as I can trust to the Coadjutor the greater part of the annual report concerning the condition of the diocese, I desire to address to the clergy and laity some thoughts that are much in my mind about more general ecclesiastical subjects. And I would take; as a title for my discourse, "Liberty and Loyalty, twin watchwords of the Catholic position," applying this motto to Faith and Worship and Discipline.

We clergymen have all, each of us, solemnly engaged to conform to the Doctrine, Discipline and Worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.² Our share in the Catholic priesthood, and our power to execute its functions, were given us on the condition of this promise. Yet I cannot help fearing that in one direction or another this declaration has come to mean but little, or less than it ought, to many. I quite recognize that I may very likely be regarded as old-fashioned, or perhaps reactionary; but I wish to place on record (it may be the last opportunity) my convictions and counsels on several points.

I. First with regard to *Doctrine*. The Church is bound not to impose as necessary to salvation, or as terms of communion, anything in belief or practice which may not be proved from Holy Scripture. As a part of the larger whole, a national Church is bound to teach what the Catholic Church has determined, especially concerning the Trinity and the Incarnation, to be the Faith handed down from the beginning and witnessed to by Apostolic writings. The individual clergyman is clearly bound by his continued recitation of the Creed to conform his thought and teaching to those declarations which he solemnly makes at the head of the people.

A distinction must be made between liberty of *thought*, of personal opinion, and liberty to teach in the Church's name, to impose on others as by authority this is *doctrine*—what the Church has not imposed or sanctioned, though it may not have been contradicted.

Let it be clearly understood that the Catholic Creeds, and not the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, are our primary standard of belief. The Thirty-nine Articles were framed in an age of controversy and bear obvious traces of the time and circumstances of their origin. They were largely intended as a compromise document, to shut out extreme statements on either side, leaving open what was then thought a reasonable and fairly wide range of opinion within certain limits. Their statements must be read with this comprehensive purpose in mind. The Articles with other formularies of the Church, and certainly not least the appointed prayers, may fairly be appealed to as determining the sense in which the larger expressions of the Creed were intended to be understood;

¹ Various publications circulated among the clergy have, I trust, in some measure made up for this omission.

² Art. VIII of the Constitution.

together with these they constitute “the Doctrine” of the Church, but separately and one by one their statements do not demand our implicit allegiance.

A second remark of a similar kind I would make. The Creeds state for our acceptance and profession Facts or Truths, not theories or explanations of those truths. No explanation of the Trinity (among the many that have been offered) is imposed upon us; nor an explanation of the exact mode in which the Divine and Human Natures are joined together in the One Person of our Lord Jesus Christ. Still less is any particular theory of the Atonement or of the Inspiration of the Scriptures binding on us, nor an explanation of eternal loss, which is represented in Scripture under various figurative expressions. We are bound to teach authoritatively the Faith; we may offer our own opinions in explanation and illustration of the Faith. We must not explain away the facts or truths which we profess to believe. An explanation of the statement that our Lord was conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary as if it might be understood to mean that He was born according to the ordinary laws of nature, only under circumstances of unusual purity, is not an explanation but a denial of the fact. So with a treatment of the statement that our Lord rose again on the third day from the dead, as if it meant that after the death of the body He continued to exist in a spiritual sphere. Playing tricks with plain words can never be a commendable exercise. It, may easily lead to disastrous moral consequences. Let us face questions honestly. If the facts are not as the Creed states them, let the facts be denied and the Creed repudiated. That is an intelligible position, however greatly to be regretted, to be respected when deliberately and with a due sense of responsibility assumed; but to repeat words as a solemn profession of belief, and then interpret them as meaning something quite different from what they say. and from what they are understood to mean by almost all who hear them—this, I venture to say, is neither intelligible nor honorable.

The tendency of Puritanism was to a minute exactitude in all manner of beliefs, as in rules of Christian conduct. The Catholic position is far wider and more liberal. It allows freedom of opinion within the limits of the declaration of facts in the Creeds. The very definitions in the Creeds, it has been pointed out, are largely in the interest of liberty, warning off intruders who would by their negations narrow the wide field of Christian truth. For instance, when men have denied or obscured either the Divine or the Human element in the Incarnation, the Creeds, like the Scriptures, have insisted plainly on both truths.

Liberty and Loyalty are twin watchwords of the Catholic position with regard to Faith and Doctrine. We must guard and cherish both, and be ready of course to apply them all round, not maintaining liberty in some points, while demanding loyalty as to others of the same character.

II. As with Faith, so with *Worship*. The Prayer Book is the law for our public services. It is not a Directory giving suggestions or outlines for worship, but it prescribes the services to be used day by day and in the administration of the Sacraments and the lesser ordinances of the Church.³ I am in favor of considerably larger liberty than our

³ The following appeared in the *Churchman* during last winter under the head of “The Problem of the Afternoon Service.”

“Bearing in mind these two points—that an afternoon service should be truly and religiously musical and yet different from the morning services, I obtained the rector’s permission to devise and use

rubrics now afford, and would contend for this. For instance, we need in missionary work services more suitable to untrained people than the regular Morning and Evening Prayer. We should be given a larger freedom to use such elastic devotions than is allowed by the repressive rule of the existing order—only when Morning and Evening Prayer have been said, or are to be said, that day in the particular church. But while restrictions are in force, in defence of which a good deal may be urged from the unpreparedness of many of our clergy and bishops for the exercise of a wider discretion, I am sure that we ought loyally to observe the restrictions. Thus, far hotter than through wanton individualism, are we in the way of gaining a general acceptance; of improvements. There is a good deal more flexibility provided for in the use of the Prayer Book than many avail themselves of or seem to recognize. Restraints, it should be remembered, put upon the liberty of the Minister guard the liberty of the congregation, freeing them from the narrowness of his individual limitations.

We are not, I may remind you, in the same position with our brethren in England. With the entangling and obstructing consequences of State Establishment, they have to do the best they can with rubrics, and Acts of Uniformity that are three hundred years old. For us the action of two successive General Conventions can at any time revise the Prayer Book, if the body of Church people so desire. So that our services, rubrics and canons (whether good or bad) are the expression of the mind of the actual living Church, of which we are members, and to which we owe, and the clergy have promised, allegiance. There is a further difference between our position and that of English churchmen. The English Bishops have retained a certain freedom in authorizing special services or deviations from the norm. This is fortunate in view of the difficulty of legislation; and it is in accordance with the general practice of the Church. But, whether wisely or unwisely, the Bishops of the American Church have surrendered a great deal of liberty that might fairly come under their *jus liturgicum*, and have allowed these powers to be narrowly restricted by canon and by rubric. I am ready to go to the limit of the authority given me to authorize variations; but I cannot go beyond that limit, nor sanction others taking the law into their own hands.

There are three or four particular points under the head of Worship about which I feel that some words should be said with respect to Liberty and Loyalty.

1. *Prayers for the Departed*. It is easy to understand how prayer for the departed came to be put into the background, by way of a reaction from a gross and material conception of Purgatory, and from a mechanical system of prayers and masses for deliverance therefrom, to which there was at least a danger of men's trusting rather than to their own strictness of living and true repentance while in this world. It was a natural but unhappy reaction. The time has certainly come when we should revert to catholic and primitive practice in this matter. We have a right to claim that our services should contain more than the very general and guarded prayers which yet cover the departed—that we

my own service at the parish church (Church of the Incarnation, New York). Devotion was to be the keynote. I eliminate the Confession and Absolution, and use for prayers, collects from our endless store. Instead of canticles, Russian anthems of like length and meaning are used after the single psalm and after each lesson, as well as for the offertory.'

The writer was apparently entirely unconscious that he and the rector were guilty of simple—or complex—lawlessness. One might ask if the Blessed Virgin's Song is never repeated on Sunday in the Church of the Incarnation. Its omission can hardly be necessary to make the afternoon different, from the morning service.

and all Christ's whole Church may obtain the remission of our sins and all other benefits of His Passion; that with the departed we may have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul. The Church must express and guide the natural instincts of the human heart, in asking for the departed mercy and rest, cleansing and illumination, preparation for perfect service in perfected life. Any revision of the Prayer Book which did not restore *explicit* petitions for the departed I for one should consider wholly inadequate to our needs and unworthy of the opportunity. But until such provision is made I cannot think it within the power of any Priest or Bishop to use in the public service collects or prayers that are not given in the Prayer Book, or to observe with its special office All Souls' Day, which, whether happily or unhappily, has been dropped from our kalendar and service-book.

2. *The Invocation of Saints.* Concerning the Invocation of Saints, which some would revive or introduce among us, I have at different times by spoken and by printed word expressed grave doubts and uttered warnings. Such a practice is not in the least involved in a belief in and realization of the Communion of Saints. We pray *for* and *with* the departed, but not *to* them. With them, our elder brothers and sisters in Christ, we approach our common Father. Whatever defence and explanation may be made of direct requests to the Saints for their prayers, such petitions offered on our knee's, in public worship, and along with prayers to God and our Lord Jesus Christ, undoubtedly tend to a confusion in the minds of the mass of people between prayers to the Supreme Being ever present with us, and addresses to creatures, however exalted, with whom we have no ascertained or guaranteed method of communication. The simple "pray for us" easily slips into a petition for direct help from the Saint. The warnings of history and experience are not to be disregarded in such a matter. Accordingly after the first English Litany all invocations have been dropped from our Anglican service-books, and no clergyman has the right to introduce such an element of devotion into the public prayers of the Church, even though these may be less formal than those of the Prayer Book, as in Children's Services, Guild offices and the like. We may well desire and plead for a more explicit recognition of our fellowship with the Saints at least, including a request of God to give us a share in their prayers. This would be in accordance with the practice of the earliest liturgies that have been preserved to us, wherein the prayers of all are asked and offered on behalf of all, the Church on earth, while begging of God a share in the prayers of those at rest, praying also for them, even the highest, for what they may still need, and for the hastening of their perfection.

3. *Reservation of the Sacrament.* In a charge on the Eucharist delivered in 1907 I treated with some fulness the question of the Reservation of the Sacrament. Since that charge is now out of print, I may repeat something of what was then said, in order to make my present statement complete. Reservation of the consecrated elements for the purpose of their distribution to the sick, or to persons otherwise unavoidably prevented from attending the public service, has the sanction of the earliest ages. Those to whom the consecrated elements were sent were not only spiritually united with their brethren by partaking of the same spiritual food; they had a pledge of this fellowship by partaking of the sacramental elements consecrated at the public service. Their portion was sent them as members of the Family from the Holy Table. To emphasize this idea, as well as for considerations of convenience, it would in my judgment be very desirable to revive among ourselves, with proper safeguards, the authoritative permission to reserve the

Sacrament for the Communion of the Sick, whether with the restrictions of the English Prayer Book of 1549—only on days when there was a public Communion in the church, or, to meet the needs of large populations and of sudden calls, as a more general custom. But however desirable a restoration of reservation for the sick may be, it will be impossible to gain the Church's permission for it, while reservation for purposes of adoration is practised and widely advocated. Such a practice, however widespread in the Western Church (it is unknown among Easterns), I cannot but regard as an unwarranted and therefore illegitimate use of the Sacrament, going beyond the purpose of its institution, which was for the pleading of our Lord's sacrifice and the, spiritual nourishment of His people. Only for this is the Lord's sacramental presence promised: only in the use of the Sacrament for its ordained purpose have we the guarantee of His blessing.

Whatever opinion any may hold as to the use of the reserved Sacrament "as a centre of prayer," we are tied to the administration of the Sacraments as prescribed in the Prayer Book; and here there is a prescribed order for administration to the sick, from which we have no authority to deviate; and further (whether, as we may judge, wisely or unwisely) in the concluding rubric; of that office the Church takes the responsibility of a person being unable under certain conditions to receive sacramentally, and of his being obliged to be content with a spiritual Communion.⁴

In the Pastoral Letter of the House of Bishops at the General Convention of 1895 it was said "The practice of reserving the Sacrament is not sanctioned by the law of this Church, though the Ordinary may, in cases of extreme necessity, authorize the reserved Sacrament to be carried to the sick." These "cases of extreme necessity" were certainly intended by the great body of Bishops who accepted the Letter to refer primarily to such emergencies as the Yellow Fever pestilence at Memphis in 1878, and the earlier visitations of Cholera in Leeds and in London, on each of which occasions Reservation of the Sacrament for the sick and dying was allowed by the diocesan. "We are deeply

⁴ A responsible magazine gives the following as a serious and conclusive argument:

"The only answer which a priest, loyal to the Church's tradition, could give to the claim [that Reservation should be subject to the Bishop's authorization] is that which was given a few years since by a distinguished priest in the East, to his Bishop's objection to his reserving. He called the Bishop's attention to the fact, that, when he was instituted as rector, he was declared in the language of the Prayer Book Office of Institution to be 'possessed of all power to perform every act of sacerdotal function among the people' of the parish, and he respectfully protested that he alone as rector had the right to decide what the details of these functions should from time to time be." (*Holy Cross Magazine*, Nov. 1915, p. 88.) I may say that I have carefully considered the arguments for the Lawfulness of Reservation urged in two tracts respectively by the Rt. Rev. W. W. Webb and the Rev. C. M. Hall, without being shaken as to the soundness of the position adopted in my former Charge (1907) and here. I am entirely unable to agree with the contention of both writers stated by the former (p. 7;— "The only logical position therefore is that our present Book gives us the privilege of celebrating in a private house if it is thought best, but does not overrule what has always been the custom and what will only supply the required needs, the Reserved Sacrament for the sick." Mr. Hall goes further and entitles his tract "Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament the Right and Duty of Every Parish Priest."

Little stress is laid by me on the declaration of Article XXVIII, or on the rubric directing that any of the consecrated Bread and Wine which may remain at the close of the service shall be reverently consumed, and not carried out of the Church for any common use; though I cannot but doubt if either of these formularies would have been worded as they are if their authors had contemplated Reservation as an allowed custom. The express, and as it, seems to me exclusive, provision of another mode of administering to the sick is in my mind the binding consideration, until this be modified by proper authority.

pained, the Bishops go on to say in their Pastoral, “to know that any among us adopt a use of the reserved elements, such as the Article condemns as ‘not ordained by Christ’ . . . Most earnestly do we appeal to the clergy to consider the wrong of such disobedience alike to the letter and the spirit of our ecclesiastical law.”⁵ This was in 1895. In 1907 at the General Convention at Richmond the question of the continuous Reservation of the Sacrament was raised in the House of Bishops, and it was proposed that “the House should declare that in its judgment the reservation of the Sacrament of our Lord’s Body and Blood for purposes of worship, the Exposition or Benediction of the Holy Sacrament, and the carrying the Sacrament in ceremonial procession are wholly unlawful, as altogether unprovided for in our formularies, and moreover without the authority of our Lord’s institution of the Sacrament.” The Committee to whom the resolution was referred reported that “in its judgment no new declaration or action on the part of the House is necessary, because the statement of the Bishops, in the Pastoral Letter of 1895, clearly states and sufficiently guards the matter by declaring that the reservation of the Sacrament for purposes of worship is unwarranted by our Lord’s institution of the Sacrament and unprovided for in our formularies.” This report was signed (mark the names) by Wm. Croswell Doane, Henry C. Potter, C. C. Grafton, Wm. A. Leonard, Arthur C. A. Hall, W. N. McVickar, C. P. Anderson. No one, Bishop, Priest, or Layman, whatever may be his personal opinion or practice in the matter, can in the face of these declarations contend that the American Church sanctions any reservation of the Sacrament for purposes of worship or as a centre of devotion.⁶

It may be urged that the practice is widespread, and increasingly so, and that in some dioceses it has the explicit sanction of the Bishop, in others his tacit consent or connivance, at least in so far as he does not formally prohibit it. This leads to my very earnest protest against a policy of drift such as seems to be deliberately adopted in some dioceses, by which a Bishop abdicates his responsible position of a representative ruler in the Church, hound to uphold, by the exercise of discipline if other means fail, its standards of faith and life and worship—whatever may be the plain and open departures therefrom on any side. I think I appreciate the motives which restrain Bishops (whom I truly respect and love) from anything that may be called coercive action; I doubt if they appreciate the difficulties in which their policy may involve their own successors in the future and their brother bishops in neighboring dioceses at the present time. Why (we are asked) should not you allow such practices as are at least tolerated in other, perhaps larger and more important, dioceses? My reply—with reference to this particular matter and to others—is plain from what I have here stated. Apart from personal opinions for or against, I cannot divest myself of the responsibility which belongs to the position I unworthily hold, nor acquiesce in what in me at any rate would be a cowardly surrender of the authority entrusted to me. It is this feeling which constrains me now to make this declaration of convictions, though I know that some of my words will be displeasing and painful to many. We have not irregularities in the way of excess (so to speak) in this diocese; our faults are more commonly in the way of defect, in lack of devotion, of penitence, of reverence for the sacraments, of realization of our membership in the Holy Catholic Church, the Communion of Saints. Advance in all this I earnestly desire and pray for and have done what I could to further; the advance, I am sure, is retarded, and

⁵ Journal of the General Convention, 1895, p. 387.

⁶ Journal of 1907, pp. 40, 100.

will be, by exaggeration and unwarranted developments. I appeal to the clergy within the diocese and beyond its limits, and to our chief pastors, to remember our obligations, positive and negative, and to refrain from the indulgence of individual preferences for which we have not the warrant of the Church in whose name we minister.⁷ A Church that exercises no discipline will win no respect, and is not likely to stir enthusiasm.

4. *Unction of the Sick*. I must take the same sort of line with regard to Unction of the Sick, though this as a private ministration may be regarded as standing on a slightly different ground. But the more highly any regard this as a Sacrament of the Church, the more surely ought they to feel that its use cannot be properly revived or regulated by individual Priests or Bishops, but that the responsibility for its omission from the rites connected with the ministering to the sick must be left with the Church.

Reunion with other portions of Christendom will not be furthered by individual imitations of their methods and practices in disregard—in one direction or another—of our own corporate standards. Such conduct is more likely to provoke contempt. At the same time it should be distinctly understood that as a body we do not condemn in others—certainly not as barriers to intercommunion—all that we do not approve or encourage among ourselves. Reunion is to be established on the basis of the Holy Scriptures, the Catholic Creeds, and Primitive Practice. What does not find sanction in these sources of authority is not to be imposed on any. Variations in matters of opinion and custom, of course, there will be. The influence; of such varieties among those in communion one with another will be helpful in the way both of restraint and of enlargement. But (let me repeat it once more) it is by corporate standards, fairly explained and loyally observed, that religious bodies are and should be judged, and not by the vagaries of individuals who are practically a law unto themselves. Liberty and Loyalty are the twin watchwords of the Catholic position with reference to Worship as to Faith.

III. *Discipline*. Under the head of Discipline a few words may be said with regard to Liberty and Loyalty on several points.

1. However we may regret the omission from our Prayer Book of the more plain directions and teaching of the English book on the subject of Confession and Absolution, our priests are certainly warranted by the Exhortation to be read in giving warning for the Holy Communion to invite any who cannot quiet their own consciences to open their grief before God's Minister. Let this exhortation, the whole of it, be read at least before the great festivals; let it be distinctly understood that the priest is ready to receive all who come to him for personal help, whether in the way of guidance, instruction or confession. Let the help and relief to troubled consciences of honest and penitent confession be simply and earnestly set forth, with the comfort and benefit of an absolution pronounced over an individual penitent after hearing his self-accusation, by one who has received authority to act in our Lord's name. Not to do all this, is to fail in our pastoral duty, to come short of our responsibility as Priests of the historic Church. On the other hand to seek to *require* confession as a preparation for Confirmation or Communion, or to impose a rule of regular confession on our people, is to go beyond our warrant. The enforced discipline of the Church in the case of offenders, and the provision for their deprivation

⁷ See Note at the end on Quotations from Anglican divines.

of and restoration to Communion, has varied at different times and in different countries. Such regulation, as distinct from pastoral care, belongs not to the parish priest but to higher ecclesiastical authority. In an age of laxity we may well pray for greater firmness and strictness on the part of the Church in the exercise of the power of the keys, and meanwhile be content to use our best endeavors to minister to the souls who voluntarily seek our help.

2. The Marriage law (so far as the Church's sanction and recognition of a marriage is concerned) is preeminently a matter of Ecclesiastical Discipline, where the individual clergyman is bound to observe and enforce the Church's rules, whatever his personal opinion concerning this or that point may be. I am greatly in hope that our canon on this subject may be made more clear and unmistakable in its requirements, and more strictly in accordance with the teaching of Holy Scripture. The Bishop is ready to bear the responsibility as to these questions which is laid upon him; it is a protection to the individual clergyman that final decisions do not rest with him.

3. The restriction of the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments to those who have received episcopal ordination may be regarded as coming under the head of Discipline rather than of Doctrine. We are not called upon to profess our belief in the Apostolic Succession as a matter of faith; various opinions concerning detailed questions on the subject may be legitimately entertained. But the Historic Church in all ages, and ours as a part thereof, has ruled that none but those who have received the ministerial commission in orderly transmission from our Lord and His Apostles should be accounted lawful Bishops, Priests, or Deacons, or allowed to exercise in her name and for her people—the ministrations belonging to these orders. There is no need, nor would it be wise, to pronounce judgment as to the efficacy of the ministry of others; it is enough to secure a regular and valid ministry for ourselves, and so to witness to what we believe to be the design of our Lord. This position explains why we cannot with loyalty to the Church's teaching and practice join in union services or in the exchange of pulpits, proceedings which seem at any rate, and are understood by people at large, to recognize an equality of ministerial authority in those, so acting. Nor, save in extraordinary circumstances, can we admit to Holy Communion persons who have not been Confirmed, whose Baptism and initiation into the Body of Christ has not been completed by the Laying on of hands.

4. Fasting Communion is a reverent custom having the sanction of the Church's practice for ages, and the recommendation of divines of recognized authority in our communion. We may urge its observance wherever practicable, and should make provision for this; but we have no right to impose it as a law, nor so to press the custom as to interfere with health or with regularity of Communion; nor must we press it to the practical putting asunder of the two great features of the Eucharist, the shewing our Lord's death, and the feasting on His Body and Blood. Some inconvenience and discomfort we might gladly bear, and perhaps less frequent actual reception, for the sake of observing the custom. But I am convinced that the *origin* of the rule was to guard against the irreverence and unseemliness that might accompany Holy Communion after a full meal, and especially in days when manners were coarser than now. Ancient canons which are not practically enforced cannot be regarded as of binding obligation. The frequent reenactment of canons in early times shews this.

5. We are not bound to minute rules concerning the amount or kind of food to be eaten on Fast and Abstinence Days; we should naturally, when practicable, observe

traditional customs in this respect; we are not free to disregard such days, or to treat Friday as an equally appropriate day with Thursday or Saturday for an entertainment.

So one might go on with reference to other questions of ecclesiastical life and rule, emphasizing both liberty and loyalty. What I am chiefly anxious to urge are those two points: First, that *our* liberty must be checked or balanced by the consideration of *others'* liberty; they have a light not to have doubtful matters pressed on them; and second, that we must recognize the authority of the present Church; Catholicism certainly includes that; while the present and national Church must not ignore its relation to the wider society, the whole body of the Catholic Church.

Let us thankfully and dutifully use to the full the provisions we have for devotion, instruction, and guidance; in Christian life; then we shall be in a strong position morally to exert our influence for further improvements brought about by due legislation. I repeat my motto: Liberty and Loyalty are twin watchwords of the Catholic position.

QUOTATIONS FROM ANGLICAN DIVINES ON EUCHARISTIC ADORATION

Persons should be put on their guard against fallacious quotations which do not really sanction the position in support of which they are cited. One need not impugn the honesty of those who give such references, though it must be feared the alternative explanation can only be ignorance or carelessness, which in a teacher is almost equally culpable with dishonesty. In *effect* it amounts to the same, though guilty *intention* is absent. A little paper has been widely circulated entitled “Does the Church teach Eucharistic Adoration? A Reply by Ten Anglican Fathers,” which is a conspicuous illustration of fallacious quotation. Citations in fragmentary form are given from Anglican authorities from Ridley to Keble and Pusey, defending and upholding (a) the worship of our Lord at, in connexion with, the Eucharist, as if this were necessarily identical with (b) the worship of our Lord in the Sacrament, on the altar, and further with the inference at least that this applies to (c) the worship of the Sacrament reserved in the tabernacle or exposed in a monstrance as enshrining our Lord’s presence as a centre of prayer. But (c) does not follow from (a), especially when a distinction is made by the writer quoted between (a) and (b). The distinction drawn *may* be mistaken, but it is not fair to quote what is said about (a) as carrying with it (b) and (c), which is what uninstructed readers of the little paper might naturally, and probably are intended to, infer. Let some of the citations be examined.

1. There is something of audacity, considering his well-known position, in referring to Bp. Ridley as teaching Eucharistic Adoration in the sense in which those words are commonly understood. The reference shews an unfamiliarity with the Works of Ridley, for “Proceedings at Bath, etc., p. 94” is apparently a second-hand reference to a Report of the trial of Archdeacon Denison, in whose defence these words of Ridley were quoted. “We adore and worship Christ in the Eucharist” are the words quoted; but Ridley’s explanation is not given: “I also worship Christ in the Sacrament, but not because He is included in the sacrament; like as I worship Christ also in the Scriptures, not because He is really included in them.” (Works of Bp. Ridley in Parker Society edition, p. 235; comp. also pp. 11, 12, 251.) Ridley’s position is not defended, but he cannot be fairly cited as teaching Eucharistic Adoration.

2. Bp. Cosin is quoted as saying (Anglo-Catholic Library, V., p. 345): “The Body and Blood of Christ are sacramentally and really (not feignedly) present when the blessed Bread and Wine are taken by the faithful communicant. Whosoever so receives them, at the time when he receiveth them, rightly doth he adore and reverence; his Saviour there together with the sacramental Bread and Cup. . . . The Adoration is then and there given to Christ Himself.” While the omission of words after “Cup” is noted, no hint is given that after the words “faithful communicant” Cosin wrote “And true is it also, that they are not present, but only when the hallowed elements are; so taken, as in another work I have more at large declared (*History of Transubstantiation*, IV., 5).” Following the last sentence quoted Cosin added: “Neither is nor ought to be directed to any external sensible object such as are the blessed elements.”

3. The context of Bp. Beveridge’s words quoted shews the sense in which they are to be understood: “Hence it is that our Church requires us to receive the holy sacrament

kneeling, not out of any respect to the creatures of bread and wine, but to put us in mind that Almighty God, our Creator and Redeemer, the only object of all religious worship, is there specially present, offering His own body and blood to us, that so we may act our faith in Him, and express our sense of His goodness to us, and our unworthiness of it, in the most humble posture that we can.” (Works, vol. I., p. 605.)

4. Keble’s words may have special weight, because he was not merely dealing with the matter incidentally, but he wrote; a treatise on the subject, and that in defence of one (Bp. Forbes of Brechin) whose teaching was attacked. Keble says as quoted, “Adoration is not only permitted but enjoined by the Church of England in her Prayer-Book.” He explains what he means by saying, “The ‘humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ’ (black rubric) cannot mean less than adoration; the right and duty of adoration being based on the recognition of *Christ Himself* (not His grace and help only) being given to the communicant” (*Eucharistic Adoration*, ch. IV., p. 130). On the same page he goes on to point out how wisely and charitably our Anglican Church, while claiming for her children the full right and duty of simple and primitive worship, disavowed on their behalf errors which experience had shewn were likely to be laid to their charge, and provided them also with a ritual rule, which would guard them from seeming to fall either into those errors or the contrary; and so ordered kneeling and kneeling only (not prostration, etc.), which avoids the semblance of that worship which to most men’s fancy had unhappily come to imply belief in Transubstantiation.

These examples may be sufficient as tests of the fairness of the quotations, or of the value of the testimony of the Anglican Fathers to the practice of Eucharistic Adoration as advocated by many in our time, and as it would be understood by readers of the little tract, in visits to our Lord in the tabernacle, and in the use of the Reserved Sacrament as a centre of devotion.

APPENDED NOTE ON THE CANON OF RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES

A conspicuous illustration of the need of both Liberty and Loyalty may be seen in the mailer of Religious Communities. One of the grounds for devout thankfulness as we review the history of our communion during the last half century is the springing; up and development of the Regular Life, as it is called, in Brotherhoods and Sisterhoods. From the time of the Reformation onwards, with notable exceptions like that afforded by Nicholas Ferrar and his companions at Little Gidding, Anglicanism had been sadly wanting in elasticity. The general tendency had been to a very respectable but distinctly monotonous form of Christian life. Special vocations, save to missionary work, were scarcely recognized; enthusiasm was repressed and eccentricity frowned on.

Thank God, we have shaken ourselves free from this condition. Not to speak of movements outside our own borders, the Church Army, various Guilds and Leagues and Societies, to promote different religious purposes and to emphasize different features of the Christian Religion, have given opportunity for the play of enthusiasm and devotion. Sisterhoods and, following somewhat, tardily in their steps, Brotherhoods have gathered together earnest souls not content with the ordinary standards of Christian life and work, but seeking a more entire consecration of themselves to the service of our Lord. We need them—(1) their *work*, their ministrations of various kinds, among the poor and ignorant, the sick and fallen, in educational and reformatory institutions, in missions and in hospitals; work much of which can be undertaken far better, and with greater hope of permanence, by an organized community than by individual laborers however zealous. (2) We need their *example* and *witness* to a greater austerity and unworldliness than is possible for all, a more literal following in our Lord's steps. (3) And we need their *prayers* and continual intercessions, with their prayerful study of spiritual subjects. We need Religious Communities and the specially dedicated life. We must allow considerable freedom to those who embrace it; not only the freedom to consecrate themselves entirely to the service of our Lord by life-vows, for which there is most probable Scriptural warrant, and certainly the authority of Catholic consent; but also freedom to regulate their own domestic life and the purely internal affairs of the community. Outsiders cannot be permitted to interfere in these matters.

But then, just because we value highly the life and work, and appreciate the influence of these communities, the Church is bound to guard the corporate bodies and their individual members, and likewise her own interests, from dangers which experience has shewn to be incidental to such enterprises. History points to dangers, as years go on, not only of laxity, but also of extravagance, arbitrariness, and independence, dangers which need the curbing of external ecclesiastical authority.⁸

It has been contended⁹ that, because in early times the dedicated life, at first of solitaries and later in communities, grew up without ecclesiastical regulation under this or

⁸ See, for instance, the articles on Monasticism and Nuns by Dr. I. Gregory Smith in the Dictionary of Ecclesiastical Antiquities, and on Monasticism in the Encyclopædia Britannica by Dr. E. C. Butler, Abbot of the Benedictine Monastery at Downshire in England.

⁹ As in part by Father Puller in his essay on "The Relation of Religious to their Bishops" printed as an Appendix to Father Hughson's *The Fundamentals of the Religious State* (Longmans, 1915).

that great spiritual leader, it should now be left free from any interference on the part of the authorities of the Church. But the historical argument seems to point in the other direction. As the dedicated life came into prominence, as questions arose concerning the discipline of those who had undertaken its obligations and then failed to observe them; and still more as communities became influential, it was felt that the sanction and the supervision of the Church were needed. This supervision might be exercised by an individual Bishop in his diocese: canonical legislation might be enacted; or in Latin Christendom the Pope claimed jurisdiction over communities. But in one form or another ecclesiastical sanction and supervision were declared to be necessary. It would go without saying that members of a community must be as much subject to the ordinary canonical control of a diocesan (unless specially exempted, through what we should consider an abuse, by Papal decree, and brought under the immediate jurisdiction of the Pope) as other persons, whether clerical or lay. Men and women neither forfeit their ecclesiastical privileges nor are exempted from such obligations by entering a community. But beyond this, while the vocation to a dedicated life, and the promise of obedience to a special rule, are personal matters; yet if transgressions of these voluntarily assumed obligations are to be dealt with by Church censures, it is clear that the Rule must be sanctioned, the authorities recognized, and the taking of vows regulated. It would be scandalous that a person who had broken away from solemn engagements should be freely and at once received to the sacraments and the full privileges of the Church. At the same time if discipline is to be exercised in such cases, the ecclesiastical authority must have cognizance of the whole matter. A community cannot claim at once the entire freedom of a private association, and the recognition and enforcement of its rules by the Church.

As with the institution of the Religious life in the Church, so with its revival in our own communion. Religious communities were formed in England and in this country in the last century with little authoritative recognition, or this was only granted by individual Bishops personally, e. g. Bp. Wilberforce of Oxford and Bp. Horatio Potter of New York. The time came when it was generally felt that this unregulated and unprotected condition could no longer safely be allowed to continue. Larger communities which had been guided by priests of experience and stability deserved more formal recognition; some enterprises which lacked these advantages needed authoritative correction; difficult questions from time to time arose which shewed the need of a closer relation of Religious communities to the episcopate.

This was recognized at the Lambeth Conference of 1897, when a Committee was appointed (on which five American Bishops were named to consider the subject of the Relation of Religious Communities within the Church to the Episcopate. This Committee was continued beyond the sessions of the Conference, being instructed to report to the Archbishop of Canterbury at the end of a year. This was done after considerable correspondence and interviews with representatives of several Orders in England, and the report was presented to the Lambeth Conference of 1908.¹⁰ The Archbishop was requested to transmit a copy to every diocesan Bishop in the Anglican communion, and to ask from the several metropolitans that each Province would send to Lambeth a statement of the judgment formed upon the subject. It was thus that the matter was introduced into our General Convention at Cincinnati in 1910. A canon recognizing

¹⁰ Report of the Lambeth Conference, 1908, p. 193.

Sisterhoods was proposed in the House of Bishops by Bp. Grafton on behalf of a special committee to whom the subject had been referred. This was improved (as Bp. Grafton acknowledged) by the Committee on Canons, and enlarged to include Brotherhoods, and was adopted by the Bishops, but no action was taken by the Deputies. This canon, further improved, was adopted by both Houses at New York in 1913.¹¹

The object of the canon was to give both sanction and regulation. It was made optional: communities were free to come under the canon or not. Considering the length of time in which no action had been taken, and during which communities had been allowed to develop without authoritative guidance, it would be manifestly unfair to impose at once a compulsory regulation. But recognition or sanction, if sought, must be accompanied by a certain amount, of guidance and regulation. If it is to be understood that a community has the sanction of the Church, and is not a purely private institution, the authorities of the Church must have knowledge and supervision of its rule.

These are the points which the canon was intended to guard:

1. That if an institution is to be recognized and protected by the Church, its constitution and rule must be first sanctioned by ecclesiastical authority.
2. That property given for the support of an institution in communion with the Church should be safeguarded from alienation to any other religious body.
3. That the members, whether clerical or lay, of a Religious community should not be exempt from the ordinary discipline of the Bishop.
4. That the special devotions of a community should be sanctioned and regulated.
5. That a Visitor of the community should be appointed, if not the Bishop of the diocese in which the Mother House is situated, some one recognized by him, whose office it will be to see that the Rule is observed and to receive appeals in case of need.

These will generally be recognized as reasonable requirements. Save for a fear that the Rule having once been sanctioned, recognition of the Community might subsequently be withdrawn by a later Bishop, there would probably have been little hesitation as to the acceptance of the terms, or in seeking canonical recognition and sanction. It must be made clear that such a fear is groundless. No community could be expected to subject itself to the varying opinions of successive Bishops. The Bishop is, of course, expected to act officially on behalf of the Church, and not in a merely personal capacity.

A distinction is made between the Bishop of the Diocese where the Mother House is situated, and the Bishop of any diocese in which a branch house of the community may be established. At the Mother House vows are taken, chapters held, officers chosen, the rule if necessary revised. Here is the need for a Visitor. A branch house would simply require the permission of the Bishop of the diocese (on his general approval of the community and its work) for its establishment, and then the licensing of clergy to minister in the chapel.

The Bishop of the diocese, as the representative of the Church in that district, is the natural and proper authority to deal with such matters, both as sanctioning the community and its Rule in the beginning, and afterwards in acting as Visitor to see that the Rule is duly observed, and to receive appeals in accordance with its provisions. A Bishop from elsewhere has no jurisdiction, nor because he happens to be in episcopal orders is he specially fitted to act as Visitor. Rather if this office is delegated to any one

¹¹ Journals of General Convention, 1910, pp. 23, 104, 123, 134; 1913, pp. 110, 148, 159.

by the diocesan, it would seem better, for the sake of avoiding confusion in people's minds, that a, Presbyter of experience and standing should be chosen. If, as is suggested by the Lambeth Report, the Bishops of a Province should make any arrangement for one of their number to act where the diocesan was unwilling to do so, this might be the solution of a difficulty, still preserving the principle of the delegation of authority, while of course the ordinary canonical jurisdiction of the diocesan would be carefully guarded from intrusion.

Freedom would naturally be accorded for multiplied offices beyond our Prayer Book abbreviation of the old Hours of Prayer, and greater variation according to seasons and clays than the Prayer Book affords, and an enlarged kalendar with the commemoration of other besides New Testament Saints. In informal devotions considerable liberty must be allowed to religious sentiment (if any please so to designate it), as well as rules of Confession and other practices conducive to strictness of life. But such freedom would not involve alterations, whether in the way of improvement or otherwise, in the Church's order for the administration of the Sacraments.

In regulating the services of a community chapel not only the members of the community have to be considered, but pupils and other inmates of the House, associates also and friends. Otherwise these may become accustomed to observances (not of a merely trivial character)¹² which would not be allowed in a parish church; they may naturally grow discontented with the ordinary ministrations of the Church, or may wake up to find that the system with which they have become familiarized is without sanction or authority in their own communion. Communities are not exempt from canonical obedience because they are vowed to a special obedience. Liberality and generosity should be shewn by the authorities of the Church, and reasonable freedom accorded: but loyalty is expected and must be required.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE ON THE "RELATION OF RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES WITHIN THE CHURCH TO THE EPISCOPATE"

A. It is essential for a due relation

1. That there should be on the part of the Episcopate a recognition of Religious Communities within the Church of England, and of the Religious Life as expressed in the Rule of such Communities.
2. That there should be on the part of the Communities a distinct recognition of the authority of the Episcopate

B. The Visitor.

1. The Bishop of the Diocese should be *ex officio* Visitor of the Mother-House of any Community established in his Diocese.

The Committee have had before them several proposals for the creation or election of a Visitor in the case of the Bishop of the Diocese being unwilling to accept the office. The Committee recommend that in such cases the Community should elect its own Visitor, subject to the approval of such election by the

¹² The Litany of the Saints and Benediction of the Sacrament have been spoken of in the publications of two communities in our country.

Archbishop or Metropolitan of the Province.

As to the visitation of Branch-Houses provision should be made in the Statutes of the Community to determine the co-relation and co-ordination of the authority of the Visitor of the Mother-House and that of the Bishop of the Diocese in which the Branch-House is situated.

2. The functions of the Visitor are

(1) To insure that the Constitution of the Community as originally established, or subsequently modified by Statute, has received authoritative sanction. Such authoritative sanction should be derived either from an Episcopal Visitor or from the Archbishop or Metropolitan of the Province.

(2) To secure, by personal Visitation either *proprio motu* or on appeal, that the Statutes and Rule of the Community are duly observed. Such appeal should be open to every member of the Community.

3. Apart from visitatorial power, it belongs to the culinary authority of the Bishop of the Diocese to license the Clergy who are to minister in the Chapel of the Mother-House of the Community, and to regulate the due administration of the Sacraments and the Services appointed in the Book of Common Prayer.

In the Branch-Houses the Committee recommend that the ministering Clergy shall be licensed by the Bishop of the Diocese on the nomination of the Visitor, or of the Governing Body, of the Mother House.

C. The Constitution of each Community should contain—

- a. The distinct recognition of the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England as supreme.
- b. Provision for formation of a proper Governing Body.
- c. Provision for rules for imposition of, and release from vows, solemn promises, or engagements with the Community; it being secured that the formal Profession of the members of a Community should be always made before the Bishop of the Diocese, or some deputy appointed by him for that purpose.
- d. Provision for due rules as to additional Offices, books of Devotion, and ornaments and appliances of House and Chapel.
- e. Provision for due rules as to possession and distribution of property.

D. In the opinion of the Committee time should be given to new Communities to deliberate over their Statutes under provisional sanction.

CANON OF THE GENERAL CONVENTION OF 1913.

No. 22 Of Religious Communities.

§ I. A religious community of men or of women desiring the official recognition of the Church shall submit for his approval its Rule and Constitution to the Bishop of the Diocese wherein the Mother-house of the community is situated; and no change in the Rule or Constitution shall be made without his approval.

§ II. In such Constitution there shall be a distinct recognition of the Doctrine, Discipline and Worship of this Church as of supreme authority.

§ III. No religious community shall establish itself in another Diocese without permission of the Bishop of that Diocese.

§ IV. The Community may elect a Chaplain, but if he be a Priest who is not canonically resident in the Diocese he must be licensed by the Bishop. Any Priest ministering in a chapel of a religious community shall be responsible to the Bishop of the Diocese for his ministrations, in the same manner as a parochial Clergyman.

§ V. In the administration of the Sacraments the Book of Common Prayer shall be used without alteration, save as it may be lawfully permitted by lawful authority.

§ VI. It shall be provided in the Constitution of a religious community that real estate and endowments belonging to the community shall be held in trust for the community as a body in communion with this Church.

§ VII. Members of a religious community who are in Holy Orders shall be subject to all canonical regulations concerning the Clergy.

§ VIII. Provision shall be made in the Constitution for the appointment of a Visitor, with the approval of the Bishop of the Diocese in which the Mother-house is situated, if the Bishop is himself unwilling to serve in such capacity. It shall be the duty of the Visitor to see that the Constitution and Rule, as approved, are duly observed, and to receive and hear appeals either from the community or from individual members thereof as to transgressions of the Rule. No full member of a community shall be dismissed therefrom without appeal to the Visitor nor shall any be released from his or her obligations thereto without the Visitor's sanction.