

# THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IS PROTESTANT

Church Association Tract 049

HISTORICAL TESTIMONY  
TO THE  
PROTESTANTISM OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND  
FROM HER  
*ARTICLES, FORMULARIES, CONSTITUTION, HIGH CHURCH AUTHORITIES AND  
CONVOCATION.*

Of all the daring, attempts to falsify history and fact, and to insult common sense, none is more astounding than the effort to advance the growth of Romanizing principles by the baseless assertion industriously propagated, that the Church of England is *not Protestant*. Imbued with principles to which *Protestantism* is a standing reproach, the advocates of this untenable proposition loudly vaunt their *Catholicity*. Their claim is amusing if tested by the sense *they have chosen* to assign to it—a sense unauthorized by the Church of England. For in the use of the word *Catholic* in her formularies she defines her meaning beyond all question of ambiguity : Thus:

“Ye shall pray for Christ’s Holy Catholic Church, that is, *for the whole congregation of Christian people dispersed throughout the world.*”—(Canon 55, 1662.)

Again,

“We are very members incorporate in the mystical body of Thy Son, *which is the blessed Company of all faithful people.*”—(Communion Service.)

This interpretation of the word “*Catholic*” has been promulgated authoritatively and continuously by the Church of England from almost the earliest period of her Reformation (1559) to the present time.

In the Catechism put forth by authority in the reign of Edward VI., with the Articles attached to it, agreed upon in the Convocation of 1552, we have the following explanation:

“*Master.* Well, thou hast now said sufficiently of the Holy Ghost. But this would I hear of thee:—why it immediately followeth that we believe the *Holy Universal Church* and the Communion of Saints?”

“*Scholar.* Therefore this calling together of the faithful is called *universal* (Catholic), because it is bound to no one special place, for God throughout all coasts of the world hath them that worship him; which, though they be far scattered asunder by divers distance of countries and dominions, yet are they members most nearly joined of that same body whereof Christ is the Head; and have one spirit, faith, sacraments, prayers, forgiveness of sins, and heavenly bliss common among them all; and be so knit with the bond of love that they endeavour themselves in nothing more than each to help other, and to build together in Christ.”

Precisely the same exposition is given in DEAN NOWELL’S Catechism, promulgated after careful revision by Convocation, with its sanction in 1572.

“It was by them (the Upper and Lower House) unanimously approved and allowed as their own book and owned doctrine.”—(*Strype, Annals*, I. i. 522.)

This Catechism, DEAN ALDRICH refers to in his Reply to Woodhead’s two Discourses concerning Adoration in the Holy Eucharist, Oxford, 1687, as follows:—

“When the sense of the Church of England was the question, one would have expected to hear what the Church Catechism says? what the Homilies? what NOWELL’S Catechism? Books allowed and published by the Church’s authority and authentic witnesses of Her judgment.”—p.11.

“The Church of England has wisely forborne to use the term of *Real Presence* in all the books that are set forth by her authority. We neither find it recommended in the Liturgy, nor the Articles, nor the Homilies, nor the Church’s nor NOWELL’S Catechisms. For, although it be once in the Liturgy and once in the Articles, it is mentioned in both places as a phrase of the Papists and rejected for their abuse of it.”—p.15.

We quote from NOWELL’S Catechism (Jacobson’s Edition), on the Catholic Church, thus;

“Magister. Quorsum tandem Ecclesiam hanc Catholicam nominas?”

“Auditor. Perinde ac si universalem dicerem. Non est enim hic coetus, conciliumque piorum, certo quopiam uno loco aut tempore adstrictum, sed fidelium qui ab orbe condito omnibus locis atque sæculis vixerunt, victurique sunt, universitatem continet atque complectitur” . . . “ad hanc Rempublicam proprie pertinent quotquot vere timent, honorant et invocant Deum, prorsus applicantes animos ad sancte pieque vivendum, quique fiduciam atque spem omnem in Deo consituentes, vitæ eternæ beatitudinem certe expectant.”

“Nam quum Deus per universas terrarum regiones atque oras ut et per omnes ætates atque sæcula habeat qui se pure casteque venerentur, hi omnes, licet diversis et loginquis temporibus atque locis separati sint atque distracti, ubicunque gentium, ubicunque terrarum fuerint, unius tamen sunt ejusdem corporis cujus caput est Christus, membra inter se quam maxime connexa atque cohærentia:” AND MUCH MORE TO THE SAME EFFECT.

*Master.* To what purpose then dost thou style this Church ‘*Catholic?*’”

*Hearer.* It is just the same as if I were to call it *universal*. For this assembly and council of pious men is not confined to any one special place, nor is it restricted by time, but comprehends and embraces the universal gathering of the faithful who have existed from the foundation of the world, and shall exist in every place and age. To this commonwealth properly belong as many as truly fear, honour, and call upon God in sincerity, earnestly endeavouring to live holily and piously, and who, reposing all their faith and hope in God, confidently await the happiness of eternal life.

“For since God throughout all regions and coasts of the world as well as in all ages and dispensations hath those who worship Him in purity and chastity, all these, though separated and scattered asunder by divers distances of time and place, wherever in the world, of whatever race they may be, yet are they members most nearly joined of that same body whereof Christ is the Head.”

Then to prevent any mistake arising from ambiguity precise definitions are given at the close:

“*Ecclesia Catholica. Latine universa congregatio—universitas piorum hominum—Respublica Christiana, vel Christianorum.*”

*De. Catholic Church.*—“Universal congregation: The whole body of pious men: Christian commonwealth or commonwealth of Christians.”

This, be it remembered, as we have already shewn, had the unanimous approval of Convocation as “their own book and owned doctrine.” Has it ever been disowned?

Of all the documents which authoritatively declare the mind of the Church of England, none more convincingly attest the truth of the position that She is “*Protestant in fact*” than the HOMILIES.<sup>1</sup> They unmercifully deal with the corruptions of Rome, and of Modern Ritualism, and their perusal will amply repay the reader. To quote one reference only on this subject and the one with which it is connected.

In the second part of the Homily for Whitsunday, (p. 495, Edn. Soc. Prom. Chr. Knowledge), we have a definition of the true Church.

“The true Church is an universal congregation or fellowship of God’s faithful and elect people, built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the head corner stone.”

And then the Homily proceeds to show that “the Church of Rome is so far wide from the nature of such a true Church that *nothing can be more;*” giving several characteristic reasons, among them the fact :-

“That Christ commended to his Church a *Sacrament* of his Body and Blood, they (the Romanists) have changed it into a *sacrifice* for the quick and dead.”

With respect to the word “*Protestant*” there is a strange misconception of its meaning, if not intentional misapplication in its use. It is regarded by those who reject it, as contradictory to *Catholic*, which it is not. Though chiefly a negative term, the appellation is not entirely so. Whilst it prominently asserts what a man is *not* in belief, it has a positive side, and a limit of application. Its opposite is not *Catholic*, but *Romanist* or *Papist*.

The historical circumstances of its origin are well known. Like most epithets which arise from political or polemical strife, it was at first a term of reproach. Party names are usually not complimentary. But in spite of this, they become badges of which men are proud, and the word *Protestant*, like *Christian*, proves no exception to the rule. More properly belonging to the Augustan Confession, it rapidly spread to the other Reformed Churches of the West. Differing among themselves in some doctrinal matters and in sacramental views, they were bonded by their opposition to the errors, superstitions, and claims of Rome. They agreed in *two fundamental principles* which Rome anathematizes—these are the characteristics of *Protestantism*:—The sufficiency of *Holy Scripture for Salvation*, and the grand doctrine of *Justification by Faith*.

It is therefore utterly beside both truth and reason to quarrel with the term on the false supposition that it is applicable to Socinians, Arians, Deists, and others. The ground which embraces the Church of England was covered long before the rise of modern sects; and amongst the Churches of the Reformation, the Church of England stands pre-eminent in hoisting the banner of Protestantism. *Protestant* she is, and *must* be, until she erases from her Confession the sixth and eleventh Articles. More than this. She is Protestant *in fact*, and *always has been* since her emancipation from the fetters of Rome. Protestant in her History, in her Constitution, in her Legal definition and Status, in her Doctrines, and in her Ecclesiastical relations.

In her Articles of Faith she not only declares “The Church of Rome has erred,” (Art. XIX.) but protests in strong and explicit terms against specific errors:— Works of Supererogation (Art. XIV.); the Infallibility of General Councils (Art. XXI.); Purgatory (Art. XXII.); Pardons, Worshipping and Adoration, as well of Images as of Saints (Art. XXII.); the use of an unknown tongue in Public Worship (Art. XXIV.); Seven Sacraments (Art. XXV.); Gazing upon, Carrying about, Lifting up, Worshipping and Reserving the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper (Arts. XXV. XXVIII.); Transubstantiation and Masses (Arts. XXVIII. XXXI.); the denial of the cup to the laity (Art. XXX.); and Celibacy of the Clergy (Art. XXXII.) Whilst thus *Protestant* in her Articles of Faith, she was emphatically so in the formularies of her earlier days long before the title was indubitably stamped upon her by the Statute Book.

In the first and second Prayer Books of Edward VI., the Litany contained the following petition:—  
“From all sedition and privy conspiracy, from the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome, and all his detestable enormities, from all false doctrine and heresy, from hardness of heart and contempt of Thy word and commandment, Good Lord, deliver us.”

The Sects which abound in these days had no existence then; the juxta-position therefore of the words “*all false doctrine and heresy,*” and their relation to the preceding, will show to what they refer.

The oath administered to Bishops, Priests and Deacons is the same in the two Prayer Books of Edward and that of Elizabeth, and commences thus:<sup>2</sup>—

"I from henceforth shall utterly *renounce, refute*, relinquish, and forsake the Bishop of Rome, and his authority, power, and jurisdiction, and I shall never consent nor agree that the Bishop of Rome shall practise, exercise, or have any manner of authority, jurisdiction, or power within this realm, or any other the king's dominions, but shall resist the same at all times, to the uttermost of my power," &c. &c.

Until the recent abolition of tests, many graduates may remember taking a similar oath at their matriculation in the University of Oxford.

Various Liturgical services in Elizabeth's reign, *prescribed by authority*, are replete with prayers against Romish error, craft, tyranny, persecution, and oppression, and on behalf of the persecuted Protestants abroad. A list of these services and prayers is given at the close of the volume published by the Parker Society. (Liturg. Services, Q. Elizabeth.) One specimen will suffice. An Order for prayer and thanksgiving was "set forth by authority in 1594 and again in 1598." We cull the following from the Prefatory Admonition to the Reader:—

"Which mischievous devices as they have all flowed from none other fountain than from the city of seven hills, the See of Rome, and the seat of the Beast, not in regard of any desert of ours, but because we have abandoned the cup of spiritual abomination wherewith these have long intoxicated the kings of the earth. So have they been continually projected, carried forward, and managed by idolatrous priests and Jesuits, his creatures, the very locusts, that crawl out of the bottomless pit. Howbeit they have been and are mightily seconded by certain Potentates of the earth, who do nothing else, but serve themselves of that idolatrous Romish *religion* . . . they likewise have been blown up by that brood of *Massing priests*," &c.

Then in one of the prayers thus offered up by the Church of England, we have the petition:—

"Good lord, strike a sense of this thy powerful mercy into our hearts from thence to fetch a sorrowful sighing for our sins—an earnest desire of amendment and most unfeigned thanks to our gracious Preserver. But those priests of Baal, the hellish chaplains of Antichrist, accursed runagates from their God and Prince . . . confound them in thy wrath. But let our gracious Queen still reign and rule in spite of Rome and Rheims (a seminary of English Papists abroad) and Spain and Hell." (*Liturgical Services. Q. Eliz. Parker Society.*)

Let not the reader suppose that these strong expressions are peculiar to a bygone age. He may find them matched by others equally forcible in a Service bound up with our present Prayer Book, —'A Form of Prayer with Thanksgiving to be used yearly upon the Fifth day of November,' to commemorate two great historical events, —"the happy deliverance of King JAMES THE FIRST and the three Estates of England from the most traitorous and bloody-intended massacre by gunpowder. And also for the happy arrival of *King WILLIAM* on this day for the deliverance of our *Church* and nation." In it we find:—

"We yield Thee our unfeigned thanks and praise for the wonderful and mighty deliverance of our Gracious Sovereign, King JAMES THE FIRST, the Queen, the Prince, and all the Royal Family, with the Nobility, *Clergy*, and Commons of England then assembled in Parliament, *by Popish treachery* appointed as sheep to the slaughter in a most barbarous and savage manner, beyond the examples of former ages."

So also:—

"Accept also, most gracious God, of our unfeigned thanks for . . . putting a new song into our mouths by bringing His Majesty, King WILLIAM, upon this day for the deliverance of our *Church* and nation from *Popish tyranny* and arbitrary power."

And once more:—

"O GOD, whose name is excellent in all the earth, . . . who on this day didst miraculously preserve our *Church* and State from the *secret contrivance* and *hellish malice of Popish conspirators*, and on this day didst begin to give us a mighty deliverance from the open tyranny and oppression of the same cruel and blood-thirsty enemies. We bless Thee . . . for this Thy late marvellous loving-kindness to our *Church* and nation in the preservation of our Religion and Liberties."

With such statements before our eyes we are bewildered to think how any one can imagine, much less assert, that our Formularies bear no testimony to the Protestantism of the Church of England.

Such a survey of her Articles and Liturgies will satisfy the most critical that the *Protestantism* of the Church of England is a most undoubted *fact*.

In addition to this there are matters of *historic* interest we can only allude to in passing, such as "*Jewell's Challenge*" and "*Jewel's Apology*," the controversies with Rome which grew out of them, and similar vindications of the doctrines of the Church of England against the corruptions of Rome.<sup>3</sup>

The Constitution of this realm is *Protestant*, and it could not be *Protestant* unless the *National* Church were Protestant also. As all know, the Act of Settlement makes it an indispensable condition that whoever mounts the throne shall be a Protestant. At the Coronation, in one of the grandest cathedral edifices of the country, the Archbishop of Canterbury, representing the Church, exacts an oath from the Sovereign, one of the articles of which is as follows:

"Will you to the utmost of your powers maintain the laws of God, the true principles of the Gospel, and the Protestant Reformed Religion established by law?"

Such is the oath which now for nearly two centuries has in accordance with the terms of the statute been administered to and taken by every King and Queen who has succeeded to the Imperial Crown of this realm at their respective coronations by one of the Archbishops or Bishops of this realm of England.

It is one of the fundamental conditions of the union of the Church and State, and the title of the Establishment *rests* upon it, that the Crown should swear to maintain *not* the Anglican—*not* the Anglo-Catholic—*not* the Catholic—but the *Protestant Reformed Religion established by law*.

Thus the Establishment is by law, and the Constitution—*Protestant*. But,—the Church of England is the Establishment,—we leave the reader to draw the inference! When the union with Scotland was being negotiated, 1705-7, the Presbyterians were naturally anxious lest their cherished religious institutions should be placed in jeopardy by an Episcopalian majority in England. They therefore stipulated—and the great men who conducted that transaction without difficulty conceded—that there should be a solemn and independent guarantee for the security of the Church Establishment in Scotland. This was carried out (5 Anne, cap. 8, Art. 25). But the *High Church party* in their hostility to a settlement which so greatly tended to strengthen the Protestant succession, either took or feigned alarm at the designation of the Presbyterian Church in Scotland as the "*true Protestant Religion*," and demanded that a similar and separate guarantee should be given by the authority of Parliament to the Established Church in England. A Bill for this object, promoted by the *zealous Churchmen* was introduced by the Archbishop (*vide* Lord Stanhope's Queen Anne, p. 275). It stands in the Statute Book, 5 Anne, cap. v. It was incorporated in the Act of the Union, 5 Anne, cap. viii, Art. 25, sect. 7, and is entitled an Act for securing the Church of England by law established. The memorable recital of that re-settlement is as follows:—

"Whereas it is reasonable and necessary that the *true Protestant religion professed* and established in the *Church of England*, and the doctrines, worship, discipline, and government thereof should be effectually and unalterably secured."

Thereupon the Act proceeds to re-enact the Acts of Uniformity of Elizabeth and Charles II, and other Acts for the establishment and preservation of the Church of England, with a special provision with respect to the Coronation Oath.

A century afterwards the union with Ireland was effected. The 5th Article of the Act of Union 39 and 40 George III. cap. 67, declares "that the Churches of England and Ireland, as now by law

established be united in one *Protestant* Episcopal Church.” Later still, in 1829, when the Catholic Emancipation Act was passed, the Church of England (10 George IV. cap. 7,) is spoken of, Sect. 2, as the “*Protestant Religion*,” and the Government as the “*Protestant Government*,” and in Sect. 24, the Church of England is designated as the “*Protestant Episcopal Church*.”—See Sir W. V. Harcourt’s letter to the *Times*, July 27, 1874.<sup>4</sup>

Before we review the ecclesiastical relations of the Church of England, it is important to dwell for a moment upon one fallacy which distinguishes these novel attempts to un-protestantise her. We are told for instance, in reply to the constitutional argument, that “it really amounts to this, that Parliament—a *secular body* has higher pretensions to theological accuracy than the *Divines* who established the Liturgy of the Church of *England*.”<sup>5</sup> If the Church had not been the Church of *England*, but all along a body dissevered from the State, we could allow some force to the reasoning; but to imagine that up to the period at least of 1828, when the TEST and CORPORATION ACTS were repealed (9 Geo. IV. c. 17), there could have been any conflict without a catastrophe between the principles of the *National Church* and those of the *National Legislature* is, from the nature of things, a glaring absurdity. Parliament is in theory but an epitome of the nation, and the reeignized tribunal for eliciting and expressing its judgment. If we dismiss Parliament from our consideration we dismiss the nation, and if we dismiss the nation, what becomes of the *National Church*? The fact is, that the men who try to persuade us that we have not been what we have been, Protestant—and are not what we are, Protestant—pursue a hazy indefinite abstraction which they call “the Church.” Their cloudy conceptions are unknown to the simple teaching which lies before us:—“The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men.” (Art. XIX)—not a small committee of “Divines” or “Clergy.” To suppose that this “congregation of faithful men” at any period of our history could have had two sets of diverging principles animating their ecclesiastical and civil polity respectively, is to suppose an impossibility. Congruity between the Protestant character impressed upon the National Church and the deeply cherished Protestant sentiment of the national heart, seems to be the necessary alternative to disestablishment.

Hence when we pass on to contemplate the present condition of things, we find that this Protestantism of the nation and of the Church is regarded as an almost insuperable obstacle by those whose boasted mission it is to eradicate the-principles of the Reformation. Better testimony we cannot desire than what they voluntarily render. In a volume of “*Essays on the Re-union of Christendom, 1867*,” edited by Dr. Lee, and prefaced by an Essay of Dr Pusey, we learn amongst other things:—

“The first great difficulty that is before us arises from the *Protestantism of England*. Till this is removed, the re-union of our Church as the Church of England with either the Greek or Latin Churches is absolutely hopeless.”—p. 89.

Again,

“A fair vision certainly, but there is this little obstacle to its fulfilment. England is *Protestant to the back-bone*. *Protestantism* is ingrained into her *Constitution*, her *laws*, her *social system*, and her *religious habits*. It has all *but (sic)* invaded the Ritual<sup>6</sup> of her Church (!) *as it certainly has full possession of the minds of the vast majority of her clergy*.” —p. 90.

So also:—

“The fact, however, stands before us, and it is a melancholy fact, that the Church of England is isolated in Christendom.” Note—“By this term (the Church of England) is included, not simply those Colonial Churches in communion with the United Church of England and Ireland, but also the *Protestant Episcopal Communions* in Scotland and America.”—p. 207.

And once more:—

“The objection in fact amounts to this—It is impossible to make England Catholic again. . . . Now we can understand such an objection as this coming from one who disbelieved in Christianity, or who abhorred Catholicism, or from one who *agreed heart and soul with the Protestantism of the Establishment or the still vaguer Protestantism of England at large.*”—p. 259.

The homage thus paid to the cardinal fact of our Protestantism by the Ritualistic leaders amply disposes of the fanciful utterances of some of their followers.

From the Constitutional position and Legal definition of the Church of England we proceed to consider *her Ecclesiastical Relations*.

It would require an epitome of BURNET, STRYPE, and other authors, to unfold the close intercourse which subsisted between the chiefs of the Reformation at home and abroad. The history of the period voluminously attests the influence upon the Church of England of such men as CALVIN, PETER MARTYR, MARTIN BUCER, BULLINGER, GUALTER, and others. That the communion between the Reformed Churches abroad and at home, was not drawn closer was due to our insular position, and to the difficulty of communication, not to any want of will or effort.

HEYLIN, the High Church historian of the Reformation, ventures to assert that Cranmer refused the proffered assistance of Calvin (*Hist. Ref.* p. 65). He gives no documentary proof, and it is a thing *incosistent* with what we know of their relations. But HEYLIN does not tell us a fact we learn from other sources: “1560. In this year John Calvin wrote to Archbishop Parker, importing how he rejoiced in the happiness of England, and that God had raised up so gracious a Queen to be instrumental in propogating the true faith of Jesus Christ by restoring the Gospel, and expelling Idolatry together with the Bishop of Rome’s usurped power, and then made a serious motion of *uniting Protestants together*. He entreated the Archbishop to prevail with Her Majesty to summon a general assembly of all *the Protestant clergy wherever dispersed*, and that a set form and method of Public service and Government of the Church might be established not only within her dominions, but also among all the Reformed and Evangelick Churches abroad.”

This was a noble offer, and the Archbishop acquainted the Queen’s Council with it. They took it into consideration and desired His Grace to thank Calvin, and to let him know they liked his proposals which were fair and desirable; but that the Church of England would retain Episcopacy. This was a great work, and weighed on the Archbishop to set on foot, when news arrived that Calvin was dead.

“Perusing some papers of Archbishop Parker, we find that John Calvin and others of the Protestant Churches of Germany and elsewhere would have had Episcopacy if permitted.”

“Calvin, Bullinger, and other learned men had written to Edward VI. in 1549, offering to make him their Defender, and to have Bishops in their Churches for better unity and concord. This letter, *two Bishops, Gardiner and Bonner, intercepted, whereby Calvin’s overture* perished. And he received an answer *as if it had been* from the Reformed Divines of those times, wherein they checked him and slighted his *proposals.*”—*Strype’s Life of Parker*, fol. 69, 70.

In those troublous times to assemble such a Protestant Conference was no easy matter.<sup>7</sup> Such a Conference however assembled at Frankfort in 1577.

“There was a great and long desired design among all Protestants now in hand in order to unite them in a profession of the same faith and doctrine. In order to which a council was held this year (1577) at Frankfort, for the drawing up a common confession of all Reformed Churches. To this Council, to assist at it the *Queen sent her ambassador*, showing her concurrence in this useful affair. The province of drawing up the Confession was committed to ZACHARIAS URSINUS, the learned Professor of Heidelberg, who had been formerly a hearer of MELANCTHON and PETER MARTYR. What the issue was, and what particular esteem the Queen obtained for this with the Protestants of Germany and Switzerland will appear from a letter of RALPH GUALTER, chief minister of Zurich, to the Bishop of Ely.

GUALTER speaks of a *'common confesion* which they had decreed in the Synod of Frankfort, the *ambassador of the most serene Queen being present, and moderating the whole business*. But that Zacharias Ursinus put a delay to the whole business, who declined to undertake the work of drawing it up, which was committed unto him.”—(*Strype's Annals*, Vol. II. Pt. ii. 103.)

This intimacy with the foreign Protestant Divines was something more than nominal. Even in the year 1578, when the deficiency in manuals of instruction had been supplied by DEAN NOWELL'S Catechisms and the exclusive use of them enjoined by the Canons of 1572, the Catechisms of *Calvin* and *Bullinger* were still ordered by statute to be used as well as others in the University of Oxford.—*Cardwell's Doc. Annals*, Vol. I. 266.)

Dissemination and authorization were not only given to their writings, but the Ministers of other Protestant Churches were admitted to benefices and preferment without Episcopal ordination; WHITTINGHAM, Dean of Durham (1578), had received his orders at Geneva.

“John Morrison, ordained by Presbyterians in Scotland, was licensed by the Archbishop in 1582 to preach and administer holy things throughout the Province of Canterbury.

“It is certain also that instances may be given, down to the time of the Civil War, of Foreigners holding *preferment without Episcopal ordination*; but the Act of Uniformity (13 and 14 Chas. II. cap. 4) made such ordination indispensable for the future.”—(*Cardwell's Doc. Annals*, Vol. II. p. 45.)

The assistance rendered to Protestants abroad was accompanied by protection and fraternal sympathy shown to those at home who took refuge among ourselves. French and German churches were founded in London during the reign of Edward VI., retaining their own forms and discipline, and receiving special privileges, immunities, *churches*, and *charters*. Broken up during the reign of Mary, they were restored upon the accession of Elizabeth, in whose reign additional foreign churches were established. A Dutch Church occupied the west part of the Church of the Augustine Friars in Broad Street, granted to them by King Edward VI. by royal letters patent. This Church soon after chose Grindal, Bishop of London, their superintendent, “who did show himself on all occasions a true patron to them, and concerned himself tenderly in their affairs.”

After the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes a crowd of Huguenots poured into this country. A French Church, with its own form of worship, was established in the crypt of Canterbury Cathedral, *where it continues to this day*.

But in closing this part of the subject we ought not to omit mention of the Synod of Dort in 1618, at which were gathered ministers from the various Protestant Churches in Europe, “whither our king sent Dr. George Carlton, Bishop of Llandaff; Dr. Hall, Dean of Worcester. Dr. John Davenant, Regius Professor in Cambridge, and Master of Queen's College; and Dr. Samuel Ward, Regent of Sidney College, Cambridge; divines of great reputation, sound learning, and well-grounded faith. There they met with divers divines from Switzerland and Germany, besides the natives of the Netherlands, who altogether in a full Synod quashed, as much as in them lay, the Arminian opinions.”<sup>8</sup>—(*Dr. Kennet. Complete History of Eng.* Vol. II. p. 719.)

By the writers of the Caroline period the term *Protestant* is always applied to the Church of England. Heylin more than once anticipates the Coronation oath by using the same words, “*the true Protestant religion established by law*” (*vide Life of Laud*, pp. 54, 104, 219, 229, 251, 524, 525, &c.); and in one place he applies the term “professors” to those of the Lutheran persuasion, in contrast with the term *Protestant* which he attaches to the Church of England. Speaking of Queen Mary, he says:—

“Notwithstanding the care of her inquisitors, many good books of true Christian consolation and good *Protestant doctrine* did either find some press in London, or were sent over to their brethren by such learned men as had retired to their places of retreat, amongst which I find none but Emden in the Lutheran countries, the rigid *Professors* of which churches abominated nothing more than an *English Protestant*, because they

concurred not with them in the monstrous doctrine of 'ubiquity' and their device of *consubstantiation*."—*Heylin, Hist. of Ref., 250.*

The period of the Restoration was a period *emphatically* Protestant. The Church of England had passed through a time of stormy trial and affliction, and her re-establishment was attended by strong measures directed against those who had laid strong hands upon her. Yet though circumstances, aided by the theological tone LAUD had bequeathed, rendered her jealous of Nonconformity, her antipathy to Popery and staunch fidelity to her Protestant principles were not less loudly asserted. With the vices and depravity of CHARLES we are not concerned. His public and official acts belong to the great constitutional settlement in progress. "In the time of Charles II." we are told, "Protestantism had become so fashionable and vehement, that a man whose Protestantism was doubtful incurred no small danger."<sup>9</sup>

The confession is valuable. Though we smile at the sneer, we cannot so briefly dismiss events among the most important of our history.

Charles in his "Letter to the Commons addressed from Breda," (1660) says:—

"If you desire the advancement and propagation of the Protestant religion, we have by our constant profession, and practice of it, given sufficient testimony to the world, that neither the unkindness of those of the same faith towards us, nor the civilities and obligations of those of a contrary profession, (of both of which we have had abundant evidence) could in the least degree startle us, or make us swerve from it. And nothing can be proposed to manifest our zeal and affection for it to which we will not readily consent."—(Kennet's Comp. Hist. Vol. III. P. 223.)

Immediately after his accession, the king issued a remarkable "declaration to all his loving subjects concerning Ecclesiastical affairs." In it, after repeating the extract just given from his letter to the Commons, he proceeds:—

"As we then said, that we did hope in due time ourselves to propose somewhat for the *propagation* of it (the Protestant Religion) that will satisfy the world that we have always made it both our care, and our study, and have enough observed what is most likely to bring disadvantage to it. And the truth is, we do think ourselves more competent to propose, and with God's assistance to determine many things now in difference from the time we have spent, and the experience we have had in most of the Reformed Churches abroad, in France, in the Low Countries, and in Germany, where we have had frequent conferences with the most learned men who have unanimously lamented the great reproach the *Protestant religion* undergoes *from the distempers, and too notorious schisms* in matters of religion in England. And as the most learned among them, have always, with great submission and reverence acknowledged and magnified the established government of the Church of England, and the great countenance and shelter the Protestant religion received from it before these unhappy times, so, many of them have with great ingenuity and sorrow confessed that they were too easily misled by misinformation and prejudice into some disesteem of it, as if it had too much complied with the Church of Rome, whereas they now acknowledge it to be the *best fence* God hath yet raised against Popery in the world."—(Kennet's Comp. Hist. III. p. 225.)

The outcome of the king's intentions was the Conference at the Savoy (1661) to accommodate matters between the Episcopalians and Nonconformists—a conference rendered abortive through the unyielding temper of both sides. (*See the note at the close of the paper.*)

The most remarkable thing is, that whilst the Legislature throughout this reign was most vehement and vigilant in protecting the interests of *Protestantism*, it was not less specially zealous for the privileges of the Church of England. Hence at an early period of his reign, when Charles with stealthy purpose was inclined to a Declaration of Indulgence towards Dissenters, a prelude specious but dangerous, and copied with more audacity by his Popish successor, he was immediately met by an Address from his Parliament against it. Hence the Act of Uniformity—the Corporation Act—the Five Mile Act. Then came to him "Representations from the Lords and Commons concerning the dangers of Popery." In the same year (1662) that a "Proclamation was issued against Priests and Jesuits," containing the stereotyped effusion of Royal zeal for the

Protestant Religion, articles were exhibited against Lord Clarendon by the Earl of Bristol, one of which affirmed: "that His Majesty was dangerously corrupted in his Religion and inclined to Popery." From this indication of general surmise we can understand the vigilant attitude of the nation against the subtle and disgraceful schemes of a semi-Popish King, whose hypocrisy was the homage paid to its Protestant feeling—a feeling, which, if trifled with by pretended Popish plots, received attestation nevertheless from the advantage thus taken of it by their contrivers. As time advanced, Addresses and Messages between the King and Parliament became more frequent.<sup>10</sup> The King's "Declaration of Indulgence" was rightly divined to be politically devised really in the interest of Popery, and gave rise to the Test Act, "requiring all persons bearing any office or place of trust" to take the Sacrament publicly according to the Rite of the Church of England, the Oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance, and to subscribe the declaration following:

"I, *A. B.*, do declare that I do believe there is not any Transubstantiation in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper or in the elements of bread and wine at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever." "Which Act and Test were a great security to the Protestant religion."—*Kennet's Complete History*, Vol. III. p. 294.)

But perhaps the most remarkable event of this kind, connected with the Protestantism of the Church of England, was an Act "to prevent the dangers that may arise from persons disaffected to the Government," (1675) . . . whereby was imposed an Oath or Test of Abhorrence by all who enjoyed any beneficial offices,—*Ecclesiastical*, Civil, Military, and by all Privy Councillors, Justices of the Peace and Members of Parliament.

It was at first proposed to be of the same form with the oath required from the Dissenting Ministers by the Oxford Five Mile Act:—

"I do swear that I will not at any time to come endeavour the alteration of the Government either in Church or State."—(*Kennet, Comp. Hist.* Vol. III. p. 259.)

The question gave rise in the Lords to a most stormy debate, which lasted seventeen days.

"There were two powerful parties in the House, one for, and the other against the Bill, *and the votes of the Bishops* turned the scale on the side of the first. The great speakers for the Bill were, the Lord Treasurer and the Lord Keeper, with Bishop Morley and Bishop Ward. The speakers against it were, the Duke of Buckingham, the Earl of Shaftesbury, the Lords Holles, Hallifax, and the Earl of Salisbury. . . . It must be observed that *this Bill was contrived by the Church party*, and was disliked by the Duke and the Papists in general, because they thought that bringing any Test in practice would certainly bring one that would turn them out of the house.—(*Rapin and Tyndal's Hist.* Vol. II. fol. 677.)

And we may add from KENNET:—

"They pleaded that this oath would be destructive of the privileges of the House, which was to vote freely and not to be *pre-obliged by an oath to the Prelates.*"

The Bill passed, and the Test was reduced to these words of a declaration and an oath:—

"I, *A. B.* do declare that it is not lawful on any pretence whatsoever to take arms against the king, and I do abhor the traitorous position of taking arms by his authority against his person, or against those that are commissioned by him according to law, in times of rebellion and war, as acting in pursuance of such commission.

"I, *A. B.* do swear that I will not endeavour any alteration *in the Protestant religion now established by law in the Church of England*, nor will I endeavour any alteration in the Government of this Kingdom in Church and State, as it is by law established."—(*Kennet's Comp. Hist.* Vol. III. p. 333.)

With the prospect before them of a Popish successor, the Protestant efforts of the Legislature grew apace, and the "Exclusion Bill" well nigh caused a rupture once more between the Crown and

Parliament. The infatuation, Popish acts, and arbitrary measures of James II. precipitated the crisis. The expulsion of the Fellows from Magdalen College, Oxford—the Court of High Commission—Suspension of the Bishop of London, and lastly the Trial of the Seven Bishops united the nation in one firm phalanx of resistance. The Church of England by identifying her own with the Protestant interests of the nation, received an accession of strength which secured and solidified her foundations. Among the measures which were taken to invite the Prince of Orange, we find a document of some interest to our argument.

“1688. Under this disposition of the King to Popery, and of the people to self-defence, this MEMORIAL OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND was presented to their Royal Highnesses the Prince and Princess of Orange:—

“Your Royal Highnesses cannot be ignorant that the *Protestants of England*, who continue true to their Religion and Government, established by law, have been many ways troubled and vexed by restless controversies and things required of them unaccountable before God and man. Ecclesiastical benefits and preferments taken from them without any other reason but the king’s pleasure: that they have been summoned and sentenced by Ecclesiastical Commissioners contrary to law.’ . . . (then follows a list of complaints against the tyrannical and illegal acts of James).

“That they most humbly Implore the protection of your Royal Highness as to the suspending and encroachments made upon the law *for the maintenance of the Protestant Religion*, our civil and fundamental rights and privileges, &c. &c.”— (*Kennet’s Comp. Hist.* Vol. III. p. 488.)

Then it was, when a common danger dissipated differences and inspired all with a common enthusiasm for a common Protestantism, that the scheme of a Comprehension, which was rife at the dawn of the succeeding reign, appeared both necessary and feasible.

“In 1688 the cause of the Hierarchy was for a moment that of the popular party. More than nine thousand clergymen with the Primate and his most respectable suffragans at their head offered themselves to endure bonds, and the spoiling of their goods for the great fundamental principles of our Constitution. The effect was a coalition which included the most zealous Cavaliers, the most zealous Republicans, and all the intermediate sections of the community. The spirit which had supported Hampden in the preceding generation—the spirit which in the succeeding generation supported Sacheverell combined to support the Archbishop (Sancroft), who was Hampden and Sacheverell in one. Those classes of society which are most deeply interested in the preservation of order, followed without scruple the guidance of a venerable man, the first Peer of Parliament, the first minister of the Church, a Tory in politics, a saint in manners, whom tyranny had in his own despite turned into a demagogue. Many, on the other hand, who had always abhorred Episcopacy as a relic of Popery, and as an instrument of arbitrary power, now asked on bended knees the blessing of a Prelate who was ready to wear fetters and to lay his aged limbs on bare stones rather than betray *the interests of the Protestant Religion*, and set the prerogative above the laws. . . .

“Actuated by these sentiments our ancestors arrayed themselves against the Government in one huge and compact mass. All ranks, all parties, all Protestant sects, made up that vast phalanx. In the van were the Lords Spiritual and Temporal. Then came the landed gentry, and the *Clergy*, both the *Universities*, all the Inns of Court, merchants, shopkeepers, farmers, the porters who plied in the streets of the great towns, the peasants who ploughed the fields. . . . The old *Exclusionist* took the old *Abhorrer* by the band. Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Independents, Baptists forgot their long feud, and remembered only *their common Protestantism* and their common danger. Divines bred in the school of Laud talked loudly not only of toleration but comprehension. The Archbishop (Sancroft)<sup>11</sup> soon after his acquittal put forth a pastoral letter *which is one of the most remarkable compositions of the age*. He had from his youth been at war with the Nonconformists, and had repeatedly assailed them with unjust and unchristian asperity. His principal work was a *hideous caricature of the Calvinistic theology*. He had drawn up for the 30th of January and for the 29th of May, Forms of Prayer which reflected on the Puritans in language so strong that the Government had thought it best to soften it down. But now his heart was melted and opened. He solemnly *enjoined the Bishops and Clergy* to have a very tender regard to *their brethren, the Protestant Dissenters*—to visit them often, to entertain them hospitably, to discourse with them civilly, to persuade them, if it might be, to conform to the Church, but if that were found impossible, *to join them heartily and affectionately in exertions for the blessed cause of the Reformation.*” (*Macaulay’s History of England*, Vol. III. p.127-130.)

And we are told in this our day, that the Church of England is not, and has never been—Protestant!

Since the time of the Reformation until recently no one within the bounds of the Church of England has dreamt of questioning her cardinal characteristic of Protestantism. The most eminent members of the High Church party<sup>12</sup> have not been less loud in proclaiming their regard for the *Protestantism* of the Church of England than those of the rival school. We select two as typical men, each the leader of the High Church party in his day. Both were brought to trial, and both took occasion to declare their unequivocal attachment and loyalty to *Protestantism*—we allude to Archbishop Laud and Bishop Atterbury.

Archbishop Laud on his trial, thus addresses the Peers:—

“Nay, my lords, I am as innocent in this business of Religion—as free from all practice, or so much as thought of practice, for any alteration to Popery, or any way blemishing the *true Protestant Religion established in the Church of England*, as I was when my mother bore me into the world. . . I beseech your lordships consider it well. For surely if I had blemished the *true Protestant Religion*, I could not have settled such men in it . . . how void of charity this speech is, and how full of falsehood, shall appear by the number of those persons whom by God’s blessing upon my labours, I have settled in the *true Protestant Religion established in England*.”—*State Trials*, Vol. IV.

In his dying speech on the scaffold, Jan. 10, 1644, Laud vindicates King Charles<sup>13</sup> thus:—

“I know him to be as free from this charge (of *bringing in Popery*) as any man living, and I hold him to be as *sound a Protestant* according to religion by law established as any man in this kingdom.”

Of himself he says: —

“This is no time to dissemble with God, least of all in matters of Religion, and therefore I desire it *may be remembered* I have always *lived in the Protestant Religion* established in England, and *in that I come now to die*.”—*Heylin’s Life of Laud*, 534.

Bishop Atterbury was also the eminent leader of the High Church party in his day. He was brought to trial in 1723 for his participation in a plot to favour the Pretender. In his eloquent defence before the House of Lords, he thus expresses himself:—

“Was I influenced by any dislike of the Established Religion—any secret inclination towards Popery, a church of greater pomp and power? Malice has ventured thus far to asperse me. I have, my lords, ever since I knew what Popery was, disliked it, and the better I knew it the more I opposed it. . . . Thirty-seven years ago I wrote in defence of Martin Luther . . . and whatever happens to me I will suffer anything, and would by God’s grace burn at the stake rather than in any material point depart from the *Protestant Religion* as professed in the Church of England.” —*Lord Mahon’s Hist. of Eng.* ii. 46.

A statement has been made, and in spite of contradiction industriously circulated,

“That *Convocation* never acknowledged the term *Protestant*, and in fact not only has the Church *never accepted* this designation but at a most serious crisis in her history, the Lower House of Convocation deliberately repudiated it.”

Such is the statement of a recent writer in the second edition of his Tract.<sup>14</sup> In the first it ran thus:—

“Not only has the Church never accepted this designation, but at a most serious crisis in her history she deliberately rejected it.”

A slight course of inquiry into the matter seems to have led to the trifling change of the “*Lower House of Convocation*” for “*the Church*.” Ignorance of real facts, and a careless remark of Burnet, led some one to make this unwarrantable assertion, which was recklessly copied by others. For its

dissemination after refutation there is no excuse. Historical accuracy in face of the proofs supplied to the writer, should have led to the excision of the whole passage, or to its alteration thus:—

“Not only has the Church never refused this designation—*Protestant*—but in the official records of Convocation has left proof that she has deliberately avowed it.”

This we proceed to show:—

King William III. had failed in his design of uniting his Protestant subjects by the admission of those, who were willing and able to serve, into employment and benefices; yet so desirous was he of this union, that he resolved to try to obtain by Convocation what he had in vain endeavoured to obtain by Parliament.

The project of a *Comprehension* was set on foot so as to bring the Presbyterians and Dissenters into relation with the Church; and a Commission was appointed, with the sanction of the Archbishop and other Divines, to review the Liturgy and Canons, and prepare suitable alterations. The party which was at work for King James took hold of the occasion to inflame men’s minds. It was said that the Church was to be pulled down, and Presbytery to be set up. The Universities took fire, and began to declare against it, and against all who promoted it as men who intended to undermine the Church. Active canvassing for Proctors to be sent to Convocation took place, so that it was soon apparent that the Clergy (at least of the Lower House) were not in a temper cool or calm enough to encourage the further prosecution of the design.

In this temper Convocation met (1689). The Clergy of the Lower House were alarmed lest the Compromise to accommodate the Dissenters should be bought at the sacrifice of Church Privileges, and hence they were jealous not about the application of the word *Protestant* to the *Church of England*, but lest by the use of *general terms* they should be committed to the *comprehension* they resisted. What they cared for was the clear expression of *established Churches*, which excluded Dissenters, in lieu of the word *religion* which included them.

The King’s address was as follows:—

“William R.

His Majesty has summoned this Convocation not only because it is usual upon holding a Parliament, but out of a pious zeal to do everything that may tend to the best establishment of the Church of England, which is so eminent a part of the Reformation, and is certainly the best suited to the constitution of this government, and therefore does most signally deserve, and shall always have both his favour and protection, and he doubts not but that you will assist him in promoting the welfare of it, so that no prejudices with which some men may have laboured to possess you shall disappoint his good intentions to deprive the Church of any benefit from your consultations. His Majesty therefore expects that the things that shall be proposed shall be calmly and impartially considered by you; and assures you that he will offer nothing to you but what shall be for the honour, peace and advantage of the Protestant Religion in general, and particularly of the Church of England.”

The Upper House of Convocation drew up the following reply to the Crown—

“We the Bishops, &c., in Convocation assembled, having received your Majesty’s gracious message, together with a Commission from your Majesty, by the Earl of Nottingham, hold ourselves bound in gratitude and duty to return our most humble thanks, and acknowledgment of the grace and goodness expressed in your Majesty’s message, and the zeal you show in it for the Protestant Religion in General and the Church of England in particular, and of the trust and confidence reposed in us by this Commission, we look on these marks of your Majesty’s care and favour as the continuance of the great deliverance Almighty God wrought for us by your means in making you the blessed instrument of preventing us from falling under the cruelty of Popish tyranny; for which as we have often thanked Almighty God, so we cannot forget that high obligation and duty which we owe to your Majesty; and on these new assurances of your protection and favour to our

Church we beg leave to renew the assurance of our constant fidelity and obedience to your Majesty, whom we pray God to continue long and happily to reign over us.”

It was not the word *Protestant*, but the words *religion in general* attached to it which excited the apprehension of the *Lower House*, strenuously opposed to the scheme of *Comprehension*. They regarded the words as indicating a policy to which they would not commit themselves. Hence, in the correspondence between the two Houses, they resolved, “that instead of the *Protestant Religion* they would rather say *Protestant Churches*.” Finally, an address was agreed upon by both Houses, which was signed by the whole Convocation, and presented to the King. It ran thus:—

“We your Majesty’s most loyal and most dutiful subjects, the Bishops and Clergy of the Province of Canterbury in Convocation assembled, having received a most gracious message from your Majesty by the Earl of Nottingham, hold ourselves bound in duty and gratitude to return our most humble acknowledgment for the same, and for the pious zeal and care your Majesty is pleased to express therein for the honour, peace, advantage, and establishment of the Church of England, whereby we doubt not the interest of the Protestant Religion in ALL OTHER Protestant Churches which is dear to us, will be better secured under the influence of your Majesty’s government and protection. And we crave leave to assure your Majesty that in pursuance of that trust and confidence you repose in us, we will consider whatever shall be offered to us from your Majesty without prejudice, and with all calmness and impartiality, and we will constantly pay the fidelity and allegiance which we have all sworn to your Majesty and the Queen, whom we pray God to continue long and happily to reign over us.”—Cardwell’s Synodalia, Vol. II., pp. 697, 698,

A comparison of this amended address, with the one which emanated from the Bishops, will show how much stronger the expression of *Protestantism* is in the former than in the latter, yet the Ritualistic publication above alluded to gravely asserts:—

“The Address in its amended form was quite different from that originally framed, and *omitted all allusion to the Protestant Religion!*”

When the Comprehension Scheme fell through, the Lower House seems to have recovered “the calmness and impartiality” of which the address speaks. Fortunately for us in these days of bold perversion and reckless assertion, the Records of Convocation contain a document which once for all clearly settles the question, and disposes of this gratuitous aspersion cast upon the prominent characteristic of the Church of England.

We invite attention to the circumstances connecteawith the Convocation of 1701.

1701. A new Convocation of the Province of Canterbury being summoned to meet in concurrence with the new Parliament was opened in the Cathedral Church of Saint Paul, London, with solemn prayers, and an excellent Latin sermon, preached by Dr. William Sherlock, Dean of that church, on Epist. Jude ver. 3. In the choice of a Prolocutor, the competition was between the learned Dr. Beveridge, Archdeacon of Colchester, and Dr. Woodward, Dean of Sarum, a civilian grown popular by opposing his Diocesan, to whom he owed his preferments. He was by a majority elected, and confirmed by the Archbishop. The first Synodical Act was an Address to the King, presented by the Archbishop, at the Head of the Bishops and Clergy to his Majesty at Kensington on Jan. 22.

“Most gracious Sovereign,

“We humbly beg leave to lay before your Majesty, now we are Assembled in Convocation, the deep resentment that every one of us had, at our first hearing of the great indignity which the French King offered to your Majesty and your people in declaring the pretended Prince of Wales to be King of your Majesty’s Realms and Dominions.

“We do hereupon take occasion to renew our sincere Protestations of a firm and unshaken allegiance to your Majesty, humbly assuring your Majesty that we will do our utmost endeavours, by God’s assistance in our respective places and stations, to defend your sacred person, and to maintain your Majesty’s rightful title to

the Imperial Crown of these Realms, and the succession thereof in the Protestant line, as now by law established, against the said pretended Prince, and all other your Majesty's open and secret enemies.

"We will always, according to our especial duty, make it our earnest prayer to God that He will long continue your Majesty's happy reign over us, that you may perfect all those great works, in which He hath wonderfully conducted you with so much glory and success, for the peace and welfare of these kingdoms, and the support of your allies, the safety and tranquillity of Europe and the preserving the Protestant Religion both here in this Church of England by law established, and in all other Protestant Churches."<sup>15</sup>

His Majesty seemed to be very well pleased with this venerable appearance, and made this gracious answer.

"My lords and the rest of the clergy,

"I cannot but be very much pleased with these expressions of your affection to me, and your concern for the honour of the nation, for maintaining the succession to the crown in the Protestant line, and for the preservation of the Protestant Churches. And I am glad of this opportunity to give you fresh assurances of my firm resolution in an especial manner to protect and support the Church of England as by law established."—(*Dr. Kennet's Complete History of England*, Vol. III. p. 845.)

Among other references we might allude to the Convocation of 1713-14.

"The next day the Convocation which had met with the Parliament, and chosen Dr. Stanhope, Prolocutor, complimented the Queen in a joint Address 'on her recovery and happy return to her Royal city in health and safety,' concluding with their wishes 'that after a long and happy reign she might be able to transmit the protection of this Church and State to a *Protestant* successor in the illustrious house of Hanover.'"—(*Rapin and Tindal's History*, Vol. IV. fol. 340.)

In 1717, when a grave attempt was threatened by the Pretender, Convocation presented a loyal and *indignant* Address, in which the following paragraph appears:

"We have seen in the late declarations of some of these men, *who nevertheless call themselves by the name of Protestants*, what we must look for should a Popish Prince ever sit upon the throne of these kingdoms."—(*Rapin and Tindal, Hist.*, Vol. IV. fol. 514.)

In 1717, an unanimous Address from the Lords, thus expressing the voice of the Episcopate of the Church of England, was voted to the King, which concludes thus:

"We have a grateful sense of your Majesty's concern for the Protestant Religion, and the Church of England, as by law established, which as it always has been the *chief of Protestant Churches*, so it can never be so well supported as by strengthening and uniting as far as may be the Protestant interest."—(*Rapin and Tindal, Hist.*, Vol. IV. pt. ii. fol. 552.)

But why multiply instances?

Such is the answer to the challenge, "Search the Prayer-book through, and you will not find the word Protestant once used. Nowhere in the Articles, Liturgy or Homilies does it occur. If there were one instance—only one solitary instance in which the designation had been adopted by our Church: if on any single occasion from the period of the Reformation until the present time she had so designated herself, the Evangelicals would have some justification for their persistent endeavours to assimilate the English Church to the Kirk of Scotland, and the Lutheran and Calvinistic congregations of the Continent."<sup>16</sup>

Under the peculiar circumstances of its origin, and of the Reformation itself it would have been singular if such a *general* polemical term as *Protestant* had made its appearance in the *particular* Service-book of a *particular* Church, considering the date, though the *Anti-Romanism* it expresses is abundantly present.<sup>17</sup> The omission of the word itself in this case is unimportant. What it stands

for is there. But there is another word—ALTAR—the *prime* necessity of this *soi-disant Catholic* worship: (Direct. Anglic. p. 3), the very foundation stone on which the whole of its cumbrous and elaborate superstructure rests, which is likewise *missing*, and its omission is very grave, and very important. In a book claiming to be “The order of Common Prayer and *Administration of the Sacraments*, and other *rites and ceremonies* of the Church according to the use of the Church of England”—if anywhere, there we ought to find it. Without it, the entire edifice constructed upon it falls to the ground. Search the Prayer-book through and through, and you will not find the word—ALTAR. Nowhere in the Articles, Liturgy, Homilies, Canons, Nowell’s Catechism or other Catechisms does it occur; if there were one instance—only one solitary instance in these authorized Standards of the Church of England, in which the name had been sanctioned by our Church, or in any case which will bear the test of historical investigation, or is free from the infirmity of accidental circumstance. If on any single occasion of her independent existence since the Reformation until the present time, she had authoritatively restored what she with set purpose abolished, both name and thing, in 1552, the Ritualists might have some plausible pretext for their persistent endeavours to assimilate the English Church to the Church of Rome!

The men who advance this preposterous proposition that the Church of England is not Protestant, of whom we spoke at the commencement of this paper, happily termed by Sir W. Harcourt, “the Ultramontanes” of our Church, are equally unfortunate in arrogating to themselves the claim of being “Catholics.” The appellation they use in a tainted, theological sense, as signifying, if anything, a share in the corruptions of Rome, and a share in the pretensions of its Priesthood. A sect or party of which the history dates no further back than about thirty years, their misguided zeal is practically devoted to the betrayal and down fall of the Church of their fathers. The main preponderating voice of this Church denies to *them* the “Catholic” assumptions they boast. The Church of Rome repels *them* with contempt. The Greek Church holds no formal Communion with *them*. Even at the recent hap-hazard Convention at Bonn, it was deemed dignified by such men to advance a proof of the validity of Anglican orders, on the principle we suppose of “*qui s’excuse, s’accuse.*” The whole Nonconformist and Presbyterian Communities, the Protestant Churches of France, Holland, Scandinavia, Switzerland, Germany and America refuse them any such claim. Where in Christendom is this community and universality of time, place and person which they affect? A narrow sect numerically and theologically speaking, steeped in the heresies of Rome, or swayed by prereformation proclivities, and fast bordering on schism, they incessantly vaunt in their peculiar sense this word—“Catholic”—a presumption only less absurd than their denial of the title *Protestant* to the Church of England in the face of Law, History and Fact.

A champion of this School admits, “If the Church of England is correctly designated Protestant the Evangelical party has an almost unassailable position.” And his reviewer<sup>18</sup> adds:—

“If it be (Protestant) then the Evangelicals are right, and all the action of the CHURCH ASSOCIATION is more than justified, and also the attempt now being made by Parliament in the same interest.”

We have shown the correctness of the designation: we have established our justification; and we claim the impregnability of the position.

---

NOTE.

THE SAVOY CONFERENCE AND REVISION OF THE PRAYER BOOK IN 1662.

The thread of history pursued in this paper will convince any impartial mind of the truth of the position maintained, that the Church of England is essentially Protestant. Yet there are so many hazy misconceptions

and distortions of fact to be met with, that we cannot but supplement the argument of the foregoing page by a few remarks.

In the preface to a revised edition of the Prayer Book,<sup>19</sup> for instance, we meet with many statements loosely put together, very misleading, and, in some respects, utterly at variance with fact. We are told, with reference to the reign of ELIZABETH, "the altars which had been removed were replaced in the chancels." *This was never the case.* Whoever is acquainted with the Ecclesiastical history of the period will know that this is *utterly opposed to truth.* A misrepresentation as serious is contained in the statement, "In the revision under CHARLES II. many alterations were made in favour of Romish doctrine."

It may occur to our readers that some mysterious, indefinite change in the principles of the Church of England took place at this critical period. We must remove such a mischievous impression by a simple appeal to facts.

It was unfortunate that, smarting under the Puritanical lash which had been plentifully applied during the preceding reign, and taught by the painful history of irregularities due to the growth of nonconformity since the earlier years of ELIZABETH'S reign, the Commissioners who met the Nonconformists at the Savoy Conference wrapped themselves in an impenetrable shroud of caution and obstinacy. Their unyielding temper was due to very natural causes. High Churchmen, such as, for the most part, would be deemed moderate in these days, they were rendered suspicious by experience and conservative by circumstance. They missed the golden opportunity to make concessions, which a wise forecast would have dictated, in their desire to preserve intact what had been *handed down to them.* We must throw ourselves back into the character and action of the times when they lived if we would understand the obstinate temper which was not confined to one side of the Conference.

Hence their whole endeavour was to fight for the Church of England against what they deemed *Puritan innovations.* Popery was far from their thoughts. Their efforts were directed to the preservation of the particular characteristics of order and discipline which marked the Church of England. It would be remote from our object to discuss the details of the Conference, but three things we desire to note:

(i.) When the Nonconformists, at the outset, presented their grievances, the Episcopalian party urged, as an argument in favour of the Service Book called in question, "that it was never found fault with by those to whom the name of *Protestant* most properly (*i.e., originally*) belongs, those that profess the Augustan Confession."—(*Cardwell's Conferences*, p. 338.)

(ii.) Our Articles, the *present standard of our doctrine*, were ratified by the same Ecclesiastical authorities that were responsible for our Prayer Book.

(iii.) They did not in anywise introduce any Romish element in their revision of the Prayer Book (of 1662). They obstinately withstood many excellent suggestions to improve it. They left some expressions dubious. They vindicated Episcopacy against the Presbyterians. They strenuously fought for the retention of the surplice, but *not* Popish vestments, and they made several concessions.

Nor was this all. The corrections proposed by SANCROFT and other advanced disciples of the Laudian School, "which *savoured* of their line of theology," "were all rejected, with the exception of the first two," which were unimportant.—(*Cardwell's Hist. of Conferences*, p. 391.)

By way of confirming what we state positively, "that *no* alterations were made in favour of Romish doctrine," we subjoin the most important of the actual additions and alterations made in the Prayer Book of ELIZABETH by the Commissioners in 1662.

- (1) The Sentences, the Epistles and Gospels, and other extracts from the Bible (except the Psalter and Ten Commandments) were taken from the version of 1611.
- (2) The Absolution was ordered to be pronounced by the priest alone, instead of by the minister.
- (3) The Book of Bel and the Dragon was reinstated in the Calendar of Lessons.<sup>20</sup>

- (4) The Prayers for the king, the royal family, the clergy and people together with the prayers of St. Chrysostom and the Benediction, were printed in the Order both of Morning and Evening Service, instead of being left, as formerly, at the end of the Litany.
- (5) The Evening Service, which previously began with the Lord's Prayer, was now opened with the Sentences, the Exhortation, the Confession, and Absolution, printed as in the Morning Service.
- (6) In the Litany the words "rebellion" and "schism" were added to the petition respecting "sedition, privy conspiracy," etc.
- (7) In a subsequent petition the words "bishops, priests, and deacons" were employed instead of "bishops, pastors, and ministers of the Church."
- (8) Among the occasional prayers and thanksgivings were now introduced, a second prayer for fair weather, the two prayers for the Ember weeks, the prayers for the Parliament and for all conditions of men, a thanksgiving for restoring public peace at home, and the General Thanksgiving.
- (9) New Collects were appointed for the 3rd Sunday in Advent, and for St. Stephen's day.
- (10) The Genealogy, which previously made part of the Gospel for the Sunday after Christmas, was now omitted.
- (11) A distinct Collect, Epistle, and Gospel were provided for a Sixth Sunday after the Epiphany.
- (12) The Gospels for the Sunday next before Easter and for Good Friday were shortened, having formerly contained within them respectively the Second Lesson for the day.
- (13) In several places, as in one of the Collects for Good Friday, in those for the 5th and 16th Sundays after Trinity, for St. Simon and St. Jude, and in other places, the word "church" was used for congregation.
- (14) A distinct Collect was supplied for Easter Even.
- (15) The first of the Anthems used on Easter-day was added.
- (16) A distinct Epistle was provided for the day of Purification.
- (17) The last clause respecting saints departed was added to the Prayer for the Church Militant.
- (18) The Rubric was added as to "covering what remaineth of the elements with a fair linen cloth."
- (19) The order in Council respecting kneeling at the Lord's Supper which had been introduced in 1552 and removed by Queen Elizabeth, *was restored*, with this alteration: instead of "any real and essential presence there being of Christ's natural flesh and blood," it is now read, "any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood."
- (20) A new office was appointed for the Baptism of Such as are of riper years.
- (21) The Preface to the Office for Confirmation was curtailed.
- (22) The clause respecting the "undoubted salvation of baptized infants dying before the commission of actual sin was placed after the office for Infant Baptism."
- (23) Some changes were made in the offices for Confirmation and Matrimony.
- (24) In the Rubric at the end of the latter, the receiving the Communion on the day of the Marriage was no longer made imperative.
- (25) In the VISITATION OF THE SICK the words, "*if he humbly and heartily desire it*" were added to the Rubric respecting Absolution.

(26) The Benediction and the Prayers that follow appear now for the first time.

(27) In the ORDER FOR BURIAL the first rubric respecting persons unbaptized or excommunicated was added.

(28) Forms of Prayer were supplied to be used at Sea.

(29) Lastly, offices were provided for the 30th of January and the 30th of May and the *old service for the 5th of November* was corrected.—(*Cardwell's Hist. of Conferences*, 382-385.)

Such were the principal alterations, the only ones worth recording, made in Book of Common Prayer by the Convocation of 1662, and finally ratified by the Act of Uniformity. Two or three of them may seem to some persons at first sight to favour sacerdotalism, but a careful examination will establish the fact that whatever may have been the wishes of individuals among the revisers, no such result was attained. The Protestant character of the Church of England remains stamped on everything which has been put forth by authority.

Footnotes:

1 The HOMILIES as well as the ARTICLES it must be remembered are at *present* standards of the doctrine of the Church of England. "The Second Book of Homilies, the several titles whereof we have joined under this article, doth contain a godly and wholesome doctrine and necessary for these times, as doth the former Book of Homilies which were set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth, and therefore we judge them to be read in the Churches diligently and distinctly that they may be understood of the people."—(Art. xxxv.) Therefore any doctrine at variance with that set forth in the Homilies, though preached in the pulpits of the Church of England—even by a Bishop—is not in the judgement of the Church "godly" or "wholesome."

2 In 1640 the oath framed by Laud and the Convocation was as follows:—

'I, A. B. do swear that I do approve the Doctrine and Discipline or Government established in the Church of England as containing all things necessary to salvation: and that I will not endeavour by myself or any other directly or indirectly to bring in any Popish doctrine contrary to that which is established: nor will I ever give my consent to alter the government of this Church by Archbishops, Bishops, &c., nor yet ever subject it to the usurpations and *superstitions* of the See of Rome. And all these things I do plainly and sincerely acknowledge and swear according to the plain and common sense and understanding of the same, without any equivocation or mental evasion or secret reservation whatsoever. And this I do heartily, willingly and truly upon the faith of a Christian So help me God in Jesus Christ."—*Rushworth*, vol. iii. p.1186.

3 I add that this history of the Church (Foxe's Martyrs) was of such value and esteem for the use of it to Christian readers and the service of our religion Reformed, that it was in the days of Queen Elizabeth enjoined to be set up in some convenient place in all the Parish Churches, together with the Bible and Bishop Jewell's Defence of the Apology of the Church of England, to be read at all suitable times by the people before or after service."—STRYPE'S Annals of the Reformation vol. iii. pt. 1, p.738.)

4 This irrefutable argument is met by quibbles about the "verbal infallibility of Acts of Parliament." It is not a question of "verbal infallibility of an Act of Parliament," but of a fundamental compact of the Constitution, whereby the Church has secured certain rights, and contracted certain—*obligations*.

5 Is the Church of England Protestant? p. 30.

6 As, for instance, the abolition of the word *Alter* from her Service Book!

7 What measures the Papacy adopted to counteract it, may be learned from the continuation of Strype's narrative.— (*See Strype's Annals*, Vol II, Pt ii.)

8 King Charles I. wrote a Declaration in Latin, dated Oxford, May 14, 1644, addressed with his greeting to "all Foreign Protestant Churches." "To all those who profess the true Reformed Protestant Religion, of what nation, degree, or condition soever they be," to contradict the rumour of his inclination to Popery. In this Declaration he alludes to the Synod of Dort thus:—

“Which Liturgy and Discipline (of the Church of England) the most eminent of Protestant authors, as well Germans as French, as well Danes as Swedes, and Switzers as well Belgians as Bohemians, do with many Elogies (and not without a kind of envy) approve and applaud in their public writings, particularly in the transactions of the Synod of Dort, wherein besides other of our Divines (who afterwards were Prelates) one of our Bishops assisted, to whose dignity all due respects and precedency were given.”—Rushworth, Vol. V. p. 75

9 “Is the Church of England Protestant?” p. 24.

10 As a specimen of these communications we may give the King’s reply to an Address of the Commons with reference to the Exclusion Bill (1678).

“Gentlemen, it shall always be my study to preserve the Protestant Religion, and to advance and support the interest of my people.”—Kennet’s History, III. p. 366)

More than twenty such records might be quoted from this historian.

11 A Non-juror be it remembered.

12 The Caroline Bishops under Laud’s primacy were certainly no timid members of the High Church School of which Laud was the eminent chief. Wren and others have left their mark on the History of the time. For brevity’s sake we will establish the Protestantism of all these men at once by referring to a remarkable Protestantism taken by the Legislature in 1641. It ran thus:—

“I, A. B., in the presence of Almighty God, promise and protest to maintain and defend as far as I lawfully may with my life, power and estate the true Reformed Protestant Religion expressed in the Doctrines of the Church of England, against all pepery and popish innovation within this realm contrary to the said doctrine, &c. Among those who took this Protestant Oath on May 4, 1641, were the Bishops of Durham, Lincoln, Gloucester, Carlisle, Bath and Wells, Hereford, Bristol, Rochester, Llandaff; on May 5, 1641, Winchester, Oxford, St. Asaph, Ely (Matthew Wren), Peterborough, Litchfield; on May 10, 1641, Chester; and on May 11, 1641, Chichester.”—(Rushworth, Vol. IV. pp. 241, 247, 248.)

13 Charles himself had voluntarily and publicly made a memorable and solemn Protestation to this effect:— 1643. The King being about to receive the Sacrament from the hands of Archbishop Usher at Christ Church, Oxford, rising from his knees and beckoning to the Archbishop for a further forbearance, made this Protestation :—

“My lord, I espy here many resolved Protestants who may declare to the world the Resolution I do now make. I have to the utmost of my power prepared my soul to become a worthy receiver. And may I so receive comfort from the blessed Sacrament as I do intend the Establishment of the true Reformed Protestant Religion as it stood in its beauty in the happy days of Queen Elizabeth, without any connivance at Popery. I bless God that in the midst of these public distractions, I have still liberty to communicate, and may this Sacrament be my damnation, if my heart do not join with my lips in this Protestation.”— (Dr Kennet, Comp. Hist of England, Vol. III. p. 135).

14 Is the Church of England Protestant? A Historical Essay, by Homersham Cox, M.A. A Judge of County Courts. London: Longmans.

15 The awkward consequence of this appeal to Convocation is ludicrously dismissed, in the Ritualistic publication before alluded to, by the lofty remark: “The voice of the Church is not heard in courtly orations, nor are her decrees proclaimed in the precincts of a king’s palace.” It is no question of “*decrees*,” but of a simple *principle* which Convocation very naturally avowed. However unfavourably Convocation may be regarded by its critics, it is left to its avowed friends, it appears, to affix the stigma to it of practically “*speaking lies in hypocrisy!*”

16 “Is the Church of England Protestant?” p. 1.

17 It has been well observed that the name of the Almighty does not once occur in the Book of Esther. What would become of the question of its inspiration if internal evidence did not supply it, irrespective of this fact?

18 Review of Mr. Homersham Cox’s Historical Essay—“Is the Church of England Protestant?”—(*Church Times*, Feb. 5, 1875.)

19 The Book of Common Prayer etc., prepared for use in the Evangelical churches by ministers and members of the Established and Nonconformist Churches. London: W.J. Johnson, 121, Fleet-street. 1870.

20 The other books (the Apocrypha), as Hierome saith, the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners, but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine." (Art. VI.)