

The Sacrament of Extreme Unction :

ITS HISTORY AND USE IN THE CHURCH OF
ENGLAND.

A PAPER

READ BEFORE THE MEMBERS AND FRIENDS OF THE GUILD
OF ALL SOULS, ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1879.

BY

THE REV. WILLIAM CROUCH, B.A.

Published by Request.

LONDON :

CHURCH PRINTING COMPANY,
11, BURLINGHAM-STREET, STRAND.

Special
Collect
1879
Crou

*To the Reverend the President, the Warden, and
Members of the Guild of All Souls.*

MY DEAR FRIENDS,

It may perhaps be thought that some apology is needed, if not to you, at least to those who do not belong to our Guild, into whose hands this Paper may come, for putting it forth in its present crude form. The popular style which seems necessary to a Paper read on such an occasion as a Meeting of the Members and Friends of our Guild is scarcely suitable to a published treatise. The Members of the Guild present at the Meeting having expressed a wish that the Paper should be published, I thought at first that I ought to recast some portions of it at least in a style better suited to the altered conditions under which it would be put forth in a more permanent form. But as the object of the Paper is to raise rather than settle the questions discussed in it, I have come to the conclusion that the claim which it makes upon the attention of Churchmen is of so ephemeral a character that it is not worth the labour that the toning down of its crudities would entail, and which I could scarcely find time for at this season. I have therefore thought it better to publish it as it was delivered, with simply the addition of a few notes containing illustrative matter which has come under my notice since the delivery of the Paper.

I take this opportunity of acknowledging my obligation to the Rev. Dr. Myrianthus, Priest of the Greek Church, London Wall, for his courtesy in giving me information in regard to the custom of his Communion; to my friend the Rev. W. M. Richardson, of Dorchester, Oxfordshire, for placing at my disposal the notes of a Paper read by him at a Clerical Meeting at Wolverhampton; and to the

published works of the Rev. J. H. Blunt and the late Bishop Forbes, of Brechin. I must also thank my fellow-members of the Guild for the kind reception they gave to my humble effort to set before them the chief questions of interest in regard to the History and Use of the Sacrament of Extreme Unction in the Church of England.

In placing this Paper in your hands my simple desire is to call the attention of English Churchmen to this neglected Sacrament, and, if it may be, to give some slight assistance in the promotion of such belief and practice in regard to it as may be in accordance with the mind of Christ as revealed in the Catholic Church. If I can be proved to have made any statement, or expressed any opinion, contrary to this, I am not only ready but anxious to retract it.

If any excuse be needed for the amount of matter in this Paper which has but an indirect bearing on the subject, I would remind you that in these days of unbelief and blasphemy it is of little use submitting to the general public, or even to the majority of Churchmen, an argument for any particular Catholic Doctrine or Practice, if it is not supported by some reference to general principles. Perhaps the somewhat wide range of this Paper may render it useful to some as affording an answer to the question which appears to be so much exercising some of our Roman friends—viz., "Why Ritualists do not become Roman Catholics." The answer plainly is that we have *de jure*, if not *de facto*, all that we want in the Anglican Communion, without committing schism, or accepting the Papal Infallibility, which Mr. Ryder is so angry with Dr. Littledale for calling "a shameless and indefensible figment," and which he himself only attempts to defend as a figment ludicrous in its barefacedness. If we have for a time to endure sufferings, which Mr. Ryder considers so light as to be real luxuries, the whole History of the Church shows us that every victory must be stamped with the Cross, and we must be content to suffer, assured that our sufferings more than anything else will benefit the Church that we love as our Mother.

Perhaps I may be expected to make a further apology for taking up this question at all, and so becoming, as some will no doubt call me, a troubler of Israel. One of our most learned theologians, whose opinion I sought on some doubtful points, replied that the pressure upon us now is so great that he would be unwilling to raise any fresh questions. Now we have to face the fact that Catholic Doctrine and Practice are generally distasteful at first to the uninstructed because they have a vague horror of anything supposed to savour of Rome. When they see us restoring bit by bit Catholic Doctrines and Practices common to us and Rome, they naturally, though erroneously, think that we are seeking to introduce everything that is Roman, and, worst of all, to bring England again under the power of an ecclesiastical tyranny. An ecclesiastical tyranny is the most hateful form of tyranny, because it is the perversion to worldly ends of one of the greatest blessings given to mankind—viz., the spiritual power of the Christian Ministry. The fear of it naturally causes irritation, and accounts for the pressure that is upon us now. The friction caused by the gradual but continuous advance of our claims running counter to the prejudices of those who do not understand us is a continual cause of irritation and anxiety. I cannot but think that this friction and irritation may be avoided by letting people see at once all that we are aiming at. When they see all that we want, they will also see what we do not want; they will see that Catholicism is consistent with the fullest Christian Liberty, and that there is no real danger of the tyranny they dread. It is true that there are would-be ecclesiastical autocrats, who speak of "my diocese," "my parish," "my people," &c., in an arbitrary and despotic spirit, but they are to be found as much among Protestants as Catholics, and nowhere more than among the much-vaunted moderate High Churchmen. We see how ecclesiastical tyranny is losing its hold on Roman Catholic countries (Did the Roman support of Turkey receive a moment's serious consideration at the Berlin Conference?); and he must indeed be blind

to the signs of the times who either hopes or fears that Englishmen, whether Catholics or Protestants, with the exception, perhaps, of an insignificant handful of fanatics, will ever submit to an ecclesiastical tyranny. I do not mean to say that we can hope to disarm all opposition. There are some of our adversaries who are opposed not to what is Roman, or even to what is Catholic only, but to religion of any kind that makes any demands upon them. We have nothing to do with conciliating them. But there are many of our bitterest antagonists who would be on our side if they only understood us, and many a Catholic who has been won over to the Faith from violent antagonism would bear witness to this. What I want to point out is this, that while we are trimming and compromising, one day defending a society and the next day repudiating it, slipping in with a doctrine or ceremony when people are asleep, and withdrawing it when they wake and stare at it, it is no wonder if people misunderstand us, and think us conspirators or anything else that is bad. Charity calls upon us not to give way to ignorant prejudice, but to be straightforward, and say openly what we mean; not to puzzle people with our inconsistency, but to have the courage of our opinions; not to evade, but to face and manfully live down the prejudice against us. When we have shown fully and clearly what the logical strength of our position is, when we have made people understand what we want and what we do not want, and when we have shown that no persecution shall hinder our claiming our full rights as members of the Catholic Church in this country, then our work of Catholicising England will be more than half done.

Commending this Paper to your friendly criticism,

I am,

Yours faithfully in Christ,

WILLIAM CROUCH.

Lent, 1879.

THE SACRAMENT OF EXTREME UNCTION.

MR. WARDEN, FELLOW MEMBERS OF THE GUILD OF
ALL SOULS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,

Having been asked to read a Paper before you on some subject connected with the object of our Guild, I thought that I could not do better than put before you the results of an investigation of the History and Rationale of the Sacrament of Extreme Unction. If there are any here who are prejudiced against the name of Extreme Unction, I would ask them to suspend their condemnation of my use of it until they have heard my reasons.

As the first object of our Guild is Prayer for the Dying as well as the Departed, I think we ought to consider it a part of our practical work to restore this Sacrament, which has been practically lost to English Churchmen, to its proper position in the Sacramental system of the Church.

I should prefer to have seen the subject in the hands of a theologian; but since our theologians say but little about it, it is left to those less learned to bring the Sacrament into prominent notice among English Churchmen, or else let it be altogether neglected, an alternative for which I do not care any longer to share the responsibility. It is rather with the idea of arousing your interest in this subject than of giving you instruction that I venture to put before you what is, I fear, but a crude explanation of the History and Rationale of the Sacrament of Extreme Unction.

We have in practice lost the Unction from our Offices for Baptism and Confirmation, and from our Ordinal; but as the Unction in their administration is not of the essence of the Sacrament, although we must deplore the loss of

such a beautiful and expressive adjunct, yet these Sacraments, though stripped of some of the dignity which belongs to their proper administration, are still left to us in their integrity. But if, in addition to the loss of these earlier Unctions, which, coming at the beginning of different stages of the spiritual life, are symbolical of the Unction of the Holy Spirit by which persons are anointed in those Sacraments as children of God, as soldiers of the Cross, and as Priests of the Church of Christ—if, in addition to the loss of these symbolical Unctions, we are deprived of Extreme Unction, the last of the Unctions, which is a Sacrament in itself, then I maintain that we should be deprived of a part of our heritage as members of the Catholic Church. But I shall endeavour to show that the Sacrament of Extreme Unction does still belong to us as members of the Catholic Church in England, and that our Priests have no more right to refuse this Sacrament to us on our sick beds than they have to refuse the Sacrament of Baptism to the children who are brought to them.

In reviewing the history of the Sacrament I must first call your attention to the use of Unction in that wonderful system of Types that is set before us in the history of God's chosen people before the Incarnation of our Blessed Lord.

The first mention of Unction in the Old Testament is in Genesis xxviii., where we are told that Jacob poured oil on the stone which he set up for a pillar to mark Bethel, the place where God appeared to him. The object of this anointing was evidently to symbolize the setting apart or consecration of the stone to mark the scene of that appearance.

In the later chapters of Exodus we find that Aaron and the other priests, as well as the Tabernacle, the Altar, and all other things used in the service of the Tabernacle were anointed by the special command of God; and the Unction is spoken of as synonymous with consecration or setting apart to the service of God. The Unction was such a solemn ceremony that the oil was to be made in a particular

way appointed by God, and was not to be used for any other purpose.*

Again we find that not only Priests, but also Kings, as in the case of Saul, David, and Jehu, and prophets, as in the case of Elisha, were anointed; and this was also to consecrate or set them apart for the service of God. The King was then called "the Lord's anointed," not from the notion of any virtue inherent in a particular family, as some people seem to think, but because he was set apart by Unction to serve God as the ruler of His people. The prophet was "the prophet of the Lord," set apart by Unction to be God's messenger of mercy or warning to His people.

We learn then from the Old Testament that Unction was a Divine institution in the Dispensation of Types, and that it symbolized the consecration or setting apart of any person or thing for the service of God.

Now before proceeding to consider what we are told about Unction in the New Testament, I would ask whether it is conceivable, speaking of Unction generally, that such an important feature in the ceremonial of the old Dispensation should be the only feature of that Ceremonial which may not find its place in the Ceremonial of the New Dispensation. As the Mosaic Ceremonial was the type of the worship of Heaven, "as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the Tabernacle, for see, saith He, that thou make all things according to the Pattern showed thee in the Mount;"† and as the worship of the Christian Church is not merely the type, but the actual representation of the Heavenly worship, it seems inconceivable that anyone who believes in the words of our Seventh Article, that "the Old Testament is not contrary to the New," or, in other words, that the New Dispensation is but a fuller Revelation of God than the Old, should think that any distinctive feature of the Mosaic Ceremonial should not find its place, at least with some modification, in the system of the Catholic Church. The sacrificial Priesthood,

* Exodus xxx. 22-33.

† Hebrews viii. 5.

the Levitical Ministry, the arrangement of the Temple, the Altar, Lights used for other purposes than giving light, Incense, Sacerdotal Vestments, the Laver, Images, and Pictures,* if not to be found in the Directorium of *the Judge*, have nevertheless been, rightly as we believe, transferred from the Jewish to the Christian Church. Circumcision, which might be quoted against me as having been given up, was literally performed on Him Whose members we are, and is spiritually intensified in the Sacrament of Baptism, just as the typical sacrifices find their consummation in the Sacrifice of the Mass, a different thing, I need scarcely remind you, from the sacrifices of Masses condemned in the Thirty-first Article.† There remains Uncction, to disallow which can scarcely be anything else but to despise the ordinances of God.

This would be a strong argument for some use of Uncction in the Catholic Church, even if there were no mention of it in the New Testament. But we do find it recognized there, and, as we shall see, not merely as a symbolical, but as a sacramental ordinance.

There are three passages in the New Testament to which I will refer you :—

St. Mark. vi. 13—“(The Apostles) anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them.”

* Those who suppose the Second Commandment to forbid images and pictures of any kind must be forgetful of the Cherubim set over the Mercy Seat and embroidered on the curtains of the Tabernacle by God's command, given at the same time as the Second Commandment. If there is idolatry in the Church of England, it is not committed by those who use the Crucifix, images, or pictures of Saints, the forms of which are given us by God, not made for ourselves,* but by those Protestants who make to themselves a false idea of God, and so worship an idol, which simply means a false idea.

† The vulgar error condemned in the Article consisted in treating each Mass as a separate thing, distinct from the Sacrifice of Calvary, and even having a different object, the remission of original sin being assigned to the latter, and that of actual sins to the former. The Article does not say anything about the formulated doctrine of the Roman Communion.

St. John xii. 3—“Then took Mary a pound of ointment of spikenard, very costly, and anointed the feet of Jesus.”

St. James v. 14, 15—“Is any sick among you? Let him call for the elders of the Church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the Name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins they shall be forgiven him.”

From the use of Uncction above referred to, or from other sources unknown to us, the Church derived Sacramental Uncction of the sick, a Sacrament recognized and used in the Eastern and Roman Communions to the present day, and, as I shall endeavour to show, at least not abrogated by the Anglican Communion.

The first of the three passages I have quoted (St. Mark vi. 13) is only useful for my present purpose so far as this, that it shows our Blessed Lord to have sanctioned the use of Uncction by His Apostles for some purpose, and that He did this without any warning that its use was not to be developed in the Church in the same way as the other leading features of the Mosaic Ceremonial.

The second of these passages (St. John xii. 3) I have never seen commented upon in connection with Sacramental Uncction, but I shall have something to say about it when we come to the Rationale of the Sacrament.

It is round the last, the passage from St. James, that the controversy has centred in regard to the Scriptural authority for the Sacrament.

Dr. Harold Browne, the present Bishop of Winchester, says, in his Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles, that this charge of St. James exactly corresponds with the miraculous cures of the early ages;* but this is obviously a mistake, for the Uncction ordered by St. James was to be performed by the Presbyters, whereas the gift of healing was not confined to them. Moreover, St. James speaks of a two-

fold effect—the healing of the body, and the healing of the soul—whereas only the former belonged to the gift of healing. I am sorry to say that there is scarcely a statement in the three pages in which Dr. Browne has treated of this Sacrament that I can reconcile with historical facts. As the book was written twenty years ago, as the Bishop has treated me with personal kindness, and as he exercises his Episcopal office with an impartiality too seldom seen in our rulers, I thought it only respectful to write to him on the subject. I received a courteous answer, in which the Bishop told me that he had not changed his views, which he at present thinks consistent with Scripture, history, and the doctrine of the Church. He added that there was no reason why I should not express my dissent from his opinions, which he was quite ready to change if I could prove them wrong. This I have set to work with a good will to do. I only hope that my attempted refutation of the theologian will not be taken to imply any ingratitude or disrespect to the Bishop.

In regard to the passage in St. James, Dr. Döllinger says:—"This is no gift of healing, for that was not confined to the presbyters, and for that Christ prescribed not Unction, but laying on of hands. Had he meant that, St. James would have bidden or advised the sick man to send for one who possessed the gift, whether presbyter or layman. And the sure operation of such a gift would have been in direct contradiction to a fact before the Apostle's eyes—namely, that a generation had then died off according to natural laws, just as was the case before or afterwards. What was to be conveyed by the medicine was, therefore, only sometimes recovery or relief, always consolation, revival of confidence, and forgiveness of sins, on condition, of course, of faith and repentance: the form is Unction with prayer. This anointing was not for any medicinal purpose, which could not be thought of in most internal diseases, though the frequent anointing for a remedy against disease among the Jews suggested this Christian Unction as a means of grace, just as Jewish

Baptism and the Jewish Passover formed the groundwork for Christian Baptism and the Eucharist."*

I may here give the opinion of Bishop Hopkins of Vermont, U.S.A. Referring to a remark of Bishop Cosin's—"If we anoint not now with oil, it is because we doubt whether it be lawful to continue that extraordinary and miraculous custom that was well used in St. James's time;"—which is rather an apology than an argument for not using the Sacrament,—he says: "This does not appear to me consistent with the language of Scripture. For the anointing directed by St. James was *not miraculous*. The healing of the sick is not attributed by the Apostle to the *oil*, but to the 'prayer of faith,' and that prayer is still used by the Church for the same purpose.† The learned Bishop (Cosin) says nothing of the *chrism*, or holy oil, used by the primitive Christians so early as the second century. But the same argument which justifies any other religious rite would apply to this: namely, that it had the warrant of the Divine command in the Church of Israel, and was manifestly adopted by the Gentile Church in the purest period of her history."‡

Dean Alford says in his Commentary on this passage: "Among all the daring perversions of Scripture by which the Church of Rome has defended her superstitions, there is none more patent than that of the present passage. The Apostle is treating of a matter totally distinct from the occasion, and the object of Extreme Unction. He is enforcing the efficacy of the prayer of faith in afflictions, ver. 13. Of such efficacy he adduces one special instance. In sickness, let the sick man inform the elders of the Church. Let them, representing the congregation of the faithful, pray over the sick man, accompanying that prayer with

* *First Age of the Church*, Trans. 2nd ed., p. 235.

† The "Prayer of Faith" would seem rather to be a comprehensive term for the whole rite, including the anointing; but this does not affect the general argument.

‡ *Law of Ritual Explained* p. 67.

the symbolical and sacramental act of anointing with oil in the Name of the Lord. Then the prayer of faith shall save (heal) the sick man, and the Lord shall raise him up out of his sickness; and even if it were occasioned by some sin, that sin shall be forgiven him." I will not trespass upon your patience by giving you Dean Alford's argument for his very strained interpretation of the latter part of the passage, or by an investigation of his assumption that the presbyters were the representatives of the congregation only,* and not, as St. Paul tells us, the ambassadors of Christ also. But I may point out that this extremely Protestant commentator, whatever he may mean, speaks of the Unction as a sacramental as well as a symbolical act, and that, if he uses words in anything like the ordinary sense, he differs from the Roman commentators, whom he so lavishly abuses, only in regard to the object of the Sacrament, and not in regard to it being a Sacrament, or, as he calls it, a sacramental act. Dean Alford considers the occasion of the anointing the sickness of one of the faithful, and the object the healing of the body, accompanied occasionally by the healing of the soul. He cannot say more of Roman Catholics than that they consider the occasion of Extreme Unction the dangerous sickness of one of the faithful, and the object the healing of the soul, accompanied occasionally by the healing of the body; and these two views of the object and occasion could scarcely be called totally distinct by any but a partizan blinded with prejudice and regardless of veracity. The expression "daring perversions" is one of those curses which like chickens go home to roost. It seems to be a canon of Protestant controversy that in dealing with Roman Catholics or Ritualists persons may dispense themselves from the obligation of the Ninth Commandment.

We shall breathe a purer atmosphere when we turn

* The Protestant mind must be utterly without any sense of humour if it can regard without a smile the idea that the Apostles looked upon themselves and their successors as mere Congregationalist ministers.

from the Commentary of Dean Alford to the Exposition of Bishop Forbes. In his explanation of the Thirty-nine Articles he says:—"The Unction of the sick is the lost pleiad of the Anglican firmament. One must at once confess and deplore that a distinctly Scriptural practice has ceased to be commanded in the Church of England. Excuses may be made of 'corrupt following of the Apostles' in that it was used, contrary to the mind of St. James, when all hope of the restoration of bodily health was gone; but it cannot be denied that there has been practically lost an Apostolic practice, whereby, in case of grievous sickness, the faithful were anointed and prayed over, for the forgiveness of their sins, and to restore them, if God so willed, or to give them spiritual support in their maladies."* I shall show later on my reason for not agreeing with Bishop Forbes' opinion that Extreme Unction has ceased to be commanded in the Church of England; and, when he speaks of it as being practically lost, he must not be taken to mean that we have been lawfully deprived of it, for he says further on:—"Since, however, the Visitation of the Sick is a private Office, and uniformity is required only in the public Offices, there is nothing to hinder the revival of the Apostolic and Scriptural custom of anointing the sick, whensoever any devout person may desire it. It is indeed difficult to say on what principle it could be refused." †

This opinion of Bishop Forbes may be illustrated by the story of the old Wesleyan woman who sent for her minister to come and oil her. It is said that the good man went to her, and, not understanding her request, suggested that such a matter should be left to the doctor; but, being referred to "what James said," and not regarding the Epistle of St. James as an epistle of straw, there was nothing for him to do but to accede to her request; so he called for a feather and some sweet oil and oiled her. I do not vouch for the truth of the story, but I can well

* Vol. ii. pp. 463, 464.

† P. 472.

understand that a minister in such a position, if he had any regard for his Bible, like Bishop Forbes, would not see on what principle it could be refused.

Before considering more closely the Sacrament of Extreme Unction in the present day, it would be well to see what references are made to it by ecclesiastical writers in the past ages of the Church.

Although St. Cyprian in the year 255 speaks of Unction in Baptism in these words, "Anointed must he of necessity be who is baptized, that having received the Chrism, that is Unction, he may be the anointed of God, and have within him the grace of Christ,"* yet we find no mention of anointing the sick from the time of St. James until the year 416, when we find it the subject of a correspondence between Decentius, Bishop of Eugubium, and Innocent I. of Rome. The answer of Innocent cannot but convince the unprejudiced reader that it was the custom of the Church at that time. Having been consulted by Decentius on this and some other matters, Innocent answered thus: "There is no doubt that this (the passage of St. James) ought to be understood of the faithful, when sick, who can be anointed with the holy oil of Chrism, which being made by the Bishop, not the Priest only, but all Christians may use, by anointing, in their own or their friends' necessities. But it was added needlessly that it was doubted as to Bishops, in what, there is no doubt, is allowed to Presbyters. For it is, therefore, said (in St. James) of Presbyters, because the Bishop, being hindered by other occupations, cannot go to all sick persons. But if a Bishop either can or thinks it meet to visit anyone, he can unhesitatingly bless and touch with the Chrism to whom it appertaineth to make the Chrism itself. For on penitents it cannot be poured because it is one kind of Sacrament. For to whom the remaining Sacraments are denied, how can it be thought that one kind is allowed?"† Dr. Browne says that Innocent "answers a question whether

* Ep. LXX.

† *Ad Decentium Resp.* viii.

the sick might be anointed with oil, and whether the Bishop might anoint," and adds that "if Extreme Unction were then a Sacrament of the Church, it is impossible that one Bishop should have asked this question of another; or, if he did, that the other should not at once have reminded him that it was a well-known Sacrament of immemorial usage." The letter of Decentius is not extant, so we cannot tell precisely what his questions were; but the main question seems to have been, not whether the sick might be anointed, since Innocent says there is no doubt about that, but whether the Bishop might himself anoint. Even if Decentius had not believed it to be a Sacrament of the Church, Bishops were not unanimous in the fifth century any more than they are in the nineteenth, and there were ignorant and heretical Bishops before that time as there have been at various times since. But Dr. Browne probably forms his opinion upon some second-hand extracts from the letter of Innocent; for if he had read the letter itself he would have seen that Innocent expressly states that he does not write because he believes Decentius to be at all ignorant of the subject, but because of the mischief that arose from some people following their own fancies in matters of ritual, instead of the Apostolical traditions and the general use of the Church, that Decentius might have the assistance of his authority in bringing the ritual of his own diocese into conformity with that of the Church of Rome, from which it had its origin, and where the Apostolical traditions were, at that time at least, faithfully cherished. Moreover, Innocent distinctly says in his letter that Unction is one kind of Sacrament, and speaks of it as equally so with the other Sacraments, which were denied to persons doing penance. How Dr. Browne can call the letter of Innocent a "doubtful answer," a "hesitating reply," or think that it proves that they "had no such custom, neither the Churches of God," if he ever read it through, I cannot conceive. It is as positive in its statements as it can well be, and clearly proves that, unless Innocent wilfully misrepresents the state of

things, the sacramental anointing of the sick was the custom of the Church in his day.

St. Cæsarius, Bishop of Arles in the sixth century, exhorts people in sickness to have recourse to this Sacrament, and not to the charms that were practised by the heathen. He says:—"As soon as any illness supervenes, let the sick person receive the Body and Blood of Christ, and then anoint his poor body, that that which is written may be fulfilled in him, 'If any is sick among you,' &c. (quoting the passage from St. James). See brethren," he goes on, "that he who in sickness has recourse to the Church will both receive health of body and obtain forgiveness of sins. Since these twofold benefits can be found in the Church, why do hapless men strain to bring on themselves manifold evils through enchanters or soothsayers and diviners?"* This reference is not noticed by Dr. Browne, who says that Innocent is the only authority from patristic ages that the Roman divines can bring. I suppose that this passage in the writings of a Father who comes midway in point of time between the Apostles and St. Bernard, the last of the Fathers, had escaped his notice; but a theological writer who also distinguished himself at Cambridge as a mathematician should bear in mind the difficulty of proving a universal negative.

In the Sacramentary of St. Gregory the Great (A.D. 590) there is a short Office, entitled "Orationes ad visitandum infirmorum," in which there is a direction of which the following is a translation: "Anoint him with holy oil and say, Almighty God have mercy upon this Thy servant, and grant him remission of all his sins, and recovery from his present sickness by this Unction and by our deprecation."

From this time the mention of this Sacrament by theological writers is more frequent. The following four instances in our own Church are to be found in the second volume of Thorpe's Anglo-Saxon Laws:—

Our Archbishop Theodore (A.D. 680) contrasts the

* *In App. S. Aug., t. v. Serm. 265, olim S. Aug. de Temp., Serm. 215.*

customs of the Greeks and Latins: "According to the Greeks a Presbyter may make the Chrism for the sick, if need be; according to the Roman use it is not allowed, save to the Bishop only."

Ecgbert, Archbishop of York (A.D. 732), in his extract "de jure Sacerdotali," has the rule, "That according to the enactment of the holy fathers, if any is sick, he be diligently anointed with sanctified oil, together with prayers."

Among the Canons enacted in the reign of King Edgar (A.D. 967) it is enjoined that "every priest give Unction to the sick, if they desire it," and "have both baptismal oil and Unction for the sick."

The Unction of the sick, "if the sick man desire it," is enjoined in the Canons of Aelfric (about the end of the tenth century); and a separate portion of the consecrated Chrism is directed to be kept for that use.

Dr. Browne ignores all these references, and says that Bellarmine can call no witness after Innocent I. before Alcuin. Whether Bellarmine could or not, all but the last two are before Alcuin; and Dr. Browne in his Commentary on the Thirty-nine Articles does not profess merely to refute Bellarmine, but, in his own words, "to interpret and explain the Articles of the Church, which bind the consciences of her clergy, according to their natural and genuine meaning, and to prove that meaning to be both Scriptural and Catholic."* The faithful carrying out of this object is not to be attained by a superficial and captious criticism of Bellarmine or any other Roman controversialist, but would entail a diligent and candid study of the history of the doctrines treated of in the Articles, a study which Dr. Browne does not seem to have found time for, or to have thought worth the trouble, at least so far as regards this Sacrament.

Although the historical evidence for this Sacrament is not so entirely wanting as Dr. Browne thinks, it must be

* Introduction to "Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles," p. II.

confessed that there are but few references to it until comparatively late times. But the few references that we do find are so clear that an unprejudiced person can have no doubt about them, especially as they are borne out by the fact that the Sacrament is used in every portion of the Catholic Church, and even by some who are beyond her pale. Bishop Forbes, who does not regard "the farther from Rome, the nearer to God," as the leading principle of the Church of England, says: "The meagreness of tradition is replaced in some measure by the agreement of the Greeks, the Armenians, the Nestorians, and all the Orientals, with the Latins on this subject; so that one cannot doubt that a Sacramental anointing of the sick has been from the beginning."*

Dr. Browne says of the Eastern Church, "The Greeks still practise Unction, but do not esteem it a Sacrament." I suppose he never heard of the Synod of Bethlehem, which decreed, "We have neither more nor fewer than seven Sacraments in the Church," one of which is declared to be the "oil of prayer," as instituted by our Lord. I believe that the word used is *μυστήριον*, or "mystery;" but the Rev. Dr. Myrianthus, Priest of the Greek Church, London Wall, tells me that "mystery" means precisely the same in the East that "sacrament" does in the West.

* "Explanation of the Thirty-nine Articles," vol. ii., p. 467. This is in accordance with the opinion of Mosheim, who, unlike most Protestants, is candid enough to admit historical facts which are not on his side. Speaking of the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church in the First Century he says: "Those who were visited with violent or dangerous disorders sent, according to the Apostle's direction, for the rulers of the Church, and, after confessing their sins, were recommended by them to the Divine mercy in prayers full of piety and fervour, and were also anointed with oil. This rite has occasioned many debates, and, indeed, they must be endless, since the silence of the ancient writers upon that head renders it impossible to decide the matter with any degree of certainty. The anointing the sick is very rarely mentioned in the ancient records of the Church, though there is no reason to doubt of its having been an universal custom among Christians."—*Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History*, translated by Maclaine, 2nd ed., vol. i., p. 105.

He says that their Catechisms always contain the question, "How many Sacraments are there?" to which the answer is invariably "Seven." Dr. Browne must at least have changed his mind upon this point, even if he is unaware of the facts I have mentioned; for the Archbishop Lycurgus told him in a conference held between them at Ely in 1870 that the Greeks do consider Unction a Sacrament, though not necessary to salvation.*

I come now to the important question whether we have a right to use this Sacrament in the Church of England.†

I will begin by stating the principle of interpretation upon which I think the laws of the Church of England are to be explained. I do not, in the first place, attach the slightest value whatever to the private opinions of those whom that irreligious affectation of piety known as Protestantism has caused to be called our blessed Reformers. We are sometimes told that in the interpretation of these laws we must be governed by the *animus imponentis*, that this *animus imponentis* is to be sought in the opinions of those who drew up the laws, and that these opinions may even be used to explain away the plain wording of the laws.‡ This is directly contrary to the principles of English law, one of the mottoes of which is

* See the Report of a Conference between the Most Reverend the Archbishop of Syria and the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Ely, published by Rivingtons, price Twopence. Bishop Harold Browne allowed in this Conference that other ordinances besides Baptism and the Holy Eucharist convey grace, and may be called Sacraments, though not in so high a sense as those two; but he seems to have a difficulty in getting free from the notion that a Sacrament must be necessary to salvation, and in distinguishing between things absolutely and conditionally necessary.

† I do not think that this is one of those questions of non-essentials which may be put off to a more convenient season; for if I were not convinced that the Church of England maintains the sevenfold Sacramental system common to both East and West, I should certainly feel bound to reconsider my position.

‡ Not only so, but those farthest removed from Catholicism are the most freely quoted, on the principle, I suppose, that, since Protestantism is a system of negations, he is the best Protestant who denies most.

Litera scripta manet, and, as an English citizen, I protest against such an attempt to fetter our liberty. Who are the unmitigated scoundrels of the sixteenth century? Who is the adulterous Henry? Who is the—well, the vain Elizabeth? Who is the bear-cub Edward VI.? Who is the cowardly, recanting, and re-recanting Cranmer, the panderer to the lust of a fickle tyrant? Who is the lecherous and perjured Luther, with his recommendation to those who had any remains of conscience to follow his own example and sin boldly? Who is the inventor of the diabolical heresy of Calvinism? Who are these offscourings of an ungodly age, the patron saints of unbelief and lust, and their weak or wicked followers, that their *animus* is to govern the Church throughout all ages? There were no doubt some good men, and good Catholics, who, desiring a true Reformation, which the Church has often wanted, and wants now, were dragged into that vortex of conflicting negations called the Reformation. Some of them, thinking superstition a less evil than unbelief, turned back in disgust from what seemed the inevitable destruction of the Church of England. Others, enduring much that was objectionable for the sake of preserving what was essential, became instrumental in what we can only regard as the miraculous preservation of the Church. I am not going to enlarge upon the question of what might have been the result of a bolder assertion of Catholic principles on the part of those who held them, though the failure of compromise in the past should be a warning to us in the future; and I would not say a word in disparagement of those who were honest and disinterested among the Reformers; but when we come to the fathers of Protestantism, the ruling spirits of the so-called Reformation, I cannot find words in the English vocabulary to express my opinion of them. Their *animus* was to Protestantize, or in other words to destroy, the Church: it was a bad one, and it was Providentially overruled. It is no thanks to them if God brought good out of evil, or at least mitigated the evil that they did.

Our Bishops refer us to the law. By all means let us

have the law: the law of the Church as it is plainly written, not a jot more, not a tittle less; the law of that Church which bids us say, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church," and in doing so bids us read her formularies in a Catholic sense; the law of that Church which does not call herself Protestant, so that it is dishonest to read in Protestantism between the lines of her formularies. We are called conspirators because we are trying not to Romanize the Church of England, but to vindicate her Catholicity. We are called traitors not because we think it right to hold something in common with Roman Catholics—for every theist does that—but because we think that the limit of what we are to hold in common is the old Vincentian canon, "*Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*," and not the fancies of those who think that the meaning of the Gospel was first discovered in the sixteenth century by a fanatic and an adulterer. We are called dishonest because we prefer the Saints to the so-called Reformers. I throw back those terms in the face of those who use them. It would be dishonest and treacherous to conspire to Romanize the Church. I repudiate the charge. I reject the claims of the Papacy because I believe the distribution of authority, and its constitutional exercise, to be a Catholic principle, to which the Papacy, with its centralized and arbitrary authority, is in direct antagonism; and I am sorry to see so much of the spirit of the Papacy in some of our Bishops, and, I must in common fairness add, in some of our Priests. But, if it is dishonest to try to Romanize the Church of England, it is still more dishonest to try to Protestantize her: for, whilst the Papacy has unfortunately been accepted by a portion of the Catholic Church (though there is, I think, a ray of hope for those of us who wish for not a wholesale secession from the Church of England,* but the true corpo-

* This is the object of that dishonest, obscure, and schismatical sect which calls itself the "Order of Corporate Reunion." It is not a "*corpus*" at all, and is, consequently, incapable of corporate reunion. It is and can be nothing but an aggregation of individuals.

rate reunion of Christendom, in the attempts to minimize the force of the acts of the Vatican Council), Protestantism, whatever individuals may think of it, is repudiated by the formularies of every portion of the Catholic Church. If it would be dishonest for an English Churchman to call himself a Papist, or to act upon principles which are distinctive of the Papal theory—and I do think it is dishonest, whether in a Bishop or anyone else—it is still more dishonest for an English Churchman to call himself a Protestant, or to teach Protestantism in the Catholic Church of England. If it be true that certain Bishops have agreed to refuse to license curates who belong to the Society of the Holy Cross because we use Catholic terminology, then those Bishops are conspirators against the Catholic Faith. If it be true that a Bishop has refused to ordain a man to the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God unless he will pledge himself not to do the work of a Priest in the Church of God, that Bishop is a traitor to his office. I must ask your indulgence for this digression, which I have thought necessary in order to explain the position of those of us who are called—I think by those who do not understand us—irreconcilables. Speaking of course for myself alone, though I think that I express the feelings of many, I give you my reasons for rejecting the idea of any reconciliation, any compromise with Protestantism.

Our Bishops refer us to the law. Let us have the law of the Church and we shall be satisfied. Now the first place in which to look for the law of the Church is the Book of Common Prayer. I take the Book of Common Prayer in its literal and grammatical sense, without regard to the fancies of the compilers; and when I find anything in it that requires explanation, I go for that explanation not to secular courts, not even to the Queen in Council, since “we give not to our princes the ministering of God’s

By its claim to be something more it becomes the latest Protestant sect. To be honest it should call itself the “Disorder of Wholesale Schism.”

Word,” any more than the ministering of the Sacraments, not to the so-called Reformed Churches of Germany or Geneva, nor to those who are falsely called our fellow-Protestants—for the Church has no fellowship with Protestantism; but I go, as everyone who professes to believe the Apostles’ Creed is bound to go, to the Catholic Church, the Body of Christ, which is really internally and essentially one, though externally divided. I would go in the first place to my Bishop in his Synod, if he were to be found there, as I trust before long he may be; but, as I do not consider Lord Penzance to be an adequate substitute for the Bishops in their Synods, I am bound to enquire for myself what Christ teaches us through the Church in her Councils and in the writings of her Saints. And if on any point which seems doubtful, and which has not been defined by the undivided Church, I find the other parts of the Catholic Church agreed, I have no doubt as to what the teaching of the Church of England must be. This, then, is my principle of interpretation—the plain, literal, and grammatical sense of the Prayer Book, explained where necessary by the decrees of the Councils of the undivided Church, the writings of the Fathers, and the general consent of the different parts of the One Catholic Church.

Let us see what we can find in the Prayer Book bearing upon the Sacrament of Extreme Unction.

In the early part of the Preface to the Prayer Book we are told that through all the alterations in the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, “the main body and essentials of it (as well in the chiefest materials as in the frame and order thereof) have still continued the same unto this day, and do yet stand firm and unshaken, notwithstanding all the vain attempts and impetuous assaults made against it by such men as are given to change, and have always discovered a greater regard to their own private fancies and interests than to that duty they owe to the public.” Now the Sacramental system of the Church is certainly among the essentials set forth in the Prayer Book, and so we are told by the law of the Church—which it may be interesting

to some people to remember is also the law of the State—that the Sacramental system of the Church has remained the same in spite of the aggression of those Protestants whose reforming zeal went somewhat farther than that of the compilers of the Prayer Book.

Further on in the same Preface we are told that “the Book as it stood before established by law doth not contain in it anything contrary to the Word of God, or to sound doctrine, or which a godly man may not with a good conscience use and submit unto, or which is not fairly defensible against any that shall oppose the same.” The Book here referred to was the Prayer Book of 1559, which was substantially the same as the Prayer Book of 1552. Although this Book shows the plainest marks of Protestant influence or “reforming zeal” of any of the Reformed Prayer Books, yet it can scarcely be taken to have condemned, even implicitly, what the Roman Communion has always held to be a Sacrament; for it is this Book of which Sir Edward Coke spoke in 1607, when he said that Pope Pius IV., “before his excommunication against Queen Elizabeth denounced, sent his letter unto her Majesty in which he did allow the Bible and Book of Divine Service, as it is now used among us, to be authentick, and not repugnant to truth. But that therein was contained enough necessary unto salvation, though there was not in it so much as might conveniently be, and that he would also allow it unto us, without changing any part, so as her Majesty would acknowledge to receive it from the Pope, and by his allowance; which her Majesty denying to do, she was then presently by the same Pope excommunicated.”* Now the form for administering the Sacrament of Extreme Unction is just one of those things which, though not necessary to salvation, might conveniently have been in the Book; but if Pius IV. did not find anything in the Book repugnant to truth, we certainly need not trouble ourselves with the idea that anything in it need be

* *The Lord Coke, his Speech and Charge.* London, 1607.

taken as denying Extreme Unction to be a Sacrament of the Church.

It is true that the form for administering this Sacrament which was contained in the Prayer Book of 1549 was omitted in the Prayer Book of 1552; but I do not think I need argue to-day the general principle that omission is not prohibition; and Edward's second Act of Uniformity, which was printed as a part of the Second Book, expressly declares the First Book to be “a very godly order..... agreeable to the Word of God and the Primitive Church, very comfortable to all good people.”

Dr. Browne says that “the English Reformers retained a form of anointing the sick in the first Service Book of Edward VI., though it does not appear that they attributed any Sacramental efficacy to it.” As there is no question that Extreme Unction was held to be a Sacrament at the time of the Reformation, and the Reformers retained it without comment, it would be more in accordance with the facts of the case to say that “it does not appear that they denied any Sacramental efficacy to it.”

The opinion of the Reformers, before any of them were contaminated by the evil influence of foreign Protestants, is to be found in a book published in 1536, composed by a commission of forty-six Divines, including all the Bishops, called the “Institution of a Christian Man,” which contains the following statement: “As touching the Sacrament of Extreme Unction, we think it convenient that all Bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach the people committed unto their spiritual charge that it shall therefore be very necessary and expedient that all true Christian people do use and observe this manner of anointing of sick persons, with due reverence and honour, as it is prescribed by the holy Apostle St. James how that the holy Fathers of the Church thought it convenient to institute and ordain that this manner of anointing of sick men, prescribed by St. James, should be observed continually in the Church of Christ, as a very godly and wholesome medicine or remedy to alleviate and mitigate

the diseases and maladies as well of the soul as of the body of Christian men. And to the intent the same should be had in more honour and veneration, the said holy Fathers willed and taught that all Christian men should repute and account the said manner of anointing among the other Sacraments of the Church, forasmuch as it is a visible sign of an invisible grace; whereof the visible sign is the anointing with oil in the Name of God, which oil (for the natural properties belonging unto the same) is a very convenient thing to signify and figure the great mercy and grace of God, and the spiritual light, joy, comfort, and gladness which God poureth out upon all faithful people calling upon Him by the inward Unction of the Holy Ghost. And the grace conferred in this Sacrament is the relief and recovery of the disease and sickness wherewith the sick person is then diseased and troubled, and also the remission of his sins, if he be then in sin." Whether the majority of the Bishops afterwards brought their individual opinions into conformity with those of Luther and Calvin is a matter of little concern to us, who have only to do with their formal and authoritative utterances; but it seems hardly right or fair to them to assume that they did, in order to justify the further assumption that they inserted the form for anointing the sick in the First Prayer Book without attributing any Sacramental efficacy to it.* If

* They certainly had not changed their minds in 1543 when the Convocation of Canterbury prepared a revised edition of this book, under the title of "*A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man.*" In this book they repeat what is quoted above as far as the words "the holy Apostle St. James," and add a fuller explanation containing the following words:—"We ought assuredly to trust that God, working in the ministration of His Sacrament, doth, by the prayer of the minister and of such as assist him, forgive those sins of the sick man which, by the frailness of his nature, in sudden motions and vehement agonies he doth commit and fall into." To anyone who wishes to know the teaching of the authorities of the Church of England at the time of the Reformation such a consensus of opinion as is to be found in these books is entitled to far more respect than the individual opinions of men of whom the most that can be said is that it is difficult to say whether there was more

they did not attribute Sacramental efficacy to it, what, in the name of common sense, did they mean by it? If it was not a Sacrament it was a superstition, certainly not agreeable to the Word of God and the Primitive Church.

I think we may argue from the Preface to the Prayer Book that, in spite of the attempts of those who love change and prefer their own opinions to their public duty as members of the Catholic Church, the Church of England has not made such a violent change in the Sacramental system of the Church as would be involved in the rejection of any one of the seven Sacraments universally recognized throughout the Church at the time of the Reformation.

But it has been said that the Twenty-fifth Article denies that Unction is a Sacrament of the Church; and it is important to notice that Dr. Browne says that the final judgment of the Reformed Church of England upon the number of the Sacraments appears first in this Article. If we look at the Article we shall find that, whether by the intention of its compilers or not, it contains much stronger statement of Catholic Dogma than many who quote it against us would honestly accept. It begins, "Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace and God's goodwill towards us, by the which He doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only

in them of the martyr, the time-server, or the heretic. I do not allow that we are bound by the private opinions of the English Bishops of the sixteenth century any more than by those of Calvin and Luther; but if those opinions are to be used at all in the interpretation of doubtful expressions it is important to know what they were, and we are more likely to find them in a semi-official statement put forth by the whole body than in the irresponsible assertions of individuals. I imagine that our Bishops would rather be judged on the questions of Ritualism and Missionary Work by the statement of opinion put forth by the Lambeth Conference than by an article in the *Nineteenth Century* and a letter to the *Echo* lately written by one of their number. I think that the Bishops of the sixteenth century should be judged in the same way.

quicken but also strengthen and confirm our faith in Him." As Bishop Forbes points out, there are five decidedly Catholic propositions contained in this paragraph: (1) Sacraments are sure witnesses of grace and God's goodwill towards us—*i.e.*, in theological language, they signify grace, or are pledges of the inward spiritual grace given to us. (2) They are effectual signs of grace and God's goodwill towards us—*i.e.*, they not only typify but convey grace; they are not bare signs, but effectual signs, that is to say, signs which have an effect. (3) By Sacraments God works invisibly in us. (4) By Sacraments He quickens our faith in Him—*i.e.*, they give life to faith. (5) By Sacraments He strengthens and confirms our faith. There is no point of Catholic teaching on the subject which is not amply and explicitly contained in these words of the Article. If our Protestant friends would read this Sacramental teaching in its plain, literal, and grammatical sense they would not only deny that Extreme Unction is a Sacrament, but they would have to deny that there is such a thing as a Sacrament at all. It is not honest for those who do not believe in Sacraments at all, as they are here spoken of, to quote the Article against us on the question of the number of the Sacraments. But, apart from their inconsistency, it does not help them. The Article goes on to say: "There are two Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel—that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord. Those five commonly called Sacraments—that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction—are not to be counted Sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures; but yet have not like nature of Sacraments with Baptism and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God." I may as well confess at once that I find a difficulty in explaining precisely what is meant by this; but it appears to me to be rather a collection of truisms crudely expressed than to involve any point of Catholic Doctrine.

We are bound to take the plain meaning of the formularies of the Church; but we are not bound to give a plain meaning to an expression which is not capable of one; and I am not prepared to follow Dr. Browne into a serious discussion of the question how a Sacrament, or anything commonly called a Sacrament, can be a state of life, or in what sense Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Unction, for which forms are provided in our Prayer Book, or in one that we are told is agreeable to the Word of God and the Primitive Church, can be said to be "corrupt following of the Apostles." But the compilers of the Articles are not generally squeamish in the matter of plainly denying what they did not believe; and if they had meant to deny that these five are Sacraments—*i.e.*, visible signs of invisible grace—they would, no doubt, have said so in unmistakable terms. The Catholic interpretation of this Article—*viz.*, that it is simply meant to distinguish between the greater Sacraments and the less—seems to be the only one of which the Article is patient, especially when it is compared with other authoritative teaching of the Church. One part of a document must always be read in connection with other parts, and, since Article XXXV. praises the Homilies, Article XXV. cannot mean that those five commonly called Sacraments are not Sacraments at all; for the Homilies directly call Matrimony a Sacrament, and of Orders they say that "neither it nor any other Sacrament else be such Sacraments as Baptism and Communion are." In fact, the Article only distinguishes the two Sacraments which are, according to the Catechism, not the only two, but the only two generally necessary to salvation, from the other five, which, if necessary at all, are only so in particular circumstances, or for particular people.* The Article could not say that the

* "Although the Sacraments of Matrimony, of Confirmation, of Holy Orders, and of Extreme Unction have been of long time past received and approved by the common consent of the Catholic Church to have the name and dignity of Sacraments, as indeed they be well worthy to have; yet there is a difference in dignity

five have not "like nature of Sacraments with Baptism and the Lord's Supper," unless it meant that they were in some sense Sacraments; and it is remarkable that the difference, according to the Article, is declared to be in the outward sign, not in the inward grace, "for that," it says, they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God." Moreover, when we look at the forms provided in our Prayer Book for Confirmation, Penance, Orders, and Matrimony, and consider how plainly the Church teaches that grace is conveyed in them, we cannot believe that she so far contradicts herself here as to deny that they are ordinances of God for the conveyance of spiritual grace.

Dr. Browne says: "Extreme Unction is an ordinance concerning which we differ from the Church of Rome more than on the other. We admit the proper use of Confirmation, Confession, Orders, and Matrimony; but Extreme Unction we neither esteem to be a Sacrament nor an ordinance of the Church at all."* I should be glad to know where Dr. Browne finds such a statement as this in the formularies of the Church, or any distinction made

and necessity between them and the other three Sacraments, that is to say, the Sacraments of Baptism, of Penance, and of the Altar, and that for divers causes."—"*Institution of a Christian Man*." I suppose that when the authors of the Institution class the Sacrament of Penance with those of Baptism and of the Altar, and say that "these three Sacraments be instituted of Christ, to be as certain instruments or remedies necessary for our salvation and the attaining of everlasting life," they mean that the Sacrament of Penance is necessary *per accidens*, conditionally on the committal of mortal sin. To say that it is necessary *per se*, as the Sacraments of Baptism and of the Altar are, would be equivalent to saying that mortal sin is necessary to salvation, since it is never said to be necessary except in the case of mortal sin. The Roman rule of confession once a-year assumes the committal of mortal sin at least once a-year, which may be a practical truth, but is certainly not a condition of salvation. The Catechism speaks of the two Sacraments which are "generally necessary to salvation"—*i.e.*, necessary *per se*—but says nothing of those which are necessary *per accidens*, or conditionally.

* "*Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*," p. 588.

between the five lesser Sacraments. If, as I believe, this distinction appears for the first time in Dr. Browne's book, I should like to know when and whence he received authority to add a new negation to the Thirty-nine Articles in the name of the Church of England. Nothing more is said against Extreme Unction than against the other four; and it should be remembered that they all stand or fall together, since they are all spoken of in the same terms. It is somewhat inconsistent for our Bishops to marry, sometimes more than once, and then to refuse to consecrate oil for us on the ground that it is condemned by this Article. I suppose that when they want to marry they call Matrimony a state of life partly allowed by Scripture; * as far as I am concerned, they may call Unction the same, if they will only consent to bless the oil for us. If it be somewhat uncertain what the Article does mean, it is quite evident what it does not mean. It cannot be taken to mean that the five commonly called Sacraments are not Sacraments at all—*i.e.*, that they are not "visible signs of invisible grace," nor to forbid the use of any one of them; and this is sufficient for our present purpose.†

* Someone present at the meeting suggested that it might be a corrupt following of the Apostles, especially of St. Peter, himself a married man.

† The Rev. Canon Carter, of Clewer, speaks thus on this question, with especial reference to the Sacrament of Penance, in his letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, "*The Present Movement a True Phase of Anglo-Catholic Church Principles*"—"The anxiety felt at the Reformation was to distinguish between the greater and the less, between the two 'generally necessary' and the others which have their special limitations. Mr. Palmer, in his *Book of the Church* already referred to, asserted their relative positions, quoting, among other testimonies, Jeremy Taylor's words: 'It is none of the doctrine of the Church of England that there are two Sacraments only; but that of these rituals commanded in Scripture, which the ecclesiastical use calls Sacraments (by a word of art) two only are generally necessary to salvation' (Taylor's *Dissuasive*, p. 240, ed. Cardwell). The Homilies, as is well known, speak of 'matrimony,' and 'ordering of ministers,' as Sacraments, as well as 'absolution.' It is this which has been pressed of late, as a protest of vital importance, against popular misbelief, because guarding the truth of the

I think I have shown that there is nothing in the Prayer Book which can, on just principles of interpretation, be taken to deny that Extreme Unction is a Sacrament of the Church. I care not whether some of the compilers wished to deny it. I care nothing for their private opinions expressed elsewhere. We are told by some of our Bishops to keep within the four corners of the Prayer Book; and I maintain that, judged by that standard, the Church of England cannot be said to have repudiated the Sacrament of Extreme Unction.

I will now turn to what I believe to be a positive command to continue the practice of it, a command which I find within the four corners of the Prayer Book, or rather, I should say, within the eight corners. I suppose that the copy the Bishops speak of with only four corners is a condensed edition, all on one page (perhaps Lord Ebury's), and that this is the reason why they do not find so much

grace of God imparted through such ordinances, and raising them above the level of mere 'rites and ceremonies,' to which long-rooted prejudice had sunk them. And it is indeed mere logomachy to say that these lesser Sacraments are not to be reckoned as real Sacraments, because they are not 'Sacraments of the Gospel' in the sense which the Church of England attaches to the term—a specific term applied by us only to the two greater Sacraments—when equally with them these lesser ordinances fall under the ancient definition of a Sacrament—namely, the 'visible sign of an invisible grace.' Questions touching Sacramental grace have assumed a wholly different character from what they bore at the time of the Reformation. Then the controversy was as to the proportionate value and efficacy of the different ordinances of grace; now it turns on the point whether there are any Sacraments at all conveying grace; for even the Holy Eucharist is viewed as a mere commemoration of love, and Holy Baptism is to many a mere seal of regeneration given one cannot say when. While this is the state of feeling among vast bodies of Churchmen, it is matter of vital concern, while fully allowing the difference between the greater and the less, to affirm the principle of Sacramental grace with the more earnest care in the case of those ordinances which are most in danger of being set aside" (pp. 31, 32). I would urge upon those who do believe in Sacramental grace that these weighty words have a special force when applied to Extreme Unction, the most neglected in the Church of England of all the Sacraments.

in it as we do. I must confess that there was a time when, in my ignorance, I was rather afraid of the limitation; but, since my attention has been, by the advice of our Bishops, concentrated upon what is to be found in the Prayer Book, I have learned more and more how much it contains. I have not yet learned to call it "our incomparable Liturgy," and, as long as I use it honestly, I do not think I am disloyal to the Church of England in expressing the belief that its compilers were lamentably ignorant of liturgical principles and altogether lacking in liturgical instinct; but I do think that—while they have bungled the Missal and Breviary, on the same principle that they would have shuffled a pack of cards, apparently with the mischievous desire to make them in every way different to what they were before, so that one's flesh creeps at the outrages upon liturgical propriety of which they have been guilty—they were providentially hindered from touching any vital part in the Sacramental system of the Church. Indeed, when I read the puerile nonsense that is talked in Convocation when any liturgical question is under discussion, I devoutly pray that, at least until our would-be liturgical reformers think it worth while to study liturgical principles in history, instead of evolving them from their own imaginations, our Prayer Book may be left as it is. It has been tinkered enough already, and I tremble for the preservation of Catholic truth among us when I see our ecclesiastical tinkers itching to use the Prayer Book as school-children use an old garment, to practise putting in patches. Whatever the imperfections of our Prayer Book may be, we ought to be very jealous of any attempt to improve (?) it by the insertion of Anglican idiosyncracies. If it may be allowed me for once to agree with Pope Pius IV., I would say of our present Prayer Book as he said of the Prayer Book of 1559, that, though it does not contain all that might conveniently be in it, it does contain all, and more than all, that is necessary to salvation. Among other things I believe that it contains ample authority for the Sacramental anointing of the sick.

The Ornaments Rubric, even if it is cut out of the four-cornered Prayer Book, still stands in the Prayer Book that we pledged ourselves at our Ordination to use, and enjoins "that such Ornaments of the Church and of the Ministers thereof, at all times of their ministrations, shall be retained and be in use, as were in this Church of England by the authority of Parliament, in the second year of King Edward VI." It is commonly supposed, and I daresay correctly, that the revisers meant to refer, partly at least, to the ornaments used under the Prayer Book of 1549. But, as a matter of fact, they did nothing of the kind. On the principle that I have already spoken of, the strict legal principle of looking at the exact wording of the law, the rubric carries us back to an earlier date and a fuller ritual than that of the Prayer Book of 1549 (if indeed the Book made any difference in the ritual). That unhappy youth Edward VI. began his short but mischievous reign on January 28th, 1547. Consequently the second year of Edward VI. began on January 28th, 1548, and the third year began on January 28th, 1549. The Prayer Book of 1549 was embodied in an Act of Parliament which had passed the House of Lords on January 15th, and the House of Commons on January 21st, 1549, just one week before the end of the second year of Edward VI. It cannot be proved to have received the Royal Assent, and so to have become an Act of Parliament, within the second year; but, even if it did, it did not propose to take effect till Whitsun Day, which was June 9th, 1549; so that the alterations, if any, in the ornaments were not in the Church by the authority of Parliament until more than four months after the commencement of the third year of Edward VI. Even if the Prayer Book of 1549 could be taken to belong to the second year, it would not be the only source from which to learn the interpretation of the Ornaments Rubric. It would only give us the minimum enjoined in it, not the maximum allowed or enjoined elsewhere.* In fact, the

* It must be borne in mind that an Act of Parliament, 25 Henry VIII., xix. 7, which was in force throughout the second year

ornaments enjoined in the Ornaments Rubric can be limited even to those of the Prayer Book of 1549 only by the assumption that second is equivalent to first and that a year is the same thing as a Prayer Book.

This point is of small importance for my purpose to-day, because, provision being made in the Prayer Book of 1549 for the anointing of the sick, the Chrismatory, or vessel for the holy oil, is one of the ornaments specially authorized by that Book. But I did not like to touch upon the question of the Ornaments Rubric without reminding you that we have a right to much more than the Prayer Book of 1549 contains authority for. We have a right, for instance, beyond the six points, to have and use such things as Holy-water Stoups, Images and Pictures of Saints, Tabernacles,*

of Edward VI., gave force of law to all canon laws and ecclesiastical ordinances which did not contradict any civil statute, or oppose the royal prerogative; so that ornaments which had the authority of the Church were also in the Church by the authority of Parliament, subject to the above provision.

* It has been said that the use of these is forbidden by the Rubric at the end of the Communion Service, which enjoins that "if any remains of that which was consecrated it shall not be carried out of the Church, but the Priest and such other of the communicants as he shall then call unto him shall, immediately after the Blessing, reverently eat and drink the same." This cannot apply to that portion of the consecrated species which is already provided for by the order to have and use a Tabernacle, any more than to that which has already been provided for by the Communion of the Priest and people. Both have logically been equally removed from the operation of this Rubric. It does not forbid Reservation, but it does assert the Real Presence, without which it would be superstition, if not idolatry, to "reverently eat and drink the same;" and it does enjoin the ablutions, without which it would be impossible to "eat and drink" the same at all. As the Presence does not depend upon the size of the Host or the fulness of the Chalice, it is just as irreverent to leave the smallest portion on the Paten, or the smallest drop in the Chalice, as any larger quantity, and is just as truly disobedience to this Rubric. The provision that the Priest may call other communicants to him might seem to smack of Protestant irreverence, as in the case of the old women who in some country churches wait to assist in emptying the Chalice; but it

Monstrances, Osculatories, Holy-water Sprinklers, Graduals, Antiphonaries, whilst the only legal hymn-book would be the "Hymnal Noted," as the translation of the old Office hymns. Indeed, by insisting on obedience to the strict letter of the law, not as explained away by secular courts, but as plainly written in our Prayer Book, our Bishops will by no means simplify the Ritual of the Church of England. We have heard charges made against the clergy of forcing advanced Ritual upon unwilling congregations; now, if they are not talking clap-trap, but are really honest when they insist on strict obedience to the law, it is the Bishops who are forcing still more advanced Ritual upon us. There was a time when we might perhaps have accepted the Prayer Book of 1549 as a compromise. I am not sorry that that compromise was not made, for I hate compromise. My idea of a compromise is that it is a sacrifice of a principle for something that seems expedient and turns out disastrous. I do not think it would be honest for us to make a compromise in this matter. The Ritual of the Church is not an absolute gift to ourselves, but a trust which we hold for our successors. I believe it to be our right and our duty to claim for ourselves, and to hand on to our successors, the full Ritual of the Western Church, with only such adaptations as may be necessitated by the structure of our Liturgy.

But, as I have already said, whatever interpretation is given to the Ornaments Rubric, if it is not interpreted away altogether, as in the four-cornered Prayer Book, it enjoins the use of the Chrismatory for the anointing of the sick; so that the use of the Sacrament of Extreme Unction, so far from being forbidden, is enjoined by the Church of England.

Having traced out the history of the Sacrament of Ex-

seems to me to be simply a providential provision by which, when a Priest has to duplicate, he need not break his fast by taking the ablations himself, but may give them to the server, or, if he is not a communicant, or not fasting, to some other person who is a communicant, and who is fasting.

treme Unction, I must now say something about its administration and effects.

The matter is oil (olive oil being ordinarily used) which is specially blessed for the purpose; but there is some divergence of practice on the question of the Minister of this Benediction. The Easterns allow it to be blessed by Priests, though it is not generally done by one Priest alone, but by seven, or at least three. In case of necessity, however, Dr. Myrianthus says that it is blessed by two Priests, or even by one alone. The Western use, from the earliest notices of the Sacrament, orders it to be blessed by the Bishop. There is one Anglican Church at least in London where the oil has been blessed by seven Priests. I think that, having regard to the words of St. James and the conservative character of the Eastern Church, we may conclude that the Roman rule is simply a matter of discipline, and that with us, if the Bishop refuses to supply consecrated oil, seven Priests (or three) would be perfectly justified in blessing it for themselves. I cannot but think that this is preferable to the use of oil blessed by a Bishop of another diocese, which has, I believe, been practised, though probably in very few instances, and which looks to me like the hawking about of sacred things, if not a schismatical intrusion. Dens, in his treatise on this Sacrament, says that "the ordinary minister is the Bishop, the extraordinary the simple Priest, but not unless by special commission of the Supreme Pontiff, or by custom as among the Greeks." I quote this because it seems to show that the Roman authorities themselves regard the reservation of the benediction to the Bishop as a matter of discipline only. A further question arises whether to bless oil for any other than his own parish is not an infringement by a Priest on the rights of the Bishop; whether one Priest cannot, except as a matter of discipline, do what three or seven can; and consequently, where there is only one Priest in a parish, as no rules are laid down in our Communion for the administration of the Sacrament, whether, in conformity with the Greek custom, he might

not, if the Bishop refuse, bless the oil himself; and whether this would not be more regular than to obtain consecrated oil in any other way. This is a question upon which I should hesitate to give a decided opinion, and I should be glad to hear suggestions on this point. However this may be, whether one, or three, or seven Priests may be allowed to bless the oil in case of the refusal of the Bishop, I think we are bound so far to respect the use of the Western Church as to regard such benediction as only a matter of sufferance in cases of necessity, and not as in any way relieving our Bishops of their responsibility for neglecting such an important duty belonging to their Office.* According to the Roman Ritual the oil is blessed by the Bishop on Maundy Thursday, and distributed to the Priests; and in case the supply of consecrated oil is not sufficient for the year it may be mixed with oil that has not been consecrated.

In regard to the mode of anointing, the Roman Ritual enjoins the anointing of the organs of the five senses—the eyes, ears, nostrils, mouth, and hands—and also of the loins and feet; but it has been questioned how many of these are necessary. It has been customary to substitute the unction of the breast or lower part of the throat for that of the loins in the case of females, and even for the sake of convenience in the case of males; and some of the unctions have generally been allowed to be omitted in the case of contagious diseases. There seems to be no reason for thinking that anything more is essential to the Sacra-

* Canon XXX. of 1603 states that, “so far was it from the purpose of the Church of England to forsake and reject the Churches of Italy, France, Spain, Germany, or any such like Churches, in all things which they held and practised, that, as the apology of the Church of England confesseth, it doth with reverence retain those ceremonies which do neither endamage the Church of God, nor offend the minds of sober men; and only departed from them in those particular points wherein they were fallen both from themselves in their ancient integrity, and from the Apostolical Churches, which were their first founders.” This seems to imply that the Western use at the time of the Reformation is binding upon us in all particulars in which it has not been specially abrogated.

ment than the one unction on the forehead or breast prescribed in the Prayer Book of 1549.

It appears that the form of words has always been deprecatory, and refer to both bodily and spiritual healing. I have already given the form from the Sacramentary of St. Gregory, which, according to the Rev. J. H. Blunt, “probably represents—as other portions of that Sacramentary are known to do—an Office of earlier date.”* I give here translations of extracts from the Roman and Greek forms.

The Roman has the following:—“O Lord God, Who hast said by Thy Apostle James, ‘Is any sick among you? let him call for the Presbyters of the Church and let them pray over him in the Name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith shall save the sick; and the Lord shall alleviate him; and if he be in sins they shall be remitted unto him;’ cure, we beseech Thee, our Redeemer, the languor of this sick person, and heal his wounds, and forgive his sins, and expel from him all dolours of mind and body, and mercifully restore full health within and without, that restored by the help of Thy mercy, he may be repaired for his former duties; Who, &c.” “Holy Lord, Almighty Father, everlasting God, Who, pouring the grace of Thy blessing into sick bodies, with manifold love guardest Thy creatures, be present of Thy goodness at the invocation of Thy Name, and, freeing Thy servant from sickness and granting him health, raise him up with Thy Right Hand, strengthen him with might, protect him with power, and, with the longed-for prosperity, restore him to Thy Holy Church, through, &c.”

Corresponding with this the Greek form has:—“Holy Father, Healer of souls and bodies, Who didst send Thine only-begotten Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, healing every disease and redeeming from death, heal this Thy servant also of the sickness of soul and body which encompasses him, and quicken him through the grace of Thy Christ;

* *Sacraments and Sacramental Ordinances*, p. 219.

for Thou art the fountain of healing, O Christ our God, and to Thee we send up the glory, to the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit."

We may compare with these, which it should be noticed are very similar in spirit, the form prescribed in the Prayer Book of 1549:—"As with this visible oil thy body outwardly is anointed, so our Heavenly Father, Almighty God, grant of His infinite goodness, that thy soul inwardly may be anointed with the Holy Ghost, Who is the Spirit of all strength, comfort, relief, and gladness; and vouchsafe for His great mercy (if it be His blessed Will) to restore unto thee thy bodily health and strength to serve Him; and send thee relief of all thy pains, troubles, and diseases, both in body and mind. And however His goodness (by His divine and unsearchable providence) shall dispose of thee, we, His unworthy ministers and servants, humbly beseech the eternal Majesty to do with thee according to the multitude of His innumerable mercies, and to pardon thee all thy sins and offences, committed by all thy bodily senses, passions, and carnal affections; Who also vouchsafe mercifully to grant unto thee ghostly strength, by His Holy Spirit, to withstand and overcome all temptations and assaults of thine adversary, that in no wise he prevail against thee, but that thou mayest have perfect victory and triumph against the Devil, sin, and death, through Christ our Lord; Who by His death hath overcome the prince of death, and with the Father and the Holy Ghost evermore liveth and reigneth God, world without end. Amen."

It is curious that the compilers of the Prayer Book of 1549 should have so carefully expressed the connection of the inward grace of healing with the outward sign of anointing, if they did not attribute Sacramental efficacy to it. This form of words seems to me to agree exactly with the statement about Unction quoted above from the "Institution of a Christian Man."

It will be convenient here to consider what are the effects of the Sacrament. The passage in St. James points

to a twofold effect which is briefly expressed in these words by the Council of Florence: "The effect is the healing of the mind, and also, but so far as is beneficial, that of the body itself."

St. Thomas gives the following as the effects: (1) Sanctifying grace; (2) Sacramental or actual graces; (3) Removal of the remains of sins, and alleviation of mind by exciting in the sick man trust in the Divine mercy; (4) Remission of sins; (5) Healing of the body. I may remind you that sanctifying grace is another name for habitual grace, that supernatural gift of grace which, abiding in the soul by way of habit, makes it formally acceptable to God. It is distinguished as primary habitual grace, which makes the unjust to be in a state of grace, and secondary habitual grace, which is an augmentation of grace in those who are in a state of grace, and so makes the justified man more righteous. It is this secondary habitual grace which, according to St. Thomas, is given *per se* in the Sacrament of Extreme Unction, and sometimes *per accidens* the primary habitual grace. Actual grace is that transient supernatural Divine help which moves the soul to think, or desire, or perform what is right. The remains of sins which are said to be removed are sluggishness of the soul in regard to heavenly things, fear on account of the uncertainty of salvation, proneness to evil, cowardice, &c., and it is not said that they are completely eradicated, but that supernatural aid is given to contend against them. The sins which are said to be remitted are venial sins, and even mortal sin in certain cases, such as when the Sacrament of Penance cannot be administered, or when mortal sin has been committed since the Sacrament of Penance has been administered and has been forgotten. The healing of the body, though fully recognized in the form for administering the Sacrament, is practically held by the Roman Communion to be a subordinate object of the Sacrament, and I cannot see that they are to be blamed for this, since the healing of the body can only be desirable from a Christian point of view when it is beneficial to the soul.

It is allowed by all whose opinion the members of our Guild would think to be entitled to respect, that the two objects, the healing of the body and the healing of the soul, have always been recognized by those who have used this Sacrament, and this is proved by the different forms I have quoted to be common to the Eastern, Roman, and Anglican Communion; and, bearing this in mind, I cannot think it consistent with my Christianity to blame those who have treated the health of the soul as of greater importance than the health of the body, and so have given practical proof of their faith in a fact which we all profess to believe.

The Rev. W. Palmer says: "The Easterns have kept more exactly than the Latins to the primitive idea and practice, calling in not one Priest only, but the Priests of the Church, and regarding the whole act as a sacramental intercession to obtain healing, whereas the Latins (as the Eastern Divines sometimes object) make it rather a preparation for expected death. Nevertheless, as the Easterns do not seek to be anointed on every trivial occasion, but when they think themselves dangerously ill, and defer for the most part as long as possible to own that they are in danger, the common practice among them differs not much from that of the Latins. And as it has become a custom for all when they are manifestly in danger to send for the Priest to anoint them, and as the great majority of them that so send and are so anointed, in compliance with the custom, are not raised up again to health of body in this life, but die, it is clear that ordinarily Christian faith and charity can only hope that at any rate the remains of sin (so far as sin is connected with disease and decay and death) may through that solemn intercession and anointing be forgiven to the soul. And this is precisely the point which is put most prominently forward in the Latin Church." *

I understand from Dr. Myrianthus that this does not

* *Dissertation on the Eastern Church*, pp. 130, 131.

fully express the practice of his own Communion at the present time. He says that with them even in slight sickness the faithful may, and sometimes do, send for the Priest to anoint them; but, making full allowance for this, I still think the difference between the two Communion to be one of degree rather than of kind.*

In considering the effects of this Sacrament there are three points which must be borne in mind: (1) That in the first reference to Unction in the New Testament which I have quoted (St. Mark vi. 13), where we are told that the Apostles "anointed with oil many that were sick and healed them," the Unction was only for the healing of the body, and that necessarily, for at that time there could be no Sacramental healing of the soul; and this very probably gave, in the early days of Sacramental Unction of the sick, a prominent, if not undue, importance in the minds of many to the bodily effects of the Sacrament; (2) that in the passage in St. James a twofold effect is assigned to the Unction—the healing of the body and the healing of the soul; (3) that when the same rite has a twofold effect, temporal and spiritual, which has always been held of Unction throughout the Church, then natural piety must lead us to regard the spiritual as of infinitely greater moment than the temporal blessing. This view of the question seems to have developed until now we find it,

* To show that Unction for spiritual purposes alone is familiar to the Greek mind I may point out that with them, besides the Unctions at Baptism, Confirmation, and Ordination, Unction is used for the whole as well as for the sick, especially as a preparation for the Easter Communion. It would be as strange as it is contrary to the wording of their prayers if the Easterns used Unction for the whole solely for spiritual effects, and Unction for the sick solely, or even mainly, for bodily effects. The Archbishop of Syria at the Conference to which I have already alluded disclaimed the identity of their Unction with the Extreme Unction of the Romans; but I think that this comes from misapprehension of the history of the latter. The Archbishop, like some among ourselves, seems to have a hatred of what is Roman for Rome's sake, which is at least as mischievous as to love what is Roman for Rome's sake.

though perhaps in slightly different degrees, the prevailing feeling throughout the Church. We may also bear in mind that the development of medical skill under God's guidance has in many cases obviated the need for supernatural healing of the body; but the terrors of death, so appalling very often even to those who have received the other Sacraments with the greatest devotion, still remain and call for the restoration amongst us of the use of this Sacrament.

Whilst treating of the object of the Sacrament I cannot pass over the anointing of our Blessed Lord by Mary,* which, although I have not seen it commented upon in this connection, I cannot dissociate in my own mind from the Sacrament of Extreme Unction. What I say on this subject I put forward simply for the consideration of those better able to deal with the question than I am. In the first place what is called ointment in our translation is not a solid, but a liquid unguent, and ought rather to be called oil. I believe that the word *μόρον*, which is used by St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. John in their accounts of this event, always means "oil;" and if the word *πιστικός* does not mean "liquid," as some commentators think, St. Matthew and St. Mark both say that Mary "poured" it (*κατίχευεν*) upon our Lord. Now when we bear in mind how closely the notion of consecration was connected with Unction in the Jewish mind, and the special commendation that Mary received, may we not regard our Lord's words, "She hath done it for my burial," as implying something more than the anticipation of the usual funeral rites, especially as those funeral rites were actually performed by Joseph and Nicodemus, and designed by the holy women, including St. Mary Magdalene herself? It would seem that the anointing could not have been viewed as performed instead of the anointing of His dead Body either by our Lord Himself, Who foresaw His anointing by Joseph and Nicodemus, or by St. Mary Magdalene, who sought to

* St. Matthew xxvi. 6-13, St. Mark xiv. 3-9, St. John xii. 1-8.

anoint Him afterwards; whilst even in regard to the customary anointing of the dead among the Jews there must probably have been some idea of consecration with a view to the future state and the resurrection of the body. I would ask, then, whether we may not hold as a pious opinion, though we may not venture to dogmatize upon it, that, as our Lord by His Baptism is held to have sanctified water to the mystical washing away of sin, though He does not definitely say that that was His object, so also by His anointing He sanctified oil to strengthen His people in their last hours, by taking away the remains of former sins, and giving them comfort and confidence in the Divine mercy, and also, as it were, to consecrate them for the final struggle with their spiritual enemies, and for the new stage in the spiritual life which is to be entered upon in the intermediate state. I may add to this that John Eckius gives as one of the effects of the Sacrament "a kind of consecration as of a soldier and wrestler of Christ." I do not at all mean to imply that the Sacrament of Extreme Unction depends in any way upon this interpretation of the anointing of our Blessed Lord; but, if the interpretation is allowable, I think it will illustrate and emphasize the importance of the Sacrament, and it certainly gives a beautiful significance to the statement of the Evangelist, that "the house was filled with the odour of the ointment."

Having considered the effects, we will pass on to the consideration of who are the proper subjects for this Sacrament. It will be evident to those who have considered its effects that it is a Sacrament of the living, and, consequently, that only those are subjects for it who have been baptized and are not in mortal sin, except in those special cases I have spoken of in which it is said to remit mortal sin.*

* "And yet we ought not thereupon"—*i.e.*, because of the remission of sin spoken of by St. James—"to conceive a vain false hope of the effect of the Sacrament, that, living in filthy and abominable sin, and not caring to be delivered from it by true

We have also seen that, if the Romans are more strict than the Greeks in theory, only allowing it to be used when the sick person is in danger of death, yet there is only a difference of degree in the practice of the two Communions. There is much to be said for the Roman strictness, whether in regard to the bodily or spiritual effects: for, if we look to the bodily effects, it would appear wrong, and like the spirit of those Jews who were continually seeking a sign from our Lord where there was no need of one, to look to God for supernatural healing before we have fairly tried those natural means which He has, in an increasing degree as time has gone on, put within our reach; whilst He Who raised Lazarus from the dead can as easily restore health when all human hope is gone as at the beginning of an illness, a fact which we sometimes see even apart from this Sacrament; and, if we look to the spiritual effects, there seems much reason in the opinion that the most fitting time for the use of the Sacrament is when death is, or seems to be, approaching. Unction has been dishonoured by extravagant and erroneous opinions in both directions. On the one hand the "Peculiar People," while disregarding the Church with her Sacramental system, refuse to employ any natural means of healing, and substitute for them anointing with oil, accompanied with prayer. They err by seeking to use too hastily, and instead of natural means, a supernatural gift which they do not really possess. On the other hand, there is the superstition that arose in the thirteenth century that it was not lawful to eat flesh or return to the use of marriage after receiving this Sacrament, which was

penance, we should, by the ministrations of Extreme Unction, have all our sins forgiven; for this Sacrament is ministered faithfully only to those that be members of Christ's Church, and such as, being fallen out of the state of grace by deadly sin, have been by penance restored to the same; which men, by this Sacrament, be strengthened and comforted in their agony and fight against the Devil, who in the time of sickness and vexation of the body is very busy to assault them."—*"Necessary Doctrine and Erudition of a Christian Man."*

speedily condemned as heretical, though, in conjunction with the superstitious dread of anything which seemed to speak of the approach of death, and on account of which people have often feared to make a will, it probably had considerable influence in the direction of postponing the use of the Sacrament until the point of death, or neglecting it altogether. Between the erroneous opinions on either side there seems to be legitimate room for considerable variety of opinion and practice. I do not see how this Sacrament could be refused to any of the faithful in any sickness of a serious nature, whilst I think that they might be generally recommended not to seek it for bodily healing until natural means have been fairly tried.

I have taken the unpopular side of the question in defending this Sacrament. I believe that I take up a still more unpopular position when I come to the defence of the name of "Extreme Unction." I am met at once by a proverb, "Give a dog a bad name, and you may as well hang him." There are some people who throw a proverb at you just as they throw a bone to a dog, and expect it to stop your mouth in the same way. But I cannot say that I have much faith in proverbial philosophy, whether Mr. Tupper's or anyone else's. Proverbs sometimes cut both ways; and the back edge, like that of an old knife, is sometimes the sharpest. Let us just look at this proverb. Suppose the case of a dog with a name that is misunderstood and wrongly thought to be a bad one; suppose the owner to find that dog, with a rope round his neck, in the hands of an official authorized to destroy dangerous dogs. Do you think the best way to save the dog's life would be to say that the dog had a bad name once, but that he would promise to change it? The answer would probably be, "You can change his name, but can you change his nature?" I think that the wisest course would be to explain the name that had been misunderstood, in the hope that the dog might be allowed to live and live down the prejudice against him and his name. Gentlemen with a habit of changing their names figure in those columns of

the newspapers devoted to the record of exploits which a paternal government rewards with gratuitous board and lodging for certain definite periods, and I do not think it right to attempt to whitewash the reputation of a Sacrament by the help of an expedient resorted to by thieves. The prejudice against the name of Extreme Unction is grounded on a misapprehension, and if it is allowed to prevail cannot but end in a sacrifice, or at least an obscuring, of truth. It is popularly supposed that this name arose from the custom of administering the Sacrament only to those *in extremis*; but this is a mistake, for it has been called "Extreme Unction" from the twelfth century, and so before it came to be used after the Viaticum in the thirteenth century.* I need not tell you that "Extreme Unction is not the antithesis to "moderate" Unction, though I think that many people are prejudiced against it because they do not like the sound of the word "extreme." Catholic writers are agreed that the word "extreme" here simply means "last," and that "Extreme Unction" is so called because it is the last of the Unctions used in the rites of the Church during the Christian's life.† On this ground I would urge upon you to maintain the use of this name, because it implies a belief that Unction is a Catholic rite

I state this on the authority of Mabillon, quoted by Bishop Forbes (*Explanation of the Thirty-nine Articles*, vol. ii., p. 470), who says that it is proved by the contemporary life of William, Archbishop of Bourges, who died A.D. 1209; but I have not had the opportunity yet of verifying this reference.

† "For the truth is, that the holy fathers of the Church did neither call this Sacrament the Extreme Unction (that is to say, the last Unction), because it should be ministered last and after all other Sacraments, neither yet did they ordain that the same should be ministered only when sick men should be brought unto the extreme pangs of death; but they did call it by the said name of Extreme Unction because it is the last in respect of the other inunctions which be ministered before in the other Sacraments of Baptism and Confirmation (in both which Sacraments Christian men be also anointed and anointed)." — *Necessary Doctrine and Erndition for any Christian Man.*"

which ought to be used on other occasions as well as in the Sacramental anointing of the sick, as St. Cyprian, in a passage already quoted, insists upon its use in Baptism. We should always bear in mind, when the use of Catholic terminology is called in question, that we must not look to the immediate controversy only. We are sometimes urged to fight for things and not for words. I think that we ought to be most jealous of any attempt to curtail our liberty in the use of terms which embody the experience of the Church through many ages, which have been used by so many saints now gone to their rest, and which are indissolubly bound up with the noble contentions of those holy men for the faith once delivered to the saints. I believe that the Day of Judgment will alone reveal the terrible loss to souls that has resulted from the practical disuse in our Communion of Catholic terminology.* I am

* I would here especially deplore the disuse of the word "Mass." It is often objected that no satisfactory explanation of its etymology can be given; but I think that this is rather an advantage than a disadvantage to a term which is the expression of so high a mystery as the "showing the Lord's death till He come." A word of clearly-defined etymology must tend to limit our conception of this mystery, as in fact all other terms which are in any degree synonymous with it do limit it, expressing only one aspect of that sublime mystery; whereas the word "Mass," untrammelled by etymological pedantry, transcending all definition, has come by force of association to express the representation of the Sacrifice of Calvary in all its aspects. The Roman passion for precise definition, identical with the Protestant refusal to believe what cannot be understood, though working on different lines, has resulted, in the definition of Transubstantiation, in the assertion that spiritual substance is governed by the same laws and can be bound down by the same definitions, as material substance, a position which I cannot distinguish from materialism. Those who pay any attention to the denunciation of Ezekiel against those who refuse to warn the wicked of their danger, and who dare not repeat to them the old lie of Satan, "Ye shall not surely die," cannot be too grateful to the Rev. H. N. Oxenham for his work on Catholic Eschatology. But it seems to me to be marred in one respect by the assumption that the Real Presence necessarily involves Transubstantiation. His reason for the assumption is that he cannot conceive of any other mode of the Real Presence. Nor can I; but it is just because Transubstantiation is

entirely at issue with the spirit of the age—the spirit of compromise—which is a spirit of untruth. I have no sympathy with the policy which governs some who would dictate to us our line of action, a policy which seeks peace at the expense of truth. The martyrs and confessors of old were as eager for the peace of Jerusalem as those who are always thinking of what they can give up for the sake of peace, but it was not in the spirit of compromise that they sought it. “Love the truth and peace, saith the Lord Almighty,” was from early times a Scripture that formed a part of their daily morning devotions, and it was from the beginning their rule of life. They never thought that peace was to be sought or desired at the expense of truth or of the expression of truth. We are told now that we need not be so particular about our mode of expressing the truth so long as we hold the truth itself. There are two answers to this. In the first place, when the use of some Catholic term is called in question, you may perhaps find another term which expresses the same truth from the point of view from which you are regarding it at the time, but you cannot transfer the associations that have grown out of the experience and controversy of ages from the old term to the new one; and so, when another aspect of the same truth is called in question, as history repeats itself and the

conceivable that I doubt it. Our Communion, while repudiating a vulgar notion of Transubstantiation which was, or was supposed to be, prevalent previous to the Tridentine definition, has Providentially been kept from defining the mode of the Presence. I think that the term “Mass” should be used on the same principle that the term “Transubstantiation” should be avoided, because we dare not attempt to tie down spiritual mysteries within the limits of our feeble conception of them, and so hinder our conception from approximating somewhat nearer to the truth. In using the word we are loyal to the Church of England, not only because of this general principle, but because it is authorized by the Prayer Book of 1549, a Book which even the most anti-Roman of our Reformers tell us is agreeable to the Word of God and the Primitive Church. The disuse of the term has resulted in a popular disbelief in the Sacrifice of the Altar, and the consequent neglect of our Blessed Lord’s command, *ταῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν* (St. Luke xxii. 19).

old controversies recur, you will find that with the old term you have lost the full expression of the truth. In the second place, we must remember that it is not enough to keep the truth at the bottom of our hearts; we have to show it forth before God, before angels, and before men. I will not argue the question whether it is possible to hold the truth without giving it expression, though I have a very strong opinion about that; but I will venture to say, without fear of contradiction, that it is impossible to bear witness to Catholic truth unless we maintain its verbal expression by Catholic terminology, and its Ritual expression by Catholic worship. When I speak of Catholic terminology and Catholic worship (a term for which I was lately taken to task by an anonymous writer in the *Church Times*, with the concurrence of the editor) I do not, of course, mean that every word and every detail of ceremonial can possibly be Catholic in the strictest sense of the word. It will be obvious to any person of average intellect that I mean terminology and worship which are based upon Catholic principles, not on insular prejudice, and which express in our own case the fact of the Church of England being a part of the one Catholic Church, and especially our close connection with the great Latin Communion, whatever the faults of that Communion may be. I do not, for instance, agree with the anonymous writer of “Words for Peace” in the *Church Times*, that a sequence of colours is specially suitable for the Church of England because it has the one merit of being neither Roman, nor Sarum, nor anything else, but a piece of priggish eclecticism. Our loyalty to the Church of England will best be shown not by attributing to her a sectarian character, not by exaggerating points of difference, but by insisting upon her points of agreement with other Communion, and so vindicating her position as the Catholic Church in this country. I think that these are sufficient reasons for keeping the name as well as the Sacrament of Extreme Unction.

In connection with the last point that we have been con-

sidering, I may call your attention to what St. Thomas says about its repetition. He says that it may be repeated as often as a person falls into another deadly sickness, because it does not confer character, nor have a necessarily lasting effect, since the health of soul and body which are its effects may be lost, and this is also decreed by the Council of Trent. St. Thomas also says that even in the same sickness, if the sick person, having been in danger of death and having been anointed, should recover for a time, and then again be in danger of death, the Sacrament may be repeated. This agrees with the Synod of Exeter (A.D. 1287), which decreed "that it should be declared through the parochial Presbyters that that Sacrament, as also some others, may be repeated as often as there is need."

There is one more point raised by Dr. Browne to which I must briefly refer. He says that the compilers of the Prayer Book of 1549 do not appear to have attributed Sacramental efficacy to the form of anointing which they retained, "but merely allowed it to be used 'if the sick person desired it,' with a prayer for pardon of sins and restoration of bodily health." I pass over the *suggestio falsi*, doubtless unintentional, to the effect that this prayer was something new, whereas we have seen that it is of the same character as those always used in the administration of the Sacrament. But what I would call attention to is the fact that Dr. Browne quotes the provision that the anointing was to be used "if the sick person desired it," as a proof that the compilers did not attribute Sacramental efficacy to it; but according to this argument we might prove that no part of the Church ever attributed Sacramental efficacy to it, a *reductio ad absurdum* which will be evident to all. For throughout the whole Church Extreme Unction is, and always has been from the time of St. James, only for those who desire it; since it has always been held throughout the Church, as it is formally laid down by St. Thomas, that the Sacrament of Extreme Unction is not necessary to salvation.

Some may think that if it is not necessary to salvation it

is not worth while to agitate for its restoration; but when we consider that even when all earthly hope is gone, if it be for the benefit of the soul, the body may be restored to health by this Sacrament from what seemed to be the bed of death; that if death come its pains may be alleviated by this Sacrament; that by it we may be strengthened to endure the terrors of death, and that fear of its approach which is sometimes found in the holiest men and women; that by it the remains of our sins may be dispersed by which we might be hampered in our last struggle, and the purification of the intermediate state be delayed in us; that by it we may have the grace that is in us increased, and so we may be brought closer to God as we pass through the valley of the shadow of death; that by it we may be consecrated anew to God, and sealed as His own, so that the Evil One may have no part in us;—when we consider all this, it is small consolation to those who are denied this Sacrament to tell them that it is not necessary to salvation.* The curse of the Church of England during the last 300 years has been the Protestant eagerness to discover how little is necessary for salvation which has taken the place of the true Christian desire to do as much as possible for God, and to be brought as close as possible to Him.

I do not believe that those who seriously and without prejudice examine the question can fail to desire that they may have the help of this Sacrament in their last hours, and I would entreat those who agree with me in this desire not merely to be satisfied with the fact that their own Priest may be willing to administer this Sacrament to them,

* "The seven Sacraments thus declared, the use and effect of them doth manifestly appear. The other two Sacraments of Confirmation and Extreme Unction, although they be not of such necessity, but that without them men may be saved, yet, forasmuch as in the ministration of them, if they be worthily taken, men receive more abundantly ghostly strength, aid, and comfort, they be very wholesome and profitable, and to be desired and reverently received."—"Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man."

if they are so happily circumstanced, but, more than that, to do all they can by personal effort, by spreading a knowledge of the subject, and by prayer, to obtain this great blessing for others, and not to rest until it is placed within the reach of every faithful member of the Church.

In conclusion, as there are Societies whose primary object is the restoration of the Church of the Altar to its proper position in the Church of England, so I would affectionately urge my fellow-members of the Guild of All Souls to make it a part of their work to do the same for the Sacrament of Extreme Unction, so that we may form the complement to those Societies in carrying out the aspiration of the Psalm, "Thou hast put gladness in my heart since the time that their Corn, and Wine, and Oil increased."