



# Praying for the Christian departed: A brief view of the doctrine and practice in Scottish Episcopacy

*Douglas Kornahrens*

---

Advocating prayer for the Christian dead has been a feature of Scottish Episcopacy since the establishment of the post-Reformation Episcopate under James VI. From the Aberdeen Doctors in the 1620s and '30s to Bishop Alexander Jolly writing in the 1830s, seven published works and one MS document have dealt with the subject. While those two hundred years saw no change or development of doctrine, the practice did move from the realm of theology to finding an explicit place in the Episcopal Church's Eucharistic practice in the Scottish Liturgy of 1764. This paper will offer a look at these documents and situate them in their contemporary Scottish theological context. Along with this, it will also chart the movement of the doctrine from the question of whether the admission of prayer for the dead is *justifiable*, to its being *established* in the Scottish Episcopalian Eucharistic liturgy.

The doctrine can be briefly stated. Negatively, based on the teaching of the Fathers, the Roman doctrine of Purgatory is rejected. In other words, there is no purifying fire suffered by the soul of the departed person prior to the Day of Judgment. There is no fullness of glory and joy in the vision of God to be enjoyed before the resurrection of the dead on the last day, and all the faithful departed benefit from the prayers of the faithful. On the positive side, it is argued that the souls of all the faithful, after the separation of the soul from the body in death, are held in some unknown 'place' until they are reunited with their bodies at the resurrection of the dead. Again, during this time the departed are at peace, without pain, and in a blessed state of union with Christ and his Angels. Lastly, in that state the departed are being prepared to face the final fire of judgment (1 Cor 3:11–15) but Divine mercy will still be available at that final event.



## The seventeenth century

During the period of the Jacobean-Caroline Episcopate the theological climate in Aberdeen and the north-east was demonstrably different from that of other parts of Scotland. As early as 1619, the issue of prayer for the departed had become a point of controversy. At Marischal College, for example, the Principal, Andrew Aidie, entered into formal debate with William Forbes, Minister at St Nicholas, over its lawfulness. Aidie denied the lawfulness of the practice, and William Forbes defended it. In the end, Patrick Forbes, the new Bishop (appointed in the previous year, 1618), having consulted the King, persuaded Aidie to resign his post<sup>1</sup> and William Forbes was appointed Principal in his place.<sup>2</sup>

It may be significant that the controversy at Marischal College over prayer for the departed was happening at precisely the same time as the proclamation of the canons of the Synod of Dort, which would consolidate Bezan-Calvinist orthodoxy. This was the orthodoxy which would come to dominate public theological opinion in Scotland. Due to an inherent conservatism not only in the north-east of Scotland but also across the region north of the Tay, there was less susceptibility to the new Dutch ideas.<sup>3</sup> In fact, some customs of former times, such as acceptance of prayer for the Christian dead, and the ancient, pre-Reformation custom of using the ‘mixture of the cup’ (diluting the wine used at the Lord’s Supper with a little water), very probably continued in Aberdeen and its vicinity into the 1630s. This then went on to become the common practice of Scottish Episcopalians.<sup>4</sup>

In a further indication of the different theological climate in Aberdeen, the Aberdeen Doctors resolutely continued to defend the Articles of Perth. At the General Assembly of 1618, Patrick Forbes, the newly consecrated Bishop of Aberdeen, and the Archbishop of St Andrews, John Spottiswoode, spoke in defence of the Articles.<sup>5</sup> Eleven years later, Forbes’ son, Dr John Forbes, the Professor of Divinity at King’s College, produced his *Irenicum* of 1629, a learned defence<sup>6</sup> of the Articles.<sup>7</sup> The Doctors also accepted the new Prayer Book, defended the Episcopate, and refused to sign the Covenant.

Principal William Forbes, however, was one of the most influential of the Doctors. Of the six Doctors who refused to sign the Covenant,

two, James Sibbald<sup>8</sup> and Robert Baron,<sup>9</sup> are known to have had particular personal connections with him. Forbes' opinions were known and approved by Patrick Forbes, the Bishop, and were followed by at least two of his colleagues. Beyond Aberdeen several of the Scottish Bishops would have been in agreement with him.<sup>10</sup> Until the Aberdeen Doctors' depositions and dispersal in 1640, it would seem a fair observation that theologically Aberdeen was swimming against the tide of Reformed thought and practice. The south and south-west of Scotland, meanwhile, was moving increasingly towards the radical Bezan-Calvinism expressed by the National Covenant and the Covenanted Assembly of 1638. The tentative conclusion can be drawn that the growing dominance of Bezan-Calvinist thought in Scotland, to the exclusion of all else, was not so much a generally Scottish phenomenon, as a peculiarity of Scotland to the south of the Tay, where the bases of power and influence lay.

The two leading figures among the Aberdeen Doctors, Bishop William Forbes and John Forbes of Corse, each dedicated a book of their major works to the refutation of the Roman doctrine of Purgatory and the discussion of prayer for the Christian departed. While the main work of William Forbes was only published in 1658 (it was in an unfinished state at the time of his death in 1633), Forbes' opinion on the subject was developed, perhaps as early as the controversy with Andrew Airdie in 1619. John Forbes of Corse's was published in 1645. We turn to William Forbes first.

William Forbes was a native Aberdonian, born in 1585 into the Corsindale branch of the large and influential Forbes family. Educated at the grammar school in Aberdeen, where he excelled in Latin and Greek at the age of twelve, he entered Marischal College and studied philosophy, gaining his MA. At the age of sixteen he was made Professor of Logic, and taught Aristotelian Logic for the next four years. He then went abroad to study for the next five years in Helmstedt in Poland, and at Liège in Belgium. There he made the friendship of such eminent scholars as Scaliger, Grotius and Vossius.<sup>11</sup> Returning, he was appointed Principal of Marischal College and Rector of the Faculty of Divinity. For a while, he was a minister in Edinburgh, where his views clashed with the general temper of the populace and as a result he returned to Aberdeen.<sup>12</sup> In 1633 Forbes was

appointed the first bishop of the newly-created diocese of Edinburgh and consecrated in the Chapel Royal at Holyrood in January 1634.<sup>13</sup> He survived, however, only a few months, dying<sup>14</sup> at the age of forty-nine on the 12<sup>th</sup> of April, 1634.<sup>15</sup>

Forbes' great and only surviving work is the *Considerationes modestae et pacificae controversiarum: de justificatione, purgatorio, invocatione sanctorum et Christo mediatore, Eucharistia*, published posthumously in London in 1658<sup>16</sup> by his friend Thomas Sydserf.<sup>17</sup> It is apparent that the work was not completed<sup>18</sup> when Forbes died.<sup>19</sup> The basis of the *Considerationes* is Forbes' teaching notes from his days at Marischal College.<sup>20</sup>

The character of the *Considerationes* is shaped by Forbes' vast knowledge of Patristic doctrine.<sup>21</sup> The closing words of the *de Purgatorio* of his *Considerationes* are, 'The Christian Commonwealth stands altogether by holy antiquity, nor will it be more properly repaired when waste than if it be re-modelled by its original.'<sup>22</sup> It was said of him that 'He was favourable to the restoration and practices of various primitive doctrines and practices which hitherto had found few supporters in Scotland.'<sup>23</sup> His opinions, however, found favour in Aberdeen. In 1621 when William Forbes was appointed one of the ministers of Edinburgh, 'He was reluctant to leave Aberdeen, and his fellow-citizens were as unwilling to lose their pastor'.<sup>24</sup> Both Bishop Thomas Sydserf, the deposed Bishop of Galloway and Restoration Bishop of Orkney, and Dr George Garden, the deprived minister of St Nicholas, Aberdeen (1692), attest to William Forbes' orthodoxy and impartiality in their respective accounts of his life.<sup>25</sup>

To return to the *Considerationes*, the central core of Forbes' understanding of prayers for the dead is to be found in the second part of chapter 3, §17–32. Here he discusses prayers and offerings for the dead. Forbes writes, 'this custom is a most ancient one [...] received in the whole Church of Christ, that [...] in the public prayers of the Church, a commemoration should be made of the departed, and rest should be sought from God for those who have died piously'.<sup>26</sup> Then follow citations of many of the Fathers who approve prayers for the dead: Tertullian, Cyprian, Arnobius, etc. Forbes also brings contemporary authorities into the discussion – the Augsburg Confession, Luther and others.

Forbes then points to references in the English Prayer Book of 1549 – the commemoration of the departed in the prayer of the Whole State of Christ’s Church, the administration of the Lord’s Supper and the Office for the Burial of the Dead. Here there is direct prayer for the peace of the departed, that they may rest in the bosom of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, in the hope of a resurrection with the just and righteous (§19).<sup>27</sup> Forbes laments the situation in the Church of England of his day – at one time (very briefly from 1549–52) the Church did pray for the departed but, since the advent of the Book of Common Prayer of 1552, prayer for the departed has been proscribed. Forbes states,

[...] the purgatory of the Romanists cannot be [...] proved from the prayers and offerings for the dead, which the Fathers practised. [...] many of the ancients [...] believed that the souls of the just did not enjoy the vision of God until the day of judgment, but were detained in certain hidden receptacles, [...] where they rest, expecting the blessed resurrection of their bodies, and the consummation of their promised glory [...] The same was the opinion of the Greeks and of the numerous other bodies of Eastern Christians [...] and still continues to be so [...].<sup>28</sup>

He then brings in several passages from Calvin in agreement with this. Forbes writes, ‘[...] Calvin does not deny to the soul before the resurrection, all blessedness and glory [...] he everywhere recognizes an inchoate glory and blessedness; merely denying that the souls before the last day enjoy wholly and completely that most excellent glory of God, which is promised in the Scriptures, and is called, the vision of God [...].’<sup>29</sup>

Wider still, Forbes continues, ‘[...] many very learned Protestants and others [...] have proved that the ancients [...] made prayers and offerings for the dead; [...] very many of the Fathers held that some lighter sins, which perchance were not remitted here in this life [...] may be remitted after death, by the intercession of the Church in her public prayers [...].’ He notes, “‘there is a certain sin which is not forgiven, neither in this world, nor in that which is to come.’”<sup>30</sup> [Matt 12:32]. The implication being that if there are sins that are unforgiven,

there are also sins that are forgiven, in the next world. He concludes, therefore, that ‘[...] the universal Church has deemed this rite not merely lawful, but also in some way profitable to the departed, and has always observed it most religiously, as handed down, if not from the Apostles themselves, yet at least from the most ancient fathers [...]’.<sup>31</sup>

The year after the controversy between William Forbes and Andrew Aidae over prayer for the departed, Bishop Patrick Forbes’ second son, John, returned to Aberdeen from his studies abroad. At the age of twenty-seven he was appointed by his father to the Professorship of Divinity at King’s College.<sup>32</sup> He had received Presbyterian ordination at Middleburg in Holland where his uncle, John Forbes, was Minister to the English Congregation. He never, however, received episcopal ordination. George Grub states, ‘[...] of all the northern divines, [John Forbes of Corse] was the one who was best known in his own day, and whose name still has the highest reputation’.<sup>33</sup> H. R. Sefton calls him ‘Scotland’s Greatest Theologian’<sup>34</sup> and T. F. Torrance considers him one of the greatest theologians in Scotland between the Reformation and the Disruption.<sup>35</sup>

In his *Memoir* of John Forbes of Corse, W. L. Low records that some clergy of the diocese, when he was appointed to the Professorship at King’s, suggested to him that he should teach theology historically.<sup>36</sup> He acted on this suggestion, which ultimately resulted in his great work, *Instructiones historico-theologicae*. T. F. Torrance describes this work as ‘of monumental importance to the history of theology [...] [it] initiated the pursuit of Reformed Patristics’.<sup>37</sup> Forbes’ *Instructiones* comprises sixteen books on major theological subjects, of which *De purgatorio* is Book XIII. The *Instructiones* was published in Amsterdam in 1645 during Forbes’ exile following his refusal to sign the Solemn League and Covenant (1643).<sup>38</sup> In 1646 he returned to Corse Castle where he died in the April of 1648.<sup>39</sup> Low says that his studies abroad were the foundation of his ‘remarkable knowledge’<sup>40</sup> of the Fathers.<sup>41</sup> Yet, while ‘His opinions were at first those of the schools which he frequented, and, though they underwent a gradual change as his studies in the writings of the Fathers drew him more to the model of the ancient Church, he never ceased to identify himself in all essential points with the continental Protestants.’<sup>42</sup>

What, then, of his views on prayers for the blessed departed? In

the *De purgatorio* of his *Instructiones*,<sup>43</sup> John Forbes agrees with William Forbes about the blessed state of the departed as they await the Resurrection and the Judgment. Chapter VIII in fact is a lengthy catalogue of supporting passages from Patristic writers.<sup>44</sup> However, John Forbes directly disagrees with William Forbes on the issue of prayer for the dead. Forbes observes that both Tertullian and Cyprian record the custom of prayer for the departed.

Tertullian says in *The Soldier's Crown*, [that] amongst the church customs of that time, [...] oblations and prayers for the dead should occur annually on the day of their birth [*pro natalitiis*]. For as Cyprian [...] expounded, oblations and sacrifices for the commemoration of martyrs were celebrated. And by the testimony of Cyprian [...] there was prayer [oblation] for the falling asleep of [...] other deceased saints in the communion of the Church. [...] Further, it began afterwards to be prayed that God would deal mercifully with them [the departed] on the Day of Judgment, as appears clearly in the testimonies of the Fathers [...] Perhaps they wished to imitate the Apostle praying for Onesiphorus who is not yet dead. 'May the Lord give him to find mercy before the Lord on that Day.' II Tim. 1:18. It was even added in the Liturgies for their repose.<sup>45</sup>

The text concerning Onesiphorus is not merely citation. 2 Tim 1:18 is a critical verse for Forbes of Corse, since the question at issue is whether or not Onesiphorus is dead. When Paul writes 'May the Lord grant that he [Onesiphorus] will find mercy from the Lord on that Day!' (2 Tim 1:16–18a) John Forbes asserts that Onesiphorus is alive, and that St Paul is not praying for him to receive mercy unaccorded in this life at the Judgment. Forbes of Corse points out, that only later, after Tertullian's death did it begin '[...] to be prayed that God would deal mercifully with them [the departed] on the Day of Judgment [...]'.<sup>46</sup> In contrast to this, John Forbes of Corse does not see Tertullian's example as one to follow. He writes, '[...] as far as concerns prayer for their rest and remission it is not safe for us to imitate the ancients, since [...] it requires certain knowledge from the word of God as to who should pray what and for whom.'<sup>47</sup>

Forbes' main argument, however, is against the Roman Doctrine of Purgatory. He opposes the ancient practice of prayer for the departed as unwarranted and unwise, but not heretical. Yet, while he may have agreed with the 'continental Protestants', since his argument is in line with Calvin's own thought on the subject,<sup>48</sup> John Forbes' whole argument is built entirely upon scriptural and Patristic sources. It is only in the last brief paragraph of his extensive *De purgatorio* that he mentions a few contemporary Protestant theologians.<sup>49</sup> In terms of published work, then, John Forbes of Corse is the *one dissenting voice* in the tradition of Scottish Episcopacy from the seventeenth century onwards.<sup>50</sup> The later quarter of the seventeenth century, however, was to prove a time of catastrophic events for Scottish Episcopacy and as a result theological enquiry would not emerge again until well into the eighteenth century.



## The eighteenth century

With the emergence of Scottish Episcopalianism as a distinct ecclesial entity after the Disestablishment of 1689 and the Presbyterian establishment of 1690, Episcopalians were doctrinally without restraint, and free to pursue their own theological tradition based entirely upon their study of the Church Fathers<sup>51</sup> – without reference to the Calvinism of the Church of Scotland as defined by the Westminster Confession of 1647. Episcopalians self-consciously considered themselves as heirs to the ancient Catholic tradition of the Undivided Church through their ordained ministry of bishops in the Apostolic Succession, presbyters or priests, and deacons, and their administration of the Sacraments.<sup>52</sup> That the Episcopalians saw themselves as the true Church of Scotland, despite disestablishment, is commonplace. They were too preoccupied with survival, however, to nurture any ambitions to return to the status of becoming the Established Church again.<sup>53</sup>

Yet prayer for the Christian departed became a particular concern of the eighteenth-century writers now to be considered. The doctrine is especially associated with the Eucharist as the particular locus of intercession, following the Eastern Liturgies.<sup>54</sup> The eighteenth century saw the appearance of four works expounding this subject, and the



1764 Scottish Liturgy specifically included a petition for the repose of the departed. Of these, two are of considerable significance.

The first is that of Archibald Campbell. Campbell was the Episcopalian Bishop of Aberdeen from 1721 to 1725, and the first published Episcopalian writer in the eighteenth century.<sup>55</sup> A contemporary, Bishop John Dowden, wrote that he ‘[...] was not only a man of curious and varied learning, but possessed much intellectual power.’<sup>56</sup> Campbell certainly became a very considerable scholar. In 1721 he published his major work *The Doctrines of a Middle State Between Death and the Resurrection* in which he sets forth his fairly detailed ideas. Campbell had been working on these ideas for some time; he had published a smaller volume of similar title in 1713.<sup>57</sup> His programme was a very thoroughly researched presentation of passages of Scripture from the Old and New Testaments, passages for the Fathers in chronological order, and the opinions of learned Protestant divines. Campbell’s *The Doctrines of a Middle State* is an enormous work with a far-ranging argument.

From internal and external evidence Campbell had obviously read Bishop William Forbes.<sup>58</sup> In the last section of *The Doctrines of a Middle State*, he enlists the opinions of ‘several great and learned Protestant Divines, since the Reformation’ and quotes from Forbes’ *De purgatorio*.<sup>59</sup> In fact, one might fairly conclude that Campbell’s section on ‘learned Protestant Divines’ is based directly on Chapter IV of William Forbes’ *De purgatorio*. With the exception of Calvin and William Forbes, all of his authorities are English.<sup>60</sup>

The basic arguments of Campbell’s *The Doctrines of a Middle State* are on the one hand to refute the Roman doctrine of a punitive purgatory, and on the other to emphasise both the Scriptural and Patristic belief that the Christian soul rests in light, peace and refreshment from death and the dissolution of the body until the second coming of Christ, the resurrection of the Body, and the Last Judgment. Commenting on Matt 13:24–31, Campbell writes,

[...] the fixed time of Retribution, of Rewards and Punishments for deeds done in the Flesh, is *after* the Resurrection and Judgment. [...] consequently, there must be a Middle State for those that die to remain in until the resurrection, which cannot

properly be called Heaven [...] for to see God as He is to be seen by the Faithfull after their Resurrection, and Comfortable Sentence is passed upon them [...] is the highest reward mankind is capable of enjoying [...] this is not to be given until after Christ's Second Coming.<sup>61</sup>

Campbell affirms prayer for the departed throughout *The Doctrines of a Middle State* in terms more or less identical to those of William Forbes. In his discussion of 1 Thess 5:23, he writes, '[...] the extent of this prayer [...] is unto the Resurrection, which is long after [...] death. And consequently the effectual prayers of the righteous upon earth are useful to the departed (St. James 5:16) [...].'<sup>62</sup> In examining this passage further, he then cites an identical prayer from the funeral rite in the English 1549 Prayer Book<sup>62</sup> quoted by William Forbes.<sup>63</sup> Campbell's work is extensive in scope, rich in able scholarship, and is not without considerable perception.

Bishop Thomas Rattray was born in 1684, and in his infancy, at the death of his father, he succeeded to both the lairdship of the ancient Rattray estate of Craighall in Perthshire and to the chiefship of the clan. He was the outstanding Scottish Episcopalian bishop of the eighteenth century, and the most influential.<sup>64</sup> As Bishop John Dowden said of him, '[he was] the one Scottish theologian of the last century who [...] left behind him any proof of high attainments [...] and to whose influence we are indebted'.<sup>65</sup> He produced three documents that are concerned with the state of the departed and prayer for the Christian dead. *Some Particular Instructions Concerning the Christian Covenant* is an essay or catechism in discursive form, possibly written in the 1730s, but not published until 1748. *The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem* is a work of genuinely original scholarship; it is simultaneously a textual and comparative analysis of the Greek Liturgy of St James,<sup>66</sup> no doubt completed shortly before Rattray's sudden death in 1743. Along with these works, there is an extant unpublished MS in the form of a letter, *The Intermediate State Between Death and the Resurrection*, of unknown date, but perhaps written in the late 1730s or early 1740s.

In *The Christian Covenant*, Rattray deals with prayer for the

departed as part of his discussion of Eucharistic intercession. He draws attention to the way in which intercession immediately follows the Words of Institution, the Prayer of Oblation, and the Epiclesis in the liturgical structure of the Eucharist.<sup>67</sup> For Rattray this is significant:

Since the intercessions of our great High Priest [...] ought certainly to be the rule of our intercessions [...] in virtue of this Memorial [the Eucharistic sacrifice] [...] we are sure that the dead stand in need thereof, as well as the living, because they still stand in need of that mercy, which is to be found even at the Day of Judgment, (2 Tim. i. 18), till which time they are not to [2 Tim 4:8] receive their crown of reward, nor to [Matt 25:21, 23]<sup>68</sup> enter into the joy of their Lord; therefore, as there can be no doubt but that His intercessions are extended to them, so, in consequence must ours be likewise. And accordingly, Prayers for the Dead, *especially at the Altar*, have always been the practice of the Catholic Church from the beginning, nor was there ever any ancient Liturgy without them [...] Tertullian testifies that it was an immemorial practice in his time [...] and it is plainly founded on Scripture Doctrine.<sup>69</sup>

The reading of 2 Tim 1:18 is the pivot of Rattray's argument as it was of John Forbes of Corse. However, while John Forbes asserts that Onesiphorus is alive, and that St Paul is not praying for him at the Judgment to receive mercy unaccorded in this life, Rattray reads the verse in exactly the opposite way. St Paul is praying for his departed friend to find continued mercy on the Day of Judgment. His argument appears to directly engage that of John Forbes in his *De purgatorio*.<sup>70</sup> Rattray considers this doctrine to be not only apostolic, but also intrinsically scriptural.<sup>71</sup>

In his *The Christian Covenant* Rattray cites neither Scottish nor English authorities, only scripture and the Early Fathers.<sup>72</sup> In *The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem* Rattray concisely encapsulates his basic teaching, 'Here the Priest shall pause a while, he and the People secretly recommending those departed whom each thinks proper.'<sup>73</sup> Then the priest prays, 'Remember, O Lord, the God of the Spirits of all Flesh, those whom we have remembered, and those

also whom we have not remembered, from righteous Abel, even to this Day: Do thou give them Rest in the Region of the Living [...].<sup>74</sup> In a footnote on the prayer, Rattray adds,

Prayers for the Dead, especially at the holy Altar, is so very early a Practice of the primitive Church, that undoubtedly it must have been derived from apostolical Tradition. [...] It is founded on that plain Scripture-Doctrine of an intermediate State betwixt Death and the Resurrection; and that the Righteous are not to receive their Crown of Reward (2 Tim. iv. 8.) nor to enter into the joy of their Lord in the Kingdom of Heaven, till the Resurrection and Judgment (Matth. xxv. 19, 20, 31–34.) [...] they are to be judged according to their Works, yet there is Mercy to be found of the Lord in that Day (2 Tim. i. 18.) [...] This prayer here is not to be so understood as if [...] those here commemorated were [already] in rest in the Region of the Living; but as an Acknowledgement that their present Happiness is the free Gift of God [...] to congratulate the same; and to wish the Increase of it; and the final Consummation of their Bliss at the last Day.<sup>75</sup>

When the manuscript of *The Intermediate State* was written is unknown, but, because of its depth of thought and richness of reference, it is possibly a late work. Its title appears in the Table of Contents of George Hay Forbes' 1854 edition of Rattray's works,<sup>76</sup> but the essay itself was not printed in the volume.<sup>77</sup> In this essay, Rattray works out a proper theological basis for praying for the Christian departed, beginning with an anthropology based on the writings of many of the earlier Fathers, and concluding with an examination of the necessity for a repentant life. Rattray sets out four propositions:

1. That the Body is not a thing adventitious to the soul [...] but is indeed an essential constituent part of the Man.
2. That the proper rewards and punishments proposed by the Christian Religion are not to take place until after the Resurrection and general Judgment.

3. That in the interval betwixt death and the Resurrection, the soul is not in a state of insensibility, but remains in certain invisible regions, in a separate state, expecting the Resurrection and Judgment
4. That the Christian virtues are necessary, not only to entitle us to the Kingdom of Heaven [...], but farther, also, as qualifications to dispose and fit us for the enjoyment of the same.

Under the first proposition Rattray draws upon Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Tatian, Athenagoras, Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian to establish the being of ‘the whole man’ as body and soul together. Without either, the whole man does not exist. Rattray writes, with regard to the second proposition,

This proposition is a plain and natural consequence of the former. For as the actions for which we are to be rewarded or punished are the actions of the whole man, so it is the whole man that must be judged, and according to that judgment, rewarded or punished for those actions. But [...] Man is dissolved by death, and the essential parts of which he is made up are separated and laid up in proper receptacles in order to a reunion, till which the Man is not, and therefore cannot be either rewarded or punished as such. Whatever therefore happens to these separate parts does not concern the Man any farther than as it relates to this reunion, and if it were not to be, would not concern him at all. Thence the apostle reasons, I Cor. 15, that if the dead rise not, all his sufferings would have advantaged him nothing [...].<sup>78</sup>

To a long list of passages from the New Testament Rattray adds testimony from the Early Fathers mentioned above.

In the third proposition Rattray argues first for a proper distinction between the word *Hades*, the place of the dead, and the English word used in the translation of it – ‘hell’. Although its original meaning was the same as *Hades*, by Rattray’s time ‘hell’ had come to mean the place of torment, the ‘Gehenna’ of Scripture. Rattray’s concern is that

the resulting confusion has undermined a proper understanding of the state of the departed in Scripture.<sup>79</sup>

He then turns to passages from the Fathers that discuss the ‘invisible regions’ that the souls of the dead inhabit until the Day of Resurrection. Rattray writes, ‘[...] to go to one’s [...] “appointed place” or region, was a known [...] phrase in the apostolical age to signifie [sic] the intermediate state to which the souls both of the good and bad go immediately after death [...] and where they remain in proper mansions [...] expecting the Resurrection and Judgment’.<sup>80</sup> The argument moves on to distinguish between the *Hades* of the departed and the Paradise of the Martyrs<sup>81</sup> citing, again, the Early Fathers.<sup>82</sup> There then follows a discussion of 2 Tim 1:18,<sup>83</sup> which Rattray concludes by saying that even if Onesiphorus is alive (perhaps he has the argument of John Forbes of Corse in mind?), St Paul clearly states that there is yet mercy to be found on the Day of Judgment. As to proposition four, this takes the form of an extended discussion of the necessity of conformity to the ‘teaching of the Scriptures and the whole Catholic Church [...] that our repentance and conversion must be effectually begun in this life’<sup>84</sup> if we would enter the rest and peace of Christ in the intermediate state, preparatory to the resurrection of the dead.

Rattray, then, engages with two fundamental premises: the state of the Christian dead, and the Church’s prayer for them. By using the earliest Christian writers, Rattray demonstrates that the ideas he defends are rooted in the earliest Christian thought. *The Intermediate State* is, in fact, a significant contribution to the theological tradition of Scottish Episcopacy in its thorough discussion of Christian anthropology in Propositions I and II. In *The Intermediate State*, as with all of his writings, Rattray’s depth of thought is expressed in language that is concise, clear and accessible.

The latter half of the eighteenth century was an ill time for Scots Episcopalians to publish. Almost none of Rattray’s works were published in his lifetime.<sup>85</sup> His great work, *The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem*, published in London in 1744 a year after his death, bears no mention of his name. *Some Particular Instructions Concerning the Christian Covenant* was not published until 1748, again in London and anonymously. It was not until 1854 that George Hay

Forbes published Rattray's *Works* at his Pitsligo Press in Burntisland. Rattray's influence on the Episcopal Church, however, can scarcely be overestimated. His memory was held in great esteem for several succeeding generations<sup>86</sup> and his scholarship and personality stand directly behind the Scottish Liturgy of 1764. The publication of *The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem* was the precipitating event that produced the Liturgy of 1764 twenty years later; Bishop Dowden describes it as 'of deep moment in the history of the Scottish Office'.<sup>87</sup> Bishop William Falconar's text published in 1755 is heavily dependent on Rattray's work. In turn, Bishop Robert Forbes' text of 1764 is based directly on Falconar's. A comparison of Rattray's *The Order for Celebrating the Sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist* (published at the end of *The Ancient Liturgy*) with the Liturgy of 1764 reveals an identical structure and some common material.<sup>88</sup>

The appearance of the 1764 Scottish Liturgy formalised prayer for the Christian departed for Scottish Episcopalians. The specific petition in the Prayer for the Whole State of Christ's Church says, 'We commend to thy gracious keeping, O Lord, all thy servants departed this life in thy faith and fear, beseeching thee to grant them everlasting light and peace'.<sup>89</sup> The petition for the departed as it appears in the Liturgy of 1764 clearly reflects the sentiment in the parallel petition in Bishop Rattray's *Order*, 'Do thou give them Rest in the Region of the Living, [...] in the Bosoms of our holy Fathers Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, whence Sorrow, Grief, and Lamentation are banished away, where the Light of thy Countenance visits, and shines continually'.<sup>90</sup>

So, then, while there was clearly a disposition towards prayer for the departed amongst Episcopalians, as evidenced by the immediate common acceptance of the 1764 Liturgy by both the Bishops and the people,<sup>91</sup> it is doubtful if the works of either William Forbes or Archibald Campbell carried any decisive influence. William Forbes' *Considerationes* would have been too rare a work to have been known widely and Archibald Campbell himself, having lived entirely in London, was too removed from the Scottish situation to have exercised a significant personal or doctrinal influence.<sup>92</sup> Quite clearly, it was the influence of Thomas Rattray which brought the practice of praying for the Christian departed into the canonical liturgical use of the Scottish Episcopal Church.



## The nineteenth century

The Act of Toleration of 1712 created two Episcopal Churches in Scotland, the ‘Qualified Chapels’ and the Scots Episcopalians. The ‘Qualified Chapels’ subscribed to the demands of the Act: that they have a priest of English or Irish ordination, that they pray for the sovereign by name, and that they use the English Prayer Book of 1662.<sup>93</sup> The Scots Episcopalians refused these qualifications for toleration, retaining their own tradition and loyalty to the House of Stuart, and were consequently without the protection of the law. By the time of the Repeal of the Penal Laws in 1792, however, Bishop John Skinner of Aberdeen had recognised the pressing need to reconcile the two Episcopal churches in Scotland, and for the Scots Episcopalians to seek toleration. At the Synod of Laurencekirk in 1804, therefore, the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England were adopted as a definite step towards one Episcopal church in Scotland and conformity with the Church of England. The Synod of 1811 specifically authorised the use of the ‘English Office in those congregations which had come under the jurisdiction of the bishops’ [the Qualified Chapels], while securing the ‘primary authority of the Scottish Office as the authorised office of the Church’.<sup>94</sup> The Synods of 1828 and 1838 moved the Scottish Episcopal Church closer to the Church of England by canonically adopting the 1662 Prayer Book Order for Morning and Evening Prayer, the usual Sunday service, and by requiring the use of the surplice as ‘the proper sacerdotal vestment’ for public worship.<sup>95</sup> Prior to this date the vesture of Scots Episcopalian clergy had continued to be the black gown. With the increasing desire for ‘Anglicisation’ among the ‘upwardly mobile’ of early nineteenth-century Scotland, the increasing conformity of the Scots Episcopal Church to the Church of England was, no doubt, congenial and attractive.

As conformity with the Church of England grew, one problem for Scottish Episcopalians in the early nineteenth century remained. How to justify their distinctive Eucharistic liturgy, which included prayer for the departed, to the English and Scots users of the Holy Communion service in the 1662 Book of Common Prayer from which the Scottish Liturgy diverged significantly. In response to this



problem, the Rev'd John Skinner, the Episcopalian Parson of Forfar and elder son of Bishop John Skinner, published his *Dissertation and Illustration*,<sup>96</sup> in 1807 in the form of a discussion of, and commentary on the Eucharistic theology and practice of the Scottish Liturgy of 1764.

Skinner's method throughout his examination of the Scottish Liturgy is to seek English authorities for support to show their sympathy with Scottish practice. Yet, his discussion of *prayer for the departed* is developed despite the Church of England's *proscription* of that prayer. Skinner gives little clue as to why he uses only English authorities, but one must assume that since he writes only three years after the 1804 Synod of Laurencekirk, of which his father was the prime mover, it must primarily have been to convince Scots users of the English Communion Office that the Scottish Liturgy conformed to the English theological tradition. He also may have been addressing any Scottish reader disposed to the movement towards 'Anglicisation' in Scotland, as well as detractors of the Scottish Liturgy. However, his argument throughout the book is a robust defence of the Eucharistic tradition of Scottish Episcopacy.

Skinner uses the entirety of his comment on the unique Scottish placing of the Prayer of the Whole State of Christ's Church immediately after the Prayer of Consecration to discuss the Episcopalian practice of praying for the Christian departed at celebrations of the Eucharist. He writes, 'Whenever the primitive Christians celebrated the holy mysteries of our Redemption, they used a form of [...] intercession for the whole catholic Church [...] [which] embraced not only the faithful on earth, but the faithful departed, "knit together [...] in one communion and fellowship in the mystical body of Christ our Lord"' .<sup>97</sup>

He quotes Charles Wheatley, the eighteenth-century English commentator on the 1662 Prayer Book,

[The Fathers] agreed in this, that the interval between death and the end of the world, is a state of expectation and imperfect bliss, in which the souls of the righteous wait for the completion and perfection of their happiness at the consummation of all things; [...] therefore [...] they thought it not improper to add a petition [for the larger] part of [the Catholic Church] which had

gone before them, that they might altogether attain a blessed and glorious resurrection [...].<sup>98</sup>

Skinner was frustrated by what he considered to be the unjust claims laid against the Scottish Liturgy. With regard to praying for the departed he writes, ‘Strange that *this*, the universal practice of the primitive ages, should avowedly be made one of the heaviest charges against the Episcopal Church in Scotland; and that [...] she should be suspected of the absurd and unscriptural belief of the Romish Purgatory; [...] our faith and practice have, on this head, been so industriously misrepresented [...].’<sup>99</sup> He then quotes at some length the seventeenth-century English commentator Herbert Thorndike’s use of 2 Tim 1:18 to argue for the scriptural basis of the practice of praying for the Christian departed. Thorndike writes, ‘[...] certain we are, the estate of those that die in God’s grace admits a solicitous expectation of the day of judgment, though assured of the issue of it.’<sup>100</sup>

However, the fullest study of the Scottish Liturgy and its doctrine, focusing particularly on the Scottish Episcopalian Eucharistic tradition was published in 1831 by Bishop Alexander Jolly and entitled *The Christian Sacrifice in the Eucharist*. Jolly was born into an Episcopalian family in Stonehaven in 1756, during the darkest period of the severe enforcement of the Penal Laws.<sup>101</sup> Educated in Stonehaven,<sup>102</sup> Bishop Jolly from his earliest childhood was steeped in the old traditions of Scottish Episcopacy.

He entered Marischal College on a full bursary, graduating about 1772. He was ordained a priest in 1777 by Robert Kilgour, the Bishop of Aberdeen and began his ministry at Turriff. In 1788 he moved to be Parson of the Episcopalian congregation in Fraserburgh where he spent the rest of his life, even though he became the Bishop of Moray in 1796. He never married, and lived an almost monastic life of virtual poverty<sup>103</sup> and prayer, spending his time in the study of his remarkable collection of books and unique archive of manuscripts relating to the Scottish Episcopal Church.<sup>104</sup> He spent the first part of his day, from 4:30 am to about lunchtime in a careful programme of prayer<sup>105</sup> and reading the Scriptures and the Church Fathers in their original languages.<sup>106</sup> The bishop, was known as ‘the venerable Bishop Jolly’ in his lifetime and after his death.<sup>107</sup> He was a man of mild manner,

grave bearing, deep piety, and great learning.<sup>108</sup> He died alone on the morning of St Peter's Day, 1838, at Fraserburgh.<sup>109</sup> In every way, by both his character and doctrine, Bishop Jolly epitomised the old tradition of Scottish Episcopacy.

Bishop Jolly's exposition of Eucharistic doctrine is to be found in Chapters I to III of *The Christian Sacrifice in the Eucharist*. Chapter IV, the longest of the book, is almost entirely a catalogue of English theological writers, indicating where they are in agreement with the Eucharistic theology of Scottish Episcopalians. It is in this chapter that Bishop Jolly comments on the 1764 Scottish Liturgy's use of prayer for the departed. He writes,

[...] that a species of prayer for the dead was of the highest, even in Apostolic antiquity, cannot be denied. It results, indeed, from the intimate [...] communion that subsists even between the members of the same Body, every one [...] endeavouring for the good and perfection of the whole—for that [...] finally perfect consummation and bliss, for which we solemnly pray at the burial of the dead, but which is not to be attained before Christ's second coming, when He, who begins the good work in this life, will perfectly accomplish it (Phil. i. 6). Till then, the souls of the faithful, [...] are [...] in a state of progression, waiting [...] in divine tranquillity, for the redemption of their bodies by the resurrection in the day of judgment, when all, even the holiest, shall stand in need of mercy, according to St. Paul's prayer for his beloved Onesiphorus, "The Lord grant unto him, that he may find mercy of the Lord in *that day*." (2 Tim. i. 18.).<sup>110</sup>

In a long footnote to the quotation, Bishop Jolly comments on the opinions of 'the great Grotius' on this passage of Scripture: 'He reasons from the blessed Apostle's affectionate salutation of his family only, and sending his good wishes for its beloved head into the state of eternity; using the preterite, the past time, to express his grateful sense of the good offices which he received from him when he was in Rome'.<sup>111</sup> Continuing his discussion, Jolly expands the doctrine, moving on from Onesiphorus, to the general doctrine of the Judgment

and the Resurrection. ‘But, at His coming [...], all, both good and bad, must [...] receive their final doom. [...] in that day, to mercy only, not to merit, must be the appeal.’<sup>112</sup> Bishop Jolly then moves on to make the distinction between praying ‘for’ the saints, and not ‘to’ the saints. ‘We are commanded to make prayers for all saints. [...] For this full and most glorious felicity the primitive church always prayed, including [...] even the holy martyrs themselves, who are still below the altar [...] [who are] represented as praying, and with apparent longing, for this full felicity [...].’<sup>113</sup> ‘But’, he continues, ‘[...] prayer for the dead – not to deliver them from purgatory, [...] but to increase and perfect their present happiness [...] is a strong guard against the dangerous doctrine and practice of the Church of Rome with regard to the saints, there being an irreconcilable difference between praying *for* them, and praying *to* them [...].’<sup>114</sup> Bishop Jolly does not enlarge upon this last point beyond stating it.

However, Bishop Jolly’s comment in *The Christian Sacrifice in the Eucharist* on prayer for the Christian departed is the last significant document on the subject produced by a Scottish Episcopalian writer. His comment, in fact, is the last document that this writer has been able to locate. George Hay Forbes, the translator of William Forbes, and publisher of Rattray’s *Works*, occasionally comments in passing on the state of the departed,<sup>115</sup> but apparently was not moved to comment upon the subject himself, and he was the last writer of the old tradition of Scottish Episcopacy to publish.<sup>116</sup> He could see the end of the tradition coming. In his “Preface” to his 1854 edition of Bishop Rattray’s *Works*, he laments, ‘Earnestly do I trust that in these days of development and change, when our native traditional theology seems in no small danger of being quite forgotten, the calm deep learning of these admirable works may be the means of recalling earnest minds to the land marks which our fathers set up’.<sup>117</sup> The phrase ‘development and change’ is a reference to the increasing influence of the Oxford Movement in the Episcopal Church, of which George Hay Forbes’ older brother, Bishop A. P. Forbes, was the foremost figure.

One can see that in Scottish Episcopacy, from the days of the Jacobean-Caroline Church down to the writers of the nineteenth century, the doctrine advocating praying for the Christian departed, and its basis in the Scriptures and the teaching of the Fathers, remained

constant. The writings of every author examined in the paper, who subscribes to the lawfulness and the Christian duty of praying for the departed in Christ, has been without deviation from one writer to another. Each of these writers relies not only on the writings of previous authors in the tradition, but also on the Scriptures and the writings of the Fathers. One can also see that the doctrine adhered to by the Scottish writers from William Forbes to Alexander Jolly, was not distinctively Scottish but was also the doctrine of many English theological writers. However what is unique to Scottish Episcopacy is that the doctrine of praying for the Christian departed found public liturgical expression when the Liturgy of 1764 came into universal use amongst Scots Episcopalians. It was certainly in its day the only non-Roman Catholic or Eastern Orthodox liturgical text to do so, and remained so until the explosion of new Eucharistic liturgical material in the 1960s.



## The twentieth century

Until the Scottish Liturgy of 1982, the petition for the departed remained unchanged. The ‘Grey Book’ Liturgy of 1970 changed the location of the Prayer for the Whole State of Christ’s Church from its place following the Prayer of Consecration to the *Synaxis* or “Liturgy of the Word”. The change of location did not disturb the text of the petition; its anthropological-eschatological import remained intact. However, the change of location substantially undermined the structural rationale of the Scottish Liturgy.<sup>118</sup> The Scottish Liturgy of 1982 appends three forms for the intercession, two of which pray for the departed, but in vague terms. In the Scottish Liturgy the departed are prayed for specifically in terms of receiving ‘everlasting light and peace’; the 1982 Liturgy, Form 1 prays, ‘that theirs may be the kingdom which is unshakeable’ [Heb 12:28], and Form 2, ‘that they may know the hope to which you call us’; Form 3 offers thanks ‘for all in whom Christ has been honoured’ but without actual prayer.<sup>119</sup> These Forms are intended to be used after the Nicene Creed in the “Liturgy of the Word” as in the 1970 Liturgy.

In an attempt to parallel the position of the Prayer for the Whole State of Christ’s Church in the Scottish Liturgy, the final paragraph

of “The Great Thanksgiving” in the 1982 Liturgy is called Prayer of Petition,<sup>120</sup> and prays that ‘we enter into our heritage in the company of the Virgin Mary, the apostles and prophets, and of all our brothers and sisters living and departed’. It does not, however, actually pray for the departed (or the living), at that point, as did the Scottish Liturgy, from the text of 1764 to its text in the 1929 Scottish Prayer Book.<sup>121</sup> Yet, the Intercession, including prayer for the departed as a constituent element, following the Consecration, has been fundamental to the Scottish Episcopalian understanding of the structure and function of the Eucharist since the time of Bishop Rattray.

Praying for the Christian departed continues to be the practice of Scottish Episcopalians. A ‘folk memory’ of the old Episcopalian doctrine may survive; one ‘cradle’ Scottish Episcopalian was heard to comment, ‘We don’t believe in Purgatory, we believe in Paradise’. It is this writer’s surmise, nonetheless, that while Episcopalians of today continue to pray for the Christian dead, the reasons that they do so have been forgotten, as George Hay Forbes foresaw in his lament for ‘our native traditional theology’.

## Notes

- 1 George Grub states that Aidie was ‘in various respects not well qualified for the office’. George Grub, *An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland: From the Introduction of Christianity to the Present Time* (Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas, 1861), II:331.
- 2 Grub writes quoting Patrick Forbes’ letter to the King, ‘[...] that his majesty had not “a more learned, sound, sanctified, and diligent divine” in his kingdom than Dr. Forbes.’ Grub also comments on the theological climate in Aberdeen, ‘it shews how far the ancient doctrines had been already received in the theological schools of Aberdeen, that Aidie was looked upon with suspicion for maintaining the negative opinion in the controversy.’ *Ibid.*, 331.
- 3 Gordon Donaldson, “Scotland’s Conservative North in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries”, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th ser., 16 (1966): 65–79.

- 4 John Forbes of Corse specifically admits the ‘moderate use of water’. *Instructiones historico-theologicae, de doctrina Christiana* (ed. George Garden; Amsterdam: Henricum Wetstenium, 1702), *Lib. XI, Cap. X*, xvii, 528 f.; Robert Woodrow writes that he has heard of the practice at Aberdeen. *Analecta: Or, Materials for a History of Remarkable Providences; Mostly Relating to Scotch Ministers and Christians* (Edinburgh: Printed for the Maitland Club, 1843), IV:269.
- 5 John Forbes, *First Book of the Irenicum of John Forbes of Corse: A Contribution to the Theology of Re-union* (ed. and trans. E. G. Selwyn; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1923), 314.
- 6 Particularly of kneeling to receive Holy Communion, and the ministrations of Holy Communion to the sick at home. Grub, *An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*, II:361.
- 7 Arguing that ‘the Supper makes the table, not vice versa.’ Forbes, *First Book of the Irenicum*, 84.
- 8 James Sibbald, Minister of St Nicholas at the time of his deposition, had a long working relationship with Forbes both at Marischal College and at St Nicholas Church. He was also in possession of a MS of William Forbes’ *Considerationes*. James Gordon, *History of Scots Affairs: From 1637 to 1641* (ed. J. Robertson and G. Grub; Aberdeen: Spalding Club, 1841), III:230, footnote 2.
- 9 Baron, Professor of Theology at Marischal College in 1638, was known to have been in possession of two MSS of Forbes: the *Considerationes* and the *Adminadversions Against Bellarmine*.
- 10 Thomas Sydserf, the Bishop of Galloway, who published some of Forbes’ works, and John Maxwell and James Wedderburn who produced the Prayer Book of 1637. Wedderburn’s views on prayer for the departed are the same as William Forbes. Anthony Milton writes, “William Forbes noted that, by abolishing prayers for the dead, the ignorant zeal of the original English Reformers had removed an important element of religious worship which had patristic warrant, ‘to the great scandal of almost all other Christians’. [*Considerationes* II:97, cf. *ibid.*, 139.] James Wedderburn admitted that ‘Our Forefathers purged out some errors and abuses, and as it falls out in all manner of purgations, some good things went with the bad.’ In fact, he candidly admitted that, ‘as

- for things expedient, wee acknowledge with greife, that some wee want.” Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600–1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 331 f.
- 11 David G. Mullan, *Episcopacy in Scotland: The History of an Idea, 1560–1638* (Edinburgh: John Donald Press, 1986), 171.
  - 12 William Forbes, *Considerationes modestae et pacificae controversiarum: De justificatione, purgatorio, invocatione sanctorum et Christo mediatore, Eucharistia* (ed. T. Sydserf; Oxford: J. H. Parker, 1856), ii:13–21.
  - 13 Grub, *An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*, II:348 f.
  - 14 *Ibid.*, 350.
  - 15 George Garden praises William Forbes’ character for traits such as holiness of life, humility of heart, gravity, modesty, temperance, prayerfulness, frequent fasting, performance of good works, active concern for the poor, repeated visitation of the sick, and every type of Christian virtue. “Vita Reverendi Viri Joh. Forbesii à Corse”, *Reverendi viri Johannis Forbesii à Corse Opera, pars altera: Instructiones historico-theologicae, de doctrina Christiana* (ed. G. Garden; Amsterdam: Henricum Wetstenium, 1702), II:19.
  - 16 Several manuscript copies of the *Considerationes* are known to have existed after William Forbes’ death. One was in the possession of Dr Robert Barron, who died in the August of 1639 in Berwick on his flight from Aberdeen; another was in the possession of Dr James Sibbald. Grub, *An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*, III:54.
  - 17 Another copy, incomplete, in the hand of John Cosin, Bishop of Durham, inscribed *Paris, 1646*, is still preserved in his Library at Durham. George Hay Forbes, “Preface”, *Considerationes*, II:4.
  - 18 George Hay Forbes notes that ‘It bears manifest internal marks of having been left by the author in an unfinished state. [...] This will also account for the roughness of style evident throughout’. *Ibid.*, 3.
  - 19 In the margins of the *Considerationes* are references to the various quotations from the works of the writers mentioned, and even where a name only is mentioned with no quotation, next to the name there is reference to the passage that Forbes had in mind. George Hay Forbes diligently checked all of the references in the



- Considerationes for accuracy. William Perry, *George Hay Forbes: A Romance in Scholarship* (London: SPCK, 1927), 51.
- 20 Grub, *An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*, II:351.
- 21 Ibid., 330 f.
- 22 Forbes, *Considerationes*, II:141.
- 23 Grub, *An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*, II:330 f.
- 24 Ibid., 331,
- 25 Forbes, *Considerationes*, II:21; Garden, “Vita”, II:20.
- 26 Forbes, *Considerationes*, II:89.
- 27 Ibid., 95.
- 28 Ibid., 97 ff.
- 29 Ibid., 99, 101. Forbes’ comments are based on his reading of Calvin’s early work, *Psychopannychia*; see the study by George H. Tavard, *The Starting Point of Calvin’s Theology* (Grand Rapids, Mich.; Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans, 2000).
- 30 Ibid., 105–07.
- 31 Ibid., 113.
- 32 Grub, *An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*, II:372.
- 33 Ibid.
- 34 Henry R. Sefton, “Scotland’s Greatest Theologian”, *Aberdeen University Review* XLV (1974): 348–52.
- 35 Thomas F. Torrance, *Scottish Theology: From John Knox to John McLeod Campbell* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), 79.
- 36 William Leslie Low, *The True Catholic Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist as Contrasted with the Roman Doctrine of Transubstantiation in the Instructiones historico-theologicæ of John Forbes of Corse, etc. [With memoir and portrait]* (Edinburgh: The Scottish Chronicle Press, 1923), 16.
- 37 Thomas F. Torrance, “From John Knox to John McLeod Campbell: A Reading of Scottish Theology”, in *Disruption to Diversity: Edinburgh Divinity, 1846–1996* (ed. D. F. Wright and G. D. Badcock; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), 6.
- 38 Sefton, “Scotland’s Greatest Theologian”, 351.
- 39 Grub, *An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*, III:108 f.
- 40 Low, *The True Catholic Doctrine*, 14.
- 41 E. G. Selwyn makes the remarkable statement, ‘[...] he is a Catholic. He takes his stand on no private judgment of the meaning

- of Scripture, but makes his constant appeal to the Fathers of the undivided Church.’ Forbes, *First Book of the Irenicum*, 212.
- 42 Grub, *An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*, II:372. Grub’s opinion is the common impression, however, this writer has demonstrated that with regard to Eucharistic doctrine, William Forbes and John Forbes held virtually identical opinions. W. D. Kornahrens, “Eucharistic Doctrine in Scottish Episcopacy, 1620–1875” (PhD thesis, University of St Andrews, 2008).
- 43 John Forbes of Corse, *Instructiones historico-theologicae*, II:624–58. (Vol. II was published in 1702, a year before vol. I.)
- 44 Ibid., 632–41.
- 45 Ibid., *cap. X*, 6., 648. (Trans. Patrick Watson, W. S.),
- 46 Ibid., *cap. X*, 1.–7.
- 47 Ibid.
- 48 John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, III.v.10; III.xx.20; III.xxv.6.
- 49 I.e., Martin Chemnitz and Andrew Rivet – there is no explicit mention of Calvin. Forbes, *Considerationes*, II:658.
- 50 Henry Scougal, John Forbes’ successor in the Chair and Professorship of Divinity at King’s College (who has been identified by this writer as the sole theological writer in Scottish Episcopacy in the latter half of the seventeenth century) may well have shared John Forbes’ opinion, but his views are not recorded. Neither Scougal’s surviving sermons, “Nine Discourses on Important Subjects”, nor his *Life of God in the Soul of Man*, comment upon the state of, or prayer for, the departed and they are his only surviving corpus of work. One single exception to this, of course, is Bishop John Sage (1652–1711) whose works (*The Principles of the Cyprianic Age*, 1695 and *A Vindication of the Principles of the Cyprianic Age*, 1701) are wholly devoted to the maintenance of episcopacy as Divinely instituted, and the defence of the deposed ‘suffering clergy’. John Sage, *Works* (3 vols.; ed J. F. Shand; Edinburgh: The Spottiswoode Society, 1844–46); Grub, *An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*, III:349.
- 51 George Hay Forbes (1821–75) was the first to make the claim of a theological tradition in Scottish Episcopacy beginning with William Forbes in his review of John Keble’s *On Eucharistical*

- Adoration*, 1857 (*The Panoply*, vol. II; Burntisland: Pitsligo Press, undated, p. 263).
- 52 To which Bishop John Sage's two learned works on Church polity, *The Principles of the Cyprianic Age* and *A Vindication of the Principles of the Cyprianic Age*, part of the pamphlet war conducted between himself and Gilbert Rule, the Principal of the College at Edinburgh, testify.
- 53 Bishop Dowden, writing with regard to the Scottish Liturgy of 1764, comments upon the dearth of Episcopalian theological writing in the period, '[...] with the exception of Bishop Archibald Campbell, [...] and subsequently Bishop Rattray, Scottish writers contributed little [...] The harsh repression, and at times active persecution, of the nonjuring clergy in Scotland was not favourable to literary enterprise'. John Dowden, *The Scottish Communion Office 1764* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922), 51.
- 54 It should be noted that since the early seventeenth century in Scotland, there had existed a native disposition toward the Eastern Liturgies, independent of Episcopalian interests, discussed by Spratt. See George W. Spratt, *The Worship and Offices of the Church of Scotland* (Edinburgh: Wm. Blackwood and Sons, 1882), 98–127.
- 55 He was a grandson of the Marquis of Argyll, executed in 1661, and was himself exiled to Guyana for his part in his uncle's insurrection against James VII. Upon his return to Britain, he converted to Episcopalianism and the Stuart cause. 'Fixing his residence at London, he devoted himself to the study of theology, and was ordained a priest'; he was consecrated a bishop in Dundee on St Bartholomew's Day [August 24 1711]. Grub, *An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*, III:356 f.
- 56 Dowden, *The Scottish Communion Office 1764*, 53.
- 57 Archibald Campbell, *Some Primitive Doctrines Reviv'd: Or the Intermediate or Middle State of Departed Souls (as to Happiness or Misery) Before the Day of Judgment. Plainly Prov'd from the Holy Scriptures* (London: printed for S. Keble and R. Gosling, 1713).
- 58 In George Hay Forbes' "Preface" to his translation and edition of Bishop Forbes' *Considerationes*, he writes, 'Mr Grub of Aberdeen

- [...] forwarded to the Editor a valuable copy of the first Edition, which once belonged to Bishop Archibald Campbell [...].’ *Considerationes*, I:3 [1850].
- 59 Ibid., vol. II, § 19, pp. 95, 97.
- 60 Archibald Campbell, *The Doctrines of a Middle State Between Death and the Resurrection: Of Prayers for the Dead: And the Necessity of Purification; Plainly Proved from the Holy Scriptures* (London: W. Tyler, 1721), 157–79.
- 61 Ibid., 7.
- 62 Ibid., 29.
- 63 Forbes, *Considerationes*, 95.
- 64 Thomas Rattray was a man of exceptional intellectual gifts whose scholarship stands behind the Liturgy of 1764, and whose leadership helped establish the Diocesan polity of the Scottish Episcopal Church today.
- 65 Dowden, *The Scottish Communion Office 1764*, 11.
- 66 Rattray used the text published in J. A. Fabricius’ *Codex apocryphus Novi Testamenti* (Hamburg: B. Schiller, 1703–19).
- 67 Rattray’s redaction of the Liturgy of St James.
- 68 Scripture citations in square brackets taken from Rattray’s footnotes to the text.
- 69 Thomas Rattray, “Some Particular Instructions Concerning the Christian Covenant” in *The Works of the Right Reverend Father in God Thomas Rattray* (ed. G. H. Forbes; Burntisland: The Pitsligo Press, 1854), 19.
- 70 John Forbes of Corse and Thomas Rattray disagreed in the matter of prayer for the departed, but this writer has demonstrated that they, among the ten writers identified, held the same Eucharistic doctrine (Kornahrens, “Eucharistic Doctrine in Scottish Episcopacy, 1620–1875”).
- 71 Rattray’s library was sold by his grandson, but a catalogue of the books sold has been preserved. This writer has seen the catalogue. Rattray also owned a work by Bishop Patrick Forbes. The catalogue does not include a copy of William Forbes’ *Considerationes*, but it is certain that he was at least nominally acquainted with it, since the copy of Campbell’s *The Doctrines of a Middle State* used by this writer was the copy given to Rattray by Campbell, inscribed

- ‘AC to TR’ on the flyleaf. It is known that Rattray owned George Garden’s two-volume edition of John Forbes of Corse’s *Works*.
- 72 There is, however, one exception, Rattray refers to George Bull, Bishop of St David’s [1634–1710], who was the commanding High Church English theologian of his day, in several places throughout his works. At the beginning of *The Christian Covenant* he directs the reader to Bishop Bull’s “Discourse V. – Concerning the First Covenant and the State of Man before the Fall”. George Bull, *Works* (ed. E. Burton; London: Robert Nelson, 1827), X:52–136.
- 73 Thomas Rattray, *The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem* (London: James Bettenham, 1744), 119.
- 74 Ibid.
- 75 Ibid.
- 76 Thomas Rattray, *The Works of the Right Reverend Father in God Thomas Rattray* (ed. G. H. Forbes; Burmtisland: Pitsligo Press, 1854).
- 77 Thomas Rattray, *On the Intermediate State*, George Hay Forbes Collection, University of St. Andrews Library, MS. Dep. 19/ 14/ 1. The MS is a copy by Bishop Alexander Jolly from a copy of the original by Bishop John Alexander (Bishop of Dunkeld, 1743–76, and Episcopal successor to Thomas Rattray).
- 78 Ibid., 5.
- 79 Ibid., 10–12.
- 80 Ibid., 17.
- 81 Ibid., 22.
- 82 Ibid., 23 f. (Adv. Haer. L. v., c. 5.).
- 83 Ibid., 29.
- 84 Ibid., 44.
- 85 Except a pair of sermons published in 1711 on 1 Peter 2:17 (‘Fear God. Honour the King.’) entitled “Liturgy and Loyalty”.
- 86 Dowden, *The Scottish Communion Office 1764*, 74; Alexander Jolly, *The Christian Sacrifice in the Eucharist* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition; Aberdeen: A. Brown & Co., 1847), 191–93.
- 87 Ibid., 71.
- 88 Rattray, *The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem*, 111–22.
- 89 The phrasing of the petition is roughly that as found in the prayer for ‘the whole state of Christes church’ (the phrase ‘Militant here

- in Earth’ was added in 1552 when the petition for the departed was dropped) of the English 1549 Prayer Book, ‘We commend unto thy mercye (O Lorde) all other of thy servaunts, which are departed hence from us, with the signe of faith, and nowe do reste in the slepe of peace [...]’ [http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/1549/Communion\\_1549.htm](http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/1549/Communion_1549.htm), p. 11. The late Professor Gordon Donaldson established the connection between the Communion Office in the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637 and that in the English Book of 1549 in his *The Making of the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637* (Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press, 1954), 81.
- 90 Indeed one might conjecture that the petition of the 1764 Liturgy is to some degree a conflation of the petition of the 1549 Prayer Book and that in Rattray’s *Order* because the former prays for peace and the latter prays for light for the departed.
- 91 Dowden, *The Scottish Communion Office 1764*, 69, footnote 4.
- 92 Grub says of him, ‘After his consecration he continued to reside in England; and it would appear that he owed his elevation rather to his rank and learning, than to any direct assistance which could be expected from him as a colleague of the Scottish bishops.’ Grub, *An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*, III:357.
- 93 Ibid., III:363 f.
- 94 Ibid., IV:131 f.; Dowden, *The Scottish Communion Office 1764*, 85.
- 95 Ibid., IV:184, 193.
- 96 John Skinner, *The Office for the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper According to the Use of the Episcopal Church in Scotland: With a Preliminary Dissertation on the Doctrine of the Eucharistical Sacrifice; A Copious Local Illustration, etc.* (Aberdeen: J. Chalmers & Co., 1807).
- 97 Ibid., 135 f.; “The Collect for All Saints Day”, 1662 Book of Common Prayer.
- 98 Ibid., 136.
- 99 Ibid., 136 f.
- 100 Ibid., 143.
- 101 William Walker, *The Life of the Right Reverend Alexander Jolly, D.D., Bishop of Moray* (Edinburgh: David Douglas, 1878), 12.

- 102 William Walker, records the fact that Bishop Jolly ‘always acknowledged himself much indebted, in the [...] progress of his religious education, to the pastoral care and guidance of the Rev. Alexander Greig, Episcopal minister of his native place.’ Greig was one of the Episcopalian clergy imprisoned during the winter of 1748–49 in Stonehaven Tolbooth for officiating before more than four persons at a time, in contravention of the newly-enacted Penal Laws. *Ibid.*, 18.
- 103 Alexander Jolly, *The Christian Sacrifice in the Eucharist: Considered as it is the Doctrine of Holy Scripture* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition; Aberdeen: A. Brown & Co., 1832), dedication [no page number].
- 104 Gavin White comments that Jolly, ‘At a time when southern Episcopalians opposed Calvinism with Latitudinarianism, and northern ones with Hutchinsonianism, Jolly was neither [...]’ Gavin White, “Jolly, Alexander”, *Dictionary of Scottish Church History and Theology* (ed. N. M. de S. Cameron; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993), 448.
- 105 Walker, *The Life of Alexander Jolly*, 47–52.
- 106 Walker says, ‘Bishop Jolly’s well-balanced mind and deep learning rendered him proof against [...] extreme tendencies.’ *Ibid.*, 72.
- 107 *Ibid.*, 26.
- 108 John Henry Hobart, the Bishop of New York, exclaimed after having met Bishop Jolly in Aberdeen in 1823, ‘If I had gone from America to Aberdeen, and seen nothing but Bishop Jolly [...] I should hold my self greatly rewarded. In our new country we have no such men [...]’ Grub, *An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*, IV:175 f.
- 109 A memorial tablet, now in the Episcopalian church in Turriff, Bishop Jolly’s first charge, describes him as, ‘Deeply learned in the ancient wisdom of the Church, he taught his flock to adhere to the old paths of the Catholic and Apostolic truth; while, by a life of holiness, devotion, and self-denial he gave to a declining age a pattern of primitive piety [...]’ Walker, *The Life of Alexander Jolly*, 158.
- 110 Jolly, *The Christian Sacrifice in the Eucharist*, 112.

- 111 The argument of the footnote is to distinguish the ‘primitive’ prayers for the dead from the Roman prayers for those in Purgatory. The argument may be reduced to the following points. 1) The primitive prayers for the dead included all good souls saved by Christ, who translated upon their departure from the body to that blessed place of peace and joy, ‘where there is no sorrow, no grief, no lamentation’. 2) The Book of Wisdom, canonical scripture in Rome, says, ‘the souls of the faithful are in the hands of God, and there shall no torment touch them’ [3:1], but, according to the doctrine of Purgatory, they are in an excruciating torment of fire, from which, prayers and alms are intended to deliver them; when, after the penalty is paid, they ascend to the Beatific Vision in the highest heaven. 3) Christ himself did not ascend until after his resurrection. The doctrine of the consummate felicity of the soul without the body, maintained by the Gnostics, was condemned by the Church. 4) If the soul is in perfect felicity without the body, we may stumble at the thought of being brought back to stand a new trial, and have a new sentence passed (Matt 25:5). The doctrine of Purgatory is not Catholic doctrine, and has no authority either in scripture or primitive antiquity. 5) The holy and happy souls await the resurrection of their bodies at their Saviour’s appearing to complete his triumph over death and the grave. 6) It was to this period between death and the resurrection that all of the prayers for the faithful departed were directed, in the spirit of St Paul’s for Onesiphorus. *Ibid.*
- 112 *Ibid.*, 114.
- 113 *Ibid.*, 116.
- 114 *Ibid.*
- 115 George Hay Forbes, “Eucharistical Adoration”, *The Panoply* (Burntisland: Pitsligo Press, 1857), II:161 f.
- 116 Kornahrens, “Eucharistic Doctrine in Scottish Episcopacy, 1620–1875”, 2; 209.
- 117 George Hay Forbes, “Preface” to Rattray’s *Works*, ii.
- 118 For a succinct explanation of this aspect of Scottish Episcopalian doctrine which understands the Eucharist to be an intercessory act of efficacious prayer over the consecrated bread and cup, Christ’s



Body and Blood in death, see Rattray's *A Christian Covenant*, 16 f., particularly observing footnote r; see also George Hay Forbes' review of John Keble's *Eucharistical Adoration* in *The Panoply*, vol. II:312 f.

<sup>119</sup> *Scottish Liturgy 1982* (Edinburgh: General Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church, 1989), 23–27.

<sup>120</sup> *Ibid.*, 9.

<sup>121</sup> *The Scottish Prayer Book* of 1929 remains the canonical Prayer Book of the Scottish Episcopal Church.