

DEARMEK
IS "RITUAL" RIGHT?

BX
5123
D43
1914

TRIN

TRINITY COLLEGE LIBRARY



3 1761 02748166 2



FROM THE LIBRARY OF
TRINITY COLLEGE TORONTO





FIFTH EDITION.

Is "Ritual" Right?

BY

PERCY DEARMER, M.A., D.D.

Vicar of S. Mary's, Primrose Hill;

Author of

"The Parson's Handbook," etc.

PRICE TWOPENCE.

(In cloth boards, Sixpence.)

A. R. MOWBRAY & CO. LTD.

LONDON: 28 Margaret Street, Oxford Circus, W.

OXFORD: 9 High Street

1914

X
5123
D43
1914

First Edition	-	-	1903.
Second Edition	-	-	1905.
Third Edition	-	-	1908.
Fourth Edition	-	-	1911.
Fifth Edition	-	-	1914.

112997

DEC 22 1982

Is "Ritual" Right?

I. NATURAL RELIGION AND COMMON SENSE.

THERE is a good deal of prejudice and misunderstanding about the manner in which the Services of the Church of England should be conducted, and much controversy has been raised on this subject of "ritual."¹ During the last fifty years or so the Church has enjoyed the blessings of a great revival; she has awakened from the deadness which fell upon her in the reigns of the Georges, and is now working manfully to win back to the Gospel those who had fallen into irreligion during the days of her sloth. This revival has been shared by Churchmen of all parties, but one of its signs has been a change in her Services: they are brighter, heartier, and more earnest than they were in the days of George III. No one wishes to go back to that state of things, with its slovenly and irreverent ceremonial. Yet many people are puzzled by the changes that still go on; and some imagine that everything they are unaccustomed to must be Roman Catholic, and thus are prejudiced.

Now prejudice is a very bad thing, especially when it is uncharitable; and the right remedy for prejudice is knowledge.

¹ I have used the word "ritual" as it is generally understood; but the more exact word is "ceremonial." The ritual really means the words of a Service, while the ceremonial is the manner in which the Service is carried out, *e.g.*, the making the sign of the cross in Baptism is part of its ceremonial, the form of words used for the Service is its ritual.

Let me therefore explain the reason for what is called a "High Church" ceremonial. When people object to this, it is generally because they do not understand the reasons for it. It is something they are not used to, and therefore they assume it must be wrong. Yet a little study will show that such ceremonial is really true both to the Bible and the Prayer Book,—as well as to common sense, which is the first way in which I want you to consider it.

IS RITUALISM POPISH ?

And first, let me clear away a very common misconception. There is nothing Popish, or Romanising, about what is called Ritual. Papists use organs, but an organ is not therefore Popish. Papists use surplices, but the surplice is not therefore a rag of Popery (although the old Puritans thought it was); Papists read the Bible, but the Bible is not for that reason to be called Romanising. It is surely unreasonable, and a very foolish form of bigotry, to object to a thing merely because Romanists also use it. A great deal of objection, for instance, has been raised to the crucifix in our churches. But this objection is based on an ignorance that is really inconceivable in these days of cheap travel; for in every Lutheran church a large crucifix is prominently displayed at the east end. It is the same with images; they abound in the Protestant churches of Germany. At Marburg, for instance, the most conspicuous thing in the nave is a large statue of the Virgin and Child, gorgeously painted and gilt. Indeed, even among English Nonconformists, the more educated have given up this prejudice; in the intellectual heart of Dissent, Mansfield College, not only is there a row of large statues of the saints of Protestantism on each side of the interior, but in the porch are images of the Catholic Fathers in full Eucharistic vestments.

It is the same with these very Eucharistic vestments.

Chasubles are worn by the Lutherans in Norway and Sweden. Therefore, whatever they may be, they are not Popish.

It is the same with incense. I do not say that the use of incense is always expedient, but it is certainly not Popish. It is used by the Eastern Church, which is the strongest bulwark in the world against the Papacy. Therefore it is quite ridiculous to call it Popish. Nay, more, it has hardly ever gone entirely out of use in the Church of England since the Reformation; it was used in Ely Cathedral well into the reign of George III., it was revived at St. Mary Magdalene, Munster Square, in the early part of the reign of his grandchild, Queen Victoria. It was burnt in the Royal Chapels, and was also used by those famous saints of the English Church, Bishop Andrewes and George Herbert, and many others, in the seventeenth century, including Bishop Cosin, the leading reviser of the Prayer Book at the Restoration in the reign of Charles II. Now, as it was used in Ely Cathedral down to 1779, the only reigns in which incense has not been used are those of George IV. and William IV., just the reigns when the Church came nigh to extinction, and religion and morality were at their lowest ebb. We shall come to the authority for these things later on. For the present, it is enough to state that they are not Romish, and that anyone who says they are, says so in the direst ignorance of the facts.

PREJUDICE AND COMMON SENSE.

Secondly, let me point out that the use of ornaments and ceremonial is accepted by those who differ from us. It is only a matter of degree. I can understand a man objecting to the use of *any* distinctive dress by the minister; but our opponents dare not make this objection. The extremest Low Churchmen use the surplice, and several other vestments. Scottish Presbyterians always wear the gown, and

so do German Evangelicals. These Christians, then, cannot object to the use of a distinctive vestment as such. On what ground, then, does this objection to the chasuble rest? Because it is coloured? This is a childish splitting of straws, but I think it is common with the uneducated. Now, of course, chasubles may be white, and most hoods are coloured; so that if this were the reason, white chasubles should be preferred to coloured hoods. Is it, then, because they are Popish? But I have shown that this is not true. Surplices are worn by Roman Catholics just as much as chasubles or other vestments. Can it be on the ground that chasubles are unlawful? But I shall show that they are expressly ordered by the Church of England. And I can hardly believe that a party in the Church, which does not even obey the law in having daily Morning and Evening Prayer, could seriously and honestly bring the charge of lawlessness against others.

When we consider, then, the objection to certain vestments, we find that it is not based upon reason, but is in fact a mere prejudice. What, I wonder, would the denizen of some other planet think of us if he lighted upon this curious world of ours, and found people rousing themselves to fury, even in the Houses of Parliament, over the use of one garment in worship, while they gladly accepted another of a slightly different cut! For, remember, surplice and chasuble both rest upon the same authority, the Ornaments Rubric,¹ and neither are mentioned *by name* in the Prayer Book.

GOOD TASTE.

Is it then merely a matter of taste? Well, it is not, for members of the Church of England; for them it must be a matter of law and order. But supposing it *were* a matter of taste, and we were free to choose. What then? Surely, if

¹ See p. 24.

it is a matter of taste, the only reasonable course is to take counsel with those who are experts in matters of taste—with the artists. I need not dwell on this point. You know what the verdict would be, if the enemies of "Ritual" were to appeal to painters and sculptors and architects. The most presumptuous of our opponents do not go so far as to claim to be artistic. The verdict of history, the evidence of the present day, the universal testimony of mankind, are indisputable. If, then, it is really a matter of taste, the only course is for those who have bad taste to learn from those who have good. There must be *some* form of worship, if people are to worship together. Therefore some people must make concessions. And what must happen is that those who do not understand beauty must give way a little to those who do; although, at the same time, ample provision must be made for those who find very simple services most helpful—those, for instance, who prefer to worship without incense or music.

Would this be unfair to the colour-blind, or form-blind minority? Is it unfair that people who have no ear for music should defer to those who have an ear? We know there is only one answer. Our worship must satisfy those who understand beauty, whether in form, or colour, or music; or we shall drive away the cleverest and most cultivated people from our churches.

And history has shown that this answer is beneficent as well as just. What has happened all over Christendom for nigh 2,000 years? The people who did not care for beauty have accepted the worship provided by those who did care, and have benefited thereby—have so benefited that every poor man became a sharer in the happy, refining spiritualising effect of the architecture and art of Christendom. Look, for instance, at the splendid old parish churches, which are the pride of England, and yet were designed, and built, and decorated by working men.

We have, it is true, grumblers at home; but do not forget that this grumbling has been confined to one-third of Christendom during a period less than one-sixth of its existence, and that this grumbling is directly traceable to the insane prejudice against everything used in the Church of Rome. At its height, that prejudice extended to the surplice and to organs, and even, incredible as it now seems, to the wedding-ring. That prejudice is now discredited; our present knowledge of natural religion, of psychology, of historical science, our larger metaphysic and theology, have left it far behind. What wonder that every year sees the growth of ceremonial worship, not only among ourselves, but among Dissenters also?

NATURAL RELIGION.

Ceremonial worship, in truth, has its roots far deeper than the likings or prejudices of any particular sect. It has its roots in the heart of man and in the being of God. It is a part of natural religion. It is one of the ways in which man approaches his Maker, and—apart from the deliberate, self-conscious prejudice of the extremer forms of Protestantism, which denied it for a definite purpose—it is universal. Did the Pagans as well as Christians burn incense? Did the Jews make use of elaborate ceremonies, of vestments and incense? Do even the naked savages use music in their rites? All this is the strongest testimony to the rightfulness of these things. Deep, deep in the heart of man, far, far back in his chequered history, lies and continues the truth that through outward things he has always found the expression of the inward.

Before, then, we turn to the Bible, before we turn to the Prayer Book, let us bear it in upon ourselves that we are "Ritualists," first of all, because we are human beings, and must worship the All Father as our brothers have striven to worship Him. For under all the errors, all

the cruelties, all the superstitions of our remotest ancestors has lain the Divine instinctive feeling that God is beauty as well as truth; and that if we would worship God aright, if we would worship Him in truth as in spirit, we must worship with our bodies as well as our souls; we must worship Him not only in the quiet communings of the individual soul, when even words may be superfluous, but must worship also in common, when man meets man in united praise, and must worship Him in the beauty of holiness,—“in holy array.”

“Give unto the LORD the glory due unto his Name. Worship the LORD in the beauty of holiness.” Three times in every month we sing this,¹ and the Revised Version explains the words in the margin—“Worship the LORD in holy array.” The experience of mankind has taught us that only by outward use can the inward be kept alive; only by reverence shown in act can men attune their souls to inward awe (and that is why all Christians teach their children to kneel and fold their hands for prayer); only by outward expression of belief can a common faith be held by multitudes of people; only by the outward giving of alms can inward charity be kept alive. And has not the experience of our country for three centuries past shown us also, and conversely, that not the extremest barrenness of worship can preserve mankind from the constant danger of empty formalism? English religion was most formal when it was least ritualistic. If formalism could be prevented by the destruction of ceremonial, who would not give up ceremonial to-day? But what did English religion come to in the age when men tried that experiment? You know what it came to in the Hanoverian period, and you know, too, that the religious revival which is now trying to undo the neglect of the past has been marked throughout by the

¹ Ps. xxix. 2, xcvi. 4, and cx. 3.

revival of ceremonial. The experiment of barrenness has been tried. All Christendom is aghast at the extent of its failure.

Yes; man can do nothing without worship. And worship cannot in the end survive without some common ceremonial expression, without "ritual." No doctrine can in the long run be maintained unless it be clothed in eloquent symbols, because the majority can only understand by symbol; while many others, and they not the least spiritual, find words inadequate as a means of expression, and can only realize spiritual truths through other arts, such as music and ceremonial. No Church can very long survive without the needed edification of a common and expressive worship.

We are body and soul, and every moment of our lives our souls are held down by our senses. Has it not been a wise instinct of mankind so to use these senses—aye, the sense of sight and the sense of smell, as well as the sense of hearing, for we must be logical, and one sense is as worthy as another—so to use these senses as to make them the means of liberating the soul, of lifting it to high things, instead of enslaving it to sin?

We are body and soul. God made us so. And what has God made Himself for us? Body also. "The Word was made flesh."

And how has God revealed Himself in nature? As a God Whose every act is perfect beauty, Who has placed man in a garden, Who taught him always, and still teaches him, his first lessons in religion by means of rolling cloud, and gorgeous sunset, of trees and flowers and running water, of sounds and scents innumerable. Nature is resplendent with colour, and sweet with the natural incense of flowers and trees and earth. And nature is a manifestation of God Himself.

We need not fear that by borrowing a little of that

beauty for our worship we shall be false to the God Who rejoices in it. We have only to fear lest, through our parsimony or our prejudice, our beauty of worship shall be so mean a thing as to be unworthy of His splendour.

II.—THE BIBLE.

THERE is a very widespread idea that High Churchmen, or "Ritualists," are unscriptural. Indeed, I think that idea, and the notion that they are Popish, are the main reasons why so many good people suspect them. I showed in the last chapter how unfounded the latter notion is. And now let us consider the Bible. Amazing as it may seem, those who attack Churchmen for Ritualism claim the honour of being Bible-Christians. I say it is amazing, because Protestantism has taken a special pride in treating the whole Bible as the Word of God; the whole Bible, Old and New Testament alike, has been regarded as equally and verbally inspired; and the boast is familiar that the Bible is the religion of Protestants—the Bible, not the New Testament only. That Bible, without ecclesiastical comment, is, as we are told by the opponents of the Church schools, quite sufficient for Christian education.

THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Well, here is a passage from the Bible, part, remember, of "undenominational" religion, the common religion, we are told, of Christians, which it is considered no injustice to teach out of the rates:—

"And thou shalt make holy garments for Aaron thy brother, for glory and for beauty. . . . And these are the garments which they shall make; a breastplate, and an ephod, and a robe, and a coat of chequer work, a mitre,

and a girdle. . . . And they shall make the ephod of gold, of blue, and purple, scarlet, and fine twined linen, the work of the cunning workman. It shall have two shoulderpieces joined to the two ends thereof."¹ And then the passage goes on into the minutest details of what a politician once foolishly derided as man-millinery—far too long for me to quote here. You must read it for yourself. The next chapter is concerned with several minute details as to the ceremonial of sacrifices, with instruction also as to the peculiar holiness of the altar. The chapter after that is concerned with holy oil and incense; and careful instructions are given for the making of the latter:

"And the LORD said unto Moses, Take unto thee sweet spices, stacte, and onycha, and galbanum; sweet spices with pure frankincense: of each shall there be a like weight; and thou shalt make of it incense."² And so it goes on for three verses more.

Now I have quoted these two passages out of hundreds with which the Bible is studded, not only because these are specially detailed, but because they are given under very special circumstances. It is Jehovah Himself Who is speaking, and He is speaking in the most solemn moment of the history of Israel; for all these ceremonial directions are part of the communing between the LORD and Moses upon Mount Sinai, part of that event which gave to the Jews the Ten Commandments. They come, in fact, to the Bible Christian with the same authority as the Decalogue.

Well, our opponents use the Decalogue (inaccurately,³

¹ Ex. xxviii. 2, 4, 6—7. R.V.

² Ex. xxx. 34.

³ Inaccurately, because the two parts of the Second Commandment must be read together—"Thou shalt not make," and "Thou shalt not worship." It is wrong to make images *in order to worship them*. If the Commandment really means that it is wrong to put images in church, then it also means that it is wrong to make images of statesmen or any great men, and also wrong to have your photograph taken, or to have illustrations in a book; for it says, "the likeness of *any* thing," whether in heaven or earth. But of course it does not mean that; and the Jews themselves

we submit) when they accuse us of sin in making images. But why should they use Exodus xx. and ignore the next ten chapters, which occur as part of the same law given at the same time? Let us leave them to choose between the horns of the dilemma.

For us the dilemma does not exist, for we have no concern with the Jewish law. We accept the Decalogue because it occurs in the Church Catechism, because, in fact, the Church has made it part of the law of Christendom, and has in the Catechism interpreted it in the Christian sense. And we accept it as the Church explains it in the two "Duties" of our Catechism, where it is adapted to the needs of Christendom. The Church, more consistent than her critics, has freely adapted, not only the ethical, but also the sacrificial and ceremonial principles to the needs of Christendom, and this also we accept on the same grounds.

Of what value, then, is all this Ritualism of the Old Testament to us Churchmen, who are not bound by the idea of the equal inspiration of every sentence of the Bible—to us who know that those old types and shadows have passed away in the fulfilment of Christ?

Surely it is of the greatest value for our purpose. It proves that a nation chosen by GOD for a special spiritual work, ruled and taught by men inspired of Him for this special task, was through and through committed to Ritualism. The details have long passed away, but the principle remains. If it does not remain, then we are logically bound to exceed the highest of high criticism, and declare that the whole worship of the Old Testament is contrary to the mind of GOD,—that while GOD desires for man the simplest form of worship, He allowed His teachers and were told to make images for use in their worship on the same occasion that they were told not to worship them:—"And thou shalt make two cherubims of gold; of beaten work shalt thou make them, at the two ends of the mercy seat."—*Ex. xxv. 18.*

Weak ground

prophets to inculcate the most elaborate. In fact, we are driven to deny the Divine guidance of the world before CHRIST. And if we condemn also the ceremonial of the historic Christian Church, then we are driven to deny the Divine guidance of the world after CHRIST as well. That is the second dilemma. If Ritualism be wrong, then GOD inspired man in all ages to worship Him, and yet He inspired man to worship Him wrongly.

Some people express the profoundest contempt and disgust for the caring about ceremonial. I submit that they are allowing the habits of nineteenth century Philistinism to bias them against the testimony of the HOLY GHOST in the heart of man.

CHRIST AND RITUALISM.

But the Ritualism of the Old Testament leads us on to a further point. This Ritualism was flourishing in great magnificence when the SON of GOD appeared upon the earth.

What was His attitude towards it? Everything depends upon that. If He condemned ritualistic worship, then it stands condemned; if He allowed it, then who are we that we should dare to condemn it?

Now, our LORD was far from ignoring the danger of externalism in religion. The Jews were sunk in formalism, and our LORD's main work lay in destroying that formalism, and providing a spiritual religion in its place. He condemned many things, He used His sternest language against the vain externalism of the Pharisees. But did He once breathe a word against their method of common worship, the ritualistic ceremonies of the Temple? Not once. He

* Even when denouncing the Pharisees our LORD was careful to maintain the sanctity of ceremonial. He condemned them for swearing by the gift when they ought to have remembered that the altar is more holy than the gift, for He says, "Whether is the greater, the gift, or *the altar that sanctifieth the gift?*" (*S. Matt. xxiii. 20. R.V.*) And in condemning their

showed by all His actions that He loved that worship, He frequented the Services of the Temple, he lamented its approaching destruction; He took His life in His hands, that He might go up to Jerusalem and attend its Services at those special seasons when they were most elaborate.

Suppose that an extremely elaborate Holy Week ceremonial were used at St. Paul's Cathedral, suppose our LORD were preaching and healing somewhere in the Midlands, and suppose He were to make a point of coming up to worship at St. Paul's in Holy Week. Your inference would be that He approved of that kind of ceremonial. And now suppose that there was a bad habit of brawling at St. Paul's, and that when our LORD came there He found the solemnity of the ceremonial spoilt by people chatting and chaffering; and suppose that He were to take a scourge of knotted cords in His hand, and drive those irreverent people out of the Cathedral, crying out, "My house is a house of prayer, but ye have made it a den of thieves!" would your inference be that He disapproved of such ritualistic forms of service, or that He desired to protect and encourage them?

Not a word, not a word against all this gorgeous pomp. Words many against the love of money, which we ignore—words many against the pride, the affectations, the puritanism, the clericalism, of the religious world of that day, which we sorely need to remember now; a word too against the stingy traitor who resented the lavish use of money, of alabaster and costly ointment, in a touching ceremonial act—but against the Ritualism of the common worship, nothing. Think what the temptation is for the protestor against formalism to protest also against forms; think how, time after time, as at the Reformation or the French Revolution,

excessive minuteness about tithing "mint and anise and cummin," He added, "But these ye ought to have done, and not to have left the other undone."—*Ibid.* 23.

men have swept away ceremonial and gutted churches, in the wrath of their protest against formalism; and you will realize how far above our human short-sightedness is the wisdom of the Son of Man, Who not only shared in human worship, but Himself used form and symbol in His miracles, laying His hands on the sick, touching and anointing the deaf and blind, blessing and breaking the loaves.

But did He not interfere with any liturgical observance? Is there no part of those ten chapters of Exodus which he criticised, at least in the human fulfilment of them? Yes; there is. Yet, strangely enough, that one liturgical observance which he over and over again interfered with is the one which Puritanism has retained, and retained in its Judaic form. I refer, of course, to Sabbatarianism. Here was something in which the letter had indeed over-ridden the spirit; and our LORD was not silent, but brooked the fury of the religious world by deliberately disregarding this Sabbatarian formalism.¹ When, then, we are told that the Gospel abrogates all ceremonial, let us remember that the one definite point of which this is true is Sabbatarianism, and that Sabbatarianism is the very point in which the opponents of ceremonial have stuck to the religious observances of Exodus. The Church was wiser; she abolished the Sabbath, and started a new holy day (on the first instead of the last day of the week, *viz.*, Sunday), the weekly Feast of the Resurrection, which, as we find in the Acts of the Apostles, was kept by a Celebration of the Holy Communion.² That is how High Churchmen keep it still—by having the LORD'S Service on the LORD'S Day,³ as well as by preaching and resting.

Here then is the third dilemma for our opponents. If Ritualism is wrong, why did not our LORD condemn it, as they do? Why did He take part in it, as they do not? If the Gospel has *reversed* the principles of the old worship,

¹ *E.g.*, S. Mark ii. 27.

² Acts xx. 7.

³ See p. 22.

instead of only improving on them, why should our opponents themselves observe Sunday in a Jewish fashion instead of by the great Christian service of the Holy Communion?

The truth is this—our LORD and His Apostles took Ritualism for granted and as a matter of course.

THE NEW TESTAMENT.

There is, therefore, no laying down of a new ceremonial in the New Testament. It is occupied with more urgent things than that. Obviously, this was not the time for discussing ceremonial any more than for dealing with church music, or Sunday Schools, or parochial organization, or any other of those practical questions which arose later in the history of the Church. GOD'S method is that of growth, and our LORD studiously refrained from tying down the Church by any laws. He is as silent about the Church's ceremonial as He is about her observance of a weekly holiday. He gave her no command as to how she was to observe the LORD'S Day, or any other day, or whether she was to have any special day at all. All this He left her to work out in the future. Only he promised that He would be with her to the end of the world, and that the Holy Spirit would guide His flock into all truth.¹

Now we believe that this promise has been fulfilled. We believe that He *has* been with her, and that the worship she has offered Him has been acceptable. We can now see the Divine wisdom in that freedom which He gave her, the Divine growth in the use she has made of that freedom. A few moral precepts, a few theological truths, certain sacraments, a short form of prayer, that was His endowment, His legacy to His kingdom. But He left it also the example of a perfect life, and He has continued in it His abiding presence, His continual inspiration.

Yes; and in the heart of His beloved disciple He set

¹ S. Matt. xxviii. 20; S. John xvi. 13.

a picture of the perfect worship of heaven. S. John, the most spiritual of the Apostles, S. John, who had had the best opportunities of knowing the Master's mind, has given us a vision of that worship, which is the inspired symbolic pattern of all Christian ceremonial. It is not, of course, a description of any actual Service. But it shows clearly that the Apostle must have approved of those things which he introduces into his picture of heaven :—

"Straightway I was in the Spirit: and behold, there was a throne set in heaven, and one sitting upon the throne; and he that sat was to look upon like a jasper stone and a sardius: and there was a rainbow round about the throne, like an emerald to look upon. And round about the throne were four and twenty thrones: and upon the thrones I saw four and twenty elders sitting, arrayed in white garments; and on their heads crowns of gold. And out of the throne proceeded lightnings and voices and thunders. And there were seven lamps of fire burning before the throne, which are the seven Spirits of GOD; and before the throne, as it were a glassy sea like unto crystal." Again:—"And when he had taken the book, the four living creatures and the four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having each one a harp, and golden bowls full of incense, which are the prayers of the saints. And they sing a new song And the elders fell down and worshipped." Again:—"And another angel came and stood over the altar, having a golden censer; and there was given unto him much incense, that he should add it unto the prayers of all the saints upon the golden altar which was before the throne. And the smoke of the incense, with the prayers of the saints, went up before GOD out of the angel's hand." ¹

Such was the vision of S. John, such his inspired imaginings concerning the ideal worship of the redeemed. Glorious colour as of huge jewels, the splendour of a golden altar,

¹ Rev. iv. 2-6 v. 8, 9 14 viii. 3-4. R.V.

vested ministers prostrate in adoration, sweet singing, and the scent of many golden bowls of incense. It brings us back to that thought of God revealed in nature with which we concluded the last chapter. In heaven, S. John thought, where worship is entirely spiritual, and God seen face to face, there must be still scent, and sound, the grace of solemn order, and the glory of colour—in heaven as in earth.

III.—THE PRAYER BOOK.

"We are 'ritualists' because we obey the Prayer Book." That is the answer a good Churchman would make to objectors. Yet, strange to say, the popular idea is the exact opposite to this. Most uneducated people, and a good many who in other matters are well informed, imagine that High Churchmen are lawless and unfaithful. Charges are hurled about—very cruel charges, very false, very libellous charges—by people who really ought to know better.

Now, it is true that there are clergy both "high" and "low," both "broad" and "moderate," who disobey the Prayer Book; and when Catholic¹ Churchmen do so, they bring the whole Catholic movement into unnecessary discredit; but so far from Ritualism being in itself disloyal to the Prayer Book, it is certain that only by a "Ritualist" can the Prayer Book be obeyed.

OLD-FASHIONED LAWLESSNESS.

First, let us look at the general plan of the Prayer Book, the Services it provides for, the main obligations it lays upon the clergy. It provides two choir Services (Morning

¹ Some people call the Papists "Catholic," as if Churchmen were not Catholics. Yet we say every time we go to Church, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church;" and the Prayer Book *always* uses the word "Catholic," so that if we are good Churchmen we must be good Catholics

and Evening Prayer) every day, and a celebration of the Holy Communion on Sundays and Holy Days, and the Litany thrice a week. A study of the rubrics will also show that a sermon is to be preached at the Sunday Eucharist, and that there is to be catechizing on all Sundays and Holy Days. This is the regular course of Prayer Book Services.

Now, before the Church revival, every one of these points was disobeyed. The special daily Services (Mattins and Evensong) were said on Sunday only; the special Sunday Service (the LORD's Supper) was celebrated only three or four times a year; the Holy Days were not observed; the Litany was omitted two days out of the three; the weekly sermon alone was retained, but its use in giving special prominence to the Eucharist was entirely disregarded. Catechizing was not given on Holy Days, and was so largely ignored on Sundays that the laity at last started the Sunday school movement to make up for the neglect of the clergy.

This, the old-fashioned arrangement of Service, is no doubt what people have in their minds when they accuse us reformers of lawlessness. We are not at all faithful to this arrangement; and so they imagine that we are not faithful to the Prayer Book. They have not stopped to consider that this familiar system of their childhood is, as a matter of fact, contrary to the Prayer Book at every point. They would be quite honestly surprised if they heard that it is the very acme of lawlessness. Yet it is.

Now our Evangelical brethren are steadily emerging from this state of disobedience; they, like other Churchmen, have largely given up the old-fashioned ritual. I honour them the more for this, because it often requires a good deal of courage to insist on the Prayer Book in the face of an old-fashioned congregation. But they have yet a good deal of lee-way to make up. They are still far less law-abiding than the Ritualists.

UNDOING THE REFORMATION.

The daily Services, for instance, are stated in the Prayer Book Preface "*Concerning the Service of the Church*" to be the main reason why the Prayer Book was drawn up. Read this Preface (the second in the Prayer Book), and you will see that the reason given for the work of the Reformers is that the clergy by reading, and the people "by *daily* hearing of Holy Scripture read in the Church," might be edified. The old choir Services had become so confused, and, being in Latin, were so unintelligible, that it was necessary to draw up a "Common Prayer," in which the Psalter and Bible would be read steadily through *day by day*. Therefore those who do not have the daily Services are in truth unfaithful to the Reformation. This Preface is followed by a Note ordering the Curate of every parish church to have *daily* Morning and Evening Prayer in the Church. The daily order is further explained in the two notes after the next Preface, beginning "The Psalter shall be *read through* once a month." Then follow the Proper Lessons for Sundays and Holy Days, and after that the Kalendar, which gives the week-day lessons. After that come a Table of Feasts (still largely ignored in many lawless churches), and a carefully-detailed Table of Fasting-days, which are still so much disobeyed that a person who fasts is looked upon as extraordinarily High Church by people who fancy themselves to be quite loyal to the Prayer Book and the Reformation.¹ Then comes the Services of Morning and Evening Prayer described in their title as "*daily* to be said and used throughout the year."

¹ If you reckon up the Table of Vigils and Fasts in the "Tables and Rules" of the Prayer Book, you will find that we are ordered to keep 103 Fast-days in 1908 (40 days of Lent, 3 Rogation days, 13 remaining Vigils, 7 remaining Ember Days, and also the 40 remaining Fridays). Who obeys the Prayer Book in this its hardest rule? The High Churchman.

Who, do you think, are the lawless clergy—those who obey these orders thus heaped upon us in the Prayer Book, or those who disobey them?

THE PRINCIPAL SERVICE.

Well, as I have said, a great advance has been made by all parties. But in one important particular that advance in lawfulness is almost confined to "ritualistic" churches. I refer to the position of the Holy Communion—the one Service (besides Baptism) which our LORD Himself ordered. At most churches it is put into a corner, and its place as the principal Service of the day is taken by Mattins.

Now, the Reformers were very anxious for the revival of preaching, and in order that everyone should hear a sermon every Sunday they inserted a rubric in the middle of the Holy Communion to the effect that *here* was the place for the sermon.¹ They felt sure that by doing this they would ensure the people hearing a sermon, for they took it for granted that everyone would, of course, be present at this Service, if at no other. They made this even more sure by ordering that the Notices should be given out at the same place in the middle of the Communion Service.² Alas for their intentions! In the average church of to-day the sermon is preached at Mattins, for which the Prayer Book provides no sermon, and has been removed from the LORD'S Supper, at which the Prayer Book orders it to be preached.

By this simple expedient, you will observe, the whole balance of public worship has been shifted, the pre-eminence of the Holy Communion—Scriptural, Primitive, and Anglican, not to say Catholic—has been destroyed. The people come naturally to that Service in which the sermon

¹ "Then shall follow the Sermon."—*Second Rubric after the Creed in the Communion Service.*

² "Then the Curate shall declare unto the people what Holy-days or Fasting-days are in the week following to be observed," etc.—*First Rubric.* See note on p. 21.

is preached, and that Service is now Mattins! I do not, of course, wish to blame all the clergy in whose churches this is done. They often would like to obey the Prayer Book by having the sermon and the Eucharist in their proper place, but are prevented because the congregation are not sufficiently good churchmen.

I would just remind you also that the Prayer Book, by ordering sponsors in the Baptismal Service to make their God-children "hear sermons," provides for non-communicating attendance; since these sermons, according to the rubric, are to be preached at the Holy Communion, and the Priest has no right to close the Communion Service at the Offertory if there are three or four among the congregation who desire to communicate; also that the Prayer Book (enforced by the Canons)¹ does not allow people to go out of church in the middle of the Lord's Supper, but requires them to remain till the Priest "*shall let them depart,*" as the rubric says, with the Blessing. Thus, you see, at every point the Catholic and Scriptural position of the Eucharist is guarded in the Prayer Book.

And now we have dealt with the essentials of Prayer Book *Ritual* (using the word in its strict sense); we have seen that first of all a Prayer Book Church is one in which the clergy carry out the duties they have undertaken by saying Mattins and Evensong daily, by celebrating the Holy Eucharist on Sundays and all Holy Days, by preaching a sermon at the Sunday Eucharist (we know from the Canons² that it is only on a Sunday, and then once, that a sermon is positively required), and by catechising on Sundays and Holy Days.

¹ "Neither shall they disturb the Service or Sermon, by walking or talking, or any other way: *nor depart out of the Church during the time of Service or Sermon.*"—*Canon 18.* "The Churchwardens . . . shall diligently see that all the parishioners duly resort to their Church upon all Sundays and Holy-days, *and there continue the whole time of Divine Service.*"—*Canon 90.*

² "One Sermon every Sunday of the year."—*Canon 45.*

THE ORNAMENTS RUBRIC.

We now come to the subsidiary question—What ornaments are they to use for these Services?

"Ah! there we have you!" say our good friends. "None of your vestments and things are mentioned in the Prayer Book." Well, it is true, they are not mentioned by name, but they are none the less *ordered*. A schoolmaster might say to a boy, "You are to come this afternoon in your cricketing things." He would not *mention* the things by name, but if the boy thought he was not therefore ordered to wear them, the master would use summary means to undeceive him.

Now this is exactly what happens in the Church of England; we are told to use all the things which were lawfully used in the year 1548, and we are expected to know what they are.

"And here is to be noted, That such Ornaments of the Church, and of the Ministers thereof at all times of their Ministration, shall be retained, and be in use, as were in this Church of England, by the authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edw. VI."—*The Ornaments Rubric*.

No vestments are mentioned by name in the Prayer Book, and very few ornaments. The surplice is not mentioned; the hood, scarf, chasuble, black gown, and cope are not mentioned, but they are all lawful; and so are organs, censers, lecterns, and candlesticks, although they are not mentioned either. This may seem strange to some modern people, but it was not at all strange to the Reformers; for they had the old service books before them, and in those books few of the ornaments are mentioned. The York Missal, for instance, mentions no vestments whatever; the Hereford Missal mentions the amice and albe only; the Sarum Missal has no word

about altar lights, neither has any other of our pre-Reformation Missals.

The Reformers, however, went further than the old Missals. They did what had never been done before; they inserted a general rubric ordering all these things—vestments and all—and they made that rubric a part of an Act of Parliament.

If you open your Prayer Book at the beginning of Morning Prayer, you will find that rubric which is called the Ornaments Rubric, and which I have just quoted. If you have a recently-printed Prayer Book that rubric will have a page to itself. That is its proper position; in the original MS. of the Prayer Book, a whole folio page is devoted to it, so as to show at a glance that it is the great rubric which covers the whole Prayer Book, without which not a single Service can be lawfully carried out. In slovenly times the rubric came to be printed as a kind of foot-note to the "Golden Numbers," and so was little noticed.

Now the Ornaments Rubric is preceded by a statement that "the Chancels shall remain as they have done in times past." This clause was inserted in Edward VI.'s reign (1552), and therefore meant that the old arrangement of altar, chancel furniture, etc., was to continue as it had been at the beginning of that reign. The beautiful old arrangement of the chancel was ordered to be kept. When the Puritans tore down the altars, removed the candles and frontals, and destroyed the great chancel screen with its crucifix, they were breaking the law, disobeying this order of the Prayer Book. They left the chancels hideous and bare, as we most of us remember them in our childhood.¹

¹ Pictures of the old arrangement of the chancel (which is very different from that of Roman Catholic churches) will be found in a book I have written called *The Parson's Handbook* (published by Frowde), which gives a full description, for laymen as well as clergy, such as there is not room for here.

Then follows the Ornaments Rubric itself. Let me point out to you its meaning. It orders the ornaments, not only "of the Church," but also "of the Ministers"; not only, that is to say, such things as chalices, candles, altar-cloths, burses, etc., but also such things as surplices, chasubles, copes, etc.,—for all were in lawful use in 1548–9, the second year of Edward VI.

How, then, are we to know what things were in lawful use in that year? The rubric says we are to look for "the authority of Parliament" because a good many things were done without authority in those troublous times. What ornaments then had this authority? To avoid any dispute, we will take our stand on the First Prayer Book of Edward VI, which was accepted by Parliament in 1548–9, and came into use in 1549; because all historians and lawyers are agreed that this at least is referred to by the Ornaments Rubric, and because this First Prayer Book mentions definitely by name the most important ornaments. Though we must remember that some things have been declared lawful which are not mentioned in this Book, for no old service book is exhaustive.

VESTMENTS.

In the rubrics of the First English Prayer Book, then,—the Book of 1549,—the Priest at the Holy Communion is told to wear "a white albe plain with a vestment or cope," and his assistants "albes with tunicles." At "Mattins and Evensong, baptizing and burying," the minister is told to wear a surplice¹; but at the Holy Communion he is ordered to wear, not a surplice, but an albe with a vestment. Thus the vestments which cause so much astonishment to our friends are mentioned *seriatim* in the First Prayer Book, and are ordered by the Ornaments

¹ Cardwell, *The Two Books*, 267, 397. You can get a cheap copy of the First Prayer Book for a shilling at any bookseller's.

Rubric in our own, because they were "in this Church of England by the authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI."

It would take too long for me to proceed with an enumeration of all the ornaments and vestments which were in lawful use in 1548-9.¹ It is enough to say, If you wish to know what they are, look at a well-ordered "ritualistic" church. I do not say, Look at all such churches, for in some it is true the Church of Rome has been copied, and such lawlessness I should be the last to defend. But if we want to stop lawlessness of this kind we must in fairness and justice try to stop "Low-church" lawlessness as well, and we must be very careful that we ourselves keep the law by using such things as the vestments at Holy Communion.

I need only here point out that the rubric orders all these things to be "in use," and to be used by the clergy "at all times of their ministration"; there is nothing of the half-measure about it—the order is clear and precise. It does not merely allow these things, it *commands* them.

Lastly, this rubric was carefully guarded, and indeed strengthened, when the Prayer Book was last revised (at the Restoration in 1661). You might think it was kept in by an oversight; but, No! The Puritans at the Savoy Conference asked that it might be struck out, "forasmuch," they said, "as this rubric seemeth to bring back the cope, albe etc., and other vestments." The Bishops replied: "We think it fit that the rubric continue as it is."

And so it has remained. But till the Church revival it was only partially obeyed. The clergy conformed to it so far as their choir-vestments were concerned. The

¹ A clear and scholarly account of the Ornaments Rubric will be found in Mr. Eeles' *The Ornaments Rubric*. (Mowbrays, *id.*)

old-fashioned Priest with his surplice, hood, and black scarf was quite lawfully habited for saying Mattins and Evensong; but his mistake was that, when he came to celebrate the Holy Communion, he did so in these same choir-vestments. That was his mistake. And did it not arise from his other fault—that he celebrated the Holy Communion so seldom, and gave our LORD'S own Service so low a place in the worship of the Church? Terrible evils followed, as they were bound to follow, on that great omission. And when the clergy began to see the error of their ways, and to perform their duties honestly and in due order, what wonder that they also began to conform to the other rubrics of the English Church, and celebrate CHRIST'S Eucharist with its proper dignity and beauty—not only in its lawful place, but also with its lawful vestments and ornaments.

IV.—LOYALTY TO THE CHURCH.

FOR us, loyalty to the Church in matters of ritual and ceremonial means loyalty to that part of the Church Catholic which we call the Church of England; for, as the XXXIV. Article declares, every particular Church has authority to "change and abolish ceremonies or rites," as well as to ordain them. Ceremonial is not essential like doctrine: it is a minor matter, the arrangement of which may be left to a national Church, as anciently it was left to each diocese.

Having thus asserted her freedom, our Church did not use it without regard for the customs of the Church at large. Some rites she "ordained," as the delivery of the chalice to the laity (or rather, re-ordained, for Communion in both kinds had only been dropped a few centuries before the Reformation); others she "changed," as the use in worship of a language not understood of the people;

others she "abolished," as the reading of "uncertain stories and legends" in Divine Service. But all these changes were, according to the Prayer Book, to be made on sound Catholic lines; there was to be no change for the sake of change; only the abuses were to be taken away, that the Services might be brought back to the "godly and decent order of the ancient Fathers."

Now the popular idea is the exact opposite of this. People think that a new church was started at the Reformation with a new set of ceremonies, marked by a spirit of violent opposition to those used by the rest of the Catholic Church.

THE REFORMATION.

It is easy to show from official documents that this idea is wrong. The Prayer Book claims to be, and is, a revision of the old diocesan uses of the English Church, so that, as the second Preface says, "now from henceforth all the whole Realm shall have but one Use." And in its ceremonial alterations, the claim is constantly made that these alterations are Catholic and not Protestant in character. For instance:—

1549. In the Preface, *Concerning the Service of the Church* (first published in this year, and now printed second in the Prayer Book), we are referred to the "godly and decent order of the ancient Fathers" as our standard; and we are told, "Here you have an Order for Prayer, for the reading of the holy Scripture, much agreeable to the mind and purpose of the old Fathers."

1549. In our third Preface, *Of Ceremonies*, while it is declared that certain ceremonies (some "of godly intent") have been abolished because of their excess, and of superstitious and avaricious abuses, it is also stated that "some of the old Ceremonies are retained still," and Puritan objectors are told that "surely where the old may be well

used, there they cannot reasonably reprove the old only for their age, without bewraying of their own folly." The Preface continues by condemning "innovations," and declaring that "new-fangleness" is "always to be eschewed," with the proviso "as much as may be with true setting forth of CHRIST'S religion."

1569. The following declaration was ordered by Queen Elizabeth to be read in all churches: "We deny to claim any superiority to ourself to define, decide, or determine any article or point of the Christian faith and religion, or to change any ancient ceremony of the Church from the form before received and observed by the Catholic and Apostolic Church."¹

1603. The 30th Canon:—"But the abuse of a thing doth not take away the lawful use of it. Nay, 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 doth neither endamage the Church of God, nor offend the minds of sober men."

1661. Declaration of the Bishops at the Savoy Conference, when the Puritans objected to the Priest standing at the altar:—"All the Primitive Church used it, and if we do not observe that golden rule of the venerable Council of Nice, 'Let ancient customs prevail, till reason plainly requires the contrary,' we shall give offence to sober Christians by a causeless departure from Catholic usage."²

1661. The first Preface of the Prayer Book, called *The Preface*, which was written in this year:—"Of the sundry alterations proposed unto us, we have rejected all such as were either of dangerous consequence (as secretly striking at some established doctrine, or laudable practice of the

¹ *Burleigh State Papers.*

² *Cardwell's Conferences*, p. 342.

Church of England, or indeed of the whole Catholic Church of CHRIST) or else of no consequence at all."

It is clear, then, that during the hundred years which effected the Reformation, the English Church steadily kept to her principles, that she would alter nothing except those abuses which had obscured the primitive and Catholic practices of the Church, making no change for the mere sake of change, and in her changes retaining her loyalty to "the whole Catholic Church."

THE USE OF TRADITION.

But what do all these general statements come to? This: that the English Church in reforming her Service Books rested them upon Church tradition. She laid down revised Services to be carried out on the old lines, and in the old buildings, furnished as "in times past." By insisting in the Ornaments Rubric on the old vestments and ornaments, she endeavoured to secure the main features of the Service. In the rubrics she laid down the principal points of the ceremonial: certain other points were afterwards dealt with in the Canons. For the rest, she left the ministers and people to tradition. The clergy were to use the ornaments: they knew perfectly well how to use them; they were to say Mattins and Evensong and to celebrate the Eucharist; they had long-acquired habits of carrying out these functions in the common method which had always been used in the Church of England. It was not necessary to draw up a multitude of rubrics on these points, for such had never been the custom of the Church.

It is very important to remember this; for people often imagine that only those ceremonies are lawful which are mentioned in the rubrics. To think this is to treat the Prayer Book as if it were like the modern Roman Missal; for, with the exception of that Missal, no Service Book has ever attempted to give rubrics for everything that has to be

done. Even in the Roman Missal itself this was never attempted till the Council of Trent. The first printed Roman Missal, for instance, that of 1474, has actually *fewer* rubrics than the Prayer Book. Even in the Consecration at the Eucharist the rubrics are fewer; they consist merely of these words: "Here he takes the host into his hands saying. He puts down the host, and raises the chalice saying. Here he puts down the chalice." And this is a very typical instance.

The first English Prayer Book (1549) was exactly like the Latin books which had preceded it, in not giving rubrics for more than the general outlines of the Service. Of course no one could have understood it who had not a knowledge of the traditional way of conducting Service. And equally, of course, every one would use the traditional way of conducting Service, except when the new book specified some variation. That was the main use of the rubrics of that book—To draw attention to the changes. The succeeding edition of the Prayer Book maintained the same method. In the last edition, when the Prayer Book took its present form, some new rubrics were added (the manual acts at the Consecration, for instance, had been previously left entirely to tradition)¹ but still the mediæval plan of having few directions was adhered to.

Let me give you some instances of this. There is no direction in the Communion Service for what is called a High Celebration, and the only hint that there may be even a server present is the direction that the Confession is to be said by "one of the Ministers." But we should make a grave mistake if we concluded that such a Service is unauthorised, for in the 24th Canon we find "the Principal Minister using a decent Cope, and being assisted with the Gospeller and Epistoler." And in the Ordering of Deacons at the end of the Prayer Book there

¹ As they were also in many of the old Missals.

is a rubric, "Then one of them appointed by the Bishop shall read the Gospel." Similarly, in the Consecration of Bishops, "another Bishop shall read the Epistle," and, "another Bishop shall read the Gospel."

The second instance is, perhaps, more interesting because the custom has never been authorised in any document since the Reformation, and yet has never passed out of use. It is the singing of "Glory be to thee, O LORD," before the Gospel, and we owe it to the Sarum Missal.

We do not realize how much is left to tradition. I fancy many people imagine there is a rubric somewhere to this effect, "The Minister shall put on his surplice and proceed to the reading-desk," or "The Minister shall go into the vestry and put on a black gown; he shall then re-enter the church and ascend the pulpit." There is, of course, nothing of the kind. In the Prayer Book the Priest is "discovered" in his stall, or at the altar, ready to begin the Service. How did he get there? Was there a solemn entry of the Ministers? Well, Canon 24 speaks of Gospeller and Epistoler, Canon 92 tells us of a Clerk of "competent skill in singing;" and if incense is used (as it lawfully may be) someone must carry it, and someone may also carry in the lights. How are all these people to get in? Who is to walk first? Well, all these questions should not puzzle us, any more than they would have puzzled the parsons who first used the Prayer Book; their answer would have been in the words of the Sarum rubric, "Then shall the Ministers approach the altar in order, first, the taperers walking side by side, then the thurifers, afterwards the sub-deacon [*i.e.* the epistoler], and then the deacon [*i.e.* the gospeller], after him the priest." But stay! There is the vergers; he is not in the Prayer Book, but none would deny his lawful existence, or that he walks at the head of a procession, as he still did in Cathedrals even in the most slovenly days. Where has that come from? We find the answer in the Salisbury

Processional: "First goes the minister carrying the verge in his hand to make way for the procession." But we have not done yet. Surpliced choirs, though not mentioned in the Prayer Book, have always existed with the highest sanction, and sometimes they walk also in procession. What is their place? You cannot answer without a knowledge of our old service books. A Roman Catholic would tell you that they walk before the celebrant; but he would be wrong so far as we are concerned, for in every English use they walk after him. Once more, before even we have reached the beginning of the Service, there is nothing to prevent the Bishop being present. What is he to do? He does always what the Sarum Processional tells him to do, and, unless he is celebrating, walks last of all. If you ask him why, he will probably say, because all the Bishops do; if you ask all the other Bishops, they will say because all the Bishops before them did; and so it would be, right back to the time of the first English Prayer Book; and then the Bishops would have pointed to their Salisbury or York Processionals.

Yet again, take the Litany. If you look at your books you will see that it just happens; it is being said—but where or by whom does not appear. Who is to sing it? The Prayer Book gives no direction till the Priest says the prayers at the end. How are we to know who begins? Well it so happens that certain Cathedrals have always maintained the custom of lay clerks singing the petitions of the Litany, and this custom they had originally from the pre-Reformation service books, when it was sung by clerks; and so we know that laymen as well as Priests may say or sing these petitions.

But we are not by any means left only to ancient tradition for our ceremonies. Besides those enshrined in the rubrics of the Prayer Book, there are many set forth in later pronouncements, and some which we should not

have known to have existed after the Reformation if diligent historians had not found them for us.¹

The First English Prayer Book helps us about some practices. It tells us, for instance, that signing oneself with the cross "may be used or left, as every man's devotion serveth without blame." The reign of Queen Elizabeth gives us our Collects, Epistles, and Gospels for Requiem Celebrations, as well as those Commemoration Services which are still used in some schools and colleges.

THE CANONS.

In the next reign (James I.) we find two customs started, for which there is still no authority whatever but Post-Reformation tradition—viz., standing to sing the Psalms, and facing East for the Creed. We also find Bishop Andrewes using the towel and basin at the Eucharist, and, of course, incense as well. In 1603 a code of Canons was issued which affect you every time you come to church. For instance, if a man came in to-day with his hat on, the churchwardens would tell him to take it off, and if he refused he would be indicted for brawling. On what authority? That of Canon 18.² There is no order to remove hats in the Prayer Book. The same Canon is the authority for bowing at the Holy Name. In some churches this is only done at the Creed, but the Canon orders it at all times—"when in time of Divine Service, the LORD JESUS shall be mentioned, due and lowly reverence shall be done by all persons present, *as it hath been accustomed*"—the same emphasis on tradition.

¹ A large collection of instances of Post-Reformation vestments, ornaments, and ceremonies in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries will be found in Mr. Staley's new edition of *Hierurgia Anglicana* (De la More Press).

² "No man shall cover his head in the church or chapel in the time of Divine Service."—*Canon 18.*

The same Canon orders that when prayers are read all members of the congregation "shall reverently kneel *upon their knees*"—a rule which, I fear, is still sometimes disobeyed. The 21st Canon settles another point by ordering that the celebrant at Holy Communion is always to receive the Sacrament himself. Yet another omission of the Prayer Book is supplied by the 55th, which gives a Bidding Prayer to be used before the sermon. The 24th and 25th Canons order copes to be worn in cathedrals, yet dignitaries who make no attempt to obey this law *have* been known to accuse other clergy of lawlessness.

Another of these Canons of 1603 orders the clergy to wear their cassocks and gowns in the streets; another enforces the use of the hood with the surplice, a matter which in the First Prayer Book had been optional, and provides for the tippet, that is to say, the black scarf.

To the 81st Canon we owe it that our fonts are of stone, and set, as the Canon says, "in the ancient usual places." If it were not for the 83rd, we need have no pulpits; alms-boxes and baptismal registers are due to the 84th and 70th, and the 82nd orders all altars to be covered with frontals. But such things as these are only of interest as illustrating the Ornaments Rubric, which covers them all.

The 7th Canon of 1640 inculcates the practice of bowing to the altar:—"We think it very meet and behoveful, and heartily commend it to all good and well-affected people, members of this Church, that they be ready to tender unto the LORD the said acknowledgment, by doing reverence and obeisance, both at their coming in and going out of the said churches, chancels, or chapels, according to the most ancient custom of the primitive Church in the purest times, and of this Church also for many years of the reign of Queen Elizabeth." Notice again that it is custom and tradition that is relied upon.

THE BISHOPS.

At the Savoy Conference in 1661 the Bishops give us some useful principles, as that the Minister is to turn to the people when he "speaks to them, as in Lessons, Absolution, and Benedictions:" but that "when he speaks for them to GOD, it is fit that they should all turn another way, as the ancient Church ever did," they say,¹ again appealing to tradition: and also we find hidden away here the final authority for the alternate recitation of the Psalms;—² the Prayer Book gives no direction as to how they are to be said; the Priest might say every verse by himself, were it not for the tradition here given.

Thus, you see, a great deal of our ordinary Church of England ceremonial is found, not in the Prayer Book, but in other authorities. There could not be room in the Prayer Book for every little point, and so we are referred to sound Church tradition.

The eighteenth century was a time of great deadness, yet on special occasions the half-forgotten traditions of the Church were witnessed to by the Bishops. At coronations, for instance, the Eucharist was celebrated properly. Non-communicating attendance was actually enforced on these occasions, as you may have noticed in reading the accounts of the Coronation of King Edward VII.

In recent years the Bishops have helped us by considering several disputed points. In 1890, for instance, the Archbishop of Canterbury pronounced judgment on the Lincoln case. Relying solely on tradition, the judgment proved the lawfulness of the two altar lights, it declared the mixed chalice to be not only lawful but necessary, if mixed at the beginning of the Service. It declared also the lawfulness of the Eastward Position, and of the singing of *Agnus Dei* at the Communion.

¹ Cardwell's *Conferences*, p. 353.

² *Ibid.* p. 338.

In 1899 the Archbishops gave their opinions on the subject of incense, and pronounced it to be lawful; ¹ and though they considered that one particular way of using it (the "liturgical" way) was not lawful, they left the Bishops to enforce the opinion or not as they pleased. ² Therefore you must not jump to the conclusion that a church is "lawless" because incense is used in it.

There are other points which sometimes are misunderstood. Let me end with one of them—the use of unleavened wafer-bread for the LORD'S Supper. Now that very name, "the LORD'S Supper," reminds us that our LORD Himself used unleavened bread at the Supper, if it took place during the Passover when leaven was not allowed. Therefore wafer-bread is Scriptural; and it is also most convenient to use, as it does not get stale, nor crumble, nor does it require to be cut up before use. But as some people were prejudiced against it, the rubric at the end of the Communion Service allows the use of common bread in such cases, by the words "it shall suffice." Let me conclude by quoting the words of Archbishop Temple on the subject:

"The rubric concerning the bread to be used at Holy Communion is somewhat ambiguous. At the time when it was inserted there were a great number who preferred ordinary bread; but there were also a great number, in all probability the majority, who preferred the old practice, sanctioned by the First Prayer

¹ The Archbishops thought the *liturgical use* of incense was unlawful; but they added that "side by side with the liturgical use, *another use* had always been common, which it was not the intention of the rulers or of the legislature to interfere with. There was nothing to prevent the use of incense for the purpose of sweetening the atmosphere of a church wherever and whenever such sweetening is needed."—*The Archbishops on Incense*, pp. 9-10.

² "It is left for the Bishops to call upon the clergy to take this opinion, but if they do not choose to act in this way, that, of course, would set the clergy in that diocese perfectly free from obedience to that opinion."—Archbishop Temple in *The Times*, Jan 20, 1900.

Book, and used unleavened bread. Of course there was much disputing. To put an end to the dispute this rubric was drawn up. Now this rubric does not say that either practice was henceforth to prevail, but simply that the new practice was to suffice. In other words, it did not say that henceforth ordinary bread was to be used, but that ordinary bread was to be allowed."

This matter of wafer-bread is typical of many other things which people sometimes attack simply through ignorance. We cannot always help being ignorant, but at least we can refrain from ignorant condemnation of others. Knowledge and wisdom are necessary if we would hope to deal justly with other people, and come to a right judgement ourselves,—knowledge, wisdom, and "above all things charity."

We do indeed suffer from lawlessness in the Church of England, but the lawlessness is very different from that which many people imagine. There is a widespread neglect of duty both among laymen and clergy; and the Church will never again become the power in the land which once she was, in more loyal days long past, till we are faithful to her commands. That is a more important subject than ceremonial; and I have left its consideration to another pamphlet, "Loyalty to the Prayer Book," where in no party spirit I have tried to point out how splendid a Christian ideal is set before us, and how grievously unfaithful to it we have been.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

- The Parson's Handbook.** For Parsons and others, on the Management of the Parish Church and its Services. Eighth Edition. Oxford University Press. 6s.
- The Server's Handbook.** For Parish Clerks and Servers. Fourth Edition. Oxford University Press. 1s.
- The English Liturgy, with additional Collects, Epistles and Gospels for the Black Letter Days, and for special occasions.** An Altar Book by the Revs. Percy Dearmer, W. H. Frere, and the Ven. S. M. Taylor, with a Preface by the Bishop of Winchester. Third Edition. Rivingtons. 2 guineas, in sheets.
- The Sanctuary.** A Book for Communicants, with Private Devotions, etc. Fourth Edition. Rivingtons. 7d., 1s., 1s. 4d., 2s. 6d.; with Prayer Book, 1s. 6d., 2s., 3s. 6d.
- The Ornaments of the Ministers.** With 41 Plates and 34 Figures. Second Edition. Mowbrays, 1908. 1s. 6d.
- Body and Soul: An Enquiry into the effect of Religion upon Health, with a description of Christian Works of Healing from the New Testament to the Present Day.** 9th impression. Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, 1909. 2s. 6d.
- Everyman's History of the English Church.** A popular History, copiously illustrated. Mowbrays, 1909. 1s., 1s. 6d., and 2s.
- Reunion and Rome.** With Prefatory Letter by his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury. Mowbrays, 1910. 1s., and 1s. 6d.
- The Dragon of Wessex.** A Historical Novel of the Days of Alfred. Mowbrays, 1911. 3s. 6d.
- Everyman's History of the Prayer Book.** With 99 Illustrations. Mowbrays, 1912. 1s. 6d., and 2s.
- Etc., etc.
-

Also the following pamphlets:—

- Is "Ritual" Right?** Mowbrays. 2d. In cloth boards, 6d.
- Loyalty to the Prayer Book.** Mowbrays. 2d.
- The Training of a Christian according to the Prayer Book and Canons.** Mowbrays. 2d.
- The Communion of Saints.** Mowbrays. 2d. In cloth, 6d.
- The Prayer Book: What it is, and how we should use it.** Third Edition. Mowbrays. 1d. Illustrated Edition, 6d.
- The Church and Social Questions.** Mowbrays. 1d.
- The Social Teaching of the Church Catechism.** Mowbrays. 1d.
- The Inner Health Movement.** Mowbrays. 1d.
- Etc., etc.

Also the following forms of service:—*Five Forms for Bidding Prayer*, Mowbrays, 3d. *A Form for Unction and the Laying-on of Hands*, Mowbrays, 3d. *A Litany of Labour*, Mowbrays, ½d. *A Memorial Service*, Mowbrays, 3d.

100

The first part of the book is devoted to a general survey of the history of the world from the beginning of time to the present day. The author discusses the various stages of human civilization, from the primitive state of nature to the development of modern societies. He traces the progress of science, art, and industry, and examines the influence of these factors on the course of human events. The second part of the book is a detailed account of the history of the United States, from the discovery of the continent to the present day. The author describes the struggles of the early settlers, the growth of the nation, and the various conflicts that have shaped its destiny. He also discusses the political and social changes that have taken place in the United States since the American Revolution.

The third part of the book is a study of the present state of the world, and a forecast of the future. The author examines the current trends in international relations, and discusses the challenges that face the world today. He also considers the role of the United States in the world, and offers his views on the course that the nation should follow in the future. The book is written in a clear and concise style, and is well illustrated with maps and diagrams. It is a valuable work for anyone who is interested in the history and future of the world.

The author of this book is a distinguished scholar and writer, and his work is highly respected. He has written many books on history and politics, and his views are widely known. This book is a masterpiece of historical writing, and it is a pleasure to read it. The author's knowledge of the subject is extensive, and his writing is both informative and engaging. This book is a must-read for anyone who is interested in the history of the world and the United States.

The book is published by the University of Chicago Press, and is available in both hardcover and paperback editions. It is a classic work of history, and it is a valuable addition to any library. The book is well illustrated with maps and diagrams, and it is a pleasure to read it. The author's knowledge of the subject is extensive, and his writing is both informative and engaging. This book is a must-read for anyone who is interested in the history of the world and the United States.

BX
5123
.D43
1914

DEARMER
IS "RITUAL"RI

11

BX
5123
.D43
1914

