





LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS





I should be glad to find favour with them; but—I do not
now for the first time, *multo malo vos salvos esse.*

Believe me, dear ———,

Ever yours truly,

“June 13, 1874.”

“SELBORNE”

In this passage I believe there is somewhat of truth. I must myself plead guilty to having entertained some hope of honesty and truthfulness in a man who protests against the “tampering with the text of hymns;”¹ but this man is, it seems, will have the decrees of the final court of appeal repudiated and forged, and to place further power in the hands of one who was *particeps criminis* in the acts. Again, a man who is reported to have done the highest honour attainable in his profession for his conscience’s sake, is a person that one hopes to be able to respect to the close of his life. From such a quarter special pleading and unjust accusation, and special pleading which would be unnecessary in a good cause, are very disappointing. It makes me lay down one’s pen and ask with the Psalmist *ostendit nobis bona?*

I am, my Lord,

Your Lordship’s obedient

Servant and Fellow-Labourer

B. M. P.

RITUALISM A MISNOMER.

“RITUALISM” is a misnomer;—it is “Sacramentalism” that is really attacked;—and only Ritualism so far as it tends to restore the Holy Eucharist to the chief and central place in Christian worship;—that place which it held throughout the whole Church for fifteen hundred years, but from which it has been dethroned in the Church of England for the last three hundred.

It is not Ritualism, as such, that is attacked;—for some Ritual is necessary in Public Worship and in social life to save us from brutality;—shaking the hand (a ridiculous thing in itself) is the Ritual expression of friendship; bowing the head, of respect; the Jew and the Quaker who keep their hats on in public worship are as much “Ritualists” in doing so, as the Churchman and Dissenter who take theirs off; it is not even the affectations of a petty mannerism, or mere excess that is attacked, for there will always be extremes; the *petit maître* and the *sans culotte* will always be mutually provocative of each other, each cari-

capturing the truth he holds, and thereby repelling the other from it. It is not "Ritualism" as such, it is not kneeling, bowing the head, taking off the hat, or wearing a surplice, that is now attacked, —but only the Ritual of the Altar, in which four things are just now prominent, viz., Lights, Incense, Vestments, and the position of the Celebrant.

Are these four things then lawful (though unusual) in the Church of England? and, if lawful, is their restoration right and desirable in itself, due consideration being shown to the circumstances of time and place, in such restoration? I think both of these questions may be fairly and honestly answered in the affirmative.

To leave, however, the question of the Celebrant's position for the present, as not coming under the "Ornament" Rubric: of the other three, Lights, Incense, and Vestments, Vestments stand on one ground, Lights and Incense on another, slightly, but only slightly, different.

The Rubric says, "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 Edward the Sixth." This "authority of Parliament" was finally ruled in the S. Barnabas case to mean an Act of Parliament passed in the second year of Edward VI.,



—which Act authorised the use of all Ornaments used under Edward's First Book; and in that First Book the Eucharistic Vestments are distinctly named: if, therefore, that Judgment is a right one (and it certainly seems fair and true) then the Eucharistic Vestments are absolutely and unquestionably lawful; and if they are so, I do think it most unfair that clergymen who have adopted them in consequence of that Judgment should now be found fault with for doing so.

But further still. If justice is to be done, this Act of Parliament must surely be interpreted on the same recognised legal principles as all other Acts,—i.e. as not interfering with any previous Parliamentary authority on the same subject, except only so far as it *expressly repeals* it, or does so by *direct, necessary implication*. I have been told, on very high legal authority, that this is a well-known principle amongst lawyers: if therefore it is set aside in the present case only, a strong sense of injustice will certainly be felt.

Let me give an illustration of this. Suppose an Act had been passed providing for the maintenance of Turnpike Roads in the last year of George III.; and another Act in the reign of George IV.; and another in the reign of William IV.; and then finally one in the reign of Victoria, saying, "Turnpike roads shall be maintained as provided by authority of Parliament in the reign of George III.;" this would throw us back at

once to the Act of the last year of George III., overleaping all intermediate Acts; but it would not interfere with any authority of Parliament on the subject *previous* to that Act, except so far only as that Act itself did so, either “*expressly, or by direct necessary implication.*”

Now if the Act of the second year of Edward VI. is thus interpreted, it must be shown with respect to Lights and Incense, that it either expressly forbids their use, or that it does so by direct necessary implication. Can either of these be shown? I think not.

Let us suppose the Minister at the Altar in albe and chasuble, which are expressly ordered, would not the use of Lights and of Incense, which always had been used, be taken for granted in that case, unless shown to be distinctly forbidden? Would not this assumption, as respects Lights at least, be greatly strengthened by the Candlesticks retained on the Altar,—retained to this day in cathedrals and college chapels? And does not the direction that, “the chancels shall remain as they have done in times past,” also favour the idea that the worship there conducted should “remain as in times past,” except where this was specially forbidden?

I say, then, that if the S. Barnabas Judgment is a sound and true one, the Eucharistic Vestments are distinctly ordered; and if the Act of the second year of Edward VI. is interpreted on

the same principle as all other Acts, Lights and Incense, the common accompaniment of Vestments, are lawful too.

That these things are "Popish" is not true, as any one may judge for himself by visiting the Greek Church in Welbeck Street, or that in London Wall;—they are Catholic, as distinguished from Roman Catholic, and on this ground alone the assumption would be that the Church of England does not forbid them. The evils of the Roman Catholic Church are: Compulsory Confession, an encroachment on the liberty of the laity; Compulsory Celibacy, a similar encroachment on the clergy; Indulgences; Service in Latin; miraculous images; and other such things. But surely we need not mix up with these evils, from which we are happily free, those outward marks of honour to CHRIST'S ordinance, which have been in use throughout the *whole* Church, and are still "retained and in use" in the Greek as well as in the Roman.

Lights, Incense, and Vestments, were ordained by God Himself for the Tabernacle and Temple worship;—and that worship was not a copy of Paganism, (the converse of this was the case,) but of the worship of heaven itself;—"See thou make all things according to the pattern showed to thee in the mount;"—that worship of which S. John speaks in the Book of Revelation, "the new song," (the choral service;) "the white robes

and crowns of gold," (the vestments;) "the angel with the golden censer," (incense;) "the seven lamps of fire before the throne of God," (the altar lights;)—can these things be wrong in themselves? Was the Church Catholic guided by a low and sensual Paganising instinct, or by a high and heavenly one, in fashioning its worship here on earth after the worship of heaven itself, as revealed by S. John? Will the Church of England be true or untrue to its own principles in restoring, along with a fuller perception of Catholic faith, a fuller use also of Catholic Worship?

But how then have these things fallen out of use in England,—Vestments being only used at coronations, Altar candles, and they too unlighted, having been retained in cathedrals and college chapels almost exclusively?

The answer is plain. The Rubric which forbids a celebration of the Sacrament unless a certain number communicate with the Priest, at once made the celebration of the Sacrament *occasional* only, and this for the first time in the history of the Church. Henceforward the service generally ended with the sermon: and the minister would scarce think it worth while to put on Cope or Vestment, (though distinctly ordered to do so,) simply to read the Ten Commandments in; and having thus got accustomed to read the first part of the Communion Service in a surplice, when there was no celebration, he would make no change

in that respect when there was ; and would continue probably the use of the Surplice throughout the latter part as well as the former. The same would follow with Lights ; the same with Incense ; the same with Choral Service, which would seem out of place in an almost empty church. Who can remember hearing the Nicene Creed, Sanctus, and Gloria in Excelsis sung till the late restoration of these things, plainly sanctioned as they are by the letter of the present Rubric? The practice of the Church of England has fallen much below its theory in these things, and it is that theory which we now desire to restore in practice, and to bring our Eucharistic Worship into harmony with that of the whole Church in all ages and places.

We believe these things to be "lawful and right" and desirable in themselves. We wish for a fair and true judgment in the matter,—and if this is not given, if judgment is wrested to please a popular cry, or to stereotype an ill-founded custom, then the respect hitherto felt for our courts of law will be seriously shaken,—and it will be said, "Judges are impartial only where they are disinterested, and in these matters they have their prejudice, and their prejudice has biased their judgment."

EDWARD STUART.

Munster Square, Regent's Park.

THE PEW SYSTEM. 3d.

SACRAMENTAL WORSHIP. (Lights, Incense, Vestments.) 6d.

LOW MASSES. 6d.

These three, by the Rev. E. STUART, are published by Palmer, 32, Little Queen Street, Lincoln's Inn Fields.

THE ASSYRIAN CHRISTIANS

REPORT OF A JOURNEY,

UNDERTAKEN BY DESIRE OF

HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

AND

HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK,

TO THE

Christians in Koordistan and Oroomiah.

BY THE

REV. EDWARD L. CUTTS, B.A.,

VICAR OF HOLY TRINITY, HAVERSTOCK HILL, LONDON.

LONDON :

PRINTED BY R. CLAY, SONS, AND TAYLOR,

BREAD STREET HILL, QUEEN VICTORIA STREET.

1877.









